



U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for United States Attorneys

United States Attorneys' Bulletin



**EXECUTIVE
OFFICE FOR
UNITED
STATES
ATTORNEYS**

Published by:

*Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Washington, D.C.
For the use of all U.S. Department of Justice Attorneys*

William P. Tyson, Director

Editor-in-Chief: Susan A. Nellor FTS 633-4024
Editor: Judith C. Campbell FTS 673-6348

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
COMMENDATIONS.....	299
CLEARINGHOUSE.....	300
POINTS TO REMEMBER	
Bluesheets and Transmittals, <u>United States Attorneys' Manual</u>	301
Employment Opportunities.....	301
False Statements Concerning Selective Service Registration..	301
Decision on Retroactive Administrative Pay Increases.....	302
Personnel.....	303
Social Security Cases Filed Against Secretary of HHS.....	303
Teletypes to All United States Attorneys.....	304
CASENOTES	
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL.....	304
CIVIL DIVISION.....	305
LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION.....	307
UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES.....	308
DISTRICT OF ALASKA.....	308
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.....	309
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.....	310
APPENDIX.....	311

COMMENDATIONS

Assistant United States Attorneys CAROLYN W. ALLEN and WILLIAM J. KOPP, Northern District of Ohio, were commended by Mr. Raymond H. Avent, Director, Regional Office, Veterans Administration, for their professionalism in prosecuting Wilkins v. Walters.

Assistant United States Attorney JAMES E. AREHART, Eastern District of Kentucky, was commended by Mr. James H. Yelvington, Special Agent-in-Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his success in the felony plea agreement of a former Director of Public Works in the City of Newport, Kentucky.

Assistant United States Attorney JOHN OLIVER BIRCH, District of Columbia, was commended by Ms. Maureen E. Corcoran, General Counsel, Department of Education, for his outstanding work in Illinois State Board of Education v. Bell.

Assistant United States Attorney E. BART DANIEL, District of South Carolina, was commended by Mr. Robert J. Ivey, Special Agent in-Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his outstanding performance in participating in the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force in the District of South Carolina.

Assistant United States Attorney BERNARD J. MALONE, JR., Northern District of New York, was commended by District Attorney Sol Greenberg, County of Albany, New York, for his role in coordinating and planning the LECC Seminar on Sexual Exploitation of Children, which was held for law enforcement officials.

Assistant United States Attorney KIYO MATSUMOTO, Eastern District of New York, was commended by Mr. Thomas C. Halloran, Regional Counsel, AEA-7, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, for her successful prosecution of United States v. Josephson.

Assistant United States Attorney GALE MCKENZIE, Northern District of Georgia, was commended by Mr. Michael K. Wolensky, Regional Administrator, Securities and Exchange Commission, Atlanta, Georgia, for her excellent work in United States v. Hale.

Assistant United States Attorney GARY H. MONTILLA and United States Attorney DANIEL F. LOPEZ-ROMO, District of Puerto Rico, were commended by Attorney General Edwin Meese III, for their successful prosecution of United States v. Casillas. A copy of Attorney General Meese's letters to Assistant United States Attorney MONTILLA and United States Attorney LOPEZ-ROMO are attached to this Bulletin.

Assistant United States Attorney JOHN B. MOYNIHAN, Western District of Texas, was commended by Colonel Seymour Copperman, Chief, General Litigation Division, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Air Force, for his successful defense of the Air Force in Munoz v. Orr and Diaz v. Orr.

Assistant United States Attorney THOMAS J. RILEY, District of Connecticut, was commended by Colonel Carl B. Sciple, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, for his outstanding efforts in obtaining settlement in two cases involving unauthorized work under Corps jurisdiction.

Assistant United States Attorney REBECCA L. ROSS, District of Columbia, was commended by Mr. Richard H. Adamson, Director, Division of Cancer Etiology, Department of Health and Human Services, for her successful prosecution of Reuber v. United States.

Assistant United States Attorney ERIC WILLIAM RUSCHKY, District of South Carolina, was commended by Mr. Robert J. Ivey, Special Agent-in-Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his successful prosecution of Robert B. Garland.

Assistant United States Attorney MARY JANE STEWART, Northern District of Georgia, was commended by Mr. Thomas V. Cash, Special Agent-in-Charge, Drug Enforcement Administration, for her professionalism and successful handling of United States v. Hortelano.

Assistant United States Attorney JUSTIN W. WILLIAMS and Special Assistant United States Attorney JANET DECOSTA, Eastern District of Virginia, were commended by Mr. Carl L. Jackson, Special Agent-in-Charge, Washington Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, for their successful prosecution of United States v. Dillow.

CLEARINGHOUSE

Jury Instructions - 18 U.S.C. §1512

Copies of accepted jury instructions relating to witness intimidation and threats, as submitted by the government in United States v. Risken, No. 84-44 (S.D. Iowa file date unknown), may be obtained by contacting Ms. Susan A. Nellor, Director, Office of Legal Services, at FTS 633-4024. Please ask for item number CH-16.

(Executive Office)

POINTS TO REMEMBER

Bluesheets and Transmittals, United States Attorneys' Manual

Updated lists of United States Attorneys' Manual Bluesheets and Transmittals are appended to this Bulletin.

(Executive Office)

Employment Opportunities

The Central District of Illinois will soon have two attorney positions vacant. The United States Attorney is looking to fill these positions with experienced attorneys from the Department of Justice. The positions are as follows: (1) an attorney with a substantial civil litigation background for the Danville branch office, and (2) an attorney with a substantial criminal investigation background to serve as the supervisory attorney in the Peoria branch office. Interested attorneys should contact United States Attorney Gerald D. Fines, 600 East Monroe Street, P.O. Box 375, Springfield, Illinois 62705 or FTS 955-4450.

The District of Massachusetts has an attorney vacancy for an experienced Assistant United States Attorney in the Public Corruption Unit in Boston. Interested attorneys should send a resume to the attention of United States Attorney William F. Weld, 1107 Federal Courthouse, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.

(Executive Office)

False Statements Concerning Selective Service Registration Made In Connection With Student Aid Applications

The Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. §462(f)(1)) provides that any person who is required to register with the Selective Service System and who fails to do so shall be ineligible for student aid under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. §1071 et seq.).

