

United States Attorneys' Bulletin

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Editor-in-Chief: Jason P. Green FTS 633-4024 Editor: Judith C. Campbell FTS 673-6348

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

....

.

COMMENDATIONS	75
CLEARINGHOUSE Legal/Policy Advisory on Asset Forfeiture Matters	76
POINTS TO REMEMBER Bluesheets and Transmittals, <u>United States Attorneys' Manual</u> Criminal Tax Indictment/Information Forms and Manual on JURIS Redelegation of Authority to U. S. Attorneys in Civil Cases Teletypes to United States Attorneys	76 77 77 78
CASENOTES OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL. OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS. CIVIL DIVISION. CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION. LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION. UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES. FEDERAL RULES.	78 78 79 81 82 83 84
APPENDIX	86



VOL. 34, NO. 3

THIRTY-THIRD YEAR

FEBRUARY 14, 1986

Please send change of address to Editor, <u>United States Attorneys'Bulletin</u>, Room 1629, Main Justice Building, 10th & Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530.

••

.

••••••

• • • • • • •

÷

•

-

.

COMMENDATIONS

Assistant United States Attorney ANDREW B. BAKER, JR., Northern District of Indiana, was commended by Major Emil D. Brupbacher, Jr., Staff Judge Advocate, United States Air Force, for his work in <u>United States</u> v. 63.69 Acres.

Assistant United States Attorney R. MICHAEL BURKE, District of Hawaii, was commended by Attorney General Edwin Meese III, for his participation in the successful prosecution of twenty-two marijuana growers.

Assistant United States Attorneys VETA M. CARNEY and ROBERT C. PERRY, Southern District of Indiana, were commended by Mr. William H. Webster, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for their successful prosecution of Lucille Jacobs.

United States Attorney MAURICE O. ELLSWORTH, District of Idaho, was commended by Mr. Paul Scragg, Vice-President, First Security Bank of Idaho, and Attorney General Edwin Meese III, for his presentation of the Department's policies at the Western States Bank Security Director's Association.

Assistant United States Attorney WILLIAM T. GRIMMER, Northern District of Indiana, was commended by Mr. Paul A. Adams, Inspector General, Department of Housing and Urban Development, for his aggressive approach in fighting fraud and abuse in government programs. Assistant United States Attorney GRIMMER was also commended by Mr. K. C. Weaver, Inspector-in-Charge, United States Postal Service, Chicago, Illinois, for his outstanding prosecution of fourteen defendants involved in a money order fraud scheme at the Indiana State Prison.

Assistant United States Attorney JOHN F. HOEHNER, Northern District of Indiana, was commended by Mr. William H. Webster, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his outstanding work on two cases involving multiple subjects operating "chop shops" in Northwest Indiana.

Assistant United States Attorneys ROBERT A. MANDEL and DAVID L. ZUERCHER, District of South Dakota, was commended by Mr. R. Springfield, Jr., Postal Inspector-in-Charge, United States Postal Service, St. Paul, Minnesota, for their outstanding efforts in the successful conclusion of United States v. Sablosky.

Assistant United States Attorney CHRISTINA M. MCKEE, Northern District of Indiana, was commended by Major Emil D. Brupbacher, Jr., Staff Judge Advocate, United States Air Force, for her work in representing the Air Force in an equal pay case.

Assistant United States Attorney JOSEPH D. NEWMAN, Southern District of Georgia, was commended by Mr. William H. Webster, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his outstanding prosecution of <u>Fred Lee Sykes</u>, Jr. Assistant United States Attorneys MARGARET M. QUINN and ANN MARIE TRACEY, Southern District of Ohio, were commended by Mr. Terence D. Dinan, Special Agent-in-Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Cincinnati, Ohio, for their outstanding efforts in the successful public corruption trial of Oliver G. McGee.

Assistant United States Attorney MARK D. STUAAN, Central District of Illinois, was commended by Mr. Philip V. Fisher, Special Agent-in-Charge, Drug Enforcement Administration, Chicago, Illinois, for his presentation on the Controlled Substance Act at a Drug Enforcement Administration Law Enforcement Seminar held in East Moline, Illinois.

Assistant United States Attorney ERIC L. WILSON, District of Hawaii, was the recipient of the Federal Bar Association's 1985 Younger Federal Lawyer Award.

CLEARINGHOUSE

Legal/Policy Advisory on Asset Forfeiture Matters

The Asset Forfeiture Office of the Criminal Division prepares advisories on numerous legal/policy issues each month in the course of their regular duties.

Copies of the following advisories may be obtained by contacting the Office of Legal Services, Executive Office for United States Attorneys, at FTS 633-4024:

- 1) Opinion No. L85-28--Administrative Forfeiture of Real Property; and
- Opinion No. L85-29--Policy With Regard to Forfeiture of Assets Which Have Been Transferred to Attorneys As Fees for Legal Services.

Please ask for item number CH-27.

(Executive Office)

POINTS TO REMEMBER

Bluesheets and Transmittals, United States Attorneys' Manual.

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

(Executive Office)

FEBRUARY 14, 1986

PAGE 77

:

.

Criminal Tax Indictment/Information Forms And Manual On JURIS

In conjunction with the recent publication of its new <u>Criminal Tax</u> Manual, the Tax Division announces the creation of two new JURIS files ("CRTAXMAN" and "FORMS") which now are available for searching in the JURIS tax file group. "CRTAXMAN" presently contains the textual portions of the <u>Criminal Tax Manual</u> published in October 1985, including Tax Division "Policy and Procedures"; "Title 26 Offenses"; and "Title 18 Offenses." The "Methods of Proof" section of the <u>Manual</u>, published in January 1986, will be available for searching in "CRTAXMAN" shortly. "FORMS" contains the Tax Division's revised, standardized, numbered, indictment/information forms as published in the <u>Manual</u> for use in prosecuting criminal tax cases. Both "CRTAXMAN" and "FORMS" contain as a document a Table of Contents to facilitate access to materials contained in the files. As new sections of the <u>Criminal Tax Manual</u> are published, they will be added to the <u>Manual</u> material already available on JURIS.

For additional information concerning the <u>Manual</u> or its availability on JURIS, contact Edward M. Vellines, Office of <u>Policy</u> and Tax Enforcement Anaylsis, Criminal Section, Tax Division, on FTS 633-3011.

(Tax Division)

Redelegation Of Authority To United States Attorneys In Civil Cases

Effective December 13, 1985, Deputy Attorney General D. Lowell Jensen authorized United States Attorneys to reject, with respect to all civil matters assigned to their respective offices, any offer in compromise and to accept offers in compromise and close claims or cases in the same manner and to the same extent as Assistant Attorneys General. However, United States Attorneys may not accept any offers in compromise of any claim or case against the United States where the principal amount to be paid by the United States exceeds \$200,000. Officials may neither close (other than by compromise or by entry of judgment) any claim or case on behalf of the United States where the gross amount involved exceeds \$200,000 nor accept any offers in compromise of any such claim or case in which the difference between the gross amount of the original claim and the proposed settlement exceeds \$200,000 or 10 percent of the original claim, whichever is greater.

This authorization supersedes directives of the Antitrust, Civil, Civil Rights, Criminal, Land and Natural Resources, and Tax Divisions only to the extent noted above. All other exceptions, limitations on or conditions of delegations to United States Attorneys contained in such directives or in 28 C.F.R., Part O remain in full force and effect.

This authorization applies to all cases or claims pending as of December 13, 1985 (the date of Mr. Jensen's memorandum to United States Attorneys).

(Executive Office)

.

Teletypes to All United States Attorneys

A listing of recent teletypes sent by the Executive Office is appended to this <u>Bulletin</u>. If a United States Attorney's office has not received one or more of these teletypes, copies may be obtained by contacting 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:

A brief amicus curiae in <u>Baker</u> v. <u>General Motors Corp.</u>, 420 Mich. 463 (1985). The question presented is whether a state statute, barring the payment of unemployment compensation to employees who financed the labor dispute that caused their unemployment, impermissibly conflicts with the right of employees under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act "to form, join, or assist labor organizations."

A petition for certiorari in <u>Commissioner v. Groetzinger</u>, 771 F.2d 269 (7th Cir. 1985). The issue is whether a full-time gambler who wagers solely for his own account, and thus does not hold himself out as offering goods or services to others, is engaged in a "trade or business" for federal income tax purposes.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES DECEMBER 12, 1985 - JANUARY 21, 1986

HIGHLIGHTS

Technical Corrections Crime Package. Extensive meetings were held in early December to process our 85-section bill intended to correct deficiencies in the landmark Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984. Although a number of provisions in our bill were pulled out so that separate hearings can be held on them, the bulk of the bill, S. 1236, was deemed to be non-controversial and was reported out by the Senate Judiciary Committee on December 12.

Anti-Terrorism Legislation. On December 12, the Senate Judiciary also voted to report Senator Specter's bill, S. 1429, to establish federal criminal jurisdiction over the murder, assault or kidnapping of United States citizens overseas. This proposal is in response to the murders of

•••

.....

