II-A-7 **PRE-TRIAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**
DISCLOSURE ISSUES
Effective Date: August 22, 2005
Last Revised: October 14, 2010

Rule 16, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, and Jenks Act Material "Open Discovery" Policy

Compliance with discovery obligations is important for a number of reasons. First and foremost, such compliance will facilitate a fair and just result in every case, which is the Department's singular goal in pursuing a criminal prosecution. That is why this Office generally follows an "open discovery" policy with respect to most straight- forward or non-complex cases. Pursuant to this policy, the defense is given access to the materials in the government's entire case-file, **excluding grand jury, tax, and work product information, or information which may result in harm to a victim or witness, as more fully discussed below**. A form discovery compliance letter to be used in such cases can be found in the Public/Criminal/Criminal Forms directory. As a general rule, "open discovery" should include, but not be limited to the disclosure of all materials likely to be disclosed to the Probation Department for the preparation of a presentence investigation report. See Section II-C-1 of this Manual.

There are cases, however, where a more restrictive discovery process is appropriate. Each Criminal Division AUSA is expected to examine the facts and circumstances of each case carefully to determine whether an "open discovery" process is appropriate for that case. Situations which may call for a more restrictive disclosure policy include, but are not limited to:

(1) Circumstances where a complete "open discovery" would endanger a witness or victim or otherwise compromise the integrity of the case;

(2) Circumstances where an ongoing investigation could be jeopardized.

AUSAs wanting to adopt a more restrictive discovery process in a particular case should notify the defense of that fact and use the discovery checklist letter which can be found in the Public/Criminal/Criminal Forms directory.

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 related 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 determine 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:

(1) Those targeting corrupt or fraudulent practices by middle or upper officials of a foreign government;

(2) Those involving alleged violations of the Arms Export Control Act or the International Emergency Economic Powers Act;

(3) those involving trading with the enemy, international terrorism, or significant international narcotics trafficking, especially if they involve foreign government or military personnel;

(4) Other significant cases involving international suspects and targets; and

(5) Cases in which one or more targets are, or have 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 NSD regarding whether to make through NSD a request that the 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.

The decision regarding whether an "open discovery" or more restrictive disclosure process is left to the sound discretion of experienced Criminal Division AUSAs. AUSAs who have less than two years experience should consult with their supervisor or mentor AUSA.

In January of 2010, the Department issued guidance for prosecutors regarding criminal discovery, which is set forth in significant part below. That guidance should be referred to and utilized as the office policy for criminal discovery. If an AUSA has a unique situation that he or she believes requires a deviation from that guidance, the AUSA should consult with and obtain the approval of a supervisor to deviate from the Department's guidance.

SUBJECT: Guidance for Prosecutors Regarding Criminal Discovery

The discovery obligations of federal prosecutors are generally established by Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 16 and 26.2, 18 U.S.C. §3500 (the Jencks Act), *Brady v. Maryland,* 373 U.S. 83 (1963), and *Giglio v. United States,* 405 U.S. 150 (1972). In addition, the United States Attorney's Manual describes the Department's policy for disclosure of exculpatory and impeachment information. *See* USAM §9-5.001. In order to meet discovery obligations in a given case, Federal prosecutors must be familiar with these authorities and with the judicial interpretations and local rules that discuss or address the application of these authorities to particular facts. In addition, it is important for prosecutors to consider thoroughly how to meet their discovery obligations in each case. Toward that end, the Department has adopted the guidance for prosecutors regarding criminal discovery set forth below. **The guidance is intended to establish a methodical approach to consideration of discovery obligations that prosecutors should follow in every case** to avoid lapses that can result in consequences adverse to the Department's pursuit of justice. The guidance is subject to legal precedent, court orders, and local rules. It provides prospective guidance only and is not intended to have the force of law or to create or confer any rights, privileges, or benefits. *See United States v. Caceres,* 440 U.S. 741 (1979).

