

Supreme Court
of the
State of New York



JUAN M. MERCHAN
JUDGE OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS
SUPREME COURT, CRIMINAL TERM
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT

CHAMBERS
100 CENTRE STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y. 10013

Via Email

September 6, 2024

Todd Blanche, Esq.
99 Wall Street
Suite 4460
New York, NY 10005

ADA Matthew Collangelo
New York County District Attorney's Office
One Hogan Place
New York, NY 10013

Re: *People v. Trump*, Ind. No. 71543-2023

Dear Counsel:

By letter dated August 14, 2024, Defendant requests an adjournment of his sentencing, currently scheduled for September 18, 2024, until after the 2024 presidential election. He argues the adjournment is necessary to provide adequate time to “assess and pursue” appellate options in the event this Court denies his pending Criminal Procedure Law (“CPL”) § 330.30 motion and to avoid the potential “politically prejudicial” impact that a public sentencing could have on him and his prospects in the upcoming election. He attempts to bolster his application by repeating a litany of perceived and unsubstantiated grievances from previous filings that do not merit this Court’s attention and will not be addressed in this Decision. The People, by letter dated August 16, 2024, state that they “defer to the Court on the appropriate post-trial schedule that allows adequate time to adjudicate defendant’s CPL § 330.30 motion[.]” Nonetheless, the People, “to assist the Court” with its determination, identify several reasons why an adjournment would be appropriate.

On August 29, 2024, Defendant informed this Court by letter that he had filed a second Removal Notice in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York (“USDC-SDNY”). Defendant’s motion was denied by Judge Hellerstein, and Defendant is currently appealing that decision to the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

As a threshold matter, this Court finds that, despite the People’s stated neutrality, they present concerns in their letter of August 16, 2024, in a manner which seemingly supports Defendant’s application for an adjournment. The People certainly do not oppose, and a careful reading of their response can fairly be construed as a joinder of the motion.

Notably, had Defendant been sentenced on July 11, 2024, as originally scheduled, there would of course have been no cause for delay. However, on July 1, 2024, the Supreme Court of the United States rendered a historic and intervening decision in *Trump v. United States*, 144 S Ct 2347 [2024]. Relying on that decision, Defendant immediately sought leave of this Court to file a CPL § 330.30 motion to set aside the verdict on the instant matter and to dismiss the indictment. In light of the Supreme Court’s decision which this Court must interpret and apply as appropriate, this Court granted Defendant leave to file his motion. Defendant’s application to adjourn sentencing until after resolution of his motion was not opposed by the People in their July 2, 2024, letter response. To allow full briefing by both parties, and this Court the time necessary to adequately consider the motion, sentencing was rescheduled initially to September 6, 2024. It was then adjourned again to September 18, 2024, following the filing of a third defense motion for this Court’s recusal. This now means that any adjournment, of even one week beyond September 18, will bring us within approximately 41 days of the 2024 presidential election.

This matter is one that stands alone, in a unique place in this Nation’s history, and this Court has presided over it since its inception – from arraignment to jury verdict and a plenitude of motions and other matters in-between. Were this Court to decide, after careful consideration of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Trump*, that this case should proceed, it will be faced with one of the most critical and difficult decisions a trial court judge faces - the sentencing of a defendant found guilty of crimes by a unanimous jury of his peers.

This adjournment request has now been decided in the same way this Court has decided every other issue that has arisen since the origination of this case, applying the facts and the law after carefully considering the issues and respective arguments of the parties to ensure that the integrity of the proceeding is protected, justice is served, and the independence of this judiciary kept firmly intact.