United States District Court

DISTRICT OF KANSAS

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

٧.

ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL

RIGOBERTO SOTO-ARREOLA

Defendant

Case Number: 11-20051-01-KHV-DJW

		accordance with the Dan Reform Act, 18 0.3.C. § 5142(1), a determining has been field. I conclude that the following facts
req	uire t	he detention of the defendant pending trial in this case.
•		Part I - Findings of Fact
	(1)	The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1) and has been convicted of a (federal offense) (state or local offense that would have been a federal offense if a circumstance giving rise to federal jurisdiction had existed) that is
		a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4).

In accordance with the Dail Deform Act. 19 U.S.C. 8 2142(f), a detention begins has been held. I conclude that the following feets

		an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in
		a felony that was committed after the defendant had been convicted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f) (1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local offenses.
_	(2)	The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state or local offense.
_	(3)	A period of not more than five years has elapsed since the (date of conviction) (release of the defendant from imprisonment) for the offense described in finding (1).
_	(4)	Findings Nos. (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the safety of (an)other person(s) and the community. I further find that the defendant has not rebutted this presumption. Alternative Findings (A)
	(1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has committed an offense
		for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in
		under 18 U.S.C. 8 924(c)

(2) The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established by finding 1 that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant as required and the safety of the community.

Alternative Findings (B)

(1) There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.

Dated: July 8, 2011

(2)	There is	a serious	risk tha	t the	defendant	will	endanger	the sa	afety o	of anoth	ner perso	n or	the co	ommunit	y.

I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by (clear and convincing evidence) (a preponderance of the evidence) that

Defendant waived a detention hearing because there is an I.C.E. detainer against him. The Court therefore orders defendant to remain detained pending further hearing.

Part II - Written Statement of Reasons for Detention

Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. 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 shall deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

DAVID J. WAXSE, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE