

- (1) the seizure was based on a judicial seizure warrant; or
- (2) an arrest was made in connection with the seizure; or
- (3) drugs or other contraband were seized from the person from whom the property was seized.

Federal law enforcement agencies may expand the circumstances requiring attorney approval. Any attorney review shall verify that:

- (1) the property is subject to federal forfeiture;
- (2) there is probable cause to support the seizure;
- (3) the property is not subject to the jurisdiction of a state court; and
- (4) there is no other legal impediment to a successful forfeiture action.

Federal law enforcement agencies will normally secure attorney review through their own offices of chief counsel or other legal unit but may, in their discretion, request that an AUSA conduct this review. Any further review processes established in the future for federal seizures will also apply to adoptive seizures.

Preseizure planning is an essential part of the review process. Property management issues must be addressed in consultation with the USMS prior to an adoption.⁴⁵

D. Minimum monetary thresholds

Generally, a state or local seizure may not be approved for adoption unless the equity in the property exceeds the following levels:

Conveyances	
Vehicles	\$2,500
Vessels	\$5,000
Aircraft	\$5,000

⁴⁵See Appendix B for a copy of the *Preseizure Planning Guide*.

Real property	
Land and any improvements	For properties with appraised values less than \$100,000 net equity must be at least \$20,000.
All other property	
Currency, bank accounts, monetary instruments, jewelry, etc. ⁴⁶	\$1,000

The U.S. Attorneys, in consultation with federal law enforcement agencies and state and local law enforcement, may institute higher or lower district-wide thresholds for judicial forfeiture cases as law enforcement or management needs require. Similarly, a federal law enforcement agency may institute higher or lower thresholds for administrative forfeiture cases. Written notice of any higher or lower thresholds shall be provided to the Chief, AFMLS and the Special-Agents-in Charge of the federal law enforcement agencies in the affected judicial district. Lower thresholds may not necessarily result in increased sharing with state and local law enforcement. Since sharing is always based on net proceeds, forfeiture of lower dollar-value property may result in no net proceeds to share.⁴⁷

In individual cases, the thresholds may be waived when forfeiture of a particular asset—e.g., a crack house, a conveyance with hidden compartments, or a vehicle used in alien smuggling seized at an international border—will serve a compelling law enforcement interest. Any waiver must be approved in writing by a supervisory-level official designated by the adopting agency, and an explanation of the reason for the waiver must be noted in the case file. The fact that the owner or person in possession of the property has been arrested or will be criminally prosecuted can be an appropriate basis for a waiver.

E. Forfeitures generally follow the prosecution

As discussed in chapter 2, section V, when property is seized as part of an ongoing federal criminal investigation and the criminal defendants are being prosecuted in federal court, the forfeiture action, as a general rule, should be commenced administratively by a federal agency or pursued in federal court, regardless of who made the seizure. Conversely,

⁴⁶ Firearms and assets related to terrorism may be forfeited regardless of value. *See A Guide to the Forfeiture of Firearms and Ammunition* (April 2006) at 22-21.

⁴⁷ “Net proceeds” represents the gross receipts from forfeiture or the sale of forfeited property less qualified third-party interests (e.g., liens, mortgages), federal case-related expenses (e.g., advertising costs, out-of-pocket investigation or litigation expenses), any award paid to a federal informant, and federal property management expenses (e.g., appraisal, storage, security, sale).

when a state or local agency has seized property as part of an ongoing state criminal investigation and the criminal defendants are being prosecuted in state court, any forfeiture action should generally be pursued in state court.

F. 30-day rule for presentation for federal adoption

A federal law enforcement agency may be required to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings by sending written notice “not more than 90 days after the date of seizure by the state or local law enforcement agency.”⁴⁸ In order to allow ample time for federal agencies to process adoptive seizures, state and local agencies must request federal adoption within 30 calendar days of seizure. Any waiver of the 30-day rule must be approved in writing by a supervisory-level official of the adopting agency where the state or local agency requesting adoption demonstrates the existence of circumstances justifying the delay.

G. Direct adoption by the U.S. Attorney

A U.S. Attorney may recommend in writing that a federal law enforcement agency adopt a particular state or local seizure or category of seizures for federal forfeiture. If the federal agency declines to adopt the seizure but has no objection to the direct adoption of the seizure by the U.S. Attorney for judicial forfeiture under federal law, the U.S. Attorney may adopt the seizure and pursue the forfeiture civilly or criminally. On the other hand, if the federal agency declines to adopt the seizure and believes that it should not be adopted for federal forfeiture and the U.S. Attorney disagrees, the U.S. Attorney may refer the matter to the AFMLS Program Management Unit. After consulting with the headquarters office of the seizing agency, AFMLS may authorize direct adoption of the seizure or category of seizures by the U.S. Attorney where a compelling law enforcement purpose justifies such action.

H. Retention of custody by state or local agency during federal forfeiture proceedings

To minimize storage and management costs to the Department of Justice, the state or local agency requesting adoption of a conveyance should serve as the substitute custodian of the property pending forfeiture. The USMS may authorize a state or local law enforcement agency requesting adoption of other personal property, except cash and other financial instruments, to serve as the substitute custodian where appropriate. Use or disposition of the property during this period by state or local law enforcement officials or others is prohibited.

⁴⁸See 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(1)(A)(iv).

I. Real property

Following consultation with the USMS and concurrence by the USAO, a federal law enforcement agency may approve a request for federal adoption of real property seized by a state or local agency. The requirements outlined in 18 U.S.C. § 985, govern the federal seizure and civil forfeiture of real property.

J. Use of anticipatory seizure warrants

If a state or local law enforcement agency commences a forfeiture action under state law, no federal forfeiture action may be commenced as long as the state court has jurisdiction over the subject property. If, however, the state or local authorities determine, for whatever reason, that the state action will be terminated before it is completed, and that the property will accordingly be released, or a federal seizing agency otherwise learns that the state court is about to order the release of property that is federally forfeitable, a federal agency may arrange to seize the property by obtaining an anticipatory seizure warrant from a federal judge or magistrate. The anticipatory seizure warrant must provide that it will be executed only after the state court has relinquished control over the property.⁴⁹

For purposes of the notice requirements in section 983(a)(1), property seized pursuant to an anticipatory seizure warrant in these circumstances is considered the subject of a federal seizure such that the period for sending notice of the forfeiture action is 60 days, commencing on the date when the anticipatory seizure warrant is executed.

⁴⁹ See *United States v. \$174,206.00 in U.S. Currency*, 320 F.3d 658 (6th Cir. 2003) (concurrent jurisdiction doctrine does not bar federal court from exercising in rem jurisdiction over property that state court has released to the claimants after state prosecutors failed to commence a forfeiture action within the deadlines specified by state law); *United States v. \$490,920 in U.S. Currency*, 911 F. Supp. 720 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (district court cannot exercise in rem jurisdiction until state court relinquishes it), *motion for reconsideration granted*, 937 F. Supp. 249, 252-53 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (court may grant anticipatory seizure warrant so Government can seize property as soon as state court relinquishes it); *United States v. One Parcel Property Lot 85*, 100 F.3d 740, 743 (10th Cir. 1996) (initiation of federal civil forfeiture action does not violate concurrent jurisdiction rule as long as property is not actually seized until after state action is dismissed); *United States v. One 1987 Jeep Wrangler*, 972 F.2d 472, 478-479 (2d Cir. 1992) (federal court may exercise jurisdiction over property under federal forfeiture law once it is released by state court and resealed; state court's order releasing property has no effect on federal forfeiture); *United States v. One Black 1999 Ford Crown Victoria Lx*, 118 F. Supp. 2d 115, 118-19 (D. Mass. 2000) (because only one court may exercise in rem jurisdiction over property at a time, federal court may not exercise jurisdiction while state forfeiture action is pending; but once state court rules that property must be released and the order is obeyed, state jurisdiction evaporates and property may be resealed and made subject to forfeiture under federal law; following *Jeep Wrangler*); *United States v. \$3,000,000 Obligation of Qatar National Bank*, 810 F. Supp. 116, 117-19 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) (federal court, though "second in time," may proceed to judgment, assert a lien that will result in seizure of the asset only upon release from state jurisdiction, but stay execution of the judgment until federal jurisdiction is perfected).

K. Concurrent jurisdiction

As noted above, a federal agency may not approve the adoption of a seizure while the property remains subject to the jurisdiction of a state court. Depending on state law, a state court may be deemed to acquire jurisdiction over property seized by a state or local agency in a variety of ways: where a state commences forfeiture proceedings against the seized property, where a party files an action in state court seeking the return of the property, where a state or local agency seizes the property pursuant to a state search warrant or seizure warrant, or even where a state or local law enforcement officer simply seizes the property in the absence of state process. As a matter of comity, the court first assuming in rem jurisdiction over the property retains jurisdiction to the exclusion of all others. Consequently, if a state court has in rem jurisdiction over property, the state court must relinquish jurisdiction before any request for adoption may be approved. In these situations, the agency requesting adoption, with the assistance of the appropriate state or local prosecutorial office, may be required to obtain a state court turnover order relinquishing jurisdiction and authorizing the transfer of the property to a federal law enforcement agency for the purpose of federal forfeiture. Where a state search warrant or seizure warrant contains this authorization, or a state statute or controlling case law authorizes release of seized property for federal forfeiture, a subsequent turnover order is unnecessary.

The turnover order must be obtained from the state court with jurisdiction over the seized property (i.e., the state court that issued the warrant allowing the seizure or before which the state forfeiture proceedings have been commenced). The USAO should not seek such orders in state court, but may assist its state counterparts in doing so. Failure to obtain a turnover order may make it impossible for a federal court to take jurisdiction over the seized property in subsequent judicial forfeiture proceedings. In some cases, this may result in the dismissal or voiding of federal judicial forfeiture proceedings and the return of the property to the person from whom it was originally seized.

Chapter 2

Administrative and Judicial Forfeiture

I. Interplay of Administrative and Civil Judicial Forfeiture

A. Preference for administrative forfeiture

Before 1990, virtually all forfeitures of properties valued at more than \$100,000 were conducted judicially. In 1990, however, the law was amended to permit the administrative forfeiture of cash and monetary instruments, without regard to value, and of other property up to a value of \$500,000. *See* 19 U.S.C. § 1607.

The legislative history of this law makes clear that Congress sought to increase the speed and efficiency of uncontested forfeiture actions and has confidence in the notice and other safeguards built into administrative forfeiture laws. Moreover, the due process protections enacted as part of the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (CAFRA) of 2000 ensure that the administrative forfeiture laws operate fairly. Accordingly, there is a preference for doing forfeitures administratively where it is possible to do so.

In general, properties subject to administrative forfeiture⁵⁰ must be forfeited administratively, unless one of the following exceptions applies.

- (1) Where several items of personal property (other than monetary instruments) are subject to civil forfeiture under the same statutory authority and on the same factual basis, and they have a common owner and a combined appraised value in excess of \$500,000, the property should be forfeited judicially in a single action.
- (2) Where the items subject to forfeiture include some that can be forfeited administratively and others that must be forfeited judicially, the forfeitures may be combined in a single judicial action.

⁵⁰ In general, all property subject to forfeiture may be forfeited administratively except (1) real property (*see* 18 U.S.C. § 985); (2) personal property having a value of more than \$500,000, except as noted in 19 U.S.C. § 1607(a); and (3) property forfeitable under a statute that does not incorporate the Customs laws (*see, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 492, relating to counterfeiting).

- (3) When pursuing administrative forfeiture might create the appearance that the Government is circumventing the time limits on administrative forfeiture set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 983(a), the forfeiture should be done judicially as explained in section I.D at page 47.
- (4) When the U.S. Attorney and the seizing agency agree that the forfeiture should proceed judicially in the first instance, administrative forfeiture is unnecessary.
- (5) When, as explained in section II.B at page 61, the U.S. Attorney requests that the seizing agency suspend the administrative forfeiture to allow the forfeiture to be handled criminally, and the seizing agency agrees to do so, the forfeitures may be pursued exclusively as part of the criminal case.

B. Administrative forfeiture of bank accounts

Section 1607(a)(4) of title 19 states that “monetary instruments” may be administratively forfeited without regard to dollar value. This is an exception to the \$500,000 cap on the administrative forfeiture of personal property set forth in section 1607(a)(1), but it does not apply to funds in a bank account.

The term *monetary instrument* is defined in 31 U.S.C. § 5312(a)(3) to mean currency, traveler’s checks, various forms of bearer paper, and “similar material.” Neither this statutory definition nor the parallel definition in the applicable regulations encompasses the funds in a bank account.⁵¹ Moreover, the legislative history of section 5312(a)(3) indicates that Congress intended the term *monetary instrument* to apply only to highly liquid assets.⁵² Consequently, funds in a bank account may not be considered monetary instruments for the purposes of the exception to the cap on administrative forfeitures. Nor may a seizing agency invoke the exception to the \$500,000 cap in section 1607(a)(4) by waiting until the funds are converted to a monetary instrument such as a check, and then forfeiting the check administratively. If funds in a bank account having a value in excess of \$500,000 are seized from a bank, they must be forfeited judicially regardless of the form they take when received from the bank by the seizing agency.

⁵¹ See also 31 C.F.R. § 103.11(u) (defining monetary instruments).

⁵² H. Rep. No. 91-975, 91st Cong. 1, 2d Sess. (1970), *reprinted in* 1970 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 4407. “It is not the intention of your committee, however, that this broadened authority be expanded any further than necessary to cover those types of bearer instruments which may substitute for currency.”

Funds that were withdrawn from a bank account by the account holder and converted to currency or a monetary instrument before the seizure by a law enforcement agency took place, however, fall within the exception in section 1607(a)(4) and thus may be forfeited administratively regardless of value. Moreover, funds in a bank account of a value of \$500,000 or less may be administratively forfeited pursuant to section 1607(a)(1), subject to the policy on handling forfeitures judicially if the aggregate value of two or more assets exceeds \$500,000, as discussed in section I.A at page 41.

C. Conversion of administrative forfeitures covered by the Customs carve-out to judicial forfeitures covered by CAFRA⁵³

There are times when an administrative forfeiture is commenced under Title 19,⁵⁴ but the ensuing judicial forfeiture is brought under another statute. Title 19 forfeitures, of course, are exempt from the provisions of CAFRA, whereas most other forfeitures are not. This section discusses what action the United States should take when it converts an administrative forfeiture action under Title 19 to a civil judicial action brought under a non-Title 19 statute that is not exempt from the CAFRA requirements.

1. Summary

The reforms enacted by CAFRA are applicable to all civil forfeitures taken under any provision of federal law except for those specifically exempted by 18 U.S.C. § 983(I). Forfeitures to which the provisions of CAFRA are not applicable include, inter alia, forfeitures under Title 19 that are enforced by Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) (formerly components of the U.S. Customs Service). In instances where CBP (on its own, or on behalf of ICE) commences an administrative forfeiture action under Title 19, but the U.S. Attorney subsequently files a civil judicial forfeiture action under a non-Title 19 statute (e.g., 21 U.S.C. § 881, which is not CAFRA-exempt) the U.S. Attorney should comply with all CAFRA deadlines, including the 90-day filing deadline under section 983(a)(3), and CBP should return the cost bond.

⁵³ Section I.C was previously circulated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 03-3 in 2003.

⁵⁴ The reference to forfeitures commenced under Title 19 is to cases in which Title 19 provides the substantive basis for the forfeiture, not cases in which the procedures in Title 19 are incorporated into other forfeiture statutes. *See, e.g.,* 18 U.S.C. § 981(d).

2. Discussion

CAFRA, which took effect on August 23, 2000, enacted a set of procedural provisions in section 983 that governs administrative and judicial forfeitures under all civil forfeiture provisions of federal law, except for those explicitly exempted by section 983(I). Thus, the procedures governing administrative and civil judicial forfeiture in section 983 apply to even the most obscure federal civil forfeiture statutes. The only forfeitures to which section 983 does not apply are those specified in section 983(I), which include, *inter alia*, all forfeitures under Title 19, all forfeitures under Title 26 (including forfeitures of firearms under the National Firearms Act), and certain forfeitures under other statutes enforced by CBP and ICE.⁵⁵ In those cases, the Customs laws remain in effect as if CAFRA had not been enacted. Because section 983(I) exempts many forfeiture provisions enforced by CBP and ICE from the application of the CAFRA reforms, it is generally referred to as the “Customs carve-out” provision.⁵⁶

Given the Customs carve-out in CAFRA, a potential problem arises when a CBP or ICE officer seizes property pursuant to Title 19 authority, initiates an administrative forfeiture action, and—as CBP is required to do—refers the case to the U.S. Attorney following the filing of a claim and cost bond, but the U.S. Attorney subsequently decides to commence a civil forfeiture action under another statute that is not exempt from CAFRA. For example, CBP or ICE may seize property in a drug case under Title 19, but the U.S. Attorney may believe it advantageous to the Government for strategic reasons to pursue the forfeiture under section 881.

Because the Government has chosen to pursue forfeiture under a CAFRA statute (*i.e.*, one not designated under the Customs carve-out provision) all of the CAFRA-mandated procedures and deadlines would become applicable to the Government’s forfeiture case. For example, CAFRA changed the deadlines for filing administrative and civil judicial forfeiture

⁵⁵ Section 983(i)(2) also exempts from the requirements of CAFRA the following provisions of law which allow for forfeiture: section 983(i)(2)(B) exempts the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; section 983(i)(2)(C) exempts the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. § 301 et seq.); section 983(i)(2)(D) exempts the Trading with the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. § 1 et seq.) and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA) (50 U.S.C. § 1701 et seq.) (IEEPA provision added by the USA Patriot Act of 2001, Pub. L. 107-56, Title III, § 316(d), Oct. 26, 2001, 115 Stat. 272, 310); and section 983(i)(2)(E) exempts section 1 of Title VI of the Embargo Act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 233; 22 U.S.C. § 401).

⁵⁶ Section 983(i) does not exempt all statutes enforced by CBP and ICE. The currency and monetary instrument report (CMIR) offenses in Title 31, smuggling offenses under 18 U.S.C. § 545, and other provisions are not exempted from the requirements of CAFRA.

actions from those required under pre-CAFRA law and abolished the cost bond.⁵⁷ In “exempted cases,” such as those filed pursuant to Title 19 under the Customs carve-out provision, the Customs laws and supplemental rules require only that forfeiture proceedings be commenced “forthwith” and be prosecuted “without delay.” Under CAFRA, however, notice of administrative forfeiture generally must be sent within 60 days of the seizure, and the civil judicial complaint must be filed within 90 days of the filing of a claim contesting the administrative forfeiture. *See* section 983(a).⁵⁸

Choosing to pursue judicial forfeiture under a CAFRA statute, after CBP has commenced an administrative forfeiture under an exempted statute, thus presents the Government with a number of questions: Does the 90-day period for filing a judicial forfeiture action under section 983(a)(3) run from the date the claim was filed with CBP (or ICE), or from the date the AUSA decided to pursue civil forfeiture under a CAFRA statute? Does the 60-day notice requirement for administrative forfeitures apply retroactively so that a claimant who did not get notice within 60 days of the seizure could demand the return of the property pursuant to section 983(a)(1)(F) on the ground that the Government did not comply with the requirements in section 983(a)(1)(A)? Should the Government return the cost bond?

The question regarding the cost bond is the easiest to resolve. If the Government is no longer pursuing civil forfeiture under a statute exempted from CAFRA, it has no legal authority to continue to hold the cost bond. In such cases, the U.S. Attorney should advise CBP that the cost bond must be released. On the other hand, if the Government pursues the

⁵⁷ 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(2)(E) provides that “any person may make a claim under subparagraph (A) [of section 983(a)(2)] without posting bond with respect to the property which is the subject of the claim.”

⁵⁸ Section 983(a)(1) deals with notice of administrative forfeiture actions, which must, in general, be sent to interested persons within 60 days of the seizure of the property.

Section 983(a)(2) deals with filing a claim in the administrative forfeiture proceeding in response to the notice. Under this provision, property owners have 30 days from the last date of publication to file a claim, and may do so without having to file a cost bond (section 983(a)(2)(E)).

Section 983(a)(3) deals with the filing of the judicial forfeiture complaint in cases where a claim is filed. Under this provision, the Government has 90 days to file a civil judicial action (or include the forfeiture allegation in a related criminal indictment).

Finally, if the Government files a civil judicial complaint, section 983(a)(4) gives any person claiming an interest in the seized property 30 days to file a claim to the property in accordance with the supplemental rules, and 20 days from the filing of the claim to file an answer.

civil judicial forfeiture under *both* the exempted statute and a CAFRA statute, the cost bond may be retained as long as the exempted cause of action remains part of the complaint.⁵⁹

The question regarding the retrospective application of the 60-day notice requirement is also easy to resolve. If, at the time it seized the property and commenced administrative forfeiture proceedings, CBP or ICE was acting pursuant to an exempted statute, it is not required to send any notice within any fixed period of time. That the U.S. Attorney subsequently decides to pursue the forfeiture under a CAFRA statute does not change that fact. Accordingly, the U.S. Attorney's charging decision would not retroactively convert a properly conducted administrative forfeiture proceeding into one that constituted a violation of the notice requirements in section 983(a)(1).

Moreover, even if we are mistaken in that regard, the same event that created the retrospective violation—the filing of the civil judicial action under the CAFRA statute—would itself render any supposed violation of the notice requirement moot. That is because we interpret section 983(a)(1)(F), which requires the return of the seized property if the Government fails to comply with the 60-day notice deadline “without prejudice to the right of the Government to commence a forfeiture proceeding at a later time,” as allowing the Government to retain possession of the seized property if it promptly files the civil judicial action upon discovery of the missed deadline. *See also Manjarrez v. United States*, 2002 WL 31870533 (N.D. Ill. 2002) (failure to send notice of an administrative forfeiture within the 60-day period prescribed by CAFRA does not bar the Government from commencing a civil judicial forfeiture action against the same property without first returning the property to the claimant). In a case where the supposed violation of the notice requirement does not even occur until the Government has decided to abandon the non-CAFRA forfeiture theory in favor of one to which the notice requirement applies, the Government will have filed the judicial action as discussed in Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 02-2, (*see* section I.F, *infra*) and maintained custody of the property pursuant to an arrest warrant in rem, before any obligation to return the seized property arises.

How to deal with the 90-day filing requirement in section 983(a)(3) presents a closer question. On the one hand, until the U.S. Attorney determines to pursue the civil judicial

⁵⁹ We note that pursuing civil judicial forfeiture under mixed theories (i.e., under CAFRA statutes and statutes covered by the Customs carve-out) will be problematic and is not recommended. Among other things, the trial procedure and jury instructions would be extraordinarily complex, given that hearsay would be admissible to allow the Government to establish probable cause (outside the presence of the jury) on the exempted theory, while only admissible evidence could be used (in the presence of the jury) to establish the forfeitability of the property by a preponderance of the evidence on the CAFRA theory. Also, if the Government meets its burden under both theories, the innocent owner defense in section 983(d) would apply to the CAFRA theory, but would not apply to the exempted theory.

forfeiture under CAFRA statute, the 90-day filing requirement simply does not apply. On the other hand, if the Government routinely seized property under an exempted statute, delayed filing any civil judicial action for more than 90 days after a claimant filed a claim and cost bond, and then filed the judicial forfeiture under a CAFRA statute, it might create the appearance that the initial seizure under the exempted statute was merely a ruse to allow the U.S. Attorney to avoid complying with CAFRA when the Government intended all along to pursue the judicial forfeiture under the CAFRA statute. Accordingly, in any case referred by CBP or ICE where the initial seizure was pursuant to an exempted statute, the U.S. Attorney should make the decision whether to switch theories to a CAFRA statute, or to include both CAFRA and non-CAFRA theories in the complaint, within 90 days of the filing of the claim and cost bond; and if the decision is made to pursue the CAFRA forfeiture, the U.S. Attorney should file the complaint before the 90 days expires, or ask the court for an extension of time in accordance with section 983(a)(3).

D. Whether to file a judicial forfeiture action when the timeliness or form of an administrative forfeiture claim is in dispute⁶⁰

There are times when the claim filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding is facially defective or filed out of time, but the claimant disputes that characterization. This section discusses whether, in such cases, the seizing agency should enter a declaration of forfeiture or refer the case to the U.S. Attorney.

1. Summary

Section 983(a)(2) requires that a claim contesting an administrative forfeiture action contain certain information and be filed within a certain number of days. If the claim is not filed in accordance with the statute, the seizing agency may enter a declaration of forfeiture pursuant to 19 U.S.C. § 1609. There are times, however, when the claimant may dispute the agency's characterization of the claim as defective or untimely.

If the seizing agency ignores the claimant's protestations and proceeds with the declaration of forfeiture without referring the case to the U.S. Attorney, it runs the risk that the claimant may turn out to have been correct. By that time, it is likely that the 90-day period for commencing a civil judicial forfeiture action pursuant to section 983(a)(3) will have expired, and that civil forfeiture of the property will be barred by the "death penalty" provision in section 983(a)(3)(B).

⁶⁰ Section I.D was previously disseminated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 03-4 in 2003.

On the other hand, if the agency routinely forwards untimely or defective claims to the U.S. Attorney, and the U.S. Attorney files a civil judicial forfeiture action to toll the 90-day period, the agency's policy of insisting on strict compliance with section 983(a)(2) will be undermined, and claimants will have little incentive to adhere to the statutory requirements.

On balance, the seizing agencies should continue to adhere to the policy of strict compliance and should only refer valid claims to the U.S. Attorney. The agencies are encouraged, however, to consult with the local U.S. Attorney if the content or timeliness of a claim filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding is questionable before deciding to issue a declaration of forfeiture.

2. Discussion

Section 983(a)(2) provides that a person contesting an administrative forfeiture proceeding must file a claim with the seizing agency not later than the deadline set forth in the letter giving the person notice of the forfeiture, or not later than 30 days after the final day of publication of that notice in a newspaper, if direct notice was not received. *See* section 983(a)(2)(B). Moreover, the statute also provides that the claim must identify the property being claimed, state the claimant's interest in the property, and be made "under oath" subject to penalty of perjury. *See* section 983(a)(2)(c).⁶¹ If no valid and timely claim is filed, the seizing agency is entitled to enter a declaration of forfeiture against the property pursuant to section 1609.

If a claim is timely and contains the required information, however, the agency must transfer the case to the U.S. Attorney, who must either commence a civil or criminal forfeiture action in the district court or return the within 90 days after the agency received the claim. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(3)(A). If the U.S. Attorney does not comply with the statutory requirement, and the 90-day deadline is neither waived by the claimant nor extended by the court, the Government must release the property and the civil forfeiture of the property is forever barred. *See* section 983(a)(3)(B).

In the vast majority of cases, no one files a claim, and the seizing agency proceeds to enter the declaration of forfeiture. In most other cases, a clearly valid and timely claim is filed, and the agency transfers the case to the U.S. Attorney as required by law. In a small but significant number of cases, however, the timeliness or adequacy of the claim is in doubt. In such cases, the seizing agency may—in its discretion—give the claimant additional time to

⁶¹ *See* section III at page 66, regarding the "under oath" requirement.

perfect the claim; but if the claim was untimely, or if the defects are not corrected, the agency has the right to proceed with the administrative forfeiture.

It is clear that the U.S. Attorney's duty to file a civil or criminal forfeiture action in the district court does not arise until a claim is filed with the seizing agency in the proper form. For example, in *Manjarrez v. United States*, 2002 WL 31870533 (N.D. Ill. 2002), the district court held that a claim filed by the claimant's attorney, instead of by the claimant personally, was not under oath as the statute requires, and therefore was not a valid claim. Accordingly, the court held, the 90-day period in which the Government was required to commence a judicial forfeiture action never began to run.

There are times, however, when it is not entirely clear that the claim filed with the seizing agency is defective or untimely. For example, the agency may believe a claim is late because it was filed after the deadline set forth in the notice letter that the agency sent to the claimant; but the claimant may assert that the notice was defective because it was sent to the wrong address. If the agency is convinced that a claim is incomplete or is filed out of time, and it sticks to its guns and proceeds with the administrative forfeiture without referring the case to the U.S. Attorney, there is always the chance that a court will agree with the claimant and hold that the Government should have filed a judicial forfeiture action within the 90-day period prescribed by section 983(a)(3)(A). In that case, because there is no provision in the statute tolling the 90-day period while such disputes are resolved, it is likely that the Government will find itself outside of the 90-day period and unable to pursue the civil forfeiture of the property.

On the other hand, if the seizing agency forwarded every questionable case to the U.S. Attorney, the agency's policy of insisting on strict compliance with the terms of section 983(a)(2) would be rendered meaningless, and claimants would have little incentive to comply with those terms.

What is truly needed to resolve this problem is a provision in the statute tolling the 90-day period while any dispute as to the adequacy or timeliness of the claim filed in the administrative forfeiture proceeding is resolved by the court. But the absence of such a provision does not mean that the Government must liberally construe the otherwise strict requirements of section 983(a)(2). In fact, a recent decision by the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit suggests that when there is a bona fide dispute as to the timeliness of a claim, the court should *equitably toll* the period for filing the judicial action to avoid any injustice to the Government.

In *Longenette v. Krusing*, 322 F.3d 758 (3d Cir. 2003), a claimant mailed his claim to the seizing agency within the statutory time period, but the agency did not receive the claim until after the time period expired. The agency assumed that the claim was untimely and entered a declaration of forfeiture, but the claimant disagreed and filed an action to recover his property in the district court. Ultimately, after protracted litigation, the court of appeals held that the claimant was correct: under pre-CAFRA law, at least, the timeliness of a claim filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding by a prisoner was determined by the “mailbox rule.” That is, the claim was deemed to have been filed when it was mailed.⁶²

By this time, however, the 5-year statute of limitations for filing a civil forfeiture action had expired. The claimant argued that, accordingly, the Government should be required to release the property and should be forever barred from commencing a civil forfeiture action. But the Third Circuit held that in fairness to the Government, given the novel legal issue involved, the statute of limitations would be equitably tolled. Thus, the Government was given 6 additional months in which to commence a new forfeiture action against the property.

While *Longenette* was a pre-CAFRA case involving the 5-year statute of limitations under 19 U.S.C. § 1621, and not the 90-day filing deadline under section 983(a)(3), the principle is the same. When the Government, in good faith, enters a declaration of forfeiture believing that the claim filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding was inadequate or untimely, but is ultimately mistaken in that belief, the U.S. Attorney may argue that the time for filing a judicial action should be equitably tolled.

There is no guarantee, of course, that any court will agree with the Government on this point. But the availability of that remedy, coupled with the disadvantages of routinely referring all cases involving defective or untimely claims to the U.S. Attorney, militates in favor of taking the more aggressive approach on this issue.

It should be added, however, that in any case in which the legal issues regarding the adequacy or timeliness of a claim are unclear, the seizing agencies are encouraged to consult with the U.S. Attorney before deciding to go forward with the administrative forfeiture of the property. Such consultations—particularly in cases where further litigation is likely—will give the U.S. Attorney, who ultimately will have to defend the agency’s action in the district

⁶² The rule seems to be otherwise for CAFRA cases and for claims filed by persons who are not prisoners. See *Sandoval v. United States*, 2001 WL 300729 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (claim is considered filed in a civil forfeiture action when it is received by the seizing agency, not when it is mailed by the claimant); *Florez-Perez v. United States*, Case No. 3:99-cv-1230-J-20A (M.D. Fla. Sept. 1, 2000) (claim sent by Federal Express on the last day for filing a claim but not received by the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) until the next day was not timely filed).

court, the opportunity to advise the agency on the strengths and weaknesses of its position and the risks involved in not transferring the case for judicial forfeiture.

3. Conclusion

Seizing agencies should insist on strict compliance with the filing requirements of section 983(a)(2), and should not routinely refer defective claims to the U.S. Attorney just because a claimant insists that a claim contained all of the required information and was timely filed. The agencies, however, should consult with the U.S. Attorney regarding any claims in which the adequacy or the timeliness of the claim is unclear. If the agency rejects the claim and declares forfeiture but a court ultimately decides that the claim filed in that proceeding was valid, the U.S. Attorney should argue that the 90-day period for filing a judicial forfeiture action under section 983(a)(3) should be equitably tolled.

E. 60-day notice period in all administrative forfeiture cases

1. Background

Through the many forfeiture statutes, Congress has made clear its intent that the Government be expeditious in providing notice and in initiating forfeiture actions against seized property. Further, a fundamental aspect of due process in any forfeiture proceeding is that notice be given as soon as practicable to apprise interested persons of the pendency of the action and afford them an opportunity to be heard.

Notice to owners and interested parties of the seizure and intent to forfeit in any non-judicial civil forfeiture proceeding is governed by section 983(a)(1), which requires “written notice” to all interested parties.

2. 60-day notice

Section 983(a)(1) requires that written notice of an administrative forfeiture action be sent to interested parties as soon as practicable but no later than 60 days after the date of the seizure. For interested parties determined after seizure, the written notice shall occur within 60 days after reasonably determining ownership or interest. *See* section 983(a)(1)(A)(v). Waivers of this notice deadline may be obtained in writing in exceptional circumstances from a designated official within the seizing agency. *See* section 983(a)(1)(B).⁶³ The exceptional circumstances are those set forth in section 983(a)(1)(D).

⁶³ For the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the designated official is the DEA forfeiture counsel in DEA headquarters.

If a waiver is granted, it must set forth the exceptional circumstances and be included in the administrative forfeiture case file. A waiver issued under this provision, however, is valid for no more than 30 days. If additional time is required, the waiver must be extended by a judicial officer pursuant to section 983(a)(1)(c).

F. Inadvertent violation of 60-day deadline for sending notice⁶⁴

This section discusses what action the Government should take if it discovers that the seizing agency has inadvertently failed to send notice of the commencement of administrative forfeiture proceedings within 60 days of the seizure of the property as required by section 983(a)(1)(A).

1. Summary

Failure to comply with the 60-day deadline for sending notice precludes the Government from pursuing administrative forfeiture of the seized property and requires that the property be returned to the property owner. Section 983(a)(1)(F), however, permits the Government to file a judicial forfeiture action—civil or criminal—against the same property, and to re seize the property with either civil or criminal process. If the judicial action is commenced as soon as practicable after the discovery of the inadvertent failure to send notice, the Government may maintain custody of the property pursuant to the new civil or criminal process without having to go through the exercise of returning the property and seizing it back.

2. Discussion

Section 983(a)(1)(A)(I) provides that in non-judicial forfeiture proceedings,⁶⁵ the Government must send notice of the forfeiture within 60 days after the date of the seizure. Section 983(a)(1)(A)(iv) extends the deadline to 90 days in cases where the forfeiture is adopted from a state or local law enforcement agency. The statute also contains various exceptions to the notice deadlines and a procedure for obtaining extensions of time.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Section I.F was previously disseminated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 02-2 in 2002.

⁶⁵ The notice requirement in section 983(a)(1) applies to all cases where the property was seized for the purpose of forfeiture, and administrative forfeiture is permissible under 19 U.S.C. § 1608 and not barred by 18 U.S.C. § 985. Seizures that are strictly for evidence, that are undertaken only pursuant to a criminal seizure warrant (21 U.S.C. § 853(f)), or that cannot, by statute, lead to an administrative forfeiture proceeding, do not trigger the notice requirements of section 983(a)(1).

⁶⁶ References in this section to the notice deadline apply to whatever deadline may be applicable in a given case, be it the 60-day deadline, the 90-day deadline, or some other deadline established pursuant to the statutory procedure for obtaining an extension of time.

Congress enacted these deadlines to ensure that property owners are given timely notice of their right to contest a forfeiture and are apprized of the procedures for doing so. Hence, law enforcement agencies should endeavor at all times to adhere to the notice deadlines and obtain extensions of time for sending notice only when necessary, and only in the manner described in the statute. *See* sections 983(a)(1)(B) and (c). Intentionally ignoring a notice deadline in order to delay the sending of notice to the property owner or other interested parties is not permissible.

There are times, however, when the failure to send notice within the statutory period is purely inadvertent. The question that arises in such cases is what action the Government must take to rectify the situation.

Section 983(a)(1)(F) provides as follows:

(F) If the Government does not send notice of a seizure of property in accordance with subparagraph (A) to the person from whom the property was seized, and no extension of time is granted, the Government shall return the property to that person *without prejudice to the right of the Government to commence a forfeiture proceeding at a later time*. The Government shall not be required to return contraband or other property that the person from whom the property was seized may not legally possess. (Emphasis added.)

In our view, subparagraph (F) evinces Congress's intent to ensure that seized property does not indefinitely remain in the hands of the Government without the property owner having any opportunity to contest the forfeiture in a court of law. Thus, if the Government fails to send notice to the person from whom the property was seized within the statutory period for sending notice, it must return the property to that person (unless the property was contraband).

Section 983(a)(1)(F) also makes clear, however, that the Government is permitted to commence a new forfeiture proceeding. This presents two questions: Can the new proceeding be administrative, or must it be judicial? And can the Government re seize the property from the property owner when it commences the new proceeding?

While the statute does not make clear whether the new forfeiture proceeding can be administrative or must be judicial, we reject the view that section 983(a)(1)(F) permits the Government to re seize property for administrative forfeiture, thus starting the clock for sending notice all over again. The statute does not prohibit such action, but returning property to a property owner after the Government has missed the notice deadline, only to snatch the property back from the owner in order to start the clock over again, may violate the spirit of

the legislation, and creates the appearance that the Government is trying to circumvent the statutory requirement. Thus, it is our view that once the Government misses the notice deadline for administrative forfeiture, and has returned the property pursuant to section 983(a)(1)(F), no new administrative forfeiture should be commenced against the same property based on the violation that led to the initial seizure, unless there are extraordinary circumstances indicating that return of the property would be contrary to the public interest.

On the other hand, section 983(a)(1)(F) does permit the Government to commence either a civil or criminal forfeiture action in court. In the case of a criminal action, the Government may name the property in an indictment or information and obtain a criminal seizure warrant, a restraining order, or some other order under 21 U.S.C. § 853(e).⁶⁷ In the case of a civil judicial action, the Government may file a complaint and obtain an arrest warrant in rem for the property pursuant to Supplemental Rule C. Like the criminal seizure warrant, the arrest warrant in rem gives the Government a lawful basis to maintain custody of the property pending the resolution of the case in court. Thus, once the Government commences a judicial forfeiture action—either civil or criminal—against the property, it may re seize the property and hold it pending the resolution of the forfeiture case.

This matter is not without some ambiguity. It is possible to read section 983(a)(1)(F) to say that once the 60-day notice deadline is missed, the property must be returned to the property owner, and must remain in the owner's possession even though a civil or criminal forfeiture action is commenced in court. We do not think, however, that this was the intent of Congress. Again, the purpose of section 983(a)(1)(F) was to ensure that the Government did not hold property indefinitely without giving the property owner a day in court. Thus, absent extraordinary circumstances, if the notice deadline has passed, *and no forfeiture action is pending*, the property must be returned to the person from whom it was seized.⁶⁸ But once a judicial forfeiture action is filed, and the property owner is assured of a day in court, the Government can maintain the property in its possession as it would in any other forfeiture case, subject only to the "hardship" provisions in section 983(f). That, in our view, is what Congress meant by the language in section 983(a)(1)(F) providing that the return of the

⁶⁷ See *In Re: 2000 White Mercedes ML320*, 220 F. Supp. 2d 1322, 1326 n.5 (M.D. Fla. 2001) (if property is already in Government custody, no section 853(f) seizure warrant can be issued, as an order under section 853(e) would be sufficient to preserve the property; a section 853(e) order need not be an injunction or restraining order, but can be any order that will "assure the availability of the property"), *aff'g* 174 F. Supp. 2d 1268 (M.D. Fla. 2001).

⁶⁸ If the judicial forfeiture action cannot be filed immediately, the prosecutor may want to consider obtaining a precomplaint civil restraining order under section 983(j), or a preindictment restraining order under section 853(e), to preserve the property until an action is commenced.

property is “without prejudice” to the right of the Government to commence a forfeiture proceeding at a later time.

The remaining question is whether, in cases where the Government files the criminal or civil judicial action immediately upon discovering the failure to send notice within the 60-or 90-day period, it is necessary to go through the exercise of physically returning the property to the property owner, only to re seize it immediately thereafter. We think that exercise is unnecessary.

Returning the property with one hand while seizing it back with the other, pursuant to an arrest warrant in rem or criminal seizure warrant, is an empty gesture that accomplishes nothing either in terms of the public interest or the private rights of the property owner. Moreover, proceeding directly to a judicial forfeiture action while maintaining custody of the property is entirely consistent with the intent of section 983(a)(1)(F). By commencing civil judicial forfeiture actions immediately upon learning of the inadvertent violation of the filing deadline, the Government will, in most cases, be placing property owners in a better position than they would have been in had the Government successfully commenced an administrative forfeiture proceeding.

As set forth in sections 983(a)(2) and (3), if the seizing agency sends notice of the administrative forfeiture action within the statutory period, the claimant has 30 days within which to file a claim to the property, after which the Government has 90 days to commence a civil or criminal forfeiture action in court. In contrast, by proceeding directly to the filing of the civil forfeiture complaint, the Government immediately places claimants in the position they would have been in if they had received the notice, filed a claim, and waited for the Government to file its complaint before the expiration of the 90-day period for doing so—assuming it did not take so long to discover the inadvertent failure to send notice that the 90-day period for filing a complaint would already have expired. Thus, filing a civil forfeiture complaint as soon as may be practicable after learning of the inadvertent violation of the notice deadline is in keeping with the intent of Congress to prevent the Government from holding on to property without giving the property owner a day in court. *See United States v. \$39,480.00 in U.S. Currency*, 190 F. Supp. 2d 929 (W.D. Tex. 2002) (where the Government inadvertently filed its complaint on the 91st day because of a clerical error on the date stamp, claimant suffered no prejudice, and strict enforcement of the 90-day rule would have a “Draconian effect” on the Government’s forfeiture case, the court equitably tolled the 90-day period and deemed the complaint timely filed).

3. Conclusion

If a seizing agency discovers that it has inadvertently failed to comply with a deadline for sending notice of the administrative forfeiture of property in a case where such deadlines apply, and the person from whom the property was seized has not waived the 60-day deadline, no further action may be taken to forfeit the property administratively based on the offense giving rise to the original seizure, and the property must be returned to the person from whom it was seized in accordance with section 983(a)(1)(F), unless the return of the property would be unlawful, or unless the Government, as soon as may be practicable, commences a judicial forfeiture proceeding by (1) naming the property in a criminal indictment or information and obtaining a judicial order pursuant to section 853(e) or (f) allowing it to hold the property; or (2) filing a civil judicial forfeiture action and retaining lawful possession of the property pursuant to an arrest warrant in rem.

G. Policy on the deadline for filing a civil forfeiture action in cases that do not begin as administrative forfeiture proceedings⁶⁹

1. Issue

In 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(3), Congress provided that the Government must commence a judicial forfeiture proceeding within 90 days of the receipt by a seizing agency of a claim filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding. Congress set no deadline, however, for commencing a judicial forfeiture proceeding in cases that do not start out as administrative forfeiture proceedings in the first instance. The question is what deadline applies to the commencement of a judicial forfeiture action when property is seized for forfeiture but there is no administrative forfeiture proceeding.

2. Summary

There are two situations in which this issue arises: when the Government could have commenced an administrative forfeiture proceeding against the seized property but, for whatever reason, opted not to do so, and when the Government is barred from forfeiting the property administratively by the limitations on such proceedings in 19 U.S.C. § 1607. The 90-day deadline in section 983(a)(3) does not apply in either situation, nor is there any other statutory deadline for commencing such actions. Nevertheless, as a matter of policy, the Department of Justice advises prosecutors that whenever administrative forfeiture is statutorily authorized but is not pursued, the U.S. Attorney should commence a judicial

⁶⁹ Section I.G was previously circulated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 07-2 in 2007.

forfeiture action (civil or criminal) within 150 days of the seizure of the property. Moreover, the Department advises that when property is seized for forfeiture but cannot be forfeited administratively because of the limitations set forth in section 1607, the U.S. Attorney should commence a judicial forfeiture action within 90 days of the receipt of a written request for the release of the property from a potential claimant.

3. Discussion

a. Section 983(a)(3)

Forfeiture cases typically begin with the seizure of property and the commencement by the seizing agency of administrative forfeiture proceedings. Indeed, it is the policy of the Department of Justice that all forfeiture cases should begin as administrative forfeiture proceedings when it is possible to do so. *See* section I.A.

When a claimant files a proper claim in an administrative forfeiture proceeding, the seizing agency must suspend the proceeding and refer the case to the U.S. Attorney. This has long been the law. Prior to the enactment of the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 (CAFRA), however, there was a widespread concern with the absence of any mechanism for forcing the Government to commence a judicial forfeiture proceeding in a timely way once a claimant had filed his claim with the seizing agency. Defense counsel complained that by filing such a claim, the claimant had done everything in his power to bring the administrative forfeiture proceeding to a halt and to demand his “day in court,” yet the Government was free to sit on the case for months or years while it determined whether to proceed with the forfeiture civilly or criminally or to return the property to the claimant. In a series of cases, the Supreme Court and the lower courts had upheld this practice against constitutional challenge. *See United States v. \$8,850 in U.S. Currency*, 461 U.S. 555, 565 (1983) (applying the 4-part test from *Barker v. Wingo*, Supreme Court finds that 18-month delay in commencing civil forfeiture action did not violate due process).

In CAFRA, Congress responded to this concern by enacting section 983(a)(3). The statute provides that “not less than 90 days after a claim has been filed,” the Government must file a civil forfeiture complaint, include the property in a criminal indictment, return the property, or obtain an extension of time from the court. Thus, it is now fairly clear what the Government must do if (1) it commences an administrative forfeiture proceeding pursuant to section 983(a)(1), and (2) a claimant files a timely claim in proper form pursuant to section 983(a)(2).

b. Cases that do not begin administratively

Congress did not consider, however, that not all forfeiture cases begin as administrative forfeitures. Notwithstanding the policy favoring administrative forfeiture, there are occasions when an Assistant U.S. Attorney may wish to by-pass the administrative forfeiture process and file a case directly as a civil forfeiture or as part of a criminal prosecution. Moreover, 19 U.S.C. § 1607, the statute that sets the boundaries for what may be forfeited administratively, expressly bars the administrative forfeiture of certain property, including all real property and most personal property having a value in excess of \$500,000, except for currency. Because section 983(a)(3) applies only to cases that begin as administrative forfeitures, CAFRA contains no deadline governing when the Government must commence judicial forfeiture proceedings when it seizes property for forfeiture in those two instances.

At present, the only guidance the courts have given in this situation is that the pre-CAFRA constitutional limitations endorsed by the Supreme Court in *\$8,850* still apply.

c. Policy concerns

While no statute requires the Government to set a filing deadline for commencing a judicial forfeiture action in cases that do not begin as administrative forfeitures, there are several legal and political considerations that militate in favor of establishing a policy in that regard.

First, Congress was clearly concerned with the absence of a mechanism to force the Government to give a potential claimant timely access to the courts once his property was seized. The deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture proceeding (60 days pursuant to section 983(a)(1)), and then for commencing a judicial action once a claimant files a claim (90 days pursuant to section 983(a)(3)), reflect that. If the Government were to seize property for forfeiture in a situation where administrative forfeiture was authorized, but then ignore the 60- and 90-day deadlines in sections 983(a)(1) and (3) on the ground that it intended all along to skip over the administrative forfeiture process and proceed directly with a judicial forfeiture, courts might suspect that the Government was actually conjuring an *ad hoc* excuse for missing the statutory deadlines, or had decided to by-pass the administrative forfeiture proceeding for the express purpose of circumventing the statutory deadlines and the underlying congressional intent. The likely consequences of creating the appearance of trying to do an end-run around the statutory deadlines include renewed efforts by Congress to curtail the Government's ability to forfeit property administratively or civilly, and judicial decisions applying the statutory deadlines to cases where there was no administrative forfeiture, even though they were never meant to apply in that context.

Similar concerns apply to the second category of cases as well. While it cannot be denied that certain categories of cases could not be prosecuted as administrative forfeitures even if the Government wanted to do so, *see* 19 U.S.C. § 1607, the courts are reluctant to conclude that Congress would not have wanted to force the Government to be at least as timely in commencing a forfeiture action when the property is valued at more than \$500,000 as it must be when the property is worth far less. Thus, there have been a number of cases in which courts have pressed prosecutors to concede that there must be a deadline for filing a judicial forfeiture action in such cases, even though no such deadline exists. By adopting a deadline for commencing a judicial action in such cases by policy or regulation, the Department of Justice may be able to relieve prosecutors of the pressure to adopt *ad hoc* deadlines on a case by case basis, and might forestall judicial attempts to cut back on the constitutional doctrine enshrined in the §8,850 decision.

d. Policy on filing a judicial forfeiture action

In light of the foregoing considerations, it is the policy of the Department of Justice to advise prosecutors to commence civil or criminal forfeiture actions in accordance with the following schedule when property is seized for forfeiture but there is no administrative forfeiture proceeding.

In cases where administrative forfeiture is possible under section 1607, but the Government has elected for whatever reason to by-pass the administrative forfeiture process, the U.S. Attorney should file a civil or criminal action for the forfeiture of the property within 150 days of the seizure of the property. This reflects the total time that the Government would have had to commence such an action if the Government had chosen to proceed in the normal way: 60 days for the commencement of a administrative forfeiture proceeding plus 90 days to file a civil forfeiture complaint or to include the property in a criminal indictment. By following this policy, the prosecutor will thus deflect any concern that the Government by-passed the administrative forfeiture process to circumvent the CAFRA deadlines.

It should be emphasized that this policy applies only in cases where the U.S. Attorney, in consultation with the seizing agency, affirmatively decided at the outset of a case that the forfeiture of the seized property would be done judicially in the first instance. It does not apply to cases where the seizure should have been handled as a routine administrative forfeiture to which the 60 or 90-day deadlines in section 983(a)(1)(A) apply, but where the notice was not sent due to inadvertence or error. The policy regarding the handling of forfeitures in that situation is set forth in section I.F at page 52.

In cases where administrative forfeiture is barred by section 1607, it is not necessary to establish a fixed deadline for commencing a judicial forfeiture action based on the date of the seizure. Congress set no deadline in this instance, and it is not necessary for the Government to adopt one. But the Government should not be free to ignore indefinitely a request made by a potential claimant for the release of his property or for the commencement of formal judicial proceedings. Accordingly, in a case where the U.S. Attorney receives a such a request in writing, the prosecutor should treat the request as if it were a “claim” referred to in section 983(a)(3)(A), and should thus commence a judicial forfeiture action within 90 days of the receipt of the request.⁷⁰

Nothing in this policy should be interpreted to allow a potential claimant to shorten the deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture in a case where administrative forfeiture is authorized. In all events, in such cases the seizing agency will have 60 days (or 90 days in the case of adoptive forfeitures) to determine whether or not to proceed with the forfeiture proceeding. *See United States v. \$200,255 in U.S. Currency*, 2006 WL 1687774, at *4 (M.D. Ga. 2006) (under the scheme set forth in section 983(a)(1), the administrative forfeiture proceeding does not begin until the seizing agency sends notice to potential claimants; then the claimant files his claim; a claim filed before the seizing agency sends notice is premature and does not start the clock running on the time to file a judicial forfeiture complaint).

II. Interplay of Administrative Forfeiture and Criminal Forfeiture

A. Starting a case administratively

A recurring issue concerns the interplay of criminal and administrative forfeiture. In general, there is no reason for the seizing agency not to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings against property even if the property could be included in a future criminal indictment. Therefore, in most cases, the seizing agency will commence administrative forfeiture proceedings against seized property by sending notice to potential claimants, while simultaneously, the U.S. Attorney will ask the grand jury to include a forfeiture allegation against the same property in a criminal indictment. This is the proper procedure. If there is no claim in the administrative forfeiture proceeding, the property will automatically be forfeited,

⁷⁰ *See United States v. \$3,294.00 in U.S. Currency*, 2006 WL 1982852, at *5 (D. Utah 2006) (where property was seized for evidence, not for forfeiture, and there was no administrative forfeiture, Government’s decision to delay the civil forfeiture for 4 years until after the criminal case was over did not violate due process under §8,850, but suggesting that the claimant could have triggered the 90-day deadline under section 983(a)(3) by filing a claim *sua sponte*).

thus simplifying the criminal case; and if there is a claim, there will be no need to supersede the indictment to include a forfeiture allegation.

In cases where no claim is filed and the property is forfeited administratively, however, it is necessary to strike the forfeiture allegation from the indictment to avoid a situation in which the court, the defendant, or the jury is confused by the procedure and mistakenly believes that the Government abandoned the administrative forfeiture once the indictment was returned, and intended to proceed with the criminal forfeiture alone. Accordingly, in cases where administrative and criminal forfeiture proceedings are instituted simultaneously, and no one files a claim in the administrative proceeding, the agency should complete the administrative forfeiture, and the AUSA handling the criminal case should file a motion reporting the completed forfeiture and therefore striking the forfeiture from the indictment.⁷¹

If the Government serves the motion to strike the forfeiture allegation on defense counsel, and the defendant does not respond, it is safe to assume that the defendant is aware of the administrative forfeiture and is not expecting to have an opportunity to contest the forfeiture in the criminal case. In that situation, the defendant would be estopped for later contesting the administrative forfeiture on the ground that the defendant never received notice of the administrative forfeiture or he or she thought the forfeiture would be handled criminally. On the other hand, if the defendant responds to the motion by stating that he or she would have contested the administrative forfeiture but for the indictment, the prosecutor should either withdraw the motion and proceed with the criminal forfeiture, or ask the court to conduct a hearing to determine if the defendant's assertion is bona fide. If the court finds that the defendant was properly notified of the administrative forfeiture and did not file a claim, it should enter an order to that effect and grant the motion to strike the forfeiture allegation. But if the court finds that the defendant may in fact have been confused regarding the status of the administrative forfeiture, the Government should proceed with the criminal forfeiture.

B. Requesting the seizing agency to suspend the administrative forfeiture

In an extraordinary case, the U.S. Attorney may have a reason why the case should not be handled administratively and may ask the seizing agency to suspend the administrative forfeiture in favor of criminal forfeiture. Seizing agencies will generally comply with that request, but the U.S. Attorney may then have to take steps to ensure that the 60-day deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture proceeding under section 983(a)(1)(A) is not violated. *See* section 983(a)(1)(A)(iii) (no notice of administrative forfeiture is required if, before the 60-day period expires, a grand jury returns an indictment naming the property, and

⁷¹ Form CRM2901 on the AFMLS Web site is designed for this purpose.

the Government takes steps to preserve its right to maintain custody of the property under the criminal forfeiture laws).

C. Disposing of administrative forfeiture in a plea agreement

Criminal prosecutors should not agree to return property that has already been forfeited administratively as part of the plea agreement in a criminal case. Once the property has been forfeited, it belongs to the Government, and may have already been liquidated, put into official use, or shared with a state or foreign law enforcement agency. Thus, the U.S. Attorney has no authority to agree to return such property as part of a plea agreement in a criminal case.

Moreover, recognizing that the seizing agencies often have put considerable resources into the administrative forfeiture of property by the time the prosecutor is negotiating a plea agreement, the U.S. Attorney should not agree to the return of property as part of a plea agreement if the property is subject to an ongoing administrative forfeiture proceeding unless (1) the seizing agency is requested to suspend the administrative forfeiture and it agrees to do so, or (2) the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) approves the decision to return the property.

D. Seizure pursuant to a criminal warrant: availability of administrative forfeiture⁷²

This section deals with the issues that arise when property is seized with a criminal seizure warrant, but the seizing agency nevertheless wants to initiate administrative forfeiture proceedings. Note: This is the reverse of the situation discussed in section II.A at page 60, which dealt with pursuing criminal forfeiture after property was seized for civil or administrative forfeiture.

1. Summary

There are two separate issues here. The first is whether a seizing agency can begin a forfeiture proceeding as a criminal forfeiture (i.e., by seizing the property with a criminal seizure warrant under section 853(f)) and then convert the proceeding to an administrative one without reseizing the property or taking some other action under the civil forfeiture statutes. The second is whether such an administrative forfeiture must be conducted in accordance with the 60-day deadline and other procedural requirements enacted by CAFRA.

⁷² Section II.D was previously disseminated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 02-3 in 2002.

The answer to the first question appears to be yes. Despite the common practice of commencing an administrative forfeiture only after the property has been seized pursuant to a civil warrant, there is no reason why property seized pursuant to a criminal warrant issued under section 853(f) cannot be forfeited administratively. There is no requirement in such cases that the Government reseize the property from itself with a civil warrant.

The second question is more difficult. The 60-day requirement in section 983(a)(1) that was enacted by CAFRA does not, by its terms, apply to criminal forfeiture proceedings. Thus, the 60-day clock never starts to tick if property is seized pursuant to a criminal seizure warrant. However, if the Government were routinely to seize property with a criminal warrant, ignore the 60-day deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture proceeding, and then commence such a proceeding at a later date, it would create the appearance of misusing the criminal forfeiture process as a way of evading CAFRA's strict deadlines. Therefore, except in extraordinary circumstances, if the Government desires to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings against property seized pursuant to a criminal seizure warrant, it should do so within 60 days of the seizure. If the 60-day deadline has passed, and the Government still desires to pursue the forfeiture civilly instead of criminally, the case should be referred to the U.S. Attorney to commence a civil judicial proceeding.

2. Discussion

Most civil forfeiture statutes authorize the seizing agency to forfeit seized property administratively in accordance with the Customs laws. *See, e.g.,* 18 U.S.C. § 981(d) and 21 U.S.C. § 881(d) (incorporating the provisions of 19 U.S.C. § 1602 et seq. into the civil forfeiture statutes). Nothing in the incorporated provisions of Title 19 limits administrative forfeiture to cases where the property was seized pursuant to a particular kind of seizure warrant. To the contrary, section 1603(a) provides that property may be seized for administrative forfeiture “upon process issued in the same manner as provided for a search warrant under the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure [i.e., Rule 41], [or] any seizure authority otherwise provided by law.” Thus, nothing in the Customs laws themselves would preclude the commencement of administrative forfeiture proceedings following the seizure of property pursuant to a criminal seizure warrant issued under section 853(f).

Likewise, the civil forfeiture statutes themselves do not prescribe a particular form of warrant to be used to commence a civil—and hence, an administrative—forfeiture proceeding. Section 981(b)—which governs seizures for the purpose of civil forfeiture under both that section and the drug laws⁷³—provides that property may be seized either pursuant to

⁷³ *See* section 881(b), incorporating section 981(b).

a warrant “obtained in the same manner as provided for a search warrant under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure” or without a warrant if (1) there is probable cause to believe the property is subject to forfeiture and an exception to the Fourth Amendment warrant requirement would apply, or (2) the property was seized by a state or local agency and transferred to a federal agency. *See* sections 981(b)(1) and (2).

Finally, it is now established that there is nothing improper about the Government beginning a case criminally and then deciding to proceed civilly, or vice versa. *See United States v. Leyland*, 277 F.3d 628 (2d Cir. 2002) (there is nothing improper about beginning forfeiture as an allegation in a criminal indictment and then switching to civil forfeiture); *United States v. Candelaria-Silva*, 166 F.3d 19 (1st Cir. 1999) (there is nothing improper in the Government beginning a forfeiture case with a civil seizure and switching to criminal forfeiture once an indictment is returned; it is commonplace). Moreover, CAFRA specifically authorizes parallel administrative and criminal forfeiture actions. *See* section 983(a)(1)(A)(iii)(I). Thus, administrative forfeiture under the Customs laws may be commenced in respect of any property seized by a federal law enforcement agency (including property seized by a state or local agency and transferred to a federal agency for the purpose of adoptive forfeiture) without regard to the nature of the warrant that was used to seize the property.⁷⁴

The second question is whether such administrative forfeiture proceedings must be commenced within the 60-day deadline set forth in section 981(a)(1)(A). Section 983(a)(1)(A)(I) provides that in non-judicial forfeiture proceedings,⁷⁵ the Government must

⁷⁴ In *United States v. Millan-Colon*, 836 F. Supp. 994 (S.D.N.Y. 1993), a district court held that it was improper for the Government to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings against property that had already been included in a criminal indictment and was subject to a pretrial restraining order in the criminal case. As mentioned in the text, that case appears to be inconsistent with later Second Circuit law, *see Leyland, supra*, and CAFRA. Moreover, *Millan-Colon* is easily distinguished from most cases in that the pretrial restraining order in that case may have signaled to the defendant that he did not need to respond to the notice of the administrative forfeiture proceeding. As mentioned in section II.A at page 61, such misunderstandings will be avoided if, once parallel administrative and criminal forfeiture proceedings have been commenced and the claimant fails to file a timely claim in the administrative forfeiture proceeding, the Government moves to strike the forfeiture allegation from the criminal indictment, thus giving the defendant a fair opportunity to argue that the default in the administrative proceeding was based on an assumption that the forfeiture in the criminal case could be opposed. A motion to strike form can be downloaded from the AFMLS Web site. *See* Form CRM2901.

⁷⁵ For purposes of section 983(a)(1), a non-judicial forfeiture proceeding is any proceeding in which (1) the motive for the seizure was, at least in part, to take custody of property that the Government intended to pursue in a civil forfeiture action; and (2) administrative forfeiture is permissible under section 1608 and notwithstanding section 985. Seizures that are strictly for evidence, that are undertaken for the purpose of criminal forfeiture, or that cannot, by statute, lead to an administrative forfeiture proceeding do not trigger the notice requirements of section 983(a)(1). *See* Cassella, “The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000,” 27 J. Legislation 97, 127 (2001).

send notice of the forfeiture action within 60 days after the date of the seizure. Section 983(a)(1)(A)(iv) extends the deadline to 90 days in cases where the forfeiture is adopted from a state or local law enforcement agency. The statute also contains various exceptions to the notice deadlines and contains a procedure for obtaining extensions of time.⁷⁶

Congress enacted these deadlines to ensure that property owners are given timely notice of their right to contest an administrative forfeiture action and are apprized of the procedures for doing so. But the statute, by its terms, only applies to *non-judicial* forfeiture proceedings, and thus cannot, and does not, apply to criminal forfeiture proceedings which must, in all cases, be judicial proceedings. Accordingly, if the Government seizes property for the purpose of criminal forfeiture and proceeds solely along the criminal forfeiture track, the 60-day deadline under section 983(a)(1)(A) never comes into play.

To be sure, there will be cases where the Government seizes property for criminal forfeiture, intending at all times that the forfeiture will be made a part of the criminal case, but then finds that the criminal forfeiture option is not viable.⁷⁷ In such cases, there is nothing in the law preventing the Government from switching to civil forfeiture, or forfeiting the property administratively. Nor would the Government be required in such circumstances to seize the property from itself with a civil seizure warrant in order to commence the civil or administrative forfeiture proceeding. CAFRA does contain an odd and burdensome procedure requiring the Government to obtain new authority to maintain custody of property already in its possession when it switches *from civil forfeiture to criminal forfeiture*. See section 983(a)(3)(B)(ii)(II).⁷⁸ But as discussed above, nothing in the civil forfeiture statutes predicates administrative forfeiture proceedings on the use of a particular form of seizure warrant.

Thus, the Government may switch theories of forfeiture from criminal forfeiture to civil or administrative forfeiture at any time. At most, the deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture would relate back to (i.e., would begin to run from) the date when the decision was made to pursue a non-judicial forfeiture, not the date of the original seizure. If, however, the Government were routinely to assert that it had originally intended to pursue

⁷⁶ References in this section to the notice deadline apply to whatever deadline may be applicable in a given case, be it the 60-day deadline, the 90-day deadline, or some other deadline established pursuant to the statutory procedure for obtaining an extension of time.

⁷⁷ Among other reasons, it may turn out that the defendant has died or is a fugitive, that criminal charges cannot be presented to a grand jury for strategic or evidentiary reasons, that the property subject to forfeiture belongs to a third party, or that the property was derived from or involved in an offense other than the offenses to be charged in the criminal case.

⁷⁸ See Form CRM1001 on the AFMLS Web site.

a forfeiture criminally, but after 60 days had passed from the date of the seizure, it had decided to pursue administrative forfeiture instead, it would create the appearance that the criminal forfeiture process had been abused, or was a post hoc invention designed to excuse the Government from having to comply with the 60-day deadline for commencing an administrative forfeiture when the property is seized for civil forfeiture in the first instance.

To avoid such appearance of impropriety, we recommend that whenever the Government commences a criminal forfeiture action by seizing property for the purpose of criminal forfeiture, but later decides to switch theories to forfeit the property under the civil forfeiture statutes, the forfeiture action be referred to the U.S. Attorney for the purpose of filing a civil complaint in the district court unless fewer than 60 days have elapsed since the date of the seizure. Only when the decision to switch theories of forfeiture is made within 60 days of the seizure should the Government consider commencing an administrative forfeiture proceeding against the seized property. There may be other exceptions to this, but the only two that presently come to mind are (1) the extraordinary case where there is clear documentation that the decision to switch from criminal to civil forfeiture was made after the 60 days expired; and (2) a case where the claimant agrees to waive the 60-day notice requirement and allow the Government to proceed administratively (e.g., as part of a settlement or plea agreement.)

III. Form of the Claim

A. Claims must be filed under oath by the claimant, not by an attorney or agent⁷⁹

This section addresses the question whether claims filed by persons contesting forfeiture actions must be filed under oath by the claimants themselves instead of being verified and filed on behalf of the claimant by an attorney or other representative.

1. Summary

The statutes and rules governing the filing of claims in administrative, civil and criminal forfeiture cases all require that the claim be filed under oath by the claimant, and not by his or her attorney or other representative.

⁷⁹ Section III.A was previously disseminated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 03-1 in 2003.

2. Discussion

With respect to claims filed in administrative forfeiture proceedings, section 983(a)(2)(C)(iii) provides in relevant part that “A claim shall...be made under oath, subject to penalty of perjury.” Moreover, section 983(h) provides that if a court finds that a “claimant’s assertion of an interest in the property was frivolous, the court may impose a civil fine *on the claimant* of an amount equal to 10 percent of the value of the forfeited property.” (Emphasis added.)

These provisions were included in CAFRA to address the concern that by eliminating the cost bond requirement,⁸⁰ Congress would be encouraging the filing of false and frivolous claims in administrative forfeiture cases.⁸¹ Given that context, it is clear that Congress intended that the claim be filed by the claimant personally, and that the claimant be the one to swear under oath that the assertions made in the claim are well-founded. *See Manjarrez v. United States*, 2002 WL 31870533 (N.D. Ill. 2002) (claim filed by claimant’s attorney, instead of by claimant personally, is not “under oath” as the statute requires, and therefore is not a valid claim).

In the case of claims (petitions) filed in the ancillary proceeding in criminal forfeiture cases, the applicable statute is section 853(n). Subsection 853(n)(2) provides in relevant part that “any person, other than the defendant, asserting a legal interest in property which has been ordered forfeited to the United States...may...petition the court for a hearing to adjudicate the validity of his alleged interest in the property....” Subsection 853(n)(2) is qualified by subsection 853(n)(3), which mandates that “the petition shall be *signed by the petitioner under penalty of perjury* and shall set forth the nature and extent of the petitioner’s right, title, or interest in the property....” (Emphasis added.) This statute appears unequivocal: if the petition must be “signed by the petitioner under penalty of perjury,” there is little room to suggest that it could be filed on behalf of a claimant by his or her attorney or other representative.⁸²

⁸⁰ Under pre-CAFRA law, a claimant had to post a bond equal to 10 percent of the value of the seized property. *See* section 1608. This provision was repealed by section 983(a)(2)(E).

⁸¹ “The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000,” 27 J. Legis. 97, 142 & nn. 239-40 (2001) (quoting legislative history of the requirement that the claim be filed under oath, subject to the penalty of perjury).

⁸² Courts have strictly enforced this provision. *See United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A. (Fifth Round Petition of Liquidation Comm’n for BCCI (Overseas) Macau)*, 980 F. Supp. 1 (D.D.C. 1997) (petition that is not signed under penalty of perjury and fails to identify asset in which claimant is asserting an interest and nature of that interest does not comply with 18 U.S.C. § 1963(l)(3)); *United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A. (Petition of BCCI Campaign Committee)*, 980 F. Supp. 16 (D.D.C. 1997) (petition dismissed because not signed under penalty of perjury). Note: section 1963(l)(3) is the RICO counterpart to section 853(n)(3).

Prior to the enactment of Supplemental Rule G, the requirements regarding claims filed in civil judicial forfeiture cases were less clear but the Rule has removed all ambiguity on this issue. Rule G(5)(a)(i)(C) says that the claim must identify the specific property claimed, identify the claimant and state the claimant's interest in the property, be signed by *the claimant* under penalty of perjury, and be served on the Government attorney handling the case. Accordingly, provisions of the prior law allowing claims to be verified by the claimant's attorney in some cases are no longer in effect.

3. Conclusion

In all federal forfeiture cases—including administrative forfeiture proceedings conducted by seizing agencies, civil judicial proceedings, and the ancillary proceedings in criminal cases—a claim filed by a person contesting the forfeiture action must be filed under oath by the claimant him or herself, and not by an attorney or other representative acting on behalf of the claimant.

IV. Criminal Forfeiture Procedure

A. Filing a motion for reconsideration in a criminal forfeiture case

1. Summary

When the order of forfeiture in a criminal case contains a legal or factual error, the Government may file a motion for reconsideration. If the order was entered prior to sentencing, as contemplated by Rule 32.2(b)(2), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the filing of the motion for reconsideration is straightforward. If the order is not entered until sentencing, however, the opportunity to move to correct the order may be quite limited. That is because the filing of a motion for reconsideration in a criminal case may not suspend the time for filing an appeal under Appellate Rule 4(b), and because, in any event, the only vehicle for correcting an order of forfeiture once it becomes part of the sentence may be Rule 35(a), which requires that the motion be made, and the relief be granted, within 7 days of the sentence.

Accordingly, prosecutors should always ask the court to issue a preliminary order of forfeiture as soon as possible in accordance with Rule 32.2(b)(2) so that there is ample opportunity to correct the order before it becomes final at sentencing. Prosecutors should not assume that a motion for reconsideration filed *after* the sentence will suspend the time for appeal.

2. Applicable rules and statutes

Rule 35(a), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, says that motions to correct an “arithmetical, technical, or other clear error” must be filed, and ruled upon, within 7 days after sentencing. Appellate Rule 4(b)(5) says that a motion filed under Rule 35(a) does not suspend the time for filing an appeal.

3. The traditional rule is that a motion for reconsideration suspends the time for filing an appeal

Prosecutors frequently find it necessary to file motions for reconsideration in criminal forfeiture cases because the court, in announcing sentence or issuing the judgment of forfeiture, has misapplied forfeiture law. The traditional rule is that a motion for reconsideration of a judgment or order may be filed at any time before the time to appeal has expired, and that the filing of such a motion suspends the time to file an appeal.⁸³ Indeed, the Supreme Court has applied this rule to motions for reconsideration filed by the Government in criminal cases. *See United States v. Ibarra*, 502 U.S. 1, 4-6 (1991) (noting the advantages of giving district courts the opportunity to correct their own alleged errors, and thus preventing unnecessary burdens from being placed on the courts of appeals); *United States v. Dieter*, 429 U.S. 6, 8 n.3 (1976).

4. Rule 35(a) motions do not suspend the time

In contrast to the traditional rule, Rule 35(a) provides that a motion to correct an “arithmetical, technical, or other clear error” in the defendant’s sentence must be filed, and ruled upon, within 7 days after sentencing.⁸⁴ Moreover, in 2002, Appellate Rule 4(b)(5) was amended to make clear that a motion filed under Rule 35(a) does not suspend the time for

⁸³ 16A Charles A. Wright et al., *Wright & Miller’s Federal Practice & Procedure* § 3950.10 (2005) (“It is not only those motions expressly listed in Rule 4(b) that stall the running of the time in which to appeal... A timely motion for reconsideration... postpones the appeal time.”); 5 Am. Jur. 2d *Appellate Review* § 303 (2004) (“In an appeal from a District Court to the United States Supreme Court, the time for appeal does not begin to run until the court entering judgment disposes of a proper motion for... reconsideration.”). *See United States v. Ibarra*, 502 U.S. 1, 6 (1991) (rejecting attempts to get around *Healy* and *Dieter*, a motion for reconsideration renders a final decision not final until the district court can rule on the motion, which suspends the time period for filing an appeal); *United States v. Dieter*, 429 U.S. 6, 8 (1976) (“consistent practice in civil and criminal cases alike has been to treat timely petitions for rehearing as rendering the original judgment nonfinal for purposes of appeal for as long as the petition is pending”); *United States v. Healy*, 376 U.S. 75, 77-78 (1964) (same); *United States v. Correa-Gomez*, 328 F.3d 297, 299 (6th Cir. 2003) (citing *Ibarra*, reiterating that a timely motion for reconsideration means that the period to file an appeal begins to run only after the district court has ruled on the motion for reconsideration).

⁸⁴ Rule 35(c) defines *sentencing* as the oral announcement of the sentence.

filing a notice of appeal. *See* Advisory Committee Note to 2002 Amendment. The question is whether motions to reconsider orders of forfeiture based on erroneous applications of forfeiture law are, in effect, Rule 35(a) motions that are subject to the 7-day rule and to the provisions of App. Rule 4(b)(5), or whether they are separate motions governed by the traditional rule that a motion for reconsideration may be filed at any time before the time for appeal has expired, and that the motion suspends the time for filing the appeal.

5. The rules applicable to Rule 35(a) motions may not apply to motions for reconsideration of a forfeiture order

A strong argument could be made that Rule 35(a) relates only to motions to modify the portion of the sentence governed by the sentencing guidelines. Prior to 1987, Rule 35(a) provided that a court could “correct an illegal sentence at any time.” Rule 35(a), Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (1986). That provision was stricken by the Sentencing Reform Act as part of the effort to ensure consistency in sentencing under a guidelines system. *See* Pub. L. 98-473; 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c) (stating the narrow grounds on which a sentence of imprisonment may be modified). In 1991, however, the rule was amended to restore narrow authority to correct an “arithmetical, technical, or other clear error.” This was viewed as a codification of cases holding that the courts retained inherent authority to correct such errors notwithstanding the repeal of the former rule. *See* 1991 Advisory Committee Note. But the Advisory Committee was careful to make clear that the narrow exception being created was not intended to create wholesale authority to revise the portion of the sentence governed by the sentencing guidelines. As the Committee Note states, the rule was amended to limit motions to correct the sentence to instances where there was an “obvious error or mistake,” but not to give the court the opportunity “to reconsider the application or interpretation of the sentencing guidelines or for the court simply to change its mind about the appropriateness of the sentence.” *Id.*

In short, the 1987 repeal of former Rule 35(a), and the 1991 amendment that restored the authority to correct certain technical errors within 7 days, were part of the sentencing reform movement that introduced the use of a guidelines system for determining the period of incarceration that could be imposed on a defendant once he or she was convicted. None of this had anything to do with the forfeiture aspects of the sentence that remain subject to the traditional rule regarding motions for reconsideration.

No court has ever held that the narrow scope of Rule 35(a) applies to a motion to correct the forfeiture aspect of a sentence. While forfeiture is part of sentencing for many purposes, it is undisputed that neither the sentencing guidelines nor the case law interpreting them apply to forfeiture, *see* U.S.S.G. § 5E1.4 and Commentary (providing that forfeiture is “automatic”

upon conviction and thus not governed by the sentencing guidelines); *see United States v. Fruchter*, 411 F.3d 377 (2d Cir. 2005) (*Booker* and *Blakely* do not apply to criminal forfeiture for two reasons: because the Supreme Court expressly stated in *Booker* that its decision did not affect forfeiture under 18 U.S.C. § 3554, and because *Booker* applies only to a determinate sentencing system in which the jury’s verdict mandates a sentence within a specific range; criminal forfeiture is not a determinate system).

Thus, the policy considerations that prompted the 1991 amendment to Rule 35(a) (and the 2002 amendment to App. Rule 4(b)(5))—i.e., the desire for finality in the calculation of the appropriate period of incarceration under the sentencing guidelines—have nothing to do with the forfeiture portion of the sentence, while at the same time, the policy considerations that militate in favor of motions for reconsideration on other legal issues—i.e., the advantages of allowing the district court to correct its own errors—apply with full force to the complex issues that arise in applying the asset forfeiture statutes in criminal cases. For these reasons, courts may ultimately hold that a motion for reconsideration of the forfeiture aspect of a criminal sentence is not limited by the provisions relating to subject matter or time set forth in Rule 35(a), and that accordingly, such motions will suspend the time for filing an appeal in accordance with the traditional rule.

6. The Department’s policy, however, is to assume that Rule 35(a) applies

There is no guarantee, however, that the courts will agree with this view. In the worst case, courts could hold that Rule 35(a) is the only means by which the Government can move to correct any portion of a criminal sentence, including the order of forfeiture, and that accordingly a motion must be filed, and ruled upon, within 7 days of the sentence. Moreover, if the courts were to reach that conclusion, it would follow that the filing of the motion does

not suspend the time for filing an appeal. *See* App. Rule 4(b)(5).⁸⁵ Accordingly, until this issue is resolved by the courts or by Congress, in a criminal case in which the order of forfeiture is not entered until sentencing, a prosecutor who files a motion for reconsideration of the order should file the motion, and urge the court to rule on it, within 7 days of the sentence. In addition, the AUSA should not assume that the filing of the motion will extend the time for filing an appeal, but should instead file the notice of appeal before the 30th day under App. Rule 4(b)(1)(B) regardless of the status of a pending motion for reconsideration. As a courtesy to the district court, the prosecutor may want to advise the court of the Government's policy on this matter so that the court understands the reasons why the Government may feel compelled to file its notice of appeal—which divests the district court of jurisdiction—even though the court may have scheduled a hearing on the Government's motion.

In all cases, however, the interests of justice would be better served if the court were to enter a preliminary order of forfeiture as soon as possible after the entry of a verdict or the acceptance of a guilty plea so that the court would have a full opportunity prior to sentencing to correct any legal or factual error. A motion for reconsideration would always be appropriate if filed after the order is entered but prior to sentencing. If that practice is followed, much unnecessary litigation over the scope of Rule 35(a), and many unnecessary appeals, may be avoided.

⁸⁵ None of this has an impact on the Government's ability to move to correct a clerical error at any time pursuant to Rule 36. For example, if the error was simply the district court's failure to make the order of forfeiture part of the judgment as required by Rule 32.2(b)(3), in most circuits the error could be corrected pursuant to Rule 36. *See United States v. Bennett*, 423 F.3d 271 (3d Cir. 2005) (if there was a preliminary order of forfeiture to which defendant did not object, the failure to include the forfeiture in both the oral pronouncement and the judgment and commitment order is a clerical error that may be corrected pursuant to Rule 36) (collecting cases); *United States v. Loe*, 248 F.3d 449, 464 (5th Cir. 2001) (if district court forgets to include forfeiture in the judgment, it may, pursuant to Rule 36, amend the judgment *nunc pro tunc*); *United States v. Hatcher*, 323 F.3d 666, 673 (8th Cir. 2003) (if there was a preliminary order of forfeiture, the failure to include the forfeiture in the judgment at sentencing is a clerical error that may be corrected at any time pursuant to Rule 36); *United States v. Thomas*, 67 Fed. Appx. 819, 2003 WL 21465365 (4th Cir. 2003) (amendment of the judgment pursuant to Rule 36 to include the forfeiture judgment 4 years after sentencing was appropriate as it accurately reflected the district court's intention at sentencing); *United States v. Arevalo*, 67 Fed. Appx. 589, 2003 WL 21204947 (11th Cir. 2003), *modified* 2004 WL 1253057 (11th Cir. 2004) (failure to make the forfeiture part of the judgment is a clerical error that may be corrected pursuant to Rule 36 as long as the court apprized the defendant of the forfeiture orally at sentencing); *but see United States v. Pease*, 331 F.3d 809, 816-17 (11th Cir. 2003) (the omission of the order of forfeiture from the judgment in a criminal case is not a clerical error that can be corrected pursuant to Rule 36; if the district court does not make the order of forfeiture part of the judgment at sentencing, and the Government does not appeal, the forfeiture is void). Most errors that arise in forfeiture cases, however, are not clerical. *See, e.g., United States v. King*, 2005 WL 1111884 (D.S.C. 2005) (where there was no mention of forfeiture either at sentencing or in the judgment, there is a clear violation of Rule 32.2(b) that cannot be corrected as a clerical error under Rule 36).

7. Conclusion

Because the law regarding the application of Rule 35(a) and App. Rule 4(b)(5) to motions to reconsider orders of forfeiture in criminal cases is unclear, AUSAs should act conservatively to protect the Government's right to appeal from the forfeiture portion of a criminal sentence. Until the law on this issue becomes more clear, prosecutors should assume that any motion for reconsideration of a criminal forfeiture order should be filed and ruled upon within 7 days of sentencing in accordance with Rule 35(a), and that the filing of the motion will not suspend the time for filing an appeal under App. Rule 4(b)(1)(B). In all cases, the Government should urge the district court to comply with Rule 32.2(b)(2) in issuing a preliminary order of forfeiture as soon as possible after the entry of a verdict or the acceptance of a guilty plea so that there is ample time to correct the order prior to sentencing.

B. Publication and notice of order of forfeiture⁸⁶

Following the entry of an order of forfeiture in any criminal case, the Government should publish notice of the forfeiture in a manner consistent with the provisions of Supplemental Rule G(4)(a) of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions. As described in Rule G(4)(a)(iv), this may include publication on the Government's forfeiture website on the Internet (www.forfeiture.gov). The notice must describe the forfeited property, state the times under the applicable statute when a petition contesting the forfeiture must be filed, and the name and the contact information for the government attorney to be served with the petition.

Moreover, consistent with Rule G(4)(b), the Government should send direct written notice to any person who reasonably appears to be a potential claimant with standing to contest the forfeiture of the property in the ancillary proceeding. Such notice may be sent by any of the means described in Rules G(4)(b)(iii)-(v).

For the purposes of this policy, "a person who reasonably appears to be a potential claimant with standing to contest the forfeiture" includes any person who appears to likely to be able to establish an ownership interest in the property within the meaning of "owner" as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 983(d)(6). As stated in that statute, an "owner" does not include a person with only a general unsecured interest in, or claim against, the property or estate of the defendant. See *United States v. Watkins*, 320 F.3d 1279, 1283-84 (11th Cir. 2003) (unsecured creditors lack standing to contest the forfeiture in the ancillary proceeding because they have no interest in the particular assets subject to forfeiture); *United States v. Phillips*, 185 F.3d

⁸⁶ Section IV.B was previously circulated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 07-1 in 2007.

183, 187 (4th Cir. 1999) (Government does not have to send notice to persons who lack standing to contest the forfeiture); *United States v. Carmichael*, 440 F. Supp. 2d 1280 (M.D. Ala. 2006) (Government is not required to send direct written notice to unsecured creditors in a criminal forfeiture case).

Notice of the order of forfeiture may be published and sent as soon as the court has issued a preliminary order of forfeiture pursuant to Rule 32.2(b). It is not necessary to wait until the order of forfeiture becomes final as to the defendant at sentencing. At the latest, however, the notice should be published and sent within a reasonable time after the order of forfeiture becomes final.

Publication of notice of a criminal order of forfeiture is not required if one of the exceptions in Rule G(4)(a) applies, or if notice of the forfeiture of the same property has previously been published in a related civil forfeiture case.

Notice in the manner set forth in this policy is consistent with the authority vested in the Attorney General by 21 U.S.C. § 853(n)(1) and with the draft amendments to Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that were approved by the Advisory Committee on the Criminal Rules on April 17, 2007.

V. Preference for Federal Forfeiture

As a general rule, if property is seized as part of an ongoing federal criminal investigation and the criminal defendants are being prosecuted in federal court—or it is anticipated that a federal prosecution will be pursued—the forfeiture action should be commenced administratively by a federal agency or pursued in federal court regardless of whether a local, state, or federal agency made the seizure. Forfeitures should follow the prosecution for both legal and practical reasons. Parallel state forfeitures can jeopardize the pending federal criminal investigation or prosecution and create unnecessary confusion. Where federal resources are expended on an investigation and state and local law enforcement are assisting in a federal prosecution, federal forfeiture, administrative or judicial, should be pursued absent extraordinary circumstances. The efforts of state and local law enforcement should be recognized through formal equitable sharing rather than a division of assets between state and federal forfeiture.

However, certain circumstances may make state forfeiture appropriate. These circumstances include but are not limited to the following:

- (1) a state forfeiture is commenced on the seized asset before the federal agency joins the investigation and has either been concluded or substantial litigation has been conducted;
- (2) an existing memorandum of understanding sets forth a different procedure for the handling of the seizures and forfeitures;
- (3) the asset was seized by a state or local agency and state law requires a turnover order. A decision not to seek the turnover order must be coordinated with agency counsel and the federal prosecuting official; if an adverse order is entered by the state court, agency counsel, the federal prosecuting official, and the local prosecuting attorney must participate in deciding how to proceed;⁸⁷
- (4) the seized asset does not meet the Department of Justice's minimum monetary thresholds; or
- (5) the pertinent federal prosecuting official has reviewed the case, declined to initiate forfeiture proceedings, and approved a referral for state forfeiture.

When a federal agency believes a state forfeiture is appropriate, the referral of an asset for state forfeiture must be discussed with agency counsel and the federal prosecuting official responsible for asset forfeiture.

A federal prosecuting official may decline a prosecution if significant assets have been referred for state prosecution after a determination to seek federal prosecution was made and without the prior consultation discussed above.

If there is a state forfeiture related to a federal criminal prosecution, federal equitable sharing requests and decisions must take into account the entire case, and seizures should be reviewed before equitable sharing recommendations or decisions are made.

VI. Firearms Forfeiture Policy Summary

This section provides a brief summary of policies bearing on the forfeiture of firearms. For further details on firearms forfeiture matters, prosecutors and law enforcement agencies

⁸⁷ See chapter 1, part VII for a full discussion of issues involving adoptive forfeitures. In particular, section E discusses the policy favoring state forfeitures where the seizure is related to a purely state prosecution.

should consult AFMLS' *Guide to the Forfeiture of Firearms and Ammunition* (April 2006), which is designated as a law enforcement sensitive document.

A. Firearms are treated differently⁸⁸

Forfeited firearms and ammunition are treated differently from other types of forfeited property in several respects. As explained below, they are not shared with state and local law enforcement, they are not sold, and most often they are destroyed. The minimum value and net equity thresholds do not apply to firearms and ammunition.

Forfeited firearms may be placed into federal official use by the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) or a federal investigative agency for such purposes as federal law enforcement use, ballistics testing, or display. USMS does not equitably share firearms with non-federal law enforcement agencies, and does not sell them. USMS policy and practice in this respect are consistent with those of DEA, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the General Services Administration (GSA). In rare cases, firearms with specific, certain, and significant historical value are placed into official use for display purposes only by a non-participating federal agency, such as the Smithsonian Institution or one of the four U.S. military museums. USMS approves this type of official use only after the subject firearms have been rendered inoperable.

Minimum value and net equity thresholds do not apply to firearms. As explained in chapters 1 and 4 of this *Manual*, the Department of Justice has established minimum monetary thresholds as to most types of property subject to federal seizure and forfeiture, and generally, will not seize property for forfeiture, or adopt a state or local law enforcement seizure for federal forfeiture, unless the net equity in the seized property meets or exceeds these thresholds. There is an exception to the net equity thresholds where a particular forfeiture serves a compelling law enforcement interest. The Department has concluded that such a compelling interest applies to firearms and ammunition involved in crime. Therefore, unlike most forms of personal property, lawfully forfeitable firearms and ammunition may be, and should be, forfeited and adopted for forfeiture regardless of their monetary value.

There are at least two reasons for exempting firearms and ammunition from the minimum equity thresholds. Because cheap firearms, used criminally, cause just as much harm as expensive ones, there is an equally strong law enforcement interest in removing both types from circulation. Moreover, as discussed below, the Federal Government generally destroys

⁸⁸ Prosecutors and law enforcement agencies are referred to *Guide to the Forfeiture of Firearms and Ammunition* (April 2006), at 20-22.

forfeited firearms and ammunition, and never resells them. Therefore, their potential resale value is simply irrelevant to the determination whether or not to forfeit them.

Unlike other types of forfeited property, federally forfeited firearms and ammunition *may not be sold*, except as scrap. Title 18, United States Code, section 3051(c)(3) provides, “*Notwithstanding any other provision of law*, the disposition of firearms forfeited by reason of a violation of *any law of the United States* shall be governed by the provisions of section 5872(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.” 18 U.S.C. § 3051(c)(3) (emphasis added). Section 5872(b) provides that no notice of public sale is required as to forfeited firearms *and that no forfeited firearm may be sold at public sale*. 26 U.S.C. § 5872(b) (emphasis added). Although section 5872(b) permits forfeited firearms to be retained for *federal* official use, forfeited firearms are not transferred to state or local law enforcement agencies as equitable sharing or otherwise. Although section 5872(b) indicates that the Administrator of General Services, GSA could sell forfeited firearms to state or local governments, GSA has determined that it will not do so. GSA’s regulations provide that seized and forfeited firearms shall not be sold as firearms, but only as scrap “after total destruction.” See 41 C.F.R. §§ 101-41, 102-42.1102-10(c) (July 2006). As a result, seized and forfeited firearms cannot be sold, and are generally destroyed.

Because sales of federally forfeited firearms are prohibited, prosecutors should take care not to enter into any agreement calling for the sale of forfeited firearms and the distribution of proceeds from any such sale. Because there can be no sale, there can be no proceeds—a fact that distinguishes forfeitures of firearms from forfeitures of most other types of property. Prosecutors should bring this prohibition on sale of forfeited firearms to the attention of the court whenever necessary to avoid entry of an order calling for such a prohibited sale. The overriding policy concern weighing against the sale or sharing of forfeited or abandoned firearms is that they may subsequently be resold and used in crime.

B. Preference for forfeiture⁸⁹

Forfeiture is the preferred way to dispose of crime-related firearms and ammunition. Forfeiture is most consistent with congressional intent, as reflected in the many specific and general forfeiture statutes that apply to firearms. Forfeiture proceedings also provide the best and clearest protections for the due process rights of firearms’ owners, including the rights of innocent third parties who may have a lawful interest in firearms that have been stolen or otherwise used without the owners’ knowledge and consent.

⁸⁹ Prosecutors and law enforcement agencies are referred to *Guide to the Forfeiture of Firearms and Ammunition* (April 2006), at 80-90.

Although there are other lawful ways of disposing of crime-related firearms and ammunition in cases where forfeiture is not possible, including abandonment, non-forfeiture “quiet title” actions, and other equitable proceedings, *see, e.g., United States v. Howell*, 425 F.3d 971 (11th Cir. 2005), it is Department of Justice policy to subject seized crime-related firearms to formal forfeiture proceedings wherever possible.

Chapter 3

Settlements

I. General Policy

A. Scope

For purposes of this chapter, the term *settlement* includes the following:

- In a criminal forfeiture case—
 - (1) A plea agreement with the defendant in a criminal case in which there is an agreement regarding the forfeiture of property; or
 - (2) The resolution of a third party claim in the ancillary proceeding in a criminal case;
- In a civil forfeiture case—
 - (3) The resolution of a claim filed by any claimant in a civil forfeiture case, either before or after the judicial complaint is filed.

B. Principles

Settlements to forfeit property are encouraged to conserve the resources of both the United States and claimants in situations where justice will be served. The following principles must be observed when negotiating and structuring settlements.

1. Factual basis

There must be a statutory basis for the forfeiture of the property and sufficient facts stated in the settlement documents to satisfy the elements of the statute.

2. Consultation

All settlements must be negotiated in consultation with the seizing agency⁹⁰ and the USMS.⁹¹ The agency's input is essential in order to reach a settlement that is based on a common understanding of the facts and circumstances surrounding the seizure. This requires that administrative action be taken by the agency to implement those settlements that include a referral back to the agency for administrative forfeiture of all or a part of the seized property. Input from the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) should be sought to determine current and prospective expenses to ensure that the settlement is fiscally sound from the Government's perspective.

3. Recovery of investigative costs

In general, the Government should not attempt to use a settlement to recover the costs of its investigation. It may be appropriate in unusual circumstances, however, to recover extraordinary expenditures, such as funds needed to clean up environmental damage to the forfeited property.

⁹⁰ The contact person at the seizing agency for the purpose of determining the agency's view of the terms of the settlement is as follows:

- (1) Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI): assistant special agent-in-charge of the respective field office or designee;
- (2) Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA): assistant special agent-in-charge or resident agent-in-charge or designee;
- (3) Customs and Border Protection/Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (CBP/ICE): associate/assistant chief counsel (CBP) for the respective field office or designee (*note*: CBP is responsible for processing all seizures for civil forfeiture made by either CBP or ICE);
- (4) U.S. Postal Inspection Service (USPIS): inspector-in-charge of respective field division or designee;
- (5) Internal Revenue Service (IRS): chief, criminal investigation division of the key district, or designee;
- (6) U.S. Secret Service (USSS): special agent-in-charge or designee, asset forfeiture program, headquarters office; and
- (7) Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives (ATF): resident agent-in-charge of the respective field office or designee.

⁹¹ In Treasury cases where the USMS is not the custodian of the property, the independent contractor will serve as the property manager, and the USMS need not be consulted. It is the responsibility of the seizing agency to contact the independent contractor and inform it of any settlement proposals.

4. Status of administrative forfeiture

Before discussing any settlement, the AUSA and the investigating agent must determine what property, if any, is presently being processed for administrative forfeiture. AUSAs may not reach agreements with defendants or their counsel in a criminal case regarding the return of property that is the subject of a pending or completed administrative forfeiture proceeding without first consulting the seizing agency.⁹² Property that has been administratively forfeited belongs to the Government and, therefore, cannot be returned to a defendant or used to pay restitution as part of a plea agreement.

5. Disagreements

If the seizing agency disagrees with the U.S. Attorney's recommended settlement proposal, it may refer the matter to the chief of the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) for resolution.

6. Property located in another district

To settle a forfeiture action involving property located in another judicial district, the U.S. Attorney handling the forfeiture must notify and coordinate with the U.S. Attorney in the district where the property is located. It is the responsibility of the U.S. Attorney in the district that forfeits property located in another district to comply with the requirements for forfeiture in the district where the property is located. Failure to comply with such requirements may result in a cloud on the Government's title; coordination will minimize this possibility.

7. Global settlements

Civil forfeiture, either judicial or administrative, should not be used to gain an advantage in a criminal case. The Government, however, may conclude a civil forfeiture action in conjunction with the resolution of the criminal charges that provided the cause of action against the property. The following principles should be observed in negotiating a global settlement:

⁹² There have been instances in which AUSAs have arranged plea agreements providing for the disposition of administratively forfeitable property without consulting the appropriate seizing agency. There also have been instances in which AUSAs have agreed to return to a defendant property that has already been forfeited administratively. Such agreements and arrangements cause great difficulty for the seizing agencies and are improper.

- (a) The Government should *not* agree to release property subject to forfeiture (civil or criminal) in order to *coerce* a guilty plea on the substantive charges, nor should the Government agree to dismiss criminal charges in order to *coerce* a forfeiture settlement.
- (b) To the maximum extent possible, the criminal plea and forfeiture should conclude the defendant's business with the Government. Delaying forfeiture considerations until after the conclusion of the criminal case unnecessarily extends the Government's involvement with the defendant and diminishes its effectiveness.
- (c) If a plea agreement in a criminal case is not to conclude a related civil forfeiture case, language to that effect should also be stated in the plea agreement. Failure to specify in this manner could be fatal to the concurrent civil forfeiture action.
- (d) Where the claimant/defendant has negotiated a plea agreement and concurrently wishes to forfeit the property subject to a civil forfeiture action, the plea agreement should state that the defendant has waived any and all rights—constitutional, statutory, or otherwise. Any civil settlement should be documented independently of the plea agreement and should include the following information:
 - (i) The claimant/defendant's interest in the property;
 - (ii) An admission of the facts supporting forfeiture;
 - (iii) That the claimant/defendant gives up all rights to the property; and
 - (iv) That he or she gives up any right to contest the forfeiture.
- (e) The defendant, in a plea agreement, must admit to facts sufficient to support the forfeiture. The Government, however, should not waive its right to reopen a civil forfeiture action where it is later determined that the settlement was based on false information or where the defendant violates the plea agreement.

8. Partial payments

Settlements shall not provide for partial payments, except upon the advice and approval of AFMLS in consultation with the USMS, Headquarters Seized Assets Division.⁹³

9. Reacquiring the property

The settlement should state that the claimant/defendant may not reacquire the forfeited property directly or indirectly through family members or any other agent. Family members who already own a partial interest in the forfeited property may, however, purchase the forfeited interest.

10. Effect on taxes and other obligations

Settlement documents should clearly state that the terms of the settlement, unless specified, do not affect the tax obligations, fines, penalties, or any other monetary obligations of the claimant/defendant owed to the Government.⁹⁴

11. Settlement authority

The authority of the U.S. Attorney to settle a forfeiture matter, other than by plea agreement with the defendant in a criminal case, is circumscribed by Attorney General Order No. 1598-92, as described in section II, *infra*.⁹⁵

⁹³ In Treasury and Homeland Security cases, the advice and approval of AFMLS should also be sought.

⁹⁴ USAOs are obligated pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 547(4) to “institute and prosecute proceedings for the collection of fines, penalties, and forfeitures incurred for violation of any revenue law, unless satisfied on investigation that justice does not require the proceedings.” Therefore, in order that appropriate actions may be taken when a proposed forfeiture settlement will release assets to a claimant/defendant who is known or likely to have other outstanding obligations to the United States (e.g., taxes), AUSAs should routinely notify the appropriate agency (e.g., IRS) of the proposed settlement.

⁹⁵ See Attorney General Order No. 1598-92, Appendix to Subpart Y, Part O, Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, establishing the settlement and compromise authority redelegated to the U.S. Attorneys from the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, in accordance with the requirements of 28 C.F.R. § 0.168(d). Attorney General Order No. 1598-92 is reprinted in Appendix E.

II. Authority of the U.S. Attorney to Enter Into a Settlement

- (1) Except as provided in section IX of this chapter, U.S. Attorneys have the authority to settle any civil or criminal forfeiture case in which the amount involved does not exceed \$1 million, regardless of the portion of the property that would be released as a result of the settlement.
- (2) Except as provided in section IX of this chapter, U.S. Attorneys also have the authority to settle any civil or criminal forfeiture case in which the amount involved exceeds \$1 million but does not exceed \$5 million, if the amount to be released does not exceed 15 percent of the amount involved.
- (3) In all other cases, the U.S. Attorney must obtain the approval of the settlement by AFMLS.

For the purposes of this provision, the term *amount involved* is defined as follows:

- (1) In a civil forfeiture case, the *amount involved* is the fair market value of the interest claimed by the person with whom the Government is attempting to reach a settlement. If the person is claiming an interest in more than one asset, the amount involved is the aggregate of those interests. For example, if the defendant property is a dwelling with a fair market value of \$1.2 million, and the claimant is a lienholder asserting a \$400,000 lien, for purposes of reaching a settlement with the lienholder the amount involved is \$400,000. In the same case, if the claimant is the owner who acknowledges the validity of the lien but is contesting the forfeiture of the equity in the property, for purposes of reaching a settlement with the owner the amount involved is \$800,000. But if the claimant is the owner who is also contesting the forfeiture of three other assets with a combined value of \$350,000, the amount involved would be \$1.15 million.
- (2) In a criminal forfeiture case, the *amount involved* is the fair market value of the defendant's interest in the aggregate value of any property that has been seized, restrained, or specifically identified as property subject to forfeiture in any forfeiture count, allegation, or bill of particulars, including substitute assets, but does not include the amount of a money judgment to the extent that there are no known assets available to satisfy the judgment. For example, if the Government has seized several assets and restrained other assets for the purpose of forfeiture in connection with a criminal prosecution, and has also alleged in the indictment that the defendant is

liable for a \$2 million money judgment, for purposes of negotiating a plea agreement with the defendant the amount involved is the aggregate value of the defendant's interest in all the assets that have actually been seized or restrained, but would not include the \$2 million unless it appears that there are assets that may be forfeited as substitute assets to satisfy the judgment.

- (3) In the ancillary proceeding in a criminal case, the *amount involved* is the fair market value of the interest in the forfeited property that is claimed by the third party with whom the Government is attempting to reach a settlement.

The *amount to be released* means the value of the property that a claimant, defendant, or third party in an ancillary proceeding would recover or would be permitted to retain.

III. Authority of AFMLS to Approve a Settlement

The chief of AFMLS⁹⁶ has the authority to approve any settlement that must be submitted to that office pursuant to section II, unless the amount to be released exceeds 15 percent of the amount involved *and* is more than \$2 million; in such case, the settlement must be approved by the Deputy Attorney General.⁹⁷

A. Examples

- (1) The Government brings a civil forfeiture action against an asset with a market value of \$1.5 million but in which the sole claimant has only \$250,000 in equity. The Government agrees to abandon the forfeiture and release the entire asset to the claimant. Because the total value of the equity involved is less than \$1 million, the U.S. Attorney has authority to approve the settlement.

⁹⁶ The authority of the Assistant Attorney General pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 0.160 for settlement of forfeiture cases is delegated to the chief, AFMLS, Criminal Division, by paragraph (c) of Attorney General Order No. 1598-92.

⁹⁷ This policy is based on 28 CFR §§ 0.160 and 0.161. Section 0.160 provides that "Assistant Attorneys General are authorized, with respect to matters assigned to their respective divisions, to: (1) Accept offers in compromise of claims asserted by the United States in all cases in which the difference between the gross amount of the original claim and the proposed settlement does not exceed \$2 million or 15 percent of the original claim, whichever is greater." This is simply another way of saying that if the amount to be returned is greater than both \$2 million and 15 percent of the amount involved, it requires approval at a higher level; but if it is less than either figure, it does not. (A number cannot be greater than the greater of two other numbers unless it is greater than both of them: $A > \max(x,y)$ if and only if $A > x$ and $A > y$.) Section 0.161 provides that matters that cannot be approved at the Criminal Division level must be approved by the Deputy Attorney General.

- (2) The Government files a civil forfeiture action against seized bank accounts and currency in the amount of \$1.8 million, but agrees as part of a settlement to release 20 percent (\$360,000) to the claimant. Because the total value of the property exceeds \$1 million, the U.S. Attorney does not have authority to settle the case without approval from the Department of Justice; but because the amount to be returned does not exceed \$2 million, the chief of AFMLS would have the authority to approve the settlement without having to consult with the Deputy Attorney General, even though the amount to be returned is more than 15 percent of the total value.

- (3) A criminal indictment alleges that the defendant must forfeit, upon conviction, various assets in which the defendant has a total equity of \$3 million. The assets are neither seized nor restrained, but are listed in the forfeiture allegation in the indictment. As part of a plea agreement, the Government agrees not to go forward with the forfeiture of most of the assets but instead agrees to accept a lump sum payment of \$750,000 in lieu of forfeiture. Because the defendant is being allowed to retain assets worth more than \$2 million and representing more than 15 percent of the total value of the property subject to forfeiture, the plea agreement must be approved by the Deputy Attorney General.

IV. Using Administrative Forfeiture to Effect a Settlement

The following procedures apply to settlement agreements in civil judicial forfeiture cases and to criminal forfeiture plea agreements where an administrative forfeiture is necessary to effectuate the agreement. In such cases, the headquarters of the seizing agency involved must be consulted by the USAO prior to finalizing an agreement in order to ensure the agency can

accommodate the terms of the agreement.⁹⁸ The Department of Justice's policy is to pursue an agreed upon administrative forfeiture where it is possible and economically efficient to do so.

A. Settlement of forfeiture after a claim is filed in an administrative forfeiture proceeding, but before a judicial complaint is filed

The following requirements must be met where a claim has been filed and the case has been referred to the U.S. Attorney, but a settlement is reached before a civil judicial complaint has been filed.

- (1) The terms of the settlement should be reduced to writing by the U.S. Attorney and include the following:
 - (a) A provision whereby the claimant/defendant identifies his or her ownership interest in the property to be forfeited;
 - (b) A provision whereby the claimant/defendant gives up all right, title, and interest in the property;
 - (c) A provision whereby the claimant/defendant agrees not to contest the Government's administrative forfeiture action and waives all deadlines under 18 U.S.C. § 983(a);
 - (d) A provision whereby the claimant/defendant agrees and states that the property to be forfeited administratively was connected to the illegal activity as proscribed by the applicable civil forfeiture statute (e.g., money to be forfeited is in fact proceeds from illegal drug trafficking);

⁹⁸ The contact person at the seizing agency, for the purpose of determining whether the terms of any settlement requiring administrative action by the agency can be implemented, is as follows:

- (1) the FBI and DEA: the forfeiture counsel;
- (2) CBP/ICE: associate/assistant chief counsel (CBP) for the respective field office or designee (*note*: CBP is responsible for processing all seizures for civil forfeiture made by either CBP or ICE);
- (3) USPIS: manager, forfeiture group, or designee;
- (4) IRS: chief, criminal investigation division of the key district, or designee;
- (5) USSS: Office of Chief Counsel or designee; and
- (6) ATF: staff assistant to chief counsel, headquarters.

- (e) Specific reference to the withdrawal of the claim; and
 - (f) A “hold harmless” provision and a general waiver of Federal Tort Claims Act rights and *Bivens* actions, as well as a waiver of all constitutional and statutory defenses and claims.
- (2) The case should be referred promptly back to the seizing agency to reinstitute the administrative process. The seizing agency shall reinstitute the administrative forfeiture process to effectuate the agreement upon receipt of a referral in compliance with this policy, consistent with its lawful authority.

Where the agreement provides for the claimant to withdraw the claim to all property subject to forfeiture, the entire case will be referred back to the agency for administrative forfeiture.

Where the agreement provides for the claimant to withdraw only a part of a claim, the case will be referred back to the agency for administrative forfeiture of that portion of the forfeitable property named in the agreement, and the agency may release the remainder to the claimant consistent with the settlement.

Republication of the notice or of the administrative forfeiture action is not necessary, provided publication covering the property to be forfeited occurred prior to the filing of the claim.

B. Settlement of civil judicial forfeiture without prior administrative action

In cases where the judicial action was commenced without a prior administrative forfeiture action, and a settlement agreement has been reached involving a proposed administrative forfeiture of seized property,

- (1) The headquarters of the seizing agency must concur in that part of the settlement that would obligate the agency to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings;
- (2) The complaint must be dismissed; and
- (3) The jurisdiction of the district court must be relinquished before referral may be made to a seizing agency under this policy.

The seizing agency shall initiate the administrative forfeiture process to effectuate such an agreement upon receipt of a referral in compliance with this policy, consistent with its lawful authority.

C. Using administrative forfeiture to settle a criminal forfeiture action

In cases where property has been seized or restrained for forfeiture under criminal statutes, and an agreement has been reached between the U.S. Attorney and the claimant/defendant prior to an order of forfeiture relating to a proposed administrative forfeiture of the property,

- (1) The headquarters of the seizing agency must concur in that part of the settlement that would obligate the agency to commence administrative forfeiture proceedings;
- (2) The seizure or restraining orders must be dismissed; and
- (3) The jurisdiction of the district court over the property must be relinquished. The seizing agency shall initiate the administrative forfeiture process to effectuate such an agreement upon receipt of a referral in compliance with this policy, consistent with its lawful authority.

V. References to the Remission Process in Settlements

No agreement, whether a settlement in civil judicial action or a plea agreement resolving both criminal charges and the forfeiture of assets, may contain any provision binding the Department of Justice and the agencies to a particular decision on a petition for remission or mitigation, or otherwise contain terms whose effectiveness is contingent upon such a decision. The remission and mitigation process, like the pardon process in criminal cases, is completely independent of the litigation and case settlement process.

AFMLS, however, in appropriate cases upon request, will adjudicate a properly filed petition for remission or mitigation prior to the negotiation of a forfeiture settlement or entry of a final order of forfeiture. It is proper to include in a settlement agreement a provision that expressly leaves open or expressly forecloses the right of any party to file a petition for remission or mitigation.

VI. Settlements in Civil Judicial Forfeiture Cases

Any settlement that purports to forfeit property binds only the parties to it and forfeits only that interest in the property that the claimant possesses. The following procedures must be followed to ensure that a valid and complete civil judicial forfeiture by settlement occurs:

- (1) A civil verified complaint for forfeiture of the property must be filed in the U.S. district court to establish the court's jurisdiction. Filing an action as a "miscellaneous docket" and other attempts to shortcut the process will not be recognized as a valid forfeiture;
- (2) All known parties in interest must be given written notice, and notice by publication must be made;
- (3) If no timely claim has been filed pursuant to the Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty or Maritime and Asset Forfeiture Claims, a default judgment must be sought pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55; and
- (4) Proposed orders of forfeiture must be filed with the settlement agreement and include the terms of the settlement agreement.

VII. Settlements in Criminal Forfeiture Cases

In any plea agreement, a defendant may only consent to the forfeiture of his or her interest in the property. Forfeiture of the defendant's interest in property held by nominees can proceed criminally, but the potential for an ancillary claim by the nominee must be anticipated. A settlement that purports to forfeit the property may only bind the parties to it and transfers only that interest which the claimant/defendant possesses.

The following procedures must be followed to ensure that a valid forfeiture results from a plea settlement:

- (1) There must be a forfeiture count or allegation in the indictment or information; otherwise, forfeiture is legally impossible. To the extent property is known to be subject to forfeiture, it should be listed in the indictment, information, or in a subsequent bill of particulars. The USAO must ensure that its criminal pleadings are in compliance with Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

- (2) The U.S. Attorney must comply with the requirements applicable to third party interests (e.g., 21 U.S.C. §§ 853(n)(1)-(7)), and the provisions of Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, including notice of the forfeiture and the right of third parties to obtain an adjudication of their interests in the property.
- (3) The settlement to forfeit property must be in writing, and the defendant must concede facts supporting the forfeiture.
- (4) The court must issue a final order of forfeiture that incorporates the settlement and must include the forfeiture order in the judgment at sentencing.
- (5) Wherever possible, in order to avoid protracted litigation of ownership issues in the context of ancillary hearings, the United States should agree to accept unencumbered property only, with the exception of valid financial institution liens, or at the very least, the plea agreement should require the defendant to convey clear title to the Government.⁹⁹

VIII. Acceptance of a Monetary Amount in Lieu of Forfeiture

A. Introduction

When it is in the interests of justice, and subject to the limitations described in this section, which have been imposed as a matter of policy rather than statutory requirement, the Government may accept and forfeit an agreed amount of money in lieu of seized forfeitable property. In a judicial forfeiture case, with court approval, the Government may also accept and forfeit an agreed amount of money in lieu of forfeitable property, including real estate, that has not been seized.

Accepting and forfeiting money in lieu of forfeitable property and releasing the forfeitable property moots any unsettled forfeiture claims against the released property.

B. Policy considerations

The many federal forfeiture statutes reflect congressional policy that property constituting or derived from criminal proceeds and property used to commit crime should be taken away from those who took it from victims or illicit customers, committed crimes with it, or let others use it to commit crime. Forfeiting the “tainted” property itself accomplishes this goal

⁹⁹ See also section IV.A at page 87.

more directly and clearly than forfeiting an agreed sum of money and leaving the property in the hands of those whose acts or failures to act made it forfeitable. It is, therefore, Department of Justice policy to forfeit available directly implicated property rather than a substitute sum of money unless the interests of justice favor substitution.

There are circumstances where accepting and forfeiting an amount of money in lieu of the property linked to an underlying offense is in the interests of justice, including cases where innocent owners own all but a small portion of the property, where forfeiture of the particular property will cause an undue hardship on innocent owners, and where, after balancing the costs and risks of continued litigation, the Government determines that settling for part of the value of allegedly forfeitable property is just and appropriate.

This discussion of accepting money in lieu of forfeitable property is limited to cases where the forfeitable property is available for forfeiture, and forfeiting a sum of money instead leaves the forfeitable property in the hands of some or all of its present owners. The policy concerns discussed in this section do not arise when the Government forfeits substitute assets under 21 U.S.C. § 853(p) because directly forfeitable property is unavailable, or sells property, either before or after forfeiture, to persons not involved in or associated with the underlying criminal activity.

C. Applicable procedures

The following procedures must be followed when the Government accepts and forfeits money in lieu of other property:

- (1) **Administrative forfeitures.** 19 U.S.C. § 1613(c), as incorporated by, *e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 981(d), 21 U.S.C. §§ 853(j), 881(d), permits federal seizing agencies, as a form of relief from administrative forfeiture, to accept and forfeit a sum of money in lieu of forfeitable seized property. *See also* 19 U.S.C. § 1614. As a matter of policy and discretion, however, DEA and FBI limit their use of this authority to cases where such substitution is determined to be in the interests of justice and a timely claim for the forfeitable property has been filed pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(2) and referred by the seizing agency to the U.S. Attorney's Office for initiation of judicial forfeiture proceedings. After consultation with the seizing agency (*see* section I), the U.S. Attorney's Office may accept a monetary amount in lieu of forfeiture of the seized property and refer the matter back to the seizing agency to effect the settlement (*see* section IV).

- (2) **Judicial forfeitures.** After commencing a judicial forfeiture case, with court approval, and pursuant to an appropriate order of forfeiture, the Government may accept and forfeit an agreed sum of money in lieu of forfeitable property.
- (A) The Government must transfer money received in lieu of forfeiture to the USMS's district office or the appropriate Treasury agency in place of the asset being released.
 - (B) Pursuant to the order of forfeiture, the USMS or the appropriate Treasury agency must deposit the forfeited money (and share it when appropriate) in the same manner as applies to other forfeited property.
 - (C) If the U.S. Postal Inspection Service or the National Marine Fisheries Service is the primary federal investigative agency, the USMS must deposit the money, deduct expenses (if any) incurred with respect to the property being released, deduct the approved equitable shares attributable to other federal agencies participating in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund, and transfer the balance by refund to the above services, as appropriate. Each service is responsible for sharing with participating state and local agencies in these cases.

D. Discussion

When it is in the interests of justice, the Government may forfeit a sum of money in lieu of forfeitable property or a forfeitable partial interest in otherwise non-forfeitable property. Parties often agree to substitute money for forfeitable property in connection with a settlement. When courts order an interlocutory sale of forfeitable property, by agreement or otherwise, the net sale proceeds also typically become a substitute *res*. Legal authority to forfeit money in lieu of other property is found in the applicable statutes, rules, regulations, and case law summarized below.

Subject to any applicable regulations¹⁰⁰ and the further restrictions described herein, which have been imposed as a matter of policy, an agency may accept and forfeit money in lieu of seized forfeitable property under 19 U.S.C. § 1613(c), which allows such substitution as a form of "relief" from forfeiture, and under 19 U.S.C. § 1614, which authorizes agencies to release property seized for administrative forfeiture upon payment of "the value of" such

¹⁰⁰ Payments in lieu of forfeiture are addressed in the proposed Department of Justice regulations (28 C.F.R. § 8.12(e)).

property. The substituted money is “treated in the same manner as the proceeds of sale of a forfeited item.” 19 U.S.C. § 1613(c).

