

JUN 23 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

JOHN F. CORCORAN, CLERK
BY:  DEPUTY CLERK

IN RE: SPEEDY TRIAL ACT

STANDING ORDER NO. 06-03

Unless the district judge to whom the case is assigned directs to the contrary, no motion for a continuance made in any criminal case will be granted unless: (1) the movant has conferred with all counsel of record concerning the continuance, including a proposed new trial date which has been cleared with the judge's scheduling clerk or the movant otherwise states why counsel have not conferred and/or obtained an alternative date; (2) the movant's motion states a valid basis for continuance under the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h), and specifically cites the section of the Act authorizing exclusion of the period of delay that would result from the continuance (see Zedner v. United States, 126 S. Ct. 1976 (2006)); and (3) the movant tenders a proposed order which, if entered, would be in compliance with the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

It is so **ORDERED**.

FOR THE COURT:

ENTER: June 23, 2006

/s/ JAMES P. JONES
Chief United States District Judge