

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

DIVISION OF ST. THOMAS & ST. JOHN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

3:26-mj-00002

DANIELLA AMOR SAUNDERS JAMES,

Defendant.

**TO: Kyle Payne, Esq., AUSA
Tiana Marie Brown, Esq., AFPD**

ORDER

THIS MATTER came before the Court on January 16, 2026 for a hearing on the Government's Motion for Detention,¹ pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 3142(a)(4) and 3142(e). Dkt. No. 8. The Government was represented by Kyle Payne, Esq., AUSA, and the Defendant was represented by Tiana Marie Brown, Esq., AFPD. The Defendant, Daniella Amor Saunders James, was also present. For the reasons that follow, the Court will grant the Government's Motion.

BACKGROUND

On January 14, 2026, the Court received a copy of an Arrest Warrant dated December 30, 2025 from the Middle District of Florida, along with an Indictment charging Defendant Daniella Amor Saunders James and four others with (1) a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846, drug

¹ Under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5, when a defendant is arrested in a district other than the district where the offense is charged, the defendant may elect to have the detention hearing conducted either in the arresting district or in the charging district. Fed. R. Crim. P. 5(c)(3). Defendant Saunders James requested to proceed with the detention hearing in the arresting district.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 2

trafficking conspiracy involving 5 kilograms or more of cocaine; (2) a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(b)(1)(B)(ii), possession with intent to distribute cocaine, involving 500 grams or more of cocaine; and (3) a violation of 21 U.S.C. § 846, attempt to distribute cocaine, involving 500 grams or more of cocaine. Dkt. Nos. 1, 1-1.

Ms. Saunders James was arrested and made an initial appearance in the District Court of the Virgin Islands, Division of St. Thomas & St. John, on January 14, 2026. The Court scheduled a detention hearing for January 16, 2026. The Government filed a Motion to Proceed by Proffer at the Detention Hearing, Dkt. No. 6, and a Motion for Detention, Dkt. No. 8.

I. The Motion for Detention

In its motion, the Government argued that no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure Ms. Saunders James's appearance at future proceedings or the safety of the community. Dkt. No. 8. The Government explained that the rebuttable presumption of detention applies pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)(A), because Ms. Saunders James is charged with an offense that carries a mandatory minimum sentence of ten years under the Controlled Substances Act. *Id.* This presumption puts a burden of production on the Defendant to present credible evidence that she does not pose a flight risk or that she is not a danger to the community. *Id.*

The Government's central argument is that Ms. Saunders James was the financial and logistical backbone of a large-scale, multinational cocaine trafficking organization led by co-

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 3

conspirator Tarik Aaron. *See* Dkt. No. 8. According to the Government, Ms. Saunders James functioned as Aaron's money collector, financial intermediary, and asset launderer, providing continuity and operational stability to the conspiracy while Aaron was incarcerated. *Id.* at 4.

Specifically, the Government submits that the organization allegedly operated through coordinated parcel shipments, cash collections, and coded communications. *Id.*

Ms. Saunders James exchanged numerous messages with co-defendant Kenneth Roy Garcia in June and July 2025 concerning shortages in cash deliveries. *Id.* at 3-5. The Government characterizes these communications as evidence that Ms. Saunders James was responsible for counting and accounting for drug proceeds. *Id.* at 6. Further, the Government notes that there is no evidence that the payments referenced in the communications between Garcia and Ms. Saunders James ever made it into a United States financial institution. *Id.* at 11.

The Government also asserted that Ms. Saunders James laundered drug proceeds through the purchase of a boat in Tennessee and its attempted importation into the U.S. Virgin Islands. *Id.* at 6. According to the Government, in November 2024, Ms. Saunders James purchased a 2015 Nor-Tech 390 Sport "go-fast" vessel for \$349,900. *Id.* The seller informed law enforcement that approximately \$341,000 of the purchase price was paid in cash, delivered in a duffel bag containing mixed denominations bound with rubber bands, and counted using a money counter supplied by Ms. Saunders James. *Id.* The remaining balance

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 4

was paid by the Defendant through two Zelle transactions totaling \$8,900. *Id.* Ms. Saunders James told the seller that she owns a vape shop in Tampa, Florida. However, the Government asserts that it has found no evidence that Ms. Saunders James's legitimate vape shop businesses generated sufficient income to support a purchase of that magnitude. *Id.* at 9.