An applicant for Title IV aid, who is required to register, must file a statement with his school certifying that he has complied with the registration requirement. A Department of Education (DOEd) regulation (34 C.F.R. §668.25) sets forth a model statement of educational purpose and registration compliance for the use of colleges and universities in processing student aid applications. The model statement requires all student aid applicants to certify either that they have registered with Selective Service or to certify that they are not required to register and to designate the specific reason registration is not required of

them. In addition, a DOEd regulation (34 C.F.R. §668.26) prescribes the requirements for verifying Selective Service registration.

During a DOEd quality control study and several DOEd program reviews, the names of registration-age student aid applicants were obtained and checked against Selective Service records. As a result, the names of seventy-eight individuals were identified as student loan applicants who certified that they had registered with Selective Service and who apparently had not registered. DOEd referred these names to the Criminal Division by letter dated February 8, 1985.

We recently referred these seventy-eight names to the FBI and requested that the Bureau conduct appropriate investigations to determine if any of these individuals failed to register with Selective Service in violation of the Military Selective Service Act and made false statements on student aid applications in violation of 20 U.S.C. §1097. The FBI will report the results of its investigations to the Criminal Division and to the appropriate United States Attorneys' offices.

As you know, the Criminal Division's policy in failure-to-register matters is to afford nonregistrants an opportunity to avoid prosecution by registering with Selective Service. It is the Criminal Division's position, however, that our so-called "beg policy" should not extend to situations where the failure-to-register offense has been compounded by a false statement offense. Therefore, if a failure-to-register/false statement case is presented to your office, care should be taken to insure that no representations are made to the subject of the investigation or his counsel that the investigation will be terminated if the subject registers prior to indictment.

No failure-to-register/false statement cases or matters can be declined or dismissed without prior authorization from the Criminal Division.

United States Attorneys may contact the General Litigation and Legal Advice Section at FTS 724-7144 and FTS 724-7526 if they have any questions concerning prosecution or policy in this area.

(Criminal Division)

Notice: Decision on Retroactive Administrative Pay Increases

This is to inform you of a recent decision issued by the Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) which states that neither the Executive Office for United States Attorneys nor the Office of Attorney Personnel Management (OAPM) has authority to effect administrative pay increases (APIs) retroactively for Assistant United States

Attorneys. The decision is applicable to any form of administrative increase for Assistant United States Attorneys. Please insure that recommendations for APIs are submitted six weeks before they are to be effective.

Delays for any reason which occur prior to OAPM receiving the request do not justify a retroactive effective date. See USAM 10-2.524. Current policy states that "United States Attorneys are responsible for submitting SF-52s and recommendations for APIs to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys three pay periods (six weeks) before the proposed effective date." Please help us avoid the issue of retroactivity by submitting APIs to us on time for processing.

Questions concerning this matter should be directed to Daniel W. Gluck, Personnel Officer, in the Executive Office for United States Attorneys on FTS 272-6918.

(Executive Office)

Personnel

On Wednesday, May 22, 1985, D. Lowell Jensen received the Oath of Office as Deputy Attorney General.

(Executive Office)

Social Security Cases Filed Against the Secretary of Health and Human Services

The Office of the General Counsel for the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) has conveyed to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys their appreciation for the use by the United States Attorneys' offices of HHS' new "critical litigation" post office box (see Points to Remember, Vol. 32, No. 17, United States Attorneys' Bulletin, September 7, 1984). HHS has also asked that United States Attorneys be reminded of the types of litigation mail HHS considers to be "critical" and requests that only these critical items be forwarded to their special post office box.

Items considered by HHS to be "critical" include: adverse court orders such as magistrate and court reversals, remands, motions for, or threats of contempt or default, or any court order which contains a time limit for action to be commenced or completed by the Secretary. Only items of this nature should be forwarded to:

Office of the General Counsel
Social Security Administration
Department of Health and Human Services
Post Office Box 17054
Baltimore, Maryland 21203

All other, non-critical items should be addressed to:

Office of the General Counsel
Social Security Administration
Department of Health and Human Services
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21235

(Executive Office)

Teletypes to All United States Attorneys

A listing of recent teletypes sent by the Executive Office is appended to this Bulletin. If a United States Attorney's office has not received one or more of these teletypes, copies may be obtained by contacting Ms. Theresa Bertucci, Chief of the Communications Center, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, at FTS 633-1020.

(Executive Office)

CASENOTES

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

The Solicitor General has authorized the filing of:

Petitions for writs of certiorari in Schultz v. Palmer and Cooper v. Schultz, Nos. 84-5815 and 84-5816 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 11, 1985) and Library of Congress v. Shaw, No. 82-1019 (D.C. Cir., rehearing denied, Feb. 20, 1985). The issue in these cases is whether sovereign immunity precludes the award of prejudgment interest or "delay adjustments" against the government in Title VII cases.

A petition for a writ of certiorari in Philadelphia Gear Corp. v. FDIC, Nos. 84-1901, 84-2007 (10th Cir., rehearing denied, Feb. 19, 1985). The issue is whether a standby letter of credit issued by a bank for the benefit of a customer's creditor is a "deposit" for purposes of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

A petition for a writ of certiorari in In re Grand Jury Subpoena, U.S.A., Hana Koecher, Nos. 84-1428 and 85-1033 (2d Cir. Feb. 28, 1985, rehearing denied, Apr. 11, 1985). The issue in

this espionage case is whether there should be an exception to the privilege against adverse spousal testimony for cases involving joint criminal activity by spouses.

A petition for a writ of certiorari in Payne v. Block, No. 81-5365 (11th Cir., rehearing denied, Mar. 19, 1985). The issues are: (1) whether a Farmers Home Administration press release announcing the availability of special crop loans, issued after a natural disaster in north Florida in 1973, violated an agency regulation requiring publicity of the special statutory loan provisions; and (2) if so, whether FmHA's non-compliance with the publicity regulation permits a court, acting under the Administrative Procedure Act, to "enforce" it by overriding a separate provision of the agency's regulations establishing a deadline for filing loan applications.

A petition for a writ of certiorari in Turner v. Orr, No. 84-3266 (11th Cir. Apr. 18, 1985). The issue is whether a district court lacks authority under Title VII to order the government to hire a minority job applicant who has not been found to have been the victim of discrimination, in order to enforce the "good faith" terms of a consent decree.

A brief amicus curiae in support of petitioners in Regents of the University of Michigan v. Ewing, S. Ct. No. 84-1273. The issue is whether the substantive due process rights of a medical student who was on academic probation were violated by the medical school's denial of his request to retake a standardized comprehensive examination, requisite for entering the clinical phase of the academic program, which he failed the first time.

CIVIL DIVISION

SUPREME COURT EXTENDS FOIA EXEMPTION 3 PROTECTION FOR FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION.

The Supreme Court has now held that Section 103(d)(3) of the National Security Act, as an Exemption 3 statute under the Freedom of Information Act, protects from mandatory public disclosure the identities of researchers (and the institutions at which they worked), who performed research for the CIA between 1953 and 1966 in project MKULTRA (brainwashing and interrogation techniques). The Supreme Court's majority opinion, written by the Chief Justice, adopted the CIA's interpretation of "intelligence sources" under the National Security Act--i.e., all suppliers of foreign intelligence information to the CIA without regard to any qualifying conditions, such as those imposed by the court of appeals. The Supreme Court's decision is expected to have a major impact in encouraging sources to provide foreign intelligence

information to the CIA without the fear of subsequent public disclosure through FOIA.

Central Intelligence Agency v. Sims, U.S. _____, Nos. 83-1075 and 83-1249 (Apr. 16, 1985). D. J. # 145-1-704.

Attorneys: Leonard Schaitman (Civil Division) FTS 633-3441;
Richard K. Willard (Civil Division) FTS 633-3301.

FOURTH CIRCUIT HOLDS THAT "GUARANTEED LOANS"--LOANS MADE BY PRIVATE BANKS TO FARMERS, WHICH ARE GUARANTEED BY THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION--ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE LOAN MORATORIUM PROVISION, 7 U.S.C. §1981a.

In Coleman v. Block, 580 F. Supp. 192 (D.N.D. 1983), the court enjoined the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) from foreclosing on real estate without first adhering to the letter of the statutory loan moratorium provision, 7 U.S.C. §1981a. The Coleman court construed Section 1981a as requiring the FmHA to give notice of the contemplated foreclosure, provide the reasons for the planned action, and afford members an informal hearing to contest the action. In this case, plaintiffs endeavored to extend the Coleman rationale to "guaranteed" loans, loans that are entered into between farmers and private lending institutions, but which are monitored and guaranteed up to ninety percent by the FmHA.

We argued in the court of appeals that extending the protections in 7 U.S.C. §1981a to guaranteed loans would wreak havoc to the guaranteed loan program. We pointed out that banks would be less inclined to participate in the guaranteed loan program if they were forced to apply 7 U.S.C. §1981a because they would not be able to protect their investment in a commercially reasonable manner. Alternatively, if the FmHA itself were forced to assume guaranteed loans from the private institution so that it could then apply Section 1981a to the foreclosure in question, the FmHA would be under a huge financial burden. Considering that approximately five hundred million dollars of private farmer program loans are now guaranteed by the FmHA, an adverse ruling would force the FmHA to make substantial cash payments to assume each loan for which Section 1981a would apply. The Fourth Circuit agreed with our arguments, holding that guaranteed loans do not fall within either 7 U.S.C. §1981a or the scope of the Coleman injunction. Its decision should help ensure the integrity of the guaranteed loan program.

Robbins v. Maryland National Bank, F.2d _____, No. 84-2298(L) (4th Cir. Apr. 22, 1985). D. J. # 145-8-1744.

Attorneys: Robert S. Greenspan (Civil Division) FTS 633-5428; Harold J. Krent (Civil Division) FTS 633-3159.

LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION

INDIAN TRIBE CAN TAX MINERAL LESSEE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The Supreme Court unanimously upheld the right of the Navajo Tribe to enact various taxes without the prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Kerr McGee, a mineral lessee on the Navajo Reservation, attacked tribal ordinances imposing taxes on the value of leasehold interests on tribal lands, or on receipts from the sale of property produced or extracted, or the sale of services within those lands, arguing the Indian Reorganization Act and the Indian Mineral Leasing Act required the Secretary's prior approval of such taxes. In less than six pages, Chief Justice Burger reaffirmed the Indians' sovereign power to tax, subject to the power of Congress, as recognized in the recent decision in Merrion v. Jicarilla Apache Tribe, 455 U.S. 130 (1982), and concluded neither statute cited by Kerr-McGee required the Secretary to approve the taxes. The IRA contained no express or implied provision requiring Secretarial approval; indeed, the IRA had no application at all to tribes like the Navajo, which declined to organize their government under that statute. Neither did the Mineral Leasing Act, although it subjected mineral leases to the review and approval of the Secretary, reach the Indian's sovereign powers of taxation. The Court concluded that Congress, in passing the Mineral Leasing Act, acted only to regulate the tribe's "role as commercial partner" and not its "role as sovereign." Finally, the Court gave short shrift to Kerr-McGee's challenge to the legitimacy of the Navajo Tribal Council, saying it was "beyond question."

Kerr-McGee Corp. v. Navajo Tribe of Indians, ___ U.S. ___, No. 84-68, (Apr. 16, 1985). D. J. # 9-1-4-2528.

Attorneys: Louis F. Claiborne (Deputy Solicitor General) FTS 633-2208; John A. Bryson (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-2740; Dirk D. Snel (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-4400.

CORPS' DENIAL OF NATIONWIDE PERMIT ON ENVIRONMENTAL
GROUNDS SUSTAINED.

The issue on appeal was whether the Corps of Engineers exceeded its authority when it denied plaintiffs a nationwide permit for deposit of dredge material for construction of Wildcat Dam and Reservoir. The Corps based its decision on the potential downstream impact on an endangered species due to the resulting increased consumptive use of water.

In its decision the Tenth Circuit affirmed the district court which held that the Corps' district engineer had acted within his authority and that he was required, under the Clean Water Act and the Endangered Species Act, to deny the nationwide permit and require the plaintiffs to proceed under the individual permit procedure.

