UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW SUITE 1400 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004 (202) 662 8800

William W. Wilkins, Jr. Chairman Michael K. Block Stephen G. Breyer Helen G. Corrothers George E. MacKinnon Ilene H. Nagel Benjamin F. Baer (ex officio) Ronald L. Gainer (ex officio)



March 29, 1989

TO: All Commissioners

FROM: Denni's Murphy, Bank Robbery Working Group

SUBJECT: Bank Robbery Cases Sentenced under the Guidelines

This memorandum provides an analysis of all robbery cases sentenced under the guidelines that had been received by the Monitoring staff as of approximately February 15, 1989. I will first present summary statistics for key offender and offense characteristics for the entire sample of 146 cases. Second, a more detailed analysis of sentencing practices is presented for a subset of 94 cases that did not involve departures, career offenders, or 924(c) convictions. Third, I provide a complete listing of departures, including information on District, judge code, and the direction and magnitude of the departure. Finally, in response to questions raised at the Commission meeting of March 15, I analyze the extent to which a two-level reduction for Acceptance of Responsibility has been awarded in plea-bargain cases, where one or more counts of indictment were dropped.

I. Overview of Full Sample

The full set of 146 monitoring cases includes 13 dispositions by trial, 98 simple pleas where no counts of indictment were dropped, and 33 plea bargains with counts reduced. There are 17 instances of clear Guideline sentencing departures, and 13 cases where there was an unexplained discrepancy between the Guideline range given in the Presentence Report and the sentence indicated in the J&C. Thirteen offenders are classified as Career Offenders For three of these cases, the judge in the Presentence Report. disputed the accuracy of the classification and gave a straight Guideline sentence. Seven of t sentenced as career offenders. Seven of the remaining seven cases were The average Criminal History Category for all 146 offenders is just below Category III. Finally, the average Guideline sentence for the entire sample is 69.8 months.

Table I below provides information on sentencing and selected offender and offense characteristics.

Table I Summary Statistics for Selected Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Dev.	Median	Range
Sentence	69.8	68.0	48.0	6 - 507
Dollar Loss	\$9440.0	16256.2	\$3300.0	0 - \$98,141
Number of Robberies, Indictment	1.6	1.6	1.0	1 - 11
Number of Robberies, Conviction	1.4	1.0	1.0	0 - 7
Offender Age	31.8	9.9	30.0	19 - 65

II. Straight Sentencing

There are 94 cases in the sample that do not involve Career Offenders, departures, or convictions under 924(c). For these cases, the sentence ranges from 24 to 115 months, with a mean of 49.3.

In order to determine where judges are sentencing in the Guideline range for the relevant Offense Level and Criminal History Category, I calculated the midpoint of the indicated Guideline range for each case and then computed the average value of this midpoint variable. If judges, on average, have sentenced in the middle of the Guideline range, the overall average sentence would be close to the average of the midpoints of the various Guideline ranges. If judges have tended to sentence at the top or bottom of the indicated range, the average sentence for the sample would be correspondingly higher or lower.

The average figure for the midpoints of all Guideline sentencing ranges in the subsample of 94 cases is 49.03. Since the average sentence for this subsample is 49.3, it appears that there is no systematic tendency for judges to sentence toward the top or bottom of the Guideline range. This can also be seen by examining the percentage of times Judges sentenced at the top and bottom of the Guideline range. About 30 percent of the sentences are at the top; Approximately 26 percent are at the bottom of the indicated

range.

Table II provides additional information on sentencing patterns for the 94 cases broken down by trials, plea bargains with counts reduced, and simple pleas.

Table II
Sentencing by Type of Disposition*

Numbor	Mean	Standard	Median	Range
Mumer	Sentence	Dev.	Sentence	
3.0	49.3	20.3	46.0	24 - 115
21.0	48.8	15.1	48.0	30 - 87
70.0	48.4	21.3	40.5	24 - 115
	21.0	3.0 49.3 21.0 48.8	Sentence Dev. 3.0 49.3 20.3 21.0 48.8 15.1 70.0 48.4 21.3	Number Mean Sentence Dev. Sentence 3.0 49.3 20.3 46.0 21.0 48.8 15.1 48.0

*Sample does not include Career Offenders, departures, or convictions under Section 924(c).

III Departures

Table III provides detailed information on the 17 Guideline departures in the full sample of 146 cases. Three of the downward departures involve career offenders. In the last case listed, the judge departed upward to 192 months, stating that the offender had escaped Career Offender status due only to a fortuitous sentencing consolidation of prior violent felonies.

Table III Guideline Departures

Direction	District	Judge Code	Indicated Guideline Range	Sentence
Downward Upward Upward Upward Upward	Mid Ca N. Iowa Nevada Oregon S. Georgia S. Georgia W. Ark W. Ark S. NY Nevada W. NY W. KY W. Texas Mid Ill Nevada E. KY Mid Fla	7319 6205 7810 7908 3j06 3j06 6105 6005 0862 7808 1708 4409 5311 7810 4305	30-37 24-30 30-37 30-37 262-327 262-327 70-87 135-168 262-327 24-30 33-41 30-37 30-37 30-37 1-7 57-71	6 22 12 27 144 144 151 108 71 12 9 30 27 45 60 27 192

IV. Acceptance of Responsibility

As indicated in my oral report to the Commission on March 15, a two-level reduction for Acceptance of Responsibility is granted routinely even when a plea bargain has already resulted a reduction of one or more counts of indictment. There are 28 plea bargains of one or more counts of indictment. There are 28 plea bargains with counts reduced in the full sample. Acceptance of Responsibility was granted in 24 of these cases. In three of the four cases where Acceptance was not granted, a 924(c) indictment count had already been dropped in the plea bargain. Table IV count had already been dropped for each plea bargain and provides a description of counts dropped for each plea bargain and indicates whether Acceptance of Responsibility was granted.

Table IV

Application of Acceptance of Responsibility in Monitoring Robbery Cases

a granta Dropped	Acceptance Granted?
Description of Counts Dropped in Plea Agreement	
111 1200	yes
1. 924(c)	yes
azi (conspiracy)	
	yes
(not in counts of indictment)	
a m 9	
4. 371	yes
5. 371	yes
6. 924(C)	yes
7. 1 robbery	yes
8. 1 attempted robbery	yes
9. 1 confessed robbery	yes
10. 924(C)	yes
11. 371	yes
12. 1 confessed robbery	yes
13. 6 robberies	no
14. 924(c)	yes
004/01	
all robbery counts—convicte	no
of Assault and Burglary	yes
17. 924(C)	yes
18. 2113(d)	yes
19. 2113 (d)	no
20 924(C)	yes
21. 1 confessed robbery	yes
	yes
2113(4)	yes
a 3 mahharies	and the contract of the contra
	yes, but judge departed
25. 924(C)	upward by 2 levels
26. 924(c)	complaining that
	guidelines too low.
of vehicle	no dudgo denarted
27. 371, arson of vehicle	yes, but judge departed
27. 371, arson of the Larceny 28. Robbery reduced to Larceny	upward.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW SUITE 1400 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004 (202) 662-8800

William W. Wilkins, Jr. Chairman Michael K. Block Stephen G. Breyer Helen G. Corrothers George E. MacKinnon Ilene H. Nagel Benjamin F. Baer (ex officio) Ronald L. Gainer (ex officio)



March 29, 1989

TO:

All Commissioners

FROM:

Dennis Murphy PM

-Scott Lyden, Bank Robbery Working Group

SUBJECT: Time Served by Base Robbery Offenders under Old Law

This memorandum reports the results of the Bank Robbery Working Group's effort to determine average and median prison time served by robbery offenders under old law for offenses that correspond to the Guideline Base Offense of unarmed robbery of one bank (Level 19, Criminal History Category I). This research supplements data for base offenders included in the statistical analysis reported by David Scheffman in a companion memorandum. The latter analysis relied only on the 1985 Augmented FPSSIS data set. The results discussed here use the full set of FPSSIS data tapes covering the period mid-1984 - mid-1987.

The criteria employed to select base offenders were very stringent. Our goal was to provide the Commission with cases that correspond as closely as possible to a pure base offense. Any offenses that would require mitigating or aggravating adjustments if sentenced under the Guidelines have been excluded. Specifically, the final sample was limited to cases of conviction for unarmed robbery of \$10,000 or less, involving no more than one bank, where the offender was not considered a minor participant or a leader, and where no deaths, injuries, or abductions were reported. All probation cases have also been excluded.

No plea bargains are included in the sample other than those specifically coded in FPSSIS as "no counts reduced". Because of this screen and other consistency checks included in the selection process, we are reasonably confident that the sample cases reflect real offense conduct and that the data therefore are not compromised by armed or multiple robberies that have been pled down to less serious offenses. Appendix 1 presents a more detailed description of the FPSSIS variables that were used to select the final sample of base offenses.

The second phase of this project utilized the Bureau of Prisons "Sentry" data file to determine prison time served by offenders in our sample. For approximately two-thirds of the

cases, time served is based on actual release dates. Presumptive parole release dates were available for almost all remaining cases.

Fifty-six cases resolved by plea and five trials survived the screening process for base offense. Table I presents summary data for time served for the entire sample and for pleas and trials individually. In order to facilitate comparisons between time served under old law and Guideline sentences, values for time served have been adjusted for good time allowances. That is, values for time served reported by BOP's Sentry system have been divided by .85, which means that actual time spent in prison can be found by multiplying the Table I values for time served by .85. For example, an offender who served 85 months in prison would have time-served-adjusted-for-good time of 100 months.

