

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

=====

ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,

Applicant,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

=====

**ON APPLICATION TO THE HONORABLE ELENA KAGAN,  
JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT,  
FOR BAIL/RELEASE PENDING TRIAL**

**APPENDIX**

---

Stephen R. Hormel  
Hormel Law Office LLC  
17722 E. Sprague Avenue  
Spokane Valley, WA 99016  
Telephone: (509) 926-5177

Attorney for Applicant  
Alma Rosa Sanchez

## Appendix Table of Contents

1.	Ninth Circuit Order Affirming Detention . . . . .	1
2.	District Court’s Order Denying Motion for Review of Magistrates Order of Detention . .	3
3.	Magistrate’s Order Granting United State’s Motion for Detention . . . . .	12
4.	Reporter’s Transcript of Detention Appeal Hearing. . . . .	23
5.	Reporter’s Transcript of Detention Hearing . . . . .	57
6.	Indictment . . . . .	79
7.	18 U.S.C. § 3142 - Bail Reform Act. . . . .	89
8.	Pretrial Services Report ( <b>Under Seal</b> ) . . . . .	97

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUN 22 2026

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 26-2249

D.C. No.

4:26-cr-06013-MKD-6

Eastern District of Washington,  
Richland

ORDER

Before: FRIEDLAND, R. NELSON, and BADE, Circuit Judges.

In this appeal from the district court’s pretrial detention order, we have jurisdiction under 18 U.S.C. § 3145(c) and 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review for clear error the district court’s factual findings concerning risk of flight and danger to the community. *United States v. Hir*, 517 F.3d 1081, 1086 (9th Cir. 2008). “[W]hether the district court’s factual determinations justify the pretrial detention order is reviewed de novo.” *Id.* at 1086-87.

The district court did not clearly err in finding, by a preponderance of the evidence, that appellant poses a risk of flight and that “no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the [defendant’s] appearance.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e); *United States v. Motamedi*, 767 F.2d 1403, 1407 (9th Cir. 1985). It also did not clearly err in finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that appellant poses a danger to the community and that “no condition or combination of

conditions will reasonably assure ... the safety of ... the community.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(1), (f)(2). These findings justify the pretrial detention order.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 12) to correct the record on appeal is denied.

The motion (Docket Entry No. 13) to file the pretrial services report under seal is granted. The clerk will file publicly the motion to seal at Docket Entry No. 13.1, and will maintain under seal the report at Docket Entry Nos. 13.2 and 15.

**AFFIRMED.**

FILED IN THE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

**Apr 16, 2026**

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ (6),

Defendant.

No. 4:26-CR-06013-MKD-6

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
REVIEW OF MAGISTRATE’S  
ORDER OF DETENTION

**ECF No. 93**

Before the Court is Defendant Alma Rosa Sanchez’s (6) Motion for Review of Magistrate’s Order of Detention. ECF No. 93. On April 10, 2026, the Court held a hearing on the motion. ECF No. 117. Defendant Sanchez (6) appeared in custody and was represented by Stephen Hormel. AUSA Brandon Pang represented the United States.

The Court has heard from the parties, reviewed the record, and is fully informed. For the reasons stated in the Magistrate Judge’s Order of Detention, ECF No. 96, stated on the record at the April 10, 2026, hearing, and supplemented by the reasons set forth below, the Court denies the motion.

**BACKGROUND**

Defendant Sanchez (6) is charged with one count of Conspiracy to Distribute Fentanyl and Methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(vi), 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii) and 846.

On March 24, 2026, the United States moved for detention. ECF No. 58. On March 26, 2026, the United States Magistrate Judge held a detention hearing and granted the United States’ Motion for Detention. ECF No. 85; ECF No. 96. Defendant Sanchez (6) appealed the United States Magistrate Judge’s decision to the undersigned District Judge. ECF No. 93.

**LEGAL STANDARD**

The Court’s review of a detention order under 18 U.S.C. § 3145(a) is de novo. *See United States v. Koenig*, 912 F.2d 1190, 1191 (9th Cir. 1990).

The Court shall order the defendant to be detained if the United States shows either (1) by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant will not appear as required, or (2) by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant poses a risk to the safety of any other person and the community. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f); *United States v. Gebro*, 948 F.2d 1118, 1121 (9th Cir. 1991) (citation omitted). The Court considers four factors in determining whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure a defendant’s appearance as required and the safety of any other person and the community: (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense,

1 (2) the weight of the evidence against the defendant, (3) the defendant’s history  
2 and characteristics, and (4) the nature and seriousness of the danger to any persons  
3 or the community that would be posed by the defendant’s release. 18 U.S.C. §  
4 3142(g).

5 Section 3142(e)(3) imposes a presumption of detention if there is probable  
6 cause that a defendant committed certain offenses. One of those categories of  
7 offenses is those where “a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is  
8 prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.).”  
9 § 3142(e)(3)(A). In such cases, the Court presumes “that no condition or  
10 combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the [defendant]  
11 as required and the safety of the community.” *Id.* The presumption is rebuttable  
12 by the defendant. *Id.*

### 13 DISCUSSION

14 The United States contends that all four factors weigh in favor of detention.  
15 The Court considers the relevant factors in turn.

16 First, the nature and circumstances of the offense weigh in favor of  
17 detention. Defendant Sanchez (6) is charged with Conspiracy to Distribute 400  
18 Grams or More of Fentanyl and 500 Grams or More of Methamphetamine, in  
19 violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846. ECF No. 12. Due to the nature of the charge, there  
20 is a rebuttable presumption of detention in this case. Moreover, the charged

1 offense carries a mandatory minimum sentence of ten years of imprisonment and a  
2 potential advisory guideline range of 292 to 365 months.

3 The United States alleges that law enforcement executed a search warrant at  
4 Defendant Sanchez's (6) home and seized over 200 pounds of methamphetamine,  
5 150 pounds of fentanyl, 16 firearms, and \$2.2 million in cash. This was alleged to  
6 have been the largest seizure of drugs, guns, and cash in this District. The quantity  
7 of narcotics, firearms, and cash found at Defendant Sanchez's (6) house poses a  
8 significant danger to the community. The seizures are indicative of a significant  
9 operation and access to funds. The United States has charged a conspiracy  
10 involving Defendant's brother Amador Sanchez (1), another brother Sergio  
11 Sanchez Mendoza (2), Eliodoro Tapia (3), Nika Eloisa Salazar (4), and Cassandra  
12 Rachel Pollard (5). Significantly, Defendant Sanchez's (6) brother, Amador  
13 Sanchez (1), has previously been convicted multiple times for drug trafficking and  
14 was on federal supervised release in relation to his most recent conviction at the  
15 time the seizure took place. Defendant Sanchez (6) rented a room in her house to  
16 Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) where he stored items despite Amado Sanchez (1)  
17 reporting to the Probation Office that he was living at their other sister's house.  
18 The United States asserts that Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) would frequent  
19 Defendant Sanchez's (6) house, at all hours of the day, immediately before  
20 proceeding to conduct drug transactions and remove and transport items.

1 Defendant Sanchez's (6) behavior in providing Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) a  
2 space to store items at a location other than where his probation officer believed he  
3 lived is indicative of helping her brother avoid the detection of probation and what  
4 they might discover during their home visits. Therefore, the overall nature and  
5 circumstances of the offense weigh in favor of detention.

6 Second, the weight of the evidence also weighs in favor of detention. The  
7 United States' allegations, as outlined above, appear strong for the purposes of this  
8 detention motion. The Court recognizes that Defendant's alleged role is less  
9 significant than that of her brother, but the weight of the evidence is strong, given  
10 the items alleged to have been seized from her home.

11 Third, Defendant Sanchez's (6) history and characteristics on balance weigh  
12 in favor of detention. Although Defendant Sanchez's (6) lack of criminal history  
13 and ties to the community weigh in favor of release, her ties to Mexico concern the  
14 Court. She was born in Mexico. She is a naturalized United States citizen. She  
15 has family in Mexico and has visited Mexico, including for extended stays (for  
16 example, for 6 months in 2011). Her husband does not have legal status in the  
17 United States. Defendant Sanchez (6) is charged with serious allegations carrying  
18 a mandatory minimum of ten years imprisonment and facing a potential advisory  
19  
20

1 guideline range of more than 20 years of imprisonment.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, Defendant  
2 Sanchez (6) has incentive to flee the country to avoid prosecution. Defendant  
3 Sanchez’s (6) family members who offered letters in support of her release appear  
4 to be linked to, although not charged in, the conspiracy or have otherwise provided  
5 inaccurate information to the Court. For example, Defendant Sanchez (6)’s sister,  
6 Bertha Sanchez, submitted a letter in support of Defendant Sanchez (6)’s release.  
7 ECF No. 86 at 4.<sup>2</sup> Bertha Sanchez offered to provide Defendant Sanchez (6) a  
8 stable residence during pretrial release and assured the Court she would be “fully  
9 committed to ensuring that [she] follows all rules and obligations.” ECF No. 86 at  
10 4. However, Bertha Sanchez has repeatedly provided inaccurate and/or false  
11 information to Defendant Amador Sanchez (1)’s supervising probation officer.  
12 Bertha Sanchez represented that Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) was residing at a  
13 home she owns while he was on supervision, when it has since been discovered

---

15 <sup>1</sup> The Court notes that her brother, Defendant Amador Sanchez (1), recently  
16 completed a 15-year federal sentence for drug trafficking, so she is aware of the  
17 realistic potential of a significant sentence for federal drug trafficking charges.

18 <sup>2</sup> The Court notes the letter was submitted in Defendant Sanchez (6)’s case and stated  
19 Rosa (the middle name of Defendant Sanchez (6)), but refers to “he” instead of  
20 “she.” ECF No. 86 at 4.

1 that he was not living at that location. Moreover, law enforcement alleges that at  
2 least two of the vehicles Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) drove during the drug  
3 transactions were registered to Bertha Sanchez. Maria, one of the other sisters who  
4 provided a letter in support of Defendant's release, ECF No. 86 at 1, is also alleged  
5 to own another vehicle that Defendant Amador Sanchez (1) was utilizing to deliver  
6 controlled substances. Given the strong reason to believe that Bertha Sanchez was  
7 providing inaccurate information to the United States Probation Officer regarding  
8 someone on supervision (*i.e.*, their brother and a codefendant in this case), she is  
9 not a reliable source of information or an appropriate person to monitor her sister  
10 while on pretrial release. The Court has significant concerns about the information  
11 provided by Defendant Sanchez (6)'s and her family in support of her release.

12 Fourth, the nature and seriousness of the danger to any persons or the  
13 community that would be posed by Defendant's release weighs in favor of  
14 detention. The allegations in this case are very serious, and the quantity of  
15 controlled substances, cash, and firearms found inside Defendant Sanchez's (6)  
16 home creates a significant risk of danger to the community.

17 The Court has considered the proposed alternatives, including alternative  
18 addresses, discussed above, and electronic monitoring. However, in the  
19 undersigned's significant history with imposing pretrial supervision conditions, the  
20 Court finds electronic monitoring is not an effective tool to address risk of flight.

1 When one chooses to flee, the individual removes the bracelet and the ability to  
2 track whereabouts ceases. Although the Probation Office receives notification, in  
3 practice, by the time a warrant can be issued, and the United States Marshals  
4 Deputies be given the warrant, briefed, and conduct necessary investigative  
5 research, and subject to their availability, sufficient time has passed minimizing the  
6 ability to locate the individual. Electronic monitoring is more effective when  
7 addressing danger to the community or monitoring an individual's whereabouts to  
8 ensure staying away from certain prohibited locations or people.

9 Upon de novo review, and considering the presumption of detention, the  
10 Court finds that the United States has shown by the preponderance of the evidence  
11 that there are no conditions that will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as  
12 required and by clear and convincing evidence that there are no conditions that will  
13 assure the safety of the community, as required by 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f).

14  
15 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

- 16 1. Defendant Alma Rosa Sanchez's (6) Motion for Review of  
17 Magistrate's Order of Detention, **ECF No. 93**, is **DENIED**.



FILED IN THE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Mar 31, 2026

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 4:26-CR-06013-MKD-6

2 Plaintiff,

ORDER GRANTING THE UNITED STATES' MOTION FOR DETENTION

3 v.

4 ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,

ECF No. 58

5 Defendant.

6  
7  
8 On Thursday, March 26, 2026, the Court conducted a hearing on the United  
9 States' Motion for Detention (ECF No. 58). Defendant was represented by court-  
10 appointed attorney Stephen Hormel. Assistant United States Attorney Laurel  
11 Holland represented the United States.

12 The Court has considered the Indictment (ECF No. 12), the Pretrial Services  
13 Report (ECF No. 54), the Supplemental Pretrial Services Report (ECF No. 82),  
14 Defendant's Letters of Support (ECF No. 86), and the arguments of counsel.

15 The issue of pretrial release is governed by 18 U.S.C. § 3142. Under that  
16 statute, a judicial officer shall order that a defendant awaiting trial be (1) "released  
17 on personal recognizance or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond,"  
18 (2) "released on a condition or combination of conditions," or (3) detained pending  
19 trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(a). The judicial officer shall conduct a detention hearing to  
20 determine "whether any condition or combination of conditions set forth in

1 [§ 3142(c)] will reasonably assure the appearance of such person as required and  
2 the safety of any other person and the community.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). The  
3 judicial officer shall order the defendant be detained if the United States shows  
4 either (1) by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant will not appear as  
5 required, or (2) by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant poses a risk to  
6 the safety of any other person and the community. *Id.*; *United States v. Gebro*, 948  
7 F.2d 1118, 1121 (9th Cir. 1991) (“On a motion for pretrial detention, the  
8 government bears the burden of showing by a preponderance of the evidence that  
9 the defendant poses a flight risk, and by clear and convincing evidence that the  
10 defendant poses a danger to the community.”).

11 Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g), the Court must consider the nature and  
12 circumstances of the offense charged, the weight of the evidence against the  
13 Defendant, as well as Defendant’s history and characteristics, including character,  
14 physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, financial resources, length  
15 of residence in the community, community ties, past conduct and history relating  
16 to alcohol and drug abuse, and also criminal history, record concerning appearance  
17 at court proceedings, whether Defendant was under supervision at the time of the  
18 alleged offense, and the nature and seriousness of the danger to the community  
19 posed by Defendant’s release.

20 The United States contended that if released, Defendant would present both

1 a risk of nonappearance and a danger to the safety of the community. ECF No. 58.  
2 Defendant, through counsel, contended there are conditions the Court could  
3 impose that would reasonably assure Defendant’s appearance as required and the  
4 safety of the community if released.

5 Section 3142(e)(3) imposes a presumption of detention if there is probable  
6 cause that a defendant committed certain offenses. As relevant here, one of those  
7 categories of offenses is those where “a maximum term of imprisonment of 10  
8 years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et  
9 seq.)” § 3142(e)(3)(A). In such a presumption case, the Court presumes “that no  
10 condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of  
11 the [defendant] as required and the safety of the community.” *Id.* However, the  
12 presumption is rebuttable by the defendant. *Id.* Here, the rebuttable presumption  
13 applies because Defendant has been charged with Conspiracy to Distribute 400  
14 Grams or More of Fentanyl and 500 Grams or More of Methamphetamine, in  
15 violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846, *see* ECF No. 12, which is an offense in the  
16 Controlled Substances Act with a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or  
17 more, *see* § 3142(e)(3)(A).

18 Although the presumption of detention shifts the burden of production to  
19 Defendant, the ultimate burden of persuasion on Defendant’s risk of  
20 nonappearance and danger to the community remains with the United States.

1 *United States v. Hir*, 517 F.3d 1081, 1086 (9th Cir. 2008). When a defendant  
2 presents evidence to rebut the presumption arising under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3),  
3 the presumption itself still mitigates against the defendant’s release, and is “to be  
4 weighed along with other evidence relevant to factors listed in § 3142(g).” *Id.*  
5 (quoting *United States v. Dominguez*, 783 F.2d 702, 707 (7th Cir. 1986)).

6 The Court has evaluated the four factors outlined in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) to  
7 determine whether there are conditions of release that would reasonably assure  
8 Defendant’s appearance in court and the safety of the community: (1) the nature  
9 and circumstances of the offense; (2) the weight of evidence against Defendant;  
10 (3) the history and characteristics of Defendant; and (4) the nature and seriousness  
11 of the danger Defendant would present to the community if released.

12 As to the first factor—the nature and circumstances of the offense—  
13 Defendant is charged with Conspiracy to Distribute 400 Grams or More of  
14 Fentanyl and 500 Grams or More of Methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C.  
15 § 846. ECF No. 12. As noted above, due to the nature of this charge, there is a  
16 rebuttable presumption of detention in this case. Additionally, the United States’  
17 proffer as to the underlying circumstances of the offense is profoundly concerning.

18 The United States alleged that 200 pounds of methamphetamine, 150 pounds  
19 of fentanyl, 2.2 million dollars in cash, and 16 firearms were found inside a locked  
20 bedroom inside Defendant’s residence. The United States asserted that

1 Defendant's brother, co-defendant Amador Sanchez Mendoza, would frequent the  
2 residence at all hours of the day, leave with black WinCo bags, and then conduct  
3 drug transactions immediately thereafter. The United States noted that although  
4 Amador Sanchez Mendoza had a house of his own, Defendant asserted she rented  
5 the locked bedroom in her home to him. Additionally, the United States alleged  
6 that an unloaded firearm was found in the basement of Defendant's home, outside  
7 of the locked bedroom. Finally, the United States asserted that at least two of  
8 Defendant's juvenile children resided in the home with Defendant, as well as  
9 Defendant's adult son with mental health issues who resided in the basement of the  
10 home.

11 The United States argued that the foregoing evidence demonstrates  
12 Defendant was a participant in the drug conspiracy, or at the bare minimum,  
13 Defendant had knowledge of her brother's activities and the contents of her own  
14 home. The United States argued that the fact that Amador Sanchez Mendoza  
15 recently finished a fifteen-year sentence for a drug trafficking offense was further  
16 proof that Defendant must have had, at the very least, knowledge of her brother's  
17 activities in her home. Additionally, the United States asserted that Defendant's  
18 lack of response when questioned by law enforcement about her brother's visits to  
19 her home was telling.

20 Quantity has a quality all its own. The 200 pounds of methamphetamine,

1 150 pounds of fentanyl, 2.2 million dollars in cash, and 16 firearms evidence an  
2 extremely large drug distribution conspiracy. The idea that Defendant would have  
3 had no idea of her brother's actions inside her home, despite both the quantity of  
4 drugs, money, and firearms in her home, as well as her brother's behavior in and  
5 out of the home, is absurd. Defendant's reaction when questioned by law  
6 enforcement about her brother's behavior at her home is telling. Therefore, the  
7 nature and circumstances of the offense weigh in favor of detention.

8 As to the second factor, the weight of the evidence is the least important  
9 factor, and Defendant is entitled to a presumption of innocence. *United States v.*  
10 *Motamedi*, 767 F.2d 1403, 1407 (9th Cir. 1985). However, the United States'  
11 proffer, as described above, appears strong for the purposes of this detention  
12 motion. Therefore, this factor weighs in favor of detention.

13 As to the third factor—Defendant's history and characteristics—Defendant's  
14 time in the community, contacts in the community, and lack of criminal history  
15 auger in favor of release. Defendant has no criminal history, and she works as a  
16 caregiver for her mother, adult son, and another individual. ECF No. 82.  
17 Defendant has resided in the community nearly her entire life, *id.*, and she has  
18 substantial ties to the community. Her husband and five children live with her in  
19 the community. *Id.* Additionally, Defendant has the support of other family and  
20

1 community members. *See* ECF No. 86. Thus, Defendant's family and obligations  
2 are in the community, and these characteristics weigh in favor of release.

3 However, Defendant also has characteristics that weigh in favor of detention  
4 due to her risk of fleeing to avoid prosecution and thus failing to appear for court.

5 First, Defendant's husband does not have legal status in the United States. Second,

6 Defendant is charged with serious allegations with a mandatory minimum term of

7 at least ten years of imprisonment. Given the seriousness of the allegations, the

8 quantity of the drugs and cash seized by the government, the term of imprisonment

9 Defendant is faced with, and her husband's lack of legal status, Defendant has

10 great incentive to flee the country to avoid prosecution. That said, Defendant last

11 left the country in 2012. But Defendant, with no prior criminal history, has never

12 faced such serious and consequential allegations. Further incentive to flee if

13 released is again found in the quantity of controlled substances and money seized.

14 These millions of dollars and hundreds of pounds of controlled substances

15 belonged to someone. It is not reasonable to assume the charged parties had,

16 between them, the full ownership interest in these items. They will be missed.

17 Someone will want to be made whole for the loss. Given that Defendant is not in a

18 position to cover this loss, there is an incentive if released for Defendant to be

19 absent when the owner's representative comes calling. In sum, Defendant's

20

1 history and characteristics weigh in favor of detention due to her risk of  
2 nonappearance.

3 As to the fourth factor—the nature and seriousness of the danger Defendant  
4 would pose to the community if released—the allegations are extremely serious.  
5 The sheer quantity of the controlled substances, cash, and firearms found inside  
6 Defendant’s home create a profound risk of danger to the community. Therefore,  
7 this factor weighs in favor of detention.

8 In conclusion, the Court finds that Defendant has overcome the rebuttable  
9 presumption of detention in this matter. However, the presumption “is not erased”  
10 but instead becomes another factor to be weighed alongside the § 3142(g) factors.  
11 *Hir*, 517 F.3d at 1086. And upon considering these five factors, the Court finds  
12 that the United States has established by the required preponderance of evidence an  
13 absence of conditions or combination of conditions of release that would  
14 reasonably assure Defendant’s appearance as required. Furthermore, the United  
15 States has established by clear and convincing evidence that Defendant poses a  
16 present risk to the safety of other persons or the community that cannot be  
17 mitigated by conditions or a combination of conditions of release.

18 Should discovery review reveal additional information that Defendant  
19 believes rebuts the United States’ detention arguments or supports her release,  
20 Defendant may file a motion to reopen the detention hearing.

1 Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED:**

2 1. The United States' Motion for Detention (**ECF No. 58**) is

3 **GRANTED.**

4 2. Defendant shall be held in detention pending disposition of this case  
5 or until further order of the Court. Defendant is committed to the custody of the  
6 Attorney General for confinement separate, to the extent practicable, from persons  
7 awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. Defendant  
8 shall be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel. On  
9 order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the United  
10 States, the person in charge of the corrections facility in which Defendant is  
11 confined shall deliver Defendant to the United States Marshals Service for the  
12 purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

13 3. Any motion to reopen the issue of detention pursuant to 18 U.S.C.  
14 § 3142(f) shall be a maximum of four-pages in length, absent a motion showing  
15 good cause for a page extension, and shall succinctly state what circumstances are  
16 new, how they are established, and the requested change in conditions of release.  
17 The motion shall indicate whether opposing counsel; United States  
18 Probation/Pretrial Services; or another party with a substantial interest in the  
19 motion objects, whether a hearing is desired, and whether a supplemental pretrial  
20 services report is requested. If the moving party, after the exercise of due

1 diligence, is unable to determine the position of any party listed above, the moving  
2 party may in the alternative document the date; time; and manner of each effort  
3 made to determine that party's position and request the Court treat the motion as  
4 expedited and submitted without argument. For any motion that includes a plan  
5 for substance abuse treatment, Defendant shall attach completed waivers of  
6 confidentiality permitting the United States Probation/Pretrial Services Office and  
7 the treatment provider to exchange without qualification, in any form and at any  
8 time, any and all information or records related to Defendant's conditions of  
9 release and supervision, and evaluation, treatment, and performance in the  
10 program. **Motions in Yakima and Spokane cases shall be heard on the**  
11 **following Wednesday docket, and Richland cases shall be heard on the**  
12 **following Thursday docket.** If the Court determines that oral argument is  
13 unnecessary on the motion, it shall be set for decision on the Court's 6:30 docket.

14 4. If a party desires that another court review this Order pursuant to 18  
15 U.S.C. § 3145, that party shall immediately notify the Magistrate Judge and  
16 opposing counsel. LCrR 46(k)(1). The party shall then promptly file a motion for  
17 review before the assigned District Judge. LCrR 46(k)(3). If the case has not yet  
18 been assigned to a District Judge, or the assigned District Judge is unavailable, the  
19 motion shall be noted for hearing before the Chief District Judge. *Id.*

20 5. Defendant is bound over to Judge Mary K. Dimke for further

1 proceedings.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 DATED March 31, 2026.



5 *Alexander C. Ekstrom*

6 ALEXANDER C. EKSTROM

7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	Case No. 4:26-cr-6013-MKD-6
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	April 10, 2026
	)	Richland, Washington
v.	)	
	)	Detention Appeal Hearing
ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,	)	
	)	Pages 1 to 34
Defendant.	)	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARY K. DIMKE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:	Brandon Pang Brandon.Pang@usdoj.gov United States Attorney's Office 825 Jadwin Avenue G-60 Richland, WA 99352 509-946-4882
--------------------	--

For the Defendant:	Stephen R. Hormel Steve@hormellaw.com Hormel Law Office 17722 East Sprague Spokane Valley, WA 99016 509-926-5177
--------------------	---

Official Court Reporter:	Kimberly J. Allen, CCR #2758 United States District Courthouse P.O. Box 685 Richland, Washington 99352 (509) 943-8175
--------------------------	---

Proceedings reported by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 (April 10, 2026; 11:09 a.m.)

2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please rise.

3 (Call to Order of the Court.)

4 THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.

11:09:25 5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Matter now before the Court is  
6 *United States of America v. Alma Rosa Sanchez*, Cause  
7 No. 4:26-cr-6013-MKD, Defendant No. 6. Time set for a detention  
8 appeal hearing.

9 Counsel, please state your presence for the Court and  
11:09:41 10 record, starting with the Government.

11 MR. PANG: Good morning, Your Honor. Brandon Pang on  
12 behalf of the United States.

13 THE COURT: Good morning.

14 MR. HORMEL: Steve Hormel on behalf of Ms. Sanchez, and  
11:09:50 15 she's present, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Good morning. Good morning, Ms. Sanchez.

17 THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

18 THE COURT: All right. We are here on an appeal from  
19 the magistrate judge's detention order. I have reviewed  
11:09:59 20 everything on the file, including the submission that was, I  
21 think, filed yesterday, as well as the nonscannables that were  
22 filed, which was the audio of the detention hearing which came  
23 in two clips, but I've reviewed that.

24 There was a photograph shown to the magistrate judge  
11:10:18 25 that never made it onto the file. I assume it is one of the

1 photographs that is in the Government's submission that came  
2 yesterday.

3 There were letters referenced during that hearing that I  
4 assume are the ones that were subsequently filed on the docket.  
11:10:32 5 But I just wanted to provide that clarification of asking those  
6 questions.

7 Mr. Pang, whatever photo was shown to the magistrate  
8 judge, I could not find it on the docket.

9 Is it the one that was in the brief you subsequently  
11:10:46 10 filed? If not, is it something you want me to see? Because I  
11 haven't seen it.

12 MR. PANG: It was included in that -- the second photo  
13 of my submission yesterday.

14 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

11:10:55 15 Mr. Hormel, the letters that were provided to the  
16 magistrate judge during the hearing, where he sort of took a  
17 pause to read them, were those the ones that were subsequently  
18 filed on the record?

19 MR. HORMEL: Yes, Your Honor.

11:11:05 20 THE COURT: Okay. Then I have reviewed those.

21 All right. It's the defense's motion so I will hear  
22 from the defense first. Mr. Hormel.

23 MR. HORMEL: Your Honor, first of all, I have learned  
24 something new in this procedure and that is we can get a digital  
11:11:24 25 format of the -- as a CJA panel member, without cost, so I will

1 remember that in the future.

2 THE COURT: Well, and I actually, I prefer to listen to  
3 the hearing as it happened as opposed to a transcript. But I'm  
4 also just, you know, thinking about, you know, cost and things  
11:11:42 5 of that nature in a *de novo* review proceeding. So that is what  
6 was behind the denial of those requests for a transcript.

7 MR. HORMEL: Yes. And I think that it -- I think that  
8 it actually turned out well, so --

9 THE COURT: Okay.

11:11:55 10 MR. HORMEL: -- I just wanted to let you know that I did  
11 learn something new at my age.