Riverside Irrigation District v. Andrews, ___ F.2d ___, Nos. 83-2114, 83-2115, 83-2219, 83-2230 (10th Cir. Mar. 26, 1985).
D. J. # 96-5-1-6-232.

Attorneys: Fred R. Disheroon (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 724-7361; Anne S. Almy (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-2749.

CERCLA; ONLY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, NOT THE STATES HAVE INJUNCTIVE AUTHORITY UNDER SECTION 107.

In this important and lengthy CERCLA opinion, the Second Circuit gave a broad and generally favorable reading to various key enforcement provisions of CERCLA. The United States restricted its amicus curiae participation to one issue; whether a state may seek injunctive relief under CERCLA Section 107, 42 U.S.C. §9607. On this issue, we fully prevailed. The Second Circuit held squarely that states do not enjoy injunctive authority under CERCLA; such authority is restricted solely to the federal government.

State of New York v. Shore Realty, ___ F.2d ___, No. 84-7925 (2d Cir. Apr. 16, 1985). D. J. # 90-11-3-72.

Attorneys: Donald T. Hornstein (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-2813; Anne S. Almy (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-2749; Nancy B. Firestone (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-5271.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES

DISTRICT OF ALASKA

NINTH CIRCUIT APPROVED WARRANTLESS DAYTIME BOARDING OF A UNITED STATES REGISTERED VESSEL IN INTERNATIONAL WATERS FOR A SAFETY CHECK WHICH LED TO THE SEIZURE OF DRUGS.

A sailboat, the Orca, was spotted by a United States Coast Guard cutter in a little travelled area in international waters. A Coast Guard party boarded the vessel to do a safety check. Once

onboard, the Orca's master was asked if he had weapons aboard; since he replied "Yes," the boarding party went below decks to secure the weapons. While doing a safety inspection of the marine toilet, drugs were found. No administrative plan authorizing the boarding was in effect.

The Ninth Circuit held that the daytime boarding to conduct a safety inspection of a United States registered vessel in international waters did not violate the 4th Amendment. No suspicion was needed to conduct such a boarding. Secondly, the Ninth Circuit found that the need to secure firearms gave the boarding party the need, based on Terry v. Ohio, to go below decks. Thus, the discovery and seizure of 3100 pounds of marijuana was upheld.

United States v. Humphrey, ___ F.2d ___, Nos A3-3023, 3025, 3026 (9th Cir. May 2, 1985). Case No. A82-76 Cr. (D. Ak).

Attorney: Michael R. Spaan (United States Attorney, District of Alaska) FTS (907) 271-5071.

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

GOVERNMENT ENTITLED TO ACTUAL TRAVEL COSTS FOR OUT-OF-STATE WITNESSES, WHERE PLAINTIFF BROUGHT SERIOUS ALLEGATIONS AGAINST THEM IN UNSUCCESSFUL AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT ACTION.

A Bureau of Prisons employee brought age discrimination action alleging that the Warden and other supervisors engaged in purposeful discrimination to force him into an early retirement. At the time of trial, four of the accused officials resided outside the district (in Washington, D.C., Minnesota, Texas and Seattle, Washington).

After judgment was entered for the United States, the government moved for costs and, without having obtained prior approval, sought reimbursement for the actual expenses these witnesses incurred in traveling to and from trial. The district court ruled that "special circumstances" existed to allow actual travel expenses and to justify an exception to the district rule limiting travel costs to 200 miles total for trial witnesses who reside out of state. The district court also permitted full reimbursement for actual travel expenses of a Bureau of Prisons psychologist from Chapel Hill, North Carolina, who testified for the defendant after the plaintiff presented medical testimony on the emotional trauma he suffered as a result of alleged on-the-job harrassment.

Lewis v. Federal Prison Industries, Inc., ___ F.Supp. ___, No. TCA 83-7021 (N.D. Fla. Jan. 8, 1985). D. J. # 157-17-391.

Attorney: Kenneth W. Sukhia (Assistant United States
Attorney, Northern District of Florida) FTS 965-7360.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES
APRIL 16, 1985 - MAY 14, 1985

HIGHLIGHTS

E.F. Hutton Conviction. The conviction of the E.F. Hutton brokerage firm for a widespread "check-kiting" scheme has provoked substantial interest on Capitol Hill. The tremendous importance of this case to the American banking system has not yet been fully recognized. While the Department has been subjected to some criticism because no one was sent to prison, we are confident that we can demonstrate not only that this case was handled properly, but that it is an extremely important case that will have repercussions for months to come. Congressional hearings can be expected, but the Committees are moving slowly as the scheme was so complex that very few people outside the Justice Department yet understand precisely what transpired.

Hate Crime Statistics. The House Subcommittee on Criminal Justice unanimously reported an amended version of H.R. 1171 to require the Department of Justice to file annual statistical reports on crimes motivated by racial, religious or ethnic bias. While no one can quarrel with the desire to have such information, producing it is problematic as the motivation of criminal offenders is difficult to discern. As this bill is politically irresistible, however, we secured a series of amendments which made the bill less objectionable than as first introduced. Subject to the approval of these amendments, and having noted our reservation concerning the value and reliability of the data which can reasonably be developed, we adopted a "no objection" position on the amended bill. OMB concurred in this approach.

**Office of the Attorney General****Washington, D. C. 20530**

6 May 1985

Mr. Gary Montilla
Assistant U.S. Attorney
District of Puerto Rico
Federal Office Building
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918

Dear Mr. Montilla:

This is to congratulate you on your recent successful prosecution of United States v. Angel Perez Casillas, et al., in the District of Puerto Rico.

In this celebrated case, justice was indeed served by the conviction of ten former officers of the Police of Puerto Rico for their seven year effort to cover up the killing by some of their members of two arrestees in 1978 at Cerro Maravilla. Your efforts in the prosecution are in keeping with the highest standards of attorneys of the Department of Justice.

Your work in the development of the evidence contributed significantly to the ultimate success of this case. Your willingness to put in long hours in the pre-trial preparation and your highly professional participation in all phases of the presentation of this case to the jury are commended. In addition, your handling of the administrative needs of the trial team greatly facilitated the prosecution efforts.

