

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

---

**State of Minnesota,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**Mohamed Mohamed Noor,**

Defendant.

**ORDER ON REQUESTS  
FOR VISUAL OR AUDIO  
COVERAGE****Court File No. 27-CR-18-6859**

---

The above-entitled matter came before Judge Kathryn L. Quaintance on February 22, 2019, on the parties' joint objection to the requests for visual or audio coverage on file with this Court. There were no appearances.

The Court and parties have received several requests by the media for visual and/or audio coverage of the pretrial hearing and the jury trial in this matter.

These requests, and the Court's action on these requests, are governed by Rule 4 of the Minnesota General Rules of Practice for the District Courts. Rule 4.01 provides the general rule that no visual or audio recordings shall be taken in any courtroom, area of a courthouse where courtrooms are located, or other area designated by order of the chief judge during a trial or hearing of any case. At the Hennepin County Government Center, these areas include Floors 3 through 19, Floor 20, and Floor 24 of the Court Tower. Fourth Judicial District Court Policy D.13(2).

General Rule of Practice 4.02(d) sets forth the exceptions to the general rule as they apply to criminal proceedings before a defendant has been found guilty. Pursuant to this rule, a judge may authorize, with the consent of all parties, the visual or audio recording and reproduction of "appropriate court proceedings."

A hearing that takes place outside the presence of the jury, such as one to determine the admissibility of evidence and to determine motions, is not an appropriate court proceeding for visual or audio reproduction. Gen. R. Prac. 4.02(d)(v). The pretrial hearing in this case is such a hearing; therefore, visual or audio coverage of the pretrial is prohibited.

With respect to the trial in this case, the parties together have provided a written objection to visual or audio coverage pursuant to Rule 4.03(b). The rule does not permit the media to file a response to the objection.

Given that both parties have objected and that the Court is not aware of any reasons or authority to override that objection, the Court does not authorize visual or audio recording of the trial in this case.

Based on the foregoing,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**

There will be no audio or visual recording or reproduction of the pretrial or trial in this matter except the recording made as the official court record.

BY THE COURT:

Date: February 22, 2019

  
Kathryn L. Quaintance  
Judge, Fourth Judicial District