12 THE COURT: It happens to all of us.

13 MR. HORMEL: Yeah. So I want to start out the same,  
14 more or less, the same place that I started out in the hearing  
11:12:09 15 before Judge Ekstrom, and that is it really appears to me --  
16 well, it does appear -- it is apparent to me that the Government  
17 is relying on the extreme amount of drugs and money that were  
18 found in the basement of Ms. Sanchez's home in a locked room  
19 occupied by her brother, and -- in what they would claim is the  
11:12:38 20 weight of the evidence, and using Ms. Rosa's, first, her silence  
21 about not talking about the matters relating to her arrest as  
22 some kind of negative against her; her comment that she didn't  
23 know what her brother was doing as a negative against her.  
24 Because there was to many drugs and money in the basement of her  
11:13:00 25 home, how could she not know; and how could she not know that

1 her brother was coming and going at all hours of the day and  
2 dealing drugs and storing money in her basement.

3 So all of those factors, Your Honor, even if you want to  
4 accept them, which I don't, but even if you want to accept them  
11:13:20 5 goes to the factor that's the weight of the evidence.

6 THE COURT: But, see, Mr. Hormel, I think that's where  
7 both Judge Ekstrom and I might differ from you. There's two  
8 things, right? There's, one, the nature and circumstances of  
9 the offense.

11:13:35 10 MR. HORMEL: That's true. Yes.

11 THE COURT: And so the nature and circumstances of the  
12 offense very much consider the quantity of drugs, they consider  
13 the number of firearms, they consider the danger those things  
14 pose to the community. So that's a bucket that is not the  
11:13:50 15 factor you're talking about. And all the things you articulated  
16 I think go to that issue.

17 Because one of the things that matters is, one, you're  
18 talking about the nature and circumstances of the offense and  
19 how is that related to the issue, like, dangerousness. Two, it  
11:14:08 20 also factors other things like, I look at it as though that  
21 drives guideline calculations. I looked at the guideline  
22 calculations on this. It's like 23 to 35 years based on the  
23 quantity of narcotics that are involved.

24 So there's other factors these things go to that don't  
11:14:27 25 impact weight of the evidence. I think weight of the evidence

1 is different. And within the nature and circumstances of the  
2 offense there's different factors, right? I don't think -- I  
3 don't think the Government's position is, you know, she was  
4 running the show and, you know, based on what they found, a high  
11:14:44 5 level, sort of director of the conspiracy. They're saying the  
6 nature and circumstances of this overall offense is very, very  
7 serious by virtue of the quantity of the drugs, the risk that  
8 poses to the community, the amount of firearms that were present  
9 with that and the danger that that poses, as well as the  
11:15:03 10 quantity of cash involved indicates really, you know, what a  
11 significant operation this is. I think this is the largest drug  
12 and gun seizure and money seizure in the history of Eastern  
13 Washington.

14 So I'm just saying, I think there are -- I think you are  
11:15:20 15 trying to lump things up in a factor that is the least important  
16 factor that I actually think the same information drives at  
17 different factors of the test. That's just what -- that's the  
18 way that I am going to be analyzing it today.

19 MR. HORMEL: Okay. Well, it makes a certain amount of  
11:15:34 20 sense, other than the fact -- and, again, you're saying that  
21 you're perceiving this different than the magistrate judge,  
22 which is -- obviously *de novo* is what that is all about.

23 THE COURT: Well, no, I'm perceiving it differently from  
24 you.

11:15:45 25 MR. HORMEL: Okay. Okay. Well -- if you -- but the

1 thing is that we're going through great lengths to say how could  
2 she not know. That goes to the weight of the evidence. You  
3 know, that doesn't just go to the nature and the circumstances.

4 THE COURT: Right.

11:15:58 5 MR. HORMEL: There have been ten years to life mandatory  
6 minimums before this Court and there have been people released,  
7 probably with worse records than Ms. Sanchez. And there have  
8 been large quantities. There have been guns that have been  
9 seized and people probably accused of being part of a conspiracy  
11:16:20 10 where they've been released.

11 We are talking about a lot of press because this was the  
12 largest drug bust in the Tri-Cities. Certainly it's not the  
13 largest drug bust in the Ninth Circuit. Okay.

14 THE COURT: No. And no one is saying that, Mr. Hormel.

11:16:37 15 MR. HORMEL: But I think it's true, because detention in  
16 situations like this are supposed to be rare. She is the model  
17 for release, other than what her brother was doing. And -- and  
18 so --

19 THE COURT: Well -- and, again, Mr. Hormel, I think --  
11:16:57 20 you know, one of the things is when you said except for what her  
21 brother was doing, you know, I've got significant concerns about  
22 this whole scenario. I'm the judge that supervises all these  
23 other individuals on supervised release. And so I'm familiar  
24 with them; I'm familiar with their backgrounds.

11:17:15 25 It's not about what her brother was doing exclusively.

1 It's what was happening in her home and there's reason to  
2 believe she allowed it. He was on supervised release reporting  
3 to the Probation Office; he's living in a home of one of their  
4 other, both her brother and hers, the defendant's, sister's  
11:17:37 5 homes. And despite the fact he's supposed to be living in that  
6 home, he's maintaining this place in her home and renting it  
7 from her when he's on supervision.

8 Why do you need a separate place that you're going in  
9 and out of and all of that while he's on supervised release?  
11:17:58 10 Which means that that other home he was living in in the other  
11 sister's house is subject to search by probation officers,  
12 right? So you've got all of this, like, factors of what is  
13 happening here.

14 So it's not just the brother. It's what she is allowing  
11:18:12 15 the brother to do, when there's every reason to believe she knew  
16 all these other circumstances. He's got a home in the sister's  
17 house; he's on supervision; that other place is subject to  
18 seizure -- or to search. That's why you need another place,  
19 because the one that the sister has is not safe.

11:18:27 20 So those are my concerns, is there's this overarching --  
21 MR. HORMEL: Suspicion.

22 THE COURT: Allowing him to have another home that's  
23 locked and he's coming/going from, which I think there's every  
24 reason to believe there is a concern that that was being done to  
11:18:44 25 evade the Probation Office's detection of what his items were

1 there. That goes to sort of like subverting law enforcement's  
2 attempts, subverting supervision. Those are all the kinds of  
3 things that make me very nervous about a person being  
4 potentially released, is sort of the implication of what is  
11:19:01 5 being done and why.

6 MR. HORMEL: But you're saying things that her brother  
7 did.

8 How -- what evidence do you have that even Bertha  
9 Sanchez knew that he was listing her residence as his residence?  
11:19:16 10 What information do you have that --

11 THE COURT: Because when the probation officer would go  
12 there to try to find him, she would talk to the sister, and the  
13 sister would say he's there, despite the fact he was never  
14 there.

11:19:26 15 MR. HORMEL: Well, I haven't seen that in my --

16 THE COURT: Well, so, Mr. Hormel, as I said, I supervise  
17 these cases, so I may have an insight that you may not have  
18 been, you know, exposed to, and that's just the reality of it.  
19 You asked the question; I gave you the answer.

11:19:40 20 MR. HORMEL: Okay. Well, and -- and, again, what  
21 information do you have that she knew that this -- this was all  
22 going on?

23 And the other thing is what information do you have  
24 about her house that would lead you to believe that she knew  
11:19:54 25 his -- her brother's every coming and going?

1           The Government certainly hasn't -- hasn't offered that  
2 to you. And the reason is because there is a way for him to get  
3 in and out of that house without anybody knowing what he's  
4 doing.

11:20:07 5           THE COURT: Okay.

6           MR. HORMEL: And so -- but, you know, now I have to  
7 disclose that before trial. But -- but --

8           THE COURT: But that's --

9           MR. HORMEL: -- that's the reason why these  
11:20:16 10 circumstances are important for the judge and the reviewer of  
11 detention to -- to have before -- instead of assuming or saying,  
12 well, this is highly suspicious. Because what you're -- what  
13 you have articulated is highly suspicious, but is that really  
14 sufficient with -- with Ms. Sanchez's background, with her  
11:20:40 15 family that's here, with -- I don't know -- so she has to be  
16 seen by clear and convincing evidence that she's a danger to the  
17 community if she's released, not her brother, not her sister,  
18 not anybody else but her.

19           And what in her background other than this arrest  
11:21:04 20 makes -- has portrayed a person who is a danger to the  
21 community? If she's released, she's going to get out and start  
22 dealing drugs again? She's going to get out and break the law?  
23 There's nothing in the record about that.

24           So, yes, Your Honor, you have all these things -- these  
11:21:24 25 things out there that -- that create questions. But when you

1 look at her as the individual, whose family is doing things  
2 around her, and -- I -- I believe the nature and circumstance of  
3 the offense is yes, the nature is it's a ten-year to life.  
4 People in this district have --

11:21:50 5 THE COURT: With a guideline range of 23 to over 30.

6 MR. HORMEL: It's a 38 level, right? The highest level  
7 you can get.

8 THE COURT: Well, there's firearms. There's two levels  
9 of firearms. There's increases that come beyond that. So  
11:22:00 10 there's firearms involved as well. So preliminarily, I am  
11 looking at these issues with respect to -- you know, I'm just  
12 doing a preliminary calculation of what's on the table,  
13 Mr. Hormel, and there's a two-level increase because there's, I  
14 think, 16 firearms, several within a locked -- locked bedroom  
11:22:19 15 and then one right outside the locked bedroom in the common  
16 area.

17 MR. HORMEL: Well, we don't even know where that is; and  
18 that came out at the hearing, because I called the Government on  
19 that. Because that picture -- that picture that shows it neatly  
11:22:33 20 displayed on a box and --

21 THE COURT: When I said common area, I meant not in the  
22 locked room.

23 MR. HORMEL: But was it visible and did --

24 THE COURT: I don't know. I have no idea.

11:22:42 25 MR. HORMEL: No, we don't have evidence of that.

1 So what I'm wondering is: Does all of that go to danger  
2 to the community or does it go to risk of flight?

3 THE COURT: It goes to both because I also have a  
4 significant concern about a risk of nonappearance in a case  
11:22:56 5 where someone has -- their, you know, guideline range is a  
6 sentence looking at -- you know, she knows what that looks like.  
7 Her brother just served a 15-year -- the brother at issue just  
8 served a 15-year sentence for similar behavior; in fact,  
9 substantially less behavior.

11:23:14 10 My understanding is -- is she still a Mexican citizen?

11 MR. HORMEL: Ms. Sanchez?

12 THE COURT: Yes, is --

13 MR. HORMEL: No, she's a United States citizen.

14 THE COURT: She was naturalized as a child, correct?

11:23:23 15 Was she naturalized as a child?

16 MR. HORMEL: She's a naturalized citizen.

17 THE COURT: Right. So Mexico recognizes dual  
18 citizenship.

19 So has she given up her Mexican citizenship or is she  
11:23:33 20 still a Mexican citizen?

21 MR. HORMEL: Is that going to be a requirement?

22 THE COURT: What do you mean it's a requirement?

23 MR. HORMEL: Would that be a requirement for her  
24 release?

11:23:38 25 THE COURT: To become a United States citizen? No.

1 MR. HORMEL: She is a naturalized citizen.

2 THE COURT: To become a naturalized citizen you do not  
3 have to give up your foreign citizenship. Mexico recognizes  
4 dual citizenship.

11:23:49 5 MR. HORMEL: Okay.

6 THE COURT: So I'm asking a question about -- you know,  
7 again, one of the factors the Court has to consider is ties to  
8 Mexico. My understanding is, because no one has told me  
9 otherwise, is that she was Mexican citizen before she became a  
10 naturalized US citizen. Her husband is a noncitizen and has no  
11 status in the United States. She has traveled to Mexico,  
12 including her last trip for six months, is my understanding. I  
13 realize it was a lengthy period of time ago. But, again, I'm  
14 evaluating all of the factors that exist here that give me  
15 concern.

11:24:17 16 But when you've got a guideline range this high, some  
17 ties to Mexico, and all these other factors, these are things I  
18 am evaluating, Mr. Hormel. So I'm asking questions.

19 MR. HORMEL: Yes. And she has every incentive to stay  
11:24:31 20 here and fight this thing, Your Honor. She has every incentive.  
21 In fact, she has every incentive not to go to Mexico, because as  
22 Judge Ekstrom pointed out, somebody is missing a bunch of guns  
23 and drugs and money, and my guess is it might be in Mexico. So  
24 why would you go to the place where people are -- are maybe  
11:24:52 25 upset they lost some money and some drugs? That would be the

1 most least likely place for someone in her status and her  
2 position with a family, an extended family in the Tri-Cities,  
3 who she cares for and who she is responsible for, to stay around  
4 here and fight these things and to bring up the facts that I --  
11:25:16 5 that I disclosed, even though I didn't want to, about the fact  
6 that there are ways that her brother could have gone in and out  
7 of this -- or did probably go in and out of this residence  
8 without anybody knowing what his -- what he was doing.

9 THE COURT: Oh, who's speculating now, Mr. Hormel?

11:25:32 10 MR. HORMEL: What's that?

11 THE COURT: I said, "Who's speculating now, Mr. Hormel?"

12 MR. HORMEL: I'm not speculating now. I just didn't  
13 choose to use those photographs for that very reason, but I'm  
14 now bringing it up.

11:25:40 15 THE COURT: Okay.

16 MR. HORMEL: It's -- it's -- but that's what trials are  
17 all about. And all of what I'm hearing is she's got to be  
18 guilty and we're finding her guilty in order to determine  
19 whether this person, who has no qualifications for detention, is  
11:25:55 20 going to be detained. Her background, her characteristics, her  
21 lack of criminal history, her involvement in her church, her  
22 involvement with her family, her taking care of her elderly  
23 mother, her taking care of her disabled son, her taking care of  
24 somebody else and I don't know who it is, are all things that  
11:26:15 25 are in her character and background that show that she's going

1 to appear and she's going to fight this thing.

2 She said to the police, "I didn't know what my brother  
3 was doing," and we're saying to her, "You're a liar." And she  
4 doesn't have a background as a liar. She has a background as a  
11:26:34 5 churchgoing person; she goes to church twice a week. She takes  
6 her son to his mental health appointments, his doctor's  
7 appointments. She takes care of her elderly mother. She is not  
8 the type of person that comes before this Court and is going to  
9 mess up her life by failing to appear to fight this thing. And  
11:26:56 10 by fleeing to Mexico, which would be a more dangerous place for  
11 her to probably go, than staying here and being here with her  
12 family here in the United States.