The customs laws, including sections 1613(c) and 1614, are incorporated by reference into most civil and criminal forfeiture statutes. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 981(d), 21 U.S.C. §§ 853(j), 881(d). Therefore, sections 1613(c) and 1614 also authorize substitution of money for seized forfeitable property in most judicial forfeiture cases, although, of course, in judicial forfeiture cases, both the substitution of money for the directly forfeitable property and the forfeiture of the substituted money require the court’s approval. *See, e.g., United States v. Approximately 64,695 Pounds of Shark Fins*, 353 F. Supp. 2d 1095, 1098-99 (S.D. Cal. 2005) (court permitted claimant to post bond as substitute *res* in exchange for release of seized shark fins, which claimant was then permitted to sell).

Although section 1613(c) and section 1614 apply by their terms only to “seized” property, the common practice of substituting and forfeiting an agreed amount of money in lieu of allegedly forfeitable property has not been so limited. Courts have recognized, generally without reference to particular statutory authority, that parties to a forfeiture case may agree to substitute a sum of money for the allegedly forfeitable property, and then may settle or litigate the forfeiture with the money serving as substitute *res*. In *Republic National Bank of Miami v. United States*, 506 U.S. 80, 82-83 (1992), the Court noted, without comment, that by agreement and with court approval, forfeitable real property had been sold and the proceeds treated as a substitute *res*. In *Ventura Packers, Inc. v. F/V Jeanine Kathleen*, 424 F.3d 852, 855 (9th Cir. 2005), as in *Republic National Bank*, the court assumed it was proper to substitute money for the forfeitable property, focusing instead upon whether the district court lost *in rem* jurisdiction when the substitute *res* was transferred out of the district.¹⁰¹

Similarly, in *United States v. Real Property Located at 22 Santa Barbara Drive*, 264 F.3d 860, 866-67 (9th Cir. 2001), the forfeitable real property was sold in 1991, the proceeds became a substitute *res*, and litigation over a variety of issues—but never the propriety of the substitution—continued for another ten years. In *United States v. An Article of Drug Consisting of 4,680 Pails*, 725 F.2d 976, 983 n.20 (5th Cir. 1984), which focused upon whether the district court lost jurisdiction when seized animal drug powder was mistakenly released and then removed from the district, the court of appeals described selling forfeitable property and using the sale proceeds as a “substitute *res* for jurisdictional purposes” as “an often-used and legitimate practice.” *See also United States v. Twelve Pieces of Real Property*,

¹⁰¹ Both the Ninth Circuit in *Ventura Packers*, 424 F.3d at 864, and the Supreme Court in *Republic National Bank*, 506 U.S. at 92-93, held that transferring the substitute *res* out of the district did not deprive the district courts of *in rem* jurisdiction.

54 Fed. Appx. 461, 463-64 (9th Cir. 2003) (affirming forfeiture of money substituted for facilitating real property in a drug trafficking case); *United States v. \$180,893.00*, 39 Fed. Appx. 570, 571-73 (same); *United States v. 250 Lindsay Lane*, 2005 WL 1994762 at *5 (W.D. Ky. Aug. 16, 2005) (by agreement, proceeds from sale of real property allegedly purchased with healthcare fraud proceeds became substitute *res*); *United States v. \$1.5 Million Letter of Credit as a Substitute Res for Seized Bank Accounts*, 1992 WL 204357 at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 7, 1992) (by stipulation, parties substituted \$1.5 million letter of credit for approximately \$4.3 million contents of seized bank accounts).

In addition to the common law, there is statutory authority for substitution in many cases. In all criminal forfeitures, and most civil forfeitures, courts have broad power to take any action necessary to preserve the forfeitable value of property. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 853(e)(1); 18 U.S.C. § 983(j)(1). Liquidation of the property, replacing it with a sum of money, is often an effective means of preserving forfeitable value. In criminal forfeitures, substitution of money for tainted property is authorized under the substitute assets provision, 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), if the defendant has transferred or commingled interests in directly forfeitable property in a way that makes liquidation and forfeiture of the property itself difficult.

In civil judicial forfeiture cases, interlocutory sales are specifically authorized by Supplemental Rule G(7)(b), which provides that the sale proceeds “are a substitute *res* subject to forfeiture in place of the property that was sold.”¹⁰² Supp. Rule G(7)(b)(iv). Rule G(7)(b) codified preexisting law approving the practice of treating interlocutory sale proceeds as a substitute *res* under Supp. Rule E(9)(b). *See United States v. One Parcel Lot 41, Berryhill Farm*, 128 F.3d 1386, 1390 (10th Cir. 1997) (interlocutory sale of residence while civil case was stayed pending criminal trial avoided waste and expense and allowed Government to satisfy mortgage); *United States v. Haro-Verdugo*, 2006 WL 1990843, at *2 (D. Ariz. 2006) (magistrate judge recommended interlocutory sale under Supp. Rule E(9)(b) where transient drug dealers were using vacant property and property was deteriorating); *United States v. 2540 Chadwick Way*, 2005 WL 2124539, at *3 (N.D. Ill. 2005) (over claimant’s objection, court ordered interlocutory sale of real property pursuant to section 983(j) to avoid mortgage foreclosure); *Aguilar v. United States*, 1999 WL 1067841, at *5 (D. Conn. 1999) (despite claimant’s objection, exigent circumstances justified interlocutory sale of real property to prevent vandalism and to pay off mortgage). *See generally AFMLS’ Guide to Interlocutory Sales and Expedited Settlement.*

¹⁰² At the Department of Justice’s request, Supp. Rule G(7)’s interlocutory sale provision has been incorporated into a proposed revision of Rule 32.2 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure now advancing through the federal rulemaking process.

Under many forfeiture statutes, the proceeds from sale of forfeitable property are directly forfeitable without the need for “substitution” because they are “derived from” or “traceable to” the forfeitable property. *E.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) (property traceable to property involved in money laundering); 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) (property derived from a specified unlawful activity proceeds); 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(6) (property traceable to drug proceeds). “Substitution” of untainted property for forfeitable property is only necessary in the interlocutory sale context where the proceeds from sale of forfeitable property would not otherwise be forfeitable. *E.g.*, 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(7) (authorizing forfeiture of facilitating real property, but not of property derived from or traceable to such property).

In judicial forfeiture cases, the Government should request that any interlocutory order substituting money for a forfeitable asset direct the USMS or the appropriate Treasury agency or other property custodian to accept and hold the money, after paying any expenses incurred with respect to the seizure and maintenance of the asset being liquidated or released, pending further orders of the court. Once a substitute *res* has been forfeited, the USMS or the appropriate Treasury agency must dispose of it in the same manner as other forfeited property.

IX. Agreements to Exempt Attorney’s Fees from Forfeiture

Any agreement to exempt an asset from forfeiture so that it can be transferred to an attorney as fees must be approved by the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division.¹⁰³

¹⁰³ See *United States Attorneys’ Manual* § 9-119.203.

Chapter 4

Third Party Interests

I. State and Local Real Property Taxes

A. Civil forfeiture cases

Notwithstanding the enactment of 18 U.S.C. § 983(d)(3), which bars recovery in certain civil forfeiture cases by persons who are not bona fide purchasers for value, it is the policy of the Department of Justice that the United States should pay state and local real property taxes that accrue up to the date of the entry of an order or judgment of forfeiture.¹⁰⁴ The reasons are two-fold. First, the refusal to pay such taxes would draw the United States into conflict with state and local authorities on matters (the collection of real property taxes) that traditionally have been left to state and local control. Second, the refusal to pay state and local real property taxes would, as a practical matter, complicate the interlocutory or post-judgment sale of real property. It would, for example, be difficult for the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) to market and sell real property on which ad valorem property taxes had not been paid. Title insurers and escrow officers might be reluctant to provide the necessary warranties in the face of unpaid state and local property taxes, thus undermining the marketability of the property.

B. Criminal forfeiture cases

For the same reasons that it is the Department's policy in civil forfeiture cases to pay state and local taxes even if those tax liabilities accrue after the events giving rise to forfeiture, it is the Department's policy to also pay such taxes in criminal forfeiture cases. There is no reason to differentiate. Pursuant to delegated authority the chief of the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) may authorize the payment of state and local taxes on

¹⁰⁴ After the Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. A Parcel of Land (92 Buena Vista)*, 507 U.S. 111 (1993), the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) opined that the United States must pay state and local taxes on civilly forfeited real property because the innocent owner defense then in effect was broad enough to include tax liens that arose after the events giving rise to forfeiture. The rationale for the OLC opinion was undermined by the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (CAFRA) of 2000, which created a uniform innocent owner defense applicable to all civil forfeiture cases, 18 U.S.C. § 983(d). In the case of interests acquired after the events giving rise to forfeiture, only bona fide purchasers for value who acquire their interest without knowledge that the property is subject to forfeiture can maintain a meritorious innocent owner defense. 18 U.S.C. § 983(d)(3). Thus, as a matter of law, taxing authorities that acquire liens after the commission of the offense giving rise to the forfeiture would not be able to recover the value of the liens under section 983(d)(3). The OLC opinion is reprinted as Appendix F.

criminally forfeited real property in the same manner and to the same extent as is authorized for the payment of such taxes on civilly forfeited real property pursuant to the policy set forth *supra*.

C. Payment of interest and penalties on state and local real property taxes

The following policy is meant to ensure consistent national treatment of the payment of interest and penalties on state and local taxes on forfeited real property:

- (1) the United States will pay interest but not penalties on overdue taxes;
- (2) the formula for the rate of interest is set forth in 28 U.S.C. § 1961(a);
- (3) higher rates of interest may be paid where the taxing authority has incurred out-of-pocket interest expenses in excess of the rate specified by section 1961(a) (e.g., where tax certificates have been sold to private investors);
- (4) U.S. Attorneys, with the concurrence of AFMLS, may agree to a higher rate of interest provided that such higher rate is not punitive; and
- (5) taxes and interest thereon may only be paid up to the amount realized from the sale of the property.

II. Guidelines and Procedures for Restoration of Forfeited Property to Crime Victims via Restitution in lieu of Remission

A. Purpose

The guidelines and procedures set forth in this policy are intended to expedite the transfer of forfeited property to the victims of the crimes underlying forfeitures, or related offenses, by releasing forfeited property, in appropriate cases, to satisfy victim restitution orders in forfeiture-related criminal cases in lieu of requiring such victims to petition the Attorney General for remission of the forfeited property.

B. Authority

With respect to property ordered forfeited under the criminal forfeiture statutes, the Attorney General has statutory authority to ...

grant petitions for remission or mitigation of forfeiture, restore forfeited property to victims of a violation of [the applicable chapter or subchapter], or take any other action to protect the rights of innocent persons which is in the interest of justice and which is not inconsistent with the provisions of [the applicable chapter or section]...

18 U.S.C. §§ 1467(h)(1) (obscene material); 1963(g)(1), 2253(h)(1) (sexual exploitation of minors); 21 U.S.C. § 853(i)(1) (controlled substances); and by incorporation of section 853(i)(1) by reference, 18 U.S.C. §§ 793(h)(3) and 794(d)(3) (espionage); 982(b)(1) (money laundering and other offenses).

In civil forfeitures also, the Attorney General is authorized to decide petitions for remission or mitigation. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 981(d) and 21 U.S.C. § 881(d). In addition, section 981 authorizes the Attorney General, in section 981 civil forfeitures, to transfer the forfeited property “as restoration to any victim of the offense giving rise to the forfeiture, including, in the case of a money laundering offense, any offense constituting the underlying specified unlawful activity.” *See* section 981(e)(6).

The authority of the Attorney General to grant petitions for remission or mitigation in criminal and civil judicial forfeitures is delegated to the chief of AFMLS by Title 28, Code of Federal Regulations, part 9 (28 C.F.R. Part 9), at 28 C.F.R. Part 9.1(b)(2). In addition, the Attorney General has delegated to the chief of AFMLS, the authority pursuant to any civil or criminal forfeiture statute enforced or administered by the Department of Justice, *e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. §§ 981(e)(6), 1963(g)(1), and 982(b)(1) [incorporating section 853(i)(1), “to restore forfeited property to victims or take other actions to protect the rights of innocent persons in civil or criminal forfeitures that are in the interest of justice and that are not inconsistent with the provisions of the statute.”¹⁰⁵ Accordingly, in appropriate cases, the chief of AFMLS has discretionary authority to authorize the restoration of forfeited property to compensate victims by means of court-ordered restitution.

Pursuant to this restoration authority, and applying the guidelines for restoration decisions set forth below and the procedures for restoration decisions set forth in section II.D.1 at page 102, the chief of AFMLS, in appropriate cases, may authorize federally forfeited property or proceeds to be transferred to the court for use in satisfaction of orders of restitution entered at sentencing pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3363 et seq. Such authority may be used by the chief of AFMLS in lieu of the separate authority and procedures set forth at 28 C.F.R. Part 9 governing petitions for remission or mitigation of forfeited property to victims. However, insofar as is reasonably feasible, such authority will be used to accomplish results that are not inconsistent with the standards set forth at 28 C.F.R. Part 9.8 for determining remission of

¹⁰⁵ *See* Attorney General Order No. 2088-97 (June 14, 1997).

forfeited property to non-owner victims. Additionally, insofar as may be applicable and not inconsistent with the standards or procedures herein, the other provisions of 28 C.F.R. Part 9 also shall apply.

C. Guidelines for restoration decisions

1. Representations

The chief of AFMLS will grant restoration requests submitted in accordance with section II.D.1 at page 102 only when the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegee, has informed AFMLS of the following in writing:

- (1) all known victims have been properly notified of the restitution proceedings and are properly accounted for in the restitution order;
- (2) to the best of knowledge and belief after consultation with the seizing agency, the losses described in the restitution order have been verified and reflect all sources of compensation received by the victims, including returns on investments, interest payments, insurance proceeds, refunds, settlement payments, lawsuit awards, and any other sources of compensation for their losses;
- (3) to the best of knowledge and belief after consultation with the seizing agency, reasonable efforts to locate additional assets establish that the victims do not have recourse reasonably available to other assets from which to obtain compensation for their losses, including, other assets owned or controlled by the defendant(s); and
- (4) there is no evidence to suggest that any of the victims knowingly contributed to, participated in, benefitted from, or acted in a willfully blind manner toward the commission of the offenses underlying the forfeiture or related offenses.

2. Statutory authority

The property to be restored must be forfeited pursuant to a statute that explicitly authorizes restoration or remission of forfeited property to victims. *See, e.g.*, sections 981(e)(6) and 982(b)(1) (incorporating the provisions of section 853(i)(1)) and section 1963(g)(1).

3. Pro rata

Restoration will be granted only to the victims and in the amounts described in the court's restitution order, or as a pro rata percentage based on such amounts.

4. Allowed losses

The losses allowed in the restitution order should primarily represent monetary losses directly caused by the illegal activities underlying the forfeiture. The chief of AFMLS may refuse to grant restoration where a pro rata distribution to the victims would be unduly skewed in favor of one or more victims who suffered non-monetary losses or losses associated with torts, physical injuries, interest foregone, or collateral expenses incurred to recover lost property or to seek other recompense (although such expenses may constitute some of the losses allowed in the restitution order).

5. Priority

Restoration decisions must not prejudice the judicial or administrative claims of owners, lienholders, or federal financial institution regulatory agencies pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Governing Financial Institution Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act (FIRREA) Forfeiture Cases.¹⁰⁶ Such claims shall have the same priority over non-owner victims in the restoration process as in the remission process. Accordingly, petitions for remission or mitigation based upon such claims must be decided by the seizing agency (in administrative cases) or the chief of AFMLS (in judicial cases) pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 9 and (if granted) paid prior to payment of restoration decisions. Restoration payments will be made from the net proceeds remaining after payment of allowed costs and the claims of owners, lienholders, and others recognized in the final order of forfeiture and/or through petitions for remission.

6. Petitions for remission or mitigation

To expedite resolution of restoration requests, when necessary, decisions on restoration requests may be made *subject to* pending decisions on petitions for remission by owners, lienholders, and federal financial institution regulatory agencies (as opposed to *delaying* a decision on the restoration request until after all petitions for remission or mitigation are decided).

¹⁰⁶ See *U.S. Attorneys' Manual*, section 9-119.500.

D. Procedures for restoration decisions

1. Restoration requests

The U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO) will forward a copy of the restitution order to the chief of AFMLS along with a written request that property forfeited in the same and/or related civil, criminal, or administrative forfeiture proceedings be used to compensate the victims and losses specified in the restitution order. The written request must identify each asset involved including the seizing agency involved and, where applicable, the agency seizure number. The request and order shall be accompanied by the written representations required of the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegee, by section II.C.1 at page 100. In cases where an order of restitution is anticipated but has not yet been signed and entered, a draft restitution order may be submitted to AFMLS at any time for an informal advance decision, which AFMLS will formally finalize after receipt of a copy of the final restitution order entered. In addition, pursuant to section II.E at page 103, the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegee, may place a 12-month hold on the final distribution of net proceeds of property subject to civil or administrative forfeiture pending issuance of a criminal restitution order. However, such holds will not apply to administrative forfeitures by non-Department of Justice seizing agencies unless the USAO obtains the written concurrence of the local agency special agent-in-charge (SAC) or other appropriate agency official.

2. Time limits

Restoration requests must be sent to AFMLS within 30 days of the entry of the restitution order into the Consolidated Asset Tracking System (CATS). The USAO must enter restitution orders in CATS within 5 days of sentencing.

3. Evidentiary basis

The USAOs should work closely with the probation office and the investigative agency for the criminal case in formulating restitution awards to ensure that the victims' losses are supported by documentary evidence, including invoices and receipts.

4. Seizing agency investigation

The USAO may direct the investigative agency for the criminal case to investigate the merits of victims' claims, including, specifically, the claimed losses and the eligibility of the victims in accordance with section II.A at page 98. When requested, the investigative agency shall submit to the USAO a report of its investigation and its recommendation on whether the

victims' claims should be recognized or opposed. The USAO shall forward a copy of the investigative agency's report and recommendation, if any, to the chief of AFMLS along with the written request for restoration approval.

5. Decision by AFMLS

Using the guidelines for restoration decisions set forth above in section II.C.1 at page 100, the chief of AFMLS will determine, on a case-by-case basis, whether the restoration request will be granted. In cases involving assets forfeited administratively by a seizing agency other than a Department of Justice seizing agency, the chief of AFMLS will need the concurrence of that agency in order to grant the restoration request as to those assets.

If the chief of AFMLS denies the restoration request, AFMLS will advise the USAO of the denial, and disposition of forfeited property to victims will be decided through the petition for remission process pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 9. If the chief of AFMLS grants the restoration request, AFMLS will forward a copy of the restoration decision to the USAO, and to the USMS headquarters (and/or to the appropriate property custodian for any forfeited property being restored that is not held by the USMS), which will coordinate disbursement of the net proceeds of the subject forfeiture(s) (administrative, civil, and/or criminal) after satisfaction of allowed costs and any rulings on petitions for remission or mitigation of forfeiture filed by owners, lienholders, and/or federal financial institution regulatory agencies under the FIRREA MOU to the court for satisfaction of the restitution order. Restoration decisions shall apply to the net proceeds of any and all property forfeited in related administrative, civil, and/or criminal forfeiture proceedings not yet distributed to compensate victims of the offenses underlying the forfeiture or related offenses.

E. Guidelines for imposing 12-month hold pending entry of a restitution order

In appropriate cases (usually fraud cases with forfeited proceeds), the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegee, may place a 12-month hold on the final distribution of net proceeds of property subject to civil forfeiture or to administrative forfeiture by a Department of Justice seizing agency pending entry of a restitution order.¹⁰⁷ The USAO will enter the hold in CATS as to each asset (including frozen, indicted, restrained, or encumbered assets) and the effective date of the hold will be the date of its entry in CATS by the USAO. The hold will remain in place for up to 12 months unless it is continued by the seizing agency or AFMLS at

¹⁰⁷ The decision of the USAO to forfeit property judicially rather than administratively should not be confused with the hold, which refers only to the proceeds of a completed forfeiture.

the end of the 12-month period pursuant to section II.E.1 at page 104 or released by the USAO at any time pursuant to section II.E.2 at page 105. Once entered into CATS, the hold will prevent the seizing agency (in administrative forfeitures by Department of Justice seizing agencies) or the chief of AFMLS (in judicial cases) from granting petitions for remission or mitigation from non-owner victims. It will also prevent entry or execution of decisions on any official use or equitable sharing requests. The hold will have no effect on the forfeiture proceedings governing such property or the ability to liquidate the property once forfeited or dispose of the property as otherwise ordered by the court. Holds will effectively override all requests for retention or transfer for official use. Further, the hold shall not prevent processing and, where appropriate, payment of petitions for remission or mitigation filed by owners, lienholders (pursuant to 28 C.F.R. Part 9), and federal financial institution regulatory agencies (pursuant to the FIRREA MOU), or the payment of awards and property management expenses, and the hold will not prevent decisions to deny, withdraw, or extinguish petitions for remission or mitigation or requests for equitable sharing or official use.

In deciding whether to place a 12-month hold on proceeds of related administrative or civil forfeitures, the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegate, should consider whether it is more efficient to compensate all victims through the restoration process or to allow the seizing agency (in administrative cases) or the chief of AFMLS (in judicial cases) to proceed with the remission process. In some cases, it might be better to use the remission process to provide the victims with at least partial compensation immediately rather than to make them wait until completion of a criminal prosecution and entry of a restitution order to obtain any compensation. On the other hand, if a victim could use the remission process to obtain a greater percentage of compensation than similarly situated victims who chose to pursue only the restitution route, then it might be better to require all victims to be compensated through the restoration process.

1. Notification

The USAO will notify, in writing, the USMS and the Department of Justice seizing agency (in administrative cases) or the chief of AFMLS (in judicial cases) of the imposition of a 12-month hold. If the USAO wishes to place a hold on the proceeds of any non-Department of Justice agency's administrative forfeiture, it must notify the local SAC or other appropriate agency official in writing and obtain written concurrence. Upon entry of a hold decision, CATS will not allow decisions on non-owner victim petitions, equitable sharing, or official use requests to be entered for 12 months from the date of the hold decision, but will continue to allow entry of decisions on and payments of owner, lienholder, and federal financial institution regulatory agency petitions, property management expenses,

and awards. The USAO will be responsible for monitoring the status of the hold. If the forfeited property has already been transferred to an owner, lienholder, or federal financial institution regulatory agency, placed into official use, or equitably shared, CATS will not accept entry of the hold decision and will notify the USAO.

2. Release or extension of hold period

If a restitution order is not issued within 12 months, the seizing agency headquarters (for administratively forfeited property) or the chief of AFMLS (for judicially forfeited property), after consulting with the USAO, may decide either to continue holding the property pending entry of a restitution order or to proceed with the petition for remission process for non-owner victims. Entry of a restitution order in CATS will automatically extend a hold for 60 days.

- (1) CATS will automatically release the hold if a restitution order is not issued (and entered into CATS by the USAO) or if the hold period is not extended by the seizing agency or AFMLS within 12 months from the date of the hold decision.
- (2) At any time during the hold period (e.g., when restitution is denied or the criminal case is dismissed), after consulting with the seizing agency or AFMLS, as the case may be, the USAO may release the hold on property to allow the seizing agency or AFMLS to proceed with the petition for remission process for non-owner victims (as well as equitable sharing and official use decisions).

3. Official use and equitable sharing requests

Owners, lienholders, and federal financial institution regulatory agencies (pursuant to the FIRREA MOU) (in that order) shall have priority over non-owner victims, who in turn shall have priority over official use requests and equitable sharing requests. In appropriate cases, the U.S. Attorney, or his or her delegee, may exempt specific forfeited assets from a 12-month hold to allow for official use or equitable sharing requests to be granted. Such an exemption should be granted only where there will be sufficient proceeds from other forfeited assets to fully compensate any owners, lienholders, federal financial institution regulatory agencies (pursuant to the FIRREA MOU), and non-owner victims.

III. Waiver of Costs to Owner Victims in Remission Cases

There has been an increasing number of cases in which property is seized for forfeiture from those who obtained it through theft or fraud in violation of federal law. In many of these cases, there is a victim of the underlying crime with a cognizable ownership interest in the property forfeited. Victims with a traceable ownership interest (owner-victims) in the property may submit a petition for remission or mitigation of the forfeiture. A purpose of remission is to ameliorate the effects of forfeiture for those with an interest in the forfeited property who lack involvement in, or knowledge of the conduct that resulted in, the forfeiture.

To provide some relief to those victimized by crime and to ensure that forfeiture by a federal agency in such cases does not cause the victim to suffer the economic effect of the crime twice, it is the policy of the Department of Justice to waive the payment of certain costs and expenses incident to the seizure and forfeiture of property that is being restored through remission to an owner victim of the underlying offense when the owner victim is a natural person. This policy does not apply to non-owner victims. The costs and expenses subject to waiver are property management and case-related expenses incurred in connection with the forfeiture and include storage, maintenance, and security costs, as well as those costs incurred in connection with the requirement that the Government provide notice of the action to potential claimants. It is preferable to restore forfeited property to owner victims, thus avoiding disposition costs. In the event property must be sold to restore property to one or more victim owners, the costs of sale will not be waived. Nor should costs be waived where the petitioner seeking remission as an owner victim is an agency of a state or the Federal Government.

IV. Using Civil Forfeiture to Recover Property for Fraud Victims in the Ninth Circuit¹⁰⁸

A. Summary of the issue

Federal prosecutors frequently use asset forfeiture as a tool for recovering property for the benefit of the victims of crime. Indeed, forfeiture has proven to be particularly effective in fraud cases, where the proceeds of the fraud can be seized or restrained prior to trial and then disbursed to the victims on an equitable basis by the Attorney General in accordance with the remission regulations once the court has entered an order of forfeiture. Between FY98 and

¹⁰⁸ Section IV was previously circulated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 05-2 in 2005.

FY05, the Attorney General distributed \$72,282,061 to 11,388 victims pursuant to this procedure.

Unfortunately, a recent appellate decision has made it difficult for the Government to use the forfeiture statutes for this purpose in the Ninth Circuit. In *United States v. \$4,224,958.57*, 392 F.3d 1002 (9th Cir. 2004) (*Boylan*), the panel held that any person who can establish that he or she was the victim of a fraud has standing to contest the forfeiture of the fraudster's property as the potential beneficiary of a constructive trust and therefore is entitled to notice of the forfeiture proceeding. In administrative forfeiture cases, this means that the seizing agency will have to send notice to all of the victims of the fraud, and that the claim of even one victim will force the agency to suspend the administrative forfeiture and turn the case over to the U.S. Attorney. In cases with large numbers of victims, this will make administrative forfeiture of fraud proceeds impractical, even if the fraudster does not oppose the forfeiture.

In civil forfeiture cases, the holding in *Boylan* means that the U.S. Attorney will have to send notice to all persons who appear to be victims of the fraud. The Government will have the right to challenge any claim that is filed on the ground that the claimant is not truly a victim, but any person who establishes his or her status as a victim will have the right to participate in pretrial discovery, to litigate pretrial motions (such as a motion to stay the civil case pending resolution of a criminal trial), and to contest the forfeitability of the property. Moreover, it means that even if the Government establishes forfeitability, the victims who file claims may attempt to establish an innocent owner defense by showing that they satisfy the requirements of a constructive trust. In the end, if any victim-claimant satisfies those requirements, the court will be required to award at least a portion of the property to that victim, thereby reducing the pool of money available for the Attorney General to distribute to the remaining victims on an equitable basis under the remission regulations. In many cases, the pool will be reduced to zero; moreover, in all cases, the Government will be liable to pay the attorney's fees of the prevailing victims even though the Government's purpose in bringing the forfeiture action was to recover the property for the victims' benefit.

In criminal cases, the Government will be able to proceed with the prosecution of the defendant without regard to the potential claims of the victims until the court enters a preliminary order of forfeiture. At that point, however, the Government will have to send notice of the forfeiture to all of the victims and litigate the claim of any victim who asserts his or her status as the beneficiary of a constructive trust as a ground to recover the forfeited property in the ancillary proceeding.

This situation has caused AFMLS to review the use of the forfeiture statutes in fraud cases that must be filed in the Ninth Circuit. This memorandum reflects the input of the forfeiture experts in the USAOs throughout the Ninth Circuit and the federal law enforcement agencies and sets forth the legal advice that AFMLS is giving to those offices pending the enactment of remedial legislation that addresses the problems caused by the *Boylan* decision.

B. Summary of the legal advice

The *Boylan* decision makes administrative and civil forfeiture of fraud proceeds impractical in cases that involve large numbers of victims and that must be filed in the Ninth Circuit. Accordingly, until Congress has an opportunity to enact remedial legislation, AFMLS strongly urges prosecutors in the Ninth Circuit to employ alternatives to civil forfeiture when seeking to recover fraud proceeds for the benefit of large numbers of victims. Among other things, prosecutors should consider enlisting other Government agencies, such as the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) and U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), to file actions to recover fraud proceeds in cases falling within their jurisdiction. Prosecutors may also consider cooperating with bankruptcy proceedings or with private litigation filed on behalf of all of the victims of the fraud offense. Finally, prosecutors may seek to preserve property using the criminal forfeiture statutes in cases where there is a criminal prosecution, but in such cases the prosecutor should withdraw the forfeiture prior to the entry of the preliminary order so that the property can be turned over to the court to apply to a restitution order.

C. Discussion

1. Using forfeiture to recover property for victims

Generally speaking, when the Government seizes fraud proceeds for civil forfeiture, its goal is to forfeit the monies and then, in remission proceedings administered by the Attorney General, distribute funds to all victims on a pro rata basis. The procedure works like this: the Government seizes any property in the fraudster's possession that is traceable to the offense and sends notice of its intent to forfeit that property to the fraudster and to any other person appearing to have a legal interest in the particular assets that have been seized. If no one files a claim, the property is forfeited administratively. If someone does file a claim, the U.S. Attorney files a civil forfeiture complaint, conducts pretrial discovery, and litigates the forfeitability of the property and the applicability of the statutory innocent owner defense

with the wrongdoer and the other claimants.¹⁰⁹ If the Government prevails, the court issues a forfeiture judgment and the Attorney General disburses the property to the victims on a pro rata basis through the remission process.¹¹⁰

Because fraud victims generally part with title to their funds by giving them to the fraudster, who then commingles them in his or her own accounts, the victims lack an interest in any specific property of the fraudster. Thus, when the Government seizes the fraudster's property, it need not provide notice to the victims that it has instituted a forfeiture proceeding.¹¹¹ The victims, for the same reason (i.e., a lack of an interest in specific property) cannot appear in the forfeiture proceeding and make a claim to the funds.¹¹² This allows the Attorney General to round up the assets of the fraudster efficiently and inexpensively and distribute them equitably to the victims.

¹⁰⁹ See 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)-(c), setting forth civil forfeiture procedure for cases governed by CAFRA and section 983(d), creating an innocent owner defense.

¹¹⁰ See 18 U.S.C. § 981(e)(6) (authorizing the Attorney General to use forfeited property for the purpose of victim restitution); 28 C.F.R. § 9 (setting forth the regulations governing the remission process); *United States v. One-Sixth Share*, 326 F.3d 36 (1st Cir. 2003) (explaining why an unsecured creditor of the wrongdoer is not permitted to contest the forfeiture of the wrongdoer's assets: "Congress has provided for justice a different way: it has provided that the Government, which stands for all the citizens, may take the criminal's property by forfeiture, and it has limited those who may assert competing claims"; victims can then petition the Attorney General for remission).

¹¹¹ See *United States v. Phillips*, 185 F.3d 183 (4th Cir. 1999) (holding that the Government does not have to send notice to persons who lack standing to contest the forfeiture).

¹¹² It is well-established that a person does not have article III standing unless that person has a legal interest in the particular assets subject to forfeiture. It is not enough to assert a generalized legal interest in the estate of the person from whom those assets have been seized. Unsecured creditors lack any interest in the debtor's assets; they have only a generalized interest in the debtor's estate. Thus, the federal courts have routinely held that unsecured creditors do not have article III standing to contest the civil forfeiture of their debtor's property. See *United States v. One-Sixth Share*, 326 F.3d 36, 44 (1st Cir. 2003) (person with an in personam judgment against the property owner has no secured interest in any particular asset and lacks standing to contest the forfeiture of specific property); *United States v. Carrell*, 252 F.3d 1193, 1207 n.2 (11th Cir. 2001) (woman contesting forfeiture on the ground that the property owner owes her child support payments lacks standing because she is not an owner); *United States v. Cambio Exacto, S.A.*, 166 F.3d 522, 529 (2d Cir. 1999) (entity to whom a money transmitter owes money lacks standing as a general creditor to contest forfeiture of money transmitter's account because there is no injury that would be redressed by successful challenge to the forfeiture); *United States v. \$20,193.39 U.S. Currency*, 16 F.3d 344 (9th Cir. 1994) ("Unlike secured creditors, general creditors cannot claim an interest in any particular asset that makes up the debtor's estate. For this reason, the federal courts have consistently held that unsecured creditors do not have standing to challenge the civil forfeiture of their debtors' property."); *United States v. \$61,483.00 in U.S. Currency*, 2003 WL 1566553, at *2 (W.D. Tex. 2003) (notwithstanding his claim of ownership, claimant lacked standing because he was an unsecured creditor); *United States v. \$124,906 in U.S. Currency*, 2000 WL 360086, at *2 (D. Or. 2000) ("unsecured creditors do not have standing to challenge the civil forfeiture of their debtor's property"); *United States v. \$15,060 in U.S. Currency*, 1999 WL 166847, at *2 (D. Or. 1999) (claimant who allegedly loaned money to defendant not knowing defendant intended to use it to facilitate drug trafficking was an unsecured creditor with no legal standing to contest the forfeiture of the seized funds).

2. Problems caused by the *Boylan* decision

Since 1998, the Department of Justice has used this procedure to remit millions of dollars to thousands of victims, but the procedure only works if the Government is able to obtain an order of forfeiture from the court. Until there is an order of forfeiture, the Attorney General is unable to disburse the property pursuant to the remission regulations because the Government cannot remit property to which it does not yet have clear title. By making it difficult if not impossible for the Government to obtain clear title to the fraudster's property, the *Boylan* decision completely upsets the statutory scheme.

The first problem concerns the practicality of providing notice in cases with large numbers of victims and managing cases in which a substantial number of victims choose to file claims. In *Boylan*, the panel held that all victims of a fraud scheme are potential beneficiaries of a constructive trust and thus have “a cognizable legal interest in the property,” 392 F.2d at 1003. Because a person with a cognizable legal interest has a due process right to notice and an opportunity to be heard before the property is forfeited, *see Dusenberry v. United States*, 534 U.S. 161, 167 (2002), the Government is required to give notice to all potential claimants who might choose to file a claim. Under the Ninth Circuit's holding, that means that, in a fraud that victimized hundreds or even thousands of persons, the Government must make a good faith effort to identify those potential claimants and then give them personal notice.¹¹³ Any of those claimants may then choose to file a claim. The Government may challenge the claim on the ground that the claimant was not a victim of the fraud,¹¹⁴ but claimants who establish their status as victims will be able to engage in pretrial discovery and motions practice and contest the forfeitability of the property.¹¹⁵ The same requirements would apply to administrative forfeiture: the seizing agency would have to give notice to all fraud victims, and any one of them could file a claim, thereby requiring the case to be filed as a judicial forfeiture action.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ See Supplemental Rule G(4)(b)(i) (providing that “the government must send notice of the action and a copy of the complaint to any person who reasonably appears to be a potential claimant”).

¹¹⁴ It is important to note that *Boylan* only grants standing to “victims”; it has no application to other unsecured creditors of the fraudster. *See United States v. Approximately \$44,888.35 in U.S. Currency*, 385 F. Supp. 2d 1057 (E.D. Cal. 2005) (*Boylan* only applies to the targets of the fraud; the fraudster's general creditors do not have standing to contest the forfeiture of his property).

¹¹⁵ *See United States v. \$557,933.89, More or Less, in U.S. Funds*, 287 F.3d 66 (2d Cir. 2002) (any claimant who has standing may contest the forfeitability of the property and will prevail if the Government fails to establish forfeitability even if the claimant is not the owner; ownership only comes into play if the Government establishes forfeitability and the court reaches the innocent owner defense).

¹¹⁶ *See* 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(3)(A) (providing that the Government has 90 days to file a judicial forfeiture complaint if any claim is filed in the administrative forfeiture proceeding).

Second, the Government will have difficulty prevailing on the merits of the forfeiture case. Notwithstanding the abundant case law holding that unsecured creditors lack standing to contest a civil forfeiture action, a claim filed by an unsecured creditor who qualifies as a victim of the fraud would not be subject to a motion to dismiss on that ground. The applicable statute provides that “any person claiming an interest in the seized property may file a claim asserting such person’s interest in the property,” 18 U.S.C. § 983(a)(4)(A), and *Boylan* holds that all fraud victims have a right to assert an interest as potential beneficiaries of a constructive trust. In addition, it appears highly likely that any victim who qualifies as the beneficiary of a constructive trust under the court of appeals’ test would also qualify as an innocent owner under section 983(d)(2)(A). The constructive trust (according to the Ninth Circuit) is “imposed by law and arises immediately with [the fraudster’s] acquisition of the proceeds of the fraud.” 392 F.3d at 1004. It thus would appear to qualify as a “property interest in existence at the time the illegal conduct giving rise to the forfeiture took place,” held by an “owner who did not know of the conduct giving rise to the forfeiture.” 18 U.S.C. § 983(d)(2)(A) (defining innocent owner). Accordingly, if any of the victim-claimants qualified as beneficiaries of a constructive trust, the court would have to award at least a portion of the property to those victims as innocent owners, and could not enter an order of forfeiture giving title to the property to the Government. 392 F.3d at 1005.¹¹⁷

Finally, these problems call into question the fairness of the forfeiture process and the efficiency of using civil forfeiture as a means of recovering property for the benefit of victims. Treating victims who are able to satisfy the elements of a constructive trust as innocent owners turns the civil forfeiture action into a liquidation proceeding, with the forfeiture court displacing the role of the Attorney General in administering the remission process and distributing forfeited assets to victims. This is obviously contrary to the statutory scheme and the interests of justice. It renders superfluous the Attorney General’s carefully calibrated scheme to ensure an orderly, fair, and inexpensive means of distributing forfeited assets to victims,¹¹⁸ and creates a situation in which some victims—i.e., those who can trace their property to the assets seized from the fraudster and can otherwise satisfy the elements of a constructive trust—would receive a more generous distribution of the forfeited assets than

¹¹⁷ For these same reasons, if victims are permitted to contest the forfeiture, the Government will not be able to quiet title to the property quickly by way of a settlement with the fraudster.

¹¹⁸ See *United States v. Bright*, 353 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2004) (holding that the district court may urge the Government to apply the forfeited funds to restitution, but ordering the Government to do so would conflict with section 981(e)(6), which gives the Government the discretion to apply forfeited funds in that fashion).

other victims who either did not file claims in the forfeiture proceeding or who could not satisfy the tracing requirement.¹¹⁹

Converting the forfeiture into a liquidation would also embroil the prosecutor in protracted litigation over matters unrelated to proving the connection between the forfeited property and the underlying crime,¹²⁰ and would, as a practical matter, make it impossible to try a forfeiture case before a jury.¹²¹ This is precisely the result Congress sought to avoid when it defined the term *owner* in the innocent owner statute specifically to exclude “a person with only a general unsecured interest in, or claim against, the property or estate of another.” 18 U.S.C. § 983(d)(6). Finally, to add insult to injury, treating victims who file claims in court as innocent owners would make the Government liable to pay their attorney’s fees as the prevailing parties under 28 U.S.C. § 2465(b).

In an earlier forfeiture case involving thousands of victims of fraud, the District of Columbia Circuit expressed many of these same concerns in explaining why creditor-victims should not be granted standing to contest the forfeiture. “Were it otherwise,” the court said, “the court litigating the forfeiture issue would be converted into a bankruptcy court and would not be able to grant forfeiture to the government until it determined that no general creditor would be unable to satisfy its claim against the defendant. That result appears patently at odds with the statutory scheme, which directs parties without an interest in specific property to seek relief from the Attorney General, not the court adjudging the forfeiture. The Attorney General has authority to dispense confiscated funds ‘to protect the rights of innocent persons,’ and general creditors seem precisely the type of innocent persons

¹¹⁹ As discussed *infra*, one of the elements of a constructive trust that the claimant must satisfy is that the defendant property is directly traceable to the property the claimant gave to the fraudster. A given victim’s ability to do this will often depend entirely on timing: the last victims of the fraud will be able to trace their money to the funds that were seized from the fraudster when the scheme collapsed, but the earlier victims will find that the fraudster has long since dissipated their money. This is the reason other courts have declined to impose constructive trusts in forfeiture cases involving large numbers of victims. *See United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A. (Petition of BCCI Depositors)*, 833 F. Supp. 9, 14 (D.D.C. 1993) (court should not impose a constructive trust even if all elements are otherwise satisfied if to do so would disrupt liquidation proceedings designed to distribute forfeited property equitably and provide an advantage to some victims at the expense of others).

¹²⁰ In the *BCCI* case, the court agreed with the Government that the forfeiture proceeding should not be turned into a liquidation, and it limited category of victims who could file claims to those with a legal interest in the specific assets subject to forfeiture. Even so, it took 7 years to resolve the forfeiture. *See United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A. (Final Order of Forfeiture and Disbursement)*, 69 F. Supp. 2d 36 (D.D.C. 1999).

¹²¹ Every claimant would have a constitutional right under the Seventh Amendment to have his or her forfeiture claim tried before a jury. *See United States v. One Lincoln Navigator 1998*, 328 F.3d 1011, 1014 n.2 (8th Cir. 2003) (claimant has a Seventh Amendment right to a jury trial on her innocent owner defense).

Congress had in mind.” *United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg)*, 46 F.3d 1185, 1191-92 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (citations omitted).

For all of these reasons, AFMLS believes that the *Boylan* decision has made using civil forfeiture to recover property for the benefit of a large number of victims impractical in the Ninth Circuit. Civil forfeiture is an in rem action designed to give the Government clear title to property derived from a criminal offense. It contains an innocent owner defense to protect the interests of persons who were unaware that their property was being used to commit an offense, but it was never intended to serve as a liquidation proceeding in which the interests of the victims of the crime are sorted out.¹²² That is the role of a liquidator appointed to distribute property in accordance with the remission regulations, not of a prosecutor or court presiding over a forfeiture case.

3. Recommendation regarding future cases involving many victims

Until Congress has an opportunity to enact remedial legislation to correct the problems created by the *Boylan* decision, AFMLS strongly urges prosecutors to employ alternatives to civil forfeiture when seeking to recover fraud proceeds for the benefit of large numbers of victims in cases that must be filed in the Ninth Circuit. Among other things, prosecutors should consider enlisting other Government agencies, such as the FTC and SEC, to file actions to recover fraud proceeds in cases falling within their jurisdiction. Prosecutors may also consider cooperating with bankruptcy proceedings or with private litigation, as long as that litigation is filed on behalf of all of the victims of the fraud offense and not for a few who are seeking an advantage over the others.¹²³

Most important, where it is possible to do so, the Government should avoid the use of civil forfeiture altogether by filing criminal charges against the fraudster and preserving his or her property pending trial by using the criminal forfeiture statutes. In particular, in criminal cases, the Government may seize the property under 21 U.S.C. § 853(f) or ask the district

¹²² Cf. *United States v. BCCI Holdings (Luxembourg) S.A. (Petition of Capital Bank)*, 980 F. Supp. 10 (D.D.C. 1997) (the ancillary proceeding in a criminal forfeiture case is not a liquidation proceeding in which defendant’s assets are divided among competing parties).

¹²³ Prosecutors must be aware, however, that it might not be possible to reveal certain types of restricted information—such as grand jury material, tax disclosures, tips from confidential informants, and wiretap recordings—to private persons or non-law enforcement agencies. Also, the prosecutor must take care not to make a premature disclosure of an ongoing criminal investigation. These considerations may severely limit the ability of the Government to cooperate with other recovery actions in many cases.

court to restrain it pursuant to section 853(e).¹²⁴ In addition, in some money laundering cases, the Government may seek the appointment of a federal receiver to collect the defendant's assets and hold them for the benefit of the victims. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 1956(b)(4). In all of these cases, however, the prosecutor should withdraw the forfeiture prior to the entry of the preliminary order so that the property can be turned over to the court to apply to a restitution order.¹²⁵ This is necessary because once the preliminary order of forfeiture is entered, the Government is obligated to commence an ancillary proceeding in which all of the victims would be entitled to notice and the right to attempt to establish standing to contest the forfeiture under section 853(n)(6)(A).¹²⁶ This would lead to all of the problems discussed above in connection with civil forfeiture cases involving large numbers of victims.

4. Recommendation regarding pending cases and smaller fraud cases

In cases where a forfeiture complaint has already been filed, and in future cases involving numbers of victims small enough to make direct communication with the victims practical, AFMLS suggests that prosecutors do the following.¹²⁷ First, as *Boylan* requires, the U.S. Attorney must send notice to all persons appearing to be victims, notifying them of their right to file claims in the forfeiture proceeding. The notice should also explain, however, that the Attorney General intends to distribute the fraudster's property to all victims on an equitable basis once the district court has entered an order of forfeiture. Filing a claim with the district court, the notice should explain, will only delay that process. Accordingly, the notice should give the victim the option of filing a remission petition with the Attorney General and should include a blank remission form to be used for that purpose. The prosecutor should then send any remission petitions that are filed to AFMLS to obtain a tentative assessment of what distribution will be made to the victims if an order of forfeiture is granted.

¹²⁴ *But see United States v. Razmilovic*, 419 F.3d 134 (2d Cir. 2005) (holding that Congress failed to incorporate the pretrial seizure and restraining order provisions from section 853 into the criminal forfeiture provision for fraud cases, 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c). The Ninth Circuit has not yet ruled on this issue. If it should decide to follow *Razmilovic*, however, the criminal forfeiture option may not be available until Congress amends section 2461(c), unless the forfeiture can be sought under another forfeiture statute such as RICO or money laundering.

¹²⁵ *See United States v. Lavin*, 299 F.3d 123 (2d Cir. 2002) (instead of pursuing forfeiture, Government used seized funds to satisfy restitution order); *United States v. O'Connor*, 321 F. Supp. 2d 722 (E.D. Va. 2004) (although the defendant has no right to use forfeited funds to satisfy a restitution order, the Government may, pursuant to section 853(i)(1), ask the court to apply the forfeited funds to restitution for the benefit of the victims).

¹²⁶ *See* Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(c).

¹²⁷ There is also little reason not to proceed with civil forfeiture in cases involving state or federal agencies as victims. Such victims will understand that they have no reason to litigate against the Government in the forfeiture action.

Second, if despite being given the remission option, the fraudster and/or some of the possible victims file claims with the district court, the Government may want to file a motion asking the district court to rule that *Boylan* simply does not apply to the particular case. Among other things, the Government might argue that the persons asserting claims are not “victims” within the meaning of the *Boylan* decision,¹²⁸ or that they do not satisfy the requirements of the case law regarding prudential standing.¹²⁹

In any event, if the case must be litigated, the Government should file a motion for summary judgment with respect to the forfeitability of the property. In serving a copy of this motion on the victims, the prosecutor should explain that this is a necessary step towards the resolution of the case because it establishes that the money in question is, in fact, the proceeds of fraud, but that it does not affect any claimant’s right to assert an innocent owner defense under section 983(d). Thus, the prosecutor may advise the victims that they may have no reason to oppose the Government’s motion. Moreover, the Government may ask that the court resolve the motion for summary judgment without a hearing so that the court does not have to deal with the logistics of allowing numerous parties to participate by telephone or in person.

Once the court grants summary judgment for the Government on the forfeitability issue, the prosecutor should assess the remaining claims and determine whether they may be settled in a way that treats all victims fairly and leaves an appropriate portion of the property available for remission to the victims who did not file claims and who are waiting for the remission process. Any settlement should include a waiver of attorney’s fees for which the Government would otherwise be liable under section 2465(b). Settlements should be pursued, however, only where it is certain that they will not result in unfair treatment of victims who did not file claims. In most cases, it will probably be necessary to oppose the claims, even of sympathetic victims, in order to avoid such unfairness.

If the Government is required to oppose the remaining claims, it should make the following arguments to the district court:¹³⁰

¹²⁸ See note 114, *supra*.

¹²⁹ See *Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow*, 542 U.S. 1, 12 (2004) (“prudential standing encompasses the general prohibition on a litigant’s raising another person’s legal rights, the rule barring adjudication of generalized grievances more appropriately addressed in the representative branches, and the requirement that a plaintiff’s complaint fall within the zone of interests protected by the law invoked”) (internal quotes and citations omitted).

¹³⁰ Chapter 4, section IV at page 106, sets forth the legal authority for these arguments. For that reason, we do not include the citations to the case law here.

- *Boylan* held only that fraud victims have standing to contest the forfeiture as *potential* beneficiaries of a constructive trust; it did not hold that every victim is automatically entitled to that status; thus, the district court must determine, as to each claimant, whether the claimant is able to satisfy the elements of a constructive trust;
- Claimants may prevail in the forfeiture proceeding only if they establish that they are “innocent owners” in terms of section 983(d); a beneficiary of a constructive trust may be an “owner” of the property subject to forfeiture, but only if all of the elements of a constructive trust are satisfied; otherwise, the claimant is only an unsecured creditor barred from asserting an innocent owner defense by section 983(d)(6);
- Because the court will be interpreting the term *owner* as used in a federal statute, it must apply the federal common law definition of a constructive trust; if the court believes that state law must be applied, prosecutors rely on the law in their respective states, distinguishing it where possible from the California law cited in *Boylan*;
- As applied by the federal courts (and most state courts), the elements of a constructive trust include the following:
 - (1) tracing: the claimant must be able to trace his or her property to the property subject to forfeiture;
 - (2) “clean hands”: persons who acted in concert with the wrongdoer cannot be considered beneficiaries of a constructive trust;
 - (3) fiduciary relationship: there must have been a fiduciary relationship between the wrongdoer and the victim;
 - (4) unjust enrichment: the claimant must show that failure to impose a constructive trust on his or her behalf will result in the unjust enrichment of another person;
 - (5) no adequate remedy at law: because a constructive trust is an equitable remedy, the claimant must show the lack of an adequate remedy at law (a number of courts have declined to impose constructive trusts in forfeiture cases on the ground that the remission process gives the victims an adequate remedy at law); and
 - (6) fairness: the claimant must show that imposing a constructive trust on his or her behalf will not result in unfairness to similarly situated victims.

In the typical fraud case, the amount of money recovered from the fraudster will be less than the total losses of all of the victims. Thus, it is unlikely that all of the victims will be able to satisfy the tracing requirement. To the contrary, it is highly likely that the persons who were most recently defrauded will be able to trace while the earlier victims will not. Thus, in the typical case, the district court will be faced with three categories of victims: (1) those who filed claims and can trace; (2) those who filed claims and cannot trace; and (3) those who did not file claims and are waiting for the remission process. Thus, the Government should be able to prevail in most cases by showing that the imposition of a constructive trust on behalf of only a few victims would be unfair to the others, including those who filed remission petitions with the Attorney General, in violation of the fairness requirement. In all events, the prosecutors should argue that the remission process gives all of the claimants an adequate remedy at law because the Attorney General intends to distribute the forfeited property to the victims pursuant to the remission regulations.

If the court agrees with the Government, dismisses the claims, and enters an order of forfeiture, the prosecutor should notify AFMLS to go forward with the remission process. (If any of the claimants appeal, the remission will be delayed until the appeal is resolved.) On the other hand, if the district court disagrees and indicates that it will grant the claims on the ground that *Boylan* requires that result, the prosecutor should consider moving to dismiss the forfeiture action and turning over all of the seized property and the remission petitions to the district court so that it may administer the constructive trust as *Boylan* envisions.

Notwithstanding the force of the arguments described above, prosecutors should understand that deciding to file and litigate a civil forfeiture case involving even a relatively small number of victims involves considerable risk. The courts may accept these arguments or they may not, and if they do not, the Government not only stands to lose the case, but will be subject to enormous awards of attorney's fees to the very people the prosecutor was trying to help in the first place.

D. Conclusion

The Ninth Circuit's decision in *Boylan* requires a new approach to recovering property for the benefit of victims in cases that must be filed in the Ninth Circuit. This section sets forth the options that AFMLS considers most appropriate. It is hoped that these measures will be temporary, and that Congress will address these issues with remedial legislation in the near future.

Because these issues are unusually complex, prosecutors in the Ninth Circuit are encouraged to contact AFMLS as early as possible in cases involving victims to seek guidance as to how to proceed.

Chapter 5

Use and Disposition of Seized and Forfeited Property

I. Management and Disposal of Seized Assets

A. Role of the U.S. Marshals Service

The U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) has primary authority over the management and disposal of seized assets in its custody that are subject to forfeiture or are forfeited under laws enforced by agencies within the Department of Justice as well as certain other federal agencies by agreement. Arrangements for property services or commitments pertaining to the management and disposition of such property are the responsibility of the USMS. The authority of the Attorney General to dispose of forfeited real property and warrant title has been delegated to the USMS director by 28 C.F.R. § 0.111(I).

B. Department of Treasury property custodians

Management and disposal of assets seized by agencies within the Department of Treasury¹³¹ and other agencies included by agreement (including certain agencies moved from Treasury to the Department of Homeland Security) are handled by property custodians (generally contractors) operating under Treasury guidelines.¹³² The Treasury agency case agent is generally the initial point of contact for issues relating to seized property custody, management, and disposal.

C. Preseizure planning

As soon as possible after assets are identified for seizure/forfeiture in a federal case, the U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO) or agent in charge of the field office responsible for an administrative forfeiture case should contact the USMS or Treasury to discuss preseizure planning. Such discussions address the impact that such proposed action may have on the USMS or Treasury in undertaking, continuing, or terminating custody of the property. The

¹³¹ For a current list of agencies participating in the Department of Treasury Forfeiture Fund, *see* 31 U.S.C. § 9703(o).

¹³² Copies of these guidelines, including "Guidelines for Seized and Forfeited Property," are available at www.treas.gov/offices/enforcement/teoaf/guidelines, or by contacting the Executive Office for Asset Forfeiture, Department of the Treasury, 1341 G Street, N.W., Suite 900, Washington, D.C. 20220.

objective of these discussions is to ensure that informed decisions are made about what property is being seized; how and when it is going to be seized; and most importantly, whether it should be seized. In addition, due consideration should be given to alternatives to seizure, e.g., restraining orders or court-ordered monitoring of assets.

D. Coordination of custody and disposition decisions

Prior to taking any action (e.g., in a settlement or plea agreement) concerning the management or disposition of property, the USAO or agent in charge of the field office responsible for an administrative forfeiture case should contact the USMS in cases involving Department of Justice seizing agencies, or Treasury in cases involving Treasury seizing agencies, to discuss any management or disposition issues which may need to be addressed. In the case of any settlement or plea agreements that require the payment of a specific amount, rather than an amount up to the proceeds of sale received in the liquidation of forfeited property, approval must be obtained from the USMS prior to the execution of the settlement or plea agreement.

II. Use of Seized Property

A. Background

Absent an order of forfeiture or declaration of administrative forfeiture affirmatively vesting title to seized property in the United States, the Government does not have title to the property and any use of such property under seizure and pending forfeiture raises issues of liability and creates the appearance of impropriety. The following general policies govern the use of seized property.

B. Use of seized property by department of justice personnel

Property under seizure and pending forfeiture may not be utilized for any reason by Department personnel, including for official use, until a final order of forfeiture is issued.

Likewise, Department personnel may not make such property available for use by others, including persons acting in the capacity of substitute custodians, for any purpose, prior to completion of the forfeiture. However, court authority may be sought for use of seized property, after consultation with the USMS, in situations such as the seizure of a ranch or business where use of equipment under seizure is necessary to maintain the ranch or business.

C. Use of seized property where custody is retained by the state or local seizing agency

To minimize storage and management costs incurred by the Department of Justice, state and local agencies that present motor vehicles or other property items for federal adoptions may be asked to serve as substitute custodians of the property, pending forfeiture, at the discretion of the USMS or Treasury, and upon consultation with the U.S. Attorney in judicial forfeiture cases. In addition, the USMS may enter into a storage and maintenance agreement with state and local agencies covering such property. Such agreements are contractual in nature, and do not require district court approval. Under such an agreement the state or local agency has a responsibility to provide adequate storage, security, and maintenance for all assets in their custody.

Any use of such vehicles or other property, including official use by federal, state, and local law enforcement officials or others, is prohibited by Department of Justice and Department of Treasury policy until such time as the forfeiture is completed and an equitable transfer is made.

D. Use of seized real property by occupants

Occupants of real property seized for forfeiture may be permitted to remain on the property, pursuant to an occupancy agreement pending the final order of forfeiture, after consultation between the USMS or Treasury and the U.S. Attorney.

A form occupancy agreement has been developed by the Department of Justice that addresses departmental concerns (e.g., maintenance and access to the property, potential for continued illegal activity, threat to health and safety, etc.). The USMS and Treasury have sample occupancy agreements designed to protect the interests of the Government in specific cases.

III. Disposition of Forfeited Property

A. Forfeiture orders

The disposition of property forfeited to the United States is an executive branch decision and not a matter for the court. Consequently, preliminary and final orders of forfeiture should include language directing forfeiture of the property to the United States “for disposition in accordance with law.”

In addition, the orders of forfeiture should specifically address any third party claims against the forfeited property that are recognized by the United States. If the interests of claimants are to be satisfied in whole or in part by payments from the proceeds of a sale of property by the USMS or Treasury, the proposed forfeiture order should provide specific guidance for the USMS or Treasury concerning such payments and, where possible, specify that such claims shall be paid only after the costs of the United States are recovered, and shall be paid only up to the amount realized from the proceeds of the forfeited property.