The Government's motion further provided that, in February 2025, a logistics company submitted paperwork to import the vessel from Florida to the Virgin Islands: the documents stated that the vessel had been purchased by Aaron and gave a Virgin Islands condominium address, although he was incarcerated in the British Virgin Islands at the time. *Id.* at 7. The U.S. Customs & Border Patrol ("CBP") put a hold on the vessel. *Id.*

Ms. Saunders James went to the CBP office to inquire about the vessel; she subsequently submitted multiple inconsistent bills of sale and purchase documents to CBP, including one reflecting component prices (motor, trailer) that did not add up to the stated total purchase price of the boat. *Id.* at 7–9. The seller told Ms. Saunders James that he would not recreate or update the bill of sale to show a payment plan. *Id.* at 8. She eventually provided CBP documents purporting to grant her power of attorney on Aaron's behalf (that misspelled her name and stated that Aaron had personally appeared before the notary), and a new purchase agreement (that incorrectly identified the vessel as a 2017 not a 2015 model). *Id.* at 8–9. The Government contends these documents were fraudulent. *Id.* at 11. Based on this evidence, the Government characterized Ms. Saunders James as an integral participant in a lucrative, multinational drug trafficking conspiracy, whose role in collecting,

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 5

concealing, and laundering proceeds was essential to the operation's success. *See generally* Dkt. No. 8.

The Government's motion addressed the four 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g) factors required for the Court to consider when making a detention determination. *Id.* at 9-11. As to the nature and circumstances of the offense, the Government notes that Ms. Saunders James is charged with a drug trafficking conspiracy involving cocaine, an offense carrying a ten-year mandatory minimum and a potential life sentence, which reflects both the seriousness of the conduct and an incentive to flee. *Id.* at 10. Second, the Government asserts that the weight of the evidence is overwhelming, as Ms. Saunders James was an integral participant who collected and reconciled drug proceeds, maintained frequent communication with Aaron while he was incarcerated, and laundered proceeds. *Id.* With respect to the Defendant's history and characteristics, the Government cites her alleged involvement in criminal activity in this case and ties to the British Virgin Islands, which, in the Government's view, increases the risk of flight in light of the severe penalties she faces. *Id.* Finally, the Government contends that the Defendant's release would pose a danger to the community, emphasizing that large-scale drug trafficking itself constitutes a serious danger and that individuals who facilitate the collection, concealment, and laundering of drug proceeds are essential to sustaining such operations. As such, the Government contends that no condition or combination of conditions of release could reasonably assure her appearance at future

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 6

proceedings or the community's safety, and she should be detained pending trial. *Id.* at 10–11.

II. The Pretrial Services Report

According to the Pretrial Services Report,² the Defendant is self-employed and owns and operates multiple businesses, including a smoke and hookah retail business in Tampa, Florida, and an event bartending business in St. Thomas. The Defendant reported that she has the ability to operate the smoke and hookah shop remotely while residing in the Virgin Islands. The Pretrial Services Report further notes that the Defendant splits her time between St. Thomas and Florida and maintains a residence in Brandon, Florida. In addition, the Defendant reported possessing a United States passport and passport card, which were in the possession of her brother at the time of the interview, and that her international travel has consisted of family trips to the British Virgin Islands.

The Report also indicated that the Defendant reported business assets valued at approximately \$350,000, vehicles valued at approximately \$28,000, and additional assets totaling approximately \$379,500, with reported liabilities of approximately \$1,800, resulting in an estimated net worth of approximately \$377,700. The Defendant also reported estimated monthly business income of approximately \$23,000 and monthly expenses

² Prior to a detention hearing, U.S. Pretrial Services is statutorily required to provide the Court with verified information relevant to pretrial release, including any risk of danger to the community, and, where appropriate, a recommendation regarding detention or conditions of release. 18 U.S.C. § 3154(1). This information is set forth in a Pretrial Services Report.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 7

totaling approximately \$8,050. The Pretrial Services Report further reflected that Ms. Saunders James does not maintain separate personal bank accounts and does not pay herself a salary, but instead uses her business accounts to pay personal living expenses, including rent, utilities, groceries, insurance, and other recurring costs.

III. The Detention Hearing

At the January 16, 2026, detention hearing, the Court first granted the Government's Motion to Proceed by Proffer³, Dkt. No. 6, and recognized that the charged offense triggered a rebuttable presumption of detention. To rebut the presumption, the Defendant presented testimony from her older brother, Mr. Phillip Saunders, who sought to act as a third-party custodian. Mr. Saunders testified that he resides in St. Thomas with his wife and children in a separate, single-story residence located a few feet away and on the same lot as his grandparents' home. He explained that, if released, the Defendant could reside either with him or at the grandparents' residence, where there is additional space and where the Defendant can continue to assist in caring for their elderly grandfather, who is unable to walk. Mr. Saunders also informed the Court that he is able to move easily between the residences, which would allow him to keep close supervision over the Defendant.

Mr. Saunders further testified that he works for the family business, which owns apartment properties, and that his work schedule is flexible. He stated that he generally

³ The Defendant did not oppose the Government's motion to proceed by proffer at the detention hearing.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 8

works during daytime hours, works limited evening hours about two nights per week, and can step away from work as needed. Based on this proximity and flexibility, Mr. Saunders testified that he would be able to monitor the Defendant's compliance with any conditions of release and agreed that he would report any violations to the Court.

Mr. Saunders also testified that the Defendant has no prior criminal history, served in the military before being discharged due to injury, and has strong family ties in the Virgin Islands. He further stated that the Defendant turned herself in after learning of the warrant and that the family was aware of the charges. He described the Defendant as someone who helps care for their elderly grandfather who cannot walk. With respect to Tarik Aaron, Mr. Saunders testified that he did not personally know him, though he had heard his name and was aware that Aaron was well-known in the community, and people would tell him when Aaron was in town. He further acknowledged that he and the Defendant have ties to the British Virgin Islands but stated that the ties were familial, not criminal. Based on this testimony, the Court found that the Defendant had rebutted the presumption.

The Government argued that detention was warranted based on flight risk and danger to the community. The Government emphasized the mandatory minimum sentence of the drug charges, the strength of the evidence, and the Defendant's alleged role as a financial facilitator in a drug trafficking organization. With respect to flight risk, the Government focused on the Defendant's access to significant financial resources, her alleged

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 9

laundering of drug proceeds, her ties to the British Virgin Islands, and the seriousness of the potential sentence.

The Defendant argued that the Government had not met its burden to show that no conditions of release could reasonably assure her appearance at future proceedings, emphasizing that she voluntarily surrendered, has no criminal history,⁴ and has strong family support and responsibilities in St. Thomas, including caring for her grandfather. The defense reiterated that her ties to the British Virgin Islands were familial rather than criminal.

The Court expressed concern regarding the Defendant's alleged level of involvement in the drug conspiracy, noting that she did not appear to be a peripheral or attenuated participant, but rather someone in the middle of the alleged conduct, assisting in carrying out the financial aspects of the conspiracy. The Court also focused on the Pretrial Services Report, which reflected the Defendant's significant assets and financial resources, including business income, vehicles, a reported net worth of approximately \$377,000, along with a monthly income of \$23,000.00, and a practice of using business accounts to pay personal expenses. The Court emphasized that this access to funds, combined with ties to the British Virgin Islands and proximity to alleged co-conspirators, heightened the risk that the

⁴ Although the Government referenced the Defendant's criminal history in its Motion, the record reflects that the Defendant has no prior charged offenses or criminal convictions. At the hearing, the Government conceded that Ms. Saunders James has no prior criminal history.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 10

Defendant could flee or evade supervision. In particular, the Court highlighted evidence that the Defendant purchased a high-performance vessel for approximately \$349,000 in cash, using a money counter, with additional payments made via Zelle, which demonstrated both access to large amounts of untraceable funds and sophistication in handling illicit proceeds.

