

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,

v.

No. CR

,

Defendants.

ORDER

On the ex parte motion of defendant _____ filed by his appointed counsel, this Court finds:

1. Counsel for [defendant] have demonstrated in that motion that the expert services of a “mitigation specialist” are reasonably necessary for [defendant’s] representation in connection with issues related to the potential sentencing in this cause.

2. From the resume submitted in connection with the motion, it appears that _____, is qualified to provide such services. _____ regularly-charged rate of \$60 per hour plus expenses is determined to be reasonably necessary to carry out her responsibilities.

3. This Court does not however contemplate the issuance of a blank check to _____ or any other court-appointed person. Accordingly [defendant’s] counsel are ordered to file detailed monthly reports reflecting the services rendered by _____ and the charges sought to be made for those

services, to enable this Court to determine the appropriateness of the charges and rule on their approval. To carry out the concept of 21 U.S.C. §848(q)(9) that such matters may be carried out on behalf of a defendant without disclosure to the government, all such submissions shall be made ex parte to this Court's chambers and shall then be filed under seal.

It is hereby ordered that effective immediately _____ is appointed as mitigation specialist for defendant _____ and that her rate is set at \$60 per hour plus expenses, subject to monthly reporting as stated in Paragraph 3 of the findings.

United States District Judge

Date: September 7, 1990