

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 1:09-cv-02802-REB- MEH

JEREMY C. MYERS,

**Plaintiff,**

v.

BRIAN KOOPMAN, in his individual capacity,

**Defendant.**

---

**DEFENDANT'S SUBMISSION OF LEGAL AUTHORITIES TO MAGISTRATE  
JUDGE HEGARTY RE: LEGALITY AND CONDITIONS OF *IN CAMERA*  
EXAMINATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS**

---

DEFENDANT Brian Koopman ("Koopman"), by and through his attorneys, the Loveland City Attorney's Office and Wick & Trautwein, LLC, hereby submits the following legal authorities to Magistrate Judge Hegarty regarding the legality and conditions of an *in camera* examination by the Court, suggested by Magistrate Judge Hegarty, of confidential informants who were the subject of Judge Hegarty's Minute Order [#187, filed 04/12/2012], which legal authorities Judge Hegarty solicited during the Status Conference held on April 26, 2012 [#193, filed 04/26/2012]:

1. *Gaines v. Hess*, 662 F.2d 1364, 1369 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) ("[A]n *in camera* hearing is the appropriate procedural vehicle for determining whether the informant's testimony would lend significant credence to [criminal defendant's] defense. Such a procedure will limit the extent of the disclosure of the informant's identity and information, thereby protecting the State's interest in avoiding unnecessary disclosure,

while at the same time it will safeguard defendant's right to the testimony of any accessible witness who may be significantly helpful to his defense. . . . Numerous other circuits have approved the *in camera* hearing as a device to ensure proper application of the *Roviaro* test. . . . The *in camera* procedure has the advantage of giving the trial court considerable flexibility in determining if disclosure is warranted. . . . We leave to the discretion of the trial court how best to determine the relevance of the informant's testimony, although the *in camera* proceedings should be transcribed and sealed to permit meaningful review while retaining limited disclosure.

2. *United States v. Moralez*, 908 F.2d 565, 569 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) ("In *Gaines v. Hess*, 662 F.2d 1364 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981), we affirmed the use of an *in camera* hearing to determine whether an informant's testimony would lend significant credence to a defendant's defense." [citing *United States v. Perez-Gomez*, 638 F.2d 215, 218 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981); *Garcia v. United States*, 373 F.2d 806, 808 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1967)]) (recognizing that other circuits have approved the use of *in camera* proceedings to assess the relevance of an informant's testimony and to ensure proper application of the *Roviaro* test) (remanding for the district court to hold *in camera* hearings to determine relevance of the informant's testimony and whether disclosure is warranted, and to ascertain the government's interests in resisting disclosure and production, "leave[ing] to the discretion of the trial court how best to conduct these proceedings," but indicating that "the *in camera* hearings should be transcribed and sealed to permit meaningful review while retaining limited disclosure."").

3. *United States v. Perez-Gomez*, 638 F.2d 215, 218 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) ("This Court has previously determined that an *in camera* hearing on the discoverability of an

informer, conducted without the presence of the [criminal] defendant or his counsel, is not an abuse of discretion.”).

4. *United States v. Fairchild*, 122 F.3d 605, 610 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1997) (“Important policy considerations exist for not allowing [criminal] defendants or their counsel to attend such [in camera informants’] hearings”).

5. *United States v. Morales*, 917 F.2d 18 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) (describing without criticism procedure used by district court to conduct *in camera* hearing to determine whether disclosure of government informant’s identity was warranted and whether government had a *bona fide* interest in resisting disclosure: “The district court conducted a hearing at which it asked counsel for the government and the defendant to submit questions to be asked of the informant. The court then excused counsel and brought the informant into a closed courtroom for interrogation. At the conclusion of the proceeding, the court made findings of fact, which it sealed. These findings, together with the sealed transcript of the *in camera* hearing, have been transmitted to us for further review.”).

6. *In the Matter of the Search of 1638 E. 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma*, 993 F.2d 773, 775 n.3 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993) (“If the district court holds such a [informants’ *in camera*] hearing, it may, if necessary, file its findings and reasoning under seal to preserve the confidentiality of the informant’s identity yet still provide for meaningful appellate review.”).

7. *United States v. Mendoza-Burciaga*, 981 F.2d 192, 195 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) (speaking approvingly of district court practice by which the court tape recorded questions posed by the criminal defendant’s counsel before the *in camera* hearing and

then had the government agents/confidential informant furnish their answers during the *in camera* hearing, during which the court itself vigorously questioned government counsel and the agents).

8. *United States v. Johnson*, 65 Fed. Appx. 628, 2003 WL 21259785 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2003) (criminal defense counsel was allowed to submit a list of questions for the district court to ask of the government's confidential informant during *in camera* hearings).

Undersigned defense counsel, Kent N. Campbell, did not, during legal research, find any reported cases specifically dealing with *in camera* examinations of confidential informants within the context of a Section 1983 civil rights suit.

DATED this 30th day of April, 2012.

WICK & TRAUTWEIN, LLC

LOVELAND CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

By: *s/Kent N. Campbell*  
Kent N. Campbell  
Kimberly B. Schutt  
323 S. College Avenue, Suite 3  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524  
Telephone: (970) 482-4011  
Fax: (970) 482-8929  
[kcampbell@wicklaw.com](mailto:kcampbell@wicklaw.com)  
[kschutt@wicklaw.com](mailto:kschutt@wicklaw.com)  
Attorneys for Defendant Brian  
Koopman

By: *s/John R. Duval*  
John R. Duval  
500 East 3rd Street  
Loveland, Colorado 80537  
Telephone: (970) 962-2540  
Fax: (970) 962-2900  
[duvalj@ci.loveland.co.us](mailto:duvalj@ci.loveland.co.us)  
Attorneys for Defendant Brian  
Koopman

**CERTIFICATE OF FILING**

I hereby certify that on April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing DEFENDANT'S SUBMISSION OF LEGAL AUTHORITIES TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE HEGARTY RE: LEGALITY AND CONDITIONS OF IN CAMERA EXAMINATION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMANTS with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the following e-mail address:

Randall R. Meyers, Esq.  
315 W. Oak, Suite 100  
Fort Collins, CO 80521  
randy.meyers@att.net  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*

/s/Jennifer E. Jones

---