By following the steps described below and being familiar with laws and policies regarding discovery obligations, prosecutors are more likely to meet all legal requirements, to make considered decisions about disclosures in a particular case, and to achieve a just result in every case. **Prosecutors are reminded to consult with the designated criminal discovery coordinator in their office when they have questions about the scope of their discovery obligations. Rules of Professional Conduct in most jurisdictions also impose ethical obligations on prosecutors regarding discovery in criminal cases. Prosecutors are also reminded to contact the Professional Responsibility Advisory Office when they have questions about those or any other ethical responsibilities.**

Step I: Gathering and Reviewing Discoverable Information[3]

A. Where to look-The Prosecution Team

Department policy states:

> It is the obligation of federal prosecutors, in preparing for trial, to seek all exculpatory and impeachment information from all members of the prosecution team. Members of the prosecution team include federal, state, and local law enforcement officers and other government officials participating in the investigation and prosecution of the criminal case against the defendant.

---

[3]For the purposes of this memorandum, "discovery" or "discoverable information" includes information required to be disclosed by Fed.R.Crim.P. 16 and 26.2, the jencks Act, *Brady*, and *Giglio*, and additional information disclosable pursuant to USAM §9-5001.

USAM §9-5.001. This search duty also extends to information prosecutors are required to disclose under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 16 and 26.2 and the Jencks Act.

In most cases, "the prosecution team" will include the agents and law enforcement officers within the relevant district working on the case. In multi-district investigations, investigations that include both Assistant United States Attorneys and prosecutors from a Department litigating component or other United States Attorney's Office (USAO), and parallel criminal and civil proceedings, this definition will necessarily be adjusted to fit the circumstances. In addition, in complex cases that involve parallel proceedings with regulatory agencies (SEC, FDIC, EPA, etc.), or other non-criminal investigative or intelligence agencies, the prosecutor should consider whether the relationship with the other agency is close enough to make it part of the prosecution team for discovery purposes.

Some factors to be considered in determining whether to review potentially discoverable information from another federal agency include:

- Whether the prosecutor and the agency conducted a joint investigation or shared resources related to investigating the case;
- Whether the agency played an active role in the prosecution, including conducting arrests or searches, interviewing witnesses, developing prosecutorial strategy, participating in targeting discussions, or otherwise acting as part of the prosecution team;
- Whether the prosecutor knows of and has access to discoverable information held by the agency;
- Whether the prosecutor has obtained other information and/or evidence from the agency;
- The degree to which information gathered by the prosecutor has been shared with the agency;
- Whether a member of an agency has been made a Special Assistant United States Attorney;
- The degree to which decisions have been made jointly regarding civil, criminal, or administrative charges; and
- The degree to which the interest's of the parties in parallel proceedings diverge such that information gathered by one party is not relevant to the other party.

Many cases arise out of investigations conducted by multi-agency task forces or otherwise involving state law enforcement agencies. In such cases, prosecutors should consider (1) whether state or local agents are working on behalf of the prosecutor or are under the prosecutor's control; (2) the extent to which state and federal governments are part of a team, are participating in a joint investigation, or are sharing resources; and (3) whether the prosecutor has ready access to the evidence. Courts will generally evaluate the role of a state or local law enforcement agency on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, prosecutors should make sure they understand the law in their circuit and their office's practice regarding discovery in cases in which a state or local agency participated in the investigation or on a task force that conducted the investigation.

Prosecutors arc encouraged to err on the side of inclusiveness when identifying the members of the prosecution team for discovery purposes. Carefully considered efforts to locate discoverable

information are more likely to avoid future litigation over *Brady* and *Giglio* issues and avoid surprises at trial.

Although the considerations set forth above generally apply in the context of national security investigations and prosecutions, special complexities arise in that context. Accordingly, the Department expects to issue additional guidance for such cases. Prosecutors should begin considering potential discovery obligations early in an investigation that has national security implications and should also carefully evaluate their discovery obligations prior to filing charges. This evaluation should consider circuit and district precedent and include consultation with national security experts in their own offices and in the National Security Division.