13 Her whole family is in the United States except for a  
14 couple of sisters in California and apparently a sibling in --  
11:27:15 15 in Mexico. She -- she's the -- she has 12 siblings, so she  
16 probably has siblings that reside in a lot of places. But the  
17 fact of the matter is her immediate family, her close family is  
18 here. She has a community that is -- has -- is behind her on  
19 this. She has her pastor.

11:27:39 20 And -- and to say because we think she might be guilty  
21 and so she has an incentive to flee because she's looking at, I  
22 mean, 25 to 30 years if she goes to trial and loses, that she  
23 shouldn't be released so that her lawyer has the ability to meet  
24 with her at her home -- we all know that representing somebody,  
11:28:06 25 especially somebody who has never been in trouble before, is a

1 lot easier if that person is at home doing the things that they  
2 normally do on a day to day.

3 THE COURT: That is not a factor for the Court to  
4 consider in determining detention.

11:28:18 5 MR. HORMEL: I think that is a factor --

6 THE COURT: Where does that fit under the statutory  
7 factors? Your ease of access to your client, where does that  
8 fit under 3142 and -3 with respect to detention?

9 MR. HORMEL: I just think it's a good due process  
11:28:31 10 argument, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. HORMEL: And I think it's worthy of noting.

13 But it seems to me that the -- that because this case  
14 involves large amounts of cash, large amounts of drugs that has  
11:28:53 15 never been seized of this quantity in Eastern Washington, that  
16 that -- and -- and because her brother was operating out of the  
17 basement of her home in a locked place, that there is a lot of  
18 speculation and assumption going on about whether or not she  
19 knew or made her place available for this --

11:29:15 20 THE COURT: Well, the grand jury determined that because  
21 the grand jury had to find probable cause to believe that she  
22 was part of the conspiracy. So what I am relying on right now  
23 is a grand jury determination of probable cause, that they found  
24 probable cause to believe that she participated in the  
11:29:32 25 conspiracy.

1 So I don't think that that's speculation in terms of  
2 it's relying on a legal finding determined by the body that is  
3 entitled and designated by statute to make that finding.

4 So that's where we are, Mr. Hormel. You may disagree  
11:29:51 5 with the grand jury, but that is -- we are at a place in which  
6 the grand jury made that determination, so there has been a  
7 finding.

8 MR. HORMEL: Yes. And what I agree with, though, is the  
9 presumption of innocence, and that weighs against a grand jury  
11:30:04 10 finding when we're talking about release. So whether or not I  
11 disagree with the grand jury, the -- I mean, you know the old  
12 saying; I don't need to repeat it.

13 THE COURT: I have more faith in our criminal justice  
14 system than that, Mr. Hormel.

11:30:19 15 MR. HORMEL: It's not -- it's not a lack of faith in the  
16 criminal justice system. It's the fact that the grand jury is  
17 a -- is a unilateral proceeding where the Government puts out  
18 their case. So that's why the presumption of innocence at this  
19 stage outweighs the indictment. And I think that the law does  
11:30:39 20 support that statement.

21 And it seems to me that there's effort being made to try  
22 to prove her guilty in order to prevent her release, when she is  
23 the ideal candidate for release.

24 Those are my -- those are my comments, Your Honor. I  
11:30:58 25 will -- I'll respond to the Government, if necessary. Thank

1 you.

2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Hormel.

3 Mr. Pang.

4 MR. PANG: Thank you, Your Honor.

11:31:14 5 I think the best place to start is to take a step back  
6 and give the Court an overview of the scope of this case. It  
7 started as an investigation into Amador Sanchez. And as that  
8 investigation unfolded, quickly agents identified a number of  
9 members who were assisting or aiding the overall operation.

11:31:41 10 Some of those individuals were operating in a much more  
11 traditional capacity, whether that was delivering drugs on  
12 behalf of Mr. Sanchez, negotiating deals on behalf of  
13 Mr. Sanchez; and then others, like this defendant, were more  
14 complicit in that they allowed their home to be used for the  
11:32:04 15 operation to continue.

16 Over the course of the operation, investigators  
17 identified a number of family members of Mr. Sanchez's who were  
18 assisting in the operation. That included Sergio, a  
19 co-defendant in this case; Alma, Ms. Sanchez, whose house was  
11:32:27 20 being utilized as a stash house. It included an individual  
21 named Bertha Sanchez, who was not only allowing Mr. Sanchez --  
22 or Amador -- I'll use first names; maybe that's easiest --  
23 Amador to --

24 THE COURT: I appreciate there's no disrespect intended.  
11:32:42 25 It's to differentiate many individuals who are family members

1 and share a last name.

2 MR. PANG: Thank you.

3 Bertha allowed Amador to use her residence as the  
4 reported residence for his supervised release. As the Court has  
11:32:56 5 already indicated, she had made assurances to Probation, during  
6 home checks or other matters, that he was residing there, when  
7 that was not true at all. He was renting a room from Alma;  
8 however, was not residing there. Turned out he was residing at  
9 a completely different location with co-defendant Pollard.

11:33:18 10 And the level -- the reasoning for this is -- is, in  
11 part, as the Court indicated, to conceal the illicit activities,  
12 but there is also some sophistication. Sergio's residence was  
13 often used to break down large quantities of controlled  
14 substances into retail-sized packages. Alma's house was used to  
11:33:42 15 store the mass quantities of drugs. And then in Amador's  
16 then-current residence, he would always keep a handful of pounds  
17 of methamphetamine or a couple of kilos on hand so that he could  
18 make deliveries in the middle of the night, if necessary. And  
19 if he ran out throughout a day, he would visit Alma's house and  
11:34:02 20 resupply himself. And that occurred sometimes multiple times a  
21 day; sometimes in the middle of the night. But that was all  
22 part of this investigation.

23 Additionally, investigators had obtained a number of  
24 tracker warrants to place on vehicles that were being utilized  
11:34:19 25 by Amador. Notably, two of those vehicles were registered to

1 Bertha Sanchez. Bertha Sanchez has offered up her home, like  
2 she did to Amador, for -- as an alternative residence for  
3 Ms. Sanchez, and that gives little assurance because, at best,  
4 like Alma, she has at least turned a blind eye to what was going  
5 on here.

11:34:42

6 The Court is familiar with the sheer quantity of drugs  
7 that is just breathtaking -- 200 pounds-plus of methamphetamine,  
8 over 150 pounds of fentanyl, 16 firearms -- that was removed  
9 from a basement of this defendant's house. And then -- and I  
10 can provide some clarity, and I want to make sure I am not  
11 overstating my case. There was one unsecured firearm that was  
12 found in the laundry room. The laundry room -- it was not  
13 readily visible from an outsider's perspective. That was a  
14 firearm that was unsecured but not visible with the naked eye  
15 unless you knew where to look. It was uncovered during the  
16 search.

11:35:03

11:35:34

17 It was still concerning, nonetheless, because that is a  
18 firearm that was unsecured that was feet away from where  
19 Ms. Sanchez's 30-year-old son, who relies on her care because of  
20 his mental health issues, was sleeping at the time the search  
21 warrant was executed, and it's feet away from the room where all  
22 of these drugs and other guns and over \$2 million were located.

11:35:50

23 That is concerning.

24 And so it's with this background that we have to assess  
25 the factors in determining whether detention is appropriate.

11:36:10

1 That gives you the overview of the nature and circumstance of  
2 the case. I suggest that that clearly indicates that detention  
3 is appropriate.

4 When we look at the weight of the evidence, the parties  
11:36:30 5 can disagree, but from the Government's perspective, the weight  
6 of the evidence is strong; but at the same time, for good  
7 reason, that is the least important factor for this Court to  
8 consider. And as I've outlined, I think this defendant has a  
9 lot of things going for -- in her favor when we look at a  
11:36:50 10 surface level of regarding her history and characteristics.

11 There are a number of very compelling letters of support  
12 telling this Court that she is a good person. And this -- the  
13 Government's position on whether she should be detained or not  
14 is not a commentary on whether we believe she's a good person.  
11:37:11 15 It's just whether we believe she's a flight risk or a danger to  
16 the community. And so these letters of support are good at a  
17 surface level. But as we've pointed out, some of these --  
18 Bertha Sanchez's letter should provide no assurance because we  
19 know she has facilitated some of these activities.

11:37:30 20 My understanding is that Maria Sanchez -- and I'm  
21 referring to ECF 86 -- she also reported -- provided a letter of  
22 support. We believe that of the three vehicles that were  
23 utilized and -- by Amador and for which we obtained trackers  
24 for, one was registered to Maria Sanchez and the other to  
11:37:51 25 Bertha.

1 THE COURT: And just so that the record is complete,  
2 when we're talking about the brother and the person she allowed  
3 to rent a room, I mean, I believe he has at least nine  
4 convictions related to drug activity, four of which are related  
5 to distribution activities, possessions with intent, delivery in  
6 the federal one.

7 Does that sound about right?

8 MR. PANG: I believe that is accurate.

9 THE COURT: Thank you.

10 MR. PANG: And I think that last one is the most  
11 concerning. Obviously he was sentenced as a federal conviction;  
12 he received a 15-year sentence. But his service of that  
13 sentence concluded only a couple years ago. That's concerning  
14 because that also suggests that in two years he was able to  
15 pick, apparently, right back off where he was, or even grow, and  
16 then through the assistance of his family.

17 This is a defendant who has never been incarcerated  
18 before, never been charged with a crime. And so that, on the  
19 one hand, weighs in her favor. But with that knowledge of what  
20 her brother has previously gone through, with the knowledge of  
21 the potential penalties that she faces, that is a lot of  
22 incentive to flee. And she's intimately aware of what it would  
23 be like to face such consequences, given that relationship with  
24 her brother.

25 The combination of that with her husband's legal status

1 can hardly -- I would say that her husband's status can hardly  
2 be used as an anchor by which that will keep her here; because  
3 he is here, she will remain here. He is here for now. He could  
4 have incentive to flee. They could both flee together, and that  
11:39:45 5 is significantly concerning.

6 The extent of her family and the number of family  
7 members that she has within this community would, in most cases,  
8 provide a justification for release. But it also provides --  
9 the counter to that is that it also provides some assurance that  
11:40:02 10 if she were to flee -- maybe with her husband, maybe without,  
11 maybe on her own -- that there are a number of individuals who  
12 can fill her position as a caretaker for the elderly mother, for  
13 her children. And who is to say she doesn't choose to return at  
14 a later date, maybe after things die down a bit.

11:40:22 15 The Government lastly points, we don't have -- there is  
16 no evidence that she was actively distributing drugs. And I  
17 should be clear about that. We don't have any evidence that she  
18 was actively handling firearms, using firearms, or anything of  
19 that nature. But what we -- the evidence we do have is  
11:40:54 20 concerning, and it goes to the last factor of the danger she  
21 presents to any member of the community. Any member of the  
22 community is important to distinguish here, because her  
23 30-year-old son in that basement, feet away from hundreds of  
24 pounds of drugs, 16 firearms and an additional one that was  
11:41:11 25 unsecured, that presents a danger to him. And her not doing

1 anything to prevent it, complying -- or being complicit in her  
2 brother and the overall conspiracy, that shows that she has a  
3 history of presenting a danger to others. That's not to mention  
4 the 8-year-old, the 14-year-old who were upstairs, the mother,  
11:41:34 5 who I believe is approximately 86 years old; you know, those are  
6 all concerning. Those all go to the danger that she presents.

7 Based on the totality, the Government would ask that  
8 this Court uphold the magistrate's decision and find that she  
9 must be detained.

11:41:48 10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 MR. PANG: Thank you.

12 THE COURT: Mr. Hormel.

13 MR. HORMEL: Again, Your Honor, the nature and  
14 circumstances of this case are really bad. Understood. But,  
11:42:11 15 again, I'm hearing that being conflated with the weight of the  
16 evidence. And I'm hearing things like she could leave, she  
17 could leave by herself, she could leave with her husband; we  
18 have all these. I think the case law -- don't have it ready;  
19 might have to -- but the case law says the ability to flee  
11:42:34 20 doesn't mean she will flee. Everybody who this Court releases  
21 has an ability to flee.

22 Does her background establish that she is a person that  
23 would flee, especially with all of her domestic responsibilities  
24 she has taken on and the community that she's surrounded herself  
11:42:54 25 with over the years? And to say that her -- I -- the Government

1 hasn't said how long they believe her brother was operating out  
2 of the basement of the house. They just know that they raided  
3 the house, and there was a large stash there.

4 But -- and then the idea that she would abandon her  
11:43:19 5 family, abandon her son, abandon her mom to go somewhere, and I  
6 believe the Government would believe that might be Mexico  
7 because of her heritage and her passport, her expired passport;  
8 that someday when the heat dies down she might return? I  
9 believe if she left, there would be a warrant, and I do believe  
11:43:44 10 there are ways of going into Mexico and securing people who have  
11 left warrants -- left the States. So --

12 THE COURT: Mr. Hormel, and I appreciate you're not one  
13 who deals with these issues as regularly as we do. The number  
14 of people who flee and then actually come back to the community  
11:44:03 15 but try to, like, live under the radar is not unheard of. I've  
16 dealt with several as -- in this position of dealing with that.  
17 And no, trying to get someone out of Mexico for a drug-related  
18 case virtually never happens. Unless you are El Chapo or  
19 someone like that, the ability to extradite people from Mexico  
11:44:23 20 for drug-related cases is very limited. So that does not  
21 provide a disincentive for anyone to flee to Mexico with pending  
22 drug charges because that is not something where you get a lot  
23 of cooperation on with respect to those issues. So I just find  
24 that even -- remarkably not persuasive.

11:44:42 25 MR. HORMEL: So she would come back without detection

1 and all of a sudden want to start her normal life with her large  
2 family that's already here --

3 THE COURT: Just dealt with a case with it not that long  
4 ago so, yes, it happens.

11:44:55 5 MR. HORMEL: But you got to look at her and what she has  
6 and what she's built in her lifetime, and what she's done in her  
7 lifetime. Nothing indicates by clear and convincing evidence,  
8 which is what the standard is for drug --

9 THE COURT: No, it's preponderance of the evidence for  
11:45:12 10 risk of nonappearance.

11 MR. HORMEL: Yeah, it was -- for danger. Nothing  
12 indicates she's a danger. And -- and because her home, the  
13 basement of her home was -- there was a large stash -- nobody is  
14 denying there was a large cache of drugs, guns, and money in her  
11:45:30 15 brother's locked room of the basement. Nobody is denying that.  
16 But it has to be what danger is she going to be to the community  
17 if released. Those are all gone. Those are all done.

