UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

United States v. Olson

United States v. Olson · No. 25-cr-69-1 (RCL) · Decided June 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia denies Erlend Olson’s motion to reconsider his pretrial detention order and his request for an evidentiary hearing. The Court concludes that the new information concerning Olson’s health and the anticipated length of pretrial proceedings does not materially alter the prior findings that he presents a flight risk, based on the seriousness of the charges, sentencing exposure, foreign ties, financial circumstances, and alleged witness tampering. Olson is ordered to remain detained pending trial.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Royce C. Lamberth
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	June 15, 2026
DOCKET	25-cr-69-1 (RCL)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendant moved under the Bail Reform Act to reconsider the district court's prior order affirming his pretrial detention and requested an evidentiary hearing based on purportedly changed circumstances, principally his health conditions and the projected delay before trial.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)(B), a detention hearing may be reopened before trial only when information was unknown to the movant at the time of the hearing and materially bears on whether conditions of release can reasonably assure the defendant's appearance and community safety. The government must establish by a preponderance of the evidence that detention is warranted based on flight risk.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published district court memorandum opinion; persuasive authority within the district and nonbinding elsewhere.
PARTIES	United States of America v. Erlend Olson

TOPICS

bail criminal procedure tax evasion sentencing

PRACTICE AREAS

criminal procedure pretrial detention bail tax crimes

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Olson presented previously unknown information with a material bearing on the conditions of release sufficient to reopen his detention hearing under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)(B).
2. Whether the four factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g), considered in light of Olson's asserted health conditions and projected delay before trial, established that conditions of release could reasonably assure his appearance.
3. Whether Olson was entitled to an evidentiary hearing on the asserted changed circumstances.

HOLDINGS

1. A detention hearing may be reopened only upon information that was unknown to the movant at the original hearing and that materially bears on whether conditions of release can reasonably assure the defendant's appearance or community safety; Olson's asserted discovery burden, projected trial delay, alleged release-history explanations, and health information did not satisfy that standard.
2. Continued pretrial detention was appropriate because the government proved by a preponderance of the evidence that no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure Olson's appearance.
3. Olson was not entitled to an evidentiary hearing because the information he presented did not warrant reopening the detention hearing.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"The Act requires that federal courts release a defendant before trial unless a court determines, after a hearing, that "no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure" the defendant's appearance in court or the "safety of any other person and the community.""* (3)

> *"Meanwhile, the government has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that pretrial detention continues to be appropriate based on the defendant's flight risk."* (15)

> *"Indeed, it continues to be true that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance in court."* (15)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Olson was charged with a fraud conspiracy, multiple fraud counts, and tax evasion arising from an alleged scheme involving approximately $250 million from investors and lenders, along with alleged concealment of more than $9 million and tax-related deception. The court relied on his substantial potential sentencing exposure, foreign citizenship and travel ties, unstable circumstances, prior release violations, and alleged attempts to tamper with witnesses. Olson also presented evidence of significant medical conditions and argued that the long period before trial justified release, but the court found that these circumstances did not overcome the existing flight-risk considerations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Olson was indicted in the District of Columbia on fraud-conspiracy, wire-fraud, mail-fraud, and tax-evasion charges. After a detention hearing, a magistrate judge in the District of New Mexico ordered him detained pending trial. The district court denied Olson's emergency motion to revoke that order, finding him principally to be a flight risk. Olson later moved for reconsideration; the court denied both reconsideration and an evidentiary hearing and ordered that he remain detained.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Worrell, No. 1:21-cr-292-RCL, 2021 WL 2366934, at *9 (D.D.C. June 9, 2021)
- United States v. Leathers, 412 F.2d 169, 171 (D.C. Cir. 1969)
- United States v. Vasquez-Benitez, 919 F.3d 546, 550 (D.C. Cir. 2019)
- United States v. Simpkins, 826 F.2d 94, 96 (D.C. Cir. 1987)
- United States v. Xulam, 84 F.3d 441, 442 (D.C. Cir. 1996)
- United States v. Bikundi, 47 F. Supp. 3d 131, 134 (D.D.C. 2014)
- United States v. Hong Vo, 978 F. Supp. 2d 41, 43 (D.D.C. 2013)
- United States v. Ali, 793 F. Supp. 2d 386, 391 (D.D.C. 2011)
- United States v. Amar, 300 F. Supp. 3d 287, 289 (D.D.C. 2018)
- United States v. Hodge, 820 F. Supp. 3d 24, 28 (D.D.C. 2026)
- United States v. Rebollo-Andino, 312 F. App’x 346, 348 (1st Cir. 2009)
- United States v. LaFontaine, 210 F.3d 125, 134-35 (2d Cir. 2000)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-columbia-united-states-district-court-for-the-distr/2026/united-states-v-olson-t5tgctvs