B. What to Review

To ensure that all discovery is disclosed on a timely basis, generally all potentially discoverable material within the custody or control of the prosecution team should be reviewed.[4] The review process should cover the following areas:

1. The Investigative Agency's Files: With respect to Department of Justice law enforcement agencies, with limited exceptions,[5] the prosecutor should be granted access to the substantive case file and any other file or document the prosecutor has reason to believe may contain discoverable information related to the matter being prosecuted.[6] Therefore, the prosecutor can personally review the file or documents or may choose to request production of potentially discoverable materials from the case agents. With respect to outside agencies, the prosecutor should request access to files and/or production of all potentially discoverable material. The investigative agency's entire investigative file, including documents such as FBI Electronic Communications (ECs), inserts, emails, etc. should be reviewed for discoverable information. If such information is contained in a document that the agency deems to be an "internal" document such as an email, an insert, an administrative document, or an EC, it may not be necessary to produce the internal document, but it will be necessary to produce all of the discoverable information contained in it. Prosecutors should also discuss with the investigative agency whether files from other investigations or non-investigative files such as confidential source files might contain discoverable information. Those additional files or relevant portions thereof should also be reviewed as necessary.

2. Confidential Informant (CI)/Witness (CW)/Human Source (CHS)/Source (CS) Files:

---

[4]How to conduct the review is discussed below.

[5]Exceptions to a prosecutor's access to Department law enforcement agencies' files are documented in agency policy, and may include, for example, access to a non-testifying source's files.

[6]Nothing in this guidance alters the Department's Policy Regarding the Disclosure to Prosecutors of Potential Impeachment Information Concerning Law Enforcement Agency Witnesses contained in USAM §9-5.100.

The credibility of cooperating witnesses or informants will always be at issue if they testify during a trial. Therefore, prosecutors are entitled to access to the agency file for each testifying CI, CW, CHS, or CS. Those files should be reviewed for discoverable information and copies made of relevant portions for discovery purposes. The entire informant/source file, not just the portion relating to the current case, including all proffer, immunity and other agreements, validation assessments, payment information, and other potential witness impeachment information should be included within this review.

If a prosecutor believes that the circumstances of the case warrant review of a non-testifying source's file, the prosecutor should follow the agency's procedures for requesting the review of such a file.

Prosecutors should take steps to protect the non-discoverable, sensitive information found within a CI, CW, CHS, or CS file. Further, prosecutors should consider whether discovery obligations arising from the review of CI, CW, CHS, and CS files may be fully discharged while better protecting government or witness interests such as security or privacy via a summary letter to defense counsel rather than producing the record in its entirety.

Prosecutors must always be mindful of security issues that may arise with respect to disclosures from confidential source files. Prior to disclosure, prosecutors should consult with the investigative agency to evaluate any such risks and to develop a strategy for addressing those risks or minimizing them as much as possible, consistent with discovery obligations.

3. Evidence and Information Gathered During the Investigation: Generally, all evidence and information gathered during the investigation should be reviewed, including anything obtained during searches or via subpoenas, etc. As discussed more fully below in Step 2, in cases involving a large volume of potentially discoverable information, prosecutors may discharge their disclosure obligations by choosing to make the voluminous information available to the defense.

4. Documents or Evidence Gathered by Civil Attorneys and/or Regulatory Agency in Parallel Civil Investigations: If a prosecutor has determined that a regulatory agency such as the SEC is a member of the prosecution team for purposes of defining discovery obligations, that agency's files should be reviewed. Of course, if a regulatory agency is not part of the prosecution team but is conducting an administrative investigation or proceeding involving the same subject matter as a criminal investigation, prosecutors may very well want to ensure that those files are reviewed not only to locate discoverable information but to locate inculpatory information that may advance the criminal case. Where there is an ongoing parallel civil proceeding in which Department civil attorneys are participating, such as a *qui tam* case, the civil case files should also be reviewed.