TABLE I
Time Served by Robbery Base Offenders
Sentenced 1984-1987

Sample	Number	Average Time Served (months)	Median Time Served (months)	Range
Pleas and Trials	61	31.2	25.1	2.0 - 146.1
Pleas	56	28.39	24.39	2.0 - 146.1
Trials	5	67.75	75.29	25.8 - 95.7

Table I indicates that base offenders who pled guilty with no counts reduced served an average of about 28 months in prison (minus good time) under old law. This corresponds to a guideline sentence toward the top of Offense Level 17, Criminal History

In order to assess the reliability of time served values obtained from Sentry, we also examined Parole Commission records for all trials and a random sample of 10 plea cases. For the ten pleas, release dates in the Parole Commission records were virtually identical to release dates in Sentry. Four of the five trial cases could be located in the Parole Commission data system. As will be discussed in the text, two of these offenders waived parole and are still in prison; there is thus a discrepancy between the BOP presumptive release date and the parole eligibility date indicated in the Parole Commission data. There were no serious discrepancies for the remaining two cases.

Category I (24 - 30 months). To the extent that such offenders would be granted Acceptance of Responsibility under the Guidelines, they would receive a level 17 sentence (19 minus 2). If median time served is used as a reference, prison time under old law is at the bottom of level 17.

Time served for trials is much higher than for pleas. The average figure of almost 68 months corresponds to a Guideline sentence near the middle of Level 26. There are, however, only five offenders in our sample who were sentenced after trial. Further, the five sentences vary widely (25.9 - 95.3 months). Subsequent analysis of Sentry and Parole Commission files for these cases indicates that three of the five offenders were assigned to high-security mental institutions. Two of these individuals waived parole and are still in confinement. Time served based on their current expected release date is 83.5 and 95.3 months (minus good time). Average time served for the remaining three offenders is 53 months.

Given the arguably aberrational nature of the trial sample, we gradually removed limiting selection criteria to increase the number of trial cases while still preserving the core characteristics of a base robbery offense. Table II reveals the results of this process on sample size and mean and median time served.

Table II

Trials: Time Served According to
Restrictiveness of Base Offense Definition

Selection Criteria relaxed	N	Mean Time Served	Median Time Served	Range
NoneAll Screens Operative	5	67.75	75.29	25.8-95.7
Includes Losses over \$10,000	7	61.07	58.08	25.8-95.7
Includes Minor and Major Roles	12	44.39	39.09	4.2-95.7
Includes Parole Offense Severity other than Level 5*	14	40.22	34.51	4.2-95.7

^{*}This screen is a consistency check on the requirement that the count of conviction was robbery and that no aggravating conduct was involved in the offense (see Appendix I).

It is evident from Table II that very high values for time served are confined to the most restrictive sample. As additional trials are included, mean time served falls to a low of 40 months (Guideline Level 21) for the full sample of 14 trial cases. If the two mental patients who waived parole are excluded from this sample, mean time served is 32.2 months (Level 19). In any event, we are reluctant to draw any conclusions from such a small number of observations, particularly in view of the possibility that cases settled by trial may by their very nature involve atypical circumstances. Thus, the sample of 56 pleas may provide more meaningful information on average time served by base offenders under old law.

APPENDIX I Selection Criteria for Base Offense Sample

FPSSIS cases were considered base offenses only if they met the following requirements. Numbers in parentheses indicate column numbers in the FPSSIS data field for relevant screening variables.

- 1. The code of conviction must have been 1100--bank robbery (337-340).
- 2. The number of prior adult convictions was 0 (132).
- 3. The number of ongoing criminal acts was Single (91).
- 4. The value for Weapon (94-95) was either 00 (no weapon, no threat) or 02 (threat, no weapon).
- 5. Type of Firearm (96) must have been coded None. This is a consistency check on the coding for Weapon.
- 6. Victim Injured (97) must have been coded 0.
- 7. Dollar Amount (99-107) must have been no more than \$10,000.
- 8. Involvement Level (93) must not have been Less Culpable or Leader.
- 9. Parole Offense Severity (159) must have been coded 5. This is a consistency check on the code of conviction and lack of aggravating circumstances. Parole Offense Severity ratings of less than 5 involve lesser offenses than robbery. Higher ratings involve aggravators such as victims injured or abducted.
- 10. Plea Bargain (92) must have been N (no counts reduced).
- 11. Finally, no probation cases were included in the sample.

Draft

BANK ROBBERY WORKING GROUP - FIELD SURVEY

C.D. CALIF.

Prosecutor (

Says L.A. has about 25% of all bank robberies in the country. Concerned that armed bank robbery seems a bit low. Not enough difference between armed and unarmed. He considers unarmed bank robberies NOT very significant, but armed robberies as very significant. Should be several more levels added to enhancement for weapon.

(referred by): bank robbery guideline is also a problem when no weapon is involved. Recommend that the base offense level be raised to 23. On top of that the enhancement for a weapon should be increased from 3 to 4. In addition, she believes that multiple bank robberies are not punished enough, and not at all after five.

However, she does feel that the career offender guideline is a tad onerous on occasion. In addition, she does not feel that a bank robbery without a weapon should count as a career offender offense.

Defender ():

The guidelines are probably comparable to past practice for persons with criminal records, and for those with no records who didn't receive probation. In his view a first offender receiving 24-30 months is not atypical. However, he prefers that the decision on probation versus jail be a separate decision prior to application of the guidelines. In addition, he thinks the guidelines should allow room to give some defendants supervision without a substantial period of custody. A good number of first offenders should have nonprison alternatives. He notes that before the guidelines a significant minority of bank robbers received nonprison alternatives.

is concerned that the career offender provision hammers bank robbers and others far beyond past sentencing practice, because of the mechanical focus on two prior offenses. In his view such a person is not as bad as the guy who has been in and out of prison his whole life. He also believes that a weapon should be required for applicability of career offender to bank robberies. He has an appeal pending in which he contends that robbery without a gun is nonviolent. He suggests that we consider a two step analysis for career offender: 1) require two priors, and 2) require a certain period of incarceration for each prior.

Probation officer (

Occasionally see a case where the bank robbery guideline seems a little low, but the only discrepancy between the guidelines and the prior system is where the defendant pleads to only some of the bank robberies charged.

For example, under the U.S. Attorney's plea policy you can usually plead to, say, two of six robberies. The result is a significantly lower sentence than past practice. Judges don't seem to depart upward in such cases.

She cited the case before Judge (2-21-89) in which the defendant entered a plea to the reduced charge of bank larceny for a range of 4-8 months. The judge sentenced the defendant to 8 months, declining to follow the P.O.'s advice for an upward departure (to 37 months or so), saying that since the agreement was to bank larceny, he would not impose a sentence that would correspond to a plea to bank robbery. In her view, under old law the case would likely have resulted in a sentence of 1 1/2 years, with about a third served.

Regarding career offender, she is concerned that sometimes two prior offenses are not horrendous enough (such as residential burglaries when no one is home) to make someone a career offender. Possibly should require defendant be armed.

M.D. FLORIDA

Prosecutor ()

Surveyed several of their offices and found widespread support for the view that the base offense level for bank robbery is too low; he proposes and increase in the base to level 24. He said that two judges in Jacksonville () and several judges in Orlando have criticized the offense level as too low, even considering that real time sentences are involved. Historically, judges have given 10-15 years for unarmed bank robbery and 20 or more for armed robbery.

He suggests that the enhancement for use of a weapon be increased to 6 levels from the current 3. He also said that the distinction between "brandishing" and "using" a weapon needs to be clarified. He also recommends that toy weapons should count for the enhancement. A number of prosecutors in his district have been concerned that multiple bank robberies sentenced on the same day count as one offense ("related" offenses), which underrepresents their criminal history and makes more difficult the application of the career offender rules. They had one case where a defendant committed five armed hold-ups of convenience stores but because they were also sentenced on the same day the

career offender provision did not apply. He would prefer that the provision be changed so that fewer upward departures are necessitated.

Defender ():

Bank robbery offense level is appropriate as currently structured. Alot of bank robbers aren't that bad.

Robbery with a weapon is traditionally viewed as a significant crime. In the past the average armed robbery sentence would be about 20-25 years, reduced to 6-8 years by parole and good time. Sentences in the past sounded worse than now because the public didn't understand what the sentences actually meant.

Regarding the career offender provision, he believes that prosecutors should be lobbying to liberalize the prior record requirement to get more bad guys included.

Probation officer ():

Bank robbery guideline is extremely lenient to bank robbers, especially those who do not use a gun, even taking into account the fact that guideline sentences are non-paroleable. Recommends a base offense level of 23 (for a range of 41-51 months after acceptance of responsibility).

In the past the average sentence was twelve years, with parole in four. Unarmed now is about 24-30 months for a first offender. The guideline levels are ok for those with guns and prior records. The career offender provision is fine: "slow learners need rehabilitation."

S.D. FLORIDA

Prosecutor (

Base offense level for bank robbery too low. Should be 20. In addition, if the person used a gun, the enhancement should add an additional 60 months (to correspond to 924(c)), or about 6 more levels than the current 3 level enhancement. If a weapon is discharged during the offense the enhancement should be 13 levels to a level 37, instead of the current 5 level enhancement. In her view, using a weapon during the offense makes it a far more serious offense, not reflected in the current enhancement.

Defender ():

Generally likes the bank robbery levels where they are. In some cases they are real good from the defendant's standpoint,

e.g. no weapon, first offender, small amount of money is relatively low, and appropriately so. However, often bank robbers have done prior crimes that jack up their offense level.

The enhancements to the base offense level work pretty well. Not sure should increase the offense level based on the money stolen because luck is too big a factor in a typical bank robbery.

Believes career offender is okay regarding bank robbery EXCEPT that for robberies to count should have to possess a weapon.

Probation officer: ():

Notwithstanding the perception of many that bank robbery is too low, he believes it is appropriate in terms of the real jail time served and the significance of supervised release. He also believes it is higher than the parole system in which a Category V resulted in 24-36 months.

The guidelines represent a cultural shock because robbery is associated with Bonnie and Clyde mythology; the reality is very different.