The comptroller general has determined that judgments in excess of the proceeds of sale are to be paid from the Judgment Fund. However, 28 U.S.C. § 524(c)(1)(D) also provides that the Assets Forfeiture Fund is available for the payment of valid liens and mortgages “subject to the discretion of the Attorney General to determine the validity of any such lien or mortgage and the amount of payment to be made...” (The USMS is authorized to pay a lien or mortgage in excess of the proceeds of sale if such payment will facilitate the liquidation of the property and, thus, reduce expenses of such property’s continued custody. Requests for approval of liens and mortgages in excess of the proceeds of sale shall be submitted to the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) for approval.)

B. Disposition of forfeited property in civil and criminal cases

The Attorney General has been given the authority under 21 U.S.C. §§ 881(e) and 853(h) and other statutes¹³³ to dispose of forfeited property “by sale or any other commercially feasible means,” without subsequent court approval. This is generally called a “forfeiture sale” of the property.¹³⁴ It is clear from the language of the forfeiture statutes, from their legislative history, and from the cases and other authorities that have addressed this issue that the Attorney General has complete authority to dispose of forfeited property.

Forfeiture divests an owner of property of all his or her right, title, and interest therein and vests such right, title, and interest in the Government. In other words, because of the property’s or its owner’s involvement in criminal activity, forfeiture extinguishes all of the former owner’s interests in that criminally derived or criminally involved asset, and vests title

¹³³ See 18 U.S.C. §§ 1467(g), 1963(f), and 2253(g).

¹³⁴ The Department of Justice takes the position that 28 U.S.C. § 2001 does not apply to judicial forfeiture sales and no judicial confirmation is required.

in the United States.¹³⁵ While the relation back doctrine found in section 853(c) provides that all right, title, and interest in forfeitable property vests in the United States upon the commission of the criminal act giving rise to the forfeiture, the Government's ownership interest therein is not confirmed to the world until a final order of forfeiture is entered by a court.

Since the forfeiture process vests title to the property in the United States, a forfeiture sale is a sale by the Government of property it owns. The forfeiture statutes give the power to the Attorney General, on behalf of the United States as owner, to dispose of the property however he or she deems suitable. After the final order of forfeiture, the court is not involved in the sale or disposal process.

IV. Attorney General's Authority to Warrant Title

A. Background

Section 2002 of the Crime Control Act of 1990, which amends 28 U.S.C. § 524(c), gives the Attorney General the authority to warrant clear title upon transfer of forfeited property. Section 524(c)(9)(A) reads as follows:

Following the completion of procedures for the forfeiture of property pursuant to any law enforced or administered by the Department, the Attorney General is authorized, in her discretion, to warrant clear title to any subsequent purchaser or transferee of such property.

The authority to execute deeds and transfer title has been delegated to chief deputies or deputy U.S. marshals by 28 C.F.R. § 0.156. The section 0.156 authority predates the asset forfeiture program and applies to all court-ordered sales of property, not just forfeited property.

The preferred means to transfer forfeited real property is by special warranty deed executed by the U.S. marshal. The special warranty deed assures the grantee/buyer that the United States, as the current seller, has done nothing to encumber the property, nor has it

¹³⁵ See *United States v. A Parcel of Land, Buildings, Appurtenances and Improvements, Known as 92 Buena Vista Avenue, Rumson, New Jersey, et al.*, 507 U.S. 111, 128-130 (1993); *United States v. Grundy*, 7 U.S. (3 Cranch) 337, 350-351 (1806); cf. *Republic National Bank of Miami v. United States*, 506 U.S. 80, 89-92 (1992); *United States v. Real Property Located at 185 Hargraves Drive (In Re Newport Saving and Loan Association)*, 928 F.2d 472, 478 (1st Cir. 1991); 21 U.S.C. § 881(h); 21 U.S.C. § 853(c); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c).

conveyed any right, title, or interest in the property while the Government was the owner of the property. In effect, the special warranty deed, discussed in part B, *infra*, warrants the forfeiture process.

Under appropriate circumstances a quitclaim deed may be used to transfer property. The quitclaim deed makes no warranty representations. It serves only to convey whatever right, title, and interest the Government had as of the execution date. Finally, property may be transferred by a general warranty deed,¹³⁶ but it is Department of Justice policy to use general warranty deeds only in exceptional circumstances as outlined in part C, *infra*.¹³⁷

B. Use of a special warranty deed and indemnification agreement

It is suggested that the language of the special warranty deed be as follows, with the insertion of the specifically applicable circumstances as required:

The grantor covenants to specially warrant the title to the property hereby conveyed against any claim arising from...[insert the specifically applicable circumstances here].

Further, when such special circumstances exist, the buyer may also request that the United States provide certain indemnifications in order to obtain title insurance. These indemnification agreements establish affirmative measures to be taken by the United States, beyond the basic terms and obligations of its warranty deed, in the event that claims are later made against the property. The indemnification agreement may be included either in the terms of the special warranty deed or in a separate document that incorporates the deed by reference. In either form, indemnification agreements will be limited to the following terms:

- (1) The United States will specially warrant its title against defects or clouds arising out of the forfeiture process and hold the buyer harmless as a result of such defects in title or clouds involving the propriety of the forfeiture of the property.
- (2) In the event that a court in a final judgment rules that the United States did not acquire valid legal title to the real property through the forfeiture process and

¹³⁶ A general warranty deed assures the grantee/buyer that title to the property is free and clear of any and all liens and encumbrances and insures the grantee/buyer from any future claims against the property.

¹³⁷ As used in this policy, the terms *general warranty deed* and *special warranty deed* are not intended to be limiting in their application. In some states, warranty deeds are not used (e.g., in California a “grant deed” provides limited statutory warranties). The use of such state variations equivalent to a general warranty deed is satisfactory for purposes of this policy.

therefore was not able to convey clear title to the buyer, the United States will refund to the buyer the amount of the purchase price of the property, plus the value of any improvements made to the property by the buyer. The amount will be paid out of the Assets Forfeiture Fund, plus interest on the total amount at the current rate as provided in 28 U.S.C. § 1961 from the date of the purchase of the property by the buyer to the date of the final judgment.

- (3) The United States, by its special warranty deed, does not warrant the title of the prior owner of the property who acquired title before the forfeiture.

C. Use of a general warranty deed

If the buyer of the forfeited property is still unable to procure a title insurance policy, then the U.S. marshal may be authorized to execute a general warranty deed. Any determination to transfer property by a general warranty deed must be approved by the USMS Asset Forfeiture Office.

It is the policy of the Department that the Attorney General's discretion to warrant clear title, through the use of a general warranty deed, will be exercised only in compelling circumstances where the financial advantage of offering a general warranty deed in the particular case, compared to the available alternatives, far outweighs both the potential cost of honoring the warranty in that case and the potential effect of increased purchaser demand for general warranty deeds in future sales of other forfeited properties. The USMS Asset Forfeiture Office, in the exercise of sound business judgment, shall also consider the cumulative potential liability that will accrue over time as a result of each successive use of a general warranty deed.

V. Purchase or Personal Use of Forfeited Property by Justice Employees

Department of Justice employees are generally prohibited from purchasing property that has been forfeited to the Government and is being sold by the Department of Justice or its agents. This policy is intended to ensure that there is no actual or apparent use of inside information by employees wishing to purchase such property. The purpose of this policy is to protect the integrity of the asset forfeiture program.

Although we are unaware that any such purchases have occurred, this policy will avoid problems before they develop. We believe it is important to the integrity of the Department's

forfeiture program that we preclude even the appearance of a conflict of interest that would otherwise arise should a Department employee purchase forfeited property.

Under 5 C.F.R. § 3801.104, Department of Justice employees are prohibited from purchasing, either directly or indirectly, or using any property if the property has been forfeited to the Government and offered for sale by the Department of Justice or its agents. In addition, Department of Justice employees are prohibited from using such property that has been purchased, directly or indirectly, by a spouse or minor child.

A written waiver to the aforementioned restrictions may be granted by the agency designee upon a determination that, in the mind of a reasonable person with knowledge of the circumstances, purchase or use by the employee of the asset will not raise a question as to whether the employee has used his or her official position or nonpublic information to obtain or assist in an advantageous purchase or create an appearance of the loss of impartiality in the performance of the employee's duties. A copy of this waiver must be filed with the Deputy Attorney General.

VI. Review of Official Use of Forfeited Property

Part IV.D of *The Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property* (revised Nov. 2005) requires notification to the "Executive Office for Asset Forfeiture...at the time property valued at \$50,000 or greater is placed into official use." Although this requirement may be satisfied by post-transfer notification, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and USMS provided the former Executive Office for Asset Forfeiture with advance notice of and an opportunity to review such decisions. Such notification should *now* be made to AFMLS.¹³⁸

Law enforcement personnel should ensure that AFMLS is given advance notice of and an opportunity to review official use actions involving federally forfeited property valued at \$50,000 or more. AFMLS will endeavor to act on all such notifications within 2 weeks of receipt.

¹³⁸ Treasury's *Guide to Equitable Sharing for Foreign Countries and Federal, State, and Local Law Enforcement Agencies* (April 2004) does not contain a similar requirement.

Chapter 6

Equitable Sharing

Equitable sharing is the process by which state and local law enforcement agencies can recover federally forfeited assets, or the proceeds from the sale of those assets, for certain, limited purposes. For a full discussion of the subject, please refer to the *Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property* (revised Nov. 2005) and the *Guide to Equitable Sharing of Federally Forfeited Property for State and Local Law Enforcement Agencies* (March 1994).¹³⁹ This chapter supplements the guidance in those publications.

Enhanced cooperation between federal law enforcement agencies on the one hand, and state and local law enforcement agencies on the other, is one of the primary goals of the Department's asset forfeiture program. While equitable sharing has fostered substantial gains in cooperation, the dramatic rise in sharing has created management challenges. State and local law enforcement agencies now familiar with the program rely upon equitable sharing to supplement law enforcement initiatives and large-scale investigative efforts. Without equitable sharing, these investigations would not be practical for many of these agencies. Consequently, federal investigative agencies, U.S. Attorneys, and the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) should place a high priority on processing and paying equitable sharing requests promptly.

I. Processing Applications for Equitable Sharing

A. Agency field office

A state or local agency may request an equitable share of forfeited property by submitting an *Application for Transfer of Federally Forfeited Property* (form DAG-71) to the appropriate field office of the federal investigative agency with primary responsibility for the investigation leading to the seizure. The requesting agency should complete the DAG-71, but federal personnel may, in their discretion, complete the form, with the exception of section VII, for the requesting agency. The field office may reject an incomplete DAG-71. Once submitted, a properly executed DAG-71 may not be changed or altered in any manner. The requesting agency may, however, submit an amended DAG-71, reflecting changes to the information reported on the original submission. The field office must enter the information

¹³⁹ These publications are available for download on the AFMLS Web site.

reported on the DAG-71 in the Department of Justice Consolidated Asset Tracking System (CATS).

Following receipt of the DAG-71, the field office must complete section I of the *Application for Transfer of Federally Forfeited Property* (form DAG-72) and enter the information in CATS. The field office recommendation reported on the DAG-72 must bear a reasonable relationship to the degree of direct participation of the requesting agency in the total law enforcement effort leading to the forfeiture. As a general rule, this recommendation should reflect an equitable sharing allocation based on a comparison of the work-hours each federal, state, and local law enforcement agency contributed to the investigation resulting in the forfeiture. Work-hours for every agency participating in the investigation should be reported on the DAG-71 or the DAG-72. Departure from an allocation based solely on work-hours may be warranted in two situations: where the resulting equitable share would not adequately reflect the relative value of an agency's participation, or where an agency participates in a task force with previously determined sharing arrangements consistent with Department policy. In either situation, information warranting a departure from a work-hours analysis must be reported on the DAG-71 or the DAG-72. The field office must forward the DAG-71 and DAG-72 to the investigative agency headquarters.

B. Deciding officials

In any administrative forfeiture where the appraised value of the property is less than \$1 million, the head of the investigative agency, or designated agency headquarters official, determines the appropriate equitable share, completes section II of the DAG-72, and enters the decision in CATS. In any judicial forfeiture where the appraised value of the property is less than \$1 million, the investigative agency completes section II of the DAG-72, enters the recommendation in CATS, and forwards the DAG-71 and DAG-72 to the U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO). The U.S. Attorney, or designee, determines the appropriate equitable share, completes section III of the DAG-72, and enters the decision in CATS. Any authorization to determine equitable sharing on behalf of the U.S. Attorney must be reduced to writing and maintained with other delegations.

In any administrative forfeiture where the appraised value of the property is \$1 million or more, the investigative agency completes section II of the DAG-72, enters the recommendation in CATS, and forwards the DAG-71 and DAG-72 to the Chief, Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS), who also makes a recommendation. In any judicial forfeiture where the appraised value of the property is \$1 million or more, in multi-district cases, and in situations involving the equitable transfer of real property, the investigative agency completes section II of the DAG-72, enters the recommendation in

CATS, and forwards the DAG-71 and DAG-72 to the USAO, which completes section III of the DAG-72, enters the recommendation in CATS, and forwards the DAG-71 and DAG 72 to the Chief, AFMLS, who also makes a recommendation. Where all components making a sharing recommendation concur with the sharing allocation, the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division determines the appropriate share.¹⁴⁰ In the absence of complete agreement among the components, the Deputy Attorney General determines the appropriate share.

C. Communication with the requesting agency

Federal officials must not represent that a sharing request is approved until the final decision maker has rendered a decision. Premature announcement of a sharing approval can cause embarrassment if the proposed sharing is ultimately disapproved or substantially altered.

Federal officials should advise sharing recipients when their requested shares are denied or reduced. Department of Justice seizing agencies should also keep other federal agencies (e.g., Department of the Treasury or Department of Homeland Security agencies) that participated in the investigation informed of any reduction or denial of their requested shares. Prompt and accurate communication about sharing matters is important, and should occur first at the field level.

II. Equitable Sharing Payments

The USMS issues equitable sharing payments after the sharing request appears in the CATS Equitable Sharing Payments Authorization Report. A request will not appear in the report unless the information permitting payment has been entered in CATS by the investigative agency, the USAO, and the USMS. Consequently, each component's timely processing ensures expeditious sharing payments.

The USMS transfers all equitable sharing payments to state and local law enforcement agencies electronically. The payment is deposited directly into a bank account designated by the recipient agency. The recipient agency also receives a confirmation of the deposit by e-mail. Known as E-SHARE, this program provides a fast, efficient, and secure method to make equitable sharing payments. Participation in the program is mandatory. In order to receive equitable sharing payments electronically, state and local agencies must submit a completed Form USM-391 to the E-SHARE Helpdesk. The form, and additional information about the

¹⁴⁰ A copy of the June 5, 1995 memorandum delegating this authority to the Assistant Attorney General is in Appendix E of this *Manual*.

E-SHARE program, may be obtained online at www.usmarshals.gov/assets/eshare/index.html or by e-mail to E.Share.Help@usdoj.gov.

III. Compliance

Failure to follow federal law or Department of Justice policy governing the equitable sharing program may render a state or local law enforcement agency ineligible for equitable sharing payments. AFMLS determines an agency's eligibility to participate in the equitable sharing program. While federal investigative agencies and U.S. Attorneys have no obligation to monitor eligibility, federal officials should promptly report any information that may affect an agency's eligibility to participate in the program to AFMLS. Participation may be barred on a temporary basis pending compliance, where, for example, a requesting agency has failed to submit a timely Federal Equitable Sharing Agreement or Federal Annual Certification Report. Participation may be limited or barred permanently, however, where, for example, state laws or local ordinances make compliance impossible.¹⁴¹ AFMLS will ensure that sharing requests by ineligible agencies will not appear in the CATS Equitable Sharing Payments Authorization Report.

IV. Role of Law Enforcement Coordinating Committees

Pursuant to the *Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property*:

“Law Enforcement Coordinating Committees shall promote and facilitate the Department of Justice forfeiture program with federal, state and local law enforcement agencies.”

By memorandum, dated June 15, 1990, to all U.S. Attorneys, the Associate Deputy Attorney General directed LECC Coordinators to “serve as a clearinghouse for state and local inquiries about the status of pending sharing cases.” LECC Coordinators should regularly consult CATS to ascertain the status of equitable sharing payments and transfers to state and local agencies. USAOs and federal investigative agencies must work together to ensure proper coordination of all equitable sharing activities.

¹⁴¹ E.g., equitable sharing payments to state and local law enforcement agencies in Oregon are limited to criminal forfeitures because the State Constitution requires federal equitable sharing payments from civil forfeitures to be used in a manner inconsistent with Department policy.

V. Equitable Sharing Ceremonies

Equitable sharing ceremonies foster goodwill and present a unique opportunity for federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies to highlight their cooperative efforts for the community. All of the state and local agencies involved in the underlying case should be invited to participate in the ceremony. Officials from the USAO, the federal seizing agency, and the USMS should routinely be included.

Equitable sharing ceremonies, where appropriate, are encouraged, but should be scheduled as quickly as possible once forfeited property is available for sharing. Agencies should not wait to accumulate forfeited property for the purpose of presentation, particularly where the recipient agency does not agree to the delay. While the E-SHARE program has eliminated the use of paper checks for equitable sharing payments, a sharing check template may be obtained from the E-SHARE Helpdesk. The template may be used to create an enlarged image of a sharing check suitable for the presentation ceremony.

A presentation ceremony should be scheduled sufficiently in advance to allow for processing of the sharing request. Requests for expedited processing of an equitable sharing request in order to conduct a presentation ceremony can be extremely disruptive to the system and generally cannot be accommodated.

On occasions when their travel schedules have permitted, the Attorney General, and the Deputy Attorney General have personally presented significant equitable sharing checks. U.S. Attorneys and federal seizing agencies should contact the official's scheduling assistant and AFMLS *as far in advance as possible* of an upcoming significant sharing opportunity. A significant amount of staff work must be done to prepare for ceremonies involving these.

Regardless of who presents the check, it is the responsibility of the federal seizing agency or the U.S. Attorney taking the lead role in the ceremony to invite the state and local recipients and to plan the presentation.

The LECC Coordinator is responsible for coordinating with the U.S. Attorney on any sharing presentation. If a U.S. Attorney renders an equitable sharing decision on a request from a state or local law enforcement agency from a different judicial district, the LECC Coordinator for the district in which the case was prosecuted should contact the USAO in the second district where the recipient agency is located to determine whether or not that U.S. Attorney wishes to participate in the ceremony.

VI. Reverse Sharing

Department of Justice investigative agencies participating in an investigation resulting in the seizure of property processed for forfeiture by another federal, state or local law enforcement agency must report the seizure in CATS and submit a request for a share of the forfeited property to the processing agency. Any forfeited funds and the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of forfeited property transferred to the requesting federal agency must be deposited in the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

VII. International Sharing of Forfeited Assets

The Department of Justice encourages international asset sharing with countries that facilitate the forfeiture of assets under U.S. law. Department policy applicable to international sharing, as well as the forfeiture of assets located overseas appears in chapter 10 of this *Manual*.

VIII. Weed and Seed Initiative; Transfers of Real Property

A. Background

Weed and Seed, administered by the Department of Justice, Community Capacity Development Office, promotes a community-based multi-agency approach to law enforcement, crime prevention, and neighborhood restoration. Focusing on designated high-crime neighborhoods, Weed and Seed employs a two-part strategy. First, law enforcement and prosecutorial agencies cooperate with local residents to “weed” out violent and drug-related criminal activity. Second, social service providers and other public and private sector representatives “seed” the neighborhood with prevention, intervention, and treatment services and revitalization efforts. Weed and Seed is founded on the premise that community organizations, social service providers, and criminal justice agencies must work together with community residents to regain control of and revitalize crime-ridden and drug-plagued neighborhoods. Weed and Seed includes both specifically funded projects and cooperative initiatives not receiving targeted federal funding. This section establishes guidelines for the transfer of forfeited real property, in appropriate cases, to states, political sub-divisions, and private, non-profit organizations in support of Weed and Seed.

B. General authorization

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(e)(1) and (2) and 21 U.S.C. § 881(e)(1)(A), the Attorney General has the authority to transfer forfeited property to any federal agency, or to any state or local law enforcement agency that participated in the seizure or forfeiture of property. Transfers made pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 881(e)(1)(A) must encourage cooperation between the recipient state or local agency and federal enforcement agencies. Limitations and conditions respecting permissible uses of transferred property are set forth in *The Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property*. This section constitutes supplementary guidance regarding the meaning of part V.A.3 of the *Guidelines*.

C. Transfer of forfeited real property pursuant to weed and seed initiative

1. Properties eligible for weed and seed

As noted above, the goal of Weed and Seed is to help local communities restore order and provide assistance in neighborhoods afflicted with high crime rates or other serious problems. The proposed use of any property to be transferred must support community-based drug treatment, crime prevention, education, improving housing, enhancing job skills, and other activities that will substantially further the Weed and Seed strategy. The property must be suited to the proposed use and the use must be consistent with all applicable federal, state and local laws and ordinances.

Any proposed transfer must have the potential for significant benefits to a particular community and these benefits must outweigh any financial loss or adverse effects to the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund. As a practical matter, the value of real property in neighborhoods which the initiative is intended to assist is typically depressed. In order for real property to be eligible for treatment as Weed and Seed property, it must have an appraised value of \$50,000 or less, or have an appraised value of \$200,000 or less, if the net equity value of the property is \$50,000 or less. Consequently, U.S. Attorneys should consider waiving minimum monetary thresholds for real property suitable for Weed and Seed.

2. Sharing requests

All requests for sharing of real property pursuant to the Weed and Seed Initiative must be submitted on the DAG-71 and must follow the established sharing procedures outlined in the *Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property*. The appropriate official in the federal investigative agency and the U.S. Attorney in the judicial district where the property is located must concur with the request. Where real property is forfeited in one

judicial district by a U.S. Attorney from another district, the U.S. Attorneys in both districts should recommend the transfer. Final approval authority for a transfer of forfeited real property rests with the Office of the Deputy Attorney General.

In addition to the forms DAG-71 and DAG-72, a request for a Weed and Seed transfer requires the submission of the following to AFMLS: (1) a written request from the U.S. Attorney or the U.S. Marshal recommending the transfer, explaining the factual and procedural history of the case and the proposed use of the property by the requested Weed and Seed recipient; (2) a draft Memorandum of Understanding to be signed by the U.S. Attorney and authorized representatives of the federal agency that processed the forfeiture, each state or local agency that would otherwise receive sharing were it not for the Weed and Seed transfer, and the organization that is contemplated to be the ultimate recipient of the transferred property, whether that recipient is a sharing agency or a qualified public or private non-profit organization; and (3) a Lead-Based Paint Declaration.¹⁴² Both the written request and memorandum should fully describe the entity to which the property is proposed to be transferred and the use to which that entity intends to put the property.

3. Transfers to state and local agencies

The transfer of a Weed and Seed property from the Federal Government is always made in the first instance to a sharing state or local law enforcement agency, or some other governmental entity permitted by applicable law to hold property for the benefit of the sharing agency. If that agency is the ultimate recipient of the property, no further transfers are necessary. If the Deputy Attorney General has approved a Weed and Seed request submitted on behalf of a qualified public or private non-profit organization, the state or local sharing agency transfers the real property to the recipient for the use described in the Memorandum of Understanding.

The authority of the participating state or local investigative agency to transfer forfeited real property to other state or local public agencies (or to qualified public or private entities) may vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. These issues must be addressed in the submitted DAG-71 and Memorandum of Understanding for a Weed and Seed request to be approved.

¹⁴² Samples are in Appendix H of this *Manual*.

D. Mortgages and ownership interests in weed and seed transferred real property

1. Mortgages

Mortgages on real property transferred pursuant to the Weed and Seed initiative are not payable from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund. Liens and mortgages are the responsibility of the recipient state or local sharing agency or non-profit entity that ultimately takes title to the property pursuant to the Memorandum of Understanding. The payment of any such mortgages should be specifically addressed in the Memorandum.

2. Qualified third-party interests

Any secured debts or other qualified interests owed to creditors on such real property are not payable from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund. Satisfaction of these interests is the responsibility of the recipient state or local agency or nonprofit entity. As with mortgages, the payment of qualified third-party interests should be addressed in the Memorandum of Understanding.

3. Abatement of lead-based paint

Structures built prior to 1978 are likely to contain lead-based paint, a potentially lethal substance which must be abated prior to any residential use of the property. The ultimate recipient of the property is responsible for the abatement, and must execute a declaration acknowledging the potential hazard presented by lead-based paint and agreeing to take the steps necessary to abate the hazard before putting the property to its contemplated use. The presence or absence of lead-based paint in a real property targeted for forfeiture should be considered during the pre-filing stage, and must be ascertained prior to submission of the Weed and Seed request and addressed in the papers submitted.

E. Asset seizure, management, and case-related expenses

Other expenses incurred in connection with the seizure, appraisal, maintenance or security of Weed and Seed property before transfer of the property are payable from the Assets Forfeiture Fund, as are case-related expenses incurred in connection with normal proceedings undertaken to protect the United States' interest in the property until the entry of a judgment or order of forfeiture.

F. Law enforcement concurrence

Any state or local law enforcement agency that would otherwise receive an equitable share of proceeds from the sale of forfeited real property must voluntarily agree to forego its share before a Weed and Seed transfer is authorized.

IX. Transfer of Property Forfeited under the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act

A. Background

The Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, 16 U.S.C. §§1801-1882, was enacted as part of an overall effort to conserve and manage the fishery resources found off the coasts of the United States. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Commerce is responsible for investigating violations of the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act. The Act provides that any fishing vessel used, and any fish taken or retained, in violation of section 1857 of the Act, are subject to forfeiture pursuant to a civil proceeding under section 1860.

Ordinarily, the property (defined as proceeds from the sale of perishable goods or a bond) seized for forfeiture pursuant to the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act is held in the court registry pending the outcome of the forfeiture proceeding. However, the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act also permits a different disposition of the proceeds as described below. The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines for litigating and processing the Act's forfeitures to facilitate the transfer of forfeited assets to NOAA.

B. General policy

Under the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, the Department of Justice may transfer to NOAA funds forfeited by the Attorney General for violations under the Act. Assets seized for forfeiture under the Act should be deposited in the Seized Asset Deposit Fund administered by the USMS. After forfeiture, the funds may be transferred by the USMS to NOAA, less any expenses incurred by the USMS and less ten percent of the net proceeds of forfeiture, which is deposited into the Assets Forfeiture Fund

C. Transfer request procedures

Since forfeitures under the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act are judicial, the local NOAA office must request the transfer of funds by submitting a .DAG-71 to the USAO in the district where the forfeiture action is pending. In preparing the DAG-71, NOAA headquarters legal counsel need not complete section VII, block B. Upon receipt of the DAG-71, the USAO has authority to approve such transfers (using form DAG-72) on property valued less than \$1,000,000 and to recommend transfers on property valued \$1,000,000 or more. The USAO need not consult with any other Department of Justice investigative agency concerning transfer requests made under the Act. As with other judicial forfeitures involving sharing, the USAO must forward the DAG-72 recommendation to the Criminal Division, AFMLS, for property valued \$1,000,000 or more.

Following the forfeiture and sharing decisions, and deduction of any expenses and the Department of Justice 10 percent share, a check for the proceeds should be cut and sent to NOAA by certified mail at the following address:

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
c/o Office of the General Counsel
8484 Georgia Avenue, Suite 400
Silver Spring, MD 20910

The check should also contain the following information:

case name and number _____
account number AD1000 BL2D02

The checks should be sent using certified mail. Any questions should be directed to the Assistant General Counsel of Enforcement and Litigation at 301-713-2292.

The USMS should process the transfer using subject classification code 4405 (portion of forfeited proceeds to other federal agencies).

Chapter 7

Assets Forfeiture Fund

I. Transfer of Funds From the Seized Asset Deposit Fund to the Assets Forfeiture Fund

The U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO) securing a forfeiture is responsible for initiating transfers from the Seized Asset Deposit Fund to the Assets Forfeiture Fund (AFF) and should provide prompt notification to the USMS of the events, which should lead to a transfer from the Seized Asset Deposit Fund.

In the case of either a consent judgment or a default judgment, the USMS will immediately transfer the forfeited cash to the AFF unless the U.S. Attorney determines that execution of the judgment should be delayed.

In the case of a judgment after trial or upon summary judgment, there is an automatic stay of execution of the judgment of 10 working days. If the USAO indicates that no motions or requests for additional stays have been filed, then the forfeited cash will be transferred to the AFF on the 11th working day following a summary judgment or a judgment after trial.¹⁴³

¹⁴³ See *American Bank of Wage Claims v. Registry of the District Court of Guam*, 431 F.2d 1215 (9th Cir. 1970).

Chapter 8

Attorney's Fees

I. Payment of Attorney's Fees in Civil Forfeiture Cases

A. Summary

The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (CAFRA) of 2000 amended 28 U.S.C. § 2465(b) to provide for an award of attorney's fees and other litigation costs to any claimant in a civil forfeiture case who "substantially prevails." Such awards will be paid out of the Judgment Fund. Forms for request payments out of the Judgment Fund are available on the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) Web site and should be submitted directly to the office that handles Judgment Fund matters.

B. Discussion

Prior to the enactment of CAFRA, there was no provision for liability for attorney's fees and costs that applied specifically to civil forfeitures. Attorney's fees were awarded to prevailing non-government parties pursuant to the Equal Access to Justice Act (EAJA). In EAJA, Congress provided that the non-government party could seek reimbursement of costs and legal fees if the Government's position was not substantially justified.¹⁴⁴

In CAFRA, Congress amended section 2465 to provide for the mandatory award of attorney's fees and other litigation costs to non-government parties who substantially prevail in a civil forfeiture proceeding, regardless of whether the Government was justified in bringing the forfeiture action. To be eligible for attorney's fees, however, the claimant must pursue the claim in court and obtain a judgment that the United States is liable for attorney's fees under section 2465.

When EAJA was enacted, the primary source of funds to pay judgments against the United States was the permanent judgment appropriation. *See* 31 U.S.C. § 1304. The Judgment Fund is by law available to pay final adverse judgments (and certain compromise

¹⁴⁴ "Except as otherwise specifically provided by statute, a court shall award to a prevailing party other than the United States fees and other expenses, in addition to any costs awarded pursuant to subsection (a), incurred by that party in any civil action (other than cases sounding in tort), including proceedings for judicial review of agency action, brought by or against the United States in any court having jurisdiction of that action, unless the court finds that the position of the United States was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust." (28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A)).

settlements) when “payment is not otherwise provided for.”¹⁴⁵ In the past, however, citing the need to establish an aggressive use of forfeiture and considering an EAJA award as a predictable expense incident thereto, the Department of Justice used its legal authority, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 524(c)(1)(A), to permit the use of Assets Forfeiture Fund (AFF) monies to pay EAJA awards arising from actions related to the forfeiture, attempted forfeiture, or seizure for forfeiture of property. The Department of Justice developed a policy and three-tier test to review requests for payment of EAJA awards from the AFF and these requests were submitted to AFMLS for review and approval.

The enactment of CAFRA provided specifically for liability for attorney’s fees and costs for a prevailing claimant in a civil proceeding. Because the provisions of section 2465 are specific to “any civil proceeding to forfeit property under any provision of civil law,” they appear to have displaced EAJA as a means for payment of attorney’s fees and costs by prevailing non-government parties in the case of civil forfeitures. Because this liability is unrelated to the strength or weakness of the Government’s case and is now a routine part of civil litigation in forfeiture cases, the awards of attorney’s fees and costs will no longer come from the AFF. Although the language of the statute is silent as to the source of funding for these payments, Congressman Henry Hyde addressed this issue. Submitted in the Congressional Record on the day CAFRA was passed was the following statement:

“In addition, this act would make the federal government liable for...attorneys fees, and pre-judgment and post-judgment interest payments on certain assets to prevailing parties in civil forfeiture proceedings.... Compensation payments could come from appropriated funds or occur without further appropriation from the Judgment Fund, or both sources.”¹⁴⁶

Since the AFF consists of non-appropriated funds, and no funds were separately appropriated to pay obligations arising under CAFRA, Congress’s intent seems clear that in civil forfeiture proceedings attorney’s fees, costs, and interest should be awarded from the Judgment Fund.

C. Procedure for requesting payment of an award from the judgment fund

When there is a judgment awarding attorney’s fees, interest, and costs in a civil forfeiture case, the USAO should submit a request for payment of the award to the Financial Management Service (FMS), Department of the Treasury, which manages the Judgment

¹⁴⁵ Section 1304(a)(1).

¹⁴⁶ *Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate: H.R. 1658 - The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000*, reprinted in 146 Cong. Rec. H2040, H2047–H2049 (daily ed. Apr. 11, 2000).

Fund. FMS has a Web site (<http://www.fms.treas.gov/judgefund>) on which there are links to procedures for submitting a request for an award of costs and fees and the appropriate forms. (These forms are also found on the AFMLS Web site) In addition to the forms and instructions, FMS's Web site also contains general information about the fund. Upon submitting the appropriate forms to FMS, a courtesy copy should be forwarded to AFMLS.

II. Forfeiture of Attorney's Fees

The policy on the forfeiture of attorney's fees is set forth in the *U.S. Attorney's Manual* and the *Criminal Resource Manual*. As set forth in those sources, any action to forfeit an attorney's fee in a civil or criminal case, as well as any agreement *not* to seek forfeiture of any attorney's fee in such case, requires the approval of the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division.

III. Payment of Attorney's Fees in Criminal Forfeiture Cases

A. Defendant's attorney's fees

1. Summary

The defendant in a criminal forfeiture action may file for an award of attorney's fees under the Hyde Amendment.¹⁴⁷ The Hyde Amendment provides that the court may award attorney's fees to defendants in criminal actions in which the Government's position was vexatious, frivolous, or in bad faith.¹⁴⁸ To prevail on a Hyde Amendment claim, the claimant must prove that (1) he or she was the prevailing party on the underlying action, (2) the Government's position was vexatious, frivolous, or in bad faith, and (3) there are no special circumstances that would make the award unjust. This burden is heavier than the one the

¹⁴⁷ "During fiscal year 1998 and in any fiscal year thereafter, the court, in any criminal case (other than a case in which the defendant is represented by assigned counsel paid for by the public) pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 26, 1997], may award to the prevailing party, other than the United States, a reasonable attorney's fee and other litigation expenses, where the court finds that the position of the United States was vexatious, frivolous, or in bad faith, unless the court finds that special circumstances make such an award unjust." The Hyde Amendment to the Department of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-119, § 617, 111 Stat. 2440, 2519 (1997), 18 U.S.C.A. § 3006A, historical and statutory notes.

¹⁴⁸ *Id.*

Government must meet under EAJA, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, for civil actions.¹⁴⁹ When a request for attorney's fees under the Hyde Amendment is made based on the criminal prosecution, it should be submitted directly to the Hyde Amendment Committee and the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys. If the request specifically addresses the criminal forfeiture, a copy should also be submitted to the chief of AFMLS. Hyde claim awards are paid from the Judgment Fund.

2. Discussion

In articulating a standard of misconduct, the Eleventh and Fourth Circuits have relied on *Black's Law Dictionary* to define the terms "vexatious," "frivolous," and "bad faith."¹⁵⁰ These courts found *vexatious* to mean "without reasonable or probable cause or excuse"; *frivolous* to mean "groundless...with little prospect of success; often brought to embarrass or annoy"; and *bad faith* to mean "not simply bad judgment or negligence, but rather it implies the conscious doing of a wrong because of dishonest purpose or moral ambiguity."¹⁵¹ The court in *United States v. Gilbert* further noted that the amendment was "targeted at prosecutorial misconduct, not prosecutorial mistake."¹⁵²

A court recently considered a defendant's claim for attorney's fees in a criminal forfeiture case where the forfeiture, but not the conviction, was found defective.¹⁵³ In *United States v. Pease*, the defendant sought attorney's fees in connection with an appeal of the criminal forfeiture. The Eleventh Circuit reversed the district court's grant of the Government's Rule 36 motion to amend the judgment post-conviction to include the necessary forfeiture language. In connection with the Hyde Amendment request, the district court found that the Government's position was not vexatious, frivolous, or in bad faith.¹⁵⁴ The court reasoned that the lack of clarity of the governing law regarding the use of Rule 36 to amend judgments

¹⁴⁹ See *United States v. Gilbert*, 198 F.3d 1293, 1299-1302 (11th Cir. 1999) (discussing legislative history of the Hyde Amendment). In its original form, the Hyde Amendment tracked the EAJA in its burden and standard of proof, but was changed prior to enactment by switching the burden from the Government to the plaintiff and heightening the standard of misconduct that must be shown. *Id.* at 1302. See also *United States v. Wade*, 255 F.3d 833, 839 n.6 (D.D.C. 2001) (discussing in footnote that the Hyde Amendment is a heavier burden for petitioner than the EAJA standard).

¹⁵⁰ *United States v. Gilbert*, 198 F.3d 1293, 1298-99 (11th Cir. 1999); *In re 1997 Grand Jury*, 215 F.3d 430, 436 (4th Cir. 2000).

¹⁵¹ *Gilbert*, 198 F.3d at 1298-99 (quoting *Black's Law Dictionary* 668 (6th Ed. 1990); *In re 1997 Grand Jury*, 215 F.3d at 436 (quoting *United States v. Gilbert*, 198 F.3d 1293, 1298-99 (11th Cir. 1999)).

¹⁵² *Gilbert*, 198 F.3d at 1304.

¹⁵³ *United States v. Pease*, No. 8:98-CR-302-T-24EAJ (M.D. Fla. July 30, 2004) (unpublished).

¹⁵⁴ *Id.*

to include previously ordered forfeitures, the legal merits of the forfeiture, and the consistency of the Government's position supported a finding that the Government's position was substantially justified—not frivolous, vexatious, or in bad faith.¹⁵⁵

There are no reported decisions granting a Hyde Amendment claim solely with regard to a criminal forfeiture. However, the analysis conducted by courts in granting Hyde Amendment claims generally is instructive. In *United States v. Adkinson*, the court found the Government acted in bad faith when they enjoined a party to the action knowing at the time of the indictment that there would be insufficient evidence to convict the defendants of bank fraud conspiracy at trial.¹⁵⁶ Furthermore, the court found the Government's position in that case to be foreclosed by binding precedent from the start, thus making it vexatious and frivolous as well.¹⁵⁷

Likewise, the court in *United States v. Holland* found the Government's position to be vexatious where the Government proceeded with a 31-count indictment concerning bank loans investigated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) on evidence concerning civil, not criminal, wrongdoings.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, the FDIC had already found the evidence insufficient to support even administrative enforcement.¹⁵⁹ The court also found that the Government had insufficient evidence to prove the requisite criminal intent.¹⁶⁰ Applying the test of whether a reasonable prosecutor should have concluded the evidence was insufficient to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, the court found that the Government's position in this case was vexatious.¹⁶¹

¹⁵⁵ *United States v. Pease*, No. 8:98-CR-302-T-24EAJ (M.D. Fla. July 30, 2004) (unpublished). The district court also denied the claimant's request for attorney's fees under EAJA, finding that the Government's position was substantially justified.

¹⁵⁶ *United States v. Adkinson*, 247 F.3d 1289, 1293 (11th Cir. 2001).

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *United States v. Holland*, 34 F. Supp. 2d 346, 353 & 364 (E.D. Va. 1999).

¹⁵⁹ *Id.* at 365.

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*

¹⁶¹ *Id.* at 364-75.

Most courts have found a Hyde Amendment action to be civil proceeding despite arising from a criminal action; as a result, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure apply.¹⁶² Moreover, the amendment provides that the procedures and limitations for granting an award shall be derived from those set forth in EAJA.¹⁶³ In pertinent part, EAJA requires the parties seeking an award to file their claims within 30 days of final judgment of the underlying civil action.¹⁶⁴ EAJA also provides for the determination of reasonable attorney's fees and other expenses.¹⁶⁵

B. Third party petitioner's attorney's fees

1. Summary

Since CAFRA strictly applies to civil forfeiture proceedings, the third party petitioner in an ancillary proceeding to a criminal forfeiture, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(n), must assert payment for attorney's fees under EAJA. EAJA provides for the award of attorney's fees to prevailing parties in any civil action against the United States in which the Government's position was not substantially justified.¹⁶⁶ A third party claimant's ancillary proceeding to a criminal forfeiture is considered a "civil action" under EAJA.¹⁶⁷ Payment of attorney's fees awarded under EAJA are paid from the AFF. The chief of AFMLS must approve any settlement of an EAJA claim.

¹⁶² *United States v. Holland*, 214 F.3d 523 (4th Cir. 2000); *United States v. Truesdale*, 211 F.3d 898, 902-904 (5th Cir. 2000); *United States v. Wade*, 255 F.3d 833, 839 (D.D.C. 2001). *But see United States v. Robbins*, 179 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1999) (finding a Hyde Amendment action was a criminal proceeding to which the appellate rule for criminal actions applies).

¹⁶³ "Such awards shall be granted pursuant to the procedures and limitations (but not burden of proof) provided for an award under Title 28, U.S.C. § 2412." Hyde Amendment, *supra* note 1.

¹⁶⁴ Section 2412(d)(1)(B).

¹⁶⁵ Section 2412(d)(2)(A).

¹⁶⁶ "Except as otherwise specifically provided by statute, a court shall award to a prevailing party other than the United States fees and other expenses, in addition to any costs awarded pursuant to subsection (a), incurred by that party in any civil action (other than cases sounding in tort), including proceedings for judicial review of agency action, brought by or against the United States in any court having jurisdiction of that action, unless the court finds that the position of the United States was substantially justified or that special circumstances make an award unjust." 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d)(1)(A).

¹⁶⁷ *United States v. Douglas*, 55 F.3d 584 (11th Cir. 1995); *United States v. McAllister*, 1998 WL 855498 (E.D. Pa. 1998); *United States v. Bachner*, 877 F. Supp. 625 (S.D. Fla 1995).

2. Discussion

EAJA requires the court to award fees upon finding (1) the applicants were the prevailing parties, (2) the Government's position was not substantially justified, and (3) no circumstances exist that would make an award unjust.¹⁶⁸

The general test for determining whether an applicant is a prevailing party is if the parties "succeed on any significant issue in litigation which achieves some of the benefit the parties sought in bringing suit."¹⁶⁹ The Supreme Court has held that a party must secure a judgment on the merits or by judicial consent decree in order to prevail under statutes awarding attorney's fees.¹⁷⁰ The court stated that these results create the "material alteration of the legal relationship of the parties' necessary to permit an award of attorney's fees."¹⁷¹ Therefore, to meet the prevailing party requirement under EAJA, a petitioner must achieve some benefit of the litigation either through a judgment on the merits or a judicial consent decree.

In *United States v. One Rural Lot*,¹⁷² the claimants were prevailing parties where they received 60 percent of the sale proceeds from forfeited property. Likewise, the property owner in *In Re Application of Gerard Mgndichian*¹⁷³ prevailed for EAJA purposes where the district court denied his motion for return of his motorcycles, but nonetheless ordered the administrative forfeiture proceedings void,¹⁷⁴ giving him the right to contest the reinstated forfeiture proceedings.¹⁷⁵

For the Government's position to be substantially justified, the Government must show it was "justified to a degree that could satisfy a reasonable person"¹⁷⁶; that is, its position had a

¹⁶⁸ *Jean v. Nelson*, 863 F.2d 759, 765 (11th Cir. 1988).

¹⁶⁹ *Hensley v. Eckerhart*, 461 U.S. 424, 433 (1983); *Sims v. Apfel*, 238 F.3d 597, 600 (5th Cir. 2001).

¹⁷⁰ *Buckhannon Board and Care Home, Inc. v. West Va. Dept. of Health and Human Resources*, 532 U.S. 598, 604-05 (2001).

¹⁷¹ *Id.* at 604.

¹⁷² *United States v. One Rural Lot*, 770 F. Supp. 66 (D.P.R. 1991).

¹⁷³ *In re Application of Gerard Mgndichian for Return of Property*, 312 F. Supp. 2d 1250 (C.D. Cal. 2003).

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

¹⁷⁵ *Id.* at 1257-60.

¹⁷⁶ *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 565 (1988).

“reasonable basis both in law and fact.”¹⁷⁷ Relevant factors that may be considered in determining whether the Government’s position was reasonable include (1) the legal merits of its position, (2) the clarity of the governing law at the time the action was instituted, (3) the stage at which the litigation was resolved, and (4) the consistency of the Government’s position.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁷ *Id.*

¹⁷⁸ See *American Bank of Wage Claims v. Registry of the District Court of Guam*, 431 F.2d 1215 (9th Cir. 1970).

Chapter 9

Grand Jury

I. Disclosures of Grand Jury Information Under 18 U.S.C. § 3322(a)

A. Summary

The Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (CAFRA) of 2000 amended 18 U.S.C. § 3322(a) to allow criminal Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSAs) to disclose grand jury information to attorneys for the Government “for use in connection with any civil forfeiture provision of federal law.” With this amendment, Congress legislatively overruled a portion of the holding in *United States v. Sells Engineering, Inc*, 463 U.S. 418 (1983), which interpreted Rule 6(e), Fed. R. Crim. P., to prohibit a criminal AUSA from disclosing grand jury information to a civil AUSA who was not part of the prosecution team. But the amendment to section 3322 did not make clear whether the “use” that the civil AUSA could make of the disclosed information included further disclosure to the public in the course of the litigation of a civil forfeiture case without obtaining a court order.

One interpretation of section 3322(a) is that it only permits one AUSA to disclose grand jury information to another AUSA, but still requires the second AUSA to obtain a court order before disclosing the information to the public in the course of civil litigation. The matter is a sensitive one, as the penalty for violating the grand jury disclosure rules set forth in Rule 6(e) is contempt. For that reason, prosecutors will naturally want to act with caution in this area.

Based on fundamental rules of statutory construction and the practice regarding the use of grand jury information in criminal cases, however, we conclude that the intent of section 3322 was to permit the civil AUSA not only to review and rely upon grand jury information in the preparation of civil forfeiture pleadings, but also to disclose that information in publicly filed documents and as evidence at trial.

Section 3322 does not, however, permit any AUSA to disclose grand jury information to seizing agency attorneys to use in administrative forfeiture proceedings. Seizing agency attorneys are not “attorneys for the government” as defined by Rule 1(b), of the Federal Rules

of Criminal Procedure. Nor does section 3322 authorize disclosure to government contractors without a court order pursuant to Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(i) and/or 6(e)(3)(A)(ii).¹⁷⁹

B. Discussion

1. Issue I

May an AUSA to whom grand jury information is disclosed for use in a civil forfeiture matter disclose that information to the public in the course of the civil forfeiture case without obtaining a court order?

CAFRA¹⁸⁰ amended section 3322(a)¹⁸¹ to allow a criminal AUSA to disclose grand jury information without obtaining a judicial order to a civil AUSA for “use in connection with any civil forfeiture provision of Federal law.” This amendment was intended to address the Supreme Court decision in *United States v. Sells Engineering*, which held that Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure does not authorize automatic disclosures of grand jury information to an attorney for the Government for use in a civil proceeding. The Supreme Court interpreted Rule 6(e) to allow automatic disclosures only to those attorneys and their supervisors who conduct the criminal matters to which the grand jury materials pertain.¹⁸² An attorney with only civil duties, the Court said, lacks both the prosecutor’s special role in supporting the grand jury and the prosecutor’s own crucial need to know what occurs before the grand jury.¹⁸³ Thus, criminal AUSAs were held to have access to grand jury materials only for criminal use.

The Supreme Court refined its decision in *United States v. John Doe, Inc. I*, 481 U.S. 102 (1987), which held that civil attorneys who were members of the prosecution team may,

¹⁷⁹ Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) authorizes disclosure to “government personnel,” which may include contract personnel, but only upon court order as discussed below. Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(i) authorizes disclosure “preliminary to or in connection with a judicial proceeding” and also requires a court order.

¹⁸⁰ CAFRA applies to any forfeiture proceeding initiated on or after August 23, 2000. *See* Pub. L. No. 106-185, § 10, 114 Stat. 202, 217.

¹⁸¹ Section 3322(a) provides:

- (a) a person who is privy to grand jury information—
 - (1) received in the course of duty as an attorney for the government; or
 - (2) disclosed under rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;may disclose that information to an attorney for the government for use in...connection with any civil forfeiture provision of Federal law.

¹⁸² 463 U.S. at 429.

¹⁸³ *See id.* at 431.

without prior court authorization, continue to use materials or information subject to Rule 6(e) in a companion or related civil proceeding. A recent Third Circuit case, *Impounded*, 277 F.3d 407 (3d Cir. 2002), further lightened the restrictions of *Sells*. The Third Circuit, interpreting an exception to the general non-disclosure rule, allowed an AUSA from one district to disclose grand jury material to an AUSA in another district since the use of the grand jury information was a part of the performance of the recipient prosecutor's criminal law enforcement duties.

The CAFRA amendment to section 3322(a) expanded the holding in *John Doe, Inc. I* to allow disclosures of grand jury information to another "attorney for the government" without a court order for "use in connection with any civil forfeiture provision of federal law." Previously, under the version of section 3322 enacted as part of the Financial Institutions Reform and Recovery Act (FIRREA) of 1989, Congress had authorized such disclosure only in cases involving bank fraud. But the legislative history of CAFRA indicates that Congress recognized that *all* civil forfeiture actions are law enforcement actions, and that grand jury information therefore should be available without a court order to government attorneys in all civil forfeiture cases.¹⁸⁴

While it is clear that Congress intended to permit an AUSA who obtained grand jury information in connection with a criminal investigation to disclose that information to another AUSA who would be handling a related civil forfeiture matter, neither the statute nor the legislative history provides any guidance as to what the civil AUSA may do with the information once it is disclosed. In particular, it is not clear whether Congress intended to permit the civil AUSA only to review and rely upon the grand jury information while preparing a civil forfeiture case, or whether it intended that the civil AUSA would be permitted to disclose the grand jury information in publicly filed documents, such as complaints and applications for seizure warrants and restraining orders, and as evidence at trial.

A fundamental rule of statutory construction provides that the plain meaning of the words is given the greatest weight in statutory interpretation. *Browder v. United States*, 312 U.S. 335, 336 (1941). In the context of civil litigation, the plain meaning of the phrase "for use in connection with any civil forfeiture provision of federal law" would include using the information in applications for seizure warrants and court orders, in the body of the forfeiture complaint, and as evidence at trial. This comports with the dictionary definition, which suggests that information is *used* when it is "put into action or service."¹⁸⁵ The more limited interpretation—that one "uses" information only to inform him or herself of the facts of a

¹⁸⁴ H.R. Rep. 105-358(I), 105th Cong., 1st Sess. 1997.

¹⁸⁵ Webster's Dictionary 1301 (10th ed. 1999).

case—seems contrary to common sense and experience. Moreover, the broader reading of the statute is consistent with the use that a criminal AUSA typically makes of grand jury information in a criminal case. It is well-established that a criminal AUSA who is privy to grand jury information may use it not only to prepare a case for trial, but may disclose it in the indictment and in the course of the criminal trial.

Accordingly, we conclude that just as the criminal AUSA may disclose grand jury information in an indictment or other document filed in the course of a criminal prosecution, or as evidence introduced in the course of a criminal trial, so may a civil AUSA disclose grand jury information in the course of civil litigation without obtaining a judicial disclosure order.

2. Issue II

May an AUSA (civil or criminal) who is privy to grand jury information disclose that information to agency counsel for use in connection with an administrative proceeding, or to a government contractor who is assisting in the preparation of a civil forfeiture case?

Section 3322(a) provides for automatic disclosures of grand jury information by an AUSA who is privy to that information “to an attorney for the government...for use in connection with any civil forfeiture provision of Federal law.” Rule 1(b) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure defines attorney for the Government as the Attorney General, an authorized assistant of the Attorney General, a U.S. Attorney, or an authorized assistant of a U.S. Attorney. Department of Justice attorneys may conduct grand jury proceedings when authorized to do so by the Attorney General. Agency or other non-Department of Justice attorneys may not be present unless they are appointed as special assistants.¹⁸⁶

In *In re Grand Jury Proceedings*,¹⁸⁷ the Third Circuit emphasized that the “term attorneys for the government is restrictive in its application.” “If it had been intended that attorneys for administrative agencies were to have free access to matters occurring before the grand jury,” the court said, “the rule would have so provided.” The Sixth Circuit, addressing the definition of attorney for the Government, found that an attorney for the Department of Justice Tax Division was not an attorney for the Government because he was not assigned to work on a particular criminal case in any “official” capacity.¹⁸⁸ Seizing agency attorneys and non-Department of Justice attorneys may obtain grand jury information without a disclosure

¹⁸⁶ *Federal Grand Jury Practice* (2000), Chap. 2, Sec.10 at 21.

¹⁸⁷ 309 F.2d 440, 443 (3d Cir. 1962).

¹⁸⁸ *United States v. Forman*, 71 F.3d 1214, 1218 (6th Cir. 1995).

order if they are appointed under 28 U.S.C. § 515 as a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney or Special Assistant to the Attorney General.¹⁸⁹ Otherwise, they are not considered “attorneys for the Government” and cannot receive grand jury information without a court order. As a result, we conclude that section 3322 does not authorize disclosure of grand jury information to a seizing agency counsel for use in connection with an administrative proceeding.

Likewise, we conclude that section 3322 does not authorize disclosure without a court order to government contractors who are assisting the civil AUSA with the preparation of the civil forfeiture case. At first glance, disclosure to the contractor paralegal or attorney who is doing the actual drafting of the document that the civil AUSA is planning to file in the civil forfeiture case would seem to fall within the scope of the use that the civil AUSA may make of the grand jury information. If the civil AUSA, for example, may disclose the grand jury information in the publicly filed civil forfeiture complaint, there would seem to be no reason he or she could not first disclose it to the contractor who is drafting the complaint. But the practice in criminal cases militates against this view.

Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) allows for disclosure of grand jury information without judicial order to “any government personnel...that an attorney for the government considers necessary to assist in performing that attorney’s duty to enforce federal criminal law.” The term *government personnel* includes not only members of the prosecution support staff, such as economists, secretaries, paralegals, law clerks, and federal criminal investigators, but also employees of any federal agency who are assisting the government prosecutor.¹⁹⁰ But it does not automatically include contractor personnel used in the asset forfeiture program.

It is true that contract personnel have been considered government personnel for purposes of Rule 6(e) in previous instances. In *United States v. Lartey*,¹⁹¹ the Second Circuit held that a retired IRS agent employed as a contractor to review financial records of the defendant, which were submitted to the grand jury, fell within the government employee exception to the grand jury secrecy rule. Relying on *In re Gruberg*¹⁹² and legislative history,¹⁹³ the court found that the exceptions to the grand jury rules were adopted to override decisions highly restrictive of the use of government experts in grand jury investigations. In a similar case, the

¹⁸⁹ *In re Perlin*, 589 F.2d 260, 267 (7th Cir. 1978) (Commodity Futures Trading Commission); *United States v. Bates*, 627 F.2d 349 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (Federal Maritime Commission); *Bradley v. Fairfax*, 634 F.2d 1126, 1129 (8th Cir. 1980) (Parole Commission hearing officer).

¹⁹⁰ *Federal Grand Jury Practice* (2000), Chap. 3, Sec. 26, at 57.

¹⁹¹ 716 F.2d 955 (2d Cir. 1983).

¹⁹² 453 F. Supp 1225, 1233-34 (S.D.N.Y. 1978).

¹⁹³ S. Rep. No. 354, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 7 (1977), reprinted in U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 527, 530).

Tenth Circuit, relying on *Lartey*, held that an expert witness under contract with the Government was government personnel within the class of government personnel to whom disclosure is permissible.¹⁹⁴

However, in the most recent case to address this issue, *United States v. Pimental*, 380 F.3d 575, 590-96 (1st Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 125 S. Ct. 1385 (Feb. 22, 2005), while concluding that temporary employees or persons under contract, including employees of a private company, can be “government personnel” for purposes of Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii), where the individuals in question are directly involved in assisting government attorneys in the prosecution of cases, the court held that the prosecutor “must seek court authorization” prior to disclosure to such persons. 380 F.3d at 596.

Therefore, in both civil and criminal cases, the AUSA must first obtain a disclosure order pursuant to either Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) or Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(i) before disclosing grand jury information to a contract employee.¹⁹⁵ That being so, it will remain necessary to obtain a disclosure order before a civil AUSA, who is entitled under section 3322(a) to use grand jury information in a civil forfeiture case, may disclose that information to a government contractor unless the information is first disclosed in a publicly filed document or in open court.

C. Conclusion

Under the CAFRA amendment to section 3322(a), criminal AUSAs may now disclose grand jury information to civil forfeiture AUSAs. This information may be used by the civil AUSAs in their complaints, restraining orders, and any other pleadings filed in a civil forfeiture case, and as evidence at trial, without getting a disclosure order. However, neither criminal nor civil AUSAs may disclose grand jury information to seizing agency attorneys to use in administrative forfeiture proceedings or to government contract employees who may be assisting in the preparation of a civil forfeiture case without obtaining a judicial order.

¹⁹⁴ *United States v. Anderson*, 778 F.2d 602 (10th Cir. 1985).

¹⁹⁵ The practice in a number of districts has been to obtain a standing order from the district court, under either Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) or Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(i), or both, authorizing disclosure to specific contract personnel who are directly involved in assisting attorneys for the Government in the prosecution of cases. Such orders should be updated frequently to reflect any changes in conditions which were considered by the court in support of the order. AFMLS has posted examples on its Web site.

