

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
UNITED STATES,)	
)	
v.)	Crim. No. 1:21cr134
)	
MARK SAHADY,)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

DEFENDANT’S MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION

Defendant Mark Sahady, by counsel, respectfully requests that the Court clarify that Defendant is no longer bound by the terms of the Order Setting Conditions of Release issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts on January 21, 2021 (attached) and is instead exclusively bound by the Order of Conditions of Release issued by this Court on February 11, 2021 (Doc. 8)

In order to avoid confusion, needless duplication of effort and because terms attending a judicial proceeding logically should spring from the venue of the proceeding, Defendant’s conditions of release during the pendency of his misdemeanor charges should be the exclusive province of the court adjudicating him – i.e., this Court.

Moreover, the Massachusetts order contains restrictions unnecessary, unenforceable and inappropriate. For example, how does one “stay away” from the Massachusetts State House? Boston’s subway, the “T,” traverses the substrata beneath the State House. Would Defendant violate the order by taking that line of the T? The State House is adjacent to the Boston Commons – home to aggressive geese and frequented by city residents and visitors alike. Did the Massachusetts court intend to bar Defendant from this popular and storied public space? Additionally, the Massachusetts court offers absolutely no justification for abridging Defendant’s

