

DISTRICT COURT, BOULDER COUNTY, COLORADO		<p>DATE FILED September 3, 2025 10:20 PM</p> <p>△ COURT USE ONLY △</p> <p>Case Number: 2025CR785 Division: 13 Courtroom:</p>
Court Address: 1777 SIXTH STREET P.O. BOX 4249, BOULDER, CO, 80306-4249		
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO		
v. Defendant(s) MOHAMED SABRY SOLIMAN		
<p align="center">Order:Mr. Soliman's motion to continue his arraignment (D-014)</p>		

The motion/proposed order attached hereto: GRANTED.

The Court has reviewed D-013, the People's Response and Objection, and D-014. The Court finds that Defendant has set forth good cause to continue the September 3, 2025 arraignment. Notwithstanding the People's representation of willingness to waive the timelines set forth in C.R.S. 16-8-103 until a motions hearing date, defense counsels' representation that restrictions imposed by the federal facility have prevented them from meaningfully reviewing discovery with Mr. Soliman is sufficient to meet the good cause standard given the nature, number, and severity of charges in this case.

To conserve resources and avoid further inconvenience to the victims, the Court suggests that the parties may reset the matter administratively on any mutually agreeable date before November 30, 2025. If an agreeable date cannot be found, or if the parties need to address other issues with the Court, the September 3, 2025 date may convert to a status conference and Mr. Soliman may appear via WebEx.

Issue Date: 9/3/2025



NANCY WOODRUFF SALOMONE
District Court Judge

COUNTY COURT, Boulder County, Colorado Court Address: 1776 6 th Avenue Boulder, CO 80306	<div style="text-align: center;"> <input type="checkbox"/> COURT USE ONLY <input type="checkbox"/> </div>
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO v. MOHAMED SOLIMAN, Defendant.	
Megan Ring, Colorado State Public Defender Kathryn Herold #40075 Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Nicole Collins #33122 Office Head, Boulder Regional Office Boulder Regional Public Defenders 2555 55TH Street D-200, Boulder, CO 80301 Phone: (303) 444-2322 Fax: (303) 449-6432 E-mail: boulder.defenders@state.co.us	Case No. 25CR785 Division 8
MR. SOLIMAN'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HIS ARRAIGNMENT (D-014)	

MOHAMED SOLIMAN, through counsel, is requesting this Court continue his arraignment. In support of this request, Mr. Soliman states the following:

1. On June 5, 2025, the government filed a complaint and information in this case. It included 118 charges. The court scheduled a preliminary hearing for July 15, 2025.
2. On June 30, 2025, the government filed an amended complaint and information. The new complaint and information contained 184 charges. As part of that amended complaint, the government charged Mr. Soliman with two counts of murder in the first degree.
3. Mr. Soliman requested the Court continue the preliminary hearing because of the additional charges. The Court denied that request.
4. On July 15, 2025, Mr. Soliman waived his preliminary hearing. At the time of that hearing counsel asked for additional time for the arraignment. The Court denied that request.
5. An arraignment is set for September 9, 2025. On August 25, 2025, Mr. Soliman filed notice of his request to continue his arraignment.
6. On August 29, 2025, the government filed a response to D-013, objecting to any continuance of the arraignment.

7. The government argues that because Mr. Soliman entered a plea in his federal case, he should have to enter a plea in his state case. It is not that simple. You cannot compare the federal timelines or procedural demands to the state timelines or procedural demands because they are completely different.
8. Unlike under Colorado law where Mr. Soliman must give notice at the time of arraignment of an insanity and/or expert mental condition testimony, federal law does not require that notice at the time of the plea.
9. Unlike under Colorado law where speedy trial is 180 days from the entering of not guilty plea, speedy trial in federal court is much more flexible. Although in federal court speedy trial started to run at the time of the filing of the indictment, on June 24, 2025, the Court in that case granted a motion to exclude days from speedy trial which has the current speedy trial in the federal case running on June 9, 2025.
10. The government in their response says they will not object to good causes to allow Mr. Soliman until the motion hearing for a change of plea pursuant to C.R.S. 16-8-103 therefore he should have to enter a plea at first arraignment. That is irrelevant to the Court's current analysis of whether Mr. Soliman is entitled to a continued arraignment. Mr. Soliman is telling this Court he has not had sufficient time to analyze the case to enter a plea. Once trial is set there is a completely different analysis that needs to take place and requirements of counsel to ensure Mr. Soliman's constitutional rights are protected. Any motion hearing in this case would be scheduled well in advance of any requirement in the federal case to make such a decision, just further demonstrating the need for continued arraignment.
11. The government has no place in telling this Court or counsel for Mr. Soliman what constitutes as effective assistance of counsel. Counsel is telling this Court, entering a plea three months after date of offense, is making us per se ineffective. For example, counsel is still waiting for permission from the federal facility where Mr. Soliman is housed to bring in a computer to review discovery with him.
12. The government further argues there is no prejudice against Mr. Soliman therefore there is no need for a continued arraignment. First and foremost, prejudice is not the standard. That said, there is clear and substantial prejudice against Mr. Soliman by the government in their attempts to circumvent Mr. Soliman's constitutional rights. Being forced, just three months after the date of offense, to enter a plea to 184 charges is prejudicial when Mr. Soliman is telling this Court he does not know what plea he wishes to enter. It is substantially prejudicial when counsel hasn't reviewed all the discovery in this case prior to entering a plea. It is substantially prejudicial when counsel has not had enough time to counsel Mr. Soliman on what plea he should enter at arraignment. It is substantially prejudicial if your counsel has not fully investigated your case and explored possible experts/lay witnesses.
13. Mr. Soliman incorporates all arguments made in D-013 into this motion.

WHEREFORE, to ensure Mr. Soliman's constitutional rights are protected under both the Colorado and United States Constitution, Mr. Soliman requests this Court continue his arraignment.

Respectfully Submitted,

MEGAN A. RING
COLORADO STATE PUBLIC DEFENDER

_____/s/Kathryn Herold_____
Kathryn Herold #40075
Supervising Deputy State Public Defender

_____/s/ Nicole Collins
Nicole Collins #33122
Office Head, Boulder Regional Office

Dated: September 2, 2025

Certificate of Service

I hereby certify that on September 2, 2025,
I served the foregoing document by
E filing same to all opposing counsel of
record.

_____/s/ Kathryn Herold ____

Attachment to Order - 2025CR00085