



OFFICE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES REGARDING DISCOVERY IN CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS

Criminal Discovery Policy

Date: October 22, 2010

I. Policy Summary and Background

On January 4, 2010, Deputy Attorney General Ogden issued a memorandum entitled "[Guidance for Prosecutors Regarding Criminal Discovery](#)" ("[DAG Ogden Criminal Discovery Guidance](#)." That same date, he issued a [memorandum](#) directing that USAOs promulgate discovery policies governing several enumerated issues. This comprehensive discovery policy implements the directives of the Deputy Attorney General.

This policy provides guidance on gathering, tracking, reviewing and producing information to criminal defendants in accordance with statutory or procedural law and case law, the Constitution, DOJ policy and local rules. These duties are defined in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rules 12 and 16; the *Jencks Act* and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 26.2; *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), *Giglio v. United States*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), and their progeny; [USAM 9-5.001](#) (Disclosure of Exculpatory and Impeachment Information) and [9-5.100](#) (Potential Impeachment Information on Law Enforcement Witnesses); and the local rules and standing orders of the district court. In some respects, this policy requires broader production than the law. It counsels AUSAs to provide broad and early discovery of information and materials to the extent that broad and early discovery does not jeopardize witness safety, national security, or an ongoing criminal investigation.¹

The responsibility to produce all discoverable information in a criminal case lies with the AUSA(s)² assigned to the case. To fulfill this responsibility, AUSAs should consider several matters:

- **What & When:** What are the policies, rules, statutes and case law that define what must be produced and when must it be produced? (*See II. Laws, Rules and Policy Governing the Production of Discoverable Information (What Must Be Produced and When?)*)
- **Who is part of the prosecution team:** AUSAs are obligated to produce information that is within the possession of the prosecution team; thus,

¹ This policy does not create or confer any rights, privileges, or benefits to defendants. *United States v. Caceres*, 440 U.S. 741 (1979).

² As used in this policy, "AUSA" includes Special Assistant U.S. Attorneys and DOJ prosecutors working on a case in this district.

defining the scope of the prosecution team is critical. (*See III. Who is Part of the Prosecution Team: Gathering and Reviewing Potentially Discoverable Information*)

- **Where to look:** Once the prosecution team has been identified, AUSAs must ensure that all discoverable information is located, reviewed and produced as required, including agency investigative and administrative files, CI files, emails, PSRs, law enforcement *Giglio*, etc. (*See IV. Potential Sources of Discoverable Information*)
- **How to produce and track:** AUSAs must decide in what form to produce the discovery (bates numbered, hard copy, e-copy, available for inspection, redacted, etc), and **must keep a detailed record of all discovery produced.** (*See V. Manner of Production and Record-keeping*)

Any deviation from this policy requires supervisory approval.

II. Laws, Rules and Policy Governing the Production of Discoverable Information (What Must Be Produced and When?)

AUSAs must produce all discoverable information in accordance with federal law, the local rules, the court's standing discovery order in criminal cases and DOJ policy. For the purposes of this memorandum, "discovery" or "discoverable information" is not limited to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16 information, but includes all information and materials the government must disclose to the defendant pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 12 and 16; the Jencks Act and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 26.2; Federal Rules of Evidence 404(b) and 413-414; *Brady*, *Giglio*, USAM 9-5.001 and 9-5.100; and the local rules.

A. Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 12 and 16

At the discovery conference, upon the defendant's request³ AUSAs should be prepared to produce or make available for inspection all materials and items required to be produced or identified by Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rules 12(b)(4) and 16, including "an inventory of items seized from the defendant by law enforcement officials which the government intends to introduce at trial," which materials are in the possession of the AUSA. Discovery materials which subsequently come into the AUSA's possession must be promptly disclosed. This policy recognizes that cases involving T.III interceptions, complex cases, or cases where arrests were made prior to indictment, a complete

³ To trigger the government's reciprocal discovery rights defined in Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rule 16 (b), the defendant must request discovery.

discovery package may be unavailable. To the extent possible discovery as set forth herein should be made as soon as practical after arraignment.

B. Disclosure of *Brady/Giglio*

The constitutional guarantee to a fair trial, as interpreted by *Brady* and *Giglio* and their progeny, requires AUSAs to disclose to the defense any evidence that is material to guilt or punishment. *Brady*, 373 U.S. at 87; *Giglio*, 405 U.S. at 154. *Brady* and *Giglio* information must be disclosed to the defense regardless of whether the defense makes a request for such information. On October 19, 2006, the Department issued an amendment to the U.S. Attorney's Manual that "requires AUSAs to go beyond the minimum obligations required by the Constitution and establishes broader standards for disclosure of exculpatory and impeachment information." The details of the requirements are set forth in [USAM § 9-5.001](#). In short, the policy requires disclosure of "information beyond that which is 'material' to guilt as articulated in *Kyles v. Whitley*, 514 U.S. 419 (1995)," and encourages AUSAs to "err on the side of disclosure." **This policy requires the prosecution team to produce "information," not just "evidence," and counsels that the assigned AUSA(s) must consider the cumulative impact of items of information in the context of the facts of the prosecution.**

1. Exculpatory Information

All exculpatory information known to or in the possession of the prosecution team, regardless of whether the information is memorialized, should be disclosed to the defendant reasonably promptly after its discovery. In accordance with the directives of USAM 9-5.001, AUSAs should go beyond the Constitutional requirements and take a broad view of materiality when determining what must be disclosed:

A prosecutor must disclose information that is inconsistent with any element of any crime charged against the defendant or that establishes a recognized affirmative defense, regardless of whether the prosecutor believes such information will make the difference between conviction and acquittal of the defendant for a charged crime.

USAM 9-5.001 C 1. This includes, but is not limited to, exculpatory information contained in interview memoranda of testifying and non-testifying witnesses and in internal emails, memos, and other reports. The exculpatory information need not be provided in its original form, e.g., it is sufficient to send a letter to defense counsel advising of the exculpatory information in lieu of providing a copy of the original source document or recording, etc, which could be an email, letter, or other document or source.

2. Impeachment Information

Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), and its progeny, require the Government to turn over to the defendant anything known to the Government which would adversely impact the outcome of a trial in a material way. USAM 9-5.001 goes beyond *Giglio*'s requirements and requires AUSAs to disclose anything that is material to the witness's credibility, or "that casts a substantial doubt upon the accuracy of any evidence ... the prosecutor intends to rely on to prove an element of any crime charged, or might have a significant bearing on the admissibility of prosecution evidence." USAM 9-5.001. The information should be disclosed "regardless of whether the information ... would itself constitute admissible evidence." USAM 9-5.001.

Examples of what must be turned over include inconsistent statements, promises of leniency or immunity made to a witness, plea/cooperation agreements entered into with a witness, any benefit provided to the witness by the Government⁴, payments to a witness, any information that may be indicative of the witness's bias including, but not limited to, the witness's incarceration, probation, or supervised release status, the prior criminal record ("rap" sheet) of a witness, and other prior material acts of misconduct of a witness.

For a fuller discussion of inconsistent statements see D. Witness Interviews, "*Brady* and *Giglio* in Interviews of Testifying and Non-testifying Witnesses," and "Interviews of Non-testifying Individuals," below.

3. Timing of Disclosure

a. Pre-Charge Disclosures.

(1) Grand Jury:

Exculpatory Information. Although the Supreme Court has held that there is no constitutional requirement that the government disclose exculpatory evidence to the grand jury, see *United States v. Williams*, 504 U.S. 36, 52-54 (1992), USAM 9-11.233 requires AUSAs to disclose to the grand jury "substantial evidence that directly negates the guilt of a subject of the investigation."

Impeachment Information: Although there is no legal duty to seek out impeachment information from the prosecution team or present impeachment information to a grand jury, if an AUSA is aware of

⁴ Such benefits include a promise to be lenient on or not bring charges against a cooperating witness's family member or other person of significance to the cooperator.

significant impeachment information relating to a testifying witness, the AUSA should consider disclosing it to the grand jury, taking into account the witness's role in the case and nature of the impeachment information, among other things.

(2) Affidavits:

Exculpatory Information. If an AUSA is aware of substantial exculpatory information at the time he or she is preparing an affidavit or assisting an agent in the preparation of an affidavit in support of a search warrant, complaint, seizure warrant, or TIII, the AUSA should disclose the information in the affidavit unless the AUSA obtains supervisory approval not to do so. See Colo. RPC 3.3(d), requiring disclosure to the tribunal of exculpatory information in ex parte submissions.

Impeachment Information. If at the time a AUSA is preparing an affidavit in support of a search warrant, complaint, seizure warrant or TIII, the AUSA is aware of impeachment information relating to the affiant or other person relied upon in the affidavit such as a confidential informant, and that impeachment information is sufficient to undermine the court's confidence in the probable cause contained in the affidavit, the AUSA should disclose the information in the affidavit unless the AUSA obtains supervisory approval not to do so. A prior judicial finding of a lack of credibility of an affiant or person relied upon in the affidavit should be disclosed in the affidavit.

b. Post- Charge Disclosures:

(1) Exculpatory Information: After a defendant is charged, exculpatory information should be disclosed reasonably promptly upon its discovery. USAM 9-5.001 D 1. If an AUSA discovers exculpatory information after conviction, sentencing and appeal, the AUSA should discuss the proper way to handle the matter with a supervisor.

(2) Impeachment information should be disclosed as follows:

(a) Pre-Trial Hearings: Impeachment information relating to government witnesses who will testify at a preliminary/detention hearing, motion to suppress, or other pre-trial hearing should be disclosed sufficiently in advance of the hearing to allow the hearing to proceed efficiently.

(b) **Guilty Pleas:** The Supreme Court has held that there is no constitutional requirement that the government disclose impeachment information prior to a guilty plea. *United States v. Ruiz*, 536 U.S. 622 (2002). Nonetheless, if the AUSA is aware of impeachment information so significant that it undermines the AUSA's confidence in the defendant's guilt, the AUSA should disclose the information to the defense and advise their supervisor.

ABA Model Rule of Ethics 3.8(d) imposes disclosure obligations on prosecutors that exceed constitutional requirements regarding exculpatory/impeachment material. PRAO has concerns with the ABA opinion interpreting prosecutor's obligations under Rule 3.8(d). PRAO is in the process (as of 4-1-10) of preparing a response to the ABA.

(c) **Trial:** Impeachment information should be disclosed "at a reasonable time before trial to allow the trial to proceed efficiently." USAM 9-5.001 D 2.

(d) **Sentencing:** USAM 9-5.001 D 3 requires: "Exculpatory and impeachment information that casts doubt upon proof of an aggravating factor at sentencing, but that does not relate to proof of guilt, should be disclosed no later than the court's initial presentence investigation." Thus, AUSAs should disclose such information no later than the date the court issues its preliminary presentence (PSR) investigation. If additional favorable information becomes apparent after the initial PSR is issued, it should be disclosed promptly.

(e) **Post-conviction evidentiary hearings:** (probation/supervised release revocations, habeas actions) Impeachment information should be disclosed at a reasonable time before the hearing to allow the hearing to proceed efficiently.

C. Impeachment Information Relating to Law Enforcement Witnesses

In some cases AUSAs may encounter *Giglio* issues with respect to law enforcement witnesses who will be the affiant or a witness at a hearing or trial. For example, an agent may have been found to have committed misconduct, or may be the subject of a pending internal or criminal investigation. [USAM 9-5.100](#) contains the Department's policy on obtaining and disclosing *Giglio* information relating to law enforcement witnesses. This office has a *Giglio* officer to assist AUSAs with *Giglio* requests relating to law enforcement witnesses. Jim Allison is the *Giglio* officer.

All potential impeachment information obtained from a law enforcement witness or the witness's agency should be carefully protected and only disclosed to those with a need to know.

1. Giglio Questions for Law Enforcement Witnesses. In every case, the AUSA should ask each potential law enforcement affiant/witness who is expected to testify if there is *Giglio* information relating to the officer/agent. If the officer/agent states he/she has *Giglio* material in the personnel file or elsewhere, the AUSA should obtain that information.

2. Requesting and Reviewing Personnel and Disciplinary Files. When requested by an AUSA, the *Giglio* officer will request all *Giglio* information from the affiant/witness's agency. If it is a federal agency, the agency official will conduct a review of the agent's personnel and disciplinary files and disclose any impeaching information from the file to the requesting *Giglio* officer. If it is a state or local agency that does not have a person qualified to conduct *Giglio* reviews, the agency will likely be asked to produce the records to the *Giglio* officer for review. Because gathering and reviewing *Giglio* records takes time, AUSAs request the information sufficiently in advance of the witness's anticipated testimony to allow the process to be completed before the witness testifies. If a *Giglio* request has been made but not responded to before trial begins, the AUSA should advise the court.

3. Disclosure of Potential Impeachment Information to the Court or Defense Counsel. Once the agency discloses any *Giglio* information to the *Giglio* officer, the *Giglio* officer in consultation with the prosecuting AUSA will review the material to determine whether it should be disclosed to the court for an *ex parte, in camera* review or to defense counsel. The *Giglio* officer will disclose the materials to the AUSA that appear to be potential *Brady* or *Giglio*. Before the AUSA discloses any material either to the court for an *ex parte, in camera* review, or to defense counsel, the AUSA should discuss the matter fully with the *Giglio* officer. If it is determined that disclosure should occur, the *Giglio* officer or prosecuting AUSA should notify the agent or agency⁵ before disclosure occurs, and give them an opportunity to be fully heard on the matter.

If an AUSA asks the court to conduct an *ex parte, in camera* review of potential *Giglio* information, the AUSA should ensure that the AUSA's *ex parte, in camera* presentation to the court, and the potential *Giglio* information reviewed by the court are made part of the court record, under seal if appropriate, so that it can be reviewed by the appellate court if necessary. The AUSA should provide the *Giglio* officer and the law enforcement agency with any pleadings or documents that are filed with the court regarding a law enforcement witness's potential impeachment information, as well as with any court rulings on potential

⁵ In some cases, an agent may be unaware that there is a pending investigation of their alleged misconduct. In such cases, the *Giglio* officer and the AUSA should be careful to discuss the matter only with the agency, and not with the agent.

impeachment information so that the *Giglio* officer can handle the information in a consistent fashion in future cases.

4. Protective Orders. AUSAs should seek protective orders of sensitive potential impeachment information in appropriate cases to prohibit disclosures by defense counsel or the defendant to third parties not involved in the case.

5. Securely Maintaining Sensitive Agency Material. All potential impeachment information received from an agency pursuant to a *Giglio* request should be securely maintained and should not be shared with any person who does not have a need to know. The AUSA should keep a copy of all potential *Giglio* information received from a *Giglio* officer in the case file. *Giglio* material disclosed to the court or to defense should be clearly marked in the criminal case file, so it is clear what was disclosed to the court. Because *Giglio* information is sensitive, *Giglio* information in a criminal case file should be kept in a sealed envelope when it is not in use. Consult a *Giglio* officer for more details on proper storage and security of *Giglio* information.

D. Witness Interviews

1. Interviews of Testifying Witnesses

Absent unusual circumstances such as potential serious threats to witness safety, national security, or an ongoing criminal investigation, AUSAs should produce reports of testifying witness interviews and witness statements to the defense prior to the hearing or trial. Interview reports of testifying witnesses should be produced sufficiently in advance of the witness's testimony to permit defense counsel to make effective use of the information. AUSAs have discretion to determine how far in advance of the testimony the reports will be disclosed based upon the particular circumstances of their case and any reciprocal discovery agreements they may reach with defense counsel.

Production of witness interview reports is required regardless of whether the reports qualify as statements as defined by the Jencks Act, contains *Brady* or *Giglio* information, or is discoverable under any other law, rule, or policy. Our policy requires earlier and broader production than is required by the Jencks Act, the local rules or the court's standing discovery order.⁶

⁶ Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 26.2 and the Jencks Act do not require disclosure of witness statements until after the witness has testified on direct examination in a hearing or trial.

Deviation from the policy of production of reports of witness interviews requires supervisory approval.

a. Jencks Act/Rule 26.2

Although this policy requires broad and early production of reports of witness interviews, AUSAs should nonetheless be familiar with the law's requirements and be prepared to object to the improper use or treatment of such reports as "witness statements" to the extent that they do not qualify as statements under the Jencks Act. Be careful not to characterize a witness interview as a Jencks Act statement in discovery letters or court pleadings if the interview does not fit the Jencks Act definition of a witness statement.

The Jencks Act defines "witness statements" as ... "(1) a written statement made by [a] witness and signed or otherwise adopted or approved by him; (2) a stenographic, mechanical, electrical, or other recording, or a transcription thereof, which is a substantially verbatim recital of an oral statement made by [the] witness and recorded contemporaneously with the making of such oral statement; or (3) a statement, however taken or recorded, or a transcription thereof, if any, made by [a] witness to a grand jury." 18 U.S.C. § 3500 (e). DEA-6's, FBI 302's, etc, that are not substantially verbatim and that have not been reviewed and adopted by the witness are not Jencks material and are not required by law to be produced as such. *U.S. v. Jordan*, 316 F.3d 1215 (11th Cir. 2003); *United States v. Gates*, 557 F.2d 1086, 1089 (5th Cir. 1977). If a witness during trial prep reads and ratifies his/her 302, it is transformed into Jencks material.

b. *Brady* and *Giglio* in Interviews of Testifying Witnesses

This policy requires production of testifying witness interview reports regardless of whether they contain *Brady* or *Giglio*. Part of the rationale for early production is that *Brady* and *Giglio* is not always readily identifiable, especially when the defense is not readily apparent. Furthermore, sometimes it is only the cumulative effect that renders the information relevant in the context of *Brady* or *Giglio*.

Because AUSAs are sometimes required by the court to respond to defense requests that are specific to *Brady* and *Giglio*, AUSAs should review witness interviews for potential *Brady* or *Giglio*. A witness interview may contain favorable information if it contains information that the witness will receive a benefit from cooperating, that indicates the witness has given materially conflicting information or information that materially conflicts with another witness statement, failed to tell the whole truth from the beginning, or failed to advise the interviewing agent of certain facts during an interview.

AUSAs should be particularly sensitive to the potential for inconsistent statements if the same potential witness has been interviewed repeatedly. Some cooperating witnesses may not tell all they know the first time they are interviewed. If a witness initially denies or minimizes his knowledge of or involvement in criminal activity, and thereafter provides information that is materially broader or different, the fact that the witness provided materially different information should be memorialized, even if the variance occurs within the same interview, and should be provided to the defense as *Giglio* information.

Memorializing Favorable Information and the Duty to Disclose. The duty to disclose to the defendant the substance of what a witness has said during interviews, debriefings, or informal discussions cannot be avoided by failing to memorialize these events. If any such events occur that are not memorialized in an interview report, the AUSA should determine what the witness said during the session and disclose the content of the witness' statements to the defense. AUSAs should emphasize to agents the importance of memorializing all impeaching information.

c. *Brady and Giglio* in Agent Notes

Although it is not necessary to produce an agent's handwritten notes as part of Rule 16 discovery or the Jencks Act, it is necessary to preserve them in the event that the accuracy of the related formal report become an issue.

It is not necessary for AUSAs to review agent notes related to each potential witness interview. However, AUSAs should review the agent's notes of critical interviews, including any interview of a defendant, and the notes relating to any report of interview. If the notes contain favorable information that is not memorialized in a formal report or any information that is materially inconsistent with the formal report, the notes or the information should be produced. Note that Rule 16(a)(1)(B)(ii) requires production of a written record, e.g. notes, of relevant statements that the defendant made before or after arrest to a person that the defendant knew was a government agent.

d. The Duty to Disclose Material Inconsistencies Learned During Pre-trial Witness Interviews.

AUSAs should disclose information learned during pre-trial witness preparation that is materially inconsistent with information provided by the same or a different government witness. All new information learned during a pre-trial preparation session is not necessarily impeachment information. New information that qualifies as impeachment information may be disclosed through a report of the interview prepared by the agent, or through a letter from the AUSA to the defense. Regardless, the AUSA and the agent should reach a clear understanding on who

will memorialize the information, and the AUSA should ensure that the inconsistency is disclosed to the defense in a timely manner.

The duty to disclose to the defendant the substance of what a witness has said during a pre-trial preparation session cannot be avoided by failing to memorialize it.

2. Interviews of Non-Testifying Individuals

Although reports of interviews of non-testifying individuals should be reviewed, AUSAs are not required to produce interview reports of non-testifying individuals unless the reports contain exculpatory information or information inconsistent with or otherwise impeaching of a testifying witness or the government's theory of the case.

3. Supervisory Approval Required to Deviate from Policy

If an AUSA believes it is appropriate to deviate from this policy, the AUSA should seek supervisory approval.

E. Discoverability of Prosecutor's Notes

A prosecutor's notes of witness interviews are usually protected from discovery by privilege rules and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 16(a)(2). AUSAs should be mindful, however, that notes that contain substantially verbatim quotes of what a witness said during an interview (potential Jencks Act), or favorable information (*Brady/Giglio*), may contain information that is discoverable. If the discoverable information in the AUSA's notes is contained in other materials provided to the defense (e.g., 302s, agent's notes, letter to defense), it will often suffice to provide the other materials to the defense. It is possible, however, that if the exact nature of the information contained in the notes becomes an issue in the case, the court may review the notes *in camera*.⁷ AUSAs should avoid having substantive interaction with witnesses without an agent or other person present who can serve as a witness to the exchange. If an issue arises in a case regarding the contents or discoverability of a prosecutor's notes, consult with a supervisor.

⁷ See *United States v. Jones*, 620 F. Supp.2d 113 (D. Mass. 2009); *United States v. Jones*, 2010 WL 565478 (D. Mass. February 19, 2010); *United States v. Livingstone*, 576 F.3d 881 (8th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reid*, 300 Fed.Appx. 50 (2d Cir. 2008); *United States v. Campos*, 20 F.3d 1171 (5th Cir. 1994) (unpublished).

F. Similar Act Evidence: Federal Rules of Evidence 404(b) and 413-414

Because early production of 404(b) and 413 evidence may facilitate the early resolution of a case, AUSAs should consider whether providing early 404(b) evidence to the defense will help resolve the case. In any event, AUSAs shall produce 404(b) and 413 evidence no later than the court's standing discovery order requires.

G. Open File Discovery

AUSAs should never agree to "Open File Discovery", even if it is going to be provided. By agreeing to open file, we assume obligations beyond Rule 16, Jencks, and the Constitution that could subject us to sanctions, even though we have met our legal obligations of disclosure.

III. Who is Part of the Prosecution Team: Gathering and Reviewing Potentially Discoverable Information

A. Prosecution Team

When gathering discoverable information, AUSAs should collect from the members of the prosecution team all information that is required to be produced by Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure Rules 12 and 16; the *Jencks Act* and Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 26.2; FRE 404(b) and 413-14; and *Brady* and *Giglio*. In USAM 9-5.001, "prosecution team" is defined as including "federal, state, and local law enforcement officers and other government officials participating in the investigation and prosecution of the criminal case against the defendant." The AUSA needs to know which agencies have played a role in the investigation and make all reasonable inquiries to ascertain what pertinent case information exists. When identifying members of the prosecution team, AUSAs should err on the side of inclusiveness, in accordance with DOJ guidance.

In complex cases involving task forces, multi-district investigations, parallel proceedings, or other non-criminal investigative or regulatory agencies, AUSAs should examine the relationship of all entities to determine "whether the relationship with the other agency is close enough to make it part of the prosecution team for discovery purposes." See [DAG Ogden's Criminal Discovery Guidance](#) for factors that may aid in determining whether an entity should be considered part of the prosecution team.

B. Obligation of AUSA to Review Potentially Discoverable Information

When practical, AUSAs should make every effort to personally review all discoverable information before it is produced, even if the information is gathered and organized by others working on the case including legal assistants, paralegals, agents, analysts, or other law enforcement personnel. In cases involving voluminous documents

or computerized information, personal review by the AUSA may be impossible. In such instances, the AUSA is advised to meet with those who will be assisting in gathering discovery to develop a discovery gathering plan and should thereafter oversee the gathering and production of discovery to ensure that all discoverable information is identified and produced, or made available to the defense for inspection and copying. Ultimate responsibility for the production of all discoverable information lies with the AUSA(s) assigned to the case.

IV. Potential Sources of Discoverable Information

The AUSA should seek out discoverable information from the prosecution team. The gathering process should include a review of the following potential sources of discoverable information. While the AUSA is the responsible person, a review of the data referred to below may by necessity be delegated to the case agent or others assisting in the prosecution.

A. Investigative Agency's Files. All substantive case-related information in the possession of an agent who is part of the investigative team should be reviewed by the AUSA to determine whether it should be disclosed as part of discovery. The search for information should not be limited to formal investigative reports such as FBI 302's, DEA-6's, IRS MOI's, etc. The investigative agency may also have substantive case-related information in other formats or locations that an agent may not consider to be part of the "investigative" file, such as electronic communications (EC's), searchable electronic databases, inserts, emails, or other forms of electronic communications. It may not be necessary to disclose the information in its original format, but AUSAs should review the information in its original format, whenever possible.

B. Confidential Informant (CI)/Witness (CW)/Human Source (CHS) Files. These files will likely contain *Giglio* information which should be disclosed to the defense or to the court for a ruling on whether it should be disclosed to the defense. AUSAs should make arrangements with the investigative agency possessing the file(s) to review the file(s) personally, whenever possible. If the file is located out of the district, AUSAs may consider asking an AUSA in the district where the file is located for assistance in reviewing the file.

C. Evidence and Information Gathered During the Investigation. AUSAs should review all evidence and information gathered during the course of the investigation, including, but not limited to, information and evidence gathered via search warrant, subpoena (grand jury, administrative, inspector general, etc), Title III wiretaps, consensual /monitorings, surveillance, and witness interviews. If the volume of evidence makes it impractical for the AUSA to review all the evidence, this obligation may be satisfied by making the evidence available to the defense for inspection and copying.

D. Documents or Evidence Gathered by Civil Attorneys and/or Regulatory Agencies in Parallel Civil Investigations. If civil attorneys and/or regulatory agencies

involved in parallel civil investigations are deemed to be part of the prosecution team, AUSAs should also gather and review any and all information and evidence from them that could be discoverable using the criteria set forth in [DAG Ogden's Criminal Discovery Guidance](#).

E. Substantive Case-Related Communications (emails, tweets, text messages, memoranda, notes). Substantive case-related communications should be reviewed and disclosed, if the material contained therein would be disclosed under the provisions of this discovery policy.

F. Personnel and Disciplinary Files that May Contain Potential *Brady* or *Giglio* Information Relating to Law Enforcement Witnesses. AUSAs should determine whether each potential law enforcement witness has on or off duty instances of misconduct, including pending investigations, that may qualify as potential impeachment or exculpatory information. See discussion in section II C, above.

G. Handwritten Notes of Agents. AUSAs should review the agent's notes of critical interviews, which would include any interview of a defendant, and the notes relating to any report of interview the accuracy of which the defense has questioned. See also II D 1 c, above.

V. Manner of Production and Record-Keeping

A. Manner of Production

1. Documents: AUSAs should maintain a record of discovery provided to or made available for review by the defense. Generally, all documentary evidence should be bates numbered. Whenever possible, discoverable documents should be scanned and produced electronically in a format that allows the documents to be searched by a word or name. Disks containing electronic data should be well-labeled so that they can readily be identified. If the discoverable documents in a case are too voluminous to be scanned, the documents should be made available to the defense for inspection and copying, and a record should be made of when the documents were made available and when the defense reviewed the documents.

2. Non-documentary evidence should be made available to the defense for inspection and photographing.

3. Video and Audio Recorded Conversations should be duplicated and produced to the defense.

B. Recording-Keeping

AUSAs should keep a written record in the criminal case file of all discovery produced to the defense and all evidence made available for inspection and copying. When discovery is provided or made available by an AUSA, the AUSA should use a discovery production letter to memorialize in detail the discovery that was provided or the items or material that was made available for inspection or copying. All production letters should be maintained in the criminal case file.

C. Privacy Protection: Redacting Documents

All personal identifiers should be redacted in whole or in part from discovery, including, but not limited to, names of minors, dates of birth, social security numbers, taxpayer identification numbers, home street addresses, telephone numbers, Medicare or Medicaid ID numbers, financial account numbers, or any other identifier which may improperly disclose private or sensitive information. Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 49.1, which contains direction for redacting documents filed with the court, should also be used as a starting point for the redaction of documents that will be produced in discovery.

VI. Cases Involving National Security

Cases involving national security, including terrorism, espionage, counterintelligence, and export enforcement, can present unique and difficult criminal discovery issues. The Department of Justice has developed special guidance for those cases, which is contained in Acting Deputy Attorney General Gary G. Grindler's September 29, 2010 memorandum, "Policy and Procedures Regarding the Government's Duty to Search for Discoverable Information in the Possession of the Intelligence Community or Military in Criminal Investigations." Prosecutors should consult that memorandum and their supervisors regarding discovery obligations relating to classified or other sensitive national security information. As a general rule, in those cases where the prosecutor, after conferring with other members of the prosecution team, has a specific reason to believe that one or more elements of the Intelligence Community (IC) possess discoverable material, he or she should consult NSD regarding whether to request a prudential search of the pertinent IC element(s). All prudential search requests and other discovery requests of the IC must be coordinated through NSD.

Although discovery issues relating to classified information are most likely to arise in national security cases, they may also arise in a variety of other criminal cases, including narcotics cases, human trafficking cases, money laundering cases, and organized crime cases. In particular, it is important to determining whether the prosecutor, or another member of the prosecution team, has specific reason to believe that one or more elements of the IC possess discoverable material in the following kinds of criminal cases.

- Those targeting corrupt or fraudulent practices by middle or upper officials of a foreign government;
- Those involving alleged violations of the Arms Export Control Act or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act;
- Those involving trading with the enemy, international terrorism, or significant international narcotics trafficking, especially if they involve foreign government or military personnel;
- Other significant cases involving international suspects and targets; and
- Cases in which one or more targets are, or have been previously been, associated with an intelligence agency.

For these cases, or for any other case in which the prosecutors, case agents, or supervisors making actual decisions on an investigation or case have a specific reason to believe that an element of the IC possesses discoverable material, the prosecutor should consult with NDS regarding whether to make through NSD a request that pertinent IC element conduct a prudential search. If neither the prosecutor, nor any other member of the prosecution team, has a reason to believe that an element of the IC possesses discoverable material, then a prudential search generally is not necessary.