18 And as the -- as the prosecutor said, there's no  
19 evidence she was involved in anything. She -- the evidence they  
11:45:50 20 have is she made her home available. But what -- what evidence  
21 do they have that when she gets out, she has any ability to do  
22 that again? Everybody who was involved was arrested.

23 So even if you take the assumption she had to have known  
24 that her brother was secreting, you know, massive amounts of  
11:46:16 25 drugs, guns, and money in her basement, she -- to say that she

1 poses a danger to the community, it just isn't -- isn't there.

2 And then preponderance of the evidence that she's going  
3 to flee? Again, it's her specific background. She has every  
4 incentive not to flee in this case for many reasons. Probably  
11:46:41 5 the most important is because of her family. Second important  
6 is her church community. And probably equal to both of those is  
7 wanting to show herself to be innocent of these charges.

8 When she told the police she didn't know what her  
9 brother was doing, we're assuming she's lying. Nothing in her  
11:47:00 10 background establishes that, Your Honor. So I would ask the  
11 Court to release her on the conditions that were recommended by  
12 the United States Probation Office in the Pretrial Services  
13 report. On those conditions, I think the Court should be  
14 satisfied that she'll appear when required and that she will not  
11:47:20 15 pose a danger to the community.

16 Thank you.

17 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Hormel.

18 All right. I have considered the statutory factors  
19 under 3142, and I am denying the motion to revoke the magistrate  
11:47:31 20 judge's detention order, and I will maintain a detention order  
21 for Ms. Sanchez.

22 I have considered all the statutory factors in this  
23 case. As to the nature and circumstances of the offense, they  
24 don't come any more serious than this with respect to drug  
11:47:50 25 offenses. The quantity of narcotics at issue, the number of

1 firearms, the amount -- the amount of cash is indicative of a  
2 whole host of things. It's just, the massive scope of the  
3 conspiracy, the significant danger. The possession of this many  
4 firearms with drugs is -- poses a really significant danger to  
11:48:10 5 the community.

6 And the quantity of cash, in addition to all the other  
7 factors, really indicates what a high-level operation this is  
8 because the fact that that much cash was entrusted to someone to  
9 maintain in a home, again, it's indicative of really how -- the  
11:48:31 10 scope, size, and sort of level of this conspiracy.

11 So all of those factors are indicative of dangerousness.

12 With respect to the weight of the evidence -- and so I  
13 find that the nature and circumstances of the offense -- and I  
14 appreciate the allegation is that she is -- her role is very  
11:48:53 15 different. Her role was allowing -- what is alleged, and a  
16 grand jury determined in some capacity, is allowing her home to  
17 be used to operate this massive operation. At a bare minimum,  
18 that is what the grand jury had to decide to -- in order to  
19 return an indictment naming her.

11:49:12 20 In terms of the weight of the evidence, from the Court's  
21 perspective, the weight of the evidence, it, you know, is  
22 sufficient, as the grand jury determined, but in evaluating the  
23 overall scope, it's -- I also still think weighs in favor of  
24 detention. Here -- and taking a step back, the Court's been  
11:49:38 25 provided as sort of wards of assurance, individuals from a whole

1 host of -- from a whole host of individuals who, frankly, the  
2 Court doesn't have reason to trust at this stage.

3 This is a conspiracy that has involved numerous family  
4 members, family members who played -- it's alleged to have  
11:49:56 5 played very different roles but the Court has had the  
6 opportunity to be aware of because of the fact that many of the  
7 people charged in this case are also on supervised release and  
8 have faced various issues with respect to their supervised  
9 release.

11:50:11 10 So with respect to Mr. Amador Sanchez, he's, you know,  
11 reporting to the Probation Office he's living in the home of one  
12 sister. That sister, despite the fact the Probation Office can  
13 never find Mr. Amador there, that sister is saying, you know, he  
14 lives there. She is also one of the sisters who I think cars  
11:50:29 15 were registered in her name that were being used in the course  
16 of these drug transactions.

17 We have, you know, another sister who writes -- and, I'm  
18 sorry, that sister wrote a letter in behalf of the defendant.  
19 So it's, frankly, not a letter I trust at all.

11:50:41 20 We have another sister who drafted a letter, and that  
21 sister also had a car registered in her name that this  
22 conspiracy was using to deliver drug transactions.

23 And then there's also another brother who is charged in  
24 this case. So just the large nature of this gives the Court  
11:51:00 25 very little reason to trust the family members who are making

1 representations to the Court that they are -- in terms of their  
2 support for Ms. Sanchez's release.

3 Her brother that she allowed to stay in the house had, I  
4 think, at least, if I counted, nine prior convictions related to  
11:51:25 5 drug activity, four of which were related to trafficking-related  
6 ability; possession with intent to distribute, delivery, and  
7 then most recently a federal conviction for which he served 15  
8 years.

9 The fact that she was renting a room to him for him to  
11:51:41 10 lock, come and go all hours of the day and night, and -- gives  
11 the Court concern about what that means as to her efforts to  
12 subvert the Probation Office's ability to monitor him. He  
13 had -- he was supposed to be living with another sister who,  
14 again, was, you know, giving questionable information to the  
11:52:04 15 Probation Office, but that's where he is supposed to be. And so  
16 the idea that he needs this separate room, which somebody with  
17 this history there is certainly reason to believe that that room  
18 is being used for no good, and the fact that she allowed that to  
19 happen, knowing he's under supervision and -- from the Court's  
11:52:26 20 perspective, that is helping him subvert the eyes of law  
21 enforcement, the eyes of the Probation Office, and that gives me  
22 concern about somebody being released and their willingness to  
23 abide by court orders, when they're already showing a  
24 willingness to subvert what the Probation Office is intending to  
11:52:43 25 do with supervision. And this would be the same the Probation

1 Office that, if released, would supervise her.

2 So this gives me significant concerns about her  
3 willingness to abide by court orders, do what the Probation  
4 Office says, you know, all of those things, given those  
11:52:57 5 concerns.

6 You know, the Court cannot overlook the fact that she  
7 was born in Mexico; nobody has indicated she's given up her  
8 Mexican citizenship, although she is a naturalized citizen. I  
9 do recognize that. Her spouse is a noncitizen who has no status  
11:53:12 10 in the country. She has traveled to Mexico and for lengthy  
11 periods of time. We're not talking a weekend stay in Mexico. I  
12 think her last visit, although a while ago but was for  
13 six months. She has family in Mexico, including at least one  
14 sibling. And I think there are indications to believe that  
11:53:27 15 these drugs originated in Mexico and there may be ties there.

16 And, again, when you are talking about a quantity when  
17 \$2 million is found in her house, the Court has concerns about,  
18 you know, what that means in terms of connections to people with  
19 funds to support flight, given all these other things. And the  
11:53:42 20 fact that this is a case, given the quantity of narcotics, that  
21 the guideline range is exceptionally high.

22 So for all of those reasons -- and I -- I appreciate she  
23 has family support. I appreciate that she has individuals that  
24 she cares for. I do not believe that those factors overcome my  
11:54:00 25 concerns about the risk of danger and the risk of nonappearance,

1 particularly that this is a presumption case that has been  
2 invoked and I am relying on.

3 And so I am maintaining the magistrate judge's detention  
4 order at this time for the reasons stated today and stated in  
11:54:20 5 the magistrate judge's order.

6 Is there anything else I need to take up on this matter  
7 at this time? Mr. Pang?

8 MR. PANG: No. Thank you.

9 THE COURT: Mr. Hormel?

11:54:30 10 MR. HORMEL: I know that we have a pretrial coming up.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 MR. HORMEL: We got our first production of discovery,  
13 which is extremely voluminous.

14 Are we going to have others?

11:54:42 15 MR. PANG: Yes.

16 MR. HORMEL: That's what I thought.

17 My guess is, Your Honor, there may be a motion coming  
18 your way. I just wanted to make --

19 THE COURT: I fully expect there will be.

11:54:51 20 MR. HORMEL: Okay. Thank you.

21 THE COURT: I will -- and obviously we don't have  
22 everyone here for the case. But I think it's -- what I would  
23 like is the parties to sit down and meet and confer about what  
24 they think is realistic. Right? And then let's set out some  
11:55:03 25 deadlines and whatever we need for more of an extended case

1 management schedule in terms of motion practice, defense expert  
2 disclosures, that those are done, you know, well in advance of  
3 trial; if there's any motion practice on either side experts but  
4 also defense so that there is time built in for *Daubert* hearings  
11:55:20 5 and all of that. So I'm going to want a very detailed case  
6 management schedule that allows for all of those things to  
7 happen, if, in fact, the parties are seeking continuance.

8 So, Mr. Pang, why don't you, you know, address that with  
9 all of the defense counsel who are not present when the time  
11:55:37 10 comes to address what the case looks like.

11 All right. Any -- anything else, Mr. Hormel?

12 MR. HORMEL: No, Your Honor. I just wanted to broach  
13 that.

14 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, sir.

11:55:48 15 All right. That concludes the hearing. Thank you.

16 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please rise.

17 Court is adjourned.

18 (Hearing concluded at 11:56 a.m.)  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, KIMBERLY J. ALLEN, do hereby certify:

That I am an Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington in Richland, Washington;

That the foregoing proceedings were taken on the date and at the time and place as shown on the first page hereto; and

That the foregoing proceedings are a full, true and accurate transcription of the requested proceedings, duly transcribed by me or under my direction.

I do further certify that I am not a relative of, employee of, or counsel for any of said parties, or otherwise interested in the event of said proceedings.

DATED this 17th day of April, 2026.



---

Kimberly J. Allen, CRR, RMR, RPR, CCR(WA)  
Washington CCR No. 2758  
Official Court Reporter  
Richland, Washington

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

1		
2		
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)Case No. 4:26-CR-06013-MKD-6
4		)
5	Plaintiff,	) March 26, 2026
6		)
7	v.	)Richland, Washington
8		)
9	ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,	)Digitally Recorded
10		)Detention Hearing
11	Defendant.	)Pages 1 to 22

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ALEXANDER C. EKSTROM  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

12	For the Plaintiff:	MS. LAUREL J. HOLLAND
13		lholland@usdoj.gov
14		US Attorney's Office
15		825 Jadwin Avenue, Suite G-60
16		Richland, Washington 99352
17		509-946-4882
18	For the Defendant:	MR. STEPHEN R. HORMEL
19		steve@hormellaw.com
20		Hormel Law Office
21		17722 East Sprague
22		Spokane Valley, Washington 99016
23		509-926-5177

24	Proceedings recorded electronically; transcribed therefrom by	
25	Official Court Reporter:	Marilynn S. McMartin, CCR #2515
		United States District Courthouse
		P.O. Box 2706
		Yakima, Washington 98907
		509-573-6613

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

INDEX

<b><u>Proceedings:</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Detention Hearing - March 26, 2026	3
Argument by Ms. Holland	3
Argument by Mr. Hormel	10
Rebuttal Argument by Ms. Holland	14
Surrebuttal Argument by Mr. Hormel	16
Court's Oral Decision	18

WITNESS INDEX

<b><u>Plaintiff Witnesses:</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
(None)	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b><u>Defense Witnesses:</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
(None)	

EXHIBITS ADMITTED

<b><u>Plaintiff</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b><u>Number</u></b>		
(None)		

<b><u>Defense</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b><u>Number</u></b>		
(None)		

GENERAL INDEX

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Reporter's Certificate.....	22

1 (March 26, 2026; digital recording start time 11:07 am)

2 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Please rise.

3 (Call to order of the Court)

4 THE COURT: Please be seated.

5 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The matter now before the court  
6 is *United States of America v. Alma Rosa Sanchez*, Cause No.  
7 4:26-CR-6013-MKD, Defendant No. 6, time set for a detention  
8 hearing.

9 Counsel, please state your presence for the court and  
10 record starting with the government.

11 MS. HOLLAND: Good morning, Your Honor. Laurel Holland  
12 for the United States.

13 THE COURT: Good morning.

14 MR. HORMEL: Steve Hormel for Ms. Sanchez, and she's  
15 present, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Good morning to you both.

17 All right. The matter comes on today for a detention  
18 hearing. I've had the opportunity to review the pretrial  
19 services report. Hear first from the government.

20 MS. HOLLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.

21 Your Honor, from the government's perspective, Ms. Sanchez  
22 is a significant danger to the community and also presents a  
23 flight risk. Ms. Sanchez is the sister of the lead defendant in  
24 this case, Amador Sanchez. She resides at what was suspected to  
25 be and later confirmed to be the stash house for the drug

1 trafficking organization in this particular case.

2 During this investigation it was documented by  
3 investigators on numerous occasions that Amador would regularly  
4 go to Alma's house at all hours and times of the day immediately  
5 before drug transactions, and he would leave holding black WinCo  
6 cloth bags. They were ultimately determined to contain large  
7 amounts of controlled substances.

8 Amador would then travel to various locations, including  
9 one of the identified residences where he resided with another  
10 codefendant, and he would complete large drug transactions  
11 thereafter.

12 During the execution of the search warrant at the  
13 defendant's home, inside a bedroom in her basement investigators  
14 located approximately 200 pounds of methamphetamine, 150 pounds  
15 of fentanyl, over \$2 million, and 16 firearms. Another firearm  
16 was located in the basement laundry room.

17 This fact pattern is concerning for a number of reasons.  
18 As is noted in the pretrial services report, the defendant had  
19 at least two juveniles residing at the residence as well as an  
20 adult son whom she described as having mental health issues.

21 He was actually residing in the basement in close proximity  
22 to the room where all of the prior items were located. He was  
23 also in close proximity to the unsecured firearm in the laundry  
24 room. And I actually have a picture of the firearm that was  
25 located in the laundry room and was not secured for the court.

1 THE COURT: All right. Give me just a moment here as  
2 well.

3 Okay. All right.

4 MS. HOLLAND: The bedroom where the significant amount  
5 of drugs and cash and firearms were located was locked at the  
6 time that investigators arrived. There were also locked safes  
7 within that room. It is the government's understanding that  
8 that room was represented by the defendant to be a room that was  
9 rented by her brother.

