

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case 2:10-cr-20310-SHM-cgc

ABDULLAH RAFIZ SHAHEED ASHANTI,

Defendant.

**ORDER DISMISSING AS MOOT DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR DISCLOSURE OF
CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANT’S IDENTITY AND PERSONAL IDENTIFYING
INFORMATION, MOTION FOR NOTICE OF THE GOVERNMENT’S INTENTION TO
USE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE IN ITS CASE-IN-CHIEF AND/OR AT SENTENCING
HEARING, MOTION FOR RELEASE OF GRAND JURY TESTIMONY, AND MOTION
FOR THE AUTOMATIC AND/OR EARLY PRODUCTION OF *JENCKS*/ RULE 26.2
STATEMENTS**

Before the Court are Defendant’s Motion for Disclosure of Confidential Informant’s Identity and Personal Identifying Information (Docket Entry “D.E.” #74), Motion for Notice of the Government’s Intention to Use Specific Evidence in its Case-in-Chief and/or at Sentencing Hearing (D.E. #77), Motion for Release of Grand Jury Testimony (D.E. #78), and Motion for the Automatic and/or Early Production of *Jencks*/ Rule 26.2 Statements (D.E #79). The instant motions were referred to United States Magistrate Judge Charmiane G. Claxton for determination.¹ (D.E. #107). On July 12, 2011, Defendant filed a Notice to Withdraw Motions (D.E. #150). Based upon

¹ At the hearing, the Magistrate Judge initially advised that she would enter Reports & Recommendations as to these motions. However, upon review of the District Court’s Order of Reference, which explicitly refers these motions for determination, the Magistrate Judge will enter an Order on these motions.

Defendant's Notice to Withdraw Motions, as orally modified with respect to other pending motions²,
the instant motions are hereby DISMISSED AS MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 13th day of July, 2011.

s/ Charmiane G. Claxton
CHARMIANE G. CLAXTON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

² Defense counsel advised at the July 13, 2011 hearing that his July 12, 2011 Notice to Withdraw Motions incorrectly listed certain pending motions that he did not wish to withdraw. (D.E. #73, 75, 76, 81). However, Defense counsel affirmed that he did intend to withdraw the remaining motions addressed in this Order (D.E. #74, #77, #78, #79), which were correctly listed in the Notice.