

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iii
Issues Presented For En Banc Rehearing.....	1
Course of Proceedings and Disposition Of The Case	3
Statement Of Facts.....	3
Argument	6
A. The Panel’s Holding That Rule 16(a)(1)(A) Does Not Require Disclosure of Contemporaneous Notes of the Defendant’s Statement “In Every Case” Is An Important Ruling That Deserves En Banc Reconsideration.....	9
B. The Panel’s Holding That the Trial Court’s Order Forbidding Cross-Examination Regarding Content of the Notes, and Its Instruction That the 302 Was Accurate Based on the Notes, Did Not Violate the Confrontation Clause Warrants En Banc Reconsideration	12
C. The Panel’s Ruling on the Jencks Act Will Unsettle the Law in This Court and Deserves En Banc Review	14
CONCLUSION.....	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Delaware v. Van Arsdall, 475 U.S. 673 (1986)12

United States v. Beasley, 576 F.2d 626 (5th Cir. 1978)14, 15

United States v. Carucci, 183 F.R.D. 614 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)9, 10

United States v. Gonzalez, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3838 (N.D.N.Y. Mar. 24, 1998)9

United States v. Griggs, 111 F. Supp. 2d 551 (M.D. Pa. 2000).....9

United States v. Landerman, 109 F.3d 1053 (5th Cir. 1997).....12, 13

United States v. Martin, 565 F.2d 362 (5th Cir. 1978)14

United States v. Molina-Guevara, 96 F.3d 698 (3d Cir. 1996).....9

United States v. Muhammad, 120 F.3d 688 (7th Cir. 1997).....10

United States v. Rosario-Perolta, 175 F.3d 48 (1st Cir. 1999)15

United States v. Wright, 2001 WL 523394 (D. Kan. Apr. 26, 2001)9

Wilkerson v. Cain, 233 F.3d 886 (5th Cir. 2000)12

STATUTES

18 U.S.C. §10012

18 U.S.C. §3500 (b) -14