

**REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON THE ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS
OF THE
PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION
FOR 2023**



**Public Integrity Section
Criminal Division
United States Department of Justice**

**Submitted Pursuant to
Section 603 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978**

INTRODUCTION

This Report to Congress is submitted pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, which requires the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on the operations and activities of the Justice Department's Public Integrity Section. The Report describes the activities of the Public Integrity Section during 2023. It also provides statistics on the nationwide federal effort against public corruption during 2023 and over the previous two decades.

The Public Integrity Section was created in 1976 in order to consolidate in one unit of the Criminal Division the Department's oversight responsibilities for the prosecution of criminal abuses of the public trust by government officials. Section attorneys prosecute selected cases involving federal, state, or local officials, and provide approvals, advice, and assistance to prosecutors and agents in the field handling public corruption cases. In addition, the Section serves as the Justice Department's core of national subject matter experts for handling various issues that arise regarding public corruption statutes and cases.

An Election Crimes Branch was created within the Section in 1980 to supervise the Department's nationwide response to election crimes, such as voter fraud and campaign-finance offenses. The Director of the Election Crimes Branch reviews all major election crime investigations throughout the country and all proposed criminal charges relating to election crime.

During the year, the Section maintained a staff of approximately thirty attorneys, including experts in extortion, bribery, election crimes, and criminal conflicts of interest. The Section management included: Corey Amundson, Chief; John D. Keller, Principal Deputy Chief; Todd Gee, Deputy Chief; Jennifer Clarke, Deputy Chief, Robert Heberle, Deputy Chief and Director, Election Crimes Branch, Marco Palmieri, Acting Deputy Chief, and Rosaleen O'Gara, Acting Deputy Chief.

Part I of the Report discusses the operations of the Public Integrity Section and highlights its major activities in 2023. Part II describes significant cases prosecuted by the Section in 2023. Part III presents nationwide data regarding the national federal effort to combat public corruption over the last two decades.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

**OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF
THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION**

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LITIGATION 1

 1. Federal Corruption 1

 2. State and Local Corruption 2

 3. Election Crimes 2

 4. Obstruction, False Statements, and Perjury 3

 5. Criminal Conflicts of Interest..... 3

B. CASE ORIGINATION 4

 1. Federal Agency Referrals 4

 2. Requests from United States Attorney’s Offices 4

 3. Recusals by United States Attorney’s Offices 5

 4. Sensitive and Multi-District Cases 6

C. SPECIAL SECTION PRIORITIES 6

 1. Election Crimes 6

 2. Threats to the Election Community 8

D. LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE 9

 1. Training and Advice 9

 2. Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors
 General on Integrity and Efficiency 10

 3. Legislative Activities 10

 4. Case Supervision and General Assistance 10

 5. International Advisory Responsibilities 11

PART II

**PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS AND
PROSECUTIONS IN 2023**

INTRODUCTION 12

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH 13

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH 14

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH 16

STATE AND LOCAL CORRUPTION. 20

FEDERAL ELECTION CRIMES 23

PART III

**NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

INTRODUCTION28
LIST OF TABLES.....28

TABLE I: Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption in 2023
.....29

TABLE II: Progress over the Past Two Decades:
Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption30

TABLE III: Federal Public Corruption Convictions by District
Over the Past Decade32

PART I

OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION

The Public Integrity Section (PIN) oversees the investigation and prosecution of all federal crimes affecting government integrity, including bribery of public officials, election crimes, and other related offenses. PIN investigates and prosecutes some of the most sensitive, complex, and contentious public corruption cases handled by the Department, including cases involving elected and appointed officials at all levels of government. PIN also serves as a source of advice and expertise for federal prosecutors and agents regarding the handling of public corruption cases nationwide and plays a key role in developing Department policy concerning public corruption and election crime investigations and prosecutions. PIN handles cases in Districts across the country, either on its own or in partnership with the local U.S. Attorney's Office

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LITIGATION

PIN attorneys handle the Section's cases from the beginning of an investigation through indictment, trial, sentencing, and appeal. Section attorneys have successfully tried numerous cases across the country involving core public corruption charges such as bribery and extortion as well as other charges, including obstruction of justice, making false statements, election crimes, fraud, theft, money laundering, racketeering, criminal civil rights violations, tax crimes, and narcotics and firearms offenses. Due to its extensive experience in investigating and prosecuting complex public corruption matters, the Section serves as a source of expertise in a variety of particularized legal issues, including the Speech or Debate Clause of the Constitution.

Cases handled by the Section generally fall into one of the following subject-matter areas: federal corruption; state and local corruption; election crimes; and criminal conflicts of interest.

1. Federal Corruption

The Public Integrity Section centralizes the Department of Justice's efforts to combat corruption in the federal government by investigating and prosecuting cases, in addition to providing guidance to the U.S. Attorney's Offices around the country. The heartland of the fight against corruption is 18 U.S.C. § 201, which prohibits the

offer, solicitation, payment, and receipt of bribes and gratuities. Bribery is also often charged under similar statutes, such as honest services mail and wire fraud (18 U.S.C §§ 1341, 1343, and 1346); federal program fraud and bribery (18 U.S.C § 666), and extortion under color of official right (18 U.S.C § 1951).

PIN attorneys also regularly charge federal officials with other criminal violations connected to their official positions, such as theft of government property (18 U.S.C. § 641); fraud; violations of the Procurement Integrity Act (18 U.S.C. § 1202, 1205).

2. State and Local Corruption

The Public Integrity Section also investigates and prosecutes corruption offenses involving state and local officials. PIN uses a variety of statutory tools to combat corruption in state and local governments, such as honest services mail and wire fraud (18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1346); federal program fraud and bribery (18 U.S.C. § 666); and extortion under color of official right (18 U.S.C. § 1951).

3. Election Crimes

PIN plays a leading role in the Department of Justice's efforts to protect the integrity of elections. Justice Department supervision over the enforcement of all criminal statutes and prosecutive theories involving corruption of the electoral process, criminal patronage violations, and campaign financing crimes is delegated to the Public Integrity Section. The Election Crimes Branch within PIN manages this supervisory responsibility. The Branch is headed by a Director and staffed on a case-by-case basis with Section prosecutors experienced the investigation and prosecution of election crimes.

PIN attorneys prosecute an array of criminal conduct related to electoral processes, including election fraud (e.g., fraudulently obtaining and marking ballots, counting and certifying election results, or registering voters) and campaign financing crimes embodied within the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (FECA). Campaign finance offenses prosecuted by PIN include excessive contributions (52 U.S.C. § 30116); contributions from foreign nationals (52 U.S.C. § 30121); disguised contributions through conduits (52 U.S.C. § 30122); and the conversion of campaign contributions (52 U.S.C. § 30114). PIN also prosecutes cases involving the use of so-called scamPACs to fraudulently raise contributions based on false pretenses.

4. Obstruction, False Statements, and Perjury

Protecting the integrity of the judicial process is critically important to the mission of the Department of Justice. PIN attorneys have extensive experience prosecuting offenses involving obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. §§ 1503, 1512, 1519); making false statements (18 U.S.C. § 1001); perjury (18 U.S.C. §§ 1621, 1623); and contempt of court (18 U.S.C. § 401), and in litigating associated legal issues.

5. Criminal Conflicts of Interest

Federal conflicts of interest statutes establish rules to safeguard the integrity of official decision-making processes, including by penalizing federal employees who participate in official matters in which the employees have financial interests, or who represent interests that are contrary to the interests of the United States.

The Public Integrity Section's work in the conflicts area falls into the following categories:

a. Criminal Referrals from Federal Agencies and Recusals.

Conflicts of interest matters—that is, alleged violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 203-209—are often referred to the Section by the various federal agencies. If investigation of a referral is warranted, the Section coordinates the investigation with the Inspector General for the agency concerned, the FBI, or both. If prosecution is warranted, the Section prosecutes the case. If a civil remedy may be appropriate in lieu of criminal prosecution, the Section or the Inspector General may refer the case to the Civil Division of the Department of Justice for its review.

b. Coordination

The Public Integrity Section works with the United States Office of Government Ethics (OGE) to coordinate conflicts of interest issues with OGE and other executive branch agencies and offices. The purpose of this coordination is to ensure that the overall legislative and enforcement efforts in this area are both complementary and consistent. The Section's coordination with OGE ensures that consistent guidance is provided with respect to the overlapping criminal, civil, and administrative interests implicated by the statutory and regulatory restrictions on federal personnel.

While the offenses outlined above constitute the core of PIN matters, the Section's investigations and cases regularly involve other federal criminal violations

including fraud, theft, money laundering, racketeering, criminal civil rights violations, tax crimes, narcotics and firearms offenses. The Section also handles cases involving national security issues and classified information.

B. CASE ORIGINATION

The investigations and prosecutions that the Section handles come to PIN by several different routes: referrals from federal agencies and law enforcement partners, requests from United States Attorney's Offices, recusals by United States Attorneys' Offices, and sensitive/multi-district cases. These categories are discussed below.

1. Federal Agency Referrals

The Section handles matters referred directly to the Section by federal agencies concerning possible federal crimes by agency employees, as well as matters referred by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other federal law enforcement agencies concerning possible federal crimes by public officials at the federal, state, or local level. The Section reviews these allegations to determine whether a criminal investigation of the matter is warranted and, ultimately, whether the matter should be prosecuted. If so, the Section will handle the matter solely or in partnership with a local United States Attorney's Office.

The Section works closely with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) of the executive branch agencies, as well as with other agency investigative components and federal law enforcement agencies.

2. Requests from United States Attorney's Offices

Many federal corruption prosecutions are handled by the local United States Attorney's Office for the geographic district where the crime occurred, a fact demonstrated by the statistical charts in Part III of this Report. In some instances, a United States Attorney's Office or other Department component asks the Section to join a case the requesting office has opened or is considering opening. At times, the available prosecutorial resources in a United States Attorney's Office may be insufficient to undertake sole responsibility for a significant corruption case. In this situation the local office may request the assistance of an experienced Section prosecutor to share responsibility for prosecuting the case. On occasion, the Section may also be asked to provide operational assistance or to assume supervisory responsibility for a case due to a partial recusal of the local office. Finally, the Public

Integrity Section may be assigned to supervise or assist with a case initially assigned to another Department component.

3. Recusals by United States Attorney's Offices

At times, a local United States Attorney's Office may confront conflicts of interest or other prudential factors weighting against handling a particular corruption case. In those instances, the Section may handle the case on its own, without involvement of the United States Attorney's Office.

A successful public corruption prosecution requires both the appearance and the reality of fairness and impartiality. This means that a successful corruption case involves not just a conviction but public perception that the conviction was warranted, not the result of improper motivation by the prosecutor, and is free of conflicts of interest. In a case in which a local conflict of interest is substantial, the local United States Attorney's office is removed from the case by a procedure called recusal. Recusal occurs when the local office either asks to step aside, or is asked to step aside by Department headquarters, as primary prosecutor. Federal cases involving corruption allegations in which the conflict is substantial are usually referred to the Public Integrity Section either for prosecution or direct operational supervision.

Allegations involving possible crimes by federal judges almost always require recusals of the local offices for significant policy, as well as practical reasons. Having the case handled outside the local offices eliminates the possible appearance of bias, as well as the practical difficulties and awkwardness that would arise if an office investigating a judge were to appear before the judge on other matters. Thus, as a matter of established Department practice, federal judicial corruption cases generally are handled by the Public Integrity Section.

Similar concerns regarding the appearance of bias also arise when the target of an investigation is a federal prosecutor, a federal investigator, or other employee assigned to work in or closely with a particular United States Attorney's Office. Thus, cases involving United States Attorneys, Assistant United States Attorneys (AUSAs), or federal investigators or employees working with AUSAs in the field generally result in a recusal of the local office. These cases are typically referred to the Public Integrity Section.

4. Sensitive and Multi-District Cases

The Section occasionally handles cases that are highly sensitive and/or multi-jurisdictional in nature—sometimes at the request of the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division. Highly sensitive matters include those implicating especially challenging legal and factual issues requiring the resources, rigor, and subject-matter expertise of the Section, while multi-district cases, involve allegations that cross judicial district lines and fall under the jurisdiction of two or more United States Attorneys’ Offices. In these cases, the Section occasionally is asked to coordinate the investigation among the various United States Attorneys’ Offices, to handle a case jointly with one or more United States Attorney’s Office, or, when appropriate, to assume sole operational responsibility for the entire case.

C. SPECIAL SECTION PRIORITIES

In 2023, in addition to the general responsibilities discussed above, the Public Integrity Section’s work included a particular focus on the following priority areas of criminal law enforcement.

1. Election Crimes

One of the Section’s law enforcement priorities is its supervision of the Justice Department’s nationwide response to election crimes. The prosecution of all forms of election crime is a high Departmental priority, and headquarters’ oversight in this area is designed to ensure that the Department’s nationwide response to election crime matters is uniform, impartial, and effective.

The Election Crimes Branch oversees the Department’s handling of all election crime allegations other than those involving federal voting rights, which are handled by the Civil Rights Division. Specifically, the Branch provides approvals, advice, and guidance on three types of election crime cases: (1) vote frauds, such as vote buying and absentee ballot fraud; (2) campaign-finance crimes, most notably under the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA); and (3) patronage crimes, such as political shakedowns and misuse of federal programs for political purposes. Vote frauds and campaign-financing offenses are the most significant, and most common types of election crimes.

The additional election-related work of the Section and its Election Crimes Branch falls into the following categories:

a. Consultation and Field Support. Under long-established Department procedures, the Section's Election Crimes Branch reviews all major election crime investigations, including all proposed grand jury investigations and FBI full-field investigations, and all election crime charges proposed by the various United States Attorneys' Offices for legal and factual sufficiency. (Justice Manual 9-85.210.) The Branch also must be consulted before a United States Attorney's Office opens an investigation into any election crime allegation.