10 From the government's perspective, the defendant -- the  
11 codefendant, Mr. Amador Sanchez, he recently finished a 15-year  
12 sentence related to drug trafficking, which is to say the idea  
13 that this defendant before the court today, his sister, had no  
14 idea as to her brother's prior activities or activities that  
15 could be associated with what was readily observed by agents  
16 involved in this investigation is simply without merit. The  
17 quantities found in there alone are extremely disturbing when  
18 given that history before this court.

19 Further, when we think about incentive to flee, the  
20 defendant knows the consequences of her actions in this  
21 particular case, the significant consequences she will face if  
22 convicted at trial, which is at least 10 years of imprisonment.  
23 And so from the government's perspective, given the family ties  
24 to Mexico, that is a very powerful and significant incentive to  
25 flee in this particular case.

1 From the government's perspective, and I would presume from  
2 this court's perspective and experience, when we look at things  
3 that are significant and helpful in terms of preventing this  
4 type of behavior, from the government's perspective -- and I  
5 understand that the United States Probation Office does not  
6 consider the underlying nature of the offense in making their  
7 recommendation.

8 And from what the government has here, we believe that the  
9 evidence here is incredibly strong, we believe that it's  
10 weighty, and we believe that it weighs in favor of the continued  
11 detention of the defendant in this matter.

12 But on top of that, Your Honor, the idea that the type of  
13 conduct that is at issue here will somehow be prevented in the  
14 future or can otherwise be effectively monitored when -- as is  
15 evident from the letters that I've just read that were written  
16 by other members of the family, her pastor, other members of the  
17 community -- it is clear that the defendant in this case  
18 maintained a certain persona and a certain forward-facing  
19 identity to the community while literally her basement contained  
20 the largest drug seizure that has happened in the Eastern  
21 District of Washington; with her brother, with a prior drug  
22 trafficking conviction where he served 15 years, was entering  
23 and exiting at all times of the day; and there was the firearm  
24 that I just showed to this court readily and easily available to  
25 anyone in that home, to include her two minor children and her

1 son with mental health issues.

2 The idea that the conditions proposed by the United States  
3 Probation Office, respectfully, would prevent any kind of  
4 further activity with someone who has so successfully disguised  
5 their involvement and has hidden, essentially, the involvement  
6 and allowed for the conduct of other people in their family to  
7 be hidden by virtue of utilizing their home, the government  
8 believes these conditions are just not sufficient.

9 In terms of flight, from the government's perspective, GPS  
10 location monitoring is effective where we have a defendant who  
11 should be prohibited from going to certain locations, so, for  
12 example, an individual who is on monitoring for -- to prevent  
13 them from going to locations where children might be present.

14 From the government's perspective, GPS location monitoring  
15 is not helpful in the situation where a defendant can cut off a  
16 bracelet and then flee, because the amount of time that it takes  
17 the probation office to determine that and then thereafter take  
18 appropriate steps are not sufficient to allow the prevention of  
19 someone from absconding from this area.

20 And from the government's perspective, given all of the  
21 issues at hand here, there is simply no way to effectively  
22 monitor this defendant to assure that she will remain in this  
23 community and not flee and to assure that she is a safe member  
24 of this community who is not otherwise involved in the type of  
25 behavior that we see in this case.

1           And so given that, we would ask that the court continue to  
2 detain Ms. Sanchez. We would ask the court find that she has  
3 not overcome the presumption of detention in this case and that  
4 all of the factors, to include the nature and circumstances of  
5 the offense; her history and characteristics, which in another  
6 circumstance may weigh in her favor, but as I articulated, in  
7 this particular instance the government believes that actually  
8 weighs against given the nature of what was actively going on in  
9 her home; and the nature that this particular case and the  
10 defendant's conduct in this case, subverting and hiding the  
11 amount of material, guns, and cash that were ultimately located  
12 here, there is just simply no way to protect the community.

13           We would ask that this court continue to detain her pending  
14 trial.

15           THE COURT: Do you have a hard copy of the photograph  
16 that you showed me of the weapon?

17           MS. HOLLAND: I'm happy to print it out. I can email it  
18 to Ms. Gore as well if that would be helpful to the court. I  
19 wanted to be able to project it. I thought that was better so  
20 that all parties could see it.

21           THE COURT: I just need another look at it --

22           MS. HOLLAND: Sure.

23           THE COURT: -- if I can.

24           MS. HOLLAND: Not a problem, Your Honor.

25           I'm happy to leave it up for as long as the court would

1 like as well or to zoom in on any portions of the picture.

2 THE COURT: All right. Can you zoom in on the receiver  
3 itself, so slightly top of center?

4 MS. HOLLAND: Is that sufficient, Your Honor? Would you  
5 like me to go further?

6 THE COURT: I think that's sufficient.

7 So this is the -- I'm looking at the list on your notice of  
8 criminal forfeiture, and this appears from its magazine size to  
9 be the final weapon that's listed there, the PWS Hardened Arms  
10 Model MK1 rifle. Is that fairly stated?

11 MS. HOLLAND: I believe so, Your Honor. And this was  
12 the unsecured firearm in the laundry room that was across from  
13 the bedroom where the defendant's adult son with mental health  
14 issues was actively residing.

15 THE COURT: I can't see from the photograph. Are there  
16 rounds in the magazine?

17 MS. HOLLAND: I am not aware of that, Your Honor. I'm  
18 sorry. I'm happy to reach out to my colleague, who's the  
19 primary attorney on this matter. If Your Honor would just give  
20 me a moment.

21 THE COURT: If you can -- if you can zoom in further, we  
22 should be able to see, and you can also talk with your agent.  
23 But if there are rounds in the magazine, they should be -- well,  
24 that said -- well, the feed lips are covering that. Why don't  
25 you talk to your agent and then let me know.

1 MS. HOLLAND: Yes. Thank you.

2 It was empty, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Very well.

4 MS. HOLLAND: Thank you.

5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I don't have any  
6 additional questions.

7 MS. HOLLAND: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 THE COURT: Counsel, whenever you're ready.

9 MR. HORMEL: Good morning, Your Honor.

10 THE COURT: Good morning.

11 MR. HORMEL: So, you know, there is a reason why the  
12 strength of evidence is the factor least this court should  
13 consider. In this case, it's a factor the court really ought to  
14 give some thought to.

15 It can even consider it, from what I heard -- and I haven't  
16 seen the discovery, but what I'm hearing is, is that this cache  
17 of drugs and money was found in a locked room in the basement  
18 that was occupied by the defendant's brother.

19 And the government is attempting to say she had to have  
20 known that -- what was going on because he was leaving at  
21 all hours, and he had a prior conviction and just got out of  
22 prison, ergo, she was involved in this drug trafficking?

23 I think that alone, Your Honor, not -- even with knowledge  
24 and what -- I conceded knowledge. But even with knowledge, it's  
25 not enough to put her involved in a conspiracy and -- let alone,

1 I heard no comment on her part other than renting a room to her  
2 brother that puts her involved in any kind of drug trafficking.

3 So I would -- what I would ask the court is -- of course,  
4 the court has to know the circumstances behind which everybody  
5 was arrested. That's obvious. But in relation to Ms. Sanchez  
6 herself, I would ask the court to take into consideration that  
7 the government's proffer really centered primarily on her  
8 brother. And it's my guess that her brother's -- with a prior  
9 conviction, prior prison time for a similar offense, his ability  
10 to get released from imprisonment might be difficult.

11 And so there are no firearms in the house. There's no  
12 evidence that she had any involvement in firearms. The fact  
13 that there may have been an unloaded firearm in her basement  
14 doesn't, again, put her in possession of that firearm or have  
15 any participation with that firearm.

16 What we do know about Ms. Sanchez -- and I do have the  
17 letters that I was just handed this morning, Your Honor; so --  
18 right before court, and so I allowed the prosecutor to review  
19 them, and I would ask the court to take a moment. And they all  
20 pretty much say the same and vouch for Ms. Sanchez's character.

21 I don't understand why the government believes that it's  
22 important to impugn her character when she's never been in  
23 trouble before. She has heavy responsibilities at her house  
24 taking care of her mother, taking care of her disabled son, and  
25 has never been in trouble with the law before. But I'll hand

1 these to the court.

2 THE COURT: Very well.

3 All right. And, Counsel, I'll read them when you've  
4 concluded, but I don't want to truncate your argument.

5 MR. HORMEL: I understand that.

6 THE COURT: Anything, anything further?

7 MR. HORMEL: Your Honor, there is no one -- in fact,  
8 let's talk about ties to Mexico. I'm not hearing ties to Mexico  
9 other than back -- her last trip to Mexico was back in 2011, and  
10 she returned back in 2012. Her passport is expired, but she  
11 will agree to turn it over to the United States Probation Office  
12 as soon as she's released.

13 So I don't understand how ties to Mexico or that has any  
14 significance in this case, particularly since she has a fairly  
15 significant size family in the Tri-Cities and in Pasco that I'm  
16 sure are interested in helping her, taking care of her. And I'm  
17 sure she's not interested in leaving her family, particularly  
18 when she's responsible for the care of her disabled son and her  
19 aging mother.

20 So as far as a risk of flight, I believe that she has  
21 proffered evidence and testimony and documentation that  
22 overcomes the -- her burden of production in determining whether  
23 or not she's a flight risk. She has -- there's no evidence  
24 whatsoever that she's a danger to the community. And, in fact,  
25 the information is quite to the contrary, including those

1 letters that you just received.

2 I understand that the government has a theory of her  
3 culpability, and she is facing an indictment that was --  
4 probable cause was found by a grand jury. Probable cause, as we  
5 all know, is not a huge burden for the government to overcome in  
6 a grand jury proceeding.

7 But when it comes to release pending trial, Congress has  
8 been pretty clear that candidates such as Ms. Sanchez, who has  
9 never been in trouble before, who can overcome the burden of  
10 production, are the best candidates for release.

11 I don't even think GPS monitoring is needed in this case  
12 because of her extensive close family that's in the area. She  
13 lives close to the courthouse. She'll be able to report to the  
14 probation office whenever possible. She's got my cell number.  
15 She can fulfill her duty of contacting me.

16 And, Your Honor, I would ask the court to follow the  
17 probation office's recommendation. I believe it's an  
18 appropriate recommendation in this case.

19 And if the court has any questions?

20 THE COURT: I don't. Thank you.

21 I'll review these letters. I will then provide them to the  
22 clerk, and I assume that you're gonna ask that they be made part  
23 of the record.

24 MR. HORMEL: All right.

25 THE COURT: All right.

1 MR. HORMEL: And I don't know -- and I didn't ask, but I  
2 don't know. A lot of times law enforcement will let things like  
3 firearms in a really nice place to take a really good photo of  
4 it. So I don't know if that's really where the firearm was  
5 found or if it was just placed there so that they could get a  
6 really nice picture of it. I don't know. But, again, Ms.  
7 Sanchez has no -- there's no indication, no evidence that she  
8 had any involvement in firearms whatsoever.

9 THE COURT: All right. Let me read the letters, and  
10 then I'll hear from the government on any additional information  
11 or responses they might wish to make.

12 (Pause in proceedings)

13 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Holland.

14 MS. HOLLAND: Defense counsel spent quite a bit of time  
15 talking about Ms. Sanchez's lack of ties to Mexico specifically.  
16 The government was trying to be respectful of the defendant's  
17 current situation with her husband because we don't want to  
18 penalize people for being truthful and forthcoming with United  
19 States Probation Office.

20 However, it is my understanding that her husband does not  
21 have lawful status here in the United States, and while it is  
22 not indicated where he hails from, that is of significant  
23 concern to the government.

24 And from another -- given the amount of family that is  
25 here, given the amount of support that she is reported to have,

1 it seems that there are many people who could otherwise care for  
2 her two juvenile children. Only two of them are juveniles. One  
3 is 8, as this court is aware, and one is 14.

4 And so the defendant is not without options and may find  
5 that to be a worthy alternative to leave this country for a  
6 period of time and then come back when she is no longer in the  
7 circumstance that she is presently.

8 On top of that, Your Honor, I would advise that when the  
9 defendant was contacted during the execution of the warrant at  
10 her home, she was confronted by agents regarding her brother's  
11 short stay, traffic at the home, because the defendant, to the  
12 government's understanding, was actually residing with his  
13 significant other, who is pregnant, at another home.

14 And that when she was confronted about the short stay,  
15 traffic, and him going and leaving in short course with those  
16 specific black WinCo bags that were ultimately also found in the  
17 home to be stuffed full of controlled substances, that she did  
18 not provide any kind of response; that she put her head down and  
19 did not answer the agent's question.

20 In regard to the gun, my understanding is that it was found  
21 on a shelving unit in the laundry room and that it could have  
22 been behind other items, and so not visible to a ready observer  
23 but, nonetheless, not secured in any way, shape, or form.

24 Thank you, Your Honor.

25 THE COURT: Very well. Thank you.

1 MR. HORMEL: Your Honor, if it's okay, may I do a  
2 surrebuttal?

3 THE COURT: Ms. Holland doesn't appear to be jumping up.  
4 I'll give you two minutes.

5 MR. HORMEL: I'm sorry about that. I just assumed that  
6 I would, so I apologize.

7 But I guess her husband's status really has nothing to do  
8 with her ability to be released, and that is because even the  
9 Ninth Circuit says her -- if she had an undocumented status,  
10 that is not a basis to hold her. So somehow making it right to  
11 do it because of her husband's status seems even far-fetched.

12 THE COURT: Well, Counsel, you're gonna have to persuade  
13 me with caselaw that that's the case, because if an individual  
14 member of someone's family doesn't have status, that is a factor  
15 I believe the court can consider in an incentive to relocate.

16 We can't consider the status of an individual before us in  
17 the context of the executive's retained authority to release in  
18 ICE proceedings, and that's still good law, but we can consider  
19 it otherwise unless you have a case to cite to me.

20 MR. HORMEL: You can consider her status for sure,  
21 understood.

22 THE COURT: But --

23 MR. HORMEL: It seems far more removed to consider a  
24 family member, especially since she has such an extensive family  
25 here in the United States, taking care of her son who's

1 disabled, getting paid to do that. That's her livelihood, part  
2 of her livelihood, and her son's health and well-being,  
3 including her aging mother.

4 So the incentive to stay here is far greater than to follow  
5 her husband and uproot her entire family or even --

6 THE COURT: Well -- and, Counsel, I understand your  
7 argument, and I understand it's entirely appropriate to argue  
8 the weight of the evidence. But in making that argument, you're  
9 making the government's point that you're saying that the  
10 totality of those things weighs in favor of her staying. The  
11 government's making the counterargument. You each can make your  
12 argument.

