

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	Criminal No. 01-455-A
)	
ZACARIAS MOUSSAOUI)	
a/k/a "Shaqil,")	
a/k/a "Abu Khalid)	
al Sahrawi,")	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

The defendant, pro se, has filed several untitled pleadings (Docket #s 205, 206 and 211) as well as a captioned motion entitled "Emergency Order Must be Given to Dismiss and Exclude the Government Appointed Standby Lawyer to Appear in My Case and in Court on the Arraignment on the 25 June 2002 Because these Appointed Standby Lawyer Undermine my Constitutional Right to Represent Myself (Pro Se) and are Actively Conspiring by "Legal" Means to Kill Me" (Docket # 213) in which the defendant disavows any relationship with stand-by counsel and requests that Charles Freeman, Esq. be considered his only legal advisor. Specifically, the defendant insists that stand-by counsel not be present at counsel table during his re-arraignment on June 25, 2002; and, instead, requests that Mr. Freeman be permitted to sit with him.

The defendant is free to refuse assistance from his stand-by counsel. However, his refusal to cooperate with stand-by counsel does not relieve them of their obligation to pursue a defense

strategy for Mr. Moussaoui and to be prepared to defend this case if Mr. Moussaoui should forfeit his right to represent himself. Therefore, stand-by counsel will remain inside the well of the court, but will not be seated at defendant's table. Stand-by counsel will not speak on behalf of the defendant unless he loses his right to represent himself.

The defendant has requested that Charles Freeman, Esq. be permitted to sit with him at counsel table to provide legal advice during the re-arraignment hearing. He also states that Mr. Freeman is the only person who can speak for him or conduct any actions outside the court on his behalf.

As the United States correctly argues in its Omnibus Response to Defendant's Pro Se Motions Regarding Attorney Charles Freeman, Mr. Freeman is not licensed to practice law in the Commonwealth of Virginia, has not been admitted to practice before this court, has not been admitted to practice in this case pro hac vice as required by Local Rule 83.1, and has not entered an appearance in this case. He may already have violated Local Rule 83.1 by submitting two pleadings, which have been filed for administrative purposes only, but will not be considered by the Court. Because Mr. Freeman has not been qualified to lawfully represent the defendant in this court, he may not sit inside the well of the court at the defendant's June 25, 2002 re-arraignment. He may, however, attend court proceedings as a

member of the public.

For all of these reasons, the defendant's repetitive motions concerning stand-by counsel and Mr. Freeman are DENIED.

The Clerk is directed to forward copies of this Order to the defendant, pro se; counsel for the United States; stand-by defense counsel; Charles Freeman, Esq.; the Court Security Officer; and the United States Marshal.

Entered this 24th day of June, 2002.

/s/

Leonie M. Brinkema
United States District Judge

Alexandria, Virginia