In the area of campaign-finance crimes, Department procedures require consultation with the Public Integrity Section's Election Crimes Branch before any investigation, including a preliminary investigation, is commenced by a United States Attorney's Office. (Justice Manual 9-85.210.) The increased coordination with the Section at the initial stage of a criminal investigation of a FECA matter enables the Department to coordinate, when necessary, with another federal agency, the Federal Election Commission, which has civil enforcement authority over FECA violations.

The Section's consultation responsibility for election matters includes providing advice to prosecutors and investigators regarding the application of federal criminal laws to vote fraud, patronage crimes, and campaign-finance crimes, and the most effective investigative techniques for particular types of election offenses. In addition, the Election Crimes Branch helps draft election crime charges and other pleadings when requested.

The majority of the Branch's consultations are in the following two categories: vote fraud, also known as election fraud or ballot fraud, and campaign financing crimes arising under the FECA. During 2023, the Branch assisted in evaluating allegations, helping to structure investigations, and drafting charges for United States Attorneys' Offices around the country in these areas of law enforcement.

b. Litigation. Section attorneys investigate and prosecute selected election crimes, either by assuming total operational responsibility for the case or by handling the case jointly with a United States Attorney's Office or other Department component.

c. District Election Officer Program. The Branch also assists in implementing the Department's long-standing District Election Officer (DEO) Program. This Program is designed to ensure that each of the Department's 94

United States Attorneys' Offices has a trained prosecutor available to oversee the handling of election crime matters within the district and to coordinate district responses with Department headquarters regarding these matters.

The DEO Program involves appointing an Assistant United States Attorney in each federal district to serve a two-year term as a DEO and providing periodic training for the DEOs in the handling of election crime and voting rights matters.

The DEO Program is also a crucial feature of the Department's nationwide Election Day Program, which takes place during the federal general elections held in November of even-numbered years. The Election Day Program ensures that federal prosecutors and investigators are available both at Department headquarters in Washington, DC, and in each district to receive complaints of election irregularities while the polls are open. As part of the Program, press releases are issued in Washington, DC, and in each district before the November federal elections that advise the public of the Department's enforcement interests in deterring and prosecuting election crimes and protecting voting rights. The press releases also provide contact information for the DEOs, local FBI officials, and Department officials in the Criminal and Civil Rights Divisions at headquarters, who may be contacted on Election Day by members of the public who have complaints of possible vote fraud or voting rights violations.

d. Inter-Agency Liaison with the Federal Election Commission. The Election Crimes Branch is the formal liaison between the Justice Department and the Federal Election Commission (FEC), an independent federal agency that shares enforcement jurisdiction with the Department over willful violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). The FEC has exclusive civil jurisdiction over all FECA violations, while the Department has exclusive criminal jurisdiction over FECA crimes.

e. Inter-Agency Liaison with the Office of Special Counsel. The Branch also serves as the Department's point of contact with the United States Office of Special Counsel (OSC). The OSC has jurisdiction over noncriminal violations of the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1509, 7321-7326, which may also involve criminal patronage crimes that are within the Department's jurisdiction.

2. Threats to the Election Community

In June 2021, the Public Integrity Section was selected to lead the Department's Election Threats Task Force to address the sharp increase in reports

of hostility and threats of violence to the election community during and following the 2020 election cycle. Because of the Section's experience handling sensitive issues that arise in investigating and prosecuting crimes targeting elections, PIN's oversight and guidance ensures consistency in investigations and prosecutions, adherence to election-related policies, and appropriate engagement with the election community.

At the Task Force's inception, the Section handled the assessment, investigation, and prosecution of all reports of threats to the election community. Through nationwide training of federal, state, and local law enforcement partners, including United States Attorney's offices, the Section has effectively transitioned to supervising and supporting such investigations and prosecutions in the field, in addition to continuing to handle individual cases when warranted.

The Section leads the Department's engagement with the election community through trainings, presentations, meetings, and preparedness briefings. The Section works with other Department components and partners in the interagency to ensure fulsome information sharing where possible. The Section regularly meets with state, local, and national organizations of election officials to provide updates regarding the Department's work in this area.

The Section continues to investigate and prosecute dozens of cases across the country.

C. LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1. Training and Advice

The Public Integrity Section is staffed with specialists who have considerable experience investigating and prosecuting corruption cases. Section attorneys participate in a wide range of formal training events for federal prosecutors and investigators. They are also available to provide informal advice on investigative methods, charging decisions, and trial strategy in specific cases.

The Section also conducts a public corruption seminar, held annually either virtually or on site, at the National Advocacy Center. Speakers at this seminar typically include both the Section's senior prosecutors and Assistant United States Attorneys from the field who have handled significant corruption cases. The seminar provides training for federal prosecutors regarding the statutes most commonly charged in corruption cases, guidance in the use of complex and

challenging investigative techniques often necessary to investigate government corruption, and advice from experienced prosecutors on conducting corruption trials.

2. Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency

Pursuant to the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-409, 122 Stat. 4302 (Oct. 14, 2008), the designee of the Chief of the Public Integrity Section serves as Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE). The CIGIE is a body composed of the Inspectors General of the various agencies of the executive branch of the federal government. The Integrity Committee of the CIGIE is charged with handling allegations against Inspectors General and senior members of their staff.

In addition, the Integrity Committee is charged with establishing policies and procedures to ensure consistency in conducting administrative investigations. The Committee's procedures, drafted with the assistance of the Public Integrity Section, provide a framework for the investigative function of the Committee. Allegations of wrongdoing by Inspectors General and their senior staff are initially reviewed by an Integrity Committee working group, with assistance from the Public Integrity Section, for potential criminal prosecution. In noncriminal matters, the procedures guide the Committee's process for reviewing or investigating alleged misconduct and for reporting on its findings. The Public Integrity Section also advises the Integrity Committee on matters of law and policy relating to its investigations.

3. Legislative Activities

An important responsibility of the Public Integrity Section is the review of proposed legislation that may affect, directly or indirectly, the investigation and prosecution of public officials and those who seek to corrupt these officials. The Section is often called upon to comment on legislation proposed by Congress, by the Administration, or by other departments of the executive branch; to draft or review testimony for congressional hearings; and to respond to congressional inquiries concerning legislative proposals. On occasion, the Section drafts legislative proposals relating to various corruption matters.

4. Case Supervision and General Assistance

Public corruption cases are often controversial, complex, and highly visible. These factors may warrant Departmental supervision and review of a particular case.

On occasion, Section attorneys are called upon to conduct a careful review of a sensitive public corruption case, evaluating the quality of the investigative work and the adequacy of any proposed indictments. Based on its experience in this area, the Section can often identify tactical or evidentiary problems early on and either provide needed assistance or, if necessary, assume operational responsibility for the prosecution.

The Section also has considerable expertise in the supervision of the use of undercover operations in serious corruption cases. The Section serves on the FBI's Criminal Undercover Operations Review Committee. A number of the Section's senior prosecutors have experience in the practical and legal problems involved in such operations and have the expertise to employ this sensitive investigative technique effectively and to advise law enforcement personnel on its use.

5. International Advisory Responsibilities

The Public Integrity Section actively participates in the area of international law enforcement. The Section regularly provides briefings and training on United States public corruption issues to visiting foreign delegations and continues the efforts of the United States to assist foreign countries in their quest to combat public corruption and election crime in their respective countries. This assistance includes participation in international proceedings and coordination with other components of the Justice Department and the State Department on the Administration's positions in this area.

Section experts also engage with visiting foreign officials handling foreign investigations and prosecutions of public corruption. These presentations are generally conducted under the auspices of the State Department's Foreign Visitor Program and the Justice Department's Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance, and Training.

PART II

PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS AND PROSECUTIONS IN 2023

INTRODUCTION

As described in Part I, the Public Integrity Section's role in the prosecution of public corruption cases ranges from sole operational responsibility for the entire case to approving an indictment or to providing advice on the drafting of charges. Part II of the Report provides examples of noteworthy public corruption cases for which the Section had either sole or shared operational responsibility during 2023.

In 2023, the Section's case work resulted in 28 guilty pleas, as well as trial convictions in the Eastern District of New York, the Northern District of Iowa, the District of Columbia, the Central District of California, the District of Puerto Rico, and the District of Massachusetts. The Section successfully tried seven cases in 2023 resulting in the convictions of seven defendants.

The descriptions of the Section's significant cases for calendar year 2023 are separated into categories, based on the branch or level of government affected by the corruption. Election crime cases are grouped separately. Unrelated cases in each category are separated by triple lines. When a conviction but not a sentencing took place in 2023, the case may be reported in this report or in a later year's report.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section has sole responsibility for the investigation and prosecution of federal judges due to the potential appearance issues that might arise if a local United States Attorney's Office were to investigate an allegation of wrongdoing by a judge before whom that United States Attorney's Office appears on a regular basis. The investigation of allegations of criminal wrongdoing in the federal judicial branch is a very sensitive matter. These investigations may involve intrusions into pending federal cases, cooperation from parties or witnesses who are appearing before the court, or potential disruption of the normal judicial process. In addition, the Section must coordinate closely with supervisory judges and the Administrative Office of United States Courts to facilitate the assignment of magistrates and judges from outside of the judicial district to handle requests during the investigation, such as grand jury supervision, or applications for warrants or electronic surveillance. The Public Integrity Section has developed substantial experience and expertise in these matters over the years. During 2023, the Section brought no cases involving the federal judicial branch.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section plays a central role in the effort to combat corruption in the federal legislative branch. These cases raise unique issues of inter-branch comity, and they are always sensitive given the high-profile stature of elected officials. The Section has developed substantial expertise regarding the unique protections provided to Members of Congress and their staff by the Speech or Debate Clause set forth in Article I of the Constitution and has worked closely and effectively with House and Senate counsel and the Ethics Committees in both houses. Department policy requires consultation with the Section in all investigations involving a Member of Congress or a congressional staff member and require Section approval of any charges against a Member of Congress involving their public office or campaign activities (Justice Manual 9-87.110). Department policy also requires Section approval of any plea agreements where the defendant is a Member of Congress (Justice Manual 9-16.110). In addition to handling its own cases, the Section routinely provides advice and guidance to prosecutors across the country regarding these sensitive investigations. During 2023, the Section handled several cases involving executive branch corruption, of which two are described below.

US v. George Santos, Eastern District of New York

On May 10, 2023, George Santos, then a United States Congressman representing the Third District of New York, was charged with seven counts of wire fraud, three counts of money laundering, one count of theft of public funds, and two counts of making materially false statements to the House of Representatives.

The charges in the indictment stem from a fraudulent political contribution solicitation scheme, in which Santos allegedly defrauded prospective political supporters by using their political contributions for personal expenses. Santos is also charged in the indictment with fraudulently receiving unemployment benefits and making false statements.

On October 10, 2023, Santos was charged in a superseding indictment with one count of conspiracy to commit offenses against the United States, two counts of

wire fraud, two counts of making materially false statements to the Federal Election Commission (FEC), two counts of falsifying records submitted to obstruct the FEC, two counts of aggravated identity theft, and one count of access device fraud, in addition to the charges in the initial indictment.

In the superseding indictment, Santos and Nancy Marks, treasurer for Santos' principal congressional campaign committee, are also alleged to have conspired with one another to devise and execute a fraudulent scheme to obtain money for the campaign by submitting materially false reports to the FEC on behalf of the campaign in which they inflated the campaign's fundraising numbers for the purpose of misleading the FEC, a national party committee, and the public.

On October 5, 2023, Marks pleaded guilty for her part of the scheme.

Santos is also charged with devising and executing a fraudulent scheme to steal the personal identity and financial information of contributors to his campaign between December 2021 and August 2022. Santos is alleged to have charged contributors' credit cards repeatedly, without their authorization.

US v. Samuel Miele, Eastern District of New York

On November 14, 2023, Samuel Miele, a congressional campaign staffer, pleaded guilty to wire fraud in connection with a scheme to fraudulently obtain political contributions.

According to court documents, Miele worked as a fundraiser for a candidate seeking election to the U.S. House of Representatives (Candidate #1). As part of the scheme, Miele impersonated a high-ranking aide to a member of House leadership while soliciting funds for Candidate #1's campaign. Miele also admitted that he committed access device fraud by charging credit cards without authorization for contributions to Candidate #1's and other candidates' campaigns, as well as for Miele's personal use.

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section frequently receives allegations of corruption in the executive branch from federal law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, the Inspectors General for the various departments and agencies, and United States military investigators. These matters involve a careful balancing of the requirements of a criminal investigation and the operational needs of the executive offices involved. During 2023, the Section handled a number of cases involving executive branch corruption, several of which are described below.

US v. Ian Diaz, Central District of California

On March 23, 2023, after a multi-week jury trial, Ian Diaz, a deputy U.S. Marshal, was convicted of conspiracy to commit cyberstalking, cyberstalking, perjury, and obstruction of a federal investigation.

According to court documents and evidence presented at trial, Diaz, and his then-wife, an unindicted co-conspirator (CC-1), posed as a person with whom Diaz was formerly in a relationship (Jane Doe). In that guise, they sent themselves harassing and threatening electronic communications that contained apparent threats to harm CC-1; solicited and lured men found through Craigslist “personal” advertisements to engage in so-called “rape fantasies” in an attempt to stage a purported sexual assault on CC-1 orchestrated by Jane Doe; and staged one or more hoax sexual assaults and attempted sexual assaults on Diaz’s former wife. Diaz and CC-1 then reported this conduct to local law enforcement, falsely claiming that Jane Doe posed a genuine and serious threat to Diaz and CC-1. Their actions caused local law enforcement to arrest, charge, and detain Jane Doe in jail for nearly three months for conduct for which Diaz and CC-1 framed her.

In addition, Diaz and CC-1 took steps to conceal their conduct, including using falsely registered email accounts, using virtual private networks to access the internet anonymously, and communicating with each other using encrypted messaging services. Diaz also deleted email accounts used to communicate in furtherance of the scheme.

On June 30, 2023, Ian Diaz was sentenced to 10 years and one month imprisonment.

US v. Prakazrel, Michel, District of Columbia

On April 26, 2023, after a five-week jury trial, Prakazrel “Pras” Michel, a U.S. entertainer and businessman, was convicted for orchestrating and executing two illegal influence campaigns targeting successive sitting Presidents of the United States at the direction of foreign national, Low Taek Jho (“Jho Low”), who remains a fugitive. In 2017, Michel sought the termination of the investigation of Jho Low and others for embezzlement and other offenses in connection with the theft of billions of dollars from the international strategic and development company known as 1Malaysia Development Berhad (1MDB) and sought the extrajudicial removal of a Chinese national back to China. In 2012, Michel conspired with Jho Low and others to make and conceal foreign and conduit campaign contributions during the 2012 U.S. presidential election to obtain access for Jho Low to the President of the United States at campaign events.

According to court documents and evidence presented at trial, in 2017, Michel conspired with Jho Low; Elliott Broidy; Nickie Lum Davis; George Higginbotham; and others to engage in undisclosed lobbying campaigns at the direction of Low and the Vice Minister of Public Security for the People’s Republic of China (“PRC”).

Over the course of roughly five years, Michel received approximately \$120 million from Jho Low in furtherance of the two schemes. In 2012, Michel received \$20 million of Low’s money and contributed it both personally and through approximately 20 straw donors to multiple political committees, causing a presidential joint fundraising committee and an independent expenditure committee to submit false reports to the Federal Election Commission (FEC). In addition, Michel submitted a false declaration to the FEC.

In 2017, Michel received another \$100 million from Low, served as his unregistered agent on 1MDB and as an agent for the PRC government regarding removal of the Chinese national, conspired to commit money laundering, made false statements to financial institutions related to the foreign influence campaigns, and tampered with witnesses.

Higginbotham pleaded guilty for his role in the scheme on Nov. 30, 2018, in the District of Columbia. On November 9, 2023, he was sentenced to probation.

Lum Davis pleaded guilty for her role in the scheme on Aug. 31, 2020, in the District of Hawaii. On January 19, 2023, she was sentenced to two years imprisonment.

Broidy pleaded guilty for his role in the scheme on Oct. 20, 2020, in the District of Columbia. He received a full presidential pardon on Jan. 19, 2021.

Low was previously indicted and remains a fugitive.

Michel is pending sentencing.

US v. Charles Littlejohn, District of Columbia

On October 12, 2023, Charles Littlejohn, an IRS contractor, pleaded guilty to unauthorized disclosure of tax return and return information.

According to court documents, Littlejohn, while working at the IRS as a government contractor, stole tax return information associated with then President Trump. Littlejohn accessed tax returns associated with then President Trump – and related individuals and entities – on an IRS database after using broad search parameters designed to conceal the true purpose of his queries. He then evaded IRS protocols established to detect and prevent large downloads or uploads from IRS devices or systems. Littlejohn then saved the tax returns to multiple personal storage devices, including an iPod, before contacting News Organization 1. Between around August 2019 and October 2019, Littlejohn provided News Organization 1 with the tax return information associated with then President Trump. Littlejohn then stole additional tax return information related to then President Trump and provided it to News Organization 1. In September 2020, News Organization 1 published a series of articles about then President Trumps’s tax returns.

In July and August 2020, Littlejohn separately stole tax return information for thousands of the nation’s wealthiest individuals. Littlejohn was again able to evade IRS detection. In November 2020, Littlejohn disclosed this tax return information to News Organization 2, which published over 50 articles using the stolen data. Littlejohn then obstructed the forthcoming investigation into his conduct by deleting and destroying evidence of his disclosures.

US v. Kathryn Drey, Northern District of Florida

On March 28, 2023, Kathryn Drey, an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Northern District of Florida, pleaded guilty to illegally steering contracts to her spouse, in violation of the federal criminal conflict of interest statute.

According to court documents, Drey directed contracts from the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Florida to companies in which her spouse had a financial interest, including while she served as chief of the office's Civil Division. Drey concealed her spouse's financial interest in contracts to conduct title searches in litigation defended by the U.S. Attorney's Office.

On July 26, 2023, Drey was sentenced to 6 months' probation.

US v. Adrian Pena, Western District of Texas

On June 30, 2023, Adrian Pena, a deputy U.S. Marshal, pleaded guilty to misusing a law enforcement service to obtain cell phone location information for personal use.

According to court documents, Pena used a law enforcement service to locate individuals with whom Pena had personal relationships and their spouses. Pena obtained the cell phone data by uploading blank and random documents to a system operated by Securus Technologies exclusively for authorized law enforcement purposes. Pena falsely certified that those documents were official and that they granted Pena permission to obtain the individuals' data.

On September 14, 2023, Pena was sentenced to 3 years' probation.

STATE AND LOCAL CORRUPTION

The Public Integrity Section plays a major role in combating corruption at all levels of government, including corruption relating to state or local public officials. During 2023, the Section handled a number of cases involving state and local corruption, several of which are described below.

US v. Dustin Guidry, Western District of Louisiana

On March 23, 2023, Dusty Guidry pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit federal program theft.

During the conspiracy, Guidry was employed at a district attorney's office in Western Louisiana and was an administrator in the office's pre-trial diversion (PTD) program. The PTD program enabled defendants to expunge their criminal convictions if they met certain requirements, to include completing cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) courses. In the scheme, vendors that provided CBT courses agreed to pay kickbacks to Guidry and another conspirator in the DA's Office, in exchange for using their official positions to steer PTD program defendants to take the vendor's courses.

US v. Sean O'Donovan, District of Massachusetts

On October 27, 2023, after a one-week jury trial, Sean O'Donovan, a former attorney, was convicted, of two counts of honest services wire fraud and one count of bribery concerning programs receiving federal funds.

According to court documents and evidence presented at trial, O'Donovan paid a bribe to influence the Medford Police Chief in connection with O'Donovan's client's recreational marijuana business. In February 2021, O'Donovan approached Individual 1, a relative of the Chief, and offered to pay Individual 1 \$25,000 to speak with the Chief about his client's anticipated application to sell recreational marijuana in Medford. At the time, the Chief had recently been appointed to serve on a committee to rank such applications on behalf of Medford's mayor, who would ultimately select three applicants to open retail marijuana stores in Medford. After

Individual 1 informed the Chief of O'Donovan's corrupt offer, the Chief immediately alerted federal authorities.

Over the course of the investigation, O'Donovan, believing he had an agreement with Individual 1 and the Chief, offered to pay Individual 1 approximately \$25,000 in exchange for the Chief's favorable action on his client's application. Specifically, O'Donovan sought to have the Chief favorably rank his client's application and, separately, advised and pressured the mayor to select the client to open a retail marijuana store in Medford. O'Donovan was slated to receive a stream of income of at least \$100,000 annually from his client's marijuana business if its Medford application were successful. O'Donovan never informed his client of the bribery scheme with Individual 1.

US v. Angel Pérez -Otero, District of Puerto Rico

On March 22, 2023, Angel Pérez -Otero, a former mayor of Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, was convicted of conspiracy, federal program bribery, and extortion.

According to court documents and evidence presented at trial, Pérez-Otero was involved in a bribery conspiracy in which, from approximately late 2019 through May 2021, he accepted thousands of dollars in cash bribes on a regular basis from the owner of a construction company. In exchange for these payments, Pérez-Otero agreed to obtain and retain contracts for the company and ensured that its invoices were promptly paid.

US v. Scott Jenkins et al, Western District of Virginia

On June 28, 2023, Scott Jenkins, a Culpeper County Sheriff, and his accomplices, Rick Tariq Rahim, Fredric Gumbinner, and James Metcalf were indicted with a conspiracy to exchange bribes for law enforcement badges and credentials.

According to court documents, from at least April 2019, Jenkins, accepted cash bribes and bribes in the form of campaign contributions totaling at least \$72,500 from Rahim, Gumbinner, Metcalf, and at least five others, including two FBI undercover agents. In return, Jenkins appointed each of the bribe payors as auxiliary

deputy sheriffs, a sworn law-enforcement position, and issued them Culpeper County Sheriff's Office badges and identification cards. Jenkins told or caused others to tell the bribe payors that those law-enforcement credentials authorized them to carry concealed firearms in all 50 states without obtaining a permit. In addition, Jenkins assisted Rahim in gaining approval for a petition to restore his firearms rights filed in Culpeper County Circuit Court that falsely stated that Rahim resided in Culpeper County.

Jenkins was charged with one count of conspiracy, four counts of honest-services mail and wire fraud, and eight counts of federal programs bribery. Rahim was charged with one count of conspiracy, three counts of honest-services mail and wire fraud, and three counts of federal programs bribery. Gumbinner was charged with one count of conspiracy, one count of honest-services wire fraud, and two counts of federal programs bribery. Metcalf was charged with one count of conspiracy, one count of honest-services wire fraud, and two counts of federal programs bribery.

On November 20, 2023, Gumbinner pleaded guilty to one count of federal programs bribery.

US v. Sixto Jorge Díaz Colón, District of Puerto Rico

On February 3, 2023, Sixto Jorge Díaz Colón was convicted after a jury trial of extortion and obstruction of justice related to his involvement in a scheme to obtain money in exchange for preventing the release of chat messages involving senior officials in the Government of Puerto Rico.

According to court documents and evidence presented at trial, Díaz Colón, attempted to extort a public official in the Government of Puerto Rico in June 2019. Díaz Colón attempted to secure a \$300,000 payment and other things of value from the official in exchange for the assurance that certain Telegram chat messages containing damaging information about various public officials in the government would not be disclosed publicly. When approached by the FBI in July 2019, Díaz Colón deleted messages containing information about his involvement in the scheme before surrendering his cellular telephone to the authorities.

On August 4, 2023, Díaz Colón was sentenced to 51 months imprisonment.

FEDERAL ELECTION CRIMES

As described in Part I, during 2023, the Public Integrity Section continued its nationwide oversight of the handling of election crime investigations and prosecutions. Set forth below are examples of the Section's 2023 casework in this area.

US v. Douglas Mackey, Eastern District of New York

On March 31, 2023, Mackey was convicted after a jury trial of Conspiracy Against Rights stemming from his scheme to deprive individuals of their constitutional right to vote.

In 2016, Mackey established an audience on Twitter with approximately 58,000 followers. A February 2016 analysis by the MIT Media Lab ranked Mackey as the 107th most important influencer of the then-upcoming Presidential Election.

As proven at trial, between September 2016 and November 2016, Mackey conspired with other influential Twitter users and with members of private online groups to use social media platforms, including Twitter, to disseminate fraudulent messages that encouraged supporters of presidential candidate Hillary Clinton to "vote" via text message or social media which was legally invalid. For example, on November 1, 2016, in or around the same time that Mackey was sending tweets suggesting the importance of limiting "black turnout," the defendant tweeted an image depicting an African American woman standing in front of an "African Americans for Hillary" sign. The ad stated: "Avoid the Line. Vote from Home," "Text 'Hillary' to 59925," and "Vote for Hillary and be a part of history." The fine print at the bottom of the deceptive image stated: "Must be 18 or older to vote. One vote per person. Must be a legal citizen of the United States. Voting by text not available in Guam, Puerto Rico, Alaska or Hawaii. Paid for by Hillary For President 2016." The tweet included the typed hashtag "#ImWithHer," a slogan frequently used by Hillary Clinton. On or about and before Election Day 2016, at least 4,900 unique telephone numbers texted "Hillary" or some derivative to the 59925-text number, which had been used in multiple deceptive campaign images tweeted by Mackey and his co-conspirators.

Several hours after tweeting the first image, Mackey tweeted an image depicting a woman seated at a conference room typing a message on her cell phone. This deceptive image was written in Spanish and mimicked a font used by the Clinton campaign in authentic ads. The image also included a copy of the Clinton campaign's logo and the "ImWithHer" hashtag.

On October 18, 2023, Mackey was sentenced to 7 months' imprisonment.

US v. James Clark, District of Arizona

On August 11, 2023, James Clark pleaded guilty to one count of making a threatening interstate communication.

According to court documents, on or about Feb. 14, 2021, Clark sent a message via the website contact form of the Arizona Secretary of State's Office, Election Division, addressed to the election official, and warned her that she needed to "resign by Tuesday February 16th by 9 am or the explosive device impacted in her personal space will be detonated."

Shortly after transmitting the message, Clark conducted online searches that included the full name of the election official in conjunction with the words "how to kill" and "address." Additionally, on or about February 18, 2021, Clark conducted online searches involving the Boston Marathon bombing.

US v. Joshua Russell, District of Arizona

On August 31, 2023, Joshua Russell pleaded guilty to one count of making a threatening interstate communication.

According to court documents, on or about August 2, 2022, on the date of Arizona's primary elections, Russell left the following voicemail for an election official with the Arizona Secretary of State's Office (Victim-1): "This message is for traitor [Victim-1's full name]. You've drug your feet, you've done nothing, to protect our election for 2020. You're committing election fraud, you're starting to do it again, from day one. You're the enemy of the United States, you're a traitor to this country, and you better put your sh[inaudible], your [expletive] affairs in order,

'cause your days [inaudible] are extremely numbered. America's coming for you, and you will pay with your life, you communist [expletive] traitor [expletive]."

Additionally, on or about September 9, 2022, Russell left the following voicemail for Victim-1: "This message is for terrorist [Victim-1's last name]. The only reason you're still walking around on this planet is because we're waiting for the midterms to see you prosecuted for the crimes you have done to our nation. You are a terrorist. You are a derelict criminal. And you have a few short months to see yourself behind bars, or we will see you to the grave. You are a traitor to this nation, and you will suffer the [expletive] consequences."

Finally, on or about November 15, 2022, Russell left the following voicemail for Victim-1: "This message is for communist, criminal, [Victim-1's full name]. We will not endure your crimes on America another day. You've been busted, over and over again. We will not wait for you to be drugged through court. A war is coming for you. The entire nation is coming for you. And we will stop, at no end, until you are in the ground. You're a traitor to this nation. You're a [expletive] piece of [expletive] communist, and you just signed your own death warrant. Get your affairs in order, cause, your days are very short."