After considering the testimony, the proffered evidence, and the § 3142(g) factors, the Court found that although the Defendant had rebutted the presumption of detention, the Government had established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Defendant posed a serious risk of flight and that no conditions or combination of conditions would reasonably assure her appearance. In ruling from the bench, the Court granted the Government's Motion for Detention and ordered Ms. Saunders James detained. This Order memorializes that ruling.

DISCUSSION

I. Applicable Legal Principles

Title 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e) authorizes the Court to detain a defendant after a hearing unless the Court finds that there exists a “condition or combination of conditions [that] will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of any other person and the community.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(1). In making this determination of whether any conditions of release can reasonably assure a defendant’s appearance and the safety of others, the Court must consider the factors set out in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g):

- (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense charged, including whether the offense is a crime of violence, a violation of section 1591, a Federal crime

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 11

of terrorism, or involves a minor victim or a controlled substance, firearm, explosive, or destructive device;

- (2) the weight of the evidence against the person;
- (3) the history and characteristics of the person including—
 - (A) the person's character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, financial resources, length of residence in the community, community ties, past conduct, history relating to drug or alcohol abuse, criminal history, and record concerning appearance at court proceedings; and
 - (B) whether, at the time of the current offense or arrest, the person was on probation, on parole, or on other release pending trial, sentencing, appeal, or completion of sentence for an offense under Federal, State, or local law; and
- (4) the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by the person's release.

18 U.S.C. § 3142(g). “To justify pretrial detention, the Government must establish risk of flight by a preponderance of the evidence and dangerousness by clear and convincing evidence.” *United States v. Kanawati*, 2008 WL 1969964, at *2 (D.V.I. May 5, 2008) (citation modified). “A finding of either risk of flight or danger to the community is a sufficient source of authority to detain the defendant.” *United States v. Richardson*, No. 2009-cr-23, 2009 WL 2044616, at *3 (D.V.I. July 9, 2009).

Pursuant to Section 3142(e)(3), in relevant part, a rebuttable presumption arises in favor of detention where “there is probable cause to believe that the person committed— . . . an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.)[.]” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)(A). Through the presumption, Congress recognized that persons charged with major felonies presented a significant risk of continuing to engage in established patterns of criminal activity and thus

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 12

posed a significant risk of pretrial recidivism. *United States v. Strong*, 775 F.2d 504, 508 (3d Cir. 1985).

Consistent with this framework, the Bail Reform Act provides that “subject to rebuttal . . . it shall be presumed that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of [a defendant] and the safety of the community if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that” the defendant committed, *inter alia*, “an offense for which a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years or more is prescribed in . . . chapter 705 of title 46.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)(A). Once the presumption in favor of detention is established, the burden is placed on the defendant to rebut the presumption by producing countervailing evidence to support his contention that he will appear in court and will not pose a threat to the community. *United States v. Carbone*, 793 F.2d 559, 560 (3d Cir. 1986). This Court has held that to rebut the presumption, a defendant is “required to produce ‘some credible evidence’ to assure his presence before the Court and safety of the community.” *United States v. Richardson*, No. 2009-cr-23, 2009 WL 2044616, at *3 (D.V.I. July 9, 2009) (quoting *Carbone*, 793 F.2d at 560).

However, even if a defendant does not rebut the presumption, the Government still retains the ultimate burden of proving that the defendant should be detained pending trial by showing that no conditions of release can ameliorate the defendant’s risk of flight or the danger he or she poses to the community. *United States v. Hendrickson*, No. 24-cr-00016 (D.V.I. Nov. 27, 2024) (“But in the end, while the presumption operates to shift the burden of

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 13

production, it does not alter the government's statutory burden of persuasion, which is consistent with the presumption of innocence.") (citing *United States v. Lee*, 195 F. Supp. 3d 120, 125 (D.D.C. 2016)).