Congratulations and thank you very much for your service.

Sincerely,

EDWIN MEESE III
Attorney General

**Office of the Attorney General****Washington, D. C. 20530**

6 May 1985

Mr. Daniel F. Lopez-Romo
United States Attorney
District of Puerto Rico
Federal Office Building
Hato Rey, Puerto Rico 00918

Dear Mr. Lopez-Romo:

This is to congratulate you on your recent successful prosecution of United States v. Angel Perez Casillas, et al., in the District of Puerto Rico.

In this celebrated case, justice was indeed served by the conviction of ten former officers of the Police of Puerto Rico for their seven year effort to cover up the killing by some of their members of two arrestees in 1978 at Cerro Maravilla. Your work and that of your staff greatly contributed to this success.

Your individual efforts in the critical investigatory stages and in the grand jury proceedings were instrumental in the development of the evidence. Your participation in the presentation of the case to the jury was essential to a successful prosecution. In addition, your judicious handling of this particularly sensitive case is in keeping with the highest standards of the Department of Justice.

Congratulations and thank you very much for your service.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Edwin Meese III".

EDWIN MEESE III
Attorney General

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
1-11.240*	TITLE 1	7/31/84	Immunity for the Act of Producing Reports
1-11.400*	TITLE 1	6/21/84	Immunity
1-12.020*	TITLE 1	6/29/84	Pre-Trial Diversion Program
1-12.100	TITLE 1	4/24/84	Eligibility Criteria
1-12.400*	TITLE 1	10/12/84	PTD Agreement
1-12.602	TITLE 1	10/12/84	Letter to Offender--(USA Form 185)
1-12.603	TITLE 1	10/12/84	Agreement--(USA Form 186)
9-2.111	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Declinations
9-2.133*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Policy Limitations on Institution of Proceedings, Consultation Prior to Institution of Criminal Charges
9-2.142(1) (c)(2)(c)*	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Dual and Successive Federal Prosecution Policy
9-2.144*	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Interstate Agreement on Detainers
9-2.147*	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Extradition and Deportation
9-2.149*	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Revocation and Naturalization
9-2.151	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Policy Limitations- Prosecutorial and Other Matters, International Matters.
9-2.172	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Appearance Bond Forfeiture Judge

* Approved by Advisory Committee, being permanently incorporated.

** In printing.

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-2.173	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Arrest of Foreign Nationals
9-4.543*	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Subpoenas to Obtain Records Located in Foreign Countries.
9-7.1000	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Video Surveillance
9-11.220	TITLE 9	3/28/85	Extraterritorial Effect of the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. §1651
9-11.220C*	TITLE 9	8/27/84	Obtaining Records to Aid in the Location of Federal Fugitives by Use of All Writs Act
9-11.230*	TITLE 9	4/16/84	Fair Credit Reporting Act and Grand Jury Subpoenas-Discretion of U.S. Attorneys
9-11.250*	TITLE 9	7/9/84	Advice of Rights to Targets and Subjects of Grand Jury Investigations
9-11.270*	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Limitation on Resubpoenaing Contumacious Witness before Successive Grand Juries
9-12.340*	TITLE 9	7/24/84	Forfeiture
9-21.340 to 9-21.350	TITLE 9	3/12/84	Psychological/Vocational Testing; Polygraph Examinations for Prisoner-Witness Candidates
9-27.510*	TITLE 9	5/25/84	Opposing Offers to Plead Nolo Contendere
9-38.000*	TITLE 9	4/06/84	Forfeitures
9-42.530*	TITLE 9	10/9/84	Dept. of Defense Memorandum of Understanding
9-46.130; 9-46.140**	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Program Fraud and Bribery-- Policy Considerations; Criminal Division Contact
9-48.120	TITLE 9	3/07/85	Computer Fraud-Reporting Requirements

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-49.150; 9-49.160	TITLE 9	3/22/85	18 U.S.C. §1029-Reporting Requirements; Fraudulent Use of Credit Cards and Debit Instruments-Prosecutions under 18 U.S.C. §1029 Statutes in Title 15
9-60.134; 9-60.135*	TITLE 9	12/14/84	Allegations of "Mental Kidnapping" or "Brain-washing" by Religious Cults; "Deprogramming" of Religious Sect Members
9-60.215*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	"Electronic, Mechanical or Other Device" (18 U.S.C. §2510(5))
9-60.243*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Other Consensual Interceptions
9-60.291*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Interception of Radio Communications
9-60.291; 9-60.292**	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Interception of Radio Communications; Unauthorized Reception of Cable Service
9-60.400*	TITLE 9	12/31/84	Criminal Sanctions Against Illegal Electronic Surveillance - the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 50 U.S.C. §1809
9-60.830	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Special Forfeiture of Collateral Profits of Crime ("Son of Sam")
9-61.130 to* 9-61.134	TITLE 9	4/30/84	National Motor Vehicle Theft Act-Dyer Act (18 U.S.C. §§2311-2313)
9-61.640 to* 9-61.642	TITLE 9	4/30/84	Bank Robbery
9-61.970	TITLE 9	3/22/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-63.132 to* 9-63.133	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Indictment; Death Penalty
9-63.195*	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Protection of Confidentiality of Security Procedures
9-63.251	TITLE 9	2/25/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution - 18 U.S.C. §32(b)
9-63.271*	TITLE 9	2/25/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution - 18 U.S.C. §33
9-63.460 to* 9-63.490	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Obscene or Harassing Telephone Calls - 47 U.S.C. §223
9-63.1130*	TITLE 9	2/25/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution - 18 U.S.C. §1365
9-64.212*	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Prosecution Policy Concerning Robbery of Persons Possessing Non-Postal Service Money or Property of the United States
9-65.940	TITLE 9	3/28/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution - 18 U.S.C §115
9-69.342	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Sentencing in Prison Contraband Cases
9-71.400*	TITLE 9	5/24/84	Prosecutive Policy
9-71.400	TITLE 9	4/26/85	Prosecutive Policy
9-75.000*	TITLE 9	12/10/84	Obscenity
9-75.084*	TITLE 9	10/12/84	Comment-Child Pornography Statutes
9-75.621	TITLE 9	10/12/84	Exception-Child Pornography Cases
9-90.330	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Computer Espionage
9-90.600**	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Registration

