

ALBERT B. SAMBAT (CABN 236472)
CHRISTOPHER J. CARLBERG (CABN 269242)
MIKAL J. CONDON (CABN 229208)
PARADI JAVANDEL (CABN 295841)
U.S. Department of Justice
Antitrust Division
450 Golden Gate Avenue
Box 36046, Room 10-0101
San Francisco, CA 941092
Tel: 415.934.5300 /Fax: 415.934.5399
albert.sambat@usdoj.gov

CHRISTOPHER CHIOU
Acting United States Attorney
Nevada Bar Number 14853
RICHARD TONY LOPEZ
Assistant United States Attorney
501 Las Vegas Boulevard South, Suite 1100
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
Tel: 702.388.6336 / Fax: 702.388.6418
RALopez@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for the United States

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RYAN HEE; and VDA OC, LLC, formerly
ADVANTAGE ON CALL, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:21-cr-00098-RFB-BNW

**OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT RYAN
HEE'S MOTION TO DISMISS OR IN THE
ALTERNATIVE TO SUPPRESS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1		
2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
3	INTRODUCTION.....	1
4	FACTUAL BACKGROUND	2
5	A. The Government’s Investigation Into Defendants’ Collusive Agreement	2
6	B. Defendant’s Consensual Interview	3
7	C. Consensual Copying of Defendant’s Devices	5
8	D. The Grand Jury Subpoenas	6
9	E. The Government’s Disclosure.....	7
10	LEGAL ANALYSIS	9
11	A. The Prosecutors’ Conduct Did Not Violate Rules of Professional Conduct.....	9
12	1. Nevada’s Rules of Professional Conduct Govern	9
13	2. The Prosecutors’ Conduct Did Not Violate Rule 4.2.....	10
14	a. Defendant Was Not Represented by CCH’s Counsel for the Purposes of Rule 4.2.....	11
15	b. Even If the Defendant Were a “Represented Person,” The Government’s Contacts Were Authorized Under Rule 4.2’s Law Enforcement Exception.	15
17	3. The Prosecutors’ Conduct Did Not Violate Rule 8.4.....	20
18	4. Violation of a Rule of Professional Conduct Does Not Give Rise to the Sanctions Sought by Defendant	22
19	B. The Government Did Not Violate Defendant’s Constitutional Rights	24
20	1. The Government’s Conduct Did Not Implicate Defendant’s Constitutional Rights.....	24
22		
23	C. Defendant Was Not Prejudiced	28
24	CONCLUSION.....	29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Chavez v. Robinson</i> , No. 18-36083, --- F.4th ---, 2021 WL 4075369 (9th Cir. Sept. 8, 2021)	26
<i>Doe v. Superior Ct.</i> , 36 Cal. App. 5th 199 (2019)	12, 18, 19
<i>Fitzgerald v. Mercedes Benz USA, LLC</i> , 2021 WL 3620429 (C.D. Cal. April 5, 2021).	11
<i>G.K. Las Vegas LP v. Simon Prop. Group, Inc.</i> , 204CV01199DAEGWF, 2008 WL 11388585 (D. Nev. June 18, 2008)	11, 12
<i>In Disciplinary Proceedings Regarding Doe</i> , 876 F. Supp. 265 (M.D. Fla. 1993)	18
<i>Joseph Binder Schweizer Emblem Co.</i> , 167 F. Supp. 2d 862 (E.D.N.C. 2001)	18, 23
<i>Malinsky v. New York</i> , 324 U.S. 401 (1945).	27
<i>Marina Dist. Dev. Co., LLC v. AC Ocean Walk, LLC</i> , No. 220CV01592-GMN-BNW, 2020 WL 5821836 (D. Nev. Sept. 30, 2020)	13
<i>Mincey v. Arizona</i> , 437 U.S. 385 (1978)	27
<i>Palmer v. Pioneer Inn Associates, Ltd.</i> , 59 P.3d 1237 (Nev. 2002)	12, 14
<i>Rebel Commc'ns v. Virgin Valley Water Dist.</i> , No. 2:10-cv-00513-LRH-GWF, 2011 WL 677308 (D. Nev. Feb. 15, 2011)	12
<i>Reck v. Pate</i> , 367 U.S. 433 (1961)	27
<i>Rothgery v. Gillespie County, Tex.</i> , 554 U.S. 191 (2008)	26
<i>Schneckloth v. Bustamonte</i> , 412 U.S. 218 (1973)	28
<i>Snider v. Superior Ct.</i> , 113 Cal. App. 4th 1187 (Cal. 2003)	12
<i>United States v. Bynum</i> , 362 F.3d 574 (9th Cir. 2004)	22
<i>United States v. Carona</i> , 660 F.3d 360 (9th Cir. 2011)	17, 18, 21
<i>United States v. Grass</i> , 239 F. Supp. 2d 535 (M.D. Pa. 2003)	passim