II. Presumption in Favor of Detention and Burden Framework

The charges against Ms. Saunders James—drug trafficking conspiracy and possession with intent to distribute over 5 kilograms of cocaine—carry a mandatory minimum sentence of ten years under the Controlled Substances Act. *See* 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(b)(1)(A)(ii), 846. Therefore, the rebuttable presumption that “no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required and the safety of the community” applies. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e)(3)(A); *see also* *United States v. Miller*, No. 00-cr-103, 2000 WL 633048, at *4 (E.D. Pa. May 5, 2000) (nature of drug trafficking offense suggests a risk of flight and danger to the community). This Court has held that, to rebut the presumption, a defendant is “required to produce ‘some credible evidence’ to assure his presence before the Court and safety of the community.” *Richardson*, 2009 WL 2044616, at *3 (*Carbone*, 793 F.2d at 560). Such evidence may include “testimony by coworkers, neighbors, family physician, friends, or other associates concerning the arrestee’s character, health, or family situation, or evidence of steady employment.” *United States v. Levy*, No. 08-cr-393, 2008 WL 4978298, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 20, 2008) (citation modified); *see also* *United States v. Suppa*, 799 F.2d 115, 120 (3d Cir. 1986). No single factor or combination of factors is dispositive. *Levy*, 2008

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 14

WL 4978298, at *1. The ultimate determination on this issue is for the Court, “based on all evidence and arguments adduced.” *Id.* (citing *Suppa*, 799 F.2d at 118-19).

III. Risk of Flight

1. Presumption

The threshold for rebutting the presumption of flight risk is low. *United States v. Chagra*, 850 F. Supp. 354, 357 (W.D. Pa. 1994) (defendant’s burden of production is “light and has been construed as easy to meet,” requiring only some credible evidence they will appear). The risk of flight determination “is not to detain habitual criminals or deceitful persons but to secure the appearance of the accused at trial.” *United States v. Himler*, 797 F.2d 156, 160-61 (3d Cir. 1986) (citation modified). However, cases hold that a defendant has “a substantial motive to flee given the severity of the sentence they may face in the event of conviction.” *United States v. Wrensford*, No. 2012-0012, 2012 WL 6028628, at *7 (D.V.I. Dec. 4, 2012) (citation modified).

At the detention hearing, Ms. Saunders James presented evidence intended to rebut the presumption that she poses a risk of flight by demonstrating ties to the community, compliance with legal process, and the availability of supervision. First, the Defendant relied on her brother’s testimony, Mr. Saunders, who testified under oath on behalf of the Defendant and offered to serve as her third-party custodian. See *United States v. Payne*, 17-cr-0031, 2018 WL 3546231, at *10 (D.V.I. July 23, 2018) (finding that the willingness of family members residing within the jurisdiction to serve as third-party custodians supported

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 15

the defendant's claim that they were not a flight risk). Mr. Saunders testified that he and the Defendant were raised in the Virgin Islands and have lived there on and off throughout their lives. He described the Defendant as having deep familial ties in the Virgin Islands, including residing with her grandparents, assisting in the daily care of her elderly grandfather who is unable to walk, and maintaining close contact with immediate and extended family. *See United States v. Anderson*, No. 09-273, 2010 WL 891041, at *11 (W.D. Pa. Mar. 10, 2010) (finding that the defendant rebutted the presumption that he was a risk of flight by presenting evidence of his family relations and ties to the community). He also confirmed that they have familial ties in the British Virgin Islands but assured the Court they are not criminal in nature.

Second, Attorney Brown, Ms. Saunders James's counsel, argued and emphasized the Defendant's voluntary surrender to law enforcement, and represented that once Ms. Saunders James became aware of the warrant, she contacted the Federal Public Defender's Office, coordinated with counsel, and turned herself in, rather than attempting to evade arrest or flee the jurisdiction. Attorney Brown further argued that this conduct undermined an inference that she would abscond if released. Third, Attorney Brown pointed to the Defendant's lack of criminal history and argued that weighed against a finding that Ms. Saunders James would disregard court orders or conditions of release. Finally, Attorney Brown highlighted the Defendant's personal responsibilities and stability, including her role in caring for her grandfather, maintaining employment and family obligations, and her

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 16

asserted willingness to remove herself from Tampa and remain under supervision in the Virgin Islands if released.

