

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :

v. :

DEBORAH JEANE PALFREY, :

Defendant. :

Criminal No. 07-46 (GK)

FILED

OCT 11 2007

ORDER

NANCY MAYER WHITTINGTON, CLERK
U.S. DISTRICT COURT

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's *Pro Se* Motion for Replacement of Her Counsel, Preston Burton, and Permitting Hybrid Representation [Dkt. No. 93]; Preston Burton's *Ex Parte* Motion to Withdraw as Counsel; and Montgomery Blair Sibley's Motion to Substitute as Counsel for Defendant [Dkt. No. 105]. Upon consideration of the Motions, Oppositions, Replies, and the entire record herein, it is hereby

ORDERED that Defendant's *Pro Se* Motion for Replacement of her Counsel [Dkt. No. 93] is **granted in part and denied in part**. At the status conference held in this case on September 7, 2007, the Court denied Defendant's request for hybrid representation. The Court now grants Defendant's request to replace Preston Burton with Montgomery Blair Sibley as her criminal case counsel, and denies her request that the Court "set aside an initial fund," beyond the scope of the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A, so that she may employ and pay the counsel of her choice; it is further

ORDERED that Preston Burton's *Ex Parte* Motion to Withdraw as

(N)

Counsel is **granted**; it is further

ORDERED that the Motion to Substitute as Counsel for Defendant [Dkt. No. 105] is **granted**¹; it is further

ORDERED that Mr. Sibley shall be permitted to submit filings on ECF, and the Clerk of the Court shall accept filings by Mr. Sibley as counsel to Defendant in this case. The Court hereby **vacates** that portion of the Court's Order of April 12, 2007 [Dkt. No. 29] requiring the Clerk of the Court to stay acceptance of such filings until this Court grants leave to file²; and it is further

ORDERED that a Status Conference is scheduled in this matter for **October 22, 2007 at 10:00 a.m.**

Oct. 11, 2007
Date

Gladys Kessler
Gladys Kessler
United States District Judge

Copies to: attorneys of record via ECF

¹ The Court understands Defendant's concern regarding a delay in the ruling on this Motion. The Motion was fully briefed on September 26, 2007. The two week delay in this ruling was occasioned by Defendant's filing, just one day after this Motion became ripe, of a motion to disqualify this judge. The motion to disqualify became ripe on October 9, 2007, and the Court ruled on October 10, 2007. Moreover, had Defendant informed the Court that she did not intend to file a reply in support of her motion to disqualify, it would have been possible to decide that motion earlier.

² The Court does not vacate the other portions of the April 12, 2007 Order.