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-103.130; 9-103.140	TITLE 9	3/28/85	Controlled Substances Registrant Protection Act of 1984-Investigative & Prosecutive Guidelines; Criminal Division Approval
9-103.230	TITLE 9	3/28/85	Policy Consideration -- Aviation Drug Trafficking Control Act
9-130.300*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Prior Authorization Generally
9-131.030*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Consultation Prior to Prosecution
9-131.110*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Hobbs Act Robbery
9-133.010*	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Investigative Jurisdiction: 29 U.S.C. §501(c) and 18 U.S.C. §664
9-134.010*	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Investigative Jurisdiction: 18 U.S.C. §1954
9-136.020*	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Investigative Jurisdiction: 18 U.S.C. §1027
9-138.030	TITLE 9	3/28/85	Consultation Prior to Prosecution
9-139.202*	TITLE 9	6/29/84	Supervisory Jurisdiction
9-139.220*	TITLE 9	6/29/84	Alternative Enforcement Measures
10-2.800*; 10-9.160	TITLE 10	4/30/84	Notice of Provision for Special Accommodations
10-3.530	TITLE 10	01/07/85	Advances to Non-Department of Justice Employees
10-3.560*	TITLE 10	12/13/84	Relocation
10-4.350*	TITLE 10	7/31/84	Use By United States Attorneys Offices of Forfeited Vehicles and Other Property

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
MAY 24, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
10-4.418*	TITLE 10	7/20/84	Maintenance of Attorney-Client Information
10-6.213**	TITLE 10	4/13/85	Monthly Reporting for Immediate Declination of Civil Referrals
10-8.110;111; 10-8.112**	TITLE 10	4/13/85	Judgment Policy

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' MANUAL--TRANSMITTALS

The following United States Attorneys' Manual Transmittals have been issued to date in accordance with USAM 1-1.500.

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 1	A2	9/29/80	6/23/80	Ch. 7, Index to Title 1, Revisions to Ch. 2, 5, 8
	A3	9/23/81	8/3/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 5, 12, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A4	9/25/81	9/7/81	Revisions to Ch. 15, Index to Title 1, Index to USAM
	A5	11/2/81	10/27/81	Revisions to Ch. 5, 7
	A6	3/11/82	12/15/81	Revisions to Ch. 3, 5, 11, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A7	3/12/82	2/9/82	Revisions to Ch. 8, Index to Title 1
	A8	5/6/82	4/27/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 8, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A9	3/9/83	8/20/82	Revisions to Ch. 5, 9, 10, 14
	A10	5/20/83	4/26/83	Revisions to Ch. 11
	A11	2/22/84	2/10/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 2
	A12	3/19/84	2/17/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A13	3/22/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8

* Transmittal is currently being printed.

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 1	A14	3/23/84	3/9 & 3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7, 9
	A15	3/26/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A16	8/31/84	3/02/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A17	3/26/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A18	3/27/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11, 13, 14, 15
	A19	3/29/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12
	A20	3/30/84	3/23/84	Index to Title 1, Table of Contents to Title 1
	A21	4/17/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3
	A22	5/22/84	5/22/84	Revision of Ch. 1-6.200
	AAA1	5/14/84		Form AAA-1
TITLE 2	A2	9/24/81	9/11/81	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A3	1/20/82	11/10/81	Revisions to Ch. 3
	A4	5/17/83	10/1/82	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A5	2/10/84	1/27/84	Complete revision of Title 2-replaces all previous transmittals
	A11	3/30/84	1/27/84	Summary Table of Contents to Title 2
	AAA2	5/14/84		Form AAA-2
TITLE 3	A2	7/2/82	5/28/82	Revisions to Ch. 5

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>Contents</u>
TITLE 3	A3	10/11/83	8/4/83	Complete revision of Title 3-replaces all previous transmittals
	AAA3	5/14/84		Form AAA-3
TITLE 4	A2	7/30/81	5/6/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 15, Index to Title 4 & Index to USAM
	A3	10/2/81	9/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 1
	A4	3/10/82	8/10/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, Index to Title 4
	A5	10/15/82	5/31/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 12
	A6	4/27/83	2/1/83	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 9, and 12
	A7	4/16/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7, 8, 12
	A8	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 2, 14, 15
	A9	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3
	A10	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A11	4/30/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 9, Index to Title 4
	A12	4/21/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A13	4/30/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A14	4/10/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 13

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 4	A15	3/28/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A16	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11
	AAA4	5/14/84		Form AAA-4
TITLE 5	A2	4/16/81	4/6/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, New Ch. 9, 9A, 9B, 9C, & 9D
	A3	3/22/84	3/5/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 2, 3(was 2A)
	A4	3/28/84	3/12/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12 (was 9C)
	A4	undated	3/19/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5 (was Ch. 4), 6, 8
	A5	3/28/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 9, 11 (was 9B)
	A6	3/28/84	3/22/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7
	A7	3/30/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10 (was 9A)
	A8	4/3/84	3/22 & 3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 13, 14, 15, Table of Contents to Title 5
	A9	12/06/84	11/01/84	Revisions to Chapter 1
	A11	4/17/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4 (was Ch. 3)
	A12	4/30/84	3/28/84	Index to Title 5
	AAA5	5/14/84		Form AAA-5
TITLE 6	A2	3/23/84	3/2/84	Complete revision of Title 6-replaces all prior transmittals