Based on this evidence, the Court concluded that Ms. Saunders James met her burden by providing some credible evidence rebutting the presumption that she was a flight risk. Nonetheless, the Government retained the burden of establishing that she should be detained pending trial by showing that no conditions or combination of conditions could reasonably assure the Defendant's appearance or the safety of the community. *United States v. Hendrickson*, No. 24-cr-00016 (D.V.I. Nov. 27, 2024) (citing *United States v. Lee*, 195 F. Supp. 3d 120, 125 (D.D.C. 2016)).

2. Preponderance of the Evidence

At the hearing, the Government argued that the Defendant poses a serious risk of flight based not on past failures to appear, but on her means and ability to flee. Specifically, the Government emphasized the severity of the potential sentence, the strength of the evidence, and the Defendant's access to substantial financial resources. The Government highlighted evidence that the Defendant took an active role in handling and laundering proceeds, including the purchase of a vessel using approximately \$349,000 in cash, with additional payments via Zelle, demonstrating access to large amounts of liquid funds. The Government further argued that the Defendant's reported assets and ties to the British Virgin Islands increase the likelihood that she could flee the jurisdiction if released.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 17

In evaluating these arguments, the Court considered the Indictment, the Pretrial Services Report, and the evidence presented at the hearing. The Court noted that the Pretrial Services Report reflects that the Defendant has significant assets, including business income, vehicles, and a reported net worth of approximately \$377,700, along with a monthly income of \$23,000.00. Further, although Ms. Saunders James reported relatively modest personal income, she acknowledged that her business accounts are used to pay her personal living expenses, including rent, utilities, groceries, insurance, and a commercial lease. The Court also considered evidence that the Defendant maintains a residence in Florida and has ties outside the U.S. Virgin Islands, including ties to the British Virgin Islands. *United States v. Cabrera Ortiz*, No. 3:24-cr-00016, 2024 WL 3673737, at *5 (D.V.I. Aug. 5, 2024) (finding heightened risk of flight where the defendant proposes a third-party custodian in a community in which her only ties are family members, she lacks independent employment or a broader support network in that district, and release would place her outside of the prosecuting district, affording a significant head start should she choose to flee); *see also United States v. Merlino*, No. 99-cr-353, 1999 WL 557943, at *3 (July 30, 1999) (legislative history indicates that family and community ties should not weigh heavily in risk of flight analysis).

Considering the arguments and the evidence, including the Defendant's access to substantial and liquid financial resources, her demonstrated ability to make large cash purchases, and the severity of the sentence she faces even if it is her first offense, the Court

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 18

found that these factors weighed in favor of detention. *See United States v. Flanders*, No. 2010-cr-00029, 2010 WL 4054442, at *8 (D.V.I. Oct. 15, 2010); *see also United States v. Thomas*, No. 2008-0020, 2009 WL 2996532, at *3 (D.V.I. Sept. 16, 2009) (“Community ties and third-party custody is not sufficient to assure Defendants’ appearance for trial, especially since Defendants face their first serious imprisonment time.”). Under these circumstances, the Court finds that no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure the Defendant’s appearance as required and the Government has met its burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Ms. Saunders James poses a risk of flight.

Because detention is warranted on the basis of flight risk, the Court need not reach the issue of danger to the community. *Richardson*, 2009 WL 2044616, at *3 (“A finding of either risk of flight or danger to the community is a sufficient source of authority to detain the defendant.”). Accordingly, based on the analysis above, the Court will grant the Government’s detention motion.

WHEREFORE, it is now hereby **ORDERED**:

1. The Government’s Motion for Detention, Dkt. No. 8, seeking to detain Defendant pending trial, is **GRANTED**.
2. The Defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal.

United States v. Saunders James
3:26-mj-00002
Order Granting Detention
Page 19

3. The Defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with counsel.
4. Upon order of a Court of the United States or upon request of an attorney for the Government, the Federal Bureau of Prisons shall deliver Defendant to the United States Marshal for the purpose of appearance in connection with a Court proceeding.
5. This matter may be reopened by Defendant at a later date pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f) if new evidence develops.

ENTER:

Dated: January 23, 2026

/s/ Emile A. Henderson III
EMILE A. HENDERSON III
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE