

Library

# United States Attorneys Bulletin



*Published by Executive Office for United States Attorneys  
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.*

Vol. 22

October 18, 1974

No. 21

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

## LAND AND NATURAL

## RESOURCES DIVISION

## NAVIGABLE WATERS:

## CRIMINAL APPEALS

## Obstruction To

Navigable Waters;

Criminal Penalties

Under 1899 River And

Harbor Act (33 U.S.C.

Secs. 403, 409); Sunken

Vessel Qualifies As

Obstruction On Which

Owner Must Post Warning

Marks Whether Or Not

Vessel's Sinking Was

Result Of Wreck And

Whether Or Not Submerged

Vessel Is Located In

Distinct Navigable Channel;

Owner's Duty To Remove;

Affirmance Of Limited

Counts Where Sentences

Run Concurrently

U.S. v. Raven (CA 5) 749

## ENVIRONMENT

## Preliminary Injunction

Granted Against

Construction Of Two

Proposed Sections Of

Highway Which, If

Built, Would Create

Irresistible Pressure

To Built Link Through

State Park

Appalachian Mountain Club,  
et al. v. Claude S. Brinegar,  
et al.Society for the Protection  
of New Hampshire Forests,  
et al. v. Brinegar, et al.

750

APPENDIX

FEDERAL RULES OF  
CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

RULE 6(d) The Grand Jury.  
Who May Be Present.

RULE 8(b) Joinder of Offenses  
and of Defendants. Joinder  
of Defendants.

U.S. v. John Robert  
Heck, Jr.

753

RULE 8(b) Joinder of Offenses  
and of Defendants. Joinder  
of Defendants.

RULE 14 Relief from Pre-  
judicial Joinder.

U.S. v. Armando Laca

755

RULE 10 Arraignment.

RULE 48(b) Dismissal. By  
Court.

U.S. v. Tarik Ali Bey

757

RULE 11 Pleas.

U.S. v. Paul Brown

759

RULE 11 Pleas.

Onesimo Limon-Gonzalez  
v. U.S.

759

RULE 15(e) Depositions.  
Use.

RULE 26 Evidence.

RULE 48(b) Dismissal. By  
Court.

U.S. v. Perry Lynch

761

RULE 18 Place of  
Prosecution and Trial.

U.S. v. Donald F.  
Bettenhausen

763

		<u>Page</u>
RULE 26 Evidence.	<u>U.S. v. Perry Lynch</u>	765
RULE 32(c)(1) Sentence and Judgment. Presentence Investigation. When Made.		
RULE 35 Correction or Reduction of Sentence.	<u>U.S. v. Gino Rosciano</u>	767
RULE 35 Correction or Reduction of Sentence.	<u>U.S. v. Gino Rosciano</u>	769
RULE 40 Commitment to Another District; Removal.	<u>U.S. v. Hon. June L. Green</u>	771
RULE 46(a) Release from Custody. Release Prior to Trial.	<u>Frank Gavino v. Hon. Lloyd F. MacMahon</u>	773
RULE 48(b) Dismissal. By Court.	<u>U.S. v. Tarik Ali Bey</u>	775

LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION  
Assistant Attorney General Wallace H. Johnson

COURTS OF APPEALS

NAVIGABLE WATERS: CRIMINAL APPEALS

OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGABLE WATERS; CRIMINAL PENALTIES UNDER 1899 RIVER AND HARBOR ACT (33 U.S.C. SECS. 403, 409); SUNKEN VESSEL QUALIFIES AS OBSTRUCTION ON WHICH OWNER MUST POST WARNING MARKS WHETHER OR NOT VESSEL'S SINKING WAS RESULT OF WRECK AND WHETHER OR NOT SUBMERGED VESSEL IS LOCATED IN DISTINCT NAVIGABLE CHANNEL; OWNER'S DUTY TO REMOVE; AFFIRMANCE OF LIMITED COUNTS WHERE SENTENCES RUN CONCURRENTLY.

United States v. Raven (C.A. 5, No. 74-1816, Sept. 20, 1974; D.J. 62-17M-108).

The owner of an 83-foot schooner sunk for 2½ months in navigable waters, was convicted of three offenses growing out of his violations of the 1899 River and Harbor Act, namely: creating an obstruction to navigation (33 U.S.C. sec. 403); failing to mark with warning lights and beacons his sunken schooner (33 U.S.C. sec. 409); and failing to commence immediate removal of his sunken schooner (33 U.S.C. sec. 409). He received a suspended 30-day sentence for each conviction, running concurrently. He took an appeal, and, without oral argument, the court of appeals affirmed the convictions.

To the shipowner's contention that he had been unfairly singled out for prosecution, the court held that, even granting the doubtful premise that the "prerogative of the Executive to commence criminal actions" could be challenged, there was no evidence of bad faith by the Government in enforcing the law.

The court held that a sunken vessel qualified as an "obstruction \* \* \* to the navigable capacity of the waters of the United States" under 33 U.S.C. sec. 403, and noted: "If floating particles can be an obstruction, certainly an 83 ft. schooner, as here, can be" (Slip Op. 7987).

The court also held that, to establish the offense of failing to mark a sunken vessel under 33 U.S.C. sec. 409, the Government need not prove that the sunken vessel had

become submerged as a result of a wreck. Nor need it prove that its submerged location was in a distinct navigable channel, "since the evidence demonstrated that [the vessel] \* \* \* was stranded in navigable waters capable of sustaining the traffic of other vessels" (Slip Op. 7989).

As to the failure to remove the sunken vessel under 33 U.S.C. sec. 409, the court expressly left open the validity of the conviction on this count because the suspended 30-day sentences ran concurrently on all three counts. The court limited its affirmance in this manner to avoid problems - "perhaps of constitutional proportions" - as to the imposition of criminal penalties against those who are unable to finance removal of the sunken vessel.

Staff: Dirk D. Snel (Land and Natural Resources Division); Assistant United States Attorney Howard T. Snyder (M.D. Fla.).

## DISTRICT COURT

### ENVIRONMENT

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION GRANTED AGAINST CONSTRUCTION OF TWO PROPOSED SECTIONS OF HIGHWAY WHICH, IF BUILT, WOULD CREATE IRRESISTIBLE PRESSURE TO BUILT LINK THROUGH STATE PARK.

Appalachian Mountain Club, et al. v. Claude S. Brinegar, et al. (D.C. N., Civil No. 74-208, August 19, 1974; D.J. 90-1-4-996); Society for the Protection of New Hampshire Forests, et al. v. Brinegar, et al. (D. N.H., Civil No. 74-219, August 19, 1974; D.J. 90-1-4-1001).

Plaintiffs instituted action to enjoin further planning and construction of two proposed sections of Interstate Highway I-93 from Littleton, New Hampshire, to Waterford, Vermont, and from Waterford to St. Johnsbury, Vermont. Presently the New Hampshire portion of I-93, which begins in Boston, runs from the Massachusetts State line, almost uninterrupted, to an intersection with Route 3 in Woodstock, less than three miles south of Franconia Notch State Park. The relatively short distance through the park is traversed by Route 3, which, one mile north of the park, intersects with the beginning of a 12-mile section of I-93 extending to Littleton. The proposed sections of I-93 from Littleton to St. Johnsbury would connect

with I-91 which extends, almost uninterrupted, from New Haven, Connecticut, through Massachusetts and Vermont to the Canadian border.

Plaintiffs' allegations are as follows: (1) The Federal Government relied upon a state-prepared environmental impact statement (EIS); (2) the EIS fails to adequately consider alternatives; (3) the EIS fails to consider what impact the proposed highway will have on the state park, and (4) the use of park lands was not justified, as required by provisions of 49 U.S.C. sec. 1653(f), hereinafter 4(f).

Judge Hugh H. Bownes, in granting the motion for preliminary injunction, found that completion of the proposed sections would "exert irresistible pressure on the highway planners" and have such "coercive effects" that construction of the final link of I-93, by following the natural and historic route through the state park, would be unavoidable, regardless of the results of future environmental studies. Thus, the court held that an EIS for the proposed sections of I-93 is required, which statement must consider the effect of the "entire highway" on Franconia Notch State Park, consider alternative routes, and include a 4(f) statement. In so ruling, the court found it unnecessary to reach the issue of whether the state-prepared EIS was acceptable.

Staff: Assistant United States Attorney  
Robert A. Schwartz (D. N.H.).