II. Presenting Forfeiture to the Grand Jury¹⁹⁶

Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 32.2(a) provides that the court may not enter a judgment of forfeiture in a criminal proceeding “unless the indictment or information contains notice to the defendant that the Government will seek the forfeiture of property as part of any sentence in accordance with the applicable statute.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(a). Similarly, Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 7(c)(2) provides that no criminal judgment of forfeiture may be entered “unless the indictment or the information provides notice that the defendant has an interest in property that is subject to forfeiture in accordance with the applicable statute.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(2).

In light of these rules and related constitutional considerations, what are the best practices for AUSAs to follow in presenting forfeiture allegations and related evidence to the grand jury, and how should the grand jury’s finding of probable cause for forfeiture be memorialized and described to the district court?

A. Summary

Because forfeiture is neither an offense nor an element of an offense, but an indeterminate part of the criminal sentence not limited by any statutory maximum amount, the Constitution does not require that the grand jury find probable cause for forfeiture, either generally or with respect to particular property. Applicable statutes and rules also do not mandate such a finding by the grand jury. For several reasons, however, the best practice is to present evidence to the grand jury that permits it to find probable cause to believe that the requisite nexus exists between the charged offenses and any money judgment amount and particular property alleged to be forfeitable, and to request that such a finding be made. The grand jury’s finding with respect to forfeiture should be memorialized in the indictment, and may then be represented to the court, in support of pretrial restraining orders or for other appropriate purposes, as the grand jury’s probable cause finding on the forfeitability of the listed property and the specified money judgment amount.

B. Discussion

1. The Constitution does not require a grand jury finding of probable cause for forfeiture

¹⁹⁶ Section II was previously circulated as Interim Legal Advice Memorandum 04-1 in 2005.

~~The authority to charge crimes in federal court, and the limits to that authority, derive~~
from the Constitution. The Fifth Amendment provides “No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury.” The Grand Jury Clause of the Fifth Amendment serves the “dual function of determining if there is probable cause to believe that a crime has been committed, and of protecting citizens against unfounded criminal prosecutions.” *Branzburg v. Hayes*, 408 U.S. 665, 686-687 (1972). Thus, elements of the criminal offense must be charged in the indictment, submitted to a jury, and proven by the Government beyond a reasonable doubt. *See, e.g., Jones v. United States*, 526 U.S. 227, 232 (1999); *see generally* section 11.2, *Federal Grand Jury Practice* (OLE August 2000).

There is no constitutional right to have the grand jury make a probable cause determination as to criminal forfeiture because forfeiture is not an element of a substantive offense. Criminal forfeiture is, instead, part of a criminal sentence. *Libretti v. United States*, 516 U.S. 29, 38-41, 48-49 (1995). Indeed, for that reason, there is no Sixth Amendment right to jury trial on criminal forfeiture. *Id.*, 516 U.S. at 48-49.¹⁹⁷

Libretti is apparently still good law, notwithstanding recent Supreme Court decisions holding that certain facts bearing upon sentencing constitute elements of separate substantive offenses. In *Jones v. United States*, the Court held that the federal car jacking statute, which authorized increased punishment in car jackings resulting in either serious bodily injury or death, created three separate offenses rather than one offense with additional penalty provisions. *Jones*, 526 U.S. at 251-52. In *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466, 490 (2000), the Court held that “other than the fact of a prior conviction, any fact that increases the penalty for a crime beyond the prescribed statutory maximum must be submitted to a jury, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt.”¹⁹⁸ In *Blakely v. Washington*, 124 S. Ct. 2531 (June 24, 2004), the Court applied the *Apprendi* rule to invalidate, under the Sixth Amendment, an upward departure under the Washington State sentencing guidelines system that was imposed on the basis of facts found by the court at sentencing.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ As explained more fully below, the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure provide that in a case where a jury returns a guilty verdict, either the defense or the prosecution may request that the jury also determine whether the Government has established the “requisite nexus” between the property alleged to be forfeitable and the offense committed by the defendant. Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(b)(4).

¹⁹⁸ In response to *Jones* and *Apprendi*, the Criminal Division advised prosecutors “Any fact which increases the statutory maximum sentence (other than prior conviction) should be charged in the indictment and proved at trial, and the [trial] jury should be instructed that it is required to find the fact beyond a reasonable doubt.”

¹⁹⁹ The Department of Justice has taken the position that *Blakely* does not apply to the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines, a question on which the Court has granted certiorari.

The Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) has taken the position that *Blakely* does not apply to criminal forfeiture for the same reasons that have persuaded the courts not to apply *Apprendi*, and because criminal forfeiture is an open-ended, indeterminate part of the defendant's sentence, in contrast to the determinate sentencing scheme invalidated in *Blakely*. In AFMLS's view, district courts finding facts bearing on forfeiture are not enhancing a defendant's sentence: upon a defendant's conviction, the forfeiture statutes themselves require forfeiture of *all* of the defendant's assets that fall into particular categories—proceeds, facilitating property, property involved in the offense. See *Quick Release*, Vol. 17, No. 7 (July 2004) at 1-2; see also Cassella, "Does *Apprendi v. New Jersey* Change the Standard of Proof in Criminal Forfeiture Cases?," 89 *Kentucky Law Journal* 631 (2001).

The first court of appeals to reach and decide the issue of *Blakely*'s application to criminal forfeiture has agreed with this position. In *United States v. Messino*, 382 F.3d 704 (7th Cir. 2004), the court of appeals explained

We have previously held that *Apprendi* has no effect on criminal forfeiture proceedings because forfeiture provisions have no statutory maximum. *United States v. Vera*, 278 F.3d 672, 673 (7th Cir. 2002). *Apprendi*'s statutory maximum was supplied by the statute of conviction; *Blakely*'s is external—the statutory maximum is found not in the criminal code, but instead, the sentencing guidelines. See [*United States v.*] *Booker*, 375 F.3d 508, 509 [(7th Cir. 2004)]. The criminal forfeiture provisions do not include a statutory maximum; they are open-ended in that *all* property representing proceeds of illegal activity is subject to forfeiture. *Vera*, 278 F.3d at 673; U.S.S.G. § 5E1.4; 21 U.S.C. § 853. Therefore, we conclude that *Blakely*, like *Apprendi*, does not apply to forfeiture proceedings.

382 F.3d at 713. The court of appeals added the following defense of the preponderance standard for criminal forfeiture:

Libretti states that "the nature of criminal forfeiture as an aspect of sentencing compels the conclusion that the right to jury verdict on forfeitability does not fall within the Sixth Amendment's constitutional protection." *Libretti v. United States*, 516 U.S. 29, 49 (1995). Furthermore, the Supreme Court's decision in *Patterson* explains that, "the Due Process Clause requires the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt all of the elements included in the definition of the offense of which the defendant is charged." *Patterson v. New York*, 432 U.S. 197, 210 (1977). Since forfeiture is not a separate substantive offense, *Libretti*, 516 U.S. at 39-40, due process is also not offended by a preponderance standard.

Messino, 382 F.3d at 713-14.

Other lower courts have uniformly held that *Blakely*'s predecessor, *Apprendi*, does not apply to criminal forfeiture because forfeiture has no statutory maximum amount. *See United States v. Shryock*, 342 F.3d 948, 991 (9th Cir. 2003); *United States v. Keene*, 341 F.3d 78, 85 (1st Cir. 2003); *United States v. Gasanova*, 332 F.3d 297, 300-01 (5th Cir. 2003); *United States v. Najjar*, 300 F.3d 466, 485-86 (4th Cir. 2002); *United States v. Corrado*, 227 F.3d 543, 550-51 (6th Cir. 2000) (*Corrado I*); *United States v. Corrado*, 286 F.3d 934, 937 (6th Cir. 2002) (*Corrado II*) (reaffirming, in related opinion, that forfeiture is part of the defendant's sentence); *United States v. Cabeza*, 258 F.3d 1256, 1257 (11th Cir. 2001).

Accordingly, a defendant has no constitutional right to have the grand jury find probable cause for forfeiture.²⁰⁰

2. Criminal forfeiture statutes and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not require that the grand jury find probable cause for forfeiture

If the Constitution does not require the grand jury to find probable cause for forfeiture, does a statute or rule require it?

Criminal forfeiture statutes typically provide that the court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of [the predicate] offense..., shall order that the person forfeit to the United States [specified types of property],” 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(1), or its equivalent, “Any person convicted of a [predicate offense] shall forfeit to the United States [specified types of property],” 21 U.S.C. § 853(a). *See also* 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) (“If a forfeiture of property is authorized in connection with a violation of an Act of Congress, and any person is charged in an indictment or information with such violation but no specific statutory provision is made for criminal forfeiture upon conviction, the government may include the forfeiture in the indictment or information in accordance with the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and

²⁰⁰ Of course, the defendant *does* have a right to indictment and a grand jury finding on the elements of the substantive offense(s) that are predicates for forfeiture. As a recent reminder of the importance of charging all applicable substantive legal theories, and the effect upon forfeiture of a failure to do so, *see United States v. Iacoboni*, 363 F.3d 1, 7 (1st Cir. 2004) (reversing forfeiture judgment based on theory that assets had facilitated money laundering with intent to conceal where indictment charged only money laundering with intent to promote criminal activity). A fact that triggers an enhanced forfeiture penalty, greater than the penalty that would otherwise apply to a given offense, would also seem to qualify as an element of the substantive offense within the meaning of *Apprendi*. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(G), made applicable in criminal cases by 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), (providing for forfeiture of *all* assets of any individual, entity, or organization engaged in certain crimes, but only if the crimes are acts of domestic or international terrorism as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2331; *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5) (defining numerous offenses as “Federal crimes of terrorism” if they are “calculated to influence or affect the conduct of government by intimidation or coercion, or to retaliate against government conduct”).

upon conviction, the court shall order the forfeiture of the property in accordance with...(21 U.S.C. § 853), other than subsection (d) of that section.”)

Such criminal forfeiture statutes do not address grand jury process with respect to forfeiture.

The issue is addressed to some extent by the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Criminal Rule 32.2(b)(4) provides that “upon a party’s request in a case in which a [trial] jury returns a verdict of guilty, the jury must determine whether the government has established the requisite nexus²⁰¹ between the [allegedly forfeitable] property and the offense committed by the defendant.” Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(b)(4). If the defendant has a right to have the trial jury determine if the forfeiture nexus exists, then logic (or at least symmetry) would suggest that the defendant might also have a right to a grand jury probable cause finding on that issue.

However, the drafters of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure decided that only the trial jury would make this determination. While Rule 32.2(b)(4) creates a right, upon timely request, to have the trial jury determine whether the forfeiture nexus exists, no such determination is assigned to the grand jury. Both Rule 32.2(a) and Rule 7(c)(2) speak only in terms of the indictment’s providing notice of forfeiture. This distinction is by design. The 1972 Advisory Committee Note to the then-new Rule 7(c)(2) explained the following:

Under the common law, in a criminal forfeiture proceeding the defendant was apparently entitled to notice, trial, and a special jury finding on the factual issues surrounding the declaration of forfeiture which followed his criminal conviction. Subdivision (c)(2) provides for notice. Changes in rules 31 and 32 provide for a special jury finding and for a judgment authorizing the Attorney General to seize the interest or property forfeited.

Thus, the Rules Committee, well aware of common law practice, made a studied decision that Rule 7(c)(2), dealing with the contents of the indictment, would only require notice of

²⁰¹ *Nexus*, used in Rule 32.2 and commonly appearing in scholarly forfeiture briefs, opinions, and legal advice memoranda, is from the Latin verb *nectere*, meaning “to tie.” It simply means “a connection, tie, or link.” *Webster’s New World Dictionary* (3d College Ed. 1988). In the forfeiture context, the “requisite nexus” is the connection between the asset and the crime that must be shown to make the property forfeitable, e.g., that the property is proceeds or derived from proceeds of the crime.

forfeiture, while Rule 31, dealing with jury verdicts at trial, required only the trial jury to return a special forfeiture verdict.²⁰²

This construction is supported by the 2000 Advisory Committee note upon the adoption of Rule 32.2(a). The note makes clear that an indictment alleging forfeiture need not itemize any particular forfeitable assets: “As courts have held, subdivision (a) is not intended to require that an itemized list of the property to be forfeited appear in the indictment or information itself.” Advisory Committee Note to 2000 Adoption of Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(a) (also noting “trend in case law” interpreting Rule 7(c)(2) as not requiring detailed description of property subject to forfeiture, or defendant’s interest in such property). Because the rules do not require that the indictment list the particular forfeitable property at all, they cannot reasonably be construed as requiring the grand jury to make findings about any such property.

3. Although the Constitution, statutes, and rules do not require a grand jury finding of probable cause for forfeiture, the best practice is to request such a finding

Although neither the Constitution, nor the forfeiture statutes, nor the rules require it, it is best to ask the grand jury to find that there is probable cause to believe that the requisite nexus exists between the offenses charged in the indictment and the assets allegedly subject to criminal forfeiture, at least in cases where the indictment identifies specific forfeitable property or a specific amount due as a forfeiture money judgment.

Such a finding serves several useful purposes.

First, the finding provides a basis for restraining directly forfeitable assets identified in the indictment.²⁰³ Section 853(e)(1)(A) provides for entry of a post-indictment restraining order “upon the filing of an indictment or information charging a violation...for which criminal forfeiture may be ordered...and alleging that the property with respect to which the

²⁰² The decision to require a special forfeiture finding only by the trial jury was made even though the Rules Committee assumed in 1972—contrary to the holding of *Libretti* decades later—that the amount of the interest or property subject to criminal forfeiture was “an element of the offense to be alleged and proved.” Advisory Committee Note to 1972 Amendment to Fed. R. Crim. P. 31(e). The reference to forfeiture was deleted from Rule 31 in 2000 in light of the creation that year of Rule 32.2, covering most aspects of criminal forfeiture procedure. Rule 32.2(b) was specifically intended to replace the special verdict requirement of Rule 31(e), a requirement that generated confusion over the scope of the determination to be made by the trial jury. Rule 32.2(b) provides instead that the court, or the jury upon a request by the Government or the defendant, must determine whether the Government has established the requisite nexus for forfeiture. *See* Advisory Committee Note to 2000 Adoption of Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(b).

²⁰³ Identified substitute assets may also be restrained in the Fourth Circuit. *In re Assets of Billman*, 915 F.2d 916, 919, 920-21 (4th Cir. 1990).

order is sought would, in the event of conviction, be subject to forfeiture under this section.” Section 853(e)(1)(A). The legislative history of section 853 indicates that Congress intended for the grand jury’s finding in support of forfeiture to be given considerable weight:

For the purposes of issuing a restraining order, the probable cause established in the indictment or information is to be determinative of any issue regarding the merits of the government’s case on which the forfeiture is to be based.

S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Cong., 2d Sess. 203 (1984), reprinted in 1984 U.S. Code Cong. & Administrative News 3182, 3386.

Although section 853 provides that the court “may” enter a post-indictment restraining order upon the Government’s application, suggesting a certain amount of discretion, the Supreme Court in *United States v. Monsanto*, 491 U.S. 600, 612-13 (1989), made it clear that Government applications for such orders should generally be granted, ruling that it was error to import “traditional principles of equity” and equitable balancing tests into the process of issuing and reviewing forfeiture restraining orders:

This reading seriously misapprehends the nature of the provisions in question. As we have said, § 853(a) is categorical.... Under § 853(e)(1), the trial court “may” enter a restraining order if the United States requests it, but not otherwise, and it is not required to enter such an order if a bond or some other means to “preserve the availability of property described in subsection (a) of this section for forfeiture” is employed. Thus, § 853(e)(1)(A) is plainly aimed at implementing the commands of § 853(a) and cannot sensibly be construed to give the district court discretion to permit the dissipation of the very property that § 853(a) requires be forfeited upon conviction.

...Whatever discretion Congress gave the district courts in §§ 853(e) and 853(c), that discretion must be cabined by the purposes for which Congress created it: “to preserve the availability of property...for forfeiture.” We cannot believe that Congress intended to permit the effectiveness of the powerful “relation-back” provision of § 853(c), and the comprehensive “any property...any proceeds” language of § 853(a), to be nullified by any other construction of the statute.

This result may seem harsh, but we have little doubt that it is the one that the statute mandates. Section 853(c) states that “[a]ll right, title, and interest in [forfeitable] property...vests in the United States upon the commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture.” Permitting a defendant to use assets for his private purposes that, under this provision, will become the property of the United States if a conviction occurs cannot be sanctioned.

Monsanto, 491 U.S. at 612-13.

Most circuits deciding the issue have concluded that such post-indictment restraining orders may be entered *ex parte*, with no prerestraint hearing. *United States v. Jones*, 160 F.3d 641, 647-49 (10th Cir. 1998) (pretrial restraints may be imposed *ex parte*); *United States v. Jenkins*, 974 F.2d 32, 35-36 (5th Cir. 1992) (no due process violation where post-indictment restraining order was entered *ex parte*); *United States v. Monsanto*, 924 F.2d 1186, 1192-93 (2d Cir. 1991) (unanimous en banc court on remand from Supreme Court) (strong Government interests and exigent circumstances in forfeiture context justify imposition of pretrial restraints without prerestraint hearing); *United States v. Bissell*, 866 F.2d 1343, 1352 (11th Cir. 1989) (no right to prerestraint hearing, citing *Calero-Toledo v. Pearson Yacht Leasing Co.*, 416 U.S. 663, 683 (1974) [upholding *ex parte* seizure of personal property]); *United States v. Moya Gomez*, 860 F.2d 706, 727-28 (7th Cir. 1989) (quoting legislative history to effect that post-indictment restraining order does not require prior notice or opportunity for hearing); *id.* at 730 (holding statutory scheme unconstitutional only to limited extent that it does not provide for *post*-restraint hearing before trial); *United States v. Spilotro*, 680 F.2d 612, 617 (9th Cir. 1982) (forfeiture under exigent circumstances creates exception to predeprivation hearing rule, citing *Calero-Toledo*); *but see United States v. Melrose East Subdivision*, 357 F.3d 492, 499 n.3 (5th Cir. 2004) (leaving question of prerestraint hearing in criminal cases open, but noting authority that due process does not require prerestraint hearing for post-indictment restraining orders); *United States v. Kirschenbaum*, 156 F.3d 784, 792-93 (7th Cir. 1998) (suggesting in *dicta* that issue whether due process requires prerestraint hearing is “difficult” and “close,” but not reaching issue); *United States v. Riley*, 78 F.3d 367, 370 (8th Cir. 1996) (declaring preconviction restraints “extreme” measures that may only be imposed where Government demonstrates “at a hearing” that defendant is likely guilty and property to be restrained will be subject to forfeiture upon conviction). *Cf. United States v. Hernandez-Escarsega*, 886 F.2d 1560 (9th Cir. 1989) (in deciding whether probable cause supported issuance of search warrant, magistrate judge entitled to consider that grand jury recently returned an indictment against the subjects of the search).

Second, the grand jury’s finding of a probable nexus between the property and the offense may be accorded deference in subsequent proceedings where probable cause is at issue, including challenges to pretrial restraint of assets allegedly needed to pay a defendant’s attorney’s fees. One circuit views the grand jury’s finding of probable cause as sufficient to satisfy the Government’s burden to uphold restraints under section 853(e)(1)(A) until trial. *See United States v. Bollin*, 264 F.3d 391, 421 (4th Cir. 2001) (citing *In re Assets of Billman*, 915 F.2d 915, 919 (4th Cir. 1990)). Although “the indictment itself establishes the merits of the government’s case” for purposes of post-indictment restraints, other circuits recognize that in extreme situations, due process may require inquiry even into matters decided by the grand jury. *United States v. Real Property in Waterboro*, 64 F.3d 752, 755-56 (1st Cir. 1995);

see United States v. Monsanto, 924 F.2d at 1191 (due process requires post-restraint hearing where assets needed for attorney's fees are involved).

The recent trend in the law is to continue post-indictment restraints based upon the grand jury's finding of probable cause unless and until the defendant establishes both (1) an actual need for the restrained assets for, among other important purposes, attorney's fees or living expenses, and (2) that there is some substantial evidence that the assets are not forfeitable. *See United States v. Jones*, 160 F.3d 641, 647-48 (10th Cir. 1998) (defendant challenging pretrial restraint of assets alleged to be forfeitable has initial burden of showing that she has no funds other than the restrained assets to hire private counsel or to pay living expenses, and that there is bona fide reason to believe restraining order should not have been entered); *United States v. Farmer*, 274 F.3d 800, 804-05 (4th Cir. 2001) (defendant entitled to pretrial hearing if property is seized for civil forfeiture and defendant demonstrates no other assets are available; following *Jones*).

Third, the grand jury's finding of probable cause is arguably sufficient to trigger the bar on intervention by third parties set forth in section 853(k)(2). Section 853(k)(2) prevents persons claiming interest in allegedly forfeitable property from

commenc[ing] an action at law or equity against the United States concerning the validity of his alleged interest in the property *subsequent to the filing of an indictment or information alleging that the property is subject to forfeiture* under this section.

21 U.S.C. § 853(k)(2) (emphasis added).

That the indictment alleges that property is subject to forfeiture indicates that the grand jury has made a probable cause determination. If the indictment only gives notice of forfeiture rather than alleging that particular property is forfeitable, and no explicit probable cause finding is included in the notice, then arguably the filing of the indictment would not bar collateral litigation over the property.

Fourth, that the grand jury has found probable cause to believe certain property is forfeitable, or to believe the defendant is liable for a certain forfeiture money judgment amount, increases the impact of the actual notice of forfeitability received by a hypothetical reasonable attorney or third party upon learning of the indictment. Such notice affects the ability of any such persons to continue to receive or retain forfeitable property of the defendant as "bona fide purchasers...reasonably without cause to believe that the property [is] subject to forfeiture." *See* sections 853(c) and (n)(6)(B); *United States v. McCorkle*, 321 F.3d 1292, 1295 n.4 (11th Cir. 2003) (attorney may lose bona fide purchaser status as to

advance fee received from client “because the client is indicted and the attorney learns additional information about his client’s guilt”); *see also Caplin & Drysdale, Chartered v. United States*, 491 U.S. 617, 632 n.10 (1989) (“the only way a lawyer could be a beneficiary of section 853(n)(6)(B)’s bona fide purchaser provision] would be to fail to read the indictment of his client”).

Fifth, the grand jury’s probable cause finding may help insulate case agents and prosecutors from subsequent liability under *Bivens*²⁰⁴ or the Hyde Amendment.²⁰⁵ The grand jury’s probable cause determination is at least some evidence tending to negate any inference that an action was commenced without probable cause. *See, e.g., Robinson v. Cattaraugus County*, 147 F.3d 153, 163 (2d Cir. 1998) (in malicious prosecution action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, district court did not err in instructing that grand jury’s probable cause determination was evidence that trial jury could consider in deciding whether prosecution was commenced without probable cause).

Finally, the practice of presenting forfeiture evidence to the grand jury, listing particular forfeitable assets in the indictment, and requesting that the grand jury find probable cause for forfeiture of those assets should help to defend indictments against future challenge if *Blakely* is ultimately construed or extended to apply to criminal forfeiture and to require that the facts supporting forfeiture of particular assets be charged in the indictment and proven to the trial jury beyond a reasonable doubt.

For all of these reasons, prosecutors should ask the grand jury to find probable cause to believe that the requisite nexus exists between the crimes charged and any particular property or money judgment amount alleged to be forfeitable.

4. It is not necessary to ask the grand jury to determine the defendant’s interest in forfeitable property

A separate issue is whether the prosecutor should also ask the grand jury to find probable cause to believe that “the defendant (or some combination of defendants [charged] in the case) had an interest in the property that is forfeitable under the applicable statute.” *See Fed. R. Crim. P. 32.2(c)(2)*. Unlike the forfeiture nexus, this issue is not even presented to the *trial* jury. Indeed, the court itself only reaches the issue of the defendant’s interest in forfeitable property in cases where no ancillary claims to the property are filed. Moreover, unlike the nexus finding, which serves the various useful purposes outlined above, a finding of probable

²⁰⁴ *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

²⁰⁵ Pub. L. No. 105-119, § 617, 111 Stat. 2440, 2519 (1997) (reprinted in 18 U.S.C. § 3006A, historical and statutory notes).

cause to believe that the defendant has an interest in particular property serves no comparable purpose in most cases. Therefore, it does not make sense to present this issue to the grand jury.²⁰⁶

Nonetheless, in cases where the defendant has attempted to conceal an interest in property subject to forfeiture, it may be important to the grand jury's understanding of the case—and its ability to make necessary findings as to elements of charged offenses—to present evidence concerning the defendant's actual, although hidden, interest in forfeitable property. For example, in a case where the defendant acquires or transfers property in such a way as to “conceal or disguise the nature, the location, the source, the ownership, or the control” of criminal proceeds in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i), the prosecutor may be required to present evidence to the grand jury tending to show that the defendant in fact had ownership or control of the property involved in such a transaction.

In any event, because only property of the defendant can be forfeited in a criminal case, the prosecutor should make reasonable efforts to establish that any property alleged to be forfeitable, and particularly property sought to be restrained as forfeitable, is property of the defendants within the meaning of the applicable forfeiture statutes, including section 853(c), which voids purported post-crime transfers of forfeitable property other than to bona fide purchasers for value reasonably without cause to believe the property was subject to forfeiture.

5. Presenting forfeiture evidence to the grand jury

Just as most trial evidence relating to forfeiture is usually best, and most easily, presented as an integral part of the overall presentation of the Government's case-in-chief, most grand jury evidence bearing on forfeiture is best, and most easily, presented as an integral part of the evidence establishing probable cause to charge the underlying criminal offenses. Questions about assets and their links to criminal activity should be asked of all witnesses likely to have such knowledge, during both lengthy grand jury investigations and the more abbreviated presentations appropriate to cases investigated primarily outside of the grand jury.

²⁰⁶ The present wording of Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(2), to the effect that no criminal judgment of forfeiture may be entered unless the indictment or the information provides notice “that the defendant *has an interest* in property” subject to forfeiture, might raise doubts about this conclusion, if not for the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 7(c)(2) explaining that the rule is meant to be read together with Rule 32.2, which provides that no findings need be made with respect to the defendant's interest in forfeitable property until after entry of a preliminary order of forfeiture, and even then only by the court, and only if no ancillary claims are filed. See Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Crim. P. 7 (2000) (changes made to reflect Rule 32.2), (2002) (subsequent changes to Rule 7(c)(2) intended to be stylistic only).

When this practice is followed, a case agent or other government witness can be brought in shortly before an indictment is returned to summarize previous testimony and documentary evidence bearing on forfeiture. In addition to reminding the grand jury of such previously presented evidence, the summary witness should be prepared to present any additional documents and information necessary to calculate the amount of any proposed forfeiture money judgment and identify and describe any particular assets to be alleged as forfeitable in the proposed indictment. It is usually best to have previously marked asset-related documents—such as certified copies of public real estate, business, and vehicle registration and title records, authentic photographs of major assets, and stipulated or authenticated bank and other financial account statements—available for examination by the grand jury during its consideration of the proposed indictment, including the forfeiture allegations.

Even if forfeiture has not been an ongoing focus of the investigation, the evidence necessary to establish the required link between the charged offenses and the particular forfeitable assets to be listed in the indictment can usually be presented by a government agent witness in a simple and straightforward manner, not requiring much grand jury time. The focus in such a presentation, as in the summary presentation described above, should be upon (1) the facts that identify the assets with particularity, and (2) the facts that make the assets forfeitable under all applicable theories of forfeiture—e.g., facts indicating that the assets “constitute, or were derived from, proceeds” of the offenses; that the assets were “used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission” of the offenses; that the assets constitute “property, real or personal, involved in” the offenses or “property traceable to such property,” etc. *See, e.g.,* section 853(a) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(1).

6. Instructing the grand jury on forfeiture

If it is consistent with local practice to do so, the prosecutor may explain to the grand jury preliminarily that (1) forfeiture is not a substantive offense, or an element of an offense, but rather a required part of the punishment imposed upon conviction for certain criminal offenses; (2) the forfeiture allegations in the proposed indictment will put the defendant on notice that the Government is seeking to forfeit certain property, or types of property, upon the defendant’s conviction; and (3) the Government will seek to forfeit substitute assets of the

defendant if some act or omission of the defendant makes the directly forfeitable property unavailable.²⁰⁷

The prosecutor should then instruct the grand jury with respect to the links that must be found to exist between the charged offenses and the assets alleged to be forfeitable. Generally, this may be done by reading and explaining the pertinent parts of the applicable forfeiture statutes, explaining how each listed asset falls within one or more of the forfeiture provisions, and explaining the basis for calculating or estimating the amount to be alleged as a forfeiture money judgment.

Finally, if the grand jurors have no questions about the forfeiture instructions, the prosecutor should ask the grand jury, during its process of considering the entire indictment, to find probable cause to believe that the listed assets have the required links to the charged offenses and that there is a factual basis for the alleged money judgment amount.

7. Memorializing and describing the grand jury's probable cause finding

As explained in section II.B.3 at page 160, there are several good reasons for asking the grand jury to find probable cause for forfeiture of particular assets. If the grand jury was actually asked to make such a finding in the course of its deliberations on the indictment, prosecutors may properly represent to the court, in connection with an application for a post-indictment restraining order or otherwise, that the grand jury has found probable cause to believe that the requisite forfeiture nexus exists with respect to the money judgment amount and any other property listed in the indictment as forfeitable.

To make the grand jury's probable cause finding readily accessible for seeking and defending pretrial restraints and the other purposes described in section II.B.3 at page 160, it is a good practice to memorialize the finding in the indictment itself. There are several ways to accomplish this.

²⁰⁷ Some districts have found it useful to cover these points in an introductory presentation to the grand jury outlining forfeiture law and procedures, as part of the grand jury's orientation during the first few weeks after a new grand jury is empaneled. This can be done by the district's forfeiture AUSA, who is in the best position to cover these issues and to address the grand jurors' questions. The orientation session also provides the prosecutor with the opportunity to explain to the grand jury that forfeiting the defendant's interest in a piece of property does not end the matter, but that an ancillary proceeding is held after a preliminary order of forfeiture is entered to allow third parties who claim to have an interest in the property to petition the court to establish that interest. While that issue is of no direct concern to the grand jurors in their deliberations, it is helpful that they understand that the Government is not seeking to forfeit the property of owners with superior interests to that of the defendant or property belonging to innocent bona fide purchasers of the property.

The grand jury finding as to forfeitability may be set forth in the indictment in a way that simply parallels the presentation of the other substantive charges and allegations in the indictment as to which the grand jury also found probable cause. Practices vary from district to district with respect to whether phrases like “The grand jury charges” appear only at the beginning of the indictment or repeatedly, e.g., “The grand jury further charges”, at the beginning of each count. In either case, introducing the forfeiture allegations in the same way as the substantive counts makes it reasonably plain on the face of the indictment that the grand jury has made a probable cause determination with respect to the entire indictment, including the forfeiture allegations.

In a district where there is frequent litigation over pretrial restraints, the prosecutor may wish to give special emphasis to the grand jury’s finding of probable cause for forfeiture of particular assets by making that finding explicit in the text of the indictment: “The grand jury further finds probable cause to believe that upon conviction of the offense[s] in violation of _____ set forth in Count[s] [##] of this Indictment/Information, the defendant[s], [NAME(S)], shall forfeit to the United States of America, pursuant to ___ U.S.C. ___, all [insert statutory language], including, without limitation, \$ _____ in United States currency and the following other particular assets: _____.” If this approach is used, it should be used consistently to avoid any negative implication that a grand jury returning an indictment with no such explicit finding did *not* find probable cause for forfeiture.

In districts that use the convention of merely giving notice of forfeiture in indictments rather than alleging forfeiture in forfeiture allegations or charging forfeiture in a forfeiture count, it is best practice to include an explicit probable cause finding of forfeitability in the notice section. Doing so will counter any possible implication or argument that the forfeiture notice was merely appended to the indictment without grand jury consideration and determination of probable cause.

Chapter 10

International Forfeiture

I. Background

Federal law enforcement should give priority to pursuing forfeitable assets beyond the borders of the United States. Federal investigators and prosecutors who seek to restrain and forfeit illicit assets located abroad should seek the advice of one of the attorneys in the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section's (AFMLS's) International Unit (IU) at 202-514-1263. It is advisable to make this contact as soon as foreign assets that might become subject to a U.S. forfeiture judgment are identified by the investigator or prosecutor. The extent and speed of forfeiture assistance can vary greatly depending upon treaty obligations and the operation of foreign domestic law. International requests for legal assistance can touch upon diplomatically sensitive issues and may require coordination with foreign or other domestic investigations. AFMLS IU attorneys will help guide you through this often complicated process.

II. Importance of Reciprocal Cooperation

The Department gives high priority to requests by foreign countries for assistance in restraining, forfeiting, and repatriating assets found in the United States that are traceable to violations of foreign law. We can expect cooperation from foreign governments in our efforts to forfeit and repatriate assets found abroad in U.S. cases only if we reciprocate in a timely and effective manner. Additionally, it is important for the United States to act on these incoming requests so that it is not perceived as a haven for foreign criminal proceeds. AFMLS IU attorneys can offer advice and assistance with the execution of incoming forfeiture requests and, in consultation with the Office of International Affairs (OIA), will attempt to channel incoming foreign requests for forfeiture assistance to established forfeiture contacts within each district.

III. Policy on International Contacts

It has long been the policy of the Department of Justice that all incoming and outgoing international contacts by prosecutors in criminal justice matters be coordinated with and through OIA. OIA is the channel through which the United States must make all formal requests to foreign governments for legal assistance. Federal prosecutors should adhere to established procedures for international contacts and should not contact foreign officials

directly on case matters unless such contacts have been approved by, are under the supervision of, or are in consultation with OIA. Often, OIA will permit prosecutors to have direct contact with foreign officials provided OIA is copied on or informed about all the relevant communications. Federal investigators and prosecutors should consult with OIA regarding the official policy on contact with foreign officials.

IV. Foreign Property Management Issues

Non-fungible assets located abroad may present unique property management issues. Federal prosecutors and investigators should keep in mind that although many countries are willing to restrain or seize assets in support of U.S. forfeiture efforts, some countries lack the resources, experience, or a legal regime that allows for adequate property management pending the resolution of the U.S. forfeiture proceeding. Certain property located abroad may require post-seizure or post-restraint preservation or management, and this will require extensive pre-seizure planning. Foreign governments may be willing to assume responsibility of preserving assets, or they may ask the United States to do so, and the United States or the foreign government may need to hire, or legally appoint, guardians, monitors, trustees, or managers for certain assets. Prosecutors should be aware that the costs of storing, maintaining, and disposing of certain assets such as vehicles, vessels, or aircraft in a foreign country may—in protracted international forfeiture cases—exceed the value of the asset itself.

When faced with the seizure of non-fungible assets abroad that may require management, a federal prosecutor or investigator should contact the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) at 202-307-9009. The USMS, if needed, may enlist the assistance of the Diplomatic Security Services, which has been cross-designated by the USMS to provide property management services for property restrained or seized abroad. In cases where the lead law enforcement agency is a Department of Treasury or Department of Homeland Security agency, the federal prosecutor or investigator should contact the Department of Treasury, Executive Office of Asset Forfeiture (TEOAF) at 202-622-9600. Finally, as is true with the forfeiture of businesses located in the United States, AFMLS must be consulted before the United States asks a foreign government to restrain or seize an ongoing business or its assets or to appoint or hire a guardian, monitor, trustee, or manager for same.

V. Publication of Notice Abroad

In civil forfeiture proceedings, the United States will be required to provide notice by publication as set forth in Rule G of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty or Maritime Claims and Asset Forfeiture Actions. When forfeitable property is located abroad, Rule G(4)(a)(iv)(B) allows the Government to choose to publish notice in “a newspaper generally

circulated in a district where the action is filed, in a newspaper generally circulated in the country where the property is located, or in legal notices published and generally circulated in the country where the property is located” or under Rule G(4)(a)(iv)(C) on the Government Internet forfeiture site. Rule G is quite new, and accordingly, the appropriateness of publishing notice in the district where the action is filed rather than the foreign country where the property is located is not yet firmly established in the law. Depending on the facts of the case, in cases where the property subject to forfeiture is located abroad, and the potential claimants are not all in the United States, it may be appropriate to publish notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the country where the assets are restrained or seized or via legal notices in that country where known potential claimants are located, and do so in the appropriate foreign language. However, publication on the Internet forfeiture site may be preferable if publication in the foreign country is not practicable or is cost prohibitive.

Publication abroad should be requested in the manner and format that complies with the requirements of domestic publication and, as much as is possible, in the manner requested by the foreign government providing assistance with the publication. Some foreign governments will assist with publication, while other governments allow us to make our own arrangements. In many instances, we can rely upon U.S. law enforcement attachés stationed in foreign countries to arrange for publication. Some foreign governments will not assist the United States with publication but still require that we obtain permission before we publish in their jurisdiction. Other countries do not want publication in their country done at all. Typically, the United States pays for any publication abroad. An AFMLS IU attorney should be consulted to ascertain a foreign government’s preferences when it comes to notice by publication in a foreign country before attempting publication in that country.

VI. Consultation With AFMLS or OIA When Seeking Repatriation of Forfeitable Assets Located Abroad

In cases where a foreign government has restrained or seized assets based upon a formal U.S. request, the prosecutor and investigators should consult an AFMLS IU attorney or the OIA attorney handling the case before seeking repatriation of those assets. AFMLS IU attorneys, in consultation with OIA, usually are aware of foreign legal constraints in connection with the repatriation of forfeitable assets, as well as any sensibilities against repatriation that select foreign governments have and, therefore, must be consulted before any action to repatriate such frozen assets is taken. Repatriation of frozen assets will require that the foreign restraint order be lifted, which can only be done with the consent of the appropriate foreign country. In some cases, it may not be possible to lift the foreign restraint simply by resolving the U.S. matter; for example, in jurisdictions that have mandatory prosecution laws. *See* discussion in section XI at page 179.

Further, federal prosecutors and investigators should always consult with an AFMLS IU or an OIA attorney before entering into an agreement with a defendant to repatriate criminally derived assets from abroad even when not restrained by the foreign government before seeking an order actually compelling the repatriation of specific assets pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(e)(4). First, the property at issue may be subject to domestic proceedings in the foreign jurisdiction. Second, certain countries deem another government's efforts at repatriating assets located in that country's jurisdiction to be a violation of that country's sovereignty, and in rare instances, deem any persons who instigate or are involved in that process to be involved in a criminal offense such as money laundering. In addition, although many countries often do not object to a negotiated voluntary repatriation of assets and allow such transfers to occur as part of a plea or settlement agreement, these countries often will object to court-ordered repatriations because they regard such a "coercive measure" to violate a person's civil rights under the laws of that foreign state. Other countries take the position that a failure to inform them of forfeitable assets located in their jurisdiction is a violation of specific treaty obligations. Finally, in matters where the United States previously asked a foreign government to restrain an asset, a voluntary repatriation obviously will require the lifting of the foreign restraint, which, although legally permissible, may subject the foreign jurisdiction to unintended legal liabilities under the foreign law, such as attorney's fees.

VII. Probable Cause Finding to Seize or Restrain Assets Abroad

Historically, the United States has made formal requests to foreign governments to seize and restrain assets for forfeiture pursuant to multilateral treaties, Mutual Legal Assistance Treaties (MLATs), letters rogatory, and letters of request without first obtaining a finding of probable cause in the United States. One federal district court case, *Kim v. Department of Justice*,²⁰⁸ however, holds that such a finding is required. Since that decision was rendered, in the exercise of caution, OIA advises prosecutors seeking the seizure or restraint of property abroad to first obtain a probable cause finding regarding the property in question before asking OIA to make the request.²⁰⁹ Without conceding that the *Kim* case was correctly

²⁰⁸ No. CV 05-3155 ABC (FMOx) (C.D. Cal. July 11, 2005) (unpublished). See also *Collelo v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 908 F. Supp. 738 (C.D. Cal. 1995), on which the *Kim* court heavily relied.

²⁰⁹ Under rare circumstances, OIA may authorize a prosecutor to move forward with a treaty request to seize or restrain assets abroad without the prosecutor first obtaining a finding of probable cause.

decided, we note that there are a number of ways listed below to obtain such a probable cause finding.²¹⁰

A. Background

In *Kim v. U.S. Department of Justice*, the U.S. Attorney for the Central District of California was conducting an investigation involving a fraud perpetrated in that district. In the course of the investigation, an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) asked OIA to request the Swiss government to restrain funds of a U.S. citizen held in a Swiss bank account. OIA made the request under the applicable mutual legal assistance treaty (MLAT), and the Swiss complied.²¹¹

The account holder then filed a motion under Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for an injunction directing the United States to withdraw its MLAT request and to ask the Swiss to release the funds. In support of his motion, the account holder argued that the MLAT request and subsequent restraint violated his Fourth Amendment rights because they were made without a finding of probable cause to believe that the restrained funds were subject to forfeiture as the proceeds of an offense.

The United States made three arguments in response: (1) that the Fourth Amendment does not apply to the restraint of funds overseas pursuant to an MLAT request because the foreign government, not the United States, actually restrains the funds; (2) that even if the

²¹⁰ OIA will consider making a formal request without a probable cause determination where the assets located in a foreign state are held by a person “with no voluntary attachment to the United States.” *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259 (1990). If the facts support this conclusion, the prosecutor should discuss this possibility with OIA.

²¹¹ The MLAT request provided sufficient facts to assure Swiss authorities that U.S. authorities had “reasonable suspicion that acts have been committed which constitute the elements of” the offenses for which the MLAT request sought assistance. Article 1(2) of the MLAT requires that the requesting state (here, the United States) make such a showing to the requested state (here, Switzerland). The showing required to trigger assistance under the MLAT as between the treaty partners neither alters nor substitutes for any showing U.S. authorities are required to make to a U.S. court to satisfy any applicable Fourth Amendment requirements. As expressed in the Technical Analysis to the MLAT:

The “reasonable suspicion” standard is less stringent than the “probable cause” standard *applicable in the United States for the issuance of arrest and search warrants*. (Emphasis added.)

The MLAT standard was intended to set the threshold showing for securing assistance from the treaty partner (e.g., compelling testimony and production of evidence) at a reasonably low level so that the treaty partners could expect assistance early in an investigation. As stated in the Technical Analysis to the MLAT:

[The “reasonable suspicion” standard] permits the verification of suspected offenses, which is one of the principal purposes of the Treaty.

Fourth Amendment applies, the applicable clause is the “reasonableness” clause (the right of the people to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures) and not the “probable cause” clause (no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause); and (3) even if the probable cause standard (rather than the reasonableness standard) were applied, the requirement was satisfied because courts in California had previously issued two seizure warrants for other property in the United States in the same case.

The district court rejected all three arguments and granted the account holder’s request for the injunction. First, the court said that the Government could not hide behind the actions of the Swiss government because in this case the Swiss were not engaged in a joint venture, conducting their own investigation based on evidence provided by the United States, but instead were merely acting as the agent of the United States pursuant to the treaty. Therefore, the Fourth Amendment applied.

Second, under the Fourth Amendment, the seizure or restraint of a bank account requires a finding of probable cause, not merely reasonable suspicion. Because a treaty cannot override the requirements of the Fourth Amendment, it was irrelevant that the treaty required a showing of reasonable suspicion and nothing more.²¹²

Finally, the court held that the Government could not rely on the finding of probable cause in connection with the two seizure warrants issued in the same case because those warrants related to other property, not the property restrained in the Swiss bank account. A probable cause finding has two parts: probable cause to believe that a crime was committed and probable cause to believe that the property in question was derived from that crime. The findings made in connection with the other warrants may have established probable cause with respect to the commission of the offense, but said nothing about the nexus between the funds in Switzerland and that offense.

Accordingly, the court concluded that the Government’s MLAT request violated the Constitution and should be enjoined.

B. Discussion

The following discussion sets forth the alternative ways in which a probable cause finding can be obtained before making a request of a foreign government to seize or restrain assets for forfeiture. Nothing in this section is intended to suggest that such a probable cause finding

²¹² The court correctly held that the MLAT cannot override constitutional requirements. The court incorrectly imputed that motive to the Government’s negotiated reasonable suspicion standard in the MLAT. More fundamentally incorrect, in OIA’s view, is the court’s determination that seeking a freeze pursuant to the MLAT requires a probable cause determination, presumably (1) by a U.S. court (2) before OIA makes the request.

is necessary other than as a matter of policy while the issues discussed in *Kim v. Department of Justice* are litigated in the appellate courts.²¹³

1. Civil forfeiture cases

In a civil forfeiture case, the first option is to obtain a civil forfeiture seizure warrant for the property pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(b) based upon a finding of probable cause by a judge or magistrate judge. This can be done on an ex parte basis. Section 981(b) applies to all civil forfeitures under section 981(a) (the general forfeiture statute for most federal crimes), 21 U.S.C. § 881(a) (the civil forfeiture statute for drug offenses), and any other forfeiture statute that contains language incorporating the procedures in chapter 46 of title 18 of the U.S. code, such as the alien smuggling provisions in 8 U.S.C. § 1324(b).²¹⁴ Accordingly, section 981(b) is available as a means of obtaining a probable cause finding in the vast majority of federal civil forfeiture actions; however, where a statute does not incorporate section 981(b), the prosecutor will have to make sure that there is an alternative statutory basis for the precomplaint seizure of the foreign property on a related finding of probable cause.

The second option is to wait until a civil forfeiture complaint is filed and then obtain an arrest warrant in rem from the district court (as opposed to the clerk of the court). Supplemental Rule G(3)(b)(ii) and (c)(iv) require a probable cause finding by a judge or magistrate judge before any arrest warrant in rem is issued for property that is not already in the custody of the Government, and provide for sending the warrant to a foreign country if the property is located abroad. Accordingly, obtaining an arrest warrant in rem under Rule G will be the preferred means of obtaining the required probable cause finding in support of MLAT requests in most civil forfeiture cases in which a forfeiture complaint has been filed.

Finally, whether or not a complaint has been filed, the Government may ask the court to issue a restraining order pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 983(j). A restraining order may be issued on an ex parte basis. Restraining orders may only be issued upon a showing of probable cause—usually in the form of an affidavit submitted along with the application for the

²¹³ OIA will consider making a formal request without a probable cause determination where the assets located in a foreign state are held by a person “with no voluntary attachment to the United States.” *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259 (1990). If the facts support this conclusion, the prosecutor should discuss this possibility with OIA.

²¹⁴ See also 18 U.S.C. § 1594 (forfeiture provisions for human trafficking).

order.²¹⁵ Thus, the issuance of a restraining order will constitute the probable cause finding required to support the MLAT request.

2. Criminal cases

If a pending indictment contains a criminal forfeiture allegation relating to property located abroad, and the grand jury has made a finding of probable cause to believe that the property listed in the indictment is subject to forfeiture, the indictment itself will serve as the necessary probable cause finding for purposes of the MLAT request. Alternatively, once the indictment is returned, the Government may obtain a post-indictment ex parte restraining order pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(e). Such a restraining order requires a finding of probable cause; therefore, the issuance of the restraining order will also provide the necessary probable cause determination.

The restraining order may be obtained in either of two ways: if the property is specifically listed in the indictment, most courts hold that the grand jury's finding of probable cause will be sufficient to support the issuance of a restraining order without any further submission by the Government.²¹⁶ However, unless the foreign authority has requested a restraining order to use in its proceeding, it should not be necessary for purposes of complying with Kim to obtain such an order where the property was listed in the indictment. Alternatively, if the property is not specifically listed in the indictment but is named in a bill of particulars, the Government may support its application for the restraining order with a probable cause affidavit.²¹⁷

The legal authority for the issuance of a criminal seizure warrant against foreign based property is unclear. Section 853(f) authorizes an AUSA to obtain a seizure warrant from the court in the same manner as a search warrant under Rule 41, and section 853(l) provides that a federal court has “jurisdiction to enter orders as provided in this section *without regard to the location of any property which may be subject to forfeiture.*” Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules Criminal Procedure arguably limits the international reach of criminal search and seizure warrants. Rule 41 permits a federal court to issue warrants for foreign-based property,

²¹⁵ See *United States v. Melrose East Subdivision*, 357 F.3d 493 (5th Cir. 2004) (applying the probable cause requirement in *United States v. Monsanto*, 491 U.S. 600 (1989), to section 983(j)(1)(A)). Form applications for post-complaint restraining orders are available on the AFMLS Web site. See, e.g., forms CIV1612 and CIV1613.

²¹⁶ See *United States v. Jamieson*, 427 F.3d 394, 405 (6th Cir. 2005) (initial issuance of restraining order may be based on grand jury's finding of probable cause); *United States v. Bollin*, 264 F.3d 391, 421 (4th Cir. 2001) (the grand jury's finding of probable cause is sufficient to satisfy the Government's burden).

²¹⁷ See forms CRM1104-09 for use in obtaining a post-indictment restraining order.

but only in domestic and international terrorism investigations, and not for any other types of investigations. Fed. R. Crim. P. 41(b)(3). Section 981(b) expressly overrides the conflicting language in Rule 41(b), whereas section 853(l) does not.

Additionally, section 853(f) is not as broad as the corresponding authority for civil seizure warrants under section 981(b). Criminal seizure warrants may only be obtained if it appears that a restraining order would be inadequate to preserve the availability of the property for forfeiture. The actual—as opposed to the constructive—restraint or seizure of property located abroad for U.S. criminal cases rarely, if ever, turns upon the type of U.S. preventive measure obtained. The type of protective measure obtained in the United States or the fact that the Government obtained such an order is usually irrelevant to the outcome of the deliberative process for obtaining a foreign preventive measure on behalf of the United States. Thus, the Government, for the most part, will be unable to present a strong argument to a U.S. court that a Rule 41 seizure warrant will better protect the availability for forfeiture of property located abroad than will a restraining order pursuant to section 853(e), mostly because the foreign government does not execute such orders, but instead obtains and enforces orders obtained pursuant to foreign law. For purposes of satisfying the holding in *Kim* in criminal cases it should always be sufficient to obtain a restraining order rather than risk litigating the scope of Rule 41(b) or trying to satisfy the higher showing needed to get a seizure warrant under section 853(f), or both.

VIII. Approval Process for Section 981(k) Seizure From Correspondent Bank Account

Section 981(k) authorizes the United States to restrain, seize and forfeit property held in bank accounts located outside of the United States by permitting the restraint, seizure, and forfeiture of an equivalent amount of funds from any correspondent/interbank account that the foreign financial institution holds in the United States. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 981(k). It is irrelevant for the purpose of section 981(k) whether the foreign funds to be forfeited ever transited through the foreign bank's U.S. correspondent account that is the subject of the section 981(k) forfeiture effort. Section 981(k) can be used to constructively restrain, seize, and forfeit assets abroad without having to resort to a treaty or letter rogatory request. However, use of this provision must be formally approved by AFMLS and will be approved only in extraordinary cases where the foreign government is unable or unwilling to provide assistance.

Approval to use section 981(k) rests with the chief of AFMLS in consultation with the appropriate officials from OIA, the Department of the Treasury, and the Department of State. Because these stakeholders in the policy issues implicated by the potential use of section

981(k) need an opportunity to review the proposed section 981(k) request to consider its ramifications, formal approval to utilize section 981(k) should be sought well in advance of the intended attempt to restrain or seize assets from any foreign bank's correspondent accounts. Applications requesting approval to use section 981(k) should be submitted in writing to the chief, AFMLS, and presented through the deputy chief of AFMLS' IU, who has responsibility for coordinating the approval process. Sample section 981(k) approval requests can be obtained from the AFMLS IU. Prosecutors should be mindful that requests for authority to use section 981(k) as the basis for forfeiting funds on deposit in accounts located outside the United States will only be approved if there are no other viable means of effecting forfeiture of the foreign property and should be considered only as a last resort. An application will not be approved solely because it is deemed more expedient than using the treaty mechanism.

Section 981(k) requests will be approved only in limited cases, such as when:

- (1) There is no applicable treaty, agreement, or legal process in the foreign nation that would allow it to restrain, seize, or forfeit the target assets for the United States;
- (2) There is a treaty or agreement in force, but the foreign nation does not recognize the U.S. offense that gives rise to forfeiture;
- (3) There is a treaty or agreement in force, and in spite of its treaty obligation, in the past the foreign nation has failed to provide forfeiture assistance, or provided untimely or unsatisfactory forfeiture assistance;
- (4) There is a treaty or agreement in force, but the foreign nation has no domestic enabling legislation that would permit it to fully execute U.S. forfeiture orders or judgments; or
- (5) There is another significant reason that in the view of the stakeholders justifies use of section 981(k), e.g., corruption within the foreign government that may compromise the execution of a treaty request, or the inability to repatriate or return victim money to the United States after forfeiture.

IX. Lack of Administrative Forfeiture Authority for Overseas Property

Forfeiture of assets located abroad must be initiated as part of a pending criminal case or judicial civil forfeiture action. There is no authority under federal law to initiate the

administrative forfeiture of property that is not physically located in the United States or its territories or possessions. Administrative forfeiture, of course, can be pursued against property properly repatriated to the United States pursuant to section VI at page 172, to the extent that there is no other prohibition to forfeiting such property administratively.

X. Consultation for Civil Forfeiture of Property Located Overseas

According to section 9-119.103 of the *U.S. Attorney's Manual* (USAM), AUSAs shall consult with OIA before filing an in rem forfeiture action based on 28 U.S.C. § 1355(b)(2). OIA and AFMLS will determine whether the foreign country where the assets are located can assist in the U.S. action.

XI. Settlements, Plea Agreements, and Attorneys Fees

Federal prosecutors should neither agree to, nor enter into, any settlement or plea agreement affecting assets located abroad and should not make any representation about the availability of assets abroad to pay for legal fees incurred by a defendant without first speaking to an AFMLS IU attorney about the foreign consequences of those decisions. *See, generally*, USAM 9-113.100 *et seq.* and USAM 9-119.200 and 9-119.202. In addition, prosecutors should be aware of limitations on negotiating with fugitives and persons fighting extradition. The policy considerations underlying the consultation and approval procedures that apply to settlement and plea agreements and agreements to use forfeitable funds to pay for attorney's fees apply with even greater force in the international context, particularly in light of the problems inherent in releasing funds held abroad. *See* section VII at page 172. In some cases, a U.S. request to restrain or seize assets will precipitate the initiation of a foreign criminal investigation, as many jurisdictions are required to prosecute all criminal matters brought to their attention. Thus, it may not be possible to make commitments to defendants or claimants regarding the disposition of funds restrained or seized abroad because the funds will remain restrained or seized under foreign law, and the United States has no authority to bind a foreign jurisdiction regarding the disposal of assets made in any U.S. proceedings. In addition, all plea and settlement agreements should include broad waiver and indemnification language that protects both U.S. officials and foreign officials and their governments from any liability for seizing, restraining, or forfeiting assets located abroad. Finally, prosecutors should also get the defendant or claimant to specifically agree to waive any right to attorney's fees under foreign law as well as agree not to oppose any legal action in any foreign jurisdiction related to U.S. forfeiture efforts or any U.S. request for related financial records.

XII. Enforcement of Judgments

With increasing frequency, countries are able to afford full faith and credit to U.S. forfeiture judgments affecting property within their borders. Before transmitting a forfeiture judgment via OIA to another jurisdiction to be given effect, prosecutors should verify that the judgment is final under U.S. law. In other words, the judgment must be final and no longer on appeal, or, where no appeal has been filed, the time for filing an appeal must have expired. These facts should be noted in the legal assistance request to the foreign authority in the jurisdiction where such judgment is to be enforced. In criminal cases, great care should be taken to obtain a final order or judgment of forfeiture. In no case should a preliminary order of forfeiture, which is only valid as to the criminal defendant, be sent to a foreign authority for execution instead of the completed final order of forfeiture. This is particularly true in cases where an asset forfeited to the United States is not in the name of the defendant, where the defendant has a legal spouse or common law spouse, or when another person could claim a valid interest in the forfeited property even if the defendant has agreed to forfeit the asset in a plea or settlement agreement. Prosecutors should be mindful that third parties who did not appear in the U.S. proceedings may still be permitted to challenge enforcement of the U.S. forfeiture orders under foreign law. Thus, when transmitting a U.S. forfeiture judgment for execution in a foreign country, it is always advisable to show the jurisdiction that third parties were provided or sent notice of the forfeiture proceedings, had an opportunity to challenge the forfeiture, and were either unsuccessful in their challenge or failed to avail themselves of the right to contest the forfeiture.

XIII. International Sharing

It is the policy of the United States to encourage international asset sharing and to recognize all foreign assistance that facilitates U.S. forfeitures so far as consistent with U.S. law. International sharing is governed by 18 U.S.C. § 981(i), 21 U.S.C. § 882(e)(1)(E), and 31 U.S.C. § 9703(h)(2), and is often guided by standing international sharing agreements or the subject of a future case-specific forfeiture sharing arrangement to be negotiated by AFMLS and approved by the Department of State. The decision to share assets forfeited to the United States with a foreign government is a completely discretionary function of the Attorney General or the Secretary of the Treasury. It requires the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and, in certain circumstances, it is a decision that can be vetoed by Congress. The 1992 international sharing memorandum of understanding between the Departments of State, Justice, and Treasury expressly prohibits investigators or prosecutors from making representations to foreign officials “that assets will be transferred in a particular case, until an international agreement and commitment to transfer assets have been approved by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General or the Secretary of the Treasury.” Prosecutors

and federal law enforcement agencies always should be mindful that any domestic sharing occurs after all international sharing is completed, and that the domestic sharing of assets located abroad will occur from and come of the federal share, which is the amount of money that the United States has available after completion of the international sharing process. Thus, federal prosecutors and investigators should take care not to make any representations about the sharing of forfeitable assets located abroad or forfeited domestically with the assistance of a foreign government to either representatives of the foreign government or any of the domestic law enforcement partners whose assistance may have contributed to the seizure and ultimate forfeiture of the assets in question.