13 MR. HORMEL: Okay. I did not follow -- I didn't follow  
14 that at all.

15 THE COURT: All right.

16 MR. HORMEL: I'm sorry about that. But in her own --  
17 her factors: her length in the community; her length at her  
18 residence; her family, all of her family that lives in her  
19 residence, in a five-bedroom home; her disabled son she cares  
20 for and gets paid by the state to care for; her aging mother --  
21 all of those are incentives and reasons why she wouldn't flee,  
22 Your Honor. And there's been no -- there is nothing in the  
23 record that would indicate she is -- she would not appear for  
24 court when required.

25 So as far as danger to the community, it sounds like the

1 government has laid a really good case that her brother is a  
2 danger to the community but not a case against her I appreciate.  
3 Your Honor, and I'd ask that you follow the probation's  
4 recommendation.

5 THE COURT: Very well.

6 Before we address this specific criteria of 3142, every  
7 case depends upon its facts, and it was a famous French general,  
8 Napoleon Bonaparte, who once said "Quantity has a quality all  
9 its own."

10 This is the largest seizure of drugs and money in the  
11 Tri-Cities. That fact alone moves that the nature of the  
12 alleged distribution is, arguably, the largest one discovered in  
13 the Tri-Cities area, and some of the incentives that result in  
14 drug trafficking cases are present in greater concentration.  
15 Quantity has a quality all its own.

16 Here dealing first with the nature and circumstance of the  
17 offense, the offense is profoundly serious, as I've indicated  
18 before, dealing with the allegations of 200 pounds of  
19 methamphetamine, 150 pounds of fentanyl, \$2.2 million in cash,  
20 and the firearms, making it profoundly dangerous to the  
21 community.

22 And here -- and we'll talk about this a little bit more in  
23 strength of the case, but controlled substances in this volume  
24 are profoundly dangerous. They speak not lower or mid-level  
25 distribution but higher level distribution.

1 Here as well, looking at the weight of the evidence against  
2 the defendant, the government will have to prove this to a jury  
3 eventually, and none of the court's comments impact that. But  
4 as I look at it, the government's case in accomplice liability  
5 or principal liability for the defendant in the conspiracy  
6 amount, as the court understands the government's argument to  
7 this, Amador Sanchez has a federal conviction for drug  
8 trafficking. He has a house of his own, presumably with a place  
9 to store whatever he wanted.

10 And so the idea that he rents a room that he locks in  
11 someone's house and that he visits it at all odd times of the  
12 night, taking things out in black WinCo bags, and that it could  
13 reasonably be said that this defendant just really doesn't know  
14 what's going on, for the purposes of this court considering the  
15 detention motion, I don't accept that even a little bit,  
16 particularly when one looks at the volume involved.

17 The degree to which it is reasonable to assume that someone  
18 doesn't know what's going on is in some ways, at least at this  
19 phase, arguably, in inverse proportion to the size of what's  
20 going on: too much dope; too much money; too many guns.

21 The defendant's time in the community, contacts, criminal  
22 history, in general augur in her favor. She's a US C. She has  
23 family and obligations here, and she has the confidence of her  
24 various communities.

25 That said, the government is correct that if you have a

1 family member who doesn't have status and may need to live  
2 elsewhere, that's a pull. It is a pull to another area, and it  
3 is an incentive when facing mandatory minimum sentences to make  
4 a different choice and reasonably considered by this court.

5 And the other thing that the court needs to consider here  
6 in issues of large quantity is the following. The government  
7 made the argument that the defendant knows the consequences of  
8 her actions as far as the potential criminal ramifications and  
9 the idea that when looking at mandatory minimums, one may decide  
10 that being elsewhere is preferable.

11 There's also the undeniable concern that \$2 million and 350  
12 pounds of controlled substances, as seized by the government,  
13 belongs to somebody. They're not happy. That's also an  
14 incentive to just be somewhere else. It's not always the case  
15 in every drug trafficking prosecution that the volumes involved  
16 would create these incentives. They do here.

17 But the government's proffer specifically regarding this  
18 defendant's response to questioning is telling. I'm persuaded  
19 that there's no condition or combination of conditions that  
20 could adequately protect the community against the danger that  
21 is posed by this behavior and, more importantly, no condition  
22 that protects against nonappearance. I'm gonna grant the  
23 government's motion on both grounds.

24 If during the course of the review of the discovery, in  
25 particular the search warrants -- and I think everybody knows I

1 reviewed them -- Mr. Hormel, if you believe that there's  
2 additional information there that you believe supports a motion  
3 to reopen, that can certainly be considered. But with that  
4 said, at this time I will grant the government's motion.

5 Anything further on behalf of the government in this matter  
6 this morning?

7 MS. HOLLAND: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Hormel, anything further on behalf of  
9 your client?

10 MR. HORMEL: No.

11 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, all. That will  
12 conclude the hearing.

13 (Digital recording end time 11:46 am)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, MARILYNN S. McMARTIN, do hereby certify:

That I am an Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington in Yakima, Washington;

That the foregoing proceedings were taken on the date and at the time and place as shown on the first page hereto; and

That the foregoing proceedings are a full, true, and accurate transcription to the best of my ability after listening to the official electronic sound recording of the requested proceedings, duly transcribed by me or under my direction.

I do further certify that I am not a relative of, employee of, or counsel for any of said parties, or otherwise interested in the event of said proceedings.

DATED this 17th day of April, 2026.



Marilynn S. McMartin, RDR, CRR  
Washington CCR #2515  
Official Court Reporter  
Yakima, Washington

FILED IN THE  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

**Mar 18, 2026**

SEAN F. McAVOY, CLERK

ECF No 12

1 Todd Blanche  
2 Deputy Attorney General of the United States  
3 Brandon Pang  
4 Caitlin Baungard  
5 Assistant United States Attorneys  
6 Eastern District of Washington  
7 Post Office Box 1494  
8 Spokane, WA 99210-1494  
9 Telephone: (509) 353-2767

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

4:26-CR-6013-MKD

11 Plaintiff,

INDICTMENT

12 v.

Vio.:

13  
14 AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA,  
15 SERGIO SANCHEZ MENDOZA,  
16 ELIODORO TAPIA,  
17 NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR,  
18 CASSAUNDRA RACHEL POLLARD,  
19 and  
20 ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ,

21 U.S.C. § 846  
Conspiracy to Distribute  
Fentanyl and  
Methamphetamine  
(Count 1)

21 Defendants.

22 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1),  
23 (b)(1)(A)(viii)  
24 Distribution of 500 Grams  
25 or More of  
26 Methamphetamine  
27 (Counts 2-3)

28 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1),  
(b)(1)(A)(vi), (viii)  
Possession with Intent to  
Distribute 400 Grams or  
More of Fentanyl and 500  
Grams or More of  
Methamphetamine  
(Count 4)

18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1),  
924(a)(8)  
Felon in Possession of  
Firearms  
(Counts 5-6)

21 U.S.C. § 853, 18 U.S.C.  
§ 924(d)(1), 28 U.S.C.  
§ 2461(c)  
Forfeiture Allegation

The Grand Jury charges:

COUNT 1

Beginning on a date unknown, but by on or about July 2025 and continuing to on or about March 3, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the Defendants, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA, SERGIO SANCHEZ MENDOZA, ELIODORO TAPIA, NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR, CASSAUNDR A RACHEL POLLARD, and ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ and other individuals, both known and unknown to the Grand Jury, did knowingly and intentionally combine, conspire, confederate and agree together with each other to commit the following offense: distribution of 400 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidinyl] propanamide (a/k/a fentanyl), in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(vi) and 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii), both Schedule II controlled substances, and all in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

COUNT 2

On or about February 9, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the Defendants, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA and CASSAUNDRA RACHEL POLLARD, did knowingly and intentionally distribute 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii).

COUNT 3

On or about February 23, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the Defendant, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA, did knowingly and intentionally distribute 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of methamphetamine, a Schedule II controlled substance, in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii).

COUNT 4

On or about March 3, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the Defendants, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA, SERGIO SANCHEZ MENDOZA, and CASSAUNDRA RACHEL POLLARD, knowingly possessed with the intent to distribute 400 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount of N-phenyl-N-[1-(2-phenylethyl)-4-piperidiny] propanamide (a/k/a fentanyl), and 500 grams or more of a mixture or substance containing a detectable amount methamphetamine, both Schedule II controlled substances, in violation of 21 U.S.C. §

1 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(vi), and (b)(1)(A)(viii).

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
COUNT 5

On or about March 3, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the Defendant, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA, knowing of his status as a person previously convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year, did knowingly possess in and affecting commerce, firearms, to wit:

- a Ruger P95, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 318-84514;
- a MOD EA9 FT, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AE01009;
- a Springfield Armory XD-45ACP, .45 caliber pistol, bearing serial number XD682471;
- a Springfield Armory XDS-9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number S3823381;
- a Taurus PT 101 AFS, .40 caliber pistol, bearing serial number STB77700;
- a Ruger 57, 5.7x28mm caliber pistol, bearing serial number 641-47539;
- a Glock 43, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AHAZ467;
- a Sig Sauer P320, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 58J246286;
- a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9 Plus, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number JLC7150;
- a Glock 17 Gen 5, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number BWNB806;
- a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number JHR3137;
- a Heckler & Koch USP Compact, .40 cal pistol, bearing serial number 26-067574;
- a Savage Quality, .32 ACP pistol, bearing serial number 8325
- a Ruger New Model Single-Six, .22 caliber pistol, bearing serial number 263-68635;
- a Smith & Wesson Bodyguard 380, .380 ACP pistol, bearing serial number KBN0832; and

1 - a PWS Hardened Arms Model MK1 rifle, bearing serial number MK1-  
2 100741

3 which firearms had theretofore been transported in interstate and/or foreign  
4 commerce, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(8).

5  
6 COUNT 6

7 On or about March 3, 2026, in the Eastern District of Washington, the  
8 Defendants, ELIODORO TAPIA and NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR, each knowing of  
9 his/her status as a person previously convicted of a crime punishable by imprisonment  
10 for a term exceeding one year, did each knowingly possess in and affecting  
11 commerce, a firearm, to wit: a Smith and Wesson Model 642, .38 SPL+P caliber  
12 pistol, bearing serial number DPS0418, which firearm had theretofore been  
13 transported in interstate and/or foreign commerce, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§  
14 922(g)(1), 924(a)(8).  
15  
16  
17

18 SERIOUS DRUG FELONY – 21 U.S.C. § 802(58)

19 Before AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA committed the offenses as charged  
20 in Counts 1, 2, 3, and 4, AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA had a final conviction  
21 for a serious drug felony, as defined in 21 U.S.C. § 802(58), to wit: Possession with  
22 Intent to Distribute 50 Grams or More of Pure (Actual) Methamphetamine, in  
23 violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1), (b)(1)(A)(viii), case number 2:11-CR-00181-  
24 WFN-14, in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington,  
25 for which he served a term of imprisonment of more than 12 months and was released  
26  
27  
28

1 from imprisonment within 15 years of the commencement of the instant offenses.

2 Before ELIODORO TAPIA committed the offense as charged in Count 1,  
3  
4 ELIODORO TAPIA had a final conviction for a serious drug felony, as defined in 21  
5 U.S.C. § 802(58), to wit: Importation of Methamphetamine, in violation of 21 U.S.C.  
6 §§ 952, 960, case number 3:20-CR-01275-AJB in the United States District Court for  
7  
8 the Southern District of California, for which he served a term of imprisonment of  
9  
10 more than 12 months and was released from imprisonment within 15 years of the  
11 commencement of the instant offense.

12 Before NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR committed the offense as charged in Count  
13  
14 1, NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR had a final conviction for a serious drug felony, as  
15 defined in 21 U.S.C. § 802(58), to wit: Conspiracy to Distribute Methamphetamine, in  
16 violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1), 846, case number 2:19-CR-00384-005-CW, in  
17  
18 the United States District Court for the District of Utah, for which she served a term of  
19 imprisonment of more than 12 months and was released from imprisonment within 15  
20  
21 years of the commencement of the instant offense.

22 NOTICE OF CRIMINAL FORFEITURE

23 The allegations contained in this Indictment are hereby realleged and  
24  
25 incorporated by reference for the purpose of alleging forfeitures.

26 Pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853, upon conviction of an offense(s) in violation of  
27  
28 21 U.S.C. §§ 841, 846, as set forth in this Indictment, Defendants AMADOR

1 SANCHEZ MENDOZA, SERGIO SANCHEZ MENDOZA, ELIODORO TAPIA,  
2 NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR, CASSAUNDRRA RACHEL POLLARD, and ALMA  
3 ROSA SANCHEZ, shall forfeit to the United States of America, any property  
4 constituting, or derived from, any proceeds obtained, directly or indirectly, as the  
5 result of such offense(s) and any property used or intended to be used, in any manner  
6 or part, to commit or to facilitate the commission of the offense(s). The assets to be  
7 forfeited include, but are not limited to:

8 Defendants AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA and ALMA ROSA SANCHEZ

- 9 - \$2,259,600.00 U.S. currency;
- 10 - a Ruger P95, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 318-84514;
- 11 - a MOD EA9 FT, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AE01009;
- 12 - a Springfield Armory XD-45ACP, .45 caliber pistol, bearing serial number  
13 XD682471;
- 14 - a Springfield Armory XDS-9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number S3823381;
- 15 - a Taurus PT 101 AFS, .40 caliber pistol, bearing serial number STB77700;
- 16 - a Ruger 57, 5.7x28mm caliber pistol, bearing serial number 641-47539;
- 17 - a Glock 43, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AHAZ467;
- 18 - a Sig Sauer P320, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 58J246286;
- 19 - a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9 Plus, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number  
20 JLC7150;
- 21 - a Glock 17 Gen 5, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number BWNB806;
- 22 - a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number  
23 JHR3137;
- 24 - a Heckler & Koch USP Compact, .40 cal pistol, bearing serial number 26-  
25 067574;
- 26 - a Savage Quality, .32 ACP pistol, bearing serial number 8325;
- 27 - a Ruger New Model Single-Six, .22 caliber pistol, bearing serial number  
28 263-68635;

- 1 - a Smith & Wesson Bodyguard 380, .380 ACP pistol, bearing serial number
- 2 KBN0832; and,
- 3 - a PWS Hardened Arms Model MK1 rifle, bearing serial number MK1-
- 4 100741.

