

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

**Case No. 08-80736-Civ-Marra/Johnson**

**JANE DOE #1 and JANE DOE #2**

**v.**

**UNITED STATES**  
\_\_\_\_\_ /

**SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF  
JANE DOE #1 AND JANE DOE #2'S RESPONSE TO GOVERNMENT'S SEALED  
MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

COME NOW Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 (also referred to as "the victims"), by and through undersigned counsel, to provide supplemental authority in support of their Response to Government's Sealed Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction (DE 127).

At issue in these pleadings is whether the victims' petition for enforcement of their CVRA rights (filed in July 2008) should now be dismissed for a purported lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Government has pointed to certain limitations on relief found in the CVRA as somehow restricting the victims' ability to obtain relief. Those limitations, found in 18 U.S.C. § 3771(d)(5), apply only to crime victims' efforts to obtain a "new trial" or to "re-open a plea or sentence," as the victims specifically argued in their Response. *See* DE 127 at 5.

In a recently-published decision, the Fifth Circuit reversed a district court ruling and agreed with the victims' interpretation of the statute. In *In re Allen*, ---F.3d---, 2012 WL 4009717 (5th Cir. 2012), the Fifth Circuit refused to apply certain time limits found in § 3771(d)(5) to crime victims seeking relief under the Act. The Fifth Circuit held that: "Because

Petitioners are not seeking to reopen a plea or sentence, that provision is *inapplicable*.” *Id.* at \*1 (emphasis added).<sup>1</sup>

Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2 respectfully submit that this holding supports their argument that § 3771(d)(5) is inapplicable to this case, meaning that the Court remains free to adopt all other remedies, including equitable remedies, to enforce the CVRA. The Government’s motion to dismiss should accordingly be denied for this reason and the other reasons previously advanced by the victims.

---

<sup>1</sup> The arguments that the Fifth Circuit agreed with were advanced by one of victims’ counsel in this case, Professor Cassell.

DATED: December 10, 2012

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ Bradley J. Edwards

Bradley J. Edwards  
FARMER, JAFFE, WEISSING,  
EDWARDS, FISTOS & LEHRMAN, P.L.  
425 North Andrews Avenue, Suite 2  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
Telephone (954) 524-2820  
Facsimile (954) 524-2822  
Florida Bar No.: 542075  
E-mail: brad@pathtojustice.com

*and*

Paul G. Cassell  
*Pro Hac Vice*  
S.J. Quinney College of Law at the  
University of Utah  
332 S. 1400 E.  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112  
Telephone: 801-585-5202  
Facsimile: 801-585-6833  
E-Mail: [cassellp@law.utah.edu](mailto:cassellp@law.utah.edu)

Attorneys for Jane Doe #1 and Jane Doe #2

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The foregoing document was served on December 10, 2012, on the following using the

Court's CM/ECF system:

Dexter Lee  
A. Marie Villafaña  
Assistant U.S. Attorneys  
500 S. Australian Ave., Suite 400  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
(561) 820-8711  
Fax: (561) 820-8777  
E-mail: Dexter.Lee@usdoj.gov  
E-mail: [ann.marie.c.villafana@usdoj.gov](mailto:ann.marie.c.villafana@usdoj.gov)  
Attorneys for the Government

Roy Black, Esq.  
Jackie Perczek, Esq.  
Black, Srebnick, Kornspan & Stumpf, P.A.  
201 South Biscayne Boulevard  
Suite 1300  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305) 37106421  
(305) 358-2006