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
	A3	12/19/84	12/14/84	Revision to Chapter 4 and Index
	AAA6	5/14/84		Form AAA-6
TITLE 7	A2	6/30/81	6/2/81	Revisions to Ch. 5, Index to Title 7, Index to USAM
	A3	12/4/81	10/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 5
	A4	1/6/84	11/22/83	Complete revision to Title 7-replaces all prior transmittals
	A12	3/3/84	12/22/83	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 7
	AAA7	5/14/84		Form AAA-7
TITLE 8	A1	4/2/84	2/15/84	Ch. 1, 2, Index to Title 8
	A2	6/21/82	4/30/82	Complete revision to Title 8
	A12	3/30/84	2/15/84	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 8
	AAA8	5/14/84		Form AAA-8
TITLE 9	A2	11/4/80	10/6/80	New Ch. 27, Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 4, 7, 17, 34, 47, 69, 120, Index to Title 9, and Index to USAM
	A3	6/30/81	4/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 4, 7, 21, 42, 61, 69, 72, 104, Index to USAM
	A4	6/1/81	5/29/81	Revisions to Ch. 4, 7, 70, 78, 90, 121, New Ch. 123, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A5	11/2/81	6/18/81	Revisions to Ch. 4, 8, 20, 47, 61, 63, 65, 75, 85, 90, 100, 110, 120, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM
	A6	12/11/81	10/8/81	Revisions to Ch. 17, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A7	1/5/82	10/8/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 7, 37, 60, 90, 139, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A8	1/13/82	11/24/81	Revisions to Ch. 34, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM
	A9	3/12/82	2/16/82	Revisions to Ch. 11, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A10	10/6/82	3/29/82	Revisions to Ch. 1, 11, 16, 69, 79, 120, 121, Entire Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A11	3/2/83	9/8/82	Revisions to Ch. 120, 121, 122
	A12	9/19/83	5/12/83	Revisions to Ch. 101
	A13	1/26/84	1/11/84	Complete revision of Ch. 132, 133
	A14	2/10/84	1/27/84	Revisions to Ch. 1
	A15	2/1/84	1/27/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8
	A16	3/23/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 135, 136
	A17	2/10/84	2/2/84	Complete revision of Ch. 39
	A18	2/3/84	2/3/84	Complete revision of Ch. 40

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A19	3/26/84	2/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 21
	A20	3/23/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 137, Ch. 138
	A21	3/19/84	2/13/84	Complete revision of Ch. 34
	A22	3/30/84	2/01/84	Complete revision of Ch. 14
	A23	8/31/84	2/16/84	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A24	3/23/84	2/28/84	Complete revision of 65
	A25	3/26/84	3/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 130
	A26	3/26/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 44
	A27	3/26/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 90
	A28	3/29/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 101
	A29	3/26/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 121
	A30	3/26/84	3/19/84	Complete revision of Ch. 9
	A31	3/26/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 78
	A32	3/29/84	3/12/84	Complete revision of Ch. 69
	A33	3/29/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 102
	A34	3/26/84	3/14/84	Complete revision of Ch. 72

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A35	3/26/84	2/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 37
	A36	3/26/84	2/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 41
	A37	4/6/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 139
	A38	3/29/84	2/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 47
	A39	3/30/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 104
	A40	4/6/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 100
	A41	4/6/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 110
	A42	3/29/84	3/14/84	Complete revision of Ch. 64
	A43	4/6/84	3/14/84	Complete revision of Ch. 120
	A44	4/5/84	3/21/84	Complete revision of Ch. 122
	A45	4/6/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 16
	A46	2/30/84	2/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 43
	A47	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 7
	A48	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A49	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 63
	A50	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 66
	A51	4/6/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 76, deletion of Ch. 77

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A52	4/16/84	3/30/84	Complete revision of Ch. 85
	A53	6/6/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 4
	A54	7/25/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11
	A55	4/23/84	4/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 134
	A56	4/30/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 42
	A57	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 60, 75
	A58	4/23/84	4/19/84	Summary Table of Contents of Title 9
	A59	4/30/84	4/16/84	Entire Index to Title 9
	A60	5/03/84	5/03/84	Complete revision of Chapter 66
	A61	5/03/84	4/30/84	Revisions to Chapter 1, section .103
	A62	12/31/84	12/28/84	Revisions to Chapter 123
	A63	5/11/84	5/9/84	Complete revision to Ch. 7
	A64	5/11/84	5/11/84	Revision to Ch. 64, section .400-700
	A65	5/17/84	5/17/84	Revisions to Ch. 120
	A66	5/10/84	5/8/84	Complete revision to Ch. 131
	A67	5/11/84	5/09/84	Revisions to Ch. 121, section .600
	A68	5/28/84	5/08/84	Revisions to Ch. 104
	A69	5/09/84	5/07/84	Revisions to Ch. 21, section .600

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A70	5/17/84	5/16/84	Revisions to Ch. 43, section .710
	A71	5/21/84	5/21/84	Complete revision of Ch. 20
	A72	5/25/84	5/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 61
	A73	6/18/84	6/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 17
	A74	6/18/84	6/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 63
	A75	6/26/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 27
	A76	6/26/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 71
	A77	7/27/84	7/25/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A78	9/10/84	8/31/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1
	A79	8/02/84	7/31/84	Complete revision of Ch. 18
	A80	8/03/84	8/03/84	Complete revision of Ch. 79
	A81	8/06/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 7
	A82	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 75
	A83	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 90
	A84	9/10/84	9/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 2
	A85	7/25/84	2/17/84	Revisions to Ch. 136
	A86	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 60
	A87	11/14/84	11/09/84	Revision to Ch. 42

TRANSMITTAL
AFFECTING
TITLE

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------

TITLE 9	A88	8/31/84	8/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12
	A89	12/31/84	12/31/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A90	10/10/84	10/01/84	Complete revision of Ch. 73
	A91	12/12/84	11/23/84	Revisions to Ch. 70
	A92	12/14/84	11/09/84	Revisions to Ch. 75
	A93	12/31/84	12/06/84	Revisions to Ch. 7
	A94	12/20/84	12/14/84	Correction to Ch. 27
	AAA9	5/14/84		Form AAA-9
TITLE 10	A2	11/2/81	8/21/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 6, Index to Title 10
	A3	12/1/81	8/21/81	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A4	12/28/81	---	Title Page to Title 10
	A5	3/26/82	1/8/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 6, Index to Title 10
	A6	6/17/82	1/4/82	Revisions to Ch. 4, Index to Title 10
	A7	3/4/83	5/31/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 5, 6, and New Ch. 9
	A8	4/5/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1
	A9	4/6/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7
	A10	4/13/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A11	3/29/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A12	4/3/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 10	A13	9/4/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A14	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A15	4/17/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3, 9
	A16	5/4/84	3/28/84	Index and Appendix to Title 10
	A17	3/30/84	3/28/84	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 10
	A18	5/4/84	4/13/84	Complete revision to Ch. 2
	A19	5/02/84	5/01/84	Revisions to Chapter 4
	A20	8/31/84	5/24/84 & 7/31/84	Revisions to Chapter 2
	A21	6/6/84	5/1/84	Corrected TOC Chapter 4 and pages 23, 24
	A22	7/30/84	7/27/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A23	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A24	11/09/84	10/19/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A25	11/09/84	10/19/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A26	11/28/84	11/28/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A27	12/07/84	11/01/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	AAA10	5/14/84		Form AAA-10
	B1	3/15/85	1/31/85	Revision to Ch. 2
TITLE 1-10	A1	4/25/84	4/20/84	Index to USAM