5 Defendants AMADOR MENDOZA SANCHEZ and CASSAUNDR  
 6 RACHEL POLLARD

- 7 - \$210,978.00 U.S. currency

8 Defendant SERGIO SANCHEZ MENDOZA

- 9 - \$10,000.00 U.S. currency

10 If any forfeitable property, as a result of any act or omission of the Defendants:

- 11 a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
- 12 b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;
- 13 c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court;
- 14 d. has been substantially diminished in value; or
- 15 e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided
- 16 without difficulty,

17 the United States of America shall be entitled to forfeiture of substitute property  
 18 pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(p).

19  
 20 Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 924(d)(1) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), upon conviction of  
 21 an offense in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 922(g)(1), 924(a)(8), Felon in Possession of  
 22 Firearms, as set forth in this Indictment, Defendants, AMADOR SANCHEZ  
 23 MENDOZA, ELIODORO TAPIA and NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR shall forfeit to the  
 24 United States of America any firearm and ammunition involved or used in the  
 25  
 26  
 27 commission of the offense, including, but not limited to the following:  
 28

1 Defendant AMADOR SANCHEZ MENDOZA

- 2 - a Ruger P95, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 318-84514;
- 3 - a MOD EA9 FT, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AE01009;
- 4 - a Springfield Armory XD-45ACP, .45 caliber pistol, bearing serial number XD682471;
- 5 - a Springfield Armory XDS-9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number S3823381;
- 6 - a Taurus PT 101 AFS, .40 caliber pistol, bearing serial number STB77700;
- 7 - a Ruger 57, 5.7x28mm caliber pistol, bearing serial number 641-47539;
- 8 - a Glock 43, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number AHAZ467;
- 9 - a Sig Sauer P320, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number 58J246286;
- 10 - a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9 Plus, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number JLC7150;
- 11 - a Glock 17 Gen 5, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number BWNB806;
- 12 - a Smith & Wesson M&P Shield 9, 9mm pistol, bearing serial number JHR3137;
- 13 - a Heckler & Koch USP Compact, .40 cal pistol, bearing serial number 26-067574;
- 14 - a Savage Quality, .32 ACP pistol, bearing serial number 8325;
- 15 - a Ruger New Model Single-Six, .22 caliber pistol, bearing serial number 263-68635;
- 16 - a Smith & Wesson Bodyguard 380, .380 ACP pistol, bearing serial number KBN0832; and,
- 17 - a PWS Hardened Arms Model MK1 rifle, bearing serial number MK1-100741.

1 Defendants ELIODORO TAPIA and NIKA ELOISA SALAZAR

2 - a Smith and Wesson Model 642, .38 SPL+P caliber pistol, bearing serial  
3 number DPS0418.

4 DATED this 18 day of March 2026.

5 A TRUE BILL



6  
7  
8  
9 Todd Blanche  
10 Deputy Attorney General

11 Alison Gregoire

12 Alison Gregoire  
13 Criminal Chief

14 Brandon Pang  
15 Brandon Pang  
16 Assistant United States Attorney

## 18 U.S.C. § 3142. Release or detention of a defendant pending trial

(a) In general.—Upon the appearance before a judicial officer of a person charged with an offense, the judicial officer shall issue an order that, pending trial, the person be—

(1) released on personal recognizance or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond, under subsection (b) of this section;

(2) released on a condition or combination of conditions under subsection (c) of this section;

(3) temporarily detained to permit revocation of conditional release, deportation, or exclusion under subsection (d) of this section; or

(4) detained under subsection (e) of this section.

(b) Release on personal recognizance or unsecured appearance bond.—The judicial officer shall order the pretrial release of the person on personal recognizance, or upon execution of an unsecured appearance bond in an amount specified by the court, subject to the condition that the person not commit a Federal, State, or local crime during the period of release and subject to the condition that the person cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample from the person if the collection of such a sample is authorized pursuant to section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a), unless the judicial officer determines that such release will not reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required or will endanger the safety of any other person or the community.

(c) Release on conditions.--(1) If the judicial officer determines that the release described in subsection (b) of this section will not reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required or will endanger the safety of any other person or the community, such judicial officer shall order the pretrial release of the person—

(A) subject to the condition that the person not commit a Federal, State, or local crime during the period of release and subject to the condition that the person cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample from the person if the collection of such a sample is authorized pursuant to section 3 of the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 14135a); and

(B) subject to the least restrictive further condition, or combination of conditions, that such judicial officer determines will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community, which may include the condition that the person—

(i) remain in the custody of a designated person, who agrees to assume supervision and to report any violation of a release condition to the court, if the designated person is able reasonably to assure the judicial officer that the person

will appear as required and will not pose a danger to the safety of any other person or the community;

(ii) maintain employment, or, if unemployed, actively seek employment;

(iii) maintain or commence an educational program;

(iv) abide by specified restrictions on personal associations, place of abode, or travel;

(v) avoid all contact with an alleged victim of the crime and with a potential witness who may testify concerning the offense;

(vi) report on a regular basis to a designated law enforcement agency, pretrial services agency, or other agency;

(vii) comply with a specified curfew;

(viii) refrain from possessing a firearm, destructive device, or other dangerous weapon;

(ix) refrain from excessive use of alcohol, or any use of a narcotic drug or other controlled substance, as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802), without a prescription by a licensed medical practitioner;

(x) undergo available medical, psychological, or psychiatric treatment, including treatment for drug or alcohol dependency, and remain in a specified institution if required for that purpose;

(xi) execute an agreement to forfeit upon failing to appear as required, property of a sufficient unencumbered value, including money, as is reasonably necessary to assure the appearance of the person as required, and shall provide the court with proof of ownership and the value of the property along with information regarding existing encumbrances as the judicial office may require;

(xii) execute a bail bond with solvent sureties; who will execute an agreement to forfeit in such amount as is reasonably necessary to assure appearance of the person as required and shall provide the court with information regarding the value of the assets and liabilities of the surety if other than an approved surety and the nature and extent of encumbrances against the surety's property; such surety shall have a net worth which shall have sufficient unencumbered value to pay the amount of the bail bond;

(xiii) return to custody for specified hours following release for employment, schooling, or other limited purposes; and

(xiv) satisfy any other condition that is reasonably necessary to assure the appearance of the person as required and to assure the safety of any other person and the community.

In any case that involves a minor victim under section 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242, 2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a) (1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425 of This title, or a failure to register offense under section 2250 of this title, any release order shall contain, at a minimum, a condition of electronic monitoring and each of the conditions specified at subparagraphs (iv), (v), (vi), (vii), and (viii).

(2) The judicial officer may not impose a financial condition that results in the pretrial detention of the person.

(3) The judicial officer may at any time amend the order to impose additional or different conditions of release.

(d) Temporary detention to permit revocation of conditional release, deportation, or exclusion.—If the judicial officer determines that—

(1) such person—

(A) is, and was at the time the offense was committed, on—

(i) release pending trial for a felony under Federal, State, or local law;

(ii) release pending imposition or execution of sentence, appeal of sentence or conviction, or completion of sentence, for any offense under Federal, State, or local law; or

(iii) probation or parole for any offense under Federal, State, or local law; or

(B) is not a citizen of the United States or lawfully admitted for permanent residence, as defined in section 101(a)(20) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(20)); and

(2) such person may flee or pose a danger to any other person or the community;

such judicial officer shall order the detention of such person, for a period of not more than ten days, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays, and direct the attorney for the Government to notify the appropriate court, probation or parole official, or State or local law enforcement official, or the appropriate official of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If the official fails or declines to take such person into custody during that period, such person shall be treated in accordance with the § 3142. Release or detention of a defendant pending trial, 18 USCA §

3142 other provisions of this section, notwithstanding the applicability of other provisions of law governing release pending trial or deportation or exclusion proceedings. If temporary detention is sought under paragraph (1)(B) of this subsection, such person has the burden of proving to the court such person's United States citizenship or lawful admission for permanent residence.

(e) Detention.—(1) If, after a hearing pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f) of this section, the judicial officer finds that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community, such judicial officer shall order the detention of the person before trial.

(2) In a case described in subsection (f)(1) of this section, a rebuttable presumption arises that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community if such judicial officer finds that—

(A) the person has been convicted of a Federal offense that is described in subsection (f)(1) of this section, or of a State or local offense that would have been an offense described in subsection (f)(1) of this section if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed;

(B) the offense described in subparagraph (A) was committed while the person was on release pending trial for a Federal, State, or local offense; and

(C) a period of not more than five years has elapsed since the date of conviction, or the release of the person from imprisonment, for the offense described in subparagraph (A), whichever is later.

(3) Subject to rebuttal by the person, it shall be presumed that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of the community if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that the person committed—

(A) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

(B) an offense under section 924(c), 956(a), or 2332b of this title;

(C) an offense listed in section 2332b(g)(5)(B) of title 18, United States Code, for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;

(D) an offense under chapter 77 of this title for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years or more is prescribed; or

(E) an offense involving a minor victim under section 1201, 1591, 2241, 2242,

2244(a)(1), 2245, 2251, 2251A, 2252(a)(1), 2252(a)(2), 2252(a)(3), 2252A(a)(1), 2252A(a)(2), 2252A(a)(3), 2252A(a)(4), 2260, 2421, 2422, 2423, or 2425 of this title.

(f) Detention hearing.—The judicial officer shall hold a hearing to determine whether any condition or combination of conditions set forth in subsection (c) of this section will reasonably assure the appearance of such person as required and the safety of any other person and the community—

(1) upon motion of the attorney for the Government, in a case that involves—

(A) a crime of violence, a violation of section 1591, or an offense listed in section 2332b(g)(5)(B) for which a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years or more is prescribed;

(B) an offense for which the maximum sentence is life imprisonment or death;

(C) an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), the Controlled Substances Import and Export Act (21 U.S.C. 951 et seq.), or chapter 705 of title 46;

(D) any felony if such person has been convicted of two or more offenses described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of this paragraph, or two or more State or local offenses that would have been offenses described in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of this paragraph if a circumstance giving rise to Federal jurisdiction had existed, or a combination of such offenses; or

(E) any felony that is not otherwise a crime of violence that involves a minor victim or that involves the possession or use of a firearm or destructive device (as those terms are defined in section 921), or any other dangerous weapon, or involves a failure to register under section 2250 of title 18, United States Code; or

(2) upon motion of the attorney for the Government or upon the judicial officer's own motion, in a case that involves—

(A) a serious risk that such person will flee; or

(B) a serious risk that such person will obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice, or threaten, injure, or intimidate, or attempt to threaten, injure, or intimidate, a prospective witness or juror.

The hearing shall be held immediately upon the person's first appearance before the judicial officer unless that person, or the attorney for the Government, seeks a continuance. Except for good cause, a continuance on motion of such person may

not exceed five days (not including any intermediate Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday), and a continuance on motion of the attorney for the Government may not exceed three days (not including any intermediate Saturday, Sunday, or legal holiday). During a continuance, such person shall be detained, and the judicial officer, on motion of the attorney for the Government or sua sponte, may order that, while in custody, a person who appears to be a narcotics addict receive a medical examination to determine whether such person is an addict. At the hearing, such person has the right to be represented by counsel, and, if financially unable to obtain adequate representation, to have counsel appointed. The person shall be afforded an opportunity to testify, to present witnesses, to cross-examine witnesses who appear at the hearing, and to present information by proffer or otherwise. The rules concerning admissibility of evidence in criminal trials do not apply to the presentation and consideration of information at the hearing. The facts the judicial officer uses to support a finding pursuant to subsection (e) that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of any other person and the community shall be supported by clear and convincing evidence. The person may be detained pending completion of the hearing. The hearing may be reopened, before or after a determination by the judicial officer, at any time before trial if the judicial officer finds that information exists that was not known to the movant at the time of the hearing and that has a material bearing on the issue whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure the appearance of such person as required and the safety of any other person and the community.

(g) Factors to be considered.--The judicial officer shall, in determining whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community, take into account the available information concerning—

(1) the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, including whether the offense is a crime of violence, a violation of section 1591, a Federal crime of terrorism, or involves a minor victim or a controlled substance, firearm, explosive, or destructive device;

(2) the weight of the evidence against the person;

(3) the history and characteristics of the person, including—

(A) the person's character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, financial resources, length of residence in the community, community ties, past conduct, history relating to drug or alcohol abuse, criminal history, and record concerning appearance at court proceedings; and

(B) whether, at the time of the current offense or arrest, the person was on probation, on parole, or on other release pending trial, sentencing, appeal, or completion of sentence for an offense under Federal, State, or local law; and

(4) the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by the person's release. In considering the conditions of release described in subsection (c)(1)(B)(xi) or (c)(1)(B)(xii) of this section, the judicial officer may upon his own motion, or shall upon the motion of the Government, conduct an inquiry into the source of the property to be designated for potential forfeiture or offered as collateral to secure a bond, and shall decline to accept the designation, or the use as collateral, of property that, because of its source, will not reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required.

(h) Contents of release order.—In a release order issued under subsection (b) or (c) of this section, the judicial officer shall—

(1) include a written statement that sets forth all the conditions to which the release is subject, in a manner sufficiently clear and specific to serve as a guide for the person's conduct; and

(2) advise the person of—

(A) the penalties for violating a condition of release, including the penalties for committing an offense while on pretrial release;

(B) the consequences of violating a condition of release, including the immediate issuance of a warrant for the person's arrest; and

(C) sections 1503 of this title (relating to intimidation of witnesses, jurors, and officers of the court), 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations), 1512 (tampering with a witness, victim, or an informant), and 1513 (retaliating against a witness, victim, or an informant).

(i) Contents of detention order.—In a detention order issued under subsection (e) of this section, the judicial officer shall—

(1) include written findings of fact and a written statement of the reasons for the detention;

(2) direct that the person be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal;

(3) direct that the person be afforded reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel; and

(4) direct that, on order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility in which the person is confined deliver the person to a United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in

connection with a court proceeding.

The judicial officer may, by subsequent order, permit the temporary release of the person, in the custody of a United States marshal or another appropriate person, to the extent that the judicial officer determines such release to be necessary for preparation of the person's defense or for another compelling reason.

(j) Presumption of innocence.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying or limiting the presumption of innocence.