5. Substantive Case-Related Communications: "Substantive" case-related communications may contain discoverable information. Those communications that contain discoverable information should be maintained in the case file or otherwise preserved in a manner that associates them with the case or investigation. "Substantive" case-related communications are most likely to occur (1) among prosecutors and/or agents, (2) between prosecutors and/or agents and witnesses and/or

victims, and (3) between victim-witness coordinators and witnesses and/or victims. Such communications may be memorialized in emails, memoranda, or notes.

"Substantive" communications include factual reports about investigative activity, factual discussions of the relative merits of evidence, factual information obtained during interviews or interactions with witnesses/victims, and factual issues relating to credibility. Communications involving case impressions or investigative or prosecutive strategies without more would not ordinarily be considered discoverable, but substantive case-related communications should be reviewed carefully to determine whether all or part of a communication (or the information contained therein) should be disclosed.

Prosecutors should also remember that with few exceptions *(see, e.g.,* Fed.R.Crim.P. 16(a)(1)(B)(ii)), the format of the information does not determine whether it is discoverable. For example, material exculpatory information that the prosecutor receives during a conversation with an agent or a witness is no less discoverable than if that same information were contained in an email. When the discoverable information contained in an email or other communication is fully memorialized elsewhere, such as in a report of interview or other document(s), then the disclosure of the report of interview or other document(s) will ordinarily satisfy the disclosure obligation.

6. Potential *Giglio* Information Relating to Law Enforcement Witnesses: Prosecutors should have candid conversations with the federal agents with whom they work regarding any potential *Giglio* issues, and they should follow the procedure established in USAM §9-5.100 whenever necessary before calling the law enforcement employee as a witness. Prosecutors should be familiar with circuit and district court precedent and local practice regarding obtaining *Giglio* information from state and local law enforcement officers.

7. Potential *Giglio* Information Relating to Non-Law Enforcement Witnesses and Fed.R.Evid. 806 Declarants: All potential *Giglio* information known by or in the possession of the prosecution team relating to non-law enforcement witnesses should be gathered and reviewed. That information includes, but is not limited to:

- Prior inconsistent statements (possibly including inconsistent attorney proffers, *see United States v. Triumph Capital Group,* 544 F.3d 149 (2d Cir. 2008))
- Statements or reports reflecting witness statement variations (see below)
- Benefits provided to witnesses including:
  - Dropped or reduced charges
  - Immunity
  - Expectations of downward departures or motions for reduction of sentence
  - Assistance in a state or local criminal proceeding
  - Considerations regarding forfeiture of assets
  - Stays of deportation or other immigration status considerations
  - S-Visas
  - Monetary benefits
  - Non-prosecution agreements

- Letters to other law enforcement officials *(e.g.* stale prosecutors, parole boards) setting forth the extent of a witness's assistance or making substantive recommendations on the witness's behalf
- Relocation assistance
- Consideration or benefits to culpable or at risk third-parties

• Other known conditions that could affect the witness's bias such as:
- Animosity toward defendant
- Animosity toward a group of which the defendant is a member or with which the defendant is affiliated
- Relationship with victim
- Known but uncharged criminal conduct (that may provide an incentive to curry favor with a prosecutor)

• Prior acts under Fed.R.Evid. 608
• Prior convictions under Fed.R.Evid. 609
• Known substance abuse or mental health issues or other issues that could affect the witness's ability to perceive and recall events

8. Information Obtained in Witness Interviews: Although not required by law, generally speaking, witness interviews[7] should be memorialized by the agent[8]. Agent and prosecutor notes and original recordings should be preserved, and prosecutors should confirm with agents that substantive interviews should be memorialized. When a prosecutor participates in an interview with an investigative agent, the prosecutor and agent should discuss note-taking responsibilities and memorialization before the interview begins (unless the prosecutor and the agent have established an understanding through prior course of dealing). Whenever possible, prosecutors should not conduct an interview without an agent present to avoid the risk of making themselves a witness to a statement and being disqualified from handling the case if the statement becomes an issue. If exigent circumstances make it impossible to secure the presence of an agent during an interview, prosecutors should try to have another office employee present. Interview memoranda of witnesses expected to testify, and of individuals who provided relevant information but are not expected to testify, should be reviewed.

a. Witness Statement Variations and the Duty to Disclose: Some witnesses' statements will vary during the course of an interview or investigation. For example, they may initially deny involvement in criminal activity, and the information they provide may broaden or change considerably over the course of time, especially if there are a series of debriefings that

---

[7]"Interview" as used herein refers to a formal question and answer session with a potential witness conducted for the purpose of obtaining information pertinent to a matter or case. It docs not include conversations with a potential witness for the purpose of scheduling or attending to other ministerial matters. Potential witnesses may provide substantive information outside of a formal interview, however. Substantive, case-related communications are addressed above.

[8]In those instances in which an interview was audio or video recorded, further memorialization will generally not be necessary.

occur over several days or weeks. Material variances in a witness's statements should be memorialized, even if they are within the same interview, and they should be provided to the defense as *Giglio* information.

b. Trial Preparation Meetings with Witnesses: Trial preparation meetings with witnesses generally need not be memorialized. However, prosecutors should be particularly attuned to new or inconsistent information disclosed by the witness during a pre-trial witness preparation session. New information that is exculpatory or impeachment information should be disclosed consistent with the provisions of USAM §9-5.001 even if the information is first disclosed in a witness preparation session. Similarly, if the new information represents a variance from the witness's prior statements, prosecutors should consider whether memorialization and disclosure is necessary consistent with the provisions of subparagraph (a) above.

c. Agent Notes: Agent notes should be reviewed if there is a reason to believe that the notes are materially different from the memorandum, if a written memorandum was not prepared, if the precise words used by the witness are significant, or if the witness disputes the agent's account of the interview. Prosecutors should pay particular attention to agent notes generated during an interview of the defendant or an individual whose statement may be attributed to a corporate defendant. Such notes may contain information that must be disclosed pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P. 16(a)(1)(A)-(C) or may themselves be discoverable under Fed.R.Crim.P. 16(a)(1)(B). *See, e.g., United Slates v. Clark,* 385 F.3d 609, 619-20 (6th Cir. 2004) and *United Slates v. Vallee,* 380 F.Supp.2d 11, 12-14 (D. Mass. 2005).

Step 2: Conducting the Review

Having gathered the information described above, prosecutors must ensure that the material is reviewed to identify discoverable information. It would be preferable if prosecutors could review the information themselves in every case, but such review is not always feasible or necessary. The prosecutor is ultimately responsible for compliance with discovery obligations. Accordingly, the prosecutor should develop a process for review of pertinent information to ensure that discoverable information is identified. Because the responsibility for compliance with discovery obligations rests with the prosecutor, the prosecutor's decision about how to conduct this review is controlling. This process may involve agents, paralegals, agency counsel, and computerized searches. Although prosecutors may delegate the process and set forth criteria for identifying *potentially* discoverable information, prosecutors should not delegate the disclosure determination itself. In cases involving voluminous evidence obtained from third parties, prosecutors should consider providing defense access to the voluminous documents to avoid the possibility that a well-intentioned review process nonetheless fails to identify material discoverable evidence. Such broad disclosure may not be feasible in national security cases involving classified information.

Step 3: Making the Disclosures

The Department's disclosure obligations are generally set forth in Fed.R.Crim.P. 16 and 26.2, 18 U.S.C. §3500 (the Jencks Act), *Brady,* and *Giglio* (collectively referred to herein as "discovery

obligations"). Prosecutors must familiarize themselves with each of the provisions and controlling case law that interprets these provisions. In addition, prosecutors should be aware that Section 9-5.001 details the Department's policy regarding the disclosure of exculpatory and impeachment information and provides for broader disclosures than required by *Brady* and *Giglio*. Prosecutors are also encouraged to provide discovery broader and more comprehensive than the discovery obligations. If a prosecutor chooses this course, the defense should be advised that the prosecutor is electing to produce discovery beyond what is required under the circumstances of the case but is not committing to any discovery obligation beyond the discovery obligations set forth above.

A. Considerations Regarding the Scope and Timing of the Disclosures: Providing broad and early discovery often promotes the truth-seeking mission of the Department and fosters a speedy resolution of many cases. It also provides a margin of error in case the prosecutor's good faith determination of the scope of appropriate discovery is in error. Prosecutors are encouraged to provide broad and early discovery consistent with any countervailing considerations. But when considering providing discovery beyond that required by the discovery obligations or providing discovery sooner than required, prosecutors should always consider any appropriate countervailing concerns in the particular case, including, but not limited to: protecting victims and witnesses from harassment or intimidation; protecting the privacy interests of witnesses; protecting privileged information; protecting the integrity of ongoing investigations; protecting the trial from efforts at obstruction: protecting national security interests; investigative agency concerns; enhancing the likelihood of receiving reciprocal discovery by defendants; any applicable legal or evidentiary privileges; and other strategic considerations that enhance the likelihood of achieving a just result in a particular case. In most jurisdictions, reports of interview (ROIs) of testifying witnesses are not considered Jencks material unless the report reflects the statement of the witness substantially verbatim or the witness has adopted it. The Working Group determined that practices differ among the USAOs and the components regarding disclosure of ROIs of testifying witnesses. Prosecutors should be familiar with and comply with the practice of their offices.

Prosecutors should never describe the discovery being provided as "open file." Even if the prosecutor intends to provide expansive discovery, it is always possible that something will be inadvertently omitted from production and the prosecutor will then have unintentionally misrepresented the scope of materials provided. Furthermore, because the concept of the "file" is imprecise, such a representation exposes the prosecutor to broader disclosure requirements than intended or to sanction for failure to disclose documents, *e.g.* agent notes or internal memos, that the court may deem to have been part of the "file."

When the disclosure obligations are not clear or when the considerations above conflict with the discovery obligations, prosecutors may seek a protective order from the court addressing the scope, timing, and form of disclosures.

B. Timing: Exculpatory information, regardless of whether the information is memorialized, must be disclosed to the defendant reasonably promptly after discovery. Impeachment information, which depends on the prosecutor's decision on who is or may be called as a

government witness, will typically be disclosed at a reasonable time before trial to allow the trial to proceed efficiently. *See* USAM §9-5.001. Section 9-5.001 also notes, however, that witness security, national security, or other issues may require that disclosures of impeachment information be made at a time and in a manner consistent with the policy embodied in the Jencks Act. Prosecutors should be attentive to controlling law in their circuit and district governing disclosure obligations at various stages of litigation, such as pre-trial hearings, guilty pleas, and sentencing.

Prosecutors should consult the local discovery rules for the district in which a case has been indicted. Many districts have broad, automatic discovery rules that require Rule 16 materials to be produced without a request by the defendant and within a specified time frame, unless a court order has been entered delaying discovery, as is common in complex cases. Prosecutors must comply with these local rules, applicable case law, and any final court order regarding discovery. In the absence of guidance from such local rules or court orders, prosecutors should consider making Rule 16 materials available as soon as is reasonably practical but must make disclosure no later than a reasonable time before trial. In deciding when and in what format to provide discovery, prosecutors should always consider security concerns and the other factors set forth in subparagraph (A) above. Prosecutors should also ensure that they disclose Fed.R.Crim.P. 16(a)(1)(E) materials in a manner that triggers the reciprocal discovery obligations in Fed.R.Crim.P. 16(b)(1).

Discovery obligations are continuing, and prosecutors should always be alert to developments occurring up to and through trial of the case that may impact their discovery obligations and require disclosure of information that was previously not disclosed.

C. Form of Disclosure: There may be instances when it is not advisable to turn over discoverable information in its original form, such as when the disclosure would create security concerns or when such information is contained in attorney notes, internal agency documents, confidential source documents, Suspicious Activity Reports, etc. If discoverable information is not provided in its original form and is instead provided in a letter to defense counsel, including particular language, where pertinent, prosecutors should take great care to ensure that the full scope of pertinent information is provided to the defendant.

Step 4: Making a Record

One of the most important steps in the discovery process is keeping good records regarding disclosures. Prosecutors should make a record of when and how information is disclosed or otherwise made available. While discovery matters are often the subject of litigation in criminal cases, keeping a record of the disclosures confines the litigation to substantive matters and avoids time-consuming disputes about what was disclosed. These records can also be critical when responding to petitions for post-conviction relief, which are often filed long after the trial of the case. Keeping accurate records of the evidence disclosed is no less important than the other steps discussed above, and poor records can negate all of the work that went into taking the first three steps.

BRADY DISCLOSURES

Criminal Division AUSAs should strive to identify and disclose as early as possible any Brady matters that arise in their cases. An AUSA who has a question regarding a Brady issue should consult with his/her direct supervisor and the Giglio coordinator prior to any determination that a disclosure will not be made or will be delayed after being discovered by the AUSA.

GIGLIO PROCEDURES

A. Preface

On December 9, 1996, the Attorney General approved a Department of Justice Policy Regarding the Disclosure to Prosecutors of Potential Impeachment Information Concerning Law Enforcement Agency Witnesses. The policy applies to all Department of Justice Investigative Agencies including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration; Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the United States Marshals Service. The Department of Treasury has also agreed that the policy will apply to its investigative agencies including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (subsequently transferred to DOJ as part of the creation of the Department of Homeland Security), Internal Revenue Service, and the United States Secret Service (subsequently transferred to the Department of Homeland Security). The purpose of the policy is to ensure that prosecutors meet their obligations under *United States v. Giglio*, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), while protecting the legitimate privacy rights of Government employees. The Attorney General directed that each prosecuting office develop a plan to implement this policy.

B. Scope of Plan

This plan pertains to requests for potential impeachment information concerning Department of Justice and Department of the Treasury law enforcement agency personnel who are either witnesses or affiants (hereinafter referred to as "covered law enforcement agency witnesses or affiants"). It does not cover such information concerning witnesses or affiants from other law enforcement agencies or departments.

C. Point of Contact

Tom Leggans, the current Supervisor of the Benton Branch Office is designated as the Southern District of Illinois' Giglio Coordinator.

The Giglio Coordinator shall coordinate all requests to the covered law enforcement agencies to search for potential impeachment information concerning identified covered law enforcement agents who are potential witnesses or affiants in a specific case. The Giglio Coordinator shall also

provide information and advice to AUSAs and agency officials regarding relevant case law and practice regarding disclosure of impeachment information.

D. Initial Contact With Covered Law Enforcement Agent Witnesses or Affiants

Each AUSA should determine directly from each potential covered law enforcement agent witness or affiant whether there is any potential impeachment information. The law enforcement agencies covered by the Department of Justice Policy have informed their agents that they are obligated to provide prosecutors this information as early as possible in the investigation.

E. District Coordination of Requests to Covered Law Enforcement Agencies

Should it become necessary to request potential impeachment information from the covered law enforcement agency, because of court directive or because, in the judgement of the AUSA such request should be made, all such requests should be made through the Giglio Coordinator. The AUSA making the request shall prepare a brief memorandum which shall: (1) describe the nature of the investigation or case, including the names of the defendants or targets involved; (2) identify the name of the covered law enforcement agent witness or affiant; (3) indicate the role of the covered law enforcement agent witness or affiant in the investigation; and, (4) indicate the bases for the request. Such requests should be made as early as possible in order to allow the agency sufficient time to process the request.

F. Submission of Request to Agency Point of Contact

The Giglio Coordinator, after receiving the request and reviewing it shall, if appropriate, submit it to the covered law enforcement agency's point of contact . The covered agency shall be given an opportunity to express its views on whether certain information should be disclosed to the court or defense counsel.

G. Documents

Documents disclosed pursuant to this plan shall be kept by the case prosecutor in a secure location in a sealed envelope in the criminal file. Documents and records disclosed pursuant to this policy shall only be retained as long as necessary. At the conclusion of the case, including any appeal or post-sentencing motions, the prosecutor shall expeditiously return documents concerning allegations disclosed pursuant to this policy, to the Giglio Coordinator, who will send the documents to the Agency Official. However, the prosecutor may keep in the relevant criminal case file, materials such as motions, responses, legal memoranda, court orders, and internal office memoranda and correspondence.

When documents are disclosed to either the court or defense counsel pursuant to this policy, the Giglio Coordinator will provide to the Agency Official the potential impeachment information disclosed, along with any judicial rulings and related pleadings, for retention in the agency's system of records.

H. In Camera Review

When appropriate, the AUSA assigned to the case shall, after consultation with the Giglio Coordinator and the covered agency, seek *ex parte*, *in camera* review and decision by the court to determine whether the potential impeachment material must be disclosed to defense counsel.

I. Protective Orders

The AUSA assigned to the case or investigation shall, with the assistance of the Giglio Coordinator, when appropriate in a case where disclosure is made, seek a protective order from the court to limit the use and dissemination of potential impeachment information by defense counsel and others.

J. Unsubstantiated or Incredible Allegations

In regard to unsubstantiated allegations, allegation that are not credible, or allegations that have resulted in exoneration, care shall be taken to protect the confidentiality of such information and the privacy and reputation of agency employees. The Requesting Official shall insure that materials provided with such allegations are expeditiously returned to the agency at the conclusion of the case or investigation.

K. Use of Impeaching Information

Before an AUSA uses or relies upon any potential impeaching information, the AUSA will notify the Giglio Coordinator, so he can contact the relevant agency official to determine the status of the potential impeaching information, and upon receiving such additional information, update the criminal case file and AUSA assigned the case. No system of records will be maintained that can be accessed by the identity of the employee having potential impeachment information, including information disclosed to the defense, that was provided by an agency.

L. Notification to Agency

In any case where potential impeaching information has been provided by an agency, the Giglio Coordinator will promptly notify the relevant agency when that case or investigation ends in a judgment or declination.

M. Change of Employee Status

When notified by an agency that an employee with potential impeachment information involved in a case where the Giglio issue was resolved has retired, has been transferred to another judicial district, or has been reassigned to a position in which the employee will be neither an affiant nor a witness, the Giglio Coordinator shall cause to be removed any records or documents containing impeaching information in the case file.

Disclosure, Destruction, and Return of Tax Information

Section 6103 of the Internal Revenue Code governs disclosure of tax information. Disclosure by the government may be made only as specifically provided in Section 6103. Attached to this memorandum is an overview of Section 6103 which sets out in detail the operative provisions of the disclosure rules and the specific limitations involving disclosure. The overview should be read carefully and direct reference should be made to the statute before any disclosure is made. Note that Section 6103 applies only to information initially gathered by the Internal Revenue Service. Section 6103 does not apply if the tax information was obtained by a federal prosecutor from a source other than the Internal Revenue Service, such as returns obtained from tax preparers pursuant to grand jury subpoena. Such disclosures are then governed by Rule 6(e) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

In that regard, our office has designed grand jury log forms that have been distributed along with the document entitled "Control and Security of Grand Jury Material." The form has a box which is to be filled in and marked when *ex parte* materials are received from the IRS. There is also a box that should be filled out when tax materials are returned to the Service at the completion of the case.

Please remember that all *ex parte* applications must be signed by the United States Attorney before submission for a court order.

Conclusion

The USAO's policy does not and cannot answer every discovery question because those obligations are often fact specific. When in doubt, consult with your supervisor or the USAO's Discovery Coordinator and take advantage of the other resources available to you, including the Professional Responsibility Advisory Office (PRAO), and online resources available on the Department's intranet website. By evaluating discovery obligations pursuant to a methodical and thoughtful approach and taking advantage of available resources, prosecutors are more likely to meet their discovery obligations in every case and in so doing achieve a just and final result in every criminal prosecution.