Foreign governments are not required to follow a specific process to submit a sharing request to the United States. They may do so pursuant to a treaty, a sharing agreement, or even via other diplomatic or law enforcement channels. Prosecutors and law enforcement agencies can and should make spontaneous sharing recommendations whenever they receive foreign assistance that facilitated the forfeiture of an asset in a U.S. case, particularly when that asset is located in the United States. When the United States forfeits assets in a judicial forfeiture case with the help of a foreign state and the seizing agency is a Department of Justice component or participant in the Department of Justice forfeiture fund, it is the responsibility of the federal prosecutor assigned to the case to send a formal sharing recommendation to AFMLS. In an administrative forfeiture matter, the seizing agency is responsible for the recommendation. In cases that implicate the Treasury forfeiture fund, the seizing agency, e.g., Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Secret Service, or Immigration and Customs Enforcement has the responsibility to send a sharing recommendation to TEOAF. However, the seizing agency should consult the prosecutor on the case first. For Department of Justice forfeiture fund international sharing recommendations, AFMLS IU prepares the sharing recommendations for approval by the Deputy Attorney General. For Treasury forfeiture fund international sharing recommendations, the director of TEOAF approves the sharing recommendations. AFMLS and TEOAF also obtain State Department and each other's concurrence for each proposed transfer to a foreign government after it is approved by their respective designees. This interagency process can be lengthy. To avoid delays, it is advisable to make the international sharing recommendation as soon as is practicable, or immediately after the final order forfeiting the foreign assets is obtained. At the earliest possible time, the seizing agency should note in any electronic asset tracking system, such as CATS or TALONS, that a particular asset might be, is, or will be subject to an international sharing request or recommendation—and definitely before that asset has been liquidated.

Prosecutors and federal law enforcement agencies always should be mindful that domestic sharing will occur only after completion of the international sharing process, and will be taken from the federal share, which is the amount of money that the United States has available at that time.

Lastly, with increasing frequency countries are enacting laws to permit them to share domestically forfeited assets with other countries. Accordingly, if U.S. prosecutors or investigators assisted in foreign cases that resulted in a foreign forfeiture, they are encouraged to contact an AFMLS IU attorney to see whether it would be fruitful to submit a sharing request to that country.

Chapter 11

Appointment of Trustees and Monitors

I. Quick Points

A. Purpose

The purpose of the trustee and monitor policy is to provide guidance for the appointment of court-appointed trustees and monitors in cases involving complex assets or business enterprises in Department of Justice federal forfeiture cases.

B. Responsibilities of trustees and monitors

The key distinction between a monitor and a trustee is that a trustee has the authority to manage an enterprise. A monitor observes and reports findings. Note: a receiver is a fiduciary who is responsible only to the court and cannot be paid from the Assets Forfeiture Fund (AFF).

C. Circumstances in which a trustee or monitor should be engaged

In almost all cases, the value of an ongoing business can be preserved without appointment of a trustee or monitor. In the typical forfeiture case where property has been restrained criminally or civilly, the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) has the capability with its own resources or with a property management contract to manage and to sell property, including most businesses.

Appointment of a trustee or monitor will occur only when (1) it is plainly necessary, (2) other alternatives have been considered and rejected, and (3) there is clearly sufficient net equity in the asset to cover the cost of the trustee or monitor. The Government must avoid involvement in the management of businesses that require aggressive action, capital investment to remain competitive, or the assumption of considerable risk. In rare cases, compelling law enforcement or policy considerations warrant the appointment of a trustee or monitor where there may be insufficient equity in the enterprise to cover the cost of the trustee.

D. Preseizure planning

In cases involving the appointment of trustees and monitors, prompt comprehensive preseizure planning with the USMS is mandatory.

E. Federal acquisitions regulations

All federal procurement rules and regulations must be followed in order to award a contract to a trustee or monitor. Under the federal acquisitions regulations (FAR), only the government contracting officer (CO) and contracting officer's technical representative (COTR) of record are authorized to direct the work of a trustee or monitor. All instructions to the trustee or monitor, whether from the U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO) or USMS, are communicated through the COTR.

F. Selection and appointment of a trustee or monitor

The USMS Office of Procurement will award a contract to a trustee or monitor based on a court order or competitive procedures outlined in the FAR. A sole source contract, although discouraged, can be awarded to a trustee or monitor as long as an appropriate justification is provided to the CO. Typical justification includes *urgent and compelling* circumstances or where only one known source can provide the required services.

G. Payment of monitor and trustee fees and expenses

Prior to entry of a final order of forfeiture, the AFF, 28 U.S.C. § 524(c), is available under certain circumstances to pay trustee and monitor fees in cases where a *Department of Justice* agency is the lead law enforcement agency. Upon the entry of an order of forfeiture, payment of fees charged by a trustee ordinarily will be made from the proceeds of the business unless compelling law enforcement or policy considerations warrant payment from the AFF. Charges to the AFF for trustees and monitors are to be recovered, as a cost, from the proceeds of sale prior to the payment of restitution, restoration, remission, and equitable sharing.

H. Goals, duties, and powers of the trustee or monitor

The restraining order or other order appointing a trustee or monitor and a statement of work define the goals of the trustee or monitor. Prior to appointment, an initial assessment must be made to determine the purpose of the trusteeship or monitorship, i.e., to prevent dissipation of the asset or to prevent the enterprise from engaging in illegal activity, or both.

I. Reporting requirements of the trustee or monitor

The trustee or monitor reports directly to the COTR. The USAO and USMS Asset Forfeiture Office (AFO) are encouraged to consult with and work with the trustee or monitor in carrying out the contract, but it is the COTR who directs the work of the trustee or monitor.

J. Dispute resolution

The USAO and USMS must consult and work closely together to address issues related to the need for engaging a trustee or monitor, as well as issues related to the duties and responsibilities of a trustee or monitor. Dispute resolution must be sought from the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS). Timely resolution of disputes is critical.

- The USAO must consult with AFMLS before seeking the appointment of a trustee or monitor.
- The USMS field office must notify USMS headquarters when it becomes aware that a trustee or monitor may be appointed.
- The USAO or USMS must notify the Asset Forfeiture Management Staff (AFMS) when they become aware that a business is losing money, has insufficient equity, or will be sold at a loss.

II. Department of Justice Policy: Trustees and Monitors in Forfeiture Cases

A. Purpose

The purpose of the trustee and monitor policy is to provide guidance that best serves the interests of the Department of Justice components in Department of Justice federal forfeiture cases on the court appointment of trustees and monitors in diverse cases involving complex assets, or business enterprises, including assets located in foreign countries. These guidelines seek to achieve the following:

- (1) Preserve assets for the Government in order to achieve the ultimate goals of separating criminals from assets that are the proceeds of or have facilitated criminal activity and of dismantling criminal enterprises;

- (2) Clarify our procurement obligations, while enhancing communication between USAOs and the USMS;
- (3) Clarify responsibilities with respect to preseizure planning in any case in which there is the potential for the appointment of a trustee or monitor;
- (4) Provide mechanisms for dispute resolution;
- (5) Provide guidance in determining whether the AFF is an appropriate source of funding for the expenses of trustees and monitors and to promote efficient use of resources.

The following principles underlie this policy:

- (1) Unless compelling circumstances exist, the United States shall seek appointment of a trustee or monitor only in cases involving complex assets and/or enterprises and where the United States will recoup its expenses.
- (2) Given the labor-intensive nature and the high cost of administering a trusteeship or monitorship, and the potential for ongoing litigation or resolution of other issues even following a final order of forfeiture, trustees and monitors are appointed only when other means of protecting the United States' interests are plainly inadequate or inappropriate.
- (3) The least intrusive method of operating a business (in which all or a part of the enterprise or its ownership is subject to forfeiture) should be employed, particularly prior to entry of a final order of forfeiture.

B. Statutory authority

The authority to appoint a trustee or monitor derives from 18 U.S.C. §§ 1963(d) and (e), 21 U.S.C. §§ 853(e) and (g), and 18 U.S.C. § 983(j), which permit a court to act to preserve property. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1964(a) and (b) grant courts broad injunctive and remedial authority in RICO cases. Unless the trustee or monitor is engaged through an already existing contract, the FAR must be followed. 48 C.F.R. Part 1.000 *et seq.*

C. Definitions and responsibilities

Historically, the terms *trustee*, *monitor*, *receiver*, and *custodian* have been used somewhat interchangeably in forfeiture cases. The key distinction between a monitor and a trustee is that only a trustee has the authority to manage an enterprise. A monitor reports findings. A

receiver is a fiduciary who is responsible only to the court. *Custodian* is a very general term that refers to a fiduciary who takes custody of property.

A trustee is appointed by a court and is granted the authority to manage and/or dispose of property.²¹⁸ Trustees may be appointed before or after property has been seized or forfeited.

A monitor is appointed by the court and is responsible for examining the operations of a business or enterprise. A monitor also reports findings to the court as to whether the assets of a business or enterprise are dissipating and will be available for forfeiture to the United States. Monitors do not control the operations of a business or enterprise, but report on their findings. Similarly, monitors do not dispose of property. In some cases, a monitor may be responsible for approving payments (e.g., all payments over \$10,000; payments not in the ordinary course of business) or performing other limited oversight functions.²¹⁹

A CO is the only employee with the authority to enter into, administer, and/or terminate contracts and make related determinations and findings. The CO is responsible for ensuring that (1) the requirements of pertinent laws, regulations, etc., have been met; (2) sufficient funds are available for obligation; and (3) contractors receive impartial, fair, and equitable treatment.

The CO typically manages multiple contracts and is rarely the subject matter expert with respect to the contracted goods and services. The COTR is the individual who manages the performance of the contract from a technical perspective after it is awarded. COs appoint COTRs to be the eyes and ears of the CO. The COTR is responsible for directing the work of a trustee or monitor in consultation with the USAO and USMS AFO. While consultation with the trustee and the USMS, USAO, and other government personnel is appropriate and encouraged, only the CO and COTR may direct the work of the trustee. The COTR is given express authority by the CO and typically performs the following functions:

- Assists the contractor in interpreting technical requirements of the contract;
- Recommends changes in contract terms to the CO;
- Monitors and evaluates contractor performance;
- Reviews and approves invoices;
- Recommends corrective actions; and
- Inspects, accepts, or rejects contract deliverables.

²¹⁸ Examples of a trustee's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, those described in Appendix J at J-1.

²¹⁹ Examples of a monitor's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, those described in Appendix J at J-3.

Section II.G discusses at length procurement procedures for trustees and monitors under the FAR.

D. Determining when a trustee or monitor should be engaged

The ultimate goal in a forfeiture case is to dismantle a criminal enterprise and to deprive a criminal of property used in or acquired as a result of illegal activity. Prior to the Government obtaining custody of an asset as a result of seizure or forfeiture, the Government has an interest in preserving the property for forfeiture and preventing further illegal activity.

Prior to forfeiture, the owners and management of an ongoing business will usually continue to operate the business unless there is probable cause to believe that the owners or management have been or are involved in criminal conduct in operating the business.

In almost all cases, the value of an ongoing business can be preserved without appointment of a trustee or monitor. In the typical forfeiture case where property has been restrained (sections 853(e), 1963(g), and 983(j)) or seized pursuant to a criminal forfeiture warrant (section 853(f) or, civilly, section 981(b)(1), etc.), the USMS has the capability with its own resources or with an existing property management contract to manage and to sell property, including most businesses.

Depending on the nature of the criminal conduct, appointment of a trustee or monitor may be appropriate. The type of oversight required depends on the stage of the case, the degree of ownership targeted for forfeiture, and the nature of the ownership interests (i.e., shares, partnerships, etc.). For example, it is usually preferable to monitor a minority partnership or stock interest. If a trustee is appointed to protect that Government's minority interest, the Government may encounter great difficulties dealing with possibly hostile majority interest holders. Similarly, if the Government has identified a majority interest for forfeiture, it must take into consideration the minority interests when fashioning a trusteeship or monitorship.

Alternatives to the appointment of a monitor or trustee must be considered to determine the least intrusive means of accomplishing and protecting the Government's goals and interests, including, but not limited to:

- (1) Particularized restraining order with or without USMS oversight and consequences for violations of the order (such as the appointment of a trustee or monitor or contempt proceedings);
- (2) Appointment of a business or property manager by USMS contract;

- (3) Restraint or seizure of valuable assets, equipment, or inventory (restraint is preferred);
- (4) Oversight and/or management by state or local regulatory agencies;
- (5) Filing of a *lis pendens*;
- (6) Interlocutory sale;
- (7) Foreclosure by a lienholder;
- (8) Retention of a professional by agreement of the business and at its own cost, to provide oversight and ensure there are no future violations;
- (9) Enforcement of state or local nuisance laws;
- (10) Seizure of property to satisfy outstanding tax obligations; and
- (11) Performance bond, or some combination of the above.

The Department of Justice must endeavor to avoid involvement in the management of businesses that require aggressive action, capital investment to remain competitive, or the assumption of considerable risk. It may be permissible to restrain or seize such a business if it is the only alternative for accomplishing the Government's objectives.

Generally, a protective order must be sought any time an ongoing business entity is targeted for forfeiture. This order should seek to restrain the owners from further encumbering the business, dissipating its assets, or selling the business. If the protective order alone, or in combination with the preceding alternatives, will not ensure the availability of the asset for forfeiture, the appointment of a manager or monitor arranged by a preexisting contract with the USMS may be appropriate. If the appointment of an outside monitor or trustee is sought, FARs must be followed. When considering a monitor or trustee, the business must be determined to be financially viable. Appointment of a trustee will occur only when it is clearly necessary and all other alternatives have been considered and rejected. In some cases, compelling law enforcement or policy considerations may warrant the appointment of a trustee or monitor even though there is not or may not be sufficient equity in the enterprises to cover the cost of the trustee or monitor. In insufficient equity cases, the USAO must thoroughly document the reasons for rejecting alternatives to the appointment of a trustee or monitor.

In addition, the AFMS must be notified as soon as the USAO or USMS become aware that a business is losing money, has insufficient equity, or will be sold at a loss. Once it is determined that continued operation of the business is not financially viable, absent compelling circumstances, the USAO will seek to terminate the business as soon as practicable, with due regard for the ownership rights of the defendant/owner (prior to forfeiture) and other partners, shareholders, and third parties. Alternatively, the business could be sold by interlocutory sale, with the assets of the business sold and disposed of, even if such sale may result in a loss.

E. Prerequisites to the selection of a trustee or monitor: Preseizure planning and other requirements

The determination of the appointment of a trustee or monitor is made only after the interested components (USAO, USMS, and investigative agencies) agree on a preseizure plan, as discussed below. The USMS field office is required to notify USMS headquarters as soon as it becomes aware that a trustee or monitor appointment is being contemplated. In cases involving the sort of complex assets that may require a trustee or monitor, preseizure planning with the USMS is mandatory. USMS headquarters will notify the USMS Office of Procurement if preexisting contracts will likely not be suitable.

The guidelines for preseizure planning require that a USAO:

- (1) Contact the USMS to engage in formal preseizure planning prior to seizing or restraining certain types of assets, including businesses and real property;
- (2) Engage in timely preindictment coordination with the USMS in criminal forfeiture cases;
- (3) Consult with the USMS prior to the submission of any proposed orders to a court that impose any restraint, seizure, property management, or financial management requirements relating to property in USMS custody;
- (4) Consult with AFMLS before initiating a forfeiture action against, or seeking a temporary restraining order affecting, an ongoing business;
- (5) Obtain the concurrence of AFMLS before initiating a forfeiture action under a money laundering facilitation theory; and
- (6) Consult with AFMLS before seeking the appointment of a trustee or monitor.

Preseizure planning includes a financial assessment of the enterprise subject to forfeiture and a determination as to whether it is in the best interest of the Government to take over or to continue the operation of a business. The preseizure plan must develop (or include) to the extent feasible an estimate of the (1) net equity subject to forfeiture; (2) cash flow of the business; (3) fees and other costs of the trustee or monitor; and (4) likely duration of the trusteeship or monitorship.

With respect to businesses continuing in operation, once the Government obtains access to business records and other information, a business review must be developed specifically identifying the challenges faced by the business and the requirements for it to succeed. The business review must identify key historic financial data, the current operating environment (including financial activity), and projections for the next 2 years. Projections should address best and worst case scenarios for the operation of the business as well as exit strategies. If the business is likely to lose money or be sold at a loss, the business plan should include a plan to mitigate loss or a plan for liquidation. If necessary, the USMS and AFMS can provide contract services to assist in developing a business plan, which expenses may be paid from the AFF.

The need to maintain confidentiality before indictment, or while an indictment is sealed, may also be critical. Appropriate measures will be taken to ensure that sensitive law enforcement information is protected while consultation and coordination occurs among the involved components.

F. Selection and appointment of a trustee or monitor

1. Qualifications of the trustee or monitor

The purpose of a trusteeship or monitorship will determine the appropriate qualifications of the trustee or monitor. The trustee or monitor (and personnel on their staff) must have expertise in the enterprise's industry. For example, if the purpose is to manage a business to prevent its dissipation, a trustee with a business and accounting background is preferred. A trustee cannot provide actual law enforcement, such as that provided by federal agents or police personnel. (The AFF is not available to fund law enforcement activities.) It may be necessary for a trustee to retain a consultant or provide personnel to address compliance and enforcement issues which would ordinarily be performed by a business.

It is required that a trustee or monitor undergo a background review to ensure that nothing in the individual's past indicates an inability to act as a trustee or monitor. A background check may be conducted by the USMS or any federal investigative agency.

2. Sources for potential trustees and monitors

As previously discussed, the USMS may have existing contracts or access through AFMS to existing contracts with companies that provide accounting, business, and monitoring services. If those preexisting contracts are not suitable, some possible sources for potential trustees and monitors include retired Department of Justice or Treasury law enforcement agents or trustees from existing panels of private trustees utilized in U.S. bankruptcy cases. The Securities and Exchange Commission and other regulatory agencies are also sources for competent experienced trustees. Trustees and monitors are available from the private sector, particularly the local business community or accounting firms that provide business management services.

G. Procurement under FAR

1. Three methods of contracting with a trustee or monitor

Unless the trustee or monitor is engaged through an already existing contract, the USMS Office of Procurement will award a contract to a trustee or monitor based on a court order or competitive procedures outlined in the FAR. If the total cost of the trustee or monitor is estimated at under \$100,000, a simplified process is used. A simplified acquisition typically takes 60 days to award.

If the cost of a trustee or monitor is estimated at over \$100,000, the FAR requires open competition involving procedures which are lengthy, since it is necessary to perform multiple steps in order to award a contract. A typical large purchase contract takes 180 days to award. In that case a sole source acquisition may be considered.

A sole source acquisition is defined as a contract for the purchase of supplies or services that is entered into or proposed to be entered into by an agency after soliciting and negotiating with only one source. A sole source contract, although discouraged, can be awarded to a trustee or monitor as long as an appropriate justification is provided to the CO. Typical justification includes “urgent and compelling” circumstances, where only one source can provide the required services or where a court orders the appointment of a particular trustee or monitor. *See* section II.J at page 195. A sole source justification must be completed prior to the award of a sole source contract. The justification must meet the necessary requirements for the CO to approve. The sole source acquisition process can take up to 60 days or more to complete.

2. Statement of work

A statement of work (SOW) sets forth the duties and responsibilities of the trustee or monitor. The SOW is an integral part of the contract with the trustee or monitor.²²⁰ A typical example of a duty of a monitor in a SOW could be reviewing books and records of a business under restraint. Ideally, the SOW should be a part of the restraining order either as a section of the order or an attachment. The SOW should reflect the duties and responsibilities likely to be needed and should not be a laundry list addressing every potential task. A SOW can be expanded or contracted depending on the changing circumstances of the case.

3. Use of staff, consultants, and private counsel by trustees and monitors

Consultants and administrative staff are often required by trustees and monitors to support their work. The CO and COTR, in consultation with the USAO or the USMS, must approve such expenditures in advance. Staff needs, including professional and administrative staff who report directly to the trustee or monitor, and outside consultants, including private counsel, must be negotiated during the interview of the trustee or monitor and included in the SOW.

4. Cautionary note

Difficulties with the execution of the contract usually occur when individuals other than the COTR interact with a trustee or monitor resulting in the failure of the Government to “speak with one voice.” This can be the result of the trustee or monitor receiving contradictory or erroneous directions from unauthorized personnel. Additionally, when government personnel direct the trustee or monitor *without* the requisite authority to do so, such direction exposes the Government to claims for additional costs, adjustments to the contract schedule, and adjustments to other contract terms and conditions. Such direction may also provide the contractor an opportunity to avoid the obligation to perform under the contract. Finally, while the Government may avoid liability for an unauthorized act, the person who provided such direction may find him or herself personally liable in an action brought by the contractor.

²²⁰A list of possible examples or duties and responsibilities are set forth in Appendix J at J-1.

H. Payment of monitor and trustee fees and expenses

1. Availability of Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund

AUSAs and USMS personnel must be aware that the costs of a trustee or monitor are a cost of the forfeiture action. Such costs may be paid out of the proceeds of the ongoing business or directly from the AFF (28 U.S.C. § 524(c)), as discussed above. If the costs are paid directly from the AFF, the AFF is reimbursed upon sale of the asset just as any other forfeiture cost is reimbursed (e.g., liens, maintenance, storage, etc.) prior to payment of restitution and equitable sharing. The only time the AFF would not be reimbursed is if the sale resulted in a loss, a situation which should be avoided unless compelling circumstances exist. *See* discussion below and elsewhere in this policy.

Prior to entry of a final order of forfeiture, the AFF is available to pay trustee and monitor fees when (1) an asset has been seized for forfeiture pursuant to a civil or criminal forfeiture proceeding or is subject to a criminal or civil restraining order; (2) the court declines to order payment from the proceeds of the ongoing business, or an evaluation of the business reveals there are insufficient funds available to pay the costs of the trustee or monitor, but compelling law enforcement or policy considerations warrant the appointment of a trustee or monitor; and (3) the services of a trustee or monitor are needed to protect the Government's interests and less intrusive means for accomplishing the Government's goals are unavailable. *See* section II.D at page 188.

Upon the entry of a preliminary or final order of forfeiture, payment of fees charged by a trustee ordinarily will be made from the proceeds of the business, unless compelling law enforcement or policy considerations warrant payment from the AFF. *See* section II.E at page 190, 18 U.S.C. § 1963(e), and 21 U.S.C. § 853(g).

Payment of the fees of a trustee or monitor shall be charged against the AFF by the USMS. The COTR reviews invoices from the trustee or monitor and approves payment from the AFF. (In some cases the COTR may dispute the invoice because the services were not included in the contract.)

I. Defining the goals, duties, and powers of the trustee or monitor

1. Defining

The restraining order or other order appointing a trustee or monitor must define the goals of the trustee or monitor. Prior to appointment, an initial assessment must be made to determine the purpose of and need for the trusteeship or monitorship (i.e., to prevent

dissipation of the asset or to prevent the enterprise from engaging in illegal activity, or both), as well as its goals.

The theory of forfeiture under which the property is seized and the nature of the business itself will inform the goals and duties of the trustee or monitor. For example, if the business subject to forfeiture was acquired with proceeds of illegal activity and is self-supporting or is subject to forfeiture as a substitute asset, the goal of the Government generally is to prevent dissipation of the business and its assets. Monitorship or trusteeship of such an asset usually requires less oversight and more often results in a profitable forfeiture than the forfeiture of an enterprise used to facilitate illegal activity.

In contrast, a business used to facilitate illegal activity often requires intense oversight to prevent further illegal activity and frequently presents difficult management, safety, or public relations issues, depending on the nature of the business. The AFF is not available to pay expenses occurred when a law enforcement function is performed. *See* section II.F.1 at page 191. Additionally, when a business which is or was facilitating illegal activity is identified for forfeiture, restrained, or forfeited, the illegal funds that have supported the business typically disappear. Such businesses often have no real value when they are operated in a legitimate manner. They may also require investment of capital to meet state and local regulatory standards. Unless compelling circumstances exist, appointment of a trustee or monitor in such cases, and indeed seizure and forfeiture, should be avoided.

J. Reporting—trustees and monitors

The issue of to whom a trustee or monitor is responsible is complex. The trustee or monitor reports directly to the COTR. The trustee or monitor is also answerable to the appointing court and to the Government, which has appointed them to protect and prevent dissipation of the asset. They may have fiduciary responsibilities to the defendant and owners of property identified for forfeiture until the entry of a preliminary order of forfeiture and may have continuing responsibilities to non-defendant owners, partners, shareholders, and third parties. Their costs are approved by the COTR and usually paid by the AFF.

The requirement that the COTR direct the trustee or monitor does not mean that the USAO or USMS is prevented from communication or discussion with the trustee or monitor about the assets and, in fact, such discussions are important and encouraged; however, only the COTR actually directs the trustee or monitor.

An example might be where drug sales and prostitution are occurring near or in a business subject to forfeiture and a trusteeship. The trustee and AUSA may propose additional security. It is the COTR and CO's responsibility to determine that (1) additional

security is required and is within the terms of the SOW; (2) the contract does not provide for additional security and modification is necessary; or (3) what is needed is law enforcement, something which the trustee cannot prove and for which the AFF is not available to pay. Preferably, the discussions about additional security would take place in a conference call or ongoing conference calls with the interested parties.

Depending on the nature of the case, personal interest, or style of the court, the court may take a greater or lesser degree of oversight of the trustee or monitor. It is not uncommon, however, for the court itself to recommend a specific trustee or monitor. In that situation, the trustee or monitor may feel a greater responsibility and accountability to the court. The COTR is ultimately responsible for directing the work of the trustee or approving payment from the AFF, but modification to the contract can be made if ordered by the court. Payment from the AFF is only available through a contract, not a court order. (*See* section II.G at page 192.)

The USAO and USMS should be aware that it is difficult to direct the trustee or monitor and to control costs in a situation where the court has appointed a trustee or monitor without input from the COTR, USAO, or USMS, or where a court wants close control over a trustee. The USAO and USMS, through the COTR, must exercise some degree of control over a trustee or monitor and their costs in order for the AFF to be a source of payment. (*See* section II.G at page 192.)

Any fiduciary obligation of a trustee to the defendant's interest in the enterprise ends following a preliminary order of forfeiture. An obligation to non-defendant owners and third parties continues until those interests are resolved through the ancillary hearing process and final order of forfeiture. Similarly, the court's oversight usually diminishes as the Government moves toward completion of forfeiture. Once the appellate process has ended and a final order of forfeiture has been entered, the court normally is not involved unless residual issues remain, such as final sale of the property and distribution of proceeds.

Chapter 12

Litigation Issues

I. Avoiding Accusations of Vindictive Prosecution

Relying primarily on the different burdens of proof applicable to criminal as opposed to civil cases, the Supreme Court has held that an acquittal in a criminal case does not bar a subsequent civil forfeiture action. *United States v. One Assortment of 89 Firearms*, 465 U.S. 354 (1984); *One Lot Emerald Cut Stones v. United States*, 409 U.S. 232 (1972). However, prosecutors initiating a civil forfeiture proceeding after a decisive event in the criminal case should be mindful of the potential for a claim of vindictiveness.

In *United States v. Goodwin*, 457 U.S. 368 (1982), the Supreme Court held that prosecutors possess wide discretion in making charging decisions. In the few cases where the Court has found it necessary to presume vindictiveness, it has done so where the defendant has exercised some right, and there exists reasonable likelihood that the prosecutor acted vindictively in response to the assertion of that right.²²¹ The prosecutor can overcome this presumption by providing the court with objective evidence supporting the prosecutor's decision.²²²

Though it is difficult to generalize, the following considerations influence the vindictive prosecution analysis. One consideration is the timing of the prosecutorial decision at issue. Decisions made in a pretrial setting, at a time when the prosecutor may still be discovering and assessing relevant information, are less likely to merit a presumption.²²³ In contrast, a prosecutorial decision made after trial begins is more likely to merit a presumption.²²⁴ A second consideration is the nature of the right the defendant seeks to invoke. If the defendant merely invokes pretrial procedural rights, e.g., the right to a jury trial, to move to suppress, to plead an affirmative defense, or to challenge the sufficiency of the indictment, "it is unrealistic to assume that a prosecutor's probable response to such motions is to seek to

²²¹ *United States v. Goodwin*, 457 U.S. 368, 373 (1982).

²²² *Id.* at 376, n.8.

²²³ *Id.* at 377.

²²⁴ *Id.*

penalize and to deter.”²²⁵ In contrast, if the defendant invokes a right to a new trial to collaterally challenge the conviction, the likelihood of vindictiveness may be greater.²²⁶

Given these considerations, care should be exercised to avoid the appearance that the Government has pursued criminal charges vindictively because the defendant exercised a right in the parallel civil forfeiture proceeding.²²⁷ If the criminal charge follows a routine pretrial event in the civil forfeiture case, e.g., the filing of an administrative or judicial claim, the risk of a court indulging a presumption of vindictiveness is negligible.²²⁸ In contrast, if the defendant prevails on the merits of a civil judicial forfeiture case, and criminal charges come afterwards, the prosecutor should be prepared to articulate the reasons for the timing of the criminal charges.

Care should also be exercised in the inverse situation, i.e., where the Government pursues civil forfeiture after the initiation of a parallel criminal case. However, in most instances a civil forfeiture action filed after events in a criminal case—even decisive events—should not give rise to a presumption. The initiation of a civil forfeiture action prior to the trial of the criminal case should not give rise to a presumption because pretrial proceedings in criminal cases usually involve routine events. Moreover, even after decisive events have occurred in the criminal case, e.g., a jury has returned an acquittal verdict against one or more of the defendants, there are often sound reasons why a prosecutor may decide to pursue an alternative remedy such as civil forfeiture. For example, the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (CAFRA) of 2000 grants the Government 90 days after a claim is filed contesting the forfeiture of an asset in which to commence a judicial forfeiture proceeding against that same asset. A prosecutor who elects to file a claim within that 90-day period—even if a decisive event occurs in the criminal case before the expiration of the 90-day period—would not be acting vindictively.

²²⁵ *Id.* at 381.

²²⁶ See *Blackledge v. Perry*, 471 U.S. 21 (1974) (defendant exercised his right to a trial de novo and consequently, during the retrial, the state increased the charge from a misdemeanor to a felony; the Court held that although there was no evidence that the prosecution acted vindictively by increasing the misdemeanor charge to a felony, the concern is the defendant’s “fear of such vindictiveness” may deter him from exercising his legal right to appeal, violating due process).

²²⁷ See *United States v. Boulter*, 799 F. Supp. 581 (W.D.N.C. 1992) (“A defendant may be able to prove vindictive prosecution in a case such as the instant one in which the Government prosecutes the defendant after he files a claim in a civil forfeiture action.” However, the defendant did not pursue such a claim, and thus, the court did not address it further).

²²⁸ *United States v. White*, 972 F.2d 16 (2d Cir. 1992) (prosecution indicted defendant after he subsequently challenged the forfeiture of his vehicle; court declined to hold that by opposing the Government’s forfeiture, the Government should be precluded from bringing criminal charges).

The vindictive prosecution issue can likely be avoided altogether if the civil forfeiture action is filed (and stayed) before the criminal case is concluded. While this involves extra work, if the prosecutor can anticipate that there is a substantial chance of acquittal, and that the Government will pursue civil forfeiture in such an event, filing the civil forfeiture case before adjudication of the criminal case can be a useful method to avoid the issue of vindictiveness altogether.

II. Is a Prosecutor Bound, Ethically or Otherwise, to Forego Forfeiture in Favor of Restitution?

Forfeiture and restitution are two separate components of many criminal sentences. Both are mandatory upon conviction. In 1996, the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act (MVRA) made restitution mandatory for most federal crimes where a victim suffers a loss. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(a)(1).²²⁹ If a court concludes to order restitution, it must order full restitution for the victim's loss, regardless of the defendant's ability to pay. *E.g.*, *United States v. Newman*, 144 F.3d 531 (7th Cir. 1998) ("Under the MVRA, a defendant's financial status is relevant only to fixing a payment schedule for the mandated restitution"). Likewise, courts must order forfeiture when a defendant is convicted of a statute that provides for forfeiture as part of the penalty. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 982: "The court, in imposing sentence on a person convicted of an offense in violation of section 1956, 1957, or 1960 of this title, shall order that the person forfeit to the United States any property, real or personal, involved in such offense, or any property traceable to such property." (emphasis added); *United States v. Monsanto*, 491 U.S. 600, 607 (1989) ("Congress could not have chosen stronger words to express its intent that forfeiture be mandatory in cases where the statute applie[s]"); *United States v. Johnston*, 199 F.3d 1015, 1022 (9th Cir. 1999) (criminal forfeiture is mandatory and designed to ensure that a defendant does not profit from his crimes). Given the mandatory nature of the two components of a sentence, it is entirely appropriate for a defendant to pay both a forfeiture and restitution. *See United States v. Emerson*, 128 F.3d 557, 566-67 (7th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Tencer*, 107 F.3d 1120, 1135 (5th Cir. 1997) (affirming restitution order for \$451,000 to fraud victims plus criminal forfeiture of \$1 million, which included the fraud proceeds plus commingled funds). And defendants have no right to a credit against a restitution order for the amount forfeited. *United States v. Alalade*, 204 F.3d 536 (4th Cir. 2000).

The perceived tension between forfeiture and restitution emerges when, as is often the case, a defendant lacks the financial ability to pay both the forfeiture and restitution. When a

²²⁹ "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when sentencing a defendant convicted of an offense described in subsection (c), the court shall order, in addition to, or in the case of a misdemeanor, in addition to or in lieu of, any other penalty authorized by law, that the defendant make restitution to the victim of the offense..."

defendant lacks the resources to make full restitution, Department of Justice policy is to collect and marshal assets for the benefit of victims using available means. These means include discontinuance of a forfeiture before a final order and asking the court to direct the custodian to turn over liquid assets to the clerk of court to be applied to restitution; the forfeiture of the defendant's assets and the handling of victim claims through the petition for remission or mitigation process; or the completion of the forfeiture action and the restoration of forfeited assets to victims through a restoration process approved by the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS).

The Justice for All Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3771, obligates “officers and employees of the Department of Justice and other departments and agencies engaged in the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime [to] make their best efforts to see that crime victims are...accorded[] the rights...” under the act,²³⁰ including the right to full and timely restitution as provided by law. Does this mean that a prosecutor should not seek forfeiture if to do so would compromise a victim's ability to collect restitution? The answer is clearly no.

At present, there is only a limited ability to restrain assets prior to trial solely for the purpose of restitution.²³¹ The restraint mechanisms provided by the asset forfeiture statutes are often the only effective mechanisms to prevent a criminal defendant from dissipating assets prior to sentencing. As there are at least three means whereby restrained or forfeited property may be turned over to victims, there is nothing improper in seeking forfeiture in cases where the prosecutor knows early on that a defendant is unlikely to be able to pay restitution if the assets are forfeited. Restraint and forfeiture do not preclude those same assets from being turned over to victims. Indeed, without the restraint mechanisms of the forfeiture statutes, a victim has much less chance of ever receiving restitution.

Thus, a prosecutor who uses forfeiture tools as a means to provide remission or restoration of assets to crime victims fulfills any obligation that prosecutor may have under the Justice for All Act to crime victims.²³² Various courts have acknowledged this use of the forfeiture statutes. *See United States v. O'Connor*, 321 F. Supp. 722 (E.D.Va. 2004) (although defendant has no right to use forfeited funds to satisfy a restitution order, the

²³⁰ 18 U.S.C. § 3771(c)(1).

²³¹ Under 18 U.S.C. § 1345(a)(1), the pretrial restraint of assets is authorized in fraud-type cases, but only in limited circumstances.

²³² An adverse court of appeals decision from the Ninth Circuit makes the administrative and civil forfeiture of fraud proceeds impractical in cases that involve large numbers of victims and that must be filed in the Ninth Circuit. Prosecutors in the Ninth Circuit who seek to use civil or administrative forfeiture in a case involving victims should consult chapter 4, section IV of this *Manual*.

Government may, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(i)(1), apply the forfeited funds for benefit of the victims through restoration or remission); *United States v. Lavin*, 299 F.3d 123 (2d Cir. 2002) (instead of pursuing forfeiture, Government used seized funds to satisfy restitution order).

III. Negotiating With Fugitives

A. Summary

Absent compelling circumstances, prosecutors should not negotiate with fugitives. Before undertaking such negotiations, prosecutors should exhaust all potentially viable pretrial motions, including any possible fugitive disentitlement motion. Even when the case cannot be resolved by pretrial motion, prosecutors should enter into negotiations reluctantly. In many instances, the policy considerations of declining to negotiate with fugitives will outweigh the potential benefit to an individual civil forfeiture case. Only in instances where other considerations, e.g., the cost of maintaining the asset subject to forfeiture, militate towards negotiating a settlement should prosecutors entertain fugitive negotiations. In such circumstances the prosecutor handling the negotiations should consult closely with the prosecutor handling the parallel criminal case.

B. Discussion

Periodically, a situation arises where an individual has been indicted, becomes a fugitive, and seeks to challenge or negotiate with the Government regarding a civil forfeiture case. Prior to the enactment of CAFRA, a fugitive in a related criminal case was not barred from opposing the civil forfeiture of property: *Degen v. United States*, 517 U.S. 820 (1996) (fugitive disentitlement doctrine cannot be created by case law); *United States v. Funds Held in the Name of Wetterer*, 17 F. Supp. 2d 161 (E.D.N.Y. 1998) (because of *Degen*, claimant that is alter ego of fugitive may file claim challenging forfeiture of bank account held by perpetrator of mail fraud/child sex abuse scheme who is resisting extradition in Guatemala); *United States v. One 1988 Chevrolet Cheyenne Half-Ton Pickup Truck*, 357 F. Supp. 2d 1321 (S.D. Ala. 2005) (tracing the history of the fugitive disentitlement doctrine and discussing the impact of *Degen*).

CAFRA reinstated the fugitive disentitlement doctrine with the passage of 28 U.S.C. § 2466, which permits a court to “disallow a person from using the resources of the courts of the United States in furtherance of a claim in any related civil forfeiture action or a claim in third party proceedings in any criminal forfeiture action” if certain conditions are met. *See Collazos v. United States*, 368 F.3d 190 (2d Cir. 2004) (section 2466 is Congress’s response to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Degen*; it does not violate the claimant’s constitutional

right to due process); *One 1988 Chevrolet Cheyenne Half-Ton Pickup Truck*, 357 F. Supp. 2d at 1326 (section 2466 is a “forceful legislative response” to the void created by *Degen*).

While it may have made financial sense to negotiate with fugitives when they were allowed to litigate civil forfeiture actions, the Government now has less incentive to negotiate with those who are barred by the fugitive disentitlement doctrine from challenging a forfeiture. If a court agrees to apply the fugitive disentitlement doctrine, the Government should be able to obtain a default judgment, at least as to the fugitive’s interest, in most cases. Thus, there would be no reason to negotiate with a party who is barred from challenging a forfeiture, and negotiation is thus discouraged in that circumstance.

Even in cases where a court may decline to apply the fugitive disentitlement doctrine, the Government may be able to prevail on a pretrial motion.²³³ For example, fugitives often will decline to appear for deposition or otherwise participate in discovery. Rule 37, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, allows the court to order a party to comply with a discovery request, and if the party fails to comply, the court can impose sanctions that include (1) an order that certain facts shall be taken as established, (2) an order refusing to allow the disobedient party to support or oppose designated claims or defenses or introduce matters in evidence, and (3) rendering judgment by default against the disobedient party. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2).

Where pretrial motions are not viable or are unsuccessful, prosecutors should pursue negotiations with fugitives reluctantly, and only as a last resort. As a general matter, it is rarely in the Government’s interest to negotiate with fugitives. *See In re Grand Jury Subpoenas Dated March 9, 2001*, 179 F. Supp. 2d 270, 277 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) (noting a response by the USAO in the Southern District of New York in the Marc Rich case that “it is our firm policy not to negotiate dispositions of criminal charges with fugitives. Such negotiations would give defendants an incentive to flee, and from the Government’s perspective, would provide defendants with the inappropriate leverage and luxury of remaining absent unless and until the Government agrees to their terms.”). Forfeiture AUSAs should be sensitive to these considerations and not take any actions that may undermine the policy considerations noted in the Rich case, and should in all circumstances coordinate closely with prosecutors handling the parallel criminal case.

In the exceptional case where negotiations with a fugitive are appropriate, prosecutors should limit the factors that influence the conduct of the negotiations. It is legitimate to take into account the Government’s litigation risk at trial, or expenses the Government may incur in maintaining an asset if the case would otherwise be delayed indefinitely. For example, if

²³³ Section 2466 “‘does not mandate the court to disallow the claimant,’ but rather confers upon the Court discretion to determine whether or not disentitlement is warranted.” 357 F. Supp. 2d at 1328.

the forfeiture involves tangible property that is incurring storage expenses or property where a lien is continuing to accrue and erode the equity, it may be in the Government's financial interest to resolve the forfeiture matter quickly. If a court declined to invoke the fugitive disentitlement doctrine, negotiation may be necessary in order to resolve the matter. But in no circumstances should a prosecutor agree to exchange assets for a defendant's agreement to surrender and face criminal charges.

IV. Criminal Forfeiture and *Brady* Obligations

In criminal forfeiture matters, the Government has not only an ethical but a legal duty to disclose information favorable to the defendant as to either guilt or punishment. *See Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963) ("suppression by the prosecution of evidence favorable to an accused upon request violates due process where the evidence is material either to guilt or to punishment irrespective of the good faith or bad faith of the prosecution").²³⁴ Forfeiture is an element of the sentence, and thus forms part of the punishment imposed on the defendant. *Libretti v. United States*, 516 U.S. 29, 38-39 (1995). Accordingly, *Brady* requires the Government, even absent a request by the defendant, to disclose evidence favorable to the defendant that relates to criminal forfeiture.

V. Considerations Relating to Global Settlements and Dealing with Claimants and Witnesses

In situations where both a civil forfeiture proceeding and a related criminal investigation or charges are pending, forfeiture attorneys may face various ethical issues. Issues generally arise in the context of settlements and plea agreements, and in dealings with witnesses. Some of these issues are set out below, with references to certain pertinent authority; however, in addition to the materials identified here, you should consult the rules that apply in the state in which you are licensed as well as the state and court(s) in which the proceedings are pending.²³⁵

²³⁴ *United States v. Agurs*, 427 U.S. 97, 110-11 (1976), extended the rule announced in *Brady* to apply to evidence that "is obviously of such substantial value to the defense that elementary fairness requires it to be disclosed even without a specific request."

²³⁵ *See* 28 U.S.C. § 530B (Department of Justice attorneys are "subject to State laws and rules, and local Federal court rules, governing attorneys in each State where such attorney engages in that attorney's duties, to the same extent and in the same manner as other attorneys in that State.")

A. Global settlements

The term *global settlement* is often used to describe a situation whereby criminal charges and civil forfeiture claims are resolved in a single agreement between the Government and the defendant. While such agreements are often recommended, being both effective and efficient in resolving disputed matters, they raise ethical issues that should be considered.

No settlement agreement should be used to gain an improper advantage in a related civil or criminal case: the Government should not agree to release property subject to forfeiture (civil or criminal) in order to coerce a guilty plea on the substantive charges; nor should the Government agree to dismiss criminal charges in order to coerce a forfeiture settlement.²³⁶

Care should be taken to avoid any plea/settlement agreement which risks undermining faith in the fairness of those who administer the criminal process, such as an agreement which appears to reduce prison time in exchange for forfeiture, or vice versa.²³⁷

A prudent practice followed by many government attorneys is that of not introducing or suggesting a global settlement disposition. If opposing counsel raise the issue, it may be responded to and pursued by government attorneys in close consultation with supervisors, and being mindful of the relevant ethical issues.²³⁸

B. Claimants and witnesses

The same ethical considerations as those which apply in global settlements, above, also apply in situations where the Government attorney is interacting with claimants and witnesses in civil forfeiture litigation in circumstances which may raise issues of fairness and proper conduct.

These issues may occur in all situations where the line between the Government's civil-litigation and prosecutorial functions may become blurred, and where there may be potential for consolidating governmental power against individuals in a way which could become

²³⁶ See chapter 3, section I.B.7 of this *Manual*; *United States Attorneys' Manual* 9-113.106; See also *Grand Jury Manual* (July 2000), Chapter 12, "Parallel Proceedings," para. 12.16, "Global Settlements," (noting that, although *ABA Model Code of Professional Responsibility*, DR 7-105(A), which prohibited attorneys from threatening criminal prosecution solely to obtain an advantage in a civil matter, was replaced by the *ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct* which omitted this provision (see *ABA Formal Ethics Opinion* 92-363 (1992)), many states still have ethical rules patterned after DR 7-105(A).

²³⁷ See *Town of Newton v. Rumery*, 480 U.S. 386, 400 (1987) (O'Connor, J., concurring).

²³⁸ See *Grand Jury Manual* (July 2008), Chapter 12, "Parallel Proceedings," para. 12.12, USABook Online.

abusive. While there is no ethical prohibition on conditioning the subject's status in a prosecution on that person's cooperation, care should be employed when the subject's cooperation is sought solely in connection with a civil forfeiture matter. Where, for example, a civil forfeiture action and a related criminal investigation or charges are pending at the same time, a claimant or witness may be required to take action in the civil forfeiture case, such as providing testimony in a deposition, where there is a perceived threat of criminal prosecution. In such cases care should be taken not to coerce cooperation or the providing of testimony in the civil case by threats or promises relating to the criminal proceedings.²³⁹ Nor should civil forfeiture discovery or other proceedings be used solely to obtain information or benefit for the criminal proceeding.²⁴⁰

Ethical issues may arise in a situation where an individual, not currently charged with a crime but involved in the offense, has relevant information that would aid the Government in pursuing a civil forfeiture case. Clearly if the situation arose in a criminal case there would be nothing improper about the prosecutor advising the witness that if he did not tell the truth about what he knew, he could be charged for his own involvement in the crime, assuming there was evidence to support a prosecution. Generally, the same should be true in a civil-case scenario. However, even though there is no blanket prohibition against threatening a prosecution to persuade someone to take a particular action in a civil matter, Government attorneys must take care to ensure that any threat of prosecution is not solely to gain an advantage in the civil matter (i.e., to ensure that the criminal charges would be brought for some legitimate purpose in addition to gaining an advantage in the civil action), that it is related to the civil case, and that it is well-founded.

²³⁹ A claimant or witness in a civil forfeiture proceeding who is also a defendant in a pending criminal case may want to cooperate in the civil case in the hope that such cooperation may be a factor in supporting a motion by the Government for reduction of sentence pursuant to section 5K1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines; however, it is not clear whether or to what extent cooperation in a civil forfeiture case would constitute a factor under section 5K1.1, though it is clear that the Guidelines expressly separate a defendant's sentence from his/her forfeiture of property. *See U.S. v. Hendrickson*, 22 F.3d 170, 175 (7th Cir.) (section 5E1.4's explicit language that '[f]orfeiture is to be imposed upon a convicted defendant as provided by statute' makes it "readily apparent that forfeiture was considered by the Sentencing Commission and was intended to be imposed in addition to, not in lieu of, incarceration") *cert. denied*, 513 U.S. 878 (1994).

²⁴⁰ *See Grand Jury Manual, supra*, at. 12.10, "Abuse of Power Claims" ("person subject to parallel proceedings may raise a claim of having been manipulated or misled by the Government in a variety of contexts," including motions to suppress evidence, motions to deny enforcement of civil subpoenas, and motions to dismiss indictment (citing cases)); *see also In re Phillips, Beckwith & Hall*, 896 F. Supp. 533 (E.D. Va 1995) (law firm moved to stay forfeiture action in view of potential criminal charges against firm personnel; court denied stay, noting that allegation of "bad faith on the Government's part by, for example, pursuing a civil lawsuit solely for the purpose of aiding a criminal investigation, or threatening or delaying bringing criminal charges in order to extract an advantage in the civil case by keeping the cloud of criminal prosecution overhead" would have produced different outcome (citing cases)).

In the context of settling civil forfeiture cases, care should be taken by the government attorney handling the civil case not to harm the Government's criminal prosecution, such as in a case where, for example, we compromise a civil forfeiture case to the benefit of a defendant/witness who has already entered into a cooperation agreement with the Government. In that circumstance the civil forfeiture settlement may be viewed as a benefit to the cooperating witness which we have to disclose, and which may be used to impeach the cooperating witness on cross-examination. Prior to negotiating a civil forfeiture settlement with a cooperating witness/defendant in a pending criminal case, the government forfeiture attorney should consult with the government criminal attorney.²⁴¹ Ethical issues may also arise where government attorneys include cooperation provisions in civil forfeiture settlements. Such provisions, which may provide for assistance or cooperation by the claimant in other civil forfeitures or in related criminal proceedings, create no ethical problems so long as the settlement agreement itself stands on its merits, and if it calls for cooperation in a criminal case, does not run afoul of ethical considerations relating to the interplay of civil and criminal cases noted above.

Again, ethics rules vary from state to state, and it is strongly recommended that each attorney dealing with related civil forfeiture and criminal cases consult the rules that apply to the states in which the attorney is licensed and the action is pending, as well as consulting the ethics advisor in the U.S. Attorneys Office.

VI. Fifth Amendment Advisements In Civil Forfeiture Cases

The procedural safeguards established by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966) protect the Fifth Amendment rights of a person not to be compelled in a criminal case to be a witness against himself. The Court held that unless a suspect in a *custodial* interrogation is first warned of his or her right to remain silent, and to have an attorney, provided at no cost, if necessary, before questioning, statements made by the suspect would not be admissible at trial. *Id.* at 492. The Court's primary concern was the coercive atmosphere surrounding a person in custody who is subject to interrogation by the police. *Id.* at 457-58. Because these conditions typically are not present in the context of a deposition of a witness or claimant in a civil forfeiture case, the Constitution does not require prosecutors to warn the witness of his or her rights against self-incrimination prior to questioning in a civil deposition. *See, e.g. United States v. Solano-Godines*, 120 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 1997) (*Miranda* warnings are not required before questioning in a civil deposition hearing). Statements made in the course of a deposition in a civil forfeiture case are admissible in the proceeding even in the absence of *Miranda* warnings, because deposition

²⁴¹ *See* chapter 3, Section I.B.2 at page 80 (stating that the seizing agency must also be consulted in connection with settlement negotiations).

hearings are civil in nature, not criminal prosecutions. Thus government attorneys do not have a legal obligation to give a Fifth Amendment advisement before commencing a witness' deposition in a civil forfeiture case.

Nonetheless, in civil forfeiture cases where the deponent is known to the Government to be a target or subject of a parallel criminal investigation or prosecution, government attorneys may wish to consider either deferring the deposition, or taking the deposition but giving an advisement that draws elements from those advisements that prosecutors routinely give targets and subjects in federal grand jury practice. For example, before taking the deposition in a civil forfeiture case of an unrepresented claimant who is a target of a parallel criminal investigation, the advisement may state simply:

You are advised that you are a target of a parallel federal criminal investigation. You may refuse to answer any question in this proceeding if a truthful answer to the question would tend to incriminate you. Anything that you do or say may be used against you in this proceeding, in a criminal proceeding, or in any other subsequent legal proceeding.

Include if applicable:

If you are represented by appointed counsel in a related criminal case, you have a right to ask the court to appoint counsel for you in this proceeding.

Or: If you are using the real property which this case seeks to forfeit as your primary residence, you have a right to ask the court to appoint counsel for you in this proceeding provided you show that you are financially unable to obtain counsel.

In contrast, before taking the deposition of a deponent who is a target, but who is represented and not a claimant, the advisement may simply state: "You are advised that you are a target of a parallel criminal investigation."

The suggestion that a government attorney may want to give an advisement to a deponent in certain civil forfeiture cases rests on several considerations. In grand jury practice, Department of Justice policy requires prosecutors to give criminal targets and subjects Fifth Amendment advisements in a target letter, and repeat those advisements on the record before the grand jury. *See* USAM 9-11.151; *Criminal Resource Manual* 160 (sample target letter). In the case of targets, the Department's policy goes further. Prosecutors must advise the person that he or she is a target of a criminal investigation. *See Grand Jury Practice Manual*, § 7.4. These policies exist notwithstanding the lack of a clear constitutional imperative requiring

prosecutors to give any advisements to targets or subjects in the context of grand jury practice. *See United States Attorneys' Manual* 9-11.151; *see also Grand Jury Practice Manual*, § 7.4. While there is no constitutional right to an attorney in a civil forfeiture proceeding, certain indigent claimants may have a statutory right to counsel. The court may authorize counsel for an indigent claimant with standing to contest the forfeiture who is represented by court-appointed counsel in a related criminal case. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 983(b)(1)(A). And, upon the request of an indigent party in a civil forfeiture action brought by the Government to forfeit that person's primary residence, the court "shall ensure that the person is represented by an attorney...." *See* 18 U.S.C. § 983(b)(1)(B). An advisement also enhances the likelihood that if the testimony is offered in a criminal prosecution, it will be admitted. Finally, the advisement helps rebut a claimant's subsequent arguments that he was not aware of the Fifth Amendment right, or, in the case of certain indigent claimants, was not aware that he may have the right to counsel in the civil forfeiture case. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 983(b); *see also* 18 U.S.C. § 981(g)(2) (authorizing a claimant to move to stay a civil forfeiture proceeding based on Fifth Amendment concerns).

Appendix A

U.S. Marshals Service Policy

October 9, 2003

Policy for Preseizure Real Property Seizures¹

MEMORANDUM TO: All Chief Deputy United States Marshals
All Administration Offices
All Asset Forfeiture Unit Chiefs

FROM: Katherine K Deoudes /s/
Chief
Asset Forfeiture Office

SUBJECT: Policy for Pre-Seizure Real Property Services

To clarify the conditions under which the United States Marshal Services (USMS) can or should order lien searches and/or appraisals **before a CATS number has been assigned to a particular asset**, *i.e.*, during the *pre-indictment* pre-seizure planning stage of a criminal or civil investigation, the following policy guidance is provided. These services are not intended to become a substitute for appraisals or title searches done by investigative agencies during the developmental stages of a forfeiture investigation. Rather, USMS is offering these services to investigative agencies and their respective U.S. Attorneys Offices as they make a final determination as to whether (1) sufficient equity exist to justify forfeiture, and (2) there is a sufficient nexus between the real property and the criminal activity under investigation. If you have further questions about either the policy or the procedures to be followed in ordering either service, please call Kim Butler, Real Property Program Manager, at (202) 307-9281.

Purpose of the policy

The policy is intended to (1) promote uniformity in appraised values of real property assets taken into government custody, and (2) encourage the seizing agency to consult USMS about assets targeted for forfeiture during the pre-seizure planning stage of and investigation.

What services are covered by this policy?

¹ The following is a reprint of the U.S. Marshals Policy for preseizure real property services, dated October 9, 2003.

Through the national contract with Fidelity National Asset Management Solutions, the Asset Forfeiture Office (AFO) may order the following services:

1. Lien search.
 - a. Definition. A lien search is a “snap shot” of the property’s current status. The lien search includes a listing of all relevant information belonging to the current record titleholder of the property including: deeds, existing liens, judgements, mortgages, tax history, and any *lis pendens* (a notice filed with the county recorder or registrar of deeds that serves as a warning to all persons that title to the property is in litigation).
 - b. Requirements. USMS must provide a minimum two of the following: Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN), full address including zip code, owner’s name, and/or full legal description. Of these four items of information, the first two are the most useful, while the legal description is least preferred.
2. Appraisals.
 - a. Definition. An appraisal is the process of developing and communicating an opinion of value, usually the market value of a piece of property. The market value is the most probable price at which a property would be bought or sold by a knowledgeable person.
 - b. Due to sensitive nature of ongoing investigation, AFO recommends that only a Broker’s Price Opinion (BPO) ordered for pre-seizure purposes. A BPO is a report written by a broker familiar with the area where the property is located containing an estimated value determined by comparables.
3. Other title products if necessary. The most common services offered under this category is referred to as a “chain-of-title.” Although this can become a very expensive depending upon the asset’s location, ascertaining the subject property’s history of vested titled owners is useful in cases involving money laundering during a specific time frame, or when the target of the investigation seeks to hide his interest through multiple nominees or a “straw man.” However, oftentimes this service is not required because the target’s interest is disclosed in the lien search or its accompanying back-up documentation. NOTE: All chain-of-title requests must be approved by Kim Butler.

When will USMS order real property services on behalf of the investigative agency?

A. District Utilizing the Fidelity Contract

USMS districts currently participating in the Fidelity pilot are listed below:

1. Northern California
2. Colorado
3. Connecticut
4. Middle Florida
5. Southern Florida (Transition District)
 - a. Southern Georgia
 - b. Northern Alabama
 - c. Western Kentucky
 - d. Middle North Carolina
6. Northern Georgia
7. Middle Georgia
8. Central Illinois
9. Northern Louisiana
10. Maryland (Transition District)
 - a. Delaware
 - b. Western Missouri
 - c. Western Virginia
 - d. Western Michigan
11. New Jersey
12. Southern New York
13. Eastern North Carolina
14. Puerto Rico
15. Southern Texas (Transition District)
 - a. Northern Mississippi
 - b. Western Louisiana
16. Eastern Virginia

NOTE: A “Transition District” will place orders under the Fidelity contract for those additional districts listed, and become the “custodial district” despite the property’s location in another district.

Before contemplating assisting an investigative agency (IA) by providing them with an appraisal or title search during the investigative stage of a forfeiture case, the IA must consult the USMS Asset Forfeiture Unit in the district where the asset is located. After reviewing the information provided by the IA, the custodial district has the discretion to order pre-seizure real property services.