Americans in connection with the TWA and Achille Lauro hijackings. The bill as reported reflects changes suggested by the Departments of State and Justice.

Electronic Surveillance Legislation. Representative Kastenmeier and Senators Mathias and Leahy continue to seek legislation to expand the federal wiretap statute, particularly to cover new communications technologies (cellular and cordless telephones, electronic mail, etc.). Their original bills (S. 1667 and H.R. 3870) would, in the Department's view, be harmful to law enforcement. Therefore, we have indicated, in Senate testimony of Deputy Assistant Attorney General James Knapp, that we are prepared to work on compromise legislation. There appears to be the basis for a compromise here. Representative Kastenmeir plans further hearings in February. In the meantime, prospects for legislation in this area are favorable. We are laboring to be constructive on this issue while at the same time avoiding new legislation which would impair investigations of drug trafficking, organized crime, espionage and other such serious offenses which often require use of electronic surveillance techniques.

<u>Armor-Piercing "Cop-Killer" Bullet Legislation</u>. On December 17, the House passed the proposed Law Officers Protection Act, H.R. 3132, by a vote of 400 to 21. The bill bans the sale, manufacture and importation of bullets made to penetrate body armor except those used by government agencies, destined for export, or for authorized testing. The Administration also developed proposed legislation to ban the production or importation of armor-piercing bullets which was submitted to the Congress as a joint Treasury-Justice proposal. However, as noted above, H.R. 3132 expands the scope of the legislation to cover sales as well as production or importation. We oppose this extension as unenforceable.

CIVIL DIVISION

D.C. CIRCUIT HOLDS FORMER PATIENTS EMPLOYED IN "EXCEPTED SERVICE" POSITIONS AT ST. ELIZABETH'S HOSPITAL MUST BE AFFORDED JOB BENEFITS AND PROTECTIONS EQUIVALENT TO THOSE AVAILABLE TO COMPETITIVELY HIRED WORKERS.

In this class action, plaintiffs were former patients of St. Elizabeth's Hospital (the only federal mental institution) who were employed at the hospital under the authority of 5 C.F.R. §213.3102(h) ("subsection (h)"). This regulation permitted former patients of federal mental institutions to be hired for jobs at the institution without going through the normal competitive hiring process for federal employment. As "excepted service" employees, these workers did not have all of the same job benefits and protections as members of the "competitive service." Plaintiffs argued that the failure to afford them equivalent benefits when they were performing the same jobs as competitively hired workers violated the Rehabilitation Act. The district court agreed and ordered that members of the class who had completed two years of satisfactory service in their subsection (h) positions be converted to competitive status. On appeal we argued that plaintiffs' excepted service status reflected their voluntary choice and that unless the competitive hiring process discriminated against recovered mental patients, provision of an alternative route to federal employment did not violate the Rehabilitation Act.

The D.C. Circuit has now affirmed the lower court's finding that denial of equivalent job benefits and protections does violate the Act, but has remanded the case to the district court to revise one critical part of the remedy. The court of appeals was concerned about the possibility that recovered patients could have recurring mental problems and found that the government had a legitimate interest in preserving its ability to remove these employees from their positions if their mental condition deteriorated. Accordingly, the court directed the district court fashion a remedy concerning job tenure which preserved the hospital's flexibility to set reasonable rules which accommodate this interest.

<u>Allen</u> v. <u>Heckler</u>, <u>F.2d</u>, No. 84-5612 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 31, 1985). D. J. # 35-16-2036.

Attorneys: William Kanter (Civil Division) FTS 633-1597; Irene M. Solet (Civil Division) FTS 633-3355.

FIFTH CIRCUIT VACATES EARLIER OPINION AND HOLDS THAT HUD CAN ENFORCE JUDGMENTS WITH CONTEMPT ORDERS.

In this case, HUD brought suit against four corporate and individual defendants alleging violations of the Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act. The Act, which is patterned after the Securities Act of 1933, protects against fraud and nondisclosure by land developers. Defendants agreed to a consent judgment by which they would make restitution to allegedly defrauded purchasers in three annual installments. When defendants failed to make the agreed payments, HUD obtained a civil contempt order imposing fines for continued noncompliance.

Defendants appealed and the Fifth Circuit reversed the judgment of contempt, holding that the contempt order violated the prohibition against imprisonment for debt contained in 28 U.S.C. $\S2007(a)$. The court stated that the threat of imprisonment was inherent in the order, and that the consent judgment was a money judgment falling within the scope of the statute. The opinion thus effectively barred HUD from enforcing judgments by the use or threatened use of contempt sanctions, and raised the possibility that other agencies enforcing similar statutes would encounter the same bar.

We filed for rehearing and the panel vacated its original opinion. In its new opinion, the court recognized that the consent order in this case was not a money judgment, but an equitable order compelling restitution to correct an offense against the public interest. Accordingly, 28 U.S.C. $\S2007(a)$ did not apply and the consent judgment was properly enforceable by

.

.

contempt. At our suggestion, the panel remanded the case to permit the district court to determine whether the defendants are currently able to comply with the terms of the order.

<u>Pierce</u> v. <u>Vision Investments, Inc.</u>, <u>F.2d</u>, No. 84-1642 (5th Cir. Jan. 3, 1986). D. J. # 36-76-204.

Attorneys: John F. Cordes (Civil Division) FTS 633-3380; Mark B. Stern (Civil Division) FTS 633-5534.

NINTH CIRCUIT REVERSES DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT ESTOPPING THE GOVERNMENT.

The plaintiff brought a successful suit in district court claiming that a 58-month delay by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in processing her application for change of status to permanent resident alien constituted "affirmative misconduct" sufficient to estop the government from deporting her. We took an appeal, arguing that the delay was at worst mere negligence and could not be elevated to affirmative misconduct. We also argued that the elements required for an estoppel, including reasonable reliance, were missing in this case.

The Ninth Circuit agreed and reversed, holding that simple delay by INS was not affirmative misconduct, and that any of its earlier decisions so holding, including <u>Villena</u> v. <u>INS</u>, 622 F.2d 1352 (9th Cir. 1980) and <u>Sun Il Yoo</u> v. <u>INS</u>, 534 F.2d 1325 (9th Cir. 1976) had been overruled by <u>INS</u> v. Miranda, 459 U.S. 14 (1982).

Jaa v. Immigration And Naturalization Service, F.2d, No. 85-1516 (9th Cir. Jan. 3, 1986). D. J. # 39-11-1994.

Attorneys: Barbara L. Herwig (Civil Division) FTS 633-5425; Richard A. Olderman (Civil Division) FTS 633-4052.

CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION

SIXTEEN-COUNT INDICTMENT RETURNED AGAINST KLAN MEMBERS IN TWO NORTH CAROLINA COUNTIES.

A federal grand jury returned a 16-count indictment against twelve defendants in this case which involves incidents of intimidation which occurred in 1982 and 1983, including cross burnings and racially motivated assaults and shootings--at the hands of Ku Klux Klan members in Iredell and Alexander Counties, North Carolina. The indictment charges that the defendants conspired to intimidate several black and white residents who lived or socialized together in the two counties. Some of the defendants are also charged with perjury in denying before a grand jury that they knew of or were involved in the cross burnings. Previously nine other individuals have either pled guilty or been convicted for their involvement in these same incidents.

<u>United States</u> v. <u>Earp</u>, F. Supp. ____, No. ST-CR-86-2 (W.D. N.C. Jan. 7, 1986). D. J. # 175-55-84.

Attorney: Isabelle Thabault (Civil Rights Division) FTS 633-4147.

FOUR PERSONS CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY TO INTERFERE WITH HOUSING AND DESTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

Arrests were made and a complaint was filed in this case in which four defendants, including a juvenile, were charged with violations of 18 U.S.C. §241 (conspiracy to interfere with housing rights) and 18 U.S.C. §844(f) (destruction of government property). A federal grand jury heard testimony on January 9, 1986, and additional testimony was heard on January 16, 1986. The case involves acts of intimidation and vandalism directed at a black couple after they moved into a house in the southwest Philadelphia area. On December 12, 1985, after the couple moved out of the house, it was destroyed by fire along with several adjoining houses. The house was owned by the Veterans Administration. Preliminary reports indicate that the fire was an arson resulting from the pouring and lighting of gasoline on the house. This matter is being handled by the United States Attorney's Office.

<u>United States</u> v. <u>Stewart</u>, <u>F. Supp.</u>, No. 86-4 (E.D. Pa. Case filed Jan. 7, 1986). D. J. <u>#</u> 175-62-166.

Attorney: Albert Glenn (Civil Rights Division) FTS 633-4853.

LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION

UNITED STATES OWNS TITLE TO BED OF UTAH LAKE.

Utah commenced this quiet title action, under 28 U.S.C. §2409a, after the Interior Department began to issue federal oil and gas leases on the bed of Utah Lake. Utah unsuccessfully contended that ownership of the bed of this navigable lake passed to it when it attained statehood in 1896. The court of appeals, in affirming a summary judgment quieting title to the bed of Utah Lake in the United States, held that the United States, through the Director of the Geological Survey, had withdrawn the lake bed as a reservoir site before statehood pursuant to an 1888 federal statute authorizing such withdrawals. This withdrawal effectively precluded the State from acquiring any ownership of the lake bed or any lesser interest in its mineral estate upon its admission to the Union. The court of appeals further held that the Submerged Lands Act of 1953, by its terms,

::

did not produce a belated conveyance to the State. At oral argument, the State disclaimed that it was invoking estopped by the government in support of its claim, and the court of appeals expressly refused to reach that issue.

<u>State of Utah v. United States</u>, F.2d___, No. 83-1731 (10th Cir. Dec. 26, 1985). D. J. # 90-1-5-1929.

Attorney: Dirk D. Snel (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-4400.

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION PROVISION IN SECTION 703 OF SURFACE MINING CONTROL AND RECLAMATION ACT DOES NOT APPLY TO STATES.

Section 703 of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act states that "no person" shall discharge or otherwise discriminate against an employee due to his efforts to enforce or testify under the Act. The court of appeals, affirming the district court and the Interior Board of Land Apeals, held that a state agency is not a "person" within the meaning of this provision. The court noted that a state would not be subject to this employee-protection provision even if it were engaged in coal mining, since the Act only subjects states engaged in mining to the performance standards found in Title V of the Act.

Leber v. Pennsylvania Dept. of Environmental Resources, F.2d_, No. 85-5166 (3d Cir. Jan. 6, 1986). D. J. # 90-1-18-3919.

Attorneys: David C. Shilton (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-5580; Jacques B. Gelin (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 633-2762.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES

EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

FOURTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMS DISTRICT COURT INJUNCTION FREEZING DEFEN-DANT'S \$250,000 APPEAL BOND IN CRIMINAL CASE TO PRESERVE FUND TO SATISFY ANY JUDGMENT ENTERED IN SUBSEQUENT CIVIL CASE BASED ON SAME FACTS AS CRIMINAL PROSECUTION.

Defendant physician was convicted in 1983 on 35 mail fraud and related counts arising from a scheme to defraud Medicaid and Champus by submitting false claims for medical services not actually performed. Defendant appealed and bond was set at \$50,000. At a subsequent bond revocation hearing, testimony established defendant had converted real estate into large amounts of cash, had deposited cash at various institutions in

amounts calculated to avoid Currency Transaction Reports, placed some cash in the custody of third persons, falsely identified himself to bank officials, and attempted to purchase bearer bonds in a third person's name. The court increased the appeal bond to \$250,000 rather than revoking the bond.

In 1985, just before defendant's conviction was affirmed, we filed a False Claims Act suit and contemporaneously a motion for pre-judgment attachment of the appeal bond, citing as authority Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 64, 65 and the All Writs Act. The district court issued an injunction, based on the bond revocation hearing testimony, freezing the appeal bond, rejecting defendant's argument that appeal bonds are sacrosanct and must be returned to the defendant pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 46(f) at the conclusion of the appeal. Defendant appealed the issuance of the injunction, arguing Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 64 incorporating state law was the exclusive basis for a pre-judgment attachment.

The Fourth Circuit affirmed, noting the state law requirements for pre-judgment attachment are less onerous than those prescribed for an injunction by Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and in any event the district court's findings also satisfied the Rule 64 requirements.

United States v. Alexander, ____ F.Supp.___, Civil Action No. 85-373-N (E.D. Va. Dec. 26, 1985).

S. David Schiller (Assistant United States Attorney, Attorney: Eastern District of Virginia) FTS 925-2186.

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

Rule 11(e). Pleas. Plea Agreement Procedure.

Rule 48(a). Dismissal. By Attorney for Government.

After the grand jury returned an indictment charging a company and one of its employees with three counts of submitting false claims to the government, a proposed plea agreement was submitted to the court providing that the company would plead guilty to all charges while the counts against the employee would be dismissed. A motion for such dismissal was presented to the court along with the plea agreement. The district court rejected this agreement. On appeal, the government argued that the court in effect issued two orders, one rejecting the proposed plea agreement under Rule 11(e) and one denying a Rule 48(a) motion to dismiss the indictment. By the court's refusal to accept the agreement, the prosecutor's authority to dismiss under Rule 48(a) was infringed. While the government concedes that the prosecutor's power to dismiss is not absolute, a court's discretion to refuse to grant a dismissal is limited.

:•:

••••••

The court of appeals held that a court's rejection of a proposed plea bargain, which also provided for dismissal of all charges against a codefendant, is governed by Rule 11(e). Rule 48(a) governing dismissals does not apply. Since the dismissal provision and the plea agreement were one package, the court's rejection of the package must be given deference reflecting the broad discretion judges have under Rule 11 rather than their more limited authority under Rule 48.

(Affirmed.)

United States v. Honorable Jim R. Carrigan, F.2d, No. 85-1530 (10th Cir. Dec. 3, 1985).

57.

FEBRUARY 14, 1986

PAGE 86

•

•

.

•

.

•• • * • *

.

......

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT FEBRUARY 14, 1986

AFFECTS USAM	TITLE NO.	DATE	SUBJECT
9-1.177	TITLE 9 '	12/31/85	Authorization for Negotiated Concessions in Organized Crime Cases
9-2.132	TITLE 9	12/31/85	Policy Limitations on Institution of Proceedings - Internal Security Matters
9-2.133*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Policy Limitation on Institution of Proceedings, Consultation Prior to Institution of Criminal Charges
9-2.151	TITLE 9	12/31/85	Policy Limitations - Prosecutorial and Other Matters, International Matters
9-2.160*	TITLE 9	7/18/85	Policy with Regard to Issuance of Subpoenas to Attorneys for Informa- tion Relating to the Representation of Clients
9-6.400*	TITLE 9	11/06/85	Pretrial Detention Hearing Reporting Requirements
9-8.250*	TITLE 9	8/16/85	Policy Concerning Application of Youth Corrections Act to Offenses Committed before Oct. 12, 1984
9-18.280*	TITLE 9	8/09/85	Policy Concerning Application of Insanity Defense Reform Act of 1984 Offenses. Committed Before Date of Enactment
9-21.340 to 9-21.350*	TITLE 9	3/12/84	Psychological/Vocational Testing; Polygraph Examinations for Prisoner- Witness Candidates
9-40.400*	TITLE 9	7/15/85	Policy Concerning Prosecution Under New Bank Bribery Statute (18 U.S.C. §215)
9-48.120*	TITLE 9	3/07/85	Computer Fraud-Reporting Require- ments

* Approved by Advisory Committee, being permanently incorporated. ** In printing.

. . . .

•

PAGE 87

• 9

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT FEBRUARY 14, 1986

AFFECTS USAM	TITLE NO.	DATE	SUBJECT
9-49.150; 9-49.160*	TITLE 9	3/22/85	18 U.S.C. §1029-Reporting Require- ments; Fraudulent Use of Credit Cards and Debit Instruments-Prosecu- tions Under 18 U.S.C. §1029 Statutes in Title 15
9-60.291; 9-60.292*	TITLE 9	8/16/85	Interception of Radio Communica- tions: Unauthorized Reception of Cable Service
9-90.330*	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Computer Espionage
9-90.600*	TITLE 9	5/06/85	Registration
9-103.130	TITLE 9	12/31/85	Revision to the Investigative and Prosecutive Guidelines for the Controlled Substance Registrant Protection Act
9-111.000*	TITLE 9	9/18/85	Policy with Regard to Forfeiture of Assets Which Have Been Transferred to Attorneys As Fees For Legal Services
9-131.030*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Consultation Prior to Prosecution
9-131.110*	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Hobbs Act Robbery
9-134.010*	TITLE 9	2/20/85	Investigative Jurisdiction: 18 U.S.C. §1954
10-2.186	TITLE 10	9/27/85	Grand Jury Reporters
10-6.213*	TITLE 10	11/22/85	Reporting of Immediate Declinations of Civil Referrals

. .'

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' MANUAL--TRANSMITTALS

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

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF TEXT	CONTENTS
TITLE 1	(Tran	smittals A2 th	rough A10 have	been superseded.)
	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
	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
	A1Ġ	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		Eorm AAA-1
	B1	7/01/85	8/31/85	Revision to Ch. 1-12.000
	B2	8/31/85	7/01/85	Revisions to Ch. 11
TITLE 2	(Tran:	smittals A2 th	irough A4 have l	peen superseded.)
	A5	2/10/84	1/27/84	Complete revision of Title 2- replaces all previous transmittals

*Transmittal is currently being printed.

. "

ن ب

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	CONTENTS
TITLE 2	A11	3/30/84	1/27/84	Summary Table of Contents to Title 2
	AAA2	5/14/84		Form AAA-2
TIȚLE 3	(Tran:	smittal A2 has	s been supersed	ed.)
	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	(Tran:	smittals A2 th	nrough A6 have	been superseded.)
	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
	<u>A</u> 9	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
	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
	B1	11/05/85	8/01/85	Revisions to Chapters 1-8, and 11-15
TITLE 5	(Trans	smittal A2 has	been supersed	ed.)

Complete revision of Ch. 1, 2, 3 (was 2A) 3/22/84 3/5/84 A3

VOL. 34, NO. 3

۰ ،

Έ.

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 5	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 S
· .	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
	B1	6/03/85	5/01/85	Revisions to Ch. 1 and Ch. 4
TITLE 6	A2	3/23/84	3/2/84	Complete revision of Title 6- replaces all prior transmittals
	A3	12/19/84	12/14/84	Revision to Ch. 4 and Index
7	AAA6	5/14/84		Form AAA-6
TITLE 7	(Trans	smittals A2 an	d A3 have been	superseded.)
	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 Contents to Title 7
	AAA7	5/14/84		Form AAA-7

•

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	CONTENTS
TITLE 8	AAA8	5/14/84		Form AAA-8
	B1	10/01/85	6/01/85	Complete revision to Title 8 (Supersedes Al, A2, and Al2
TITLE 9		smittals A5 th superseded.)	rough A12, A14,	A47, A49 A50, A56 and A61 have
	A13	1/26/84	1/11/84	Complete revision of Ch. 132, 133
	A14	2/10/84	1/27/84	Revisions to Ch. 1 (Superseded by A78)
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
	A19	3/26/84	2/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 21
	A20	3/23/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 137, 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 Ch. 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
	Å30	3/26/84	3/19/84	Complete revision of Ch. 9

•

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF TEXT	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 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
۰.	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 (Superseded by A63)
• •	A48	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A49	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 63 (Superseded by A74)
	A50	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 66 (Superseded by A60)
	A51	4/6/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 76, deletion of Ch. 77
	A52	4/16/84	3/30/84	Complete revision of Ch. 85

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF TEXT	CONTENTS
TITLE 9	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 (Superseded by A87)
	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 Ch. 66 (Supersedes A50)
	A61	5/03/84	4/30/84	Revisions to Ch. 1, section .103 (Superseded by A78)
	A62	12/31/84	12/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 123
	A63	5/11/84	5/9/84	Complete revision to Ch. 7 (Supersedes A47)
	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
	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

TRANSMITTAL
AFFECTING
TITLE

TITLE 9

÷

.

TING	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	CONTENTS
9	Ą73	6/18/84	6/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 17
	A74	6/18/84	6/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 63 (Supersedes A49)
	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 (Supersedes A14 and A61)
	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	Revisions to Ch. 42 (Supersedes A56)
	88A	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

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF TEXT	CONTENTS
TITLE 9	B1 .	3/15/85	01/31/85	Revisions to Ch. 60
	B2	3/29/85	01/31/85	Revisions to Ch. 61
	B3	3/29/85	01/31/85	Revisions to Ch. 71
	B4	6/24/85	4/01/85	Revisions to Ch. 63
	B5	6/24/85	4/04/85	Revisions to Ch. 11
	B6	6/27/85	4/01/85	Revisions to Ch. 139
	B7	6/27/85	5/01/85	Revisions to Ch. 12
	B 8	7/01/85	4/01/85	Revision to Ch. 4
	B9	7/31/85	7/31/85	Revision to Ch. 130
	B11	9/27/85	7/01/85	Revision to Ch. 27 and Ch. 38
	B12	9/27/85	7/01/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B13	10/01/85	7/01/85	Revision to Ch. 60
	B14	11/29/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B15	10/21/85	7/01/85	Revision to Ch. 75
	B16	10/22/85	7/01/85	Revision to Ch. 64
	B17	10/21/85	8/30/85	Revision to Ch. 136
	B18	10/21/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 63
	B19	11/05/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 133
	B20	11/01/85	8/30/85	Revision to Ch. 134
	B21	11/05/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 11
	B23	11/20/85	11/05/85	Revision to Ch. 71
	B24	11/20/85	11/05/85	Revision to Ch. 46
	B26	11/29/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 138
	B28	11/29/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 65

4

ъ.

PAGE 96

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	CONTENTS
TITLE 9	B29	11/01/85	11/05/86	Revision to Ch. 103
	B31	11/01/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 7
	B33	11/01/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 69
	B35	12/31/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 132
	B36	11/29/85	8/01/85	Revision to Ch. 110
	B39	11/29/85	11/05/85	Revision to Ch. 60
TITLE 10	(Trans	mittal A2 thm	ough A7 have be	en superseded.)
	•		-	
	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
	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 Contents to Title 10
	A18	5/4/84	4/13/84	Complete revision to Ch. 2
	A19	5/02/84	5/01/84	Revisions to Ch. 4
	A20	8/31/84	5/24/84 & 7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A21	6/6/84	5/1/84	Corrected TOC, Ch. 4 and pages 23, 24
	A22	7/30/84	7/27/84	Revision to Ch. 2

TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE	<u>NO.</u>	DATE OF TRANSMITTAL	DATE OF	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 10	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
	B2	5/31/85	5/01/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B3	6/27/85	4/01/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B4	7/23/85	4/01/85	Revision to Ch. 4
	B7	7/31/85	5/01/85	Revision to Ch. 2 AppendixForm Index
	B 8	11/01/85	8/16/85	Revisions to Ch. 2 and Ch. 8
	B9	11/01/85	8/16/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B10	11/29/85	8/21/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B11	11/29/85	8/16/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B12	11/29/85	8/1/85	Revision to Ch. 2
	B14	11/29/85	8/1/85	Revision to Ch. 2
TITLE 1-10	A1	4/25/84	4/20/84	Index to USAM

If you have any questions regarding the above, please contact Judy Beeman at FTS 673-6348.

FEBRUARY 14, 1986

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS TELETYPES TO ALL UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

- 01-21-86 From Richard L. DeHaan, Director, Office of Administration and Review, by Ronald J. Vincoli, Assistant Director, Personnel Management Staff, re: "Requests for Appointment."
- 01-22-86 From Richard L. DeHaan, Director, Office of Administration and Review, by Ronald J. Vincoli, Assistant Director, Personnel Management Staff, re: "Personnel Management Staff Assignments."
- 01-23-86 From William P. Tyson, Director, by Jason P. Green, Director, Office of Legal Services, re: "Model Rules Governing Complaints of Judicial Misconduct and Disability with Comment"--Ninth Judicial Circuit.
- 01-30-86 From William P. Tyson, Director, by Richard L. DeHaan, Director, Office of Administration and Review, re: "Relocation Expenses."

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' LIST

DISTRICT U.S. ATTORNEY Frank W. Donaldson Alabama, N John C. Bell Alabama, M Alabama. S J. B. Sessions, III Michael R. Spaan Alaska Stephen M. McNamee Arizona Arkansas, E George W. Proctor J. Michael Fitzhugh Arkansas, W ¹oseph P. Russoniello Donald B. Ayer California, N California, E California, C Robert C. Bonner California, S Peter K. Nunez Robert N. Miller Colorado Connecticut Stanley A. Twardy, Jr. Delaware William C. Carpenter, Jr. District of Columbia Joseph E. diGenova Florida, N W. Thomas Dillard Robert W. Merkle Florida, M Florida, S Leon B. Kellner Larry D. Thompson Georgia, N <u>Georgia, M</u> Joe D. Whitley Georgia, S Hinton R. Pierce David T. Wood Guam Daniel A. Bent Hawaii Idaho Maurice O. Ellsworth Illinois, N Anton R. Valukas Frederick J. Hess Illinois, S Illinois, C Gerald D. Fines Indiana, N James G. Richmond Indiana, S John D. Tinder Evan L. Hultman Iowa, N Iowa, S Richard C. Turner Kansas Benjamin L. Burgess, Jr. Kentucky, E Louis G. DeFalaise Kentucky, W Alexander T. Taft, Jr. Louisiana, E John Volz Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr. Louisiana, M Joseph S. Cage, Jr. Louisiana. W Maine Richard S. Cohen Maryland Catherine C. Blake William F. Weld Massachusetts Michigan, E Roy C. Hayes Michigan, W John A. Smietanka Francis X. Hermann Minnesota Mississippi, N Robert Q. Whitwell George L. Phillips Mississippi, S Thomas E. Dittmeier Missouri, E Missouri, W Robert G. Ulrich

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

DISTRICT

U.S. ATTORNEY

	Montana	Byron H. Dunbar
	Nebraska	
	Nevada	William A. Maddox
	New Hampshire	Richard V. Wiebusch
	New Jersey	Thomas W. Greelish
	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	Anthony W. Nyktas
	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
٠	Rhode Island	Lincoln C. Almond
<u></u>	South Carolina	Vinton DeVane Lide
	South Dakota	Philip N. Hogen
	Tennessee, E	John W. Gill, Jr.
	Tennessee, M	Joe B. Brown
	Tennessee, W	W. Hickman Ewing, Jr.
	Texas, N	Marvin Collins
	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	Justin W. Williams
	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