Court jacher

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

:

•

1

:

:

:

::

Criminal Division – Felony Branch

TUPERINA COURT OF 2081 MCT OF COULDIAN 2010 AL DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

ALBRECHT MUTH

2

203 MAR -7 A 9:55

Case No. 201 CF1 15683 Hon. Russell Canan Status Hearing: March 7, 2013 Trial: March 25, 2013

MOTION FOR CHANGE OF VENUE

Trial in this matter is scheduled to begin March 25, 2013. Albrecht Muth, through undersigned counsel, hereby moves to this Court pursuant to the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of a fair trial and *Welch v. United States*, 466 A.2d 829 (D.C. 1983), for a change of venue based on irremediable adverse pretrial publicity against him. Mr. Muth provides the following points and authorities in support of his motion.

1. On August 16, 2011, Mr. Muth was arrested for the murder of Viola Drath, who he found dead in their home on August 12, 2011.

2. Since Ms. Drath's death this case has been in the media as both front page and local news. The press continues to report on almost every status and other hearing in this case and most recently reported in great detail the allegations contained in the government's motion in limine to admit evidence of other crimes, to which the defendant is not yet required to respond.

3. Because of the amount of media coverage there is no way the Mr. Muth will receive a fair trial in the District of Columbia.

4. The leading case on change of venue motions in this jurisdiction is Welch v. United States, 466 A.2d 829 (D.C. 1983). In Welch, our Court of Appeals cites one of its earlier en banc decisions for the proposition that change of venue is not available in the District

of Columbia. Welch, 466 A.2d at 834 (citing United States v. Edwards, 430 A.2d 1321, 1345 (D.C. 1981). In addition, the Welch court quotes the following passage from Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart, 427 U.S. 539, 565 (1976): "Pretrial publicity, even if pervasive and concentrated, cannot be regarded as leading automatically and in every kind of criminal case to an unfair trial."

 Despite these edicts, the Welch court went on to recognize that pretrial publicity can be so inflammatory as to give rise to a presumption that a defendant was deprived of a fair trial. Id. at 835 (citing Rideau v. Louisiana, 373 U.S. 723 (1963)). Even in concluding that the pretrial publicity in the case before it did not rise to the level of precluding a fair trial for the defendant, the Welch court left open the possibility that "extreme circumstances" might require a change of venue. Welch, 466 A.2d at 835.
The Welch court affirmed the trial court's factual findings that "the media coverage has been neither inherently prejudicial nor dramatically staged." The trial court also found and the appellate court agreed that "the [media] accounts [of the case] have been straight-forward, unemotional factual accounts of events and of the progress of official

and unofficial investigations." Id.

7. The same cannot be said of the instant case. Thus, finding a D.C. resident who has not seen and been influenced by these stories will be next to impossible.

WHEREFORE for the foregoing reasons and any reasons that might appear at a hearing on this motion, Mr. Muth respectfully moves this Court for entry of an order changing the venue of the trial to a location that would allow selection of jurors not prejudiced by the sensational pretrial publicity that has attended his case.

2

Respectfully submitted,

Dana Page (D.C. Bar No. 484029) Craig Nickein (D.C. Bar No. 986250) Public Defender Service On Behalf of Albrecht Muth 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004 (202) 824-2549

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing Motion was emailed to Glenn Kirschner and Erin Lyons, Assistant United States Attorneys, Office of the United States Attorney, 555 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530, on this 7th day of March, 2013.

Dana Page