B. District Utilizing Local Contractors/Vendors

If the custodial district is not participating in the Fidelity pilot program, the following conditions must be met before AFO will order pre-seizure real property services:

1. The IA must brief the local USMS Asset Forfeiture Unit on the likelihood of the asset's forfeiture. If there are no asset forfeiture personnel dedicated at the local USMS District office, the IA may call Kim Butler at AFO for assistance.
2. If the custodial district has a local title services contract in place, the USMS district office may, at its discretion, order the appropriate products.
3. If the case involves the forfeiture of multiple assets of all types (real and personal property, businesses and/or bank accounts) in multiple districts involving several different agencies, *e.g.*, an Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force (OCDETF) case, products may be ordered through the Fidelity contract directly from AFO. Under these circumstances, please contact Peter Madriñan, AFO's Field Operations Pre-Seizure Planning Coordinator, at (202) 353-3217.

Asset Forfeiture Unit Chiefs: Please disseminate this memorandum to the appropriate personnel on your staff.

cc: All United States Marshals

Appendix B

U.S. Marshals Service Preseizure Planning Guide

Introduction

This Pre-Seizure Planning Guide is intended to provide guidance and checklists to be utilized by all components participating in the Department of Justice, Asset Forfeiture Program. The goal of these checklists is to aide in anticipating and making informed decisions about what property is being seized; how and when it is going to be seized; and, most importantly, whether it should be seized.

The checklists that are included in this guide are:

Pre-Seizure Planning Summary Sheet: This sheet is a summary of all of the assets involved in a given case. One Summary Sheet should be completed per case.

Real Property Checklist: A separate Real Property Checklist should be completed for each piece of real property. A separate Net Equity Worksheet accompanies the Real Property Checklist.

Business Checklist: A Business Checklist should be completed for each business being considered for forfeiture. The complex nature of business forfeitures may make it necessary to include information that is not explicitly mentioned in the checklist.

Conveyances: A Conveyance Checklist should be completed for the seizure of multiple and/or unique conveyances. A Net Equity Worksheet for conveyances is also included.

Personal Property: A Personal Property Checklist should be completed for unique or complex assets such as livestock, furniture/household items, precious items, collectables, and fine arts.

Given that each case is unique, you may find that the information included in these checklists do not apply to all assets in all cases, more or less information may be necessary. Therefore, use these checklists as a starting point, adding any additional information that may be useful in the forfeiture process.

The Asset Forfeiture Office

PRE-SEIZURE PLANNING SUMMARY SHEET

Date _____

POINTS OF CONTACT:

AUSA _____ Phone # _____
Asset Forfeiture AUSA _____ Phone # _____
Agency _____ Agent _____ Phone # _____
DUSM _____ Phone # _____

CASE INFORMATION:

Case Identifier: _____

Originating District: _____

Other Districts involved: _____

Task Force Case: YES NO If yes, participating agencies _____

Adoptive Case: YES NO
If yes, contact name _____ Phone # _____

Type of Case: Civil Criminal
Proposed date of seizure / Post & Walk _____

Will a TRO or Protective Order be Issued: YES NO

Proposed date of indictment/complaint/warrant of arrest in rem: _____

Is a draft copy available? YES NO *If yes, obtain a copy.*

Defendant's Name: _____

Defendant's Status: Fugitive YES NO

Type of Case: Drugs Money Laundering RICO
Other (*describe*) _____

ASSET INFORMATION:

Number of assets, by category, targeted for seizure – *once identified, refer to applicable form:*

_____ Real Estate _____ Business(es) _____ Personal Property _____ Other

Number of personal properties by category targeted for seizure:

_____ Vehicles _____ Aircraft _____ Cash (approx.) \$ _____
_____ Art _____ Jewelry _____ Financial Instr.
_____ Vessels _____ Collectibles _____ Other (*describe*)

Describe: _____

PRE-SEIZURE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE REAL PROPERTY

Complete one form per property

TYPE OF REAL PROPERTY:

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single Family Detached Residence | <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment/Condo Unit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment/Condo Building | <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial (<i>type of use</i>) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant/Undeveloped Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>describe</i>) _____ |

Location/Address: _____

Legal Description: (*attach copy if available*) _____

Title Owner: Name: _____ Phone#: _____

Address: _____

O & E/Title Report/Appraisal available? Yes No *If yes, obtain a copy.*

Has a Lis Pendens been filed? Yes No

Items to be procured by USMS: Drive-By Appraisal Title Report/Abstract
 Full Appraisal (*Only if full, unrestricted access to property is available and the actions taken by the appraisers or USMS personnel will not inhibit or reveal the investigation.*)

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

Is there any available information that will assist the USMS regarding personal safety issues during seizure operations (pets, fences, alarms, water hazards, booby traps, children, etc.)?

REAL PROPERTY (CONT'D.)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS:

Property Condition: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Photos Available: Yes No

Potential Contamination: Yes No

If yes, what contaminants? _____

If yes, has anyone been contacted to provide an assessment of the property? Yes No

Company Name: _____ Phone # _____

Year Built: _____

If pre-1960 and residential, has lead-based paint assessment been completed? Yes No

If yes, Company Name: _____ Phone # _____

Date _____

SPECIFIC CONCERNS *(describe briefly if applicable):*

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Swimming pool | <input type="checkbox"/> Safe on premises | <input type="checkbox"/> Structural defects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratories | <input type="checkbox"/> Historical site | <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Live stock | <input type="checkbox"/> Environmentally protected | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous chemicals |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other structures | <input type="checkbox"/> Association fees | <input type="checkbox"/> Known code violations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Underground tanks | <input type="checkbox"/> Other personal property | <input type="checkbox"/> Other potential liabilities |

Describe: _____

CONTENTS OF PROPERTY:

Are contents being seized? Yes No

If no, have arrangements been made to remove or destroy? Yes No

Is an inventory required? Yes No

Additional comments on contents : _____

REAL PROPERTY (CONT'D.)

OCCUPANCY:

Is the property occupied? Yes No If yes, Owners Renters

Occupants, if allowed to remain occupied, provide name, phone, and identifier (i.e., DOB, SSN)

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Identifier: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Identifier: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Identifier: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Identifier: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Identifier: _____

Will the defendant(s) be arrested simultaneously at the time of seizure? Yes No

Following the arrest of the defendant(s), will the property be left vacant? Yes No

General remarks: _____

NET EQUITY *(If info is available, complete Net Equity Worksheet):*

Does the asset meet the minimum net equity threshold value? Yes No Unknown

If no, what law enforcement benefits are to be derived from the seizure? _____

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION:

Will the AUSA provide or give a press release? Yes No

Next meeting scheduled? Yes No If yes, Date: _____ Time: _____

Location of next meeting: _____

Prepared by: Printed name: _____ Title: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Case AUSA's concurrence, review and approval:

Printed name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

REAL PROPERTY NET EQUITY WORKSHEET

Name of Case: U.S. v. _____

District: _____ Court Case: (Docket number) _____

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | a. Appraised value (Date of appraisal _____)
minus | \$ _____ |
| | b. Expenses ¹
equals
plus | (_____)
\$ _____ |
| | c. Income
equals | \$ _____ |
| | d. Net value | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">\$ _____</div> |
| 2. | a. Net value
minus | \$ _____ |
| | b. Liens ²
equals | (_____) |
| | c. U.S. equity | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">\$ _____</div> |
| 3. | a. U.S. equity
divided by | \$ _____ |
| | b. Appraised value
equals | \$ _____ |
| | c. Percentage of U.S. equity | <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">_____ %</div> |

¹Includes advertising, maintenance (includes management fees of \$_____/month x 12 months), sales commission, sellers' expenses to close, etc.

²Includes the total of all items, principal and interest from the date of seizure to the date this worksheet is completed.

Prepared by:

Printed Name: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

AUSA's Signature: _____ Date: _____

PRE-SEIZURE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE BUSINESS

Complete one form per business

BUSINESS IDENTIFIERS:

Type of Business (i.e., restaurant, warehouse, automobile dealership, etc.): _____

Legal or Corporate Name: _____

Address: _____ Phone #: _____

Business name (Doing business as): _____

Address: _____ Phone #: _____

Is the business: Corporation Partnership Sole Proprietorship
 Joint Venture Limited Liability Company (LLC)

Describe: _____

If applicable, list all shareholders, officers, and directors:

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Position: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Position: _____

Name: _____ Phone #: _____ Position: _____

Is business privately or publicly owned? Private Public

Is the business currently operating or idle? Operating Idle

If operating, will the business continue to operate upon the arrest of the defendant(s)?

Yes No

Status of registration with the State: Active Inactive Defunct Other

SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS:

Is there any available information that will assist the USMS regarding personal safety issues during seizure operations (guard dogs, fences, weak floors, water hazards, booby traps, security personnel, open pits, heavy machinery, etc.)? List or describe:

BUSINESS (CONT'D.)

ASSET INFORMATION:

Are we seizing the legal entity? (the entire corporation with assets and liabilities) Yes No

If no, what assets are targeted for seizure? _____

Upon seizure, will the government hold a majority interest? Yes No

If not, how much? _____%

Will the business require a monitor or the appointment of a trustee? Yes No Unknown

Is the business located on leased or owned property? Leased Owned Unknown

Real Property Lessor(s) or owner(s) :

Name(s): _____ Phone#: _____

Address: _____

Current status of lease/mortgage: Current Behind

If in arrears, how many months?: _____

Will the real estate be seized as part of the business? Yes No

Type of Structure:

Stand alone building of steel and block construction

Attached structure to residence

Strip mall store

Warehouse

Other (*describe*): _____

Condition of Structure:

Excellent Good Fair Poor

Size of Structure: Approx. _____ Sq. footage

Known structural defects or immediate repairs identified: List and describe: _____

BUSINESS (CONT'D.)

ASSET INFORMATION *(Cont'd.)*

Specific concerns:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous materials on site | <input type="checkbox"/> Incomplete construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potential contaminants | <input type="checkbox"/> Known code violations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Underground tanks | <input type="checkbox"/> Type of safes/security systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Operable fire extinguisher system | <input type="checkbox"/> Other potential liabilities (describe) |

Describe Specific Concerns : _____

Will the locks require replacement? Yes No

Are contents of business leased or owned? Leased Owned Unknown

Real Property Lessor(s) or owner(s)

Name(s): _____ Phone#: _____

Address: _____

BUSINESS RECORDS:

List all business licenses and indicate if they are current:

Tax License: _____ Current Expired

License: _____ Current Expired

License: _____ Current Expired

Records Custodian: _____ Phone # _____

Address: _____

Corporate Attorney: _____ Phone # _____

Address: _____

Corporate Accountant: _____ Phone # _____

Address: _____

Are there any records that have been subpoenaed that will assist in determining the financial status of the business (tax returns, financial reports, etc.)? Yes No

If yes, are they available for review by the USMS? Yes No

Obtain availability date for review by the USMS: _____

Has a lien/judgment search been initiated? Yes No If yes, obtain a copy.

BUSINESS (CONT'D.)**BUSINESS RECORDS (Cont'd.):**

Has a Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) search been conducted? Yes No

Is there an existing budget (balance/income statements)? Yes No

Location of existing operating/maintenance/escrow capital accounts?

List all banks and account numbers:

Bank: _____ Account # _____

Bank: _____ Account # _____

Bank: _____ Account # _____

Does the business have appropriate insurance coverage? (fire, flood, general liability, etc.):

Yes No Explain: _____

Is the business in compliance with all tax reporting requirements? (i.e., Federal, State, SS):

Federal: Yes No Explain: _____

State: Yes No Explain: _____

SS: Yes No Explain: _____

Other: Yes No Explain: _____

Will the business remain to be viable and productive post-arrest of defendant(s)?

Yes No

Post-arrest of defendant(s), will the business require government capital contribution in order to continue operations?

Yes No

Is there any known pending litigation against the business, its principals, or its employees?

Yes No If yes, explain: _____

DEFENDANT AND/OR EMPLOYEE INFORMATION:

Number of part-time and full-time employees? _____ Full-time _____ Part-time

Are the employees unionized? Yes No

If yes, name of union: _____

If yes, when will the next contract be negotiated? Date: _____

BUSINESS (CONT'D.)

DEFENDANT AND/OR EMPLOYEE INFORMATION *(Cont'd.)*

Will the defendant(s) be arrested simultaneously at the time of seizure? Yes No
Following the arrest of the defendant(s), will the property be left vacant? Yes No

FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION:

Next meeting scheduled? Yes No
If yes, obtain Date: _____ Time: _____

Will media coverage or public knowledge of the seizure effect negatively on the operating business?
 Yes No

Will the seizure impact the local economy or population? (i.e., major community employer):
 Yes No If yes, (*indicate which*) what efforts can be made to minimize this effect?

Will the AUSA provide or give a press release? Yes No
If yes, obtain name and phone number of press information officer:
Name: _____ Phone # _____

Location of next meeting: _____

NOTE: THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, ONCE COMPLETED, MUST BE FAXED TO YOUR ASSET FORFEITURE OFFICE REPRESENTATIVE.

Prepared by:
Printed name: _____ Title: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____

Case AUSA's concurrence, review and approval:
Printed name: _____
Signature: _____ Date: _____

Case Identifier: _____

PRE-SEIZURE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE CONVEYANCES

USMS District: _____

CATS Number: _____

Seizing Agency: _____

Seizure Date: _____

USMS Custody Date: _____

Seizure Location: _____

Type of Forfeiture: Administrative Civil Criminal

CONVEYANCE DESCRIPTION:

Type: Vehicle Vessel Aircraft Other

Make _____

VIN/Serial/TAG: _____

Model: _____

State of Registration: _____

Plate/Tag Number/Tail Number: _____

Conveyance Condition: Good Fair Poor Scrap

Is the conveyance operating? Yes No

For Aircraft: Are logbooks present? Yes No

VALUE INFORMATION:

Seizing Agency Appraisal: \$ _____

USMS (NADA Loan): \$ _____

First Lienholder: _____

Second Lienholder: _____

Address: _____

Address: _____

Amount: \$ _____

Amount: \$ _____

POINTS OF CONTACT:

Seizing Agent: _____

Phone #: _____

AUSA: _____

Phone #: _____

Other: _____

Phone #: _____

CUSTODY:

USMS Contractor: _____

Phone #: _____

State/Local Agency: _____

Phone #: _____

Seizing Agency: _____

Phone #: _____

Other: _____

Phone #: _____

Is Equitable Sharing Anticipated? Yes No

Placing into Official Use? Yes No

CONVEYANCES NET EQUITY WORKSHEET

CATS ID #: _____

Docket #: _____

Vehicle
 Vessel
 Aircraft
 Other

Year: _____ Make: _____

Model: _____ Color: _____

VIN #: _____

Serial #: _____

Tail #: _____

Location of Hidden Trap(s) - if any: _____

Appraised value (Date of Appraisal: _____) \$ _____

minus

Cost of Storage per month \$ _____ X 9 - \$(_____)

Lien¹ - \$(_____)

Misc. Costs (prep for sale/repairs)² - \$(_____)

Costs to Disable/Seal Hidden Traps - \$(_____)

equals

Total Net Equity = \$ _____

\$ _____ / \$ _____ = _____ %

Total Net Equity Divided by Appraised Value Equals % of U.S. Equity

¹ Includes total of all liens, principal and interest from the dates of seizure to the date this worksheet is completed.

² Includes maintenance and disposal expenses, e.g., advertising, sales commission, property manager salary, etc.

Preparer's Name: _____ Title: _____

Preparer's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Case Identifier: _____

PRE-SEIZURE PLANNING QUESTIONNAIRE PERSONAL PROPERTY

USMS District: _____ CATS Number: _____
Seizing Agency: _____ Seizure Date: _____
USMS Custody Date: _____ Seizure Location: _____

Type of Forfeiture: Administrative Civil Criminal

TYPE OF PROPERTY:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Animal | <input type="checkbox"/> Chemical/Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic Equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> Explosives/Firearms |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Furniture/Household Items | <input type="checkbox"/> Gambling Devices |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grow Equipment | <input type="checkbox"/> Heavy Machinery |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Precious Items | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>describe</i>) _____ |

Condition: Excellent Good Fair Poor

VALUE INFORMATION:

Appraised Value: \$ _____
Monthly Cost (storage): \$ _____
First Lienholder: _____ Second Lienholder: _____
Address: _____ Address: _____
Amount: \$ _____ Amount: \$ _____

POINTS OF CONTACT:

Seizing Agent: _____ Phone #: _____
AUSA: _____ Phone #: _____
Other: _____ Phone #: _____
Custodian: _____ Phone #: _____

Is Equitable Sharing Anticipated? Yes No

Placing into Official Use? Yes No

PERSONAL PROPERTY NET EQUITY WORKSHEET

Name of Case: U.S. v. _____
 District: _____
 Court Case: (Docket number) _____
 CATS #: _____

Identification of Personal Property: _____

- | | | | |
|----|---|----------|-----------|
| 1. | a. Appraised value (Date of appraisal _____)
minus | \$ _____ | |
| | b. Expenses ¹
equals | | (_____) |
| | c. Net value | \$ _____ | |
| | | | |
| 2. | a. Net value
minus | \$ _____ | |
| | b. Liens ²
equals | | (_____) |
| | c. U.S. equity | \$ _____ | |
| | | | |
| 3. | a. U.S. equity
divided by | \$ _____ | |
| | b. Appraised value
equals | | \$ _____ |
| | c. Percentage of U.S. equity | | _____ % |

¹ Includes maintenance and disposal expenses, e.g., advertising, sales commission, property manager salary, etc.

² Includes total of all liens, principal and interest from the date of seizure to the date this worksheet is completed.

Prepared by:
 Printed Name: _____ Title: _____ Date: _____

Supervisory Review: _____

Resources Available Through the USMS Asset Forfeiture Office

Telephone No. (202) 307-9221

Facsimile No. (202) 307-5020

BUSINESS RELATED SERVICES:

- Business Evaluations
- Internal Controls Evaluations
- Management Reviews
- Asset Valuation
- Business Management
- Drafting Court Orders
- Interpreting Court Orders
- Business Monitors / Trustees
- Formal Business Appraisals
- Operational Reviews
- Accounting Overview & Reporting
- Asset, Business Liquidation
- Cash Planning/Budgets
- Cash Flow Analysis
- Identification of Straw Owners
- Manage Trade Creditor and Inquires

REAL PROPERTY RELATED SERVICES:

- Correcting Complex Title Problems
- Title Report Analysis
- Environmental Report Analysis
- Identification of Straw Owners
- Drafting Court Orders
- Interpreting Court Orders
- Drafting Contracts, Leases, Agreements
- Appraisal Analysis
- Market Value Analysis
- Management and Disposition of Commercial Properties
- Coordination of National Auctions
- Negotiation of Complex Sales
- Brokerage Agreements for all Types of Properties

UNIQUE AND COMPLEX ASSETS:

- The Asset Forfeiture Office offers technical support and assistance in the area of unique and complex assets.

Checklist Glossary

Abstract of Title: A complete summary of all consecutive grants, conveyances, wills, records, and judicial proceedings that affect the title to a specific parcel of real property, together with a statement of all recorded liens and encumbrances affecting the property and their present status.

Administrative Declaration of Forfeiture: An administrative ruling issued by the investigative agency processing an administrative forfeiture, following publication of notice of intent to forfeit, declaring that no claims to the property had been received and that the seized property has therefore been forfeited to the United States. Such a declaration has the force and effect of a court order.

Administrative Forfeiture: The process by which property may be forfeited to the United States by the investigative agency that seized it, without judicial involvement.

Appraisal: An opinion of the value of the property prepared by a licensed appraiser.

Business: Usually a commercial or mercantile activity engaged in as a means of livelihood; a commercial or sometimes an industrial enterprise.

Case Identifier: The primary case identifier should be the CATS identification number, if one exists. If one does not exist, the case identifier may be the case name.

Civil Order of Forfeiture: In a civil case, the court order issued following a judgment for the United States declaring that the property, which is the named defendant in the case, is forfeited. The civil order of forfeiture affects “the whole world,” including unknown claimants. (See also final order of forfeiture.)

Collectible: An object that is collected by fanciers; especially one other than such traditionally collectable items as art, stamps, coins and antiques.

Commercial Real Property: Commercial real property is any vacant land that is zoned for commercial or industrial use; a structure utilized for operating a business; or a residential structure with four or more units.

Contamination: The process by which something is polluted by the infusion of or contact with dirt or foulness from an outside source (e.g., ground water contaminated by industrial wastes).

Conveyances: Aircraft, vehicles, vessels and other vehicle of transportation capable of conveying persons or property. See 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)(4).

Corporation: A legal entity created under State law, consisting of an association of one or more individuals but regarded under the law as having an existence and personality separate from such individuals. The main characteristics of a corporation are its perpetual

existence (that is, the corporation exists indefinitely and only ceases to exist if and when it is properly dissolved through legal proceedings); centralized management in the board of directors; liability of a shareholder limited to the amount of his or her investment; and free transferability of corporate shares.

Drive-by Appraisal: A preliminary opinion about a property's value by a licensed appraiser based upon an external examination of the property's condition and a public records search only.

Equitable Sharing: The process by which forfeited property or its proceeds are transferred to a State or local law enforcement agency to a degree or in an amount that bears a reasonable relationship to the degree of direct participation of the State or local agency in the law enforcement effort resulting in the forfeiture. 21 U.S.C. § 881(e)(3).

Escrow: The process by which money and/or documents are held by a disinterested third person (a stakeholder) until satisfaction of the terms and conditions of the escrow instructions (as prepared by the parties to the escrow) has been achieved.

Expenses: Items of business outlays chargeable against revenue of a specific project or period.

Final Order of Forfeiture: In a criminal case, the court order issued following the disposition of all petitions, or if no petitions are filed in a timely manner, by which the United States gains clear title to property subject to the preliminary order of forfeiture. The preliminary order of forfeiture becomes final as to the whole world only when the ancillary proceeding is concluded.

Financial Instrument: A legal document conveying a financial interest, such as checks, certificates of deposit, money orders, stocks, bonds, airline tickets, and promissory notes.

Hidden Compartments (“Traps”): A compartment, especially in a vehicle, that has been designed, fabricated, adjusted, altered, changed, or tampered with, to transport, store or conceal weapons, contraband or illegal aliens.

Joint Venture: The joining of two or more persons in a specific business enterprise, such as the development of a condominium project or a shopping center. The parties may pool their respective resources (such as money, expertise, property or equipment). There must be an agreement, express or implied, to share in the losses or profits of the venture. Joint ventures are a business form of partnership and for tax purposes are treated as partnerships. The main difference between the two is that a joint venture is a special joining of the parties for a specific project with no intention on the part of the parties to enter into any continuing partnership relationship.

Lead-Based Paint Assessment: An evaluation following an inspection of all painted surfaces in residential property. The evaluation is to determine if there are any sources of serious lead exposure (such as peeling paint and lead dust) and what actions are required to address these hazards.

Legal Description: A description of a piece of real property that is acceptable by the courts of the State where the property is located and is used in real property conveyance documents.

Lien: Qualified rights that a creditor has in certain property of his/her debtor, as security for the debt, or his/her performance of some act for the debtor.

Limited Liability Company: An entity with two or more members that may engage in any lawful business activity (subject to any limitations contained in its articles or organization and to compliance with any other applicable laws), except for the banking business, the business of issuing policies or insurance and assuming insurance risks, or the trust company business, and except for rendering some professional services. In general, a legal liability company affords its members and managers (including officers) limited liability essentially like that enjoined by a corporate shareholder, and tax treatment essentially like that of a partnership.

Lis pendens (Latin for suit pending): A notice filed with the county recorder or registrar of deeds that serves as a warning to all persons that the title to the property is in litigation and that potential purchasers are in danger of being bound by an adverse judgment against the property. The objective of a lis pendens is to prevent a bona fide sale of the property or its refinancing pending the outcome of the forfeiture litigation.

Market Value: The price that a purchaser might be willing but not compelled to pay to purchase, and the lowest price a seller, willing to but not compelled to sell, would accept. It assumes a motivated buyer and seller, and reasonable marketing time. For vehicles, vessels, and aircraft, current NADA or BUC guidebooks may be used to determine market value.

Monitor: An individual appointed by the court who is responsible for examining the operations of a business or enterprise; and who reports his/her findings to the court as to whether the assets of a business or enterprise are dissipating and will be available for forfeiture to the United States. A monitor does not control the operations of a business or enterprise, but merely reports on his/her findings. A monitor may be responsible for approving payments, (e.g., all payments over \$10,000, payments not in the ordinary course of business), or performing other very limited oversight functions.

Net Equity: The net equity is the projected equity in an asset at the time of disposition. This amount should take into account all expenses, including maintenance and disposal of the asset.

Official Use: The transfer to a Federal agency or a State or local agency for its use when authorized by the forfeiture statute and approved by the Attorney General.

Owners and Encumbrances Report (O & E Report): A report that based upon an examination of the title to real property that tells the State who is the owner of the real property and what encumbrances (e.g., mortgages, taxes, liens, and similar matters) affect the real property. (See also title report.)

Partnership: As defined in the Uniform Partnership Act, which is in force in a majority of states, “an association of two or more persons who carry on a business for profit as co-owners.” Under this act, a partnership can hold title to property in the name of the partnership, holding by tenancy in partnership. One tax advantage to this form of ownership is that the partnership itself does not pay taxes. Its income is distributed to each partner, who is responsible for paying his or her own taxes.

Personal Property: Things that are tangible and movable; property that is not classified as real property.

Preliminary Order of Forfeiture: The order entered by the court forfeiting all the defendant’s interests and assets that the jury has found to be forfeitable in its special verdict. The order should identify specifically each forfeited asset and state that the interest of the defendant in each asset is “forfeited to the United States for disposition in accordance with law.” In addition, the order “must authorize the Attorney General to seize the interest or property subject to forfeiture on terms that the court considers proper.”

Posting: The placing of the forfeiture complaint and the warrant of arrest in rem (the arrest warrant), issued by the clerk of the court pursuant to Rule C(3) of the Supplemental Rules for Admiralty and Maritime Claims, upon the real property that is the defendant in rem in the forfeiture action. In the case of unoccupied land, the process consists of tacking the arrest warrant in a visible location on the property. Where a structure is involved, the complaint and arrest warrant is tacked on the outside of the structure.

Real Estate: The physical land at, above and below the earth’s surface with all appurtenances, including any structures; any and every interest in land whether corporeal or incorporeal, freehold or nonfreehold; for all practical purpose, the term real estate is synonymous with real property.

RICO: Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations. Criminal statute, including forfeiture provisions found at 18 U.S.C. § 1961, et seq.

Shareholder (“Stockholder”): One who holds or owns a share in a property. A “stockholder” is one who owns corporate stock reflecting his/her share of the corporation.

Sole Proprietorship: A method of owning a business in which one person owns the entire business and reports all profits and losses directly on his or her personal income tax, as contrasted with corporate, joint or partnership ownership.

Task Force Case: A case in which a combination of law enforcement agencies participate in the investigation. The law enforcement agencies represented on the task force may be composed of Federal agencies, or Federal, State and local agencies.

Temporary Restraining Order: An order of the court forbidding the defendant to act until a hearing can be held.

Title Report: A preliminary report showing the current state of the title to real property along with the recorded objections to clear the title (e.g., unpaid mortgages and easements). Unlike an abstract of title, a title report shows only the current state of the title along with the recorded objections to clear the title such as unpaid mortgages and easements. (See also Owners and Encumbrances Report.)

Trustee: An individual appointed by a court and granted the authority to manage and/or dispose of property. Trustees may be appointed before or after property has been seized or forfeited.

Uniform Commercial Code (UCC): One of the uniform laws drafted by the National Conference of Commissioner on Uniform State Laws governing commercial transactions (e.g., sale of goods, commercial paper, investment securities etc.). The UCC provides that the security interests in personal property may be filed in certain state offices, such as the county clerk's office, the Secretary of State's office, or other commercial departments in certain state offices.

Warrant of Arrest in Rem: A written order of the court, based upon a verified complaint, issued under the authority of Admiralty Rule C(3), which commands the Marshal to arrest (seize) the property named therein, and which gives the court jurisdiction over the property to be seized.

Appendix C

Land and Natural Resources Division Policy¹

May 6, 1990 1

MEMORANDUM

TO: Edward S. G. Dennis, Jr.
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division

FROM: Richard B. Stewart /s/
Assistant Attorney General
Environment and Natural Resources Division

SUBJECT: Environmental Liability in Relation to
Federal Property Ownership: New EPA Regulation

SUMMARY

This is to advise you of a recent regulation promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) concerning the hazardous substance activity reporting requirements for federal agencies when selling or transferring federal real property. The regulation implements Section 120(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA or Superfund), 42 U.S.C. 9620(h). The regulation should assist the law enforcement components in the Department in establishing procedures for seizure and forfeiture of property that may be contaminated with hazardous substances.

EPA's regulation governs the notice federal agencies must give when selling or transferring real property on which hazardous substances have been stored, released or disposed of. Federal agencies must include in the contract of sale or transfer notice of any hazardous substance which "during the time the property was owned by the United States" was "stored for one year or more, known to have been released, or disposed of." The notice

¹ The following is a reprint of a memorandum from the Land and Natural Resources Division, dated May 16, 1990.

must include the “type and quantity of such hazardous substance and notice of the time at which such storage, release, or disposal took place, to the extent such information is available on the basis of a complete search of agency files.” 55 Fed. Reg. 14212 (April 16, 1990), to be codified at 42 C.F.R. 373.1. Because the regulation focuses on hazardous substance conditions which occurred *during* the federal ownership, federal law enforcement agencies will not bear the burden of concern over waste problems created by prior owners.

The regulation constitutes a government interpretation of Section 120(h), which establishes special conditions for federal agencies when they transfer property. Many agencies, including the Department, have been concerned over their exposure to clean up and other costs under the environmental laws, in particular CERCLA, when they obtain real property particularly as a result of forfeiture proceedings in connection with law enforcement activities. To assist the Department in both understanding this regulation, and assessing its potential liability for environmental contamination on real property, I am providing an additional explanation of the pertinent provisions of federal environmental law.

CERCLA BACKGROUND

Liability Scheme. CERCLA establishes both funding and authority for EPA to undertake clean up of hazardous substance sites, and also structures a liability scheme under which persons who fund clean up of hazardous substances may recover their costs. EPA’s funds, known as the Superfund, are generally not available for response actions on federally owned property.² As a result, federal agencies must plan and budget for clean up of hazardous substances at their own property.

The heart of CERCLA rests in its liability scheme, found primarily in Section 107, which establishes classes of persons who may be liable for clean up costs. Liable parties include (1) owners and operators of facilities; (2) certain prior owners and operators; (3) generators, i.e., those who arrange for the disposal of waste; and (4) transporters of waste. 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a). Facility is a broadly defined term, including landfills, pits, buildings, vehicles, and “any site or area where a hazardous substance has been deposited, stored, disposed of, or placed, or otherwise come to be located.” 42 U.S.C. § 9601(9). Consumer products in consumer use are excluded.

Liable parties may be held liable for the costs of removal or remedial actions, natural resource damages and health assessments, as each of these terms is used in CERCLA. 42 U.S.C. § 9607(a). Generally these costs are incurred by a federal or state governmental entity, which then seeks to recover from liable parties. CERCLA also permits actions for contribution among and between liable parties. 42 U.S.C. § 9613(f)(1). In such suits, the court is to “allocate response costs among liable parties using such equitable factors as the court deems are appropriate.” *id.*

Defenses Available. CERCLA recognizes few defenses. Under Section 107(b), the only defenses to liability require proof that the “release or threat of release of a hazardous substance and the damages resulting therefrom were caused solely by —

(1) an act of God;

² See section 111(e)(3), 42 U.S.C. § 9611(e)(3), E.O. 12580 §§ 2(a), 2(e), 9(i). Short term or emergency responses, known as removal actions, may be undertaken by the Superfund at federally owned properties at the discretion of the EPA.

(2)an act of war;

(3)an act or omission of a third party other than an employee or agency of the defendant, or than one whose act or omission occurs in connection with a contractual relationship, existing directly or indirectly with the defendant. . .”

To invoke the CERCLA “third party” defense, the liable party must also demonstrate (1) exercise of “due care with respect to the hazardous substance concerned” and (2) taking of “precautions against foreseeable acts or omissions” of possible third parties. See 42 U.S.C. § 9607(b)(3).³

Government “innocent landowner” defense. In 1986, when Congress amended CERCLA, it supplemented the third party defense to address the so-called innocent landowner. Concerned that the contracts for sale and transfer of property would put subsequent purchasers in a “contractual relationship” that would vitiate the availability of the third party defense, Congress added detailed definitional requirements to address such circumstances. Section 101(35) defines “contractual relationship” to include land transfer arrangements with specified limitations; a party meeting these limits is, notwithstanding the land transfer, eligible to invoke the third party defense.

The conditions established in Section 101(35) for the innocent landowner defense are as follows:

- acquisition of the property “after the disposal or placement of the hazardous substance on, in, or at the facility,” and;
- either:
 - no knowledge of the hazardous substance, or

“The defendant is a government entity which acquired the facility by escheat, or through any other involuntary transfer or acquisition, or through the exercise of eminent domain authority by purchase or condemnation” or acquisition of the property by inheritance or bequest, but;

“if the defendant obtained actual knowledge of the release or threatened release of a hazardous substance at such facility when the defendant owned the real property and then subsequently transferred ownership of the property to another person without disclosing such knowledge” no defense under Section 107(b) will be available.

Together, Section 107(b) (3), with the definitions in Section 101(35), allows a government entity which acquires through involuntary means (this includes seizures and forfeitures, which are “involuntary” to the law enforcement violator) to invoke a defense from liability for hazardous substance contamination found on real property as a result of prior owner’s activities if that federal agency (1) exercises due care once it owns the

³ Federal agency compliance with EPA’s section 120(h) property transfer regulations does not constitute a defense to liability for cost recovery under CERCLA. The liability regime governs when someone else *may* seek to hold a party liable for cleanup costs. The property transfer regulation, on the other hand, does effect the federal agencies’ obligation to clean up property, since the pendency of suits or claims by third parties is irrelevant to section 120 responsibilities.

property, (2) secures the property from other third party actions, and (3) provides notice to any transferee of those hazardous substance conditions about which it knows.⁴

Section 120 Obligations. In 1986, Congress expressed particular concern about the slow pace of clean up at major federal facilities. For the most part, the debate concerned large federal properties such as military bases and defense production facilities, nuclear and conventional. CERCLA had, since its enactment in 1980, included a waiver of sovereign immunity, subjecting federal agencies to the requirements of the federal statute. However, compliance had been slow. Congress responded in 1986 with detailed provisions in Section 120, designed to assure that federal facility clean up was made subject to EPA oversight, and that federal agencies thoroughly inventoried and reported on hazardous substance practices in their operations.

The Section 120 obligations are organized around reporting of hazardous waste facilities and subsequent clean up schedules for those sites posing sufficient threat to warrant inclusion on EPA's National Priorities List. Thus Sections 120(b) and (c) require federal agencies to report to EPA, for maintenance on a Federal Agency Hazardous Waste Compliance Docket, facilities engaged in the storage, treatment or disposal of hazardous waste (see 42 U.S.C. § 3016); any information provided in permit applications or other reports required for the storage, treatment or disposal of hazardous wastes (see 42 U.S.C. §§ 3005, 3010)⁵; and any information required to be reported when notice is given of a hazardous substance release (see 42 U.S.C. § 9603). From this information, EPA is to oversee the conduct of "preliminary assessments" of the federal properties, and evaluate such facilities to determine if they should be listed on the National Priority List. 42 U.S.C. § 9620(b), (c).

For federal facilities on the National Priority List, Section 120(e) provides a detailed arrangement for conduct of appropriate remedial investigations and feasibility studies (the RI/FS) necessary to select a remedy, and schedules for the conduct of such remedial actions as are found to be needed. 42 U.S.C. § 9620(e).

Section 120(j) allows the President to issue special orders exempting Department of Defense and Department of Energy facilities from any CERCLA requirements, if necessary to protect the national security interests of the United States. There are conditions on this authority, including notification to Congress and a limitation of one year, with the authorization to extend. 42 U.S.C. § 9620(j).

Section 120(h) Requirements. Section 120(h) addresses property transferred by Federal agencies. The section, which has been construed in EPA's recent regulations, provides in brief the following: Subsection (1) requires notice in the contract of sale or transfer of hazardous substances stored, released or disposed of at federally owned property; Subsection (2) requires EPA to promulgate regulations establishing the form of the notice required; Subsection (3) requires notice in any deed transferring federal property of the hazardous substances on the property and any remedial action taken. It also provides that such deed will include a covenant that necessary remedial action has been undertaken and that the United States will conduct any additional remedial action found to be necessary after the transfer of the property.

⁴ Steps necessary to meet these conditions will vary from site to site.

⁵ These basic reporting requirements are found in a companion statute, the Resource Recovery and Conservation Act, addressed briefly below.

On its face, Section 120(h) might be read to impose onerous obligations on federal property owners, resulting in a situation where the United States would be perpetually responsible for hazardous substances found on any of its properties, without regard to how long the property was held or what government function was performed at the property. It appears from the legislative history of the 1986 amendments, however, that in Section 120 Congress was principally concerned with federal facilities engaged in waste generating practices. There is no indication that Congress intended law enforcement agencies, who come to own property temporarily and in the course of punishing violations of the law, to carry the burden and expense of perpetual clean up of such properties. As a result, EPA's regulation construes Section 120(h) to provide a more reasonable reading, consistent with legislative purpose.

The preamble to the regulation explains this interpretation:

EPA believes that the concern of Congress in enacting section 120(h) was with federally owned facilities whose own operations might involve storage, disposal or release of hazardous substances. The types of facilities cited in Congressional discussion of section 120 included military bases, Department of Energy nuclear production facilities, and other civilian installations. Moreover, nothing in the text or legislative history of the statute suggests that Congress meant to require agencies which had not in some manner been responsible for the storage, release or disposal of hazardous substances to unilaterally assume the obligation in section 120(h) (3) of remedying the contamination prior to sale and warranting that contamination that came to light after sale would also be corrected. In addition, section 120(h)(l) requires the notice to contain information about the type and quantity of hazardous substance stored, released, or disposed of, and the time at which such storage, release or disposal took place. It is unlikely that the agency would be expected to have such detailed information with respect to an activity which took place before the agency held the property.

Therefore, it is EPA's belief, in light of the overall statutory scheme, that section 120(h) (1) was meant to apply where the storage, release, or disposal referred to in the statute occurred during the time the property was owned by the Federal government.

55 Fed. Reg. 14210. Consistent with this interpretation, EPA's regulation requires:

... whenever any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States enters into any contract for the sale or other transfer of real property which is owned by the United States and at which, during the time the property was owned by the United States, any hazardous substance was stored for one year or more, known to have been released, or disposed of, the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality must include in such contract notice of the type and quantity of such hazardous substance and notice of the time at which such storage, release, or disposal took place, to the extent such information is available on the basis of a complete search of agency files.

55 Fed. Reg. 14212 (emphasis added).

The regulation does not directly address the Section 120(h)(3) deed and covenant requirement. Although it could be argued that subsection (h)(3) should be read more broadly than subsection (h)(1)⁶, we believe that it should be read in consonance with subsection (h)(1). As a result, the obligation to include information in the deed, including warranties with regard to clean up, will cover only those hazardous substance activities which are subject to the notice requirement of Section 120(h)(1). On the same reasoning which supports not requiring agencies to give Section 120 (h)(1) notice of events which did not occur during their ownership, the statute does not support requiring the agencies to provide warranties for hazardous waste activities which did not occur during their ownership.

Relationship of CERCLA Notice Requirements. Although EPA's regulation limits the burden of notice required of federal agencies under Section 120(h), federal agencies must take care to assure that they can invoke the so-called "innocent landowner" defense described above. In order to do so, notice of known hazardous substance activities on federal properties must be provided prior to sale or transfer. We recommend that Departmental components establish routine practices of assembling sufficient information to give notice to prospective purchasers of those hazardous substance activities which the agency knows have occurred on the property, even where our information reflects that the hazardous substances were stored, released or disposed of prior to governmental ownership. Even though the EPA Section 120(h) regulation might permit an agency to give notice of solely those hazardous substance activities which occur during governmental ownership, Section 107(b), as clarified by Section 101(35) mandates that the governmental entity who seeks to invoke an 'innocent landowner' defense must provide notice to purchasers of known hazardous substance activities. For Section 120(h) disclosure, practices during federal ownership are sufficient; to qualify for the defense, however, any information about activities prior to federal ownership should also be disclosed.⁷

⁶ The deed must provide information about the nature of hazardous substance activity, "to the extent such information is available on the basis of a complete search of agency files." The covenant is to warrant that "(i) all remedial action necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to any such substance remaining on the property has been taken before the date of such transfer and that any additional remedial action found to be necessary will be conducted by the United States. See 42 U.S.C. § 9620(h)(3)(A), (B). Since Congress again tied the federal agency's obligations to a search of its own files, using language parallel to subsection (h)(1), it is logical that the obligation to clean up and warrant the clean up applies to the same property as the obligation to give notice. A broader reading would make the United States perpetually the guarantor of the environmental health of any property that ever enters government inventories, even if the agency had no knowledge of the conditions and no obligation to provide notice. It is more likely that Congress intended governmental responsibility under subsection 120(h)(3) to cover the same property as the notice requirements of subsection 120(h)(1).

This reading also makes sense since section 120(h) does not exculpate federal agencies from CERCLA liability parties under section 107(a), even where it does not have a notice or covenant responsibility under section 120(h), although those circumstances should be rare. Thus, in the event an agency provides notice and covenants based on a complete search of its files, but additional information demonstrates other hazardous substances for which the agency is a responsible party, the agency may bear liability for cleanup costs incurred.

⁷ For example, property used as a drug lab may be seized with certain hazardous chemicals on site, which law enforcement officers will dispose of properly. Information obtained from witnesses or informants may address where other drugs were processed, where wastes or bad batches were dumped or other information about contamination at the site. The information concerning what we do with hazardous substances during our ownership is pertinent to the section 120(h) requirements. The information concerning previous disposals is pertinent to invoking the "innocent landowner" defense and should be disclosed for that reason only.

In sum, while CERCLA Section 120 addresses supplemental responsibilities for federal agencies, governmental entities must also observe their obligations under other sections of CERCLA. Departmental components should take the steps necessary to assure that they can invoke the one defense from liability which Congress made specifically available to the governmental property acquirer.⁸

RCRA BACKGROUND

While the primary purpose of this memorandum is to advise you of requirements under CERCLA, federal agencies handling hazardous substances also need to be familiar with the companion statute, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), 42 U.S.C. §§ 6901 - 6992. RCRA is designed generally to manage ongoing activities involving handling of solid and hazardous waste. A few provisions are pertinent to this memorandum's discussion of CERCLA. Broadly, while the CERCLA provisions addressed herein concerned federal real property, RCRA concerns itself with the personal property--the hazardous substances, containers, equipment or other materials.⁹

Where federal agencies have hazardous waste on their property, they will generally have to comply with RCRA in the handling and disposal of that waste. RCRA governs storage, treatment and disposal of hazardous waste, requiring entities who conduct such activities to have permits. All persons must assure that hazardous waste is stored, treated or disposed of at permitted RCRA facilities. For Department components taking property in the course of law enforcement efforts, this will generally mean securing and disposing of any hazardous waste in accordance with RCRA, usually by contracting for transport and disposal in a permitted facility. Without going through all of the details of RCRA regulation, it is important to note that storage of most hazardous wastes at a location for longer than 90 days requires that the facility be permitted as a storage facility. As you review Departmental practices, please assure that waste materials are being handled lawfully and are not maintained or disposed of at unpermitted facilities.

You should also be aware that federal agencies engaging in hazardous waste activities may be required to give notice of those activities to EPA. As summarized above, RCRA Section 3016 requires federal agencies to maintain an inventory of sites at which hazardous wastes are stored, treated or disposed. 42 U.S.C. § 6937. Under these requirements, for example, a federal entity which takes real property on which hazardous waste has been stored could, after the passage of time, itself become responsible for a RCRA storage facility, and have to give notice to EPA.

⁸ As addressed above, CERCLA subjects federal agencies to potential suit from any party who incurs costs as a result of cleaning up hazardous substance contamination. Federal agency compliance with section 120(h) is not a defense to claims by these governmental or private entities that they have spent money to clean up contamination resulting from governmental property or activities. Rather, allegations of non-compliance with the section 120(h) obligations would provide a different cause of action against the federal agency, likely arising under the "citizen's suit" provision, 42 U.S.C. § 9659(a)(1).

⁹ Under RCRA sovereign immunity has been waived to state and local regulation of solid and hazardous waste. Federal agencies must therefore comply not only with federal law, but with state and local law as well. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 6961.

CONCLUSION

Department components involved with property on which hazardous substances are found must consider the potential responsibility under federal environmental laws outlined in this memorandum. The recent EPA Federal Property Transfer Regulations reflect an effort to reduce the burden that CERCLA places on law enforcement agencies. As there are a multitude of specific circumstances in which the statutes and regulations are applied, we are happy to continue to work with the Department components in applying these laws.

Attachments

Appendix D

Notice, Covenant and Warranty¹

NOTICE [For Contract of Sale and for Deed]

This notice provides information concerning hazardous substances known or believed to have been stored, released or disposed of at [provide common identification of the property, such as a site name or street address; followed by a proper legal description]. The United States of America owned the described property as a result of deed [dated; record book entry]. The [name of agency(s)] has (have) provided the information contained herein for the time period(s) indicated based on a complete search of agency files.

This notice is to be recorded with the deed transferring title of this property to _____ pursuant to a contract or option dated [fill in date].

A. Hazardous Substances Known to have been Released, Disposed of or Stored during United States Ownership

Information provided in this part addresses the period from date of deed to [date of sale], [being the period when the [name of agency] had administrative jurisdiction over the subject land, or being the entire period in which title was vested in the United States,] based on a complete search of agency files. [repeat for other agency(s) if needed]

1. Identify any hazardous substances removed from the site for disposal.

[e.g., provide information from, summarize or attach manifests identifying any hazardous substances disposed of from site by United States or other notification of hazardous substances provided to federal, state or local agency.]

2. Identify any hazardous waste storage, treatment or disposal units on the site.

[e.g., provide information from, summarize or attach any permit or permit application or other notice provided by U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or state or local agency with responsibility for hazardous substances.]

¹ The following is a reprint of a proposed notice to be included in the contract of sale and the deed.

3. Identify any other information concerning hazardous substances stored, disposed or released on the property

[e.g., summarize any information concerning hazardous substance activity reported by witnesses.]

4. Where property was used, in whole or in part, for, or potentially affected by, continuing operations which generate hazardous substances, identify all such operations and substances

[e.g., for property on which hazardous substances were in use during United States ownership, provide information from, attach or summarize any permits, notifications, reports or documentation concerning hazardous substances prepared, filed or submitted during the time of United States ownership. Include such documentation whether prepared by the United States, its agencies, or private tenants, residents or occupants on the real property.)

B. Actual Knowledge of Hazardous Substances at Property, without regard to United States Ownership

Information in this part addresses hazardous substances which may have been stored, released or disposed of prior to United States ownership. To the extent possible, this notification also describes the source of the information. The United States cannot assure that information based on reports by other persons, indirect evidence or other sources is accurate in all respects.

1. Describe any known instances of authorized or permitted storage, disposal or release of hazardous substances at the property.

[e.g., provide information from, attach or summarize any permits, notifications, reports or documentation concerning hazardous substances issued to prior owners or prior operators and located at property]

2. Describe any known instances of unauthorized or unpermitted storage, disposal or release of hazardous substances at the property.

[e.g., indirect evidence from conditions at site, reports from informants, witnesses, evidence from state or local regulatory entities]

C. Definitions

1. "Hazardous substances" has the meaning provided in 42 U.S.C. § 101(14) and 40 C.F.R. §§ 300.6 and 302.4 and thus includes all hazardous wastes identified and listed pursuant to 40 C.F.R. part 261.

2. Descriptions of hazardous substances shall include, to the extent such information is known and is appropriate, the common name, the chemical abstracts name, the chemical abstracts number and the EPA hazardous waste number, or other information sufficient to describe the substance. Material safety data sheets should be provided to prospective buyers.

3. “Disposal” and “storage” shall have the meanings set forth in 42 U.S.C. §§ 6903(3), (33) and regulations promulgated thereunder. “Release” shall have the meaning set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 9601(22) and regulations promulgated thereunder.

COVENANT and WARRANTY [for Deed]

The United States hereby covenants and warrants that —

- (i) all remedial action necessary to protect human health and the environment with respect to any such substance identified in part A of this Notice remaining on the property has been taken before the date of such transfer, and
- (ii) any additional remedial action found to be necessary with respect to any such substance identified in part A of this Notice after the date of such transfer shall be conducted by the United States.

Appendix E

Redelegations of Authority

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Office of the Attorney General
28 CFR Part 0
[A.G. Order No. 1598-92]

Redelegations of Authority to United States Attorneys, Deputy Assistant Attorneys General, Section Chiefs, and Director, Asset Forfeiture Office, in the Criminal Division:

AGENCY: Department of Justice.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: This Order is the Criminal Divisions implementation of the first increase in the settlement and compromise authority delegated to the Assistant Attorneys General since 1981. It provides a corresponding increase in the settlement and compromise authority re delegated to United States Attorneys, Deputy Assistant Attorneys General, Section Chiefs, and the Director, Asset Forfeiture Office, in the Criminal Division, to further the efficient operation of the Department of Justice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: [Insert date of publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.]

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lee JRadek, Director, Asset Forfeiture Office, Criminal Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. 20530, 202-514-1263.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This Order conforms the redelegations of the Assistant Attorney General's authority to compromise civil penalties and forfeitures and close civil claims to subpart Y, part 0, title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 0.160, 0.164, 0.165, and 0.168 as amended by the Attorney General (Order No. 1478-91, 56 FR 8923-24, March 4, 1991). Subject to limitations set forth in 0.160(c) and 0.168(a), 0.168(d) provides that redelegations of this authority by Assistant Attorneys General to United States Attorneys will include the authority: (1) to accept offers in compromise in cases involving original claims by the United States of not more than \$500,000; (2) to accept offers in compromise in cases involving original claims by the United States between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000, so long as the difference between the original claim and the proposed settlement does not exceed 15

¹ The following is a reprint of Attorney General Order No. 1598-92.

percent of the original claim; and (3) to accept offers in compromise of claims against the United States in cases where the principal amount of the proposed settlement does not exceed \$500,000.

This Order supersedes Criminal Division Directive No. 116 (48 FR 50712-13, November 3, 1983), which contains the current re delegation of the authority of the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, to compromise civil penalties and forfeitures and close civil claims.

This Order is exempt from the requirements of Executive Order 12291 as a regulation related to agency organization and management. Furthermore, this Order will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities because its effect is internal to the Department of Justice. 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

List of Subjects in 28 CFR Part 0

Authority delegations (Government agencies), Organization and functions (Government agencies), Penalties, Seizures and forfeitures.

Accordingly, 28 CFR Part 0 is amended as follows:

PART 0 - ORGANIZATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1. The authority citation for Part 0 continues to read as follows:

AUTHORITY: 5 U.S.C. 301; 28 U.S.C. 509, 510, 515-19.

2. The Appendix to Subpart Y of Part 0 is amended by removing Criminal Division Directive No. 116.

3. The Appendix to Subpart Y of Part 0 is further amended by adding Order No. [] to read as follows: [Order No. ____]

REDELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY TO UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL, SECTION CHIEFS, AND DIRECTOR, ASSET FORFEITURE OFFICE, IN THE CRIMINAL DIVISION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by part 0 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as amended, particularly §§ 0.160, 0.162, 0.164, 0.168 and 0.171, it is hereby ordered as follows:

(a)(1) Each U.S. Attorney is authorized in cases delegated to the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division —

(A) To accept or reject offers in compromise of —

(i) Claims in behalf of the United States in all cases (other than forfeiture cases) in which the original claim \$500,000, and in all cases in which the original claim was between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000, so long as the difference between the gross amount of the original claim and the proposed settlement does not exceed 15 percent of the original claim; and in all civil or criminal forfeiture cases, except that the U.S. Attorney shall consult with the Asset Forfeiture Office of the Criminal Division before accepting offers in compromise or plea

offers in forfeiture cases in which the original claim was \$5,000,000 or more, and in forfeiture cases in which the original claim was between \$500,000 and \$5,000,000, when the difference between the gross amount of the original forfeiture sought and the proposed settlement exceeds 15 percent of the original claim and

(ii) Claims against the United States in all cases, or in administrative actions to settle, in which the amount of the proposed settlement does not exceed \$500,000; and

(B) To close (other than by compromise or entry of judgment) claims asserted by the United States in all cases (other than forfeiture cases) in which the gross amount of the original claim does not exceed \$500,000, and in all civil or criminal forfeiture cases, except that the U.S. Attorney shall consult with the Asset Forfeiture Office of the Criminal Division before closing a forfeiture case in which the gross amount of the original forfeiture sought is \$500,000 or more.

(2) This subsection does not apply —

(A) When, for any reason, the compromise or closing of a particular claim (other than a forfeiture case) will, as a practical matter, control or adversely influence the disposition of other claims which, when added to the claim in question, total more than the respective amounts designated above;

(B) When the U.S. Attorney is of the opinion that because of a question of law or policy presented, or for any other reason, the matter should receive the personal attention of the Assistant Attorney General;

(C) When a settlement converts into a mandatory duty the otherwise discretionary authority of an agency or department to revise, amend, or promulgate regulations;

(D) When a settlement commits a department or agency to expend funds that Congress has not appropriated and that have not been budgeted for the action in question, or commits a department or agency to seek a particular appropriation or budget authorization; or

(E) When a settlement limits the discretion of a Secretary or agency administrator to make policy or managerial decisions committed to the Secretary or agency administrator by Congress or by the Constitution.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of this Order, the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division may delegate to U.S. Attorneys authority to compromise or close other cases, including those involving amounts greater than as set forth in paragraph (a) above, and up to the maximum limit of his authority, where the circumstances warrant such delegation.

(c) All other authority delegated to me by §§ 0.160, 0.162, 0.164 and 0.171 of title 28 of the Code of Federal Regulations not falling within the limitations of paragraph (a) of this Order is hereby redelegated to Section Chiefs in the Criminal Division, except that —

(1) The authority delegated to me by §§ 0.160, 0.162, 0.164 and 0.171 of that title relating to conducting, handling, or supervising civil and criminal forfeiture litigation (other than bail bond forfeiture), including acceptance or denial of petitions for remission or mitigation of forfeiture, is hereby redelegated to the Director of the Asset Forfeiture Office; and

(2) When a Section Chief or the Director of the Asset Forfeiture Office is of the opinion that because of a question of law or policy presented, or for any other reason, a matter described in paragraph (c) should receive the personal attention of a Deputy Assistant Attorney General or Assistant Attorney General, he shall refer the matter to the appropriate Deputy Assistant Attorney General or to the Assistant Attorney General.

(d) Notwithstanding any of the above redelegations, when the agency or agencies involved have objected in writing to the proposed closing or dismissal of a case, or to the acceptance or rejection of an offer in compromise, any such unresolved objection shall be referred to the Assistant Attorney General for resolution.

MAY 19, 1992

/s/

Date

Robert S. Mueller, III
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division

Approved:

June 5, 1992

/s/

Date

Wayne A. Budd
Associate Attorney General

Appendix F

Office of Legal Counsel Opinion, AG Order No. 1860-94

Office of Legal Counsel Opinion¹

You have asked us to reconsider our opinion that property seized by and forfeited to the United States is not subject to state or local taxation for the period between the commission of the offense that leads to the order of forfeiture and the entry of the order of forfeiture. *See* Liability of the United States for State and Local Taxes on Seized and Forfeited Property, 15 Op. O.L.C. 85 (1991) (preliminary print) (“Harrison Memorandum”). In light of the Supreme Court’s decision in *United States v. 92 Buena Vista Ave.*, 113 S. Ct. 1126 (1993), we partially reverse our opinion.

Because states and localities may not tax federal property (absent express congressional authorization),² the time at which ownership of forfeited property passes to the United States and the extent of the ownership interest that passes to the United States determine whether state and local taxes are owed. In many property transactions, the time and the extent of transfer of ownership are unambiguous and independent issues. In cases of transfers of ownership under the federal forfeiture statutes, however, the answer to the question of when ownership is transferred has been a matter of dispute, and of great consequence for the extent of the interest transferred.

The Harrison Memorandum expresses the Justice Department’s traditional view that title vests in the United States at the time of the offense. This view is based on an interpretation of the “relation back” doctrine, which provides that a judicial order of forfeiture retroactively vests title to the forfeited property in the United States as of the time of the offense that leads to forfeiture, not as of the time of the judicial order itself. *See* 21 U.S.C. § 881(h) (“[a]ll right, title, and interest in property [subject to forfeiture] shall vest in the United States upon commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture...”); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c), 21 U.S.C. § 853(c) (substantially identical to quoted language from 21 U.S.C. § 881(h)). Under the Department’s traditional interpretation, title in forfeited property vests in the federal government at the time of the offense. The date of the judicial order of forfeiture is not significant. From the date of the offense, states and other parties are barred from acquiring interests in the property from the owner whose interests are forfeited to the United States. *See In re One 1985*

¹ The following is a reprint of the Office of Legal Counsel Opinion.

² *See, e.g., United States v. City of Detroit*, 355 U.S. 466, 469 (1958) (“[A] [s]tate cannot constitutionally levy a tax directly against the Government of the United States or its property without the consent of Congress.”); *M’Culloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316 (1819).