TELETYPES

- 05-06-85 From Laurence S. McWhorter, Deputy Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, re: "Annual Financial Disclosure Reports."
- 05-08-85 From C. Madison Brewer, Director, Office of Management Information Systems and Support, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, re: "Special Diskette."
- 05-09-85 From William P. Tyson, Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, re: "Status of Funds - FY '85; Suspension of 91-Day Appointment Program for Assistant United States Attorneys."
- 05-09-85 From C. Madison Brewer, Director, Office of Management Information Systems and Support, by Tim Murphy, Assistant Director, Debt Collection Staff, re: "Request to Report Results of Comprehensive Crime Control Act Notices to Criminal Fine Debtors."
- 05-14-85 From William P. Tyson, Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, by C. Madison Brewer, Director, Office of Management Information Systems and Support, re: "Change in Federal Civil Postjudgment Interest Rate."
- 05-17-85 From C. Madison Brewer, Director, Office of Management Information Systems and Support, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, by Tim Murphy, Assistant Director, Debt Collection Staff, re: "Conference in Basic Debt Collection for United States Attorney Personnel."
- 05-21-85 From William P. Tyson, Director, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, by Susan A. Nellor, Director, Office of Legal Services, re: "Prosecution Guidelines and Declination Process."

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' LIST

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>U.S. ATTORNEY</u>
Alabama, N	Frank W. Donaldson
Alabama, M	John C. Bell
Alabama, S	J. B. Sessions, III
Alaska	Michael R. Spaan
Arizona	Stephen M. McNamee
Arkansas, E	George W. Proctor
Arkansas, W	W. Asa Hutchinson
California, N	Joseph P. Russoniello
California, E	Donald B. Ayer
California, C	Robert C. Bonner
California, S	Peter K. Nunez
Colorado	Robert N. Miller
Connecticut	Alan H. Nevas
Delaware	Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
District of Columbia	Joseph E. diGenova
Florida, N	W. Thomas Dillard
Florida, M	Robert W. Merkle
Florida, S	Stanley Marcus
Georgia, N	Larry D. Thompson
Georgia, M	Joe D. Whitley
Georgia, S	Hinton R. Pierce
Guam	David T. Wood
Hawaii	Daniel A. Bent
Idaho	William R. Vanhole
Illinois, N	Anton R. Valukus
Illinois, S	Frederick J. Hess
Illinois, C	Gerald D. Fines
Indiana, N	R. Lawrence Steele, Jr.
Indiana, S	John D. Tinder
Iowa, N	Evan L. Hultman
Iowa, S	Richard C. Turner
Kansas	Benjamin L. Burgess, Jr.
Kentucky, E	Louis G. DeFalaise
Kentucky, W	Ronald E. Meredith
Louisiana, E	John Volz
Louisiana, M	Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr.
Louisiana, W	Joseph S. Cage, Jr.
Maine	Richard S. Cohen
Maryland	J. Frederick Motz
Massachusetts	William F. Weld
Michigan, E	Joel M. Shere
Michigan, W	John A. Smietanka
Minnesota	James M. Rosenbaum
Mississippi, N	Glen H. Davidson
Mississippi, S	George L. Phillips
Missouri, E	Thomas E. Dittmeier
Missouri, W	Robert G. Ulrich

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>U.S. ATTORNEY</u>
Montana	Byron H. Dunbar
Nebraska	Ronald D. Lahners
Nevada	William A. Maddox
New Hampshire	Bruce E. Kenna
New Jersey	W. Hunt Dumont
New Mexico	William L. Lutz
New York, N	Frederick J. Scullin, Jr.
New York, S	Rudolph W. Giuliani
New York, E	Raymond J. Dearie
New York, W	Salvatore R. Martoche
North Carolina, E	Samuel T. Currin
North Carolina, M	Kenneth W. McAllister
North Carolina, W	Charles R. Brewer
North Dakota	Rodney S. Webb
Ohio, N	Patrick M. McLaughlin
Ohio, S	Christopher K. Barnes
Oklahoma, N	Layn R. Phillips
Oklahoma, E	Roger Hilfiger
Oklahoma, W	William S. Price
Oregon	Charles H. Turner
Pennsylvania, E	Edward S. G. Dennis, Jr.
Pennsylvania, M	James J. West
Pennsylvania, W	J. Alan Johnson
Puerto Rico	Daniel F. Lopez-Romo
Rhode Island	Lincoln C. Almond
South Carolina	Henry Dargan McMaster
South Dakota	Philip N. Hogen
Tennessee, E	John W. Gill, Jr.
Tennessee, M	Joe B. Brown
Tennessee, W	W. Hickman Ewing, Jr.
Texas, N	James A. Rolfe
Texas, S	Henry K. Oncken
Texas, E	Robert J. Wortham
Texas, W	Helen M. Eversberg
Utah	Brent D. Ward
Vermont	George W. F. Cook
Virgin Islands	James W. Diehm
Virginia, E	Elsie L. Munsell
Virginia, W	John P. Alderman
Washington, E	John E. Lamp
Washington, W	Gene S. Anderson
West Virginia, N	William A. Kolibash
West Virginia, S	David A. Faber
Wisconsin, E	Joseph P. Stadtmueller
Wisconsin, W	John R. Byrnes
Wyoming	Richard A. Stacy
North Mariana Islands	David T. Wood