1	<i>United States v. Guerrerio</i> , 675 F. Supp. 1430 (S.D.N.Y. 1987)	20, 24
2	<i>United States v. Kenny</i> , 645 F.2d 1323 (9th Cir. 1981)	17, 18, 19, 27
3	<i>United States v. Lopez</i> , 4 F.3d 1455 (9th Cir. 1993)	23
4	<i>United States v. Powe</i> , 9 F.3d 68 (9th Cir. 1993)	16, 17, 19, 20
5	<i>United States v. Scozzafava</i> , 833 F. Supp. 203 (W.D.N.Y. 1993)	19
6	<i>United States v. Talao</i> , 222 F.3d 1133 (9th Cir. 2000)	23
7	<i>United States v. Tingle</i> , 658 F.2d 1332 (9th Cir. 1981)	27
8	<i>United States v. Tucker</i> , 8 F.3d 673 (9th Cir. 1993)	29
9	Statutes	
10	18 U.S.C § 2511	22
11	28 C.F.R. § 77.5	24
12	28 U.S.C. § 530B	24
13	Rules	
14	ABA Model Rule 4.2	passim
15	ABA Model Rule 8.4	passim
16	California Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 1-100(A)	24
17	California Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 4.2	10, 11, 16, 17
18	California Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 8.4.	passim
19	California Rule of Professional Conduct 8.5	10
20	Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 1.0(f)	14
21	Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 1.0A(d)	24
22	Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 4.2	1, 10, 14, 16
23	Nevada Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4	10, 20, 21
24		

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Hee's Motion to Dismiss makes sweeping, legally and factually unsupported accusations of prosecutorial misconduct arising from purported ethical and constitutional violations. Defendant's arguments are facially invalid and legally meritless. The government violated no ethical rules or constitutional requirements.

The government did not violate Nevada's Rule 4.2 because Defendant was not represented at the time of his interview. In addition, the ABA's Model Rule 4.2 (and California's) contains an express exception for law enforcement investigative activities, which is incorporated by reference in Nevada and which Defendant ignores. Defendant also ignores countless Ninth Circuit precedents. The law is clear: even if Defendant was represented by counsel in connection with the government's investigation (he was not), preindictment, noncustodial interviews of represented persons for a law enforcement purpose do not violate Rule 4.2.

Similarly, the government did not violate Rule 8.4. The Ninth Circuit has routinely found that a prosecutor's supervision of otherwise lawful investigatory techniques—including those involving subterfuge or deceit—do not constitute a violation of her ethical obligations. And the ABA's Standing Committee on Ethics and Professional Responsibility has endorsed surreptitious recordings under circumstances akin to those here, including for counsel not engaged in law enforcement. Given the seriousness of the purported violations he is seeking to remedy, Defendant's failure to acknowledge this substantial authority to the contrary is troubling.

Defendant's attempt to shoehorn the government's authorized preindictment contact with him into a panoply of alleged constitutional violations is similarly unavailing. The Fifth Amendment is implicated only when a defendant is in custody or when his statements are coerced or involuntary; the Sixth Amendment right to counsel does not attach preindictment. Neither right was implicated by Defendant's voluntary, uncoerced, noncustodial preindictment confession. Finally, Defendant's argument that his Fourth Amendment rights were violated

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.