US v. Mark Rissi, District of Arizona

On April 13, 2023, Mark Rissi pleaded guilty to two counts of making a threatening interstate communication.

According to court documents, on or about September 27, 2021, Rissi said the following in a voicemail message he left for Clint Hickman, an election official with the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors: "Hello Mr. Hickman, I am glad that you are standing up for democracy and want to place your hand on the Bible and say that the election was honest and fair. I really appreciate that. When we come to lynch your stupid lying Commie [expletive], you'll remember that you lied on the [expletive] Bible, you piece of [expletive]. You're gonna die, you piece of [expletive]. We're going to hang you. We're going to hang you."

Additionally, on or about December 8, 2021, Rissi said the following in a voicemail message he left for then-Attorney General of Arizona Mark Brnovich: "This message is for Attorney General Mark Brnovich . . . I'm a victim of a crime.

My family is a victim of a crime. My extended family is a victim of a crime. That crime was the theft of the 2020 election. The election that was fraudulent across the state of Arizona, that the Attorney General knows was fraudulent, that the Attorney General has images of the conspirators deleting election fraud data from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors computer system. Do your job, Brnovich, or you will hang with those [expletive] in the end. We will see to it. Torches and pitchforks. That's your future, [expletive]. Do your job.”

On August 28, 2023, Rissi was sentenced to 30 months imprisonment.

US v. Chad Stark, Northern District of Georgia

On August 31, 2023, Chad Stark pleaded guilty to one count of a sending a threat using a telecommunications device.

According to court documents, around January 5, 2021, Stark posted a message to Craigslist entitled, “Georgia Patriots it’s time to kill [Official A] the Chinese agent - \$10,000.” The message included the following: “It’s time to invoke our Second Amendment right it’s time to put a bullet in the treasonous Chinese [Official A]. Then we work our way down to [Official B] the local and federal corrupt judges. It’s our duty as American Patriots to put an end to the lives of these traitors and take back our country by force. . . . If we want our country back we have to exterminate these people. One good loyal Patriot deer hunter in camo and a rifle can send a very clear message to these corrupt governors... milita up Georgia it’s time to spill blood.... we need to pay a visit to [Official C] and her family as well and put a bullet in her behind the ears. Remember one thing local law enforcement the key word being local..... we will find you oathbreakers and we’re going to pay your family to visit your mom your dad your brothers and sisters your children your wife... we’re going to make examples of traitors to our country... death to you and all you communist friends.”

On November 29, 2023, Stark was sentenced to 24 months imprisonment.

US v. Solomon Peña et al, District of New Mexico

On May 24, 2023, Solomon Peña, a former New Mexico House of Representatives Candidate and his accomplices, Demetrio Trujillo and Jose Trujillo, were indicted for a shooting spree targeting the homes of four elected officials.

Peña is charged with conspiracy, four counts of interference with federally protected activities, and four counts of using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence.

Jose Trujillo is charged with conspiracy, four counts of interference with federally protected activities, and four counts of using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence, possession with intent to distribute 40 grams and more of fentanyl and using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a drug trafficking crime.

Demetrio Trujillo is charged with conspiracy, four counts of interference with federally protected activities, and four counts of using and carrying a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence.

According to the indictment, Peña ran for District 14 of the New Mexico House of Representatives during the November 2022 mid-term elections. Following his electoral defeat in November 2022, Peña allegedly organized the shootings on the homes of two Bernalillo County commissioners and two New Mexico state legislators. The shootings were carried out between Dec. 4, 2022, and Jan. 3, 2023.

PART III

NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

INTRODUCTION

The tables in this section of the Report reflect data that is compiled from annual nationwide surveys of the United States Attorneys' Offices and from the Public Integrity Section.

As discussed in Part I, most corruption cases are handled by the local United States Attorney's Office in the district where the crime occurred. However, on occasion, outside prosecutors are asked either to assist the local office on a corruption case, or to handle the case entirely as a result of recusal of the local office due to a possible conflict of interest. The figures in Tables I through III include all public corruption prosecutions within each district including cases handled by the United States Attorneys' Offices and the Public Integrity Section.

LIST OF TABLES

- TABLE I:** Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption in 2023
- TABLE II:** Progress Over the Past Two Decades: Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption
- TABLE III:** Federal Public Corruption Convictions by District Over the Past Decade

TABLE I
NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS
IN 2023

Federal Officials	
Charged	208
Convicted	229
Awaiting Trial	104

State Officials	
Charged	51
Convicted	58
Awaiting Trial	37

Local Officials	
Charged	141
Convicted	121
Awaiting Trial	108

Others Involved	
Charged	143
Convicted	142
Awaiting Trial	144

Totals	
Charged	543
Convicted	550
Awaiting Trial	393

TABLE II

**PROGRESS OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES:
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS BY UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
FEDERAL OFFICIALS										
Charged	424	445	463	426	518	425	422	412	381	337
Convicted	381	390	407	405	458	426	397	392	369	315
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	98	118	112	116	117	107	103	110	108	113
STATE OFFICIALS										
Charged	111	96	101	128	144	93	168	93	100	133
Convicted	81	94	116	85	123	102	108	143	78	119
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	48	51	38	65	61	57	105	41	68	68
LOCAL OFFICIALS										
Charged	268	309	291	284	287	270	296	282	319	334
Convicted	252	232	241	275	246	257	280	276	295	303
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	105	148	141	127	127	148	146	127	135	149
PRIVATE CITIZENS INVOLVED IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION OFFENSES										
Charged	410	313	295	303	355	294	298	295	278	330
Convicted	306	311	266	249	302	276	251	296	318	300
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	168	136	148	179	184	161	200	191	144	169
TOTALS										
Charged	1213	1,163	1,150	1,141	1,304	1,082	1,184	1,082	1,078	1,134
Convicted	1020	1,027	1,030	1,014	1,129	1,061	1,036	1,107	1,060	1,037
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	419	453	439	487	489	473	554	469	455	499

TABLE II (continued)

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Totals
FEDERAL OFFICIALS											
Charged	364	458	354	383	275	300	242	246	183	208	7,266
Convicted	364	402	326	334	250	307	207	228	205	229	6,792
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	111	153	170	169	165	131	154	153	128	104	X
STATE OFFICIALS											
Charged	80	123	139	63	85	60	55	52	50	51	1,925
Convicted	109	97	125	68	72	63	30	43	68	58	1,782
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	33	66	74	53	59	46	48	60	36	37	X
LOCAL OFFICIALS											
Charged	231	259	234	223	171	213	135	167	122	141	4,836
Convicted	252	200	213	208	175	199	110	138	149	121	4,422
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	100	135	148	150	110	111	129	150	107	108	X
PRIVATE CITIZENS INVOLVED IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION OFFENSES											
Charged	241	262	255	194	234	207	196	181	111	143	5,195
Convicted	264	205	222	227	198	165	122	189	167	142	4,776
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	106	150	177	149	145	163	230	192	130	144	X
TOTALS											
Charged	916	1102	982	863	765	780	628	646	466	543	19,222
Convicted	989	904	886	837	695	734	469	598	589	550	17,772
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	350	504	569	521	479	451	561	555	401	393	X

TABLE III

**UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES
FEDERAL PUBLIC CORRUPTION CONVICTIONS
BY DISTRICT OVER THE PAST DECADE**

U.S. Attorney's Office	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Totals
Alabama, Middle	8	6	2	4	3	5	2	8	4	4	46
Alabama, Northern	11	13	8	7	11	8	4	2	2	12	78
Alabama, Southern	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	6	21
Alaska	1	4	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	20
Arizona	29	18	8	18	29	26	12	16	23	13	192
Arkansas, Eastern	3	10	14	15	2	3	5	0	1	0	53
Arkansas, Western	2	3	0	1	4	4	1	2	0	0	17
California, Central	66	53	32	23	13	41	23	14	18	21	304
California, Eastern	10	12	14	12	8	8	3	8	11	2	88
California, Northern	9	12	8	12	4	11	4	9	9	10	88
California, Southern	10	7	10	13	7	5	5	3	6	1	67
Colorado	2	0	3	1	6	8	2	0	0	0	22
Connecticut	9	6	0	0	1	4	0	7	5	1	33
Delaware	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	6
District of Columbia	15	8	7	10	19	21	11	8	17	19	135
Florida, Middle	28	27	10	24	14	13	4	5	6	6	137
Florida, Northern	9	14	18	9	5	13	8	5	5	4	90
Florida, Southern	27	42	38	26	39	30	23	21	16	23	285
Georgia, Middle	10	11	2	6	1	4	0	6	0	0	40
Georgia, Northern	33	22	67	24	19	11	11	4	22	10	223
Georgia, Southern	4	1	4	5	2	0	0	6	1	0	23
Guam & NMI	3	10	1	0	2	2	2	4	1	5	30
Hawaii	4	5	0	2	2	5	4	4	9	0	35

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Totals
Idaho	0	3	4	1	7	2	2	2	2	3	26
Illinois, Central	10	0	1	4	0	3	1	1	0	5	25
Illinois, Northern	18	16	30	25	13	26	22	32	28	44	254
Illinois, Southern	4	3	4	5	5	3	8	4	3	10	49
Indiana, Northern	7	7	10	5	5	5	5	5	9	10	68
Indiana, Southern	10	5	10	4	4	1	4	7	8	5	58
Iowa, Northern	2	4	3	2	0	5	2	1	1	3	23
Iowa, Southern	2	2	6	2	2	0	1	0	0	1	16
Kansas	2	2	0	2	12	16	3	3	11	1	52
Kentucky, Eastern	15	10	17	15	7	14	15	5	2	15	115
Kentucky, Western	4	3	3	6	2	6	5	2	3	4	38
Louisiana, Eastern	10	12	16	14	11	10	8	51	27	11	170
Louisiana, Middle	7	9	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	29
Louisiana, Western	4	6	22	9	10	12	8	8	4	4	87
Maine	3	4	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	14
Maryland	38	31	23	80	17	11	11	2	17	4	234
Massachusetts	18	16	17	19	11	26	4	21	12	15	159
Michigan, Eastern	13	4	25	20	24	16	3	14	11	12	142
Michigan, Western	6	2	9	7	3	7	1	2	0	9	46
Minnesota	5	4	5	3	3	7	3	8	5	1	44
Mississippi, Northern	8	3	4	3	3	2	0	4	3	1	31
Mississippi, Southern	10	8	3	6	4	2	5	12	6	7	63
Missouri, Eastern	10	5	6	3	6	5	4	2	11	2	54
Missouri, Western	9	6	12	11	15	11	8	5	9	8	94
Montana	27	8	26	19	10	16	13	0	4	4	127

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Totals
Nebraska	4	3	6	8	14	8	9	3	7	5	67
Nevada	6	0	0	1	5	2	3	4	2	1	24
New Hampshire	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	5
New Jersey	33	23	28	21	31	35	15	29	22	12	249
New Mexico	10	12	4	6	1	4	5	0	2	3	47
New York, Eastern	9	28	8	12	16	17	11	8	14	18	141
New York, Northern	0	4	2	1	2	3	1	6	3	2	24
New York, Southern	13	19	20	15	33	1	8	18	7	21	155
New York, Western	19	17	18	18	2	1	2	9	1	2	89
North Carolina, Eastern	6	13	15	5	16	4	2	5	6	3	75
North Carolina, Middle	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	9
North Carolina, Western	2	4	2	4	3	4	6	0	1	0	26
North Dakota	0	1	0	2	3	3	0	2	2	0	13
Ohio, Northern	11	18	13	12	8	7	11	16	4	15	115
Ohio, Southern	9	12	1	0	2	5	8	10	6	7	60
Oklahoma, Eastern	11	10	4	12	4	11	2	0	1	1	56
Oklahoma, Northern	4	4	5	0	5	0	2	0	1	0	21
Oklahoma, Western	7	6	4	9	4	7	2	3	2	8	52
Oregon	4	3	0	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	15
Pennsylvania, Eastern	36	27	26	26	29	21	9	13	7	7	201
Pennsylvania, Middle	1	14	3	14	7	6	5	8	7	4	69
Pennsylvania, Western	6	8	3	8	4	2	2	2	7	4	46
Puerto Rico	47	13	41	13	28	25	7	27	36	26	263
Rhode Island	4	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	9

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Totals
South Carolina	7	3	6	0	7	10	0	5	0	4	42
South Dakota	1	6	1	15	6	13	6	3	6	5	62
Tennessee, Eastern	11	8	4	2	5	3	2	1	2	0	38
Tennessee, Middle	0	5	7	5	5	0	0	0	3	2	27
Tennessee, Western	8	21	9	10	13	0	2	4	3	0	70
Texas, Eastern	6	3	4	4	0	1	2	4	4	2	30
Texas, Northern	39	48	49	18	8	16	13	2	15	11	219
Texas, Southern	29	11	3	12	6	17	2	30	15	15	140
Texas, Western	28	29	30	33	8	11	13	4	14	6	176
Utah	2	0	2	1	0	0	3	1	2	0	11
Vermont	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Virgin Islands	2	1	0	0	4	4	2	1	0	1	15
Virginia, Eastern	34	40	32	32	16	26	26	27	16	14	263
Virginia, Western	5	8	4	3	0	3	1	2	1	1	28
Washington, Eastern	0	0	7	1	0	3	0	2	0	2	15
Washington, Western	7	5	9	7	7	7	5	5	7	3	62
West Virginia, Northern	18	3	3	3	2	2	4	2	5	1	43
West Virginia, Southern	4	2	1	4	11	10	5	6	6	10	59
Wisconsin, Eastern	4	5	3	2	8	7	6	3	4	7	49
Wisconsin, Western	5	2	4	6	0	1	1	1	4	4	28
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1