SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRIMINAL DIVISION -- FELONY BRANCH

SUPERIOR COURT OF
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRIMINAL DIVISION

2012 SEP 26 P 3: 23

FILED

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	Criminal No: 2011-CF1-5683
	:	
v.	:	Judge Russell F. Canan
	:	
ALBRECHT MUTH	:	Status Hearing: October 9, 2012

GOVERNMENT'S NOTICE OF DISCOVERY

The United States, by its counsel, the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, respectfully requests that the Court file as part of the record in this case the attached discovery letter delivered to defense counsel on September 25, 2012.

RONALD C. MACHEN JR.
United States Attorney

GLENN L. KIRSCHNER
ERIN LYONS
Assistant United States Attorneys
(202) 252-7100 (GK)
(202) 252-7244 (EL)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice of Discovery was served via email delivery upon attorney Dana Page, Esq. and Craig Hickein, Esq. of the Public Defender Service, 633 Indiana Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004, this 28th day of September, 2012

Glenn L. Kirschner
Assistant United States Attorney

U.S. Department of Justice

United States Attorney

District of Columbia

Judiciary Center
555 Fourth St. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

September 25, 2012

Dana Page, Esq.
Craig Hickein, Esq.
Public Defender Service
633 Indiana Ave. NW
Washington, D.C. 20004

Re: United States v. Albrecht Muth
Case No. 2011-CF1-15683

Dear Counsel:

We hope our meeting on September 19, 2012 was helpful as we move through the discovery process in this case. As you know, four members of your defense team spent the majority of the day reviewing numerous boxes and bags of documents and other materials previously recovered from your client's home. We appreciate your efforts to narrow the scope of the materials you wanted copied. Though still quite voluminous, we are in the process of having those materials copied as quickly as possible and they should be ready for you in the next few days.

As we discussed, we are attempting to make the physical evidence available for you to view and have tentatively set the morning of September 27, 2012 for an evidence viewing at our office. In the event there is any impediment to the evidence technicians being able to transport the evidence to our office on that date, we will let you know promptly. Additionally, as you are aware, earlier in this case we honored your request to visit, view, and photograph the crime scene before it was released to the decedent's family.

As documented in an earlier discovery letter, we provided you with a computer hard drive containing files and images of the two computer laptops recovered in this case. In the September 19th meeting, you indicated that there was some difficulty accessing the images on that hard drive. On September 20, our IT specialist, John Marsh, contacted you. Mr. Hickein indicated that your investigator had the hard drive and was on leave, but thought you had everything, including the images. He relayed to Mr. Marsh that your IT specialist would contact him after your investigator returns if there were any questions concerning the hard drive. We will continue to make Mr. Marsh available.

We are in receipt of your letter dated September 17, 2012, in which you request additional information about some materials provided to you previously. For ease of reference, we will use the

numbers you designated in your letter to provide the additional information you requested.

Items 1 through 6 were reviewed by Drs. Hugonnet and Phillips, but not by the mental health professionals at St. Elizabeths

Items 7 through 15 are self explanatory (see our letter of September 17, 2012)

Item 16 was a test that was administered by Dr. Hugonnet to your client

Items 17 through 19 were articles obtained by Dr. Hugonnet from the internet

Items 20 through 25 are self-explanatory and constitute additional discovery[1]

Please feel free to call with any questions.

Sincerely,

Glenn L. Kirschner
Assistant United States Attorney
(202) 252-7100

cc: Superior Court Case File

[1]In our earlier letter, Item 25 was erroneously labeled Secret Service documents, rather than State Department documents.