Nissan, 889 F.2d 1317, 1319-20 (4th Cir. 1989); *Eggleston v. Colorado*, 873 F.2d 242, 245-48 (10th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 493 U.S. 1070 (1990)(cases decided before *Buena Vista* and consistent with the Harrison Memorandum).

The Harrison Memorandum considers and rejects several possible grounds for limiting the operation of the relation back doctrine and requiring payment of state and local tax liens for the period between the offense and the forfeiture order. The two grounds of principal concern here are the “innocent owner” defense in the civil drug forfeiture statute, *see* 21 U.S.C. § 881(a) (6)³, and the “bona fide purchaser” defense in the criminal drug forfeiture statute, *see* 21 U.S.C. § 853(c), and in the forfeiture provision of the RICO statute, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 1963 (c). The Harrison Memorandum concludes that these defenses do not protect a state or locality (or anyone else) who innocently acquires a property interest after the time of the offense. The Supreme Court’s decision in *Buena Vista* forces us to reconsider this conclusion. We conclude that the Harrison Memorandum’s conclusion concerning the innocent owner defense must be reversed, but that the Harrison Memorandum’s conclusion regarding the *bona fide* purchasers defense is correct (although this latter conclusion is less certain than the Harrison Memorandum indicates and we reach it through an analysis different from that set forth in the Harrison Memorandum).

I.

The civil drug forfeiture statute provides that “no property shall be forfeited..., to the extent of the interest of an owner, by reason of any act or omission established by that owner to have been committed or omitted without the knowledge or consent of that owner.” 21 U.S.C. § 881(a) (6). The Harrison Memorandum accepted that “owner” could include a state or locality holding a tax lien on the property. *See* Harrison Memorandum, 15 Op. O.L.C. at 88 (preliminary print). The Memorandum concluded, however, that this “innocent owner” provision does not apply to asserted property interests that arise after the time of the offense because, as of the moment of the offense, the property belongs (by operation of the relation back doctrine) to the United States, and not to the person from whom a third party innocently acquires an interest.

We conclude, consistent with the Harrison Memorandum, that a state or locality holding a tax lien can be an “owner” as that term is defined in the civil forfeiture statute’s innocent owner provisions. The broad language of the statute— “[a]ll... things of value” and “[a]ll real property, including any right, title and interest” provides no reason to exclude a tax lien-holder from the definition of “owner.” 21 U.S.C. § 881(a) (6), (7). The legislative history urges a broad reading⁴. And the courts have followed, sometimes explicitly, the path suggested by

³ The conclusions with regard to section 881(a) (6), the innocent owner provision immediately at issue in *Buena Vista* and applicable to all “things of value” traceable to an exchange for a controlled substance, also apply to section 881(a) (7), which contains a nearly identical innocent owner provision applicable to real property used in a drug offense. *See* n.2, *supra*, and n.6, *infra*.

⁴ *See* Joint Explanatory Statement of Titles II and III, 95th Cong., 2d Sess. (1978), *reprinted in* 1978 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 9522 (in section 881(a) (6), “[t]he term ‘owner’ should be broadly interpreted to include any person with a recognizable legal or equitable interest in the property seized”); *see also* S. Rep. No. 225, 98th Cong., 2d Sess. 195, 215 (1984), *reprinted in* 1984 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 3182, 3378, 3398 (describing section 881(a) (7) as, in effect, extending section 881(a) (6) to cover real property used in a drug offense but not acquired with proceeds of prohibited drug transactions).

Congress⁵. The “innocence” requirement of an innocent owner defense would seem to be easy to satisfy in most cases. Like an innocent donee or purchaser, a state or locality holding a tax lien generally has obtained its interest without knowledge of the offense giving rise to the forfeiture.

The Harrison Memorandum’s further conclusion with regard to the innocent owner defense, however, cannot survive the ruling in *Buena Vista*. The plurality and concurring opinions reject the interpretation of the relation back doctrine set forth in the Harrison Memorandum, and agree that the innocent owner defense is available to persons who acquire interest in forfeitable property after the commission of the offense that rendered the property subject to forfeiture. The opinions differ only as to the reading of the statute that leads to this result.

The plurality and the concurrence both analyze the common law doctrine of relation back as transferring ownership of forfeited property retroactively to the date of the offense, *but only* upon the entry of a judgment of forfeiture. Until a court issues such a judgment, this retroactive vesting of ownership in the United States does not occur, and all defenses to forfeiture that an owner of the property otherwise may invoke will remain available. Thus, a person who has acquired an interest in the property may raise any such defense in a forfeiture proceeding. If that person prevails, a judgment of forfeiture will not vest (retroactively) ownership off that property interest in the United States. *Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1135-36, 1137 (plurality opinion), 1138-39 (Scalia, J., concurring).

The plurality and the concurrence both conclude that the federal civil forfeiture statute is fully compatible with the common law, and that the statutory innocent owner clause provides a defense for a third party who innocently acquires ownership of the property after the offense and before a judgment of forfeiture. The plurality notes that section 881(h), which sets forth the relation back doctrine for the civil forfeiture statute, applies that doctrine only to “property described in subsection (a) of this section.” Subsection (a) (6) excepts, from its description of forfeitable property, the property of an innocent owner. Therefore, in the plurality’s analysis, subsection (a) places the property of an innocent owner beyond the reach of the forfeiture and relation back provisions in subsection (h). *See Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1136-37. Accordingly, an ownership interest in forfeitable property that is transferred to an innocent person (after the offense giving rise to forfeiture) does not vest in the United States as of the time of the offense. Indeed, it does not vest in the United States at all.

⁵ *See, e.g., United States v. 717 S. Woodward St.*, 1993 U.S. App. Lexis 21051 at *15 (3d Cir. Aug. 20, 1993) (citing legislative history); *United States v. 6960 Miraflores Ave.*, 995 F.2d 1558, 1561 (11th Cir. 1993) (“Lienholders have the right to assert their claims of innocent ownership” under section 881(a), as interpreted in *Buena Vista*); *United States v. 6109 Grubb Rd.*, 886 F.2d 618, 625 n.4 (3d Cir. 1989) (cited in *Buena Vista* and citing legislative history); *see also United States v. 2350 N.W. 187 St.*, 996 F.2d 1141 (11th Cir. 1993) (*Buena Vista* analysis of section 881(a) innocent owner provisions assumed to apply where purported innocent owner is local tax lien holder).

Interpreting the civil forfeiture statute as a more straightforward codification of common law doctrine,⁶ the concurrence reads the phrase, in subsection (h), “shall vest in the United States upon commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture” as meaning “shall vest in the United States upon forfeiture, effective as of commission of the act giving rise to forfeiture.” *Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1140 (Scalia, J., concurring).⁷ The result, of course, is the same as under the plurality’s analysis: a property interest innocently acquired after the offense is not forfeited to the United States if an owner asserts the interest in a proper and timely way, before the entry of a forfeiture judgment.

In sum, we reverse the Harrison Memorandum’s conclusion that the innocent owner defense, set forth in 21 U.S.C. § 881(a), does not protect state and local claims for tax liabilities arising between the time of an offense rendering property subject forfeiture and the issuance of a court order of forfeiture.⁸

II.

The two federal criminal forfeiture statutes addressed in the Harrison Memorandum do not contain an innocent owner defense. Those statutes, however, do provide protection for a “transferee [who] establishes in a hearing [to ‘amend’ an order of forfeiture] that he is a *bona fide* purchaser for value of [the] property [subject to criminal forfeiture] who at the time of purchase was reasonably without cause to believe that the property was subject to forfeiture...” 21 U.S.C. § 853(c); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c) (same). The Harrison Memorandum concluded that this statutory “*bona fide* purchaser” defense is not available to a state or locality asserting a lien for tax liability incurred after the offense that made the property subject to forfeiture.

We conclude, consistent with the apparent assumption of the Harrison Memorandum, that such tax liens are “property” or an “interest” in property under the two criminal forfeiture statutes. Both statutes define property broadly, as including all “real property” and all “tangible and intangible personal property, including rights, privileges, interests, claims and securities.” 21 U.S.C. § 853(b); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(b) (same); *see also* 21 U.S.C.

⁶ The concurrence specifically rejects the plurality’s reading of the phrase, in subsection (h), “property described in subsection (a)” as meaning, in effect, “property forfeitable under subsection (a).” The concurrence stresses that subsection (h) refers to “property *described* in subsection (a),” not property deemed forfeitable under subsection (a). Since subsection (a) describes property generally and does not declare that property that cannot be forfeited is not “property,” the “property described in subsection (a)” refers to all relevant property interests, including those of innocent owners. *Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1139 (Scalia, J., concurring).

⁷ The concurrence “acknowledge[s] that there is some textual difficulty with th[is] interpretation,” but argues, first, that the imprecision imputed to the quoted language in subsection (h) is to be expected “in a legal culture familiar with retroactive forfeiture” and, second, that the civil forfeiture statute as a whole, including subsection (d) and its adoption of forfeiture procedures applicable under 19 U.S.C. § 1602 *et seq.*, does not make sense if one rejects the concurrence’s reading of subsection (h) (and the plurality’s reading of subsections (a) and (h)). *Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1140 (Scalia, J., concurring).

⁸ The local tax lien cases decided by lower courts since the Supreme Court’s decision in *Buena Vista* do not alter our conclusion. In *2350 N.W. 187 St.*, 996 F.2d 1141, the court vacated the judgments in two cases in which the district courts had relied on the interpretation of the relation back doctrine described in the Harrison Memorandum, and had granted summary judgment against a county invoking the innocent owner defense in 21 U.S.C. § 881(a) (6), (7) to assert liens for property taxes owed for some of the period between an offense giving rise to forfeiture and the entry of a judgment of forfeiture. The appellate court remanded the cases for further consideration in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Buena Vista*.

§ 853(c), (n) (6); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c), (l) (6) (forfeiture and bona fide purchaser defense provisions referring to “interest” in such property). The legislative history and the courts’ application of this statutory language also suggest a definition of property interests broad enough to include state and local tax liens on real property.⁹

The Harrison Memorandum suggests two arguments—one based on the relation back doctrine and another based on the definition of *bona fide* purchaser—to support its conclusion that the *bona fide* purchaser defense does not extend to holders of property interests that consist of liens for state and local taxes for the period after the offense and before a judgment of forfeiture.

A.

The Harrison Memorandum’s central argument concerning the relation back doctrine addresses the bona fide purchaser defense no less than the innocent owner defense. *See* Harrison Memorandum, 15 Op. O.L.C. at 88 (preliminary print). On the interpretation set forth in the Harrison Memorandum, the United States has owned the property since the commission of the offense giving rise to the criminal forfeiture, and no one, including a *bona fide* purchaser, can later acquire any interest from the former owner.

Although the question is a closer one than in the civil forfeiture context, we conclude that the Supreme Court’s decision in *Buena Vista* rejects this argument as well.¹⁰ We recognize that the plurality’s holding is based on a reading of the civil forfeiture statute (and its innocent owner provisions) and does not address the criminal forfeiture statutes (and their *bona fide* purchaser provisions). That holding also does not require the plurality to adopt the interpretation of the common law relation back doctrine that the opinion sets forth. Nonetheless, the plurality’s discussion of the common law doctrine makes clear that it agrees with the concurrence that the relation back doctrine vests ownership retroactively in the United States only upon entry of a final judgment of forfeiture. Under that reading, if a state or locality establishes that it is a “*bona fide* purchaser” of an interest in the property by virtue of a tax lien, and does so before a court orders forfeiture, the

⁹ *See* S. Rep. No. 225 at 193, *reprinted in* 1984 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News at 3376 (section enacting current 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c) and 21 U.S.C. § 853(c) “allows the use of criminal forfeiture as an alternative to civil forfeiture in all drug felony cases”); *id.* at 211, *reprinted in* 1984 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News at 3394 (property defined as subject to criminal forfeiture under 18 U.S.C. § 1963(a) and 21 U.S.C. § 853(a) is equivalent to property subject to civil forfeiture under 21 U.S.C. § 881(a)); *United States v. Reckmeyer*, 836 F.2d 200, 205 (4th Cir. 1987) (unsecured creditor who has reduced his claim to judgment and acquired a lien could seek an amendment to a forfeiture order under 21 U.S.C. § 853(n)); *United States v. Robinson*, 721 F. Supp. 1541, 1545 (D.R.I. 1989) (a leasehold interest ordinarily is a real property interest within the definition in 21 U.S.C. § 853(b)); *see also United States v. Monsanto*, 491 U.S. 600, 606-09 (1989) (noting breadth of forfeitable property under 21 U.S.C. § 853 (a)).

¹⁰ *Cf. United States v. Harry*, 1993 U.S. Dist. Lexis 11999 at *21-27 (E.D. Iowa May 6, 1993) (drawing on *Buena Vista* discussion of innocent owners to resolve *bona fide* purchaser issue under the criminal forfeiture statute).

order of forfeiture will not extend to the lien-holder's interest and, therefore, will not vest title to that interest in the United States.¹¹

We also recognize that the concurrence in *Buena Vista* suggests that the relation back doctrine precludes a *bona fide* purchaser defense under the criminal statutes where it allows an innocent owner defense under the civil statute. As the concurrence points out, the criminal forfeiture statutes establish a procedure by which a person asserting a *bona fide* purchaser defense raises that defense *after* the court has entered an order of forfeiture. See 21 U.S.C. § 853(n); 18 U.S.C. § 1963 (l). In contrast, the civil forfeiture process (on both the plurality's and the concurrence's reading) contemplates that a person asserting an innocent owner defense will do so *before* the court enters an order of forfeiture. As the concurrence sees it, in the former case, the court order already has vested title retroactively in the United States (effective as of the date of the offense) before the "transferee" asserts a claim to be a *bona fide* purchaser. In the latter case, however, the court will not yet have issued the order vesting title retroactively when the "owner" asserts an innocent owner claim. (The concurrence argues that the civil statute's use of the term "owner" and the criminal statutes' use of "transferee" reflects this distinction and suggests its significance.) On this view, if a transferee's claim to be a *bona fide* purchaser succeeds and the court amends the order of forfeiture, the amendment does not void, retroactively, the initial retroactive vesting of title in the United States. The amendment to the initial order of forfeiture simply effects a new transfer of title to the *bona fide* purchaser, leaving undisturbed the United States' ownership from the time of the offense to the time of the amendment to the forfeiture order. See *Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1141 (Scalia, J., concurring).

The *Buena Vista* concurrence fails to establish, however, that the criminal forfeiture statutes' *bona fide* purchaser defense does not protect liens for state and local tax liabilities incurred after the offense giving rise to the forfeiture. Only the concurrence advances the argument. The plurality does not join in it, and nothing in the dissenting opinion suggests that the dissenters would adopt the concurrence's views.

Further, the concurrence's argument reads too much into the actual, multi-step procedures by which a court adjudicates a criminal forfeiture claim. It thereby overlooks—or confuses those procedures with—the more fundamental legal (and fictional) process through which a retroactive transfer of ownership occurs. The better interpretation of the criminal forfeiture statutes is that the procedures of entering an order of forfeiture, holding a hearing at which transferees assert claims to be *bona fide* purchasers, and amending the order of forfeiture upon successful presentation of such a claim are but phases in a single (if protracted) process for determining what property interest vests, retroactively, in the United States when the court enters its final, amended order of forfeiture. The entire process is the equivalent of the single order of forfeiture in the civil context.

This interpretation fits more easily with the statutory language, especially when that language is read in light of the discussion in *Buena Vista* of common law relation back doctrine. The criminal forfeiture statutes provide that title in property subject to forfeiture "shall be ordered forfeited to the United States *unless* the transferee establishes" that he is a *bona fide* purchaser for value, and that "the United States shall have clear title to [the] property" only '*following* the court's disposition of all petitions" filed by transferees asserting claims to be *bona*

¹¹ This conclusion would follow rather simply from the court's analysis in *Buena Vista* when the state or locality asserts its *bona fide* purchaser defense at or before the proceedings in which the court issues an order of forfeiture. The conclusion is less certain under the procedure set forth in the criminal forfeiture statutes, which provides for assertion of *bona fide* purchaser claims at a hearing held after the court issues an initial order of forfeiture. The remainder of this subsection addresses this issue.

fide purchasers. 21 U.S.C. § 853(c), (n)(7); 18 U.S.C. § 1963(c), (l)(7) (emphasis added). Such language would seem to suggest that the United States *never obtains* title from a *bona fide* purchaser, not that the United States first obtains title and then must give it back. Only after the entry of the final, amended order of forfeiture would ownership vest retroactively in the United States.¹²

This conclusion also avoids an incongruity that the concurrence’s interpretation would create: an innocent owner (under the civil statute) would owe state and local taxes from the moment he or she acquired the property, but a *bona fide* purchaser for value (under the criminal statutes) would not owe taxes from the time he or she acquired the property until the time the court amended the order of forfeiture.

Finally, the conclusion we reach also is consistent with the statutory distinction between “owner” and “transferee.” A person claiming to be a *bona fide* purchaser is nothing more than a transferee until he or she establishes to the court that he or she is a *bona fide* purchaser (whether the transferee does so after an initial forfeiture order, as the statute contemplates, or at some earlier stage). Only after the transferee has made this showing is he or she recognized as an owner (indeed, an innocent owner) of a particular type. Similarly, a person claiming to be an innocent owner is recognized as an innocent owner only after he or she proves to the court that he or she meets the standards of innocent ownership. Before that, such a person is, in the eyes of the court, merely a transferee. The civil forfeiture laws simply do not address or refer explicitly to those who assert, but have not yet established, that they are innocent owners.

For these reasons, we do not believe that the concurrence’s discussion of the legal significance of the differences between the civil and criminal forfeiture statutes (which, in any case, is unnecessary to its conclusions) is correct.

B.

The Harrison Memorandum also states that state and local tax authorities cannot “qualify as *bona fide* purchasers for value” under the criminal forfeiture statutes. Harrison Memorandum, 15 Op. O.L.C. at 88 (preliminary print). The Memorandum does not set forth the basis for this conclusion. The *Buena Vista* plurality and concurrence have nothing to say about this issue and, thus, do not require a reversal of the Harrison Memorandum. Although the matter is not free from doubt, we believe that the stronger argument is that state and local tax lien-holders are not “*bona fide* purchasers.”

The courts have not adopted a clear and uniform view of how to interpret “*bona fide* purchaser” under the criminal forfeiture statutes. *See, e.g., United States v. Lavin*, 942 F.2d 177, 182-89 (3d Cir. 1991) (*bona fide* purchaser acquires interest through volitional, advertent and, generally, commercial transaction; victim of embezzlement acquired interest through unwitting and inadvertent tortious action of another and therefore was not a *bona fide* purchaser); *United States v. Reckmeyer*, 836 F.2d 200, 206-08 (4th Cir. 1987) (*bona fide* purchaser includes a general, unsecured creditor of defendant who gave value to defendant in arms’-length transaction with expectation that he would receive equivalent value in the future, and whose interest must have been in some part of the forfeited property because debtor’s entire estate had been forfeited); *cf. United States v. Campos*, 859 F.2d 1233, 1237-38 (6th Cir. 1988) (general, unsecured creditor is not a *bona fide* purchaser,

¹² Although the statutory language does not fit perfectly with the interpretation adopted here, somewhat imprecise drafting concerning the sequence of events leading to a retroactive vesting of title is, as the *Buena Vista* concurrence points out, perhaps to be expected in a legal culture familiar with retroactive vesting. *See Buena Vista*, 113 S. Ct. at 1140 (Scalia, J., concurring).

because he does not have a legal interest in the forfeited property); *Torres v. \$36,256.80 U.S. Currency*, 1993 U.S. Dist. Lexis 9107 at *19-23 (S.D.N.Y. July 7, 1993) (similar to *Campos*; also pointing out significance, for general, unsecured creditor, of unusual circumstance in *Reckmeyer* that entire estate had been seized); *United States v. Mageean*, 649 F. Supp. 820, 824, 829 (D. Nev. 1986) (definition of *bona fide* purchaser cannot be “stretch[ed]” to include tort claimants, but “there is no reason that a good-faith provider of goods and services,” although an unsecured creditor, “cannot be a bona fide purchaser”), *aff’d without opinion*, 822 F.2d 62 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also United States v. 3181 S.W. 138th Place*, 778 F. Supp. 1570, 1574-75 (S.D. Fla. 1991) (civil forfeiture case stating that locality is not *bona fide* purchaser by virtue of tax lien), *vacated on other grounds*, 996 F.2d 1141 (11th Cir. 1993); S. Rep. No. 225 at 201, 209, *reprinted in* 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 3384, 3391.

We are aware of no case that has decided the precise question at issue here. We acknowledge that some of the claims that courts have rejected are weaker than those presented by tax liens, and that at least one court has pointed to a primary purpose of the criminal forfeiture statutes’ relation back provisions that would not be served by denying the bona fide purchaser defense to holders of liens for state and local taxes. *See Reckmeyer*, 836 F.2d at 208 (“Congress’s primary concern in adopting the relation-back provision was to make it possible for courts to void sham or fraudulent transfers that we are aimed at avoiding the consequences of forfeiture”). Nonetheless, we have found no authority that has construed *bona fide* purchaser broadly enough to encompass such a tax lien-holder.

A state or locality does provide something of value, in the form of government services, in return for the interest it acquires in property (ultimately in the form of a lien) by virtue of its taxing authority. This exchange, however, does not fit the transactional, arms’-length exchange of values contemplated in the case law and suggested by the statutory phrase “*bona fide*” purchaser for value.¹³ Therefore, we do not reverse the Harrison

¹³ *See, e.g., Lavin*, 942 F.2d at 185-86 (Congress derived *bona fide* purchaser exception “from hornbook commercial law” principle of protecting the “innocent purchaser for valuable consideration” which had developed at common law “in order to promote finality in commercial transactions and thus to... foster commerce”); *Reckmeyer*, 836 F.2d at 208 (scope of *bona fide* purchaser provision “construed liberally” is to protect “all persons who give value to the defendant in an arms’-length transaction with the expectation that they would receive equivalent value in return”).

Memorandum's conclusion that the *bona fide* purchaser provisions cannot be relied upon to require payment of state and local tax liens.¹⁴

III.

For the reasons set forth above, we reach the following conclusions: In civil forfeiture proceedings (under 21 U.S.C. § 881) the United States may—and, indeed, must—pay liens for state and local taxes accruing after the commission of the offense leading to forfeiture and before the entry of a judicial order of forfeiture, if the lien-holder establishes, before the court enters the order of forfeiture, that it is an innocent owner of the interest it asserts. In criminal forfeiture proceedings (under 18 U.S.C. § 1963 or 21 U.S.C. § 853), however, the United States may not pay such liens because state and local tax lien-holders are not *bona fide* purchasers for value of the interests they would assert, and therefore do not come within any applicable exception to a statute that, upon entry of a court's final order of forfeiture, vests full ownership retroactively in the United States as of the date of the offense.

¹⁴ The Harrison Memorandum also found that payment of liens for state and local taxes, accruing after the offense, was not within the Attorney General's discretionary authority under 28 U.S.C. § 524(c) (1) (D) ("payment of valid liens... against property that has been forfeited") or 28 U.S.C. § 524(c) (1) (E) (payments "in connection with remission or mitigation procedures relating to property forfeited"). We reach the same conclusion through a different analysis. A tax lien-holder who establishes that he or she is an innocent owner under the civil forfeiture statute or a *bona fide* purchaser under the criminal statutes is protected from the operation of the relation back doctrine, and need not rely on the Attorney General's discretionary payment of a valid lien or remission or mitigation of a forfeiture that has not occurred with respect to the lienholder's interest. *See* S. Rep. No. 225 at 207-08, 217, *reprinted in* 1984 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News at 3390-3391, 3400; *Lavin*, 942 F.2d at 185 (*bona fide* purchaser provisions designed to require protection previously left to discretion of Attorney General). If the tax lien-holder fails to establish that he or she is protected by one of these defenses to forfeiture, there can be no "valid lien" for taxes to be paid and no forfeited interest (in the form of tax liabilities) for the Attorney General to "remi[t] or mitigat[e]." Because ownership of the property will have vested in the United States as of the commission of the offense, state and local authorities cannot (absent a congressional waiver of immunity from state and local taxation that we do not find in 28 U.S.C. § 524 or elsewhere) levy taxes on such property after the date of the offense any more than they could levy taxes on a federal courthouse or post office.

A.G. ORDER NO. 1860-94

Office of the Attorney General
Washington, DC 20530

ORDER NO. 1860-94

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO RESTORE FORFEITED PROPERTY OR TAKE OTHER ACTION
TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INNOCENT PERSONS IN CRIMINAL FORFEITURES

By virtue of the authority vested in me as Attorney General of the United States, including 18 U.S.C. §§ 793(h)(3), 794(d)(3), 982(b)(1), 1467(h)(1), 1963(g)(1), 2253(h)(1), 21 U.S.C. § 853(i)(1), and 28 U.S.C. §§ 509 and 510, I hereby delegate to the Director, Asset Forfeiture Office, Criminal Division, my authority, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 793(h)(3), 794(d)(3), 982(b)(1), 1467(h)(1), 1963(g)(1), 2253(h)(1), and 21 U.S.C. § 853(i)(1), to restore forfeited property to victims or take other actions to protect the rights of innocent persons in criminal forfeitures which are in the interest of justice and which are not inconsistent with the provisions of those sections.

_____/s/_____
Date Janet eRo
Attorney General

¹ The following is a reprint of the Attorney General's Order No. 1860-94, dated March 19, 1994.

Appendix G

Department of Justice Asset Forfeiture Program Custodial and Authority Chart

Agency/Component	Property Custodian	Statutory Jurisdiction	Seizure Authority
Asset Forfeiture Management Staff, Justice Management Division	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 U.S.C. § 524(c) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable
Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice	<p>U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) for cases brought by participants in Justice Program</p> <p>Treasury Contractor for cases brought by participants in the Treasury Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All criminal and civil asset forfeiture statutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)	ATF, USMS, and the Treasury Contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 981 and 982 • 28 U.S.C. § 2461 • 49 U.S.C. § 80304 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 3051
Department of Defense—Defense Criminal Investigation Service (DCIS)	USMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 U.S.C. § 2709, amended in 2005—all criminal and civil asset forfeiture statutes. Primarily, but not limited to, 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) (civil) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(6)(A) (criminal) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) (civil) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(6)(A) (criminal)
Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)	USMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. §§ 981, 982 • 21 U.S.C. §§ 824, 853, and 881 • 28 U.S.C. § 2461 • 46 U.S.C. § app. 1904 • 49 U.S.C. § 46306 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 981 • 21 U.S.C. § 881 • 46 U.S.C. § app. 1904 • 49 U.S.C. § 46306

Agency/Component	Property Custodian	Statutory Jurisdiction	Seizure Authority
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys—U.S. Attorneys’ Offices	USMS for cases brought by participants in Justice Program Treasury Contractor for cases brought by participants in the Treasury Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All criminal and civil asset forfeiture statutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)	USMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28 C.F.R. § 0.85(a)—all laws not specifically assigned to the sole jurisdiction of another agency.¹ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28 C.F.R. § 8.2
Food and Drug Administration—Office of Criminal Investigations	USMS and Treasury Contractor (bulk evidence only)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 301-397 and related Title 18 and 21 statutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. §§ 301-397 and related Title 18 and 21 statutes
U.S. Department of Agriculture—Office of Inspector General	The seizing agency identifies the appropriate custodian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 7 U.S.C. § 2024 7 U.S.C. § 2270a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable²
U.S. Marshals Service (USMS)	USMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28 U.S.C. § 566
U.S. Postal Inspection Service (USPIS)	USPIS—Administrative Forfeitures USMS—Judicial Forfeitures ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 U.S.C. § 3061 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18 U.S.C. § 3061(a)

¹ A specific comprehensive list can be found in the *Outline of Forfeiture Law and Procedures* monograph published by the FBI Legal Forfeiture Unit.

² There is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the OIG-USDA, Justice, Treasury, and USPIS establishing OIG-USDA’s participation in the Justice’s Assets Forfeiture Fund (AFF). OIG-USDA submits the appropriate paperwork to the seizing agency to document OIG-USDA’s participation. For cases in which Postal and Treasury are the additional parties, the MOU provides for transfers to the Justice’s AFF from the Postal Fund and the Treasury Asset Forfeiture Fund in forfeitures worked with OIG-USDA.

³ There is an MOU between the USMS and the USPIS should the USPIS want to retain judicial property for Official Use, the USPIS may keep custody. *Note:* Some judicial districts get a substitute custodial agreement for this.

Agency/Component	Property Custodian	Statutory Jurisdiction	Seizure Authority
State Department, Bureau of Diplomatic Security	USMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 22 U.S.C. § 2709, amended in 2005—all criminal and civil asset forfeiture statutes. Primarily, but not limited to, 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) (civil) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(6)(A) (criminal) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(A) (civil) and 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(6)(A) (criminal)
Non-Justice, Non-Treasury Fund Federal Participant ⁴	USMS (if proceeds eligible for deposit into the DOJ AFF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBD

Department of the Treasury Asset Forfeiture Program

Agency/Component	Property Custodian	Statutory Jurisdiction	Seizure Authority
Executive Office for Asset Forfeiture, Department of the Treasury	Not applicable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 31 U.S.C. § 9703 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not applicable
Internal Revenue Service—Criminal Investigation	Treasury Contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. §§ 981 and 982 • 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956 and 1957 • 31 U.S.C. §§ 5317 and 5324 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treasury Directive 15-42

⁴ The analysis as to whether the Fund is or is not available comes down to whether the proceeds (if any) can be deposited into the AFF. If the forfeiture statute doesn't direct the disposition proceeds to go to another entity (e.g., Secretary of the Treasury or Interior) and 28 U.S.C. § 524(c)(4) doesn't prohibit the deposit of the funds into the AFF, then the Fund is available and the USMS should take custody of the property. If the proceeds go elsewhere, then the USMS can still manage the property (using the Fund) but must seek a reimbursable agreement with the lead agency to ensure the costs are reimbursed. If the proceeds don't cover costs, then it has to come out of the agency's appropriation.

Agency/Component	Property Custodian	Statutory Jurisdiction	Seizure Authority
U.S. Coast Guard	Not applicable ⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 U.S.C. § 89 • 14 U.S.C. § 141 • 14 U.S.C. § 143 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 U.S.C. § 1324 • 14 U.S.C. § 89 • 16 U.S.C. § 1861 • 16 U.S.C. § 3374 • 18 U.S.C. § 981-82 • 18 U.S.C. § 1028 • 18 U.S.C. § 1594 • 19 U.S.C. §§ 1581, 1590, 1594, 1595, and 1595a • 19 U.S.C. § 1703 • 46 U.S.C. App. § 1904 • 46 U.S.C. §§ 70106 and 70118 • 50 U.S.C. §§ 191-92
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement U.S. Customs and Border Protection	Treasury Contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tariff Act of 1789; <i>as amended</i> • Immigration & Nationality Act (1952); <i>as amended</i> • 18 U.S.C. §§ 981 and 982 • Title 21 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)–1994⁶ • Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act (2000) • USA PATRIOT Act (2001) • Homeland Security Act (2002) • Patriot Act Reauthorization Act of 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 U.S.C. §§ 1324, 1324(b) • 8 U.S.C. § 1324a • 18 U.S.C. § 545 • 18 U.S.C. § 981 and 982 • 18 U.S.C. § 1028 • 18 U.S.C. § 1594 • 19 U.S.C. §§ 1581, 1590, 1594, 1595, and 1595a • 19 U.S.C. § 1703 • 31 U.S.C. §§ 5317 and 5332 • 22 U.S.C. § 401 • 50 U.S.C. § 1701, et. seq.⁷
U.S. Secret Service	Treasury Contractor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. § 3056 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18 U.S.C. §§ 981 and 982

⁵ U.S. Coast Guard normally turns items seized over to other agencies, i.e., ICE, DEA, FBI, USMS. As such, those agencies would dictate the property custodian.

⁶ The Title 21 MOU dated 1994 remains in effect and negotiations are underway to update the MOU. The jurisdictional authority for ICE/CBP Title 21 use includes international, border nexus, and the functional equivalent of the border. It excludes domestic enforcement and administrative forfeiture activities.

⁷ The seizure authority for both ICE and CBP is extremely lengthy. The statutory authorities include administrative, criminal and civil seizure & forfeiture statutes and (some limited) abilities found in Titles 8, 12, 13, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28, 31, 33, 39, 42, 46 & Appendix, 49, 50 & Appendix.

Appendix H

Equitable Sharing Attachments

Request for Adoption of State or Local Seizure

<p>Federal Use Only</p> <p>Asset Identifier: _____</p> <p>Agency Case Number: _____</p> <p>Agency Seizure Number: _____</p> <p>Seizure Date: _____</p> <p>Date Request Received: _____</p>

- Request must be submitted to the federal investigative agency within 30 calendar days of state and local seizure date unless circumstances merit a waiver.
- Federal investigative agency shall review all requests for adoptions.
- U.S. Marshals Service must be consulted for purposes of pre-seizure planning prior to adoption.

Name of Requesting State or Local Agency: _____

Contact Person: _____ Telephone Number: (_____) _____

Date of Seizure: _____

Date of Request: _____

Delay Requested in Processing: Yes () Reason: _____
No () ()

Criminal Case:

State () Case # _____ District Attorney Assigned: _____

Federal () Case # _____ Assistant U.S. Attorney: _____

▪ Was Property Seized Pursuant to State Warrant:

▪ State Forfeiture Action Initiated:

Yes () Attach Copy

No ()

Yes ()

No ()

If yes, explain circumstances: _____

Forfeitures Generally Follow the Prosecution

As a general rule, if a state or local agency has seized property as part of an ongoing state criminal investigation, and, if the criminal defendants are being prosecuted in state court, the forfeiture action should also be pursued in state court.

However, certain circumstances may make federal forfeiture appropriate. These circumstances include but are not limited to the following:

- (1) state laws or procedures are inadequate or forfeiture experience is lacking in the state system with the result that a state forfeiture action may be unfeasible or unsuccessful;
- (2) the seized asset poses unique management or disposition problems (*e.g.*, real property or a business) requiring U.S. Marshals Service involvement;
- (3) state laws or procedures will result in a delay in forfeiture leading to significant diminution in the value of the asset or a delay in the resolution of the case that adversely affects an innocent owner or lienholder; or
- (4) the pertinent state or local prosecuting official has reviewed the case and declined to initiate forfeiture proceedings for any reason.

- Has a state or local prosecutor declined to proceed with forfeiture under state law?

Yes () No ()

- Please provide name of state or local prosecutor and declination date:

Name N Date

- Has another federal agency been contacted and declined to proceed with this forfeiture under federal law?

Yes () No ()

- Have you attached copies of pertinent investigative or arrest reports and copies of any affidavits filed in support of a seizure warrant? Yes () No ()

Delegation of Authority to Make Final Determinations in Uncontested Equitable Sharing Requests

June 5, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division
United States Attorneys
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation
Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration
Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service
Director, United States Marshals Service

FROM: Jamie S. Gorelick
Deputy Attorney General

SUBJECT: Delegation of Authority to Make Final Determinations in Uncontested Equitable Sharing Requests

Parts V.D.3 and 4 of The Attorney General's Guidelines on Seized and Forfeited Property (1990) provide that final determinations of equitable sharing (1) of forfeited property valued at \$1 million or greater, (2) in multi-district cases, or (3) involving the transfer of real property are to be made by the Deputy Attorney General or her designee.

I hereby delegate to the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division (or her designee) the authority to make final equitable sharing determinations that otherwise would require my approval, provided the Asset Forfeiture Office (AFO) of the Criminal Division, the United States Attorney, and the federal seizing agency agree on the allocation of judicially forfeited property or that AFO and the federal seizing agency agree on the allocation of administratively forfeited property.

I will continue to make final equitable sharing determinations where there is not complete agreement among AFO, the United States Attorney, and the federal seizing agency on the sharing of judicially forfeited property or between AFO and the federal seizing agency on the sharing of administratively forfeited property.

Recommendation:

Delegation of decision-making authority to the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division (or her designee) in equitable sharing cases (1) involving property valued at \$1 million or more, (2) in multi-district cases, or (3) involving the transfer of real property, provided that AFO, the United States Attorney, and the federal seizing agency agree on the allocation of judicially forfeited property or that AFO and the federal seizing agency agree on the allocation of administratively forfeited property.

APPROVE /s/ Jamie S. Gorelick

DISAPPROVE

OTHER

Request for Transfer of Real Property Pursuant to the Weed and Seed Initiative; Memorandum of Understanding; and Lead Based Paint Declaration

Request for Transfer of Real Property Pursuant to the Weed and Seed Initiative

The United States Attorney for the _____ District of _____ requests permission to transfer the following property to a community group through the Weed and Seed Initiative:

(Identify property)

Enclosed herewith is the draft Memorandum of Understanding and the DAG-71 and DAG-72 forms for the property. (Note whether any liens exist, and if so, how they will be paid).

The community group involved in this request is non-profit and the transfer will significantly impact the community. (Explain proposed use of property by community group.)

The benefit to the neighborhood greatly outweighs any financial loss of the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund. Further, the (state or local law enforcement agency) agrees to waive its share of any proceeds of sale of this property, and the (federal investigative agency) concurs in this transfer.

For the foregoing reasons, the undersigned recommends the transfer of this property to (recipient) pursuant to the Weed and Seed Initiative.

United States Attorney

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
REGARDING
[PROPERTY]**

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the property located at [PROPERTY] (the Property), more fully described in Attachment A, is entered into by the United States Attorney's Office for the [DISTRICT], the [SEIZING AGENCY], the [LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY], the United States Marshals Service (USMS) and [NON-PROFIT AGENCY]. This MOU sets forth the agreement by these parties to transfer the Property from the United States to [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] through the Weed and Seed Initiative.

The Weed and Seed Initiative is a federal program designed to reclaim and rejuvenate neighborhoods impacted by drug trafficking and other violent criminal activity. In furtherance of that design, the United States transfers forfeited property through state and local law enforcement agencies to local public agencies and private non-profit organizations that will use the property in a manner that promotes the goals of the Initiative. The Property was forfeited to the United States pursuant to [STATUTE] because it was [STATE STATUTORY REASON FOR FORFEITURE].

The United States agrees to convey the Property according to the conditions set forth in this MOU to the [LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY], with the understanding that the [LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY] will immediately convey the Property to [NON-PROFIT AGENCY], which agrees to take the Property as is and subject to the terms of this MOU [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] shall be responsible for any and all liens filed against the Property, any and all taxes, including transfer tax, any title insurance, and any property insurance.

[NON-PROFIT AGENCY] agrees to use the Property in a manner that promotes the goals of the Weed and Seed Initiative. Specifically, [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] shall use the Property as [STATE USE OF THE PROPERTY].

[NON-PROFIT AGENCY] shall commence using the Property as so specified within one year from the date of title conveyance of the Property and shall so use the Property thereafter for a period of five continuous years. In the event that [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] does not, for whatever reason, including, but not limited to, force majeure and acts of God, commence such use of the Property within one year from the date of title conveyance or use the Property as specified above for a period of five continuous years, then:

- (1) Title to the Property will revert, at the sole discretion of the USMS, to the United States, with all right, title, and interest in the Property accruing to the United States without cause;
- (2) The United States shall not be liable for any costs resulting from exercising its reversion rights to the Property as provided in (1) above or for any encumbrances or liens recorded against the Property after the conveyance of title; and
- (3) The United States shall not be liable for the costs of any structure, edifice, or improvements of any kind made upon the Property after the conveyance of title.

After having used the Property as specified for a period of five continuous years, [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] will hold clear title to the Property with no reversion rights to the United States.

[NON-PROFIT AGENCY] agrees to indemnify the United States, the United States Department of Justice, the United States Marshals Service, and the [SEIZING AGENCY], and their officers, employees and agents, from any claim by any third party, their heirs, successors or assigns, including costs and expenses for or on account of any and all law suits or claims of any character whatsoever, in connection with the above-described transfer, use, and reversion of the Property.

The [LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY] agrees to waive any interest in the proceeds from a sale of the Property in order that the Property may be transferred to [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] pursuant to the Weed and Seed Initiative. The [LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY] recommends the transfer.

It is the responsibility of [NON-PROFIT AGENCY] to ensure that the proposed use of the Property is consistent with state and local zoning laws, rules, regulations and orders.

[NAME]
United States Attorney
[DISTRICT]
DATED: _____

[NAME]
[Local Law Enf. Agency Rep]
DATED: _____

NAME AND TITLE
[SEIZING AGENCY]
DATED: _____

NAME AND TITLE
[NON- PROFIT AGENCY]
DATED: _____

NAME AND TITLE
United States Marshals Service
DATED: _____

Lead Based Paint Declaration

This declaration, made to the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) by the [Name of Organization], is an addendum to, and an integral part of, the [the Property], which concerns the conditions of the transfer or the [the Property] from the United States to the [Name of Organization].

The [Name of Organization] agrees that prior to occupancy of the Property as a residential habitation, it shall treat, pursuant to 24 C.F.R. Subtitle A, § 35.56(a)(2), all defective paint surfaces discovered on the Property and identified in the December 13, 1996 report of American Lead Consultants, of Waldorf, Maryland, a copy of which the [Name of Organization] hereby acknowledges having previously received, and that occupancy of the Property as a residential habitation shall take place only after the USMS determines, and confirms in writing to the [Name of Organization] that treatment pursuant to 24 C.F.R. Subtitle A, § 35.56 (a)(2) has been successfully accomplished. [Name of Organization] shall provide documentary evidence of successful treatment and, if requested by USMS, reasonable access to the Property to the USMS and its contractors, so that the USMS may make the required determination.

The [Name of Organization] hereby acknowledges that, in accordance with 24 C.F.R. Subtitle A, §§ 35.56 (a)(3) and 35.5(a), it has been notified by the USMS:

1. That the Property was constructed prior to 1978;
2. That the Property may contain lead-based paint;
3. Of the hazards of the lead-based paint;
4. Of the symptoms and treatment of lead-based paint poisoning; and
5. Of the precautions to be taken to avoid lead-based paint poisoning (including maintenance and removal techniques for eliminating such hazards);

and that it has received a copy of the EPA document entitled *Protect Your Family From Lead in Your Home* (EPA #747-K-94-001)

Dated: _____

Appendix I

Approval, Consultation and Notification Requirements

Topic	Requirement	Reference
Administrative Forfeiture	<i>Headquarters</i> of seizing agency must be consulted where a civil or criminal forfeiture agreement requires an administrative forfeiture	Policy Manual Chap. 3.IV USAM 9-113.103
Attorney's Fees	<i>Assistant Attorney General</i> must give approval to enter into a formal or informal, written or oral agreement, to exempt from forfeiture an asset transferred to an attorney as fees for legal services, including those restrained as substitute assets	Policy Manual Chap. 8.II USAM 9-119.104
Attorney's Fees	<i>Assistant Attorney General's</i> approval is required for any action to institute a criminal or civil forfeiture proceeding against an asset transferred to an attorney as a fee for legal services	Policy Manual Chap. 8.II USAM 9-119.104 USAM 9-119.202
Business Entities	<i>USAO</i> must consult with <i>AFMLS</i> prior to seeking forfeiture of a business on the theory that it facilitated money laundering	Policy Manual Chap. 1.I.D.4 USAM 9-111.124
Business Entities	<i>USAO</i> must consult with <i>AFMLS</i> prior to filing indictment, information, or complaint in any forfeiture action against, seeking the seizure of, or moving to restrain an ongoing business	Policy Manual Chap. 1.I.D.4 USAM 9-105.330
Business Entities	<i>USAO</i> or <i>USMS</i> must notify the <i>Justice Management Division, Asset Forfeiture Management Staff</i> when they learn that a restrained or seized business is losing money, has insufficient equity, or will be sold at a loss	Policy Manual Chap. 11.I.J
Business Entities: Trustees & Monitors	<i>USAO</i> must consult with <i>AFMLS</i> before seeking appointment of a trustee, monitor, or similar fiduciary	Policy Manual Chap. 11.I.J

Topic	Requirement	Reference
Correspondent Accounts	<i>AFMLS</i> must give approval before serving a restraining order, seizure warrant, or warrant of arrest on a correspondent bank account under 18 U.S.C. § 981(k) (chief of <i>AFMLS</i> will get concurrence from director of OIA)	Memorandum from AAG Chertoff USA Patriot Act, Section 319, codified at 18 U.S.C. § 981(k)
Correspondent Accounts	<i>AFMLS</i> must give approval before the <i>AAG</i> can issue summonses or subpoenas to foreign banks that maintain correspondent accounts in the United States to get records (chief of <i>AFMLS</i> will get approval from OIA as well)	Memorandum from AAG Chertoff AG order delegating authority to AAG USA Patriot Act, Section 319, codified at 31 U.S.C. § 5318(k)
Deposit of Seized Cash	<i>AFMLS</i> must give approval for exceptions to the policy requiring prompt deposit of any seized cash into the Seized Asset Deposit Fund (delegated by AAG) unless the seized cash is less than \$5,000.	Policy Manual Chap. 1.VI USAM 9-119.108 USAM 9-111.600
EAJA Awards	<i>AFMLS</i> must give approval to use funds to pay EAJA awards arising from forfeiture actions	Policy Manual Chap. 8.I.B USAM 9-119.105 USAM 9-117.210
Equitable Sharing/Official Use	<i>Deputy Attorney General</i> must approve equitable sharing in cases involving (1) \$1 million or more in forfeited assets, (2) multi-district cases, or (3) cases involving real property transfers to a state or local agency for law enforcement related use	Policy Manual Chap. 6 n.130 USAM 9-119.106
Equitable Sharing/Official Use	<i>Attorney General</i> and <i>Secretary of State</i> approval required before forfeited assets can be shared internationally	Policy Manual Chap. 6.IV USAM 9-119.107 USAM 9-116.400
Equitable Sharing/Official Use	<i>USAO</i> must consult with <i>AFMLS</i> or with seizing agency during 12-month holding period to release hold on property and allow petition for remission process to proceed (and equitable sharing, etc)	Policy Manual Chap. 4.II.E.2
Equitable Sharing/Official Use	Notification must be provided to <i>AFMLS</i> of all equitable sharing agreements approved by the <i>USAO</i> under \$1 million from judicial forfeitures	Policy Manual Chap. 6.II.B USAM 9-116.210
Equitable Sharing/Official Use	<i>AFMLS</i> should be notified if seizing agency decides to place property into agency's official use and the property is valued at \$50,000 or more	Policy Manual Chap. 5.VI USAM 9-118.440IV.D

Topic	Requirement	Reference
Foreign Property	AFMLS (which will consult with OIA) must be consulted before taking steps to present a foreign government for enforcement or recognition of any civil or criminal forfeiture order entered in the United States for property located within the foreign jurisdiction	Policy Manual Chap. 6.IV USAM 9-119.103 USAM 9-13.526
Liens/Mortgages	AFMLS must approve any requests for payment of liens and mortgages in excess of sale proceeds	Policy Manual Chap. 5.III.A <i>Expedited Forfeiture Settlement Policy I(B)</i> does not require approval, only encourages consultation with AFMLS USAM 9-119.109 USAM 9-113.800
Plea Agreements or Settlements	USMS and the seizing agency must be consulted during negotiation of settlements	Policy Manual Chap. 3.I.B.2 USAM 9-113.102
Plea Agreements or Settlements	Deputy Attorney General must approve settlements where the amount to be released exceeds \$2 million and 15 percent of the amount involved	Policy Manual Chap. 3.III USAM 9-113.200
Plea Agreements or Settlements	Chief of AFMLS has authority to approve a forfeiture settlement unless the amount to be released exceeds 15 percent of the amount involved and is greater than \$2 million, and the amount involved is greater than \$1 million	Policy Manual Chap. 3.II-III USAM 9-113.200
Plea Agreements or Settlements	U.S. Attorney may approve any settlement in a criminal or civil forfeiture claim if the amount involved is less than \$1 million or if the amount to be released does not exceed 15 percent of the amount involved and the amount involved is less than \$5 million	Policy Manual Chap. 3.II USAM 9-113.200 USAM says cases not in excess of \$500,000 and cases between \$5 million and \$5 million provided the amount released is not more than 15 percent of the amount involved.
Plea Agreements or Settlements	Seizing agency must be consulted before entering into plea agreements or settlements returning property that is the subject of administrative forfeiture proceedings	Policy Manual Chap. 2.II.C USAM 9-113.103

Topic	Requirement	Reference
Plea Agreements or Settlements	<i>AFMLS</i> must give approval to return of property subject to administrative forfeiture as part of a plea agreement	Policy Manual Chap. 2.II.C
Plea Agreements or Settlements	<i>USAO</i> must obtain advice and approval of <i>AFMLS</i> prior to any settlement that provides for unsecured partial payment (with the USMS)	Policy Manual Chap. 3.I.B.8 USAM 9-113.107
Preseizure Planning	<i>USMS</i> must be consulted as part of the preseizure planning process prior to seizure/restraint and forfeiture of assets	Policy Manual Chap. 1.I.A USAM 9-111.110
Preseizure Planning	<i>USAO</i> must give approval prior to the release of sensitive law enforcement information to third party contractors for the purpose of preseizure planning (preseizure)	Policy Manual Chap. 1.I.B
Real property	<i>USMS</i> must be consulted prior to adoption of seizure of real property <i>AFMLS</i> may authorize direct adoption of state and local seizures by U.S. Attorneys for judicial forfeiture in appropriate circumstances	Policy Manual Chap. 6.I.C USAM 9-116.190 Policy Manual Chap.6.I.H USAM 9-116.170
Real property	<i>USMS</i> must be consulted prior to seizure of contaminated real property	Policy Manual Chap. 1.IV.B USAM 9-111.400 USAM says <i>USAO</i> should exercise its discretion
Real property	<i>Assistant Attorney General</i> must approve real property transfers, including transfers to state or local agencies for further transfer to other government agencies or non-profit agencies for use in the Weed and Seed Program (delegated by AAG)	Policy Manual Chap. 6.V.C.1 USAM 9-116.520
Restitution	Notification must be provided to <i>AFMLS</i> of the imposition of 12-month hold for entry of restitution order (or USMS or seizing agency)	Policy Manual Chap. 4.II.E
Restraining orders	<i>AFMLS</i> review required for any proposed forfeiture restraining order in a RICO prosecution	Criminal Resource Manual 2084
Seizure Thresholds	Supervisory level approval in the <i>USAO</i> required for any downward departure from the seizing thresholds (in writing)	Policy Manual Chap. 1.I.D.1 USAM 9-111.120

Appendix J

Examples of Responsibilities of Trustees and Examples of Duties and Responsibilities of a Monitor

Examples of Responsibilities of Trustees

- Prepare periodic reports, or reports upon request, for the USAO and USMS, in a useful form.
- Manage, maintain, preserve, safeguard, and protect the interests of the Government and/or innocent third party shareholders, partners, and creditors.
- Initiate any action or claim to recover assets rightfully belonging to the Government's interest in a business or asset. This is to be done in consultation with the USAO and USMS.
- Manage and operate a specified business or revenue-producing asset and recommend changes, if needed, in the management of the business or asset.
- Arrange for the inventory of supplies, equipment, tools, furnishings, and other material resources associated with a business or property.
- Execute the powers and duties associated with the management of human resources of a business or revenue-producing asset, to include recruitment, selection, discharge, and compensation of employees.
- Responsible for bringing business into compliance with environmental and zoning laws.
- Receive, review, approve, and make all disbursements of proceeds received from a joint venture to full or limited partners. Receive, review, approve, and pay all expenses, including accounting, legal, and all other expenses related to the ongoing operations of the partnership.
- Ensure an appraisal/valuation of the business is performed.
- Set, determine, reallocate, charge, hold back, adjust, and modify distributions to any owner. Charge respective partners their appropriate share of historical, present, or future costs; distributions; reimbursements; and disbursements.

- Exercise all rights, powers, voting privileges, and authority generally conferred by law or necessity that are advisable or consistent with accomplishing the purposes of a joint venture or partnership agreement associated with a business or revenue-producing assets.
- With authorization from the USAO or USMS, employ, discharge, and fix compensation of such agents and employees, including lawyers, accountants, bankers, consultants, and other professionals, who assist in accomplishing the duties and responsibilities of the trustee.
- In executing the powers granted in performance of the duties described in a court order, the trustee may rely on any resolution, certificate, statement, instrument, opinion, report, notice, request, consent, order, or other document believed to be genuine and signed or presented by the proper party.
- Access to and/or the right to inspect, review, audit, or request surrender of all books and records of the business, asset, or partnership as the trustee deems necessary and appropriate.
- Authority to arrange and dispose of the Government's interest in a business, joint venture, partnership, corporate holding, financial instrument, or other personal or real property asset with the approval of the USAO or USMS, as appropriate.
- Access to, and the right to inspect, review, observe, appraise, and evaluate all operations and facilities of a business, at any reasonable time and consistent with state law, as the trustee, in sole discretion, deems necessary and appropriate.
- Access to all funds contained in any and all bank accounts of the asset or those funds maintained for the purpose of operating, managing, preserving, and protecting the asset, including, but not limited to, funds designated for the payment of insurance, rent, workman's compensation, and payroll.
- Execute any and all documents on the business's behalf, either personally or as power of attorney.
- Have the right to office space and administrative services at a business that is being monitored, or has been seized or forfeited.
- Refer all media contacts to the USAO.

Examples of duties and responsibilities of a monitor

- To have access to and/or the right to inspect, review, audit, or request surrender of all books and records of the business, asset, or partnership as the monitor deems necessary and appropriate.
- To have access to and the right to inspect, review, observe, appraise, and evaluate all operations and facilities of a business, at any reasonable time and consistent with state law, as the monitor, in sole discretion, deems necessary and appropriate.
- To have access to all cash receipts, check registers, deposits, bank statements, canceled checks, and payable and payroll vouchers for funds contained in any and all bank accounts of the asset or those funds maintained for the purpose of operating, managing, preserving, and protecting the asset, including, but not limited to, funds designated for the payment of insurance, rent, workman's compensation, payroll, and payroll tax deposits.
- To have the right to office space and administrative services at a business that is being monitored.
- To receive, review, and approve any disbursements above a certain dollar value specified in the order of the court (i.e., any disbursement in excess of \$5,000).
- To evaluate cash management and determine the current cash position and projections. To determine if enough cash is generated from operations to cover expenses. To evaluate internal controls. To determine if the cash is properly secured and deposited regularly. To evaluate banking relationships and identify any potential problems. To verify the bank statements reconciled monthly. To determine if controls over liquid assets prevent dissipation. To verify that excess cash is invested for interest and FDIC-insured. To identify any temporary investments, stocks, bonds, or other liquid assets.
- To evaluate the level of training and supervision of employees.
- To determine the outstanding accounts receivable balances and, if they are increasing or decreasing, to explain why. To evaluate the accounts receivable collection process and compare to other similar companies in the same industry.
- To identify all outstanding liabilities, including vendor payables, payroll payables, taxes payable, and long term liabilities such as bank loans, mortgages, long-term contractual commitments, or guarantees. To project the future balances and determine the effect on the business equity.
- To evaluate the physical and fiscal controls over the inventory and determine the inventory balance and if it is the proper amount for the business. To evaluate the ordering and receiving procedures for inventory. To identify the level of obsolete, spoiled, or damaged inventory. To determine if the company has the optimum amount of inventory at the right time to provide service to customers. To determine if any inventory is on consignment or if a floor plan or any other unique inventory arrangement exists.

- To take an inventory or verify the inventory provided of furniture, fixtures, and equipment. To determine the value, age, location, condition, and costs of all property, plants, and equipment. To identify projections for replacements or new acquisitions and how the replacements or new acquisitions are to be funded. To obtain control over all the necessary titles, deeds, registrations, etc., to assure no dissipation, if provided for in court orders. To evaluate the physical security over the fixed assets. To identify any long-term leased equipment and evaluate the ultimate liability.
- To evaluate the business's marketing and advertising program.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of operations and give an opinion as to the continued successful running of the company. To evaluate and report on any environmental issues and safety considerations.
- To determine if a budget for maintenance and repairs is used by a business, and if not, if there is a procedure in the place of reporting lighting, electrical, plumbing, air conditioning, and other problems. To report on the general appearance of the facilities upon visitation.
- To evaluate the risk management of the business and determine if the business has the proper insurance coverage for fire, flood, and general liability. To identify and assure that all patents, trademarks, licenses, and permits are maintained. To identify and assess the risks associated with employee benefit plans, retirement, insurance, or savings plans. To identify any paid-up life insurance plans, etc.
- To evaluate the quality and reliability of the business's accounting systems. To prepare a rolling 6-month comparative analysis for the businesses' balance sheet, profit and loss statement, and cash flow statement. Identify monthly changes in revenues, expenses, and the values of assets, liabilities, and owner's equity. To prepare an annual comparative analysis for the business's balance sheet, profit and loss statement, and cash flow statement identifying annual changes in revenues, expenses, and the value of assets, liabilities, and owner's equity. To prepare a monthly and annual report with explanations of trends identified and the possible effect on the continued success of the business.
- To determine the status of all tax and compliance reports and to verify that subject reports are timely filed. Some of these reporting requirements are as follows: (1) federal income tax, (2) state income tax, (3) local income tax, (4) sales tax, (5) federal quarterly form 941, (6) state quarterly employment tax, (7) local property tax, (8) federal annual form 940, (9) state annual unemployment reports, (10) employee W-2s and W-3s, (11) federal 1099s, (12) and state income taxes withheld from the employees' paychecks along with social security and Medicare taxes and the employer-matching requirements.
- To report any extraordinary events that occur outside the normal daily operations immediately to the USMS and USAO and to the court. Some of these events may include, but are not limited to, casualty losses, employee complaints such as EEOC or sexual harassment, any accident on business property, litigation, loss of key employees, major equipment failures, and any other that seriously effects the smooth operation of the business.
- Refer all media contacts to the USAO.