matters in a manner which supports the verdict. That is after all what they did, is render a verdict against the defendant.

So based on the testimony offered at trial, a rational trier of fact could have found the essential elements of conspiracy to kidnap and murder Drug Enforcement Agent Camarena beyond a reasonable doubt, therefore, this motion, in the view of the Court, should be denied for those reasons.

We have three separate motions filed under Rule 33. The first is a motion under Rule 33 for a new trial based upon the verdict being against the weight of the evidence.

Well, I think by what I have just said, I do not believe the verdict to have been against the weight of the evidence. In fact, the verdict would be well-supported by the evidence presented if the evidence is believed. And the jury believed it.

The Court's conclusion is that a new trial should not be granted on the grounds that the verdict is against the weight of the evidence.

Now, Federal Rule 33 provides that the Court may grant a new trial to a defendant if required in the interest of justice, and places the burden on a defendant in a motion for new trial to persuade the Court that the