Is not troubled by counting unarmed bank robberies under career offender provision.

N.D. ILLINOIS

Prosecutor ()

Offense level seems a bit low. Supports the proposed six level increase in the base offense level. Hasn't focussed on the enhancements because when a firearm is involved his office always charges 924(c). He is satisfied with the current application career offender to bank robberies.

<u>Defender</u> ():

His office feels the bank robbery guideline is about right. However, when career offender is applied in bank robbery context, it's too high--particularly where there is a nonviolent, unarmed bank robbery involved as the instant or a prior offense.

Probation officer ():

While only a few cases to date, doesn't see a need to raise the offense levels for bank robbery at this time. Most cases they see have injury and/or use of a firearm and prior record, which provide reasonable and appropriate enhancements.

D. KANSAS

Prosecutor ()

Generally, the bank robbery offense level is a little too low, compared to past practice. The problem is particularly significant with respect to multiple bank robberies; multiple robberies aren't punished enough.

The criminal history undercounts prior robberies by counting different robberies consolidated for sentencing as ONE offense.

<u>Defender</u> ():

Satisfied with the offense levels, but not surprised that prosecutors have problems with them. When take into account possible enhancements, believes there is sufficient sentencing flexibility. His judges are sentencing at the upper end of the ranges, even on pleas.

While he is a little surprised by the levels on armed robbery, he thinks the increases are adequate. In addition, he feels that there should be some provision for diminishing the impact when multiple enhancements are applicable (such as weapon AND role). He agrees with the Commission view that a toy gun should NOT qualify for the weapon enhancement. He feels that a toy gun does not pose the same threat as a real gun.

Probation officer (

Maybe a little low compared to prior sentences. Dismissed robberies aren't counted under the guidelines but were under the parole guidelines. Guidelines underpunish defendants for those.

says the guideline doesn't fully give weight to the distinction between a note job and an armed robbery. He recommends that the base offense level remain as it is but that the 3 level enhancement for use of a gun be increased to at least 8 levels. He also recommends that a toy gun count for purposes of giving the enhancement.

D. MARYLAND

Prosecutor ():

Bank robbery guidelines is vastly inappropriate; level 18 is much too low. Recommends a 6 level increase to about 24 or 25.

Typical case he sees is a note job. Pre-guidelines would have routinely gotten 15 years, to serve 6 or 7. Also concerned

that criminal history calculation underrepresents seriousness of record by counting multiple bank robberies consolidated for sentencing as one offense.

Defender ():

Bank robbery is working out well, compared to drug offenses. The guideline is a tad lighter than previous sentences, maybe one or two levels or so light. The proposed increase of six levels is way out of line.

Concerned that the Commission is taking a few areas and upping the ante, based on complaints from prosecutors, and is doing nothing about guidelines that represent a significant increase in past practice. The Commission is starting to seem like the "Step 'N Fetchit" of the Justice Department.

Regarding career offender, concerned that the Commission too literally follows statute by clinging to "crime of violence" rather than using judgment about what offenses should qualify for career offender treatment. He believes a weapon should be required for an offense to qualify. He has a case where a person became a career offender with two misdemeanor assault convictions as his priors, because the potential state punishment was over a year. That's too easy, in his view, to become a "career offender."

Probation officer ():

Doesn't see a problem with the base offense level for bank robbery. Is concerned that the weapon and injury enhancements may be a little light compared to the parole guidelines.

D. MASSACHUSETTS

Prosecutor ():

problem with bank robbery guideline is that they lost some of the heftier sentences. Even accounting for parole, the guideline sentences are still a little less. Particular problem at the lower end for single count cases. They mostly deal in multiple robberies so it is not as much a practical as a theoretical problem for them.

Believes weapon enhancement should be changed in INCLUDE fake weapons, toy guns, and the like.

Defender ():

Satisfied with current levels for bank robbery. His office gets few single case bank robberies with no prior record so it is

difficult to comment on that kind of case. Most of his defendants have long records and are career offenders or commit multiple bank robberies.

Feels that the career offender provision gives sentences that are generally too high. Would prefer if career offender did not apply to note jobs, and would like acceptance of responsibility make applicable in a meaningful way to career offenders.

Probation officer (

General feeling is that bank robbery is low, even accounting for parole. Defenders are happy with it; it is relatively lower than other guidelines. Recommends a base offense level of 22.

If don't raise the base offense level, recommends raising the enhancement for using a weapon. Also, clarify meaning of (2)(B) "otherwise use" regarding weapon use.

E.D. MICHIGAN

Prosecutor ()

Recommends increase the base offense level to 20, and making the enhancement for a weapon a 4 or 5 level increase, instead of 3 levels. Feels that brandishing a toy weapon should result in an increase in the offense level, but a smaller increase than a real weapon. Is comfortable with the application of career offender to unarmed bank robberies.

Defender ():

The bank robbery guideline is about right, except that the system needs some flexiblity to give probation in the exceptional case. Guidelines lack that personalized sentencing feature of the past.

Must make clearer to the public that this is more real time than the old system. Sounds significantly less but when analyze the real time served it is not significantly less.

Believes career offender is s problem. Doesn't like the fact that the judge must sentences near the top. Also, should require a weapon use for career offender to apply. As currently structured, career offender is like an octupus.

<u>Probation officer</u> ():

Robbery guideline is too low. Recommends an increase in the base to level 27. Also feels that the enhancement for

brandishing a firearm should be increased from a 3 to a 5 level enhancement.

E.D. NEW YORK

Prosecutor (

District does so few unarmed bank robberies that he has no feel for the appropriateness of the offense level for unarmed. As for armed he feels that a three level enhancement for brandishing a weapon is not sufficient and should be increased by an additional level or two. He also feels that use of a toy weapon should be an aggravating factor, though possibly not as much as for a real weapon.

In the past his judges have generally sentenced armed bank robbers to around 12 years with about (a guess) 5-6 years served. His office has generally not charged 924(c) counts because of past DOJ policy on limited use and that sparing use has continued, though he feels it may change based on direction from main DOJ.

Regarding career offender, he thinks that there should be a distinction between armed and unarmed bank robbery so that note jobs are not counted.

Defender ():

Satisfied with offense levels for bank robbery. Of the 10 cases they have pending in their office, the minimum guideline sentence is 22 years. He think that is enough. In 17 years he has had only one defendant with no prior and who committed a note job. That defendant got a one year sentence because of the special circumstances.

He believes that the ability of a judge to depart upward for special circumstances gives sufficient upper end sentencing flexibility that offense levels do not need to be increased. Nothing will be accomplished by boosting the ante. As it is he says they now have trials rather than pleas in bank robbery cases because there is not enough incentive to plead, particularly for career offenders.

Probation officer ():

Guideline for bank robbery is just fine. The base offense level is appropriate and the add-ons are good. Career offender as applied to bank robbery is a rare bird, but not too severe.

B.D. NEW YORK

Defender ():

There are instances when the guideline for bank robbery is too low to suit a prosecutor's tastes, but the level is about right. People are used to hearing long sentences, without focussing on the parole guidelines. Punishment for a note job bank robbery of about 3 or more years under the guidelines is NOT lenient. There needs to be more flexibility for less restrictive punishment for some nonviolent first offenders.

The problem with the bank robbery guideline is that it doesn't adequately distinguish between the poor pathetic note job bank robber and the guy who puts people in danger. The enhancements for use of a weapon don't sufficiently reflect the significance of the threat to people who walk in with guns. They are sufficiently punished if the prosecutor charges 924(c) and the defendant gets a consecutive five years. There needs to be a greater differential between pointing a gun and firing a gun than 3 versus 5 levels.

Probation officer ():

No real objection to the current level. There has been some concern about relevant conduct in evaluating the impact of the plea agreement when bank robberies are dismissed. However, he feels that even though dismissed robberies do not count, the levels are high enough to fairly reflect past practice. He concedes that the Northeast has been lenient on sentencing bank robbers.

W.D. NO. CAROLINA

Prosecutor (

Generally views bank robbery -- particularly where there is no criminal history -- as unusually low. Believes the base offense level should be raised to about level 21-22. He cites a case in which a defendant faces a 24-30 month sentence, even though he terrorized bank employees. Ashcraft is giving thought to referring bank robberies for state prosecution because of the lenity of the guidelines as applied to bank robberies.

A specific case attracted Ashcraft's concern about the disparate impact in sentencing that can result because of the career offender provision. In the case (), sentenced by Judge on October 25, 1988, four robbers

received sentences of 46 months, 30 months, 33 months and 120 months. The longer sentence for the leader of the robbery who carried a gun, represented a downward departure from the applicable career offender provision, that called for 210 to 262 months. The government moved for a downward departure based on substantial assistance because of the extreme disparity in treatment of the four defendants.

He believes these defendants would have faced 10-14 years before the guidelines, with the gunmen facing 15-19 years. In terms of time served, he believes they would have served 3-4 years (36-48 months), 5-7 (60-84 months) if they carried a gun.

Defender: no federal defender in this district.

Probation officer (

):

Bank robbery guideline is too low.

Without any enhancements there's very little punishment for a bank robbery. And most bank robberies don't involve enhancements: note jobs without a weapon, little money stolen, no one touched or injured.

cited the _______ case (# _____ and # _____; Judge ______, sentencing 7-25-88) to illustrate his concern about sentences being lower under the guidelines. In that case the plea agreement involved a plea to one count of bank robbery and one count of bank larceny (reduced from two counts of bank robbery). The guideline range was 27-33 months; the sentence imposed was 31 months as recommended by the P.O. because the previous bank robbery of the defendant was eleven years earlier and the judge is not high on departures (and the P.O. learned in training that he should shoot for the middle of the range as his recommended sentence).

The pre-guideline sentence would have been about 15 years based on a recommendation by the P.O. of a sentence of 10-15 years. The time served would have been about 6-7 years (60-84 months). The P.O. was very surprised by how low the range was for this defendant under the guidelines. Recommends an enhancment for prior SIMILAR offenses. He notes that it is better to rob two banks than sell 1/2 kilo of cocaine.

D. OREGON

Prosecutor (

):

The guidelines are a little low, a little less than before, even accounting for parole.

Oregon is the per capita bank robbery leader in the country. Prior to the guidelines the average bank robber received an average of 13 years, a multiple offender, 13-18 years. Accounting for parole that comes to about 40-60 months time served. The guidelines only increase a couple of levels for a series of bank robberies; it is not enough of an increase.

Would like to see some enhancement for threats, or pretending to have a gun, or using a toy gun.

Recommends that career offender parallel the career criminal statutes that require THREE predicate offenses and the use of a weapon.

Thinks the current offense level for an unarmed bank robbery is too harsh. But compared to the guidelines, generally, it is the closest to fairly representing the appropriate level for the average bank robber. Would like to see the availability of probation for all first time unarmed bank robbers.

Does believe that some enhancement is appropriate for use of a weapon, but won't comment on what precise level is appropriate. Also believes that in a substantial number of cases it is appropriate that a toy gun not qualify for the weapon enhancement. Regarding the applicability of career offender to bank robbery does not believe it should apply to nonviolent "violent offenses" such as unarmed bank robbery. Thinks the career offender provision generally is "one of the most outrageous provisions in the guidelines that will result in trials in virtually every case.

Probation officer ()

Robbery guideline could be a little higher, but not by much. It is pretty close to our experience before the guidelines. Recommends an increase in the base offense level to 21. In addition, while he does not have a solution to propose, he feels the incremental punishment for additional bank robberies is not significant enough. He notes that his district had about 350 bank robberies last year.

Regarding the career offender provision as applied to bank robberies, he feels bank robbery is appropriately considered a violent offense. He notes that while there may be some occasions when it is too strict, the judge can usually find a basis for departing downward if it is justified.

E.D. PENNSYLVANIA

Prosecutor ():

Bank robbery has not posed problems to date. Have had several cases and not disappointed by the results.

Defender ():

Level for armed bank robbery is about right. Unarmed bank robbery is much too high -- for the pitiful was the robberies are committed. The guidelines represent a Draconian increase in penalty for unarmed, nonviolent bank robbers. Recommends a base offense level of 11 or 12 before acceptance of responsibility.

Under old law such an offender would have received 2-3 years at most, with some getting probation and some receiving 3-4 years. The average time served would have been about 8-10 months.

Probation officer (

Recommends that the base offense level be raised to 23. If it is raised then the enhancement for brandishing a weapon is fine; otherwise, it should be raised significantly. Most of the bank robberies in her district are note jobs and usually involve a string of robberies. In the past defendants have received about a ten year sentence, of which 5-6 years would be served.

Regarding career offender, she is concerned that including unarmed bank robberies may be too inclusive, given the often pathetic nature of the note-job bank robber. "Not many of these people are John Dillinger."

SOUTH CAROLINA

Defender ():

Some of the judges are pretty upset by the offense levels for bank robbery. Expects that most cases will be referred to the state for prosecution because there is a mandatory minimum of seven years for an armed bank robbery (parole after about 5 years).

Feels the offense level for unarmed bank robbery is about right because it is a very different offense than when someone uses a weapon. In his district they often have persons rob banks

with notes that are basically street people who do not pose any real danger. He would suggest an enhancement where the person claims to have a gun or bomb even though it is not visible. He suggests a 3 level increase for such a threat, with 2 additional levels (total of 5) for displaying a weapon. Recommends that a toy gun be treated the same as a real one because of its effect on the fear of the victim and increased danger from someone reacting to the apparent presence of a gun.

Regarding career offender, he does not feel that an unarmed bank robbery is a crime of violence, so it should not be counted for career offender.

Probation officer ()

Base offense level for bank robbery is too low. Recommends a base of 25 with a 5 level enhancement for use of a weapon (instead of the current 3 levels). Believes career offender as applied to bank robbery is appropriate.

M.D. TENNESSEE

Prosecutor ():

Bank robbery is too low based on past practice. Recommends a range of 37 or more months AFTER aceptance of responsibility as more appropriate than the current level; specifically, recommends that the base offense level be increased to 23 or 24. Also recommends that for armed bank robbery the range should be at least 60 months. Part of the concern about some guideline sentences being too low is a perception problem; getting the public educated to the fact that the guidelines call for real time sentences.

Has a concern that punishment does not increase quickly enough for recidivist.

Defender ():

Bank robbery guideline fairly accurately represents bank robbery in the greater scheme of things. He thinks the inclusion of dollar loss as an enhancement may be potentially arbitrary because of the significance of luck.

Concerned about impact of career offender on bank robbery. In the case pending before Judge , a potential plea bargain is in jeopardy because the applicability of career offender could raise the sentence from 63 to 263 or more months. The case may go to trial when it would otherwise have been disposed of with a plea. If the case had been handled at the state level the defendant would have faced 20-40 years, but the

career offender provision makes the sentence higher than the state life sentence that permits parole after 20 years.

He is also concerned that the two priors were fairly old, 1979 and 1980 and that offenses that did not involve weapons are to be included. He doesn not think "violent offenses" should be read to include burglaries and note job bank robberies.

Probation officer ():

No complaints about bank robbery guideline. Not enough experience yet.

S.D. TEXAS

Prosecutor ()

Recommends increasing the base offense level to 26. Bank robberies are a tremendous problem in his district ("we have them out the nose"). Also recommends increasing the enhancement for use of a weapon to an 11 level increase, to more appropriate move toward a sentence before the guidelines of 25 years to life time served.

Recommends an enhancement for use of a toy weapon, and a larger increase for use of a real weapon. Does not believe career offender should be applicable if there is no weapon, no violence or express threat of violence.

Defender ():

Prior law cases are stiffer than under the guidelines. The guidelines let people out too soon. A base offense level 24 would be more appropriate.

Most bank robberies prosecuted federally in his district are aggravated robberies (with a firearm). In the past the first aggravated robbery would mean a sentence of about 10 years, with parole after 40 months for the exceptional case. The guidelines let everyone out too early.

Probation officer ():

Says bank robbery is a little low, although he concedes that part of the problem is that people are not getting used to the significance of a real time sentence. Recommends a couple of levels increase in the base offense level. If the base is raised, then the enhancements for weapons will be adequate. He believes that the weapon enhancement should apply to a toy gun if it is apparently real. Career offender is fine as is.

E.D. VIRGINIA

Prosecutor (

):

says the guideline offense level is too light by a couple of levels.

says he is alone in his office in believing the guideline is not too light given that the guideline sentences are virtually real time.

According to , before the guidelines a non-weapon bank robbery would have received about 15-20 years, with about half actually served (7 1/2 to 10 years); an aggravated robbery, about 20 years, with at least half and possibly as much as 2/3 considerably less than that. In addition, is concerned that each additional robbery is only about a one level increase and that after 5 or 6 robberies the guidelines don't provide for an incremental punishment (absent departure).

referred me to who is currently dealing with a two district multi-robbery case. Defendant faces sentencing by Judge in late March on a plea to three of five Virginia robberies. The U.S. Attorney's office refused a defense request for a Rule 20 in connection with a guilty plea in Maryland to two of five charged robberies. There, the defendant was sentenced to 30 months under the guidelines. Justice was concerned that agreeing to the Rule 20 would have resulted in too lenient a sentence because of the multiple count grouping rules and the slow increase in punishment for additional bank has been instructed to argue that the Virginia sentence should run CONSECUTIVE to the Maryland sentence even though the result of a Rule 20 proceeding would have been more lenient than that. wonders whether this decision should be up to prosecutors.

Probation officer (

Offense level is way low for bank robbery, particularly in comparision to the penalty for drug offenses. He would like to see the base offense level increased to the 27-32 range.

He points out that in the past a first offender who commits a note job would have received about an 18 year sentence, and would have served at least 6 years (60 months).

He mentioned the ... case (mentioned above) as illustrative of the problem. There the defendant committed robberies in Maryland and Virginia and the government refused to permit consolidation via Rule 20. He points out that even if the Virginia sentence is imposed consecutive to the one in Maryland, which he expects, the total sentence will only be about 60 months. Before the guidelines a similar defendant would have

received about 20 years and served (most likely) 9 years. Because of the multiple count rules and the fact that the prosecutors permitted several counts to be dismissed, the guideline range was only 30-37 months.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

1331 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE. NW SUITE 1400 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004 (202) 662-8800

William W. Wilkins, Jr. Chairman Michael K. Block Stephen G. Bieyer Helen G. Corrothers George E. MacKinnon Itene H. Nago! Benjamin, F. Baer (ex official Ronald L. Gainer (ex official



March 29, 1989

TO:

All Commissioners

FROM:

David Scheffman (for the Bank Robbery Working Group)

SUBJECT:

Analysis of Past Practice from FY 1985 Augmented FPSSIS

The purpose of this memorandum is to present some data and analyses of offenders convicted of bank robbery drawn from the FY 1985 augmented FPSSIS data. We have deliberately not drawn any specific conclusions from our analysis. Instead, we provide basic information about past practice in a form that will (hopefully) allow the Commission to determine the relationship between past practice and the Guidelines.

I. Introduction to the Data

The FY 1985 augmented FPSSIS data were used in the original ("Rhodes") analysis of past practice. With the cooperation of the Bureau of Prisons and the Parole Commission, we have updated that data, in order to have a greater number of accurate estimates of actual time served. We use as our estimates of actual time served the presumptive release date as determined by a Parole Commission hearing for the offender, or the offender's actual release date from prison (release, or release to parole or halfway house). Offenders in the augmented FPSSIS for whom we could not obtain presumptive or actual release dates are not included in our sample. In addition, we dropped offenders identified as being convicted of "conspiracy" or "accessory," or whose instant conviction involved non-bank-

robbery counts (including 924c). Therefore, our sample consists of offenders in the FY 1985 augmented FPSSIS who, as far as can be determined, were convicted of only bank robbery(ies). I will call this data the Bank Robbery Task Force, Version 0 (BRTF0) data set.

This memorandum presents an analysis of this task force data (BRTF0). We are currently working with the Parole Commission to see if we can further refine our data to get a more complete or more accurate set of release dates for the FY 1985 augmented FPSSIS sample. We expect to report an analysis of any updated data to the Commission during the week of April 3. However, I do not believe that the updated data will result in major changes in the analyses that will be presented here.

II. Introduction to the Analyses

The purpose of the analyses presented here is to compare past practice, as summarized by the BRTFO data set, with Guidelines sentences. In order to facilitate comparisons with the Guidelines Sentencing Table, we have inflated our time served estimates from past practice to correct for the 15% good time provision in the Guidelines. For example, for an offender in the BRTFO data set who served 85 months or actual prison time, the time-served-corrected-for-good-time would be 100 months (reflecting the fact that under the Guidelines, an offender sentenced to 100 months would actually serve 85 months if he received the standard good time credits). In what follows, when we refer to time served, we mean time served corrected for good time.

A. The Basic Offense Analysis

We have conducted two basic types of analyses. The purpose of the first is to identify types of basic offenses in BRTFO data set, and to

will call this the Basic Offense Analysis. A basic offense involves robbery of one bank, where the offender was unarmed, or if armed, did not use or discharge the weapon (i.e., an armed basic offender only possessed, displayed, or brandished a weapon), did not injure anyone, did not take a hostage or physically restrain anyone, and was not a minor participant in the robbery. An unarmed basic offense would, if the loss associated with the robbery was not greater than \$10,000, have a Offense Level of 19 under the Guidelines, if the offender received no credit for acceptance of responsibility. An armed basic offense would, if the loss associated with the robbery was not greater than \$10,000, have an Offense Level of 22 under the Guidelines, if the offender received no credit for acceptance of responsibility.

The purpose of concentrating first on basic offenses is to try to compare past practice with the Guidelines without the complications of significant aggravators or mitigators, other than the simplest weapon category. The augmented FPSSIS data does not allow us to identify basic offenders perfectly. For example, our criterion for one bank robbed was that the "Events" variable in augmented FPSSIS was coded with a value of 1, which is not likely to be a perfect indicator that one and only one bank was robbed. Nonetheless, we believe that the sample of basic offenses drawn from the BRTFO data is a reasonable representation of basic offenders. We will also present data on offenses that met all our criteria for being classed as basic offenses, except that more than one (real offense) bank robbery may have been involved, i.e., for offenses for which the Events variable took on the values of 1-9.

B. The All Offense Analysis

By construction, the basic offense analysis cannot get at the importance of major aggravators (except for possession, display or brandishing a weapon) or mitigators (other than a plea) in past practice, or provide a comparison with how these aggravators or mitigators (complicated offenses) are treated under the Guidelines. Unfortunately, we have too little data in order to provide much precision in identifying how complicated offenses were treated in past practice. Nonetheless, we will provide a comparison of time served with estimated Guidelines sentences for samples that include complicated offenses. In addition, by the time of the Commission Meeting we hope to have some simple statistical (regression) estimates that attempt to quantify the importance of some of the major aggravators and mitigators.

III. The Basic Offense Analysis

The basis of this analysis is a number of tables of data, attached to the cover sheet titled BASIC OFFENSE DATA ANALYSIS. These tables contain simple cross-tabulations from our basic offense data set. The first set of tables is taken from Data Set C_X , which is the data for all basic single event offenses, including those offenders who were sentenced to probation. There are 256 offenders in the C_X data set. In the first page of tables based on the C_X data, the upper part of the page presents data on basic unarmed offenses in which the loss was no more than \$10,000, and the offender was convicted at trial. The lower part of the page presents data on similar offenses for which the charge was resolved by a plea. The MEAN and MEDIAN are of time-served-corrected-for-good-time (that we will denote by the acronym FT). The entry ST. DEV. is the standard deviation of FT, and RANGE is the range of FT. Finally, N is the number of offenders in each category. The entries EVNT.MN. and EVNT.RNG. variables relating to

the number of events, which in the C_X data set are equal to 1, so those rows are blank.

An offender was denoted as ARMED if the augmented FPSSIS data indicated that the <u>real</u> offense involved possession, display, or brandishing a weapon. The loss categories, LOSS ≤ \$10,000, and LOSS > \$10,000, were taken from the augmented FPSSIS loss numbers.

The meaning of the headings of the columns in the tables is: ALL represents the summary of all offenders in the given category (e.g., unarmed, no more than \$10,000, convicted at trial); the Roman numerals I-VI represent Guideline criminal history categories. Criminal history categories were created from the augmented FPSSIS data using the Prison Impact Model. Dennis Murphy will be reporting on the accuracy of that method of determining criminal history categories.

The next set of tables drawn from the Basic Offense Data is based on the D_X data set. The D_X data removes the offenders who were sentenced to probation from the C_X data set. There are 184 offenders in the D_X data set (so, there were 72 offenders in the C_X data set who were sentenced to probation).

The APPENDIX TO THE BASIC OFFENSE DATA ANALYSIS has eight more sets of tables. The C data set is for basic offenses that involved one or more events. As you can see, the variables EVNT.MN and EVNT.RNG. now have data entries. EVNT.MN is the mean number of events for each category. EVNT.RNG is the range of the number of events in each category.

Finally, the D data set removes offenders sentenced to probation from the C data set.

In principle, some of the entries in the tables for data sets C_X and D_X can be easily compared with Guideline sentences. For example, of those offenders convicted at trial, all those for which the loss was no more than \$10,000 would receive a Guidelines offense level of 19 if they were unarmed and 22 if they were armed. Offenders whose charges were settled by pleas can also be compared, if some assumption is made about whether or not acceptance of responsibility would be given under the Guidelines.

The next set of tables drawn from the Basic Offense Data in the Appendix provides a comparison of time served (corrected for good time) (FT) and Guideline sentence (GT) for data sets C and D. This is done for the purpose of comparing past practice and the Guidelines under the assumption that each Event is a conviction charge of bank robbery. The categories in these tables are labeled, and appear in the same order as they appeared in the earlier table. To understand the categories: U means unarmed, A means armed (weapon possessed, displayed, or brandished), $L \leq$ 10K means loss was no greater than \$10,000, L > 10K means loss greater than \$10,000, T means that the offender was convicted at trial, and P means that the case was resolved by plea. For example, the first category, U.L < 10K/T is the category of unarmed offenders for which the loss was not greater than \$10,000. The Guideline sentences (GT) presented in these tables were derived from the augmented FPSSIS data, using the Prison Impact Model. (Again, Dennis Murphy will discuss the accuracy of these Guideline sentence calculations). For each offender, we took the midpoint of the Guideline range for his predicted Guideline sentence without applying the Career Offender provision. For cases resolved by plea, we applied a two level (acceptance of responsibility) discount.

Our final examination of past practice involves the Career Offender provision. We have identified probable career offenders in our data sets. This involved applying the career offender provision to the relevant augmented FPSSIS data. However, we did not count a past conviction for burglary as a relevant conviction, because we cannot distinguish commercial and residential burglaries in our data. In our total sample (A) of 518 offenders, we identified 119 (23%) likely career offenders in this manner. The last set of table in the Appendix compare FT and GT for data sets C_X^*, D_X^*, C^* , and D^* , which are the same as data sets C_X, D_X, C , and D, except that probable career offenders have been removed.

IV. The All Offense Analysis

A. Comparison of Time Served and Guideline Sentence

The basis of this analysis is the tables attached to the cover sheet

ALL OFFENSE ANALYSIS - COMPARISON OF FT AND GT. The tables here
are similar to the last two sets of tables from the Appendix of the Basic

Offense Data that compare time served and Guideline sentence for data sets

C and D. (See description of those tables above). Data A is our full set of

offenders, i.e., it includes offenders for which significant aggravators (e.g.,
injury, or weapon used), or mitigators (e.g., minor participant) were present.

Data B removes from data set A those offenders sentenced to probation.

Again, in computing Guidelines sentences for cases resolved by plea, a two
level reduction was taken, reflecting possible application of acceptance of
responsibility.

In the APPENDIX TO THE ALL OFFENSE ANALYSIS, as in the Basic Offense Analysis, we removed probable career offenders (again, not counting burglary) from data sets A and B, giving us data sets A* and B*. The set

of tables in the Appendix compares FT and GT for those two data sets.

DATA KEY

- A: Full Data Sct (all offenses), N=520
- B: Full Data Sct Without Offenders Sentenced to Probation, N=474
- C: All "Basic Offenses," But Not Requiring Events=1), N=426
- D: Data Set C Without Offenders Sentenced to Probation, N=393
- C_X: Data Sct C, But Requiring Events=1, N=256
- D_X: Data Set D, But Requiring Events=1, N=237
- *: Data sets with a * are the same as un-*'ed data sets, except probable career offenders have been removed. For example, A* is the A data set with probable career offenders removed. The number of offenders in the *'ed data sets are: A*: N=399, B*: N=365, C*: N=319, D*: N=293, C_X^* : N=199, D_X^* : N=184.

ACRONYM KEY

FT: Time served corrected for Good Time

GT: Guideline Sentence

N: Number of Offenders in given category

U: Unarmed*

A: Armed

T: Convicted at Trial

P: Case resolved by Plea

 $L \le 10K$: Loss no greater than \$10,000

 $L \ge 10K$: Loss greater than \$10,000

U,L≤10K/T: Unarmed, Loss no greater than \$10,000, convicted at trial

U,L≤10K/P: Unarmed, Loss no greater than \$10,000, case resolved by Plea

A,L≤10K/T: Armed, Loss no greater than \$10,000, convicted at trial

A,L≤10K/P: Armed, Loss no greater than \$10,000, case resolved by Plea

For data sets C,D,C_X , and D_X , armed means a real offense involving possession, display, or brandishing a weapon. For data sets A and B, armed means a real offense involving possession, display, brandishing, using, or discharging a weapon.

BASIC OFFENSE DATA ANALYSIS

C_X DATA

				et j			
Unarmed, ≤10K/T (<u>U, L<10/T</u>)		. I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	64	38	45	52	79	88	84
MEDIAN	72	38	65	52	<u> 79</u>	80	84
ST. DEV.	35	9	39	3/		51	14
RANGE	0-143	32-45	0-72	31-74		41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.						-	
N	_/3_		3	_2_			2
/Plea (<u>U. L<10/P</u>)		1	II	III	IV	v .	vi
MEAN	47	20	42	47	61	74	71
MEDIAN	39	10	_ 33_	41	_ 73_	74	73
ST. DEV.	34	20	37	22	36	34	33
RANGE	0-145	0-73	0-123	0-79	5-123	30-145	0-113
EVNT.MN.		*****					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
EVNT.RNG.							
	w. 7	21	,,	7 2	17	111	//

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Cx

Armed, ≤ 10 K/Tria $(A, L<10/T)$		I	II	III	īv	V	VI
MEAN	86			<u> 77</u>		81	110
MEDIAN _	82			_77_		_8/_	110
ST. DEV	17			9			
RANGE	70-110			70-83			
EVNT.MN	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
EVNT.RNG							
n _	4_				_0_		
/Plea (<u>A, L<10/P</u>)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN _	51	40	56	_53_	54	68	66
MEDIAN _	42	33	66	66	70	72	63
ST. DEV	30	29	26	22	_26_	16	50
RANGE _	0-160	0-108	27-120	5-79	0-76	32-80	0-160
EVNT.MN.							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
EVNT.RNG	<u> </u>	· _ · ·		: ':			
	83	3 /	15	17	10	7	F

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Cx

narmed, >10K/Trial						
(U. L>10/T) ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	vi
mean <u>47</u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		3/	80	
MEDIAN 32				3/	80	
ST. DEV. 28						
range 29-80				30-32		
EVNT.MN.						
EVNT.RNG.						
N <u>3</u>	_0_	<u> </u>				0
/Plea (<u>U. L>10/P</u>) ALL	1	II	III	IV	v	vi
MEAN <u>22</u>	<u> 17</u>			_70_		
MEDIAN 22	14			70		
ST. DEV. 24	_/7					
- RANGE 0-70	0-41			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
EVNT.MN.		. .				
EVNT.RNG.	<u> </u>					
N _ 9_	8				_0	0

Armed, >10K/Tri (A, L>10/T)		I	ΙΙ	III	IV	v	vi
MEAN .	8/	69		127	68	114	
MEDIAN	92	<u> 74</u>	· <u> </u>	157	68	114	
ST. DEV.	44	49					
RANGE	5-127	5-120					
EVNT.MN.				<u> </u>	-		
EVNT.RNG.							•
N	8						0
/Plea (A, L>10/P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V .	VI
MEAN	54	34	5/	66	72	72	130
MEDIAN	37	32	_75	56	72	_72_	151
ST. DEV.	41	25	44	37		_4_	_52
RANGE	0-168	0-76	0-79	37-115		69-75	72-160
EVNT.MN.	14		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				·
EVNT.RNG.			 	. <u> </u>		·	
N	29	16_		4		2	_3

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Cx

All Trials (ALL T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	70	60	45	77_	52	90	93
MEDIAN	74	45	65	74	50	80	94
ST. DEV.	36	43	39	34	25	35	18
RANGE	0-143	5-120	0-72	31-127	30-79	41-143	74-110
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.							
4	28			5	4	6	3
All Pleas							
(ALL P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	48	29	50	5/	60	72	_77_
MEDIAN	41	. ,		42		_73_	72
ST. DEV.	34	26	32	24	3/	27	46
RANGE	•			0-115		,	the state of the s
EVNT.MN.				•			
EVNT.RNG.				-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
N	228	86	29	39	29	23	22

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Cx

Unarmed/Trial							
(U/T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	6/	_38	45	52	47	86	84
MEDIAN	68	38	65	52	32	80	84
ST. DEV.	34	9	39	3/	28	42	_/4
RANGE	0-143	32-45	0-72	3/-74	30-79	41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.	·			·		. <u> </u>	
N	16		3	2	_3	4	_2_
Unarmed/Plea	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	۷I
MEAN	45	_19	42	47	62	<u> 74</u>	<u> 7/</u>
MEDIAN	39	10	33	41	73	74	73
ST. DEV.	34	19	37	22	35	34	33
- RANGE	0-145	0-74	0-123	0-79	5-123	30-145	0-113
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.					•		
3.7	116	29	//	22	18	10	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: CX

Armed/Trial (A/T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	83	69		93	68	97	110
MEDIAN	82	74		<u>83</u>	68	97	110
ST. DEV.	36	49		29		23	
RANGE	5-127	5-120		70-127		81-114	
EVNT.MN.		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		<u> </u>			
EVNT.RNG.							-
N	12						
the state of the s		and the second second second second	the state of the s		4		
Armed/Plea (A/P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	vi
	ALL <u>5-2</u>	1 _38_	11 55	111 _57	1V _ <u>\$6</u>	v <u>69</u>	vi <u>84</u>
<u>(A/P)</u>			11 _ <u>55</u> _67				
(A/P) MEAN	_52_	38	_55	<u> 57</u>	_56_		84
(A/P) MEAN MEDIAN	<u>52</u> <u>42</u>	38 32 28	<u>55</u> <u>67</u>	57	<u>56</u> <u>70</u>		84 69 56
(A/P) MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV.	<u>52</u> <u>42</u> <u>33</u>	38 32 28	<u>55</u> <u>67</u> 28	57 66 26	<u>56</u> <u>70</u> <u>25</u>	_69 _72 _15	84 69 56
(A/P) MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV. RANGE	52 42 33 0-168	38 32 28	<u>55</u> <u>67</u> 28	57 66 26	<u>56</u> <u>70</u> <u>25</u>	_69 _72 _15	84 69 56

Loss ≤10K/Tria (<u>L<10 T</u>)	al ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	69	_38_	45	65	<u> 79</u>	86	93
MEDIAN	74	38	65	72	79	80	94
ST. DEV.	<u>33</u>	9	39	_23_		42	18
RANGE	0-143	32-45	0-72	31-83		41-143	74-11
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.		-					
N			3				_3_
/Plea (<u>L<10/P</u>)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	49	30	50	49	59	72	69
MEDIAN	41	28	4/	42	72	_73_	70
ST. DEV.	_33_	27	3/	22	32	29	40
RANGE	0-160	0-108	0-/23	0-79	0-123	30-145	0-16
EVNT.MN.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			·
EVNT.RNG.							
N	190	62	26	35	37	2/	19

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Cx

Loss > 10K/Tr							
(L>10/T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	72	69		127	43	97	
MEDIAN	_74	74		127		97	
ST. DEV.	42	49			2/	24	
RANGE	5-127	5-120	<u> </u>		29-68	80-114	_
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.				•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
N		_5_				2	_0_
/Plea							
(<u>L>10/P</u>)	** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** **	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	47	_28_	_51	66	7/	_72	130
MEDIAN	37		75				
ST. DEV.	40		44				
- RANGE	0-168	the state of the s	0-79				
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.							
3. 7	28	24	3	4	2		_ <

D_X DATA

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: PX

Unarmed,≤10K, (U, L<10/T)	Trial ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	69	38	68	<u></u>	79	88	84
MEDIAN	_73_	_38_	68	<u>52</u>	79	80	84
ST. DEV.	3/	9	_5_	3/		51	14
RANGE	3/-/43	32-45	64-72	3/-74		41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
EVNT.RNG.							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
N	12					3	2_
/Plea (<u>U, L<10/P</u>)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	50	23	46	49	61	74	78
MEDIAN	42	_22_	38	42	_73_	_74_	73
ST. DEV.	_33_	20	36	20	36	34	25
RANGE	1-145	1-74	5-123	2/-79	5-123	30-145	34-113
EVNT.MN.				· /			
EVNT.RNG.							
N	100	27	10	22	17	14	10

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D_X

Armed,≤10K/Tria	a 1						
(A. L<10/T)		1	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN _	86			77		81	1/0
MEDIAN	82			77		8/	110
ST. DEV.	17			9			
RANGE _	70-110			70-83			
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.							
N	4			_2_			
/Plea (A, L<10/P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	55	46	56	_53_	61	68	76
MEDIAN	66	35	66	_66_	70	72	66
ST. DEV.	28	27	26_		_18_	16	46
RANGE	5-160	5-109	27-120	5-19	<u> 32-16</u>	32-80	26-16.
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.					• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		
N	77	27	15	12	9	7	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: DX

Unarmed, > 10K/Trial (U, L>10/T) ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
112	<u></u>			3/	80	
$ \begin{array}{ccc} \text{MEAN} & \underline{7/} \\ \text{MEDIAN} & \underline{32} \end{array} $				3/	80	
st. dev. 28				2		
range 29-80				29-32		
EVNT.MN.						
EVNT.RNG. 3	$\overline{\sigma}$			7		$\overline{}$
N <u>3</u>						
/Plea (U, L>10/P) ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN 29	22			70		
median <u>32</u>	27			70		
ST. DEV. $\frac{23}{}$	16					
- RANGE $3-70$	3-41					
EVNT.MN.						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
EVNT.RNG	6	0				0

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Dx

Armed, >10K/Tr: (A, L>10/T)	ial ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	81	68		127	68	114	
MEDIAN	92	74_		127	68	114	
ST. DEV.	44	49					
RANGE	5-127	5-120					
EVNT.MN.				j: 			
EVNT.RNG.				- <u></u>			0
N	8		<u> </u>				
/Plea (A, L>10/P)) ALL	.	II	III	ıv	v	٧I
MEAN	60_	39	77	66	72	72	/30
MEDIAN	67	32	_77	56	72	_72_	151
ST. DEV.	39	22	3_	37		_4_	5-2
RANGE	5-168	5-76	75-79	37-115		69-75	72-168
EVNT.MN.							<u> </u>
EVNT.RNG.							
N	26	14	2	4	1	2	3_

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: DX

All Trials (ALL T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	<u>73</u>	60				90	93
MEDIAN	_74_	45	68	74	50	80	94
ST. DEV.	34	43	_5	34	25	35	18
RANGE	5-143	5-120	84-72	30-127	29-79	41-143	74-110
EVNT.MN.					 		
EVNT.RNG.							
	27	_7_	_2_	_5	4_	6	3

All Pleas	ALL	ī	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	53	34_	54	5-2	62	72	85
MEDIAN	42	3/_	42	42	72	73	73
ST. DEV.	32	25	30	22	29	28	40
RANGE	1-168	1-109	5-123	5-115	5-123	30-145	26-160
EVNT.MN.				-			

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: DX

Unarmed/Tri	al	•					
(U/T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	65	_38_	68	52	47	86	84
MEDIAN	_72_	<u> 38</u>	68	52	32	80	84
ST. DEV.	_3/_	9	_5	31	28	42	14
RANGE	29-143	32-45	64-72	3/-74	29-79	41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.				·			
EVNT.RNG.	· · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-			-	·
N	15	2			3		
	·						
Unarmed/Ple	a ALL	I	II	III	IV	v .	VI
MEAN	49		46	49	62	74	_78_
MEDIAN	41-	_22	_38_	42	<u>73</u>	74	_73_
ST. DEV.	33	19	36	20	35	34	25
RANGE	1-145	1-74	5-123	21-79	5-123	30-145	34-113
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.	The second secon				•		
N	107	33	10	22	18	14	10

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Dx

Armed/Trial (A/T)	ALL	I	II	ııı	IV	v	VI
MEAN	83	68		_93_	68	97	//0
MEDIAN	82	74		83	68	97	110
ST. DEV.	36	49		29		23	
RANGE	5-/27	5-120		70-127		8/-114	
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
N	12	_5		<u>3</u>			
Armed/Plea (A/P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	57	43	59	57	_62	69	92
MEDIAN	66	33	_68	66	<u> 71</u>	72	69
ST. DEV.	_3/	25	25	26	18	14	5-2
RANGE	5-168	5-109	27-120	5-115	32-76	32-80	26-160
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		 -		
	102	41	17	16	10	9	10

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: Dx

Loss ≤10K/Tria (L<10 T)	l ALL	I	II	III	IV		VI
MEAN	_73_	_38_	68	65	79	86	93
MEDIAN	74	38	68	72	79	80	94
ST. DEV.	29	9	_5	_23_		42	18
RANGE	3/-143	32-45	64-72	31-83		41-143	74-110
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.		-		-			
N	16	2	2	_4_		4	3
(2)							
/Plea (<u>L<10/P</u>)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	52	34	52	50	61	72	77
MEDIAN	42	29	42	42	72	_73_	<u>73</u>
ST. DEV.	3/	26	-	2/	30	29	34
RANGE	1-160	1-109				/	26-16
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.							
N	_177	54	25	34	26	2/	1/2

DATA: Dx

Loss >10K/Tria	al						
(L>10/T)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	72	68		127	43	97	
MEDIAN	74	_74_		127	_32_	97	
ST. DEV.	42	49			22	24	
RANGE	5-127	5-120			29-68	80-114	
EVNT.MN.			***				
EVNT.RNG.						· ·	
N		_5	0			_2_	0
/Plea							
(L>10/P)	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	_57_	34	77	66	7/	72	130
MEDIAN	3 7	32	_77	56	_7/_	_72	15/
ST. DEV.	38	21	<u>3</u>	37		_4_	5-2
- RANGE	3-168	3-76	75-79	37-115	70-72	69-75	72-16
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.							
N	33	20	2	4	2	2	3

APPENDIX TO BASIC OFFENSE DATA ANALYSIS

C DATA

U. L<10/T	ALL	T	II	III	IV	v	vi
MEAN	62	40	45	_52	79	_88_	83
MEDIAN	73	38	64	52	79	86_	81
ST. DEV.	36_	32	_39_	31		51	10
RANGE	0-143	4-80	0-72	31-74		41-143	74.94
EVNT.MN.	2	3				1-1	1-2
EVNT.RNG.	1-6	1-6	3	2		3	3
N	_16_						
U, L<10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	52	_27	41	_50	62	84_	76
MEDIAN	42	23	_28_	42	_73_	80	75
ST. DEV.	39	26	45	29_	36	33	42_
• RANGE	0-155	0-105	0-149	_	0-123		0-155
EVNT.MN.	2_	2	2	2		2	2 1-8
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-4	1-9	1-5	1-8	1-6	22
N	_18/_	49	_/7_	40	2 7	<u>-7</u>	

A. L<10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	91			_77_		8/	110
MEDIAN	83			77		81	110
ST. DEV.	18			9			
RANGE	70-110			70-83			109-110
EVNT.MN.							2
EVNT.RNG.	1-2			1-1			1-2
N					_0_		
			- ` . - ` .				
		V .					
A. L<10/P	ALL	1	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	6/	42_	57	65	72	67	97
MEDIAN	67	35	66	<u> 47</u>	_73_	72	72
ST. DEV.	42_	29	31	33	38	34	77
• RANGE	0-296	0-109	5-120	5-150	0-155	0-130	0-296
EVNT.MN.	2	2	<u></u>	2	_3		<u>Z</u>
EVNT.RNG.	1-7	1-6	1-6	1-7	1-6	1-2	1-5
	1-0	11	,9	21	26	10	13

<u>U. L>10/T</u> ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
mean 47				31	80	
median 32				31	80	
st. dev. <u>28</u>				2		
RANGE 29-8	0			29-32		
EVNT.MN						
EVNT.RNG. [-]				1-1		
и				2		
U. L>10/P ALL	Ĭ	II	III	IV	v	VI
mean <u>39</u>	21	53	70	87	86	
MEDIAN 32	5	74	70	\$7	80	
st. dev. <u>39</u>	30	42		24_	18	
• RANGE 0-115	0-115	5-80		70-104	73-107	
EVNT.MN. 4	4	5	6	5	5	_5_
EVNT.RNG. 1-9	1-9	2-6		1-8	4-6	
N 25	15	3	/	2	3	/

A. L>10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	86	69	95	127	15	114	/2/
MEDIAN	95	74	95	127	75	114	121
ST. DEV.	39	49			9		
RANGE	5-127	5-120			68-81		~~~
EVNT.MN.	1	1-1			1-2		
EVNT.RNG.	1-3	1-1			2		
N							
A, L>10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	vi
MEAN	68	47	72	_73_	8/	//2	/30
MEDIAN	70	35	75	73	78	_75_	151
ST. DEV.	43	_33_	33	_28_	23	79	52
* RANGE	0-231	0-108	0-117		<u>55-111</u>	69-231	72-14
EVNT.MN.	7	2	1-9	1-5	4-	<u> </u>	1-1
EVNT.RNG.	56	26	7	8	6	4	3

ALL T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	72	56	_58	_77_	_58	90	98
MEDIAN	79	45	_68_	74	68	80_	101
ST. DEV.	36	42	41	34	25	35	18
RANGE	0-143	4-120	0-95	31-127	29-81	41-143	74-121
EVNT.MN.		$\frac{Z}{I}$					
		1-6	1-2	1-1	1-2	6	<u> </u>
N	35		<u> </u>				
ALL P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	57	35	54	58	69	83	85
MEDIAN	63	31	46	64	73	75	74
ST. DEV.	41	30	39_	_31_	36_	39_	<u>59</u>
RANGE	0-296	0-115		0-150		0-231	0-296
EVNT.MN.	2	2	2	2	3	2	1-0
EVNT.RNG.		1-9	1-9	1-1	1-8	1-6	1-8
N	39/	_/3/	_50	_70	60	_41	_3/_

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: C

U/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	vi
MEAN	60	40	45	52	47	86	83
MEDIAN	72	38	64	52	32	_86	81
ST. DEV.	34	32	39	31	28	42	10
RANGE	0-143	4-80	0-72	31-74	<u> 29-79</u>	41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.		3_					
EVNT.RNG.	1-6	1-6	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-2
N	_19_	_4_	_3_		3		3
					***		•
<u>U/P</u>	ALL	.	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	41	25	12	6/	63	85	73

42

0-119

2

1-6

29

73

34

1-8

80

32

6-123 30-149

42,

0-155

2

EVNT.RNG. 1-9

27

0-115

2

44

0-149

2

22

MEDIAN

* RANGE

ST. DEV.

EVNT.MN.

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: C

A/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	88	_68_	95	93	75	97	113
MEDIAN	_89_	74	95	83	75	97	116
ST. DEV.	_33_	49		29	9	23	_7_
RANGE	5-127	5-120		70-127	68-81	81-114	109-121
EVNT.MN.			2		2		2
EVNT.RNG.	1-3	1-1		1-1	1-2	1-1	1-1
N	16	_5_					_3_
A/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	_63_	44	62	68	74	80	103
MEDIAN	_68_	35	<u>19</u>	69	73	73	76
ST. DEV.	42	30	32	32_	36	52	73
RANGE	0-296	0-109	0-120	5-150	0-155	0+231	0-296
EVNT.MN.	2	2		2	_3_	10	
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-9	1-9	1-7	1-7	1-3	1-5
N	185	_67	28	29	3/	14	16
		and the second s	the state of the s		·	the state of the s	the state of the s

L<10 T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	ΫI
MEAN	69	40	45	65	79	86	94
MEDIAN	74	38	64	72	79	80	94.
ST. DEV.	34	32_	39	23		42	16
RANGE	0-143	4-80	0-72	31-83		41-143	74-110
EVNT.MN.	_2_	3					
EVNT.RNG.	1-6	1-6	1-1	1-1		1-1	1-2
N	_2/_		3_	_4_		_4	_5_
L<10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	_56_	34	49	55	<u> 67</u>	77	84
MEDIAN	61	29	35	53	ファ	\sim	74
the property of the second second					<u> 73</u>	76	
ST. DEV.	40	28	39	31	37		<u>57</u>
ST. DEV.					37	<u>34</u> 0-149	57 0-294
	40	28	39	31	37 0-/55 2	_34_	57 0-294 2
* RANGE	40 6-296 2	<u>28</u> 0-109	39	31	37	<u>34</u> 0-149	<u>57</u> 0-294

L>10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	78	69	95	/27	53	97	12/
MEDIAN	80	74	95	127	50	97	121
ST. DEV.	40	49			26	24	
RANGE	5-127	5-120			29-81	80-114	
EVNT.MN.			2				_3_
EVNT.RNG.	1-3	1-1			1-2	1-1	
N	_/4_						
					v in the second		
L>10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	59	37	67	73	83	10/	78
MEDIAN	68	32	75	73	78	75	[1]
ST. DEV.	44	34	35	27	22	_58_	78
• RANGE	0-231	0-115	0-117	37-115	55-111	69-231	0-168
EVNT.MN.	_3_	3	4	3	4	<u>3</u> .	_2
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-9	1-9	1-6	1-8	1-6	1-5
N	81	4/	12	9	8	7	4

D DATA

DATA: D

U. L<10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	66	40	68	52	79	88	83
MEDIAN	74	38	68	5-2	79	80	8/
ST. DEV.	33	32	_5_	3/		5-1	10
RANGE	4-143	4-80	64-72	31-74		41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.	2	3					
EVNT.RNG.						<u>/-/</u>	1-2
N	15	<u> </u>				3	3
U. L<10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	57	_31_	52	52	64	84	84
MEDIAN	59	27	_33_	42	_73_	80	76
ST. DEV.	37	25	45	28	35	33	36
• RANGE	1-155	1-105	5-149	5-120	5-123	30-149	515
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.		1-6			1-6	1-8	1-8
N	166	42	_15	39	26	24	20

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D

A, L<10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	91			_72		81_	110
MEDIAN	83					81	110
ST. DEV.	_18_						
RANGE	70-110			70-83			109-110
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.				1-1			1-2
N	<u> 5</u>		_0				
A. L<10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	66	48	_57	65	78	75	105
MEDIAN	68	39	66	67	75	72	76
ST. DEV.	40	26	31	33	33	25	_75_
RANGE	5-296	5-109	5-120	5-150	32-155	32-130	26-296
EVNT.MN.					_3_		
EVNT.RNG.	1-7				1-6		
N	190	36	<u></u>	2/	23	<u> </u>	_/2

DATA: D

U. L>10/T	ALL	I	ı II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	47				31_	80	
MEDIAN	_32_				3/	80	
ST. DEV.	28						
RANGE	29-80				29-32		
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.	<u> </u>				1-1		
N	_3	0			2		_0_
<u>U, L>10/P</u>	ALL	I	II .	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	51	31	53	70	87	86	
MEDIAN	41	27	74	70	87	80	
ST. DEV.	37	32	42		24	18	
- RANGE	3-115	3-115	5-80		70-104	73-107	
	//	3	5	6	5	5	
EVNT.MN.	_4_						
EVNT.MN. EVNT.RNG.		1-8	2-6		1-8	4-6	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D

A. L>10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	<u>86</u>	69	95	127	75	114	121
MEDIAN	95	74	75	127	75	114	12/
ST. DEV.	39	49			9		
RANGE	5-127	5-120			68-81		
EVNT.MN.							_3_
EVNT.RNG.	1-3	1-1			1-2		
N							
A, L>10/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	73	53	81	73	81	112	130
MEDIAN	72	37	_77_	_73_	_78_	75	15-1
ST. DEV.	40	30	_2/_	28	23	79	5-2
RANGE	5-23/	5-108	49-117	37-115	55-111	69-23/	72-16
EVNT.MN.		and the second second					
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-9	1-9	1-5	1-7	1-3	1-1
N	52	23	F	8	6	4	3

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: D

ALL T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	75	_56	_77	_ 77	58	90	78
MEDIAN	79	45	72	<u>74</u>	68	80	101
ST. DEV.	34	42	16	34	25	35	18
RANGE	4-143	4-120	64-95	3/-127	29-8/	41-143	74-12
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.		1-6	1-2	<u></u>	1-2	1-1	1-3
N	34		3	_5_		6	_6
ALL P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	62	41	60	59	_73	<u>85</u>	95
MEDIAN	69	33	68	65	_73_	_76_	77
ST. DEV.	39	28	36	30	33	37	5-4
RANGE	1-296	1-115	5-149	5-150	5-154	30-23/	5-296
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.		1-9	1-9	1-7	1-8	1-6	1-8
N	357		45	69	57	40	35

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D.

U/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	63	_40	68	52	42	86	83
MEDIAN	_73	38	68	5-2	32	80	8/
ST. DEV.	32	32	_5	31	28	42	10
RANGE	4-143	4-80	64-72	3/-74	29-19	41-143	74-94
EVNT.MN.		3					
EVNT.RNG.		1-6	1-1	1-1	1-1	1-/	1-2
N	18	_4_		_2_	_3_	_4_	_3_
						North Hills The	
U/P	ALL		II II	III	IV	v	VI
<u>U/P</u> MEAN	ALL 57	<u> 3/</u>	11 _ <u>52</u> _	<u></u>	1V _66_	<u>85</u>	vi 84
			_				
MEAN	57		_	<u>52</u>	66	85	84
MEAN MEDIAN	57	<u>3/</u> <u>27</u>	_	<u>52</u> <u>#3</u>	<u>66</u> <u>73</u>	85	84 76
MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV.	<u>57</u> <u>55</u> <u>37</u>	31 27 26	52 38 43	52 43 28	66 73 34	85 80 32	84 76 36 5-155
MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV. RANGE	57 55 37 1-155 2	31 27 26 1-115	52 38 43 5-149	52 43 28	66 73 34 5-123	85 80 32 30-149	84 76 36 5-155

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D

			•				
A/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
MEAN	88	69	95	93	_ 75	97	_//3
MEDIAN	89	74_	95	83	75	97	1/0
		and the second of the second o	the state of the s	· ·	and the second s	23	the state of the s
RANGE	5-127	5-120		70-/2]	68-81	81-114	109-10
EVNT.RNG.			1 1			1-1	
N	16	_5_		3		_2_	_3_
							-

			** **	= -					
A/P	ALL	I	II	III	IV	V	vi		
MEAN	68	50	65	68_	79	86	110		
MEDIAN	69	_38_	69	69	75	74	81		
ST. DEV.	40	27	30	32	31	48	70		
° RANGE	5-296	5-109	5-120	5-150	32-155	32-23/	26-29		
EVNT.MN.		_2			3				
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-9	1-9	1-7	1-7	1-3	1-5		
N	172	59	27	29	29	_/3_	15		

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: D

L<10 T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VΙ
MEAN	72	40	68	64	78	86	94
MEDIAN	76	38	68	72	<u> 78</u>	80	94
ST. DEV.	3/	32	_5_	23		42	16
RANGE	4-143	4-80	64-72	3/-83		41-143	74-110
EVNT.MN.		3					
EVNT.RNG.	1-6	1-6	<u>/-/</u>	1-1		1-1	/- 2
N	20	_4_	_2_	_4_		4_	_5_
L<10/P	ALL	. 1	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	61	39	55	56	71	82	92
MEDIAN	66	_32	41	_58	_73_	76	76
ST. DEV.	39	27	37	31	34	3/	5-4
• RANGE	1-296	1-109	5-149	5-150	5-154	30-149	5-296
EVNT.MN.			2				
EVNT.RNG.	1-9	1-6	1-9	1-7	1-8	1-6	1-8
N	286	78	34	60	49	33	32

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: D

L>10/T	ALL	I	II	III	IV	v	VI
MEAN	78	69	95	127	53	97	121
MEDIAN	80	_74_	95	127	50	97	12/
ST. DEV.	40	49			26	24	
RANGE	5-127	5-120			29-81	80-114	
EVNT.MN.							
EVNT.RNG.	/-3	<u>/-/</u>		·	1-1		
N	_14_					_2_	
						1	
<u>L>10/P</u>	ALL	T	II	III	ıv	v	VI
L>10/P MEAN	ALL 67	1 46	11 _ 7 4_	73	τν <u>83</u>	v <u>/01</u>	vi /30
		1 46 34	74 75				
MEAN	67	1 <u>46</u> <u>34</u> <u>32</u>	<u> </u>	<u>73</u> _73_	83		130
MEAN MEDIAN	<u>67</u> <u>70</u>	1 46 34 32 3-1/5	74 75		<u>83</u> <u>78</u>	101 75 58	130 151 52
MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV.	67 70 40	46 34 32	74 75 29		83 78 22	101 75 58	130 151 52
MEAN MEDIAN ST. DEV. RANGE	67 70 40 3-23/ 3	46 34 32 3-115	74 75 29 5-117		83 78 22 55-111	101 -75 -58 -69-231	130 151 52

COMPARISON OF FT AND GT

C DATA (Event = 1,2,...,9)

DATA: C (Events = 1,2,...,9) II

4.		ALL		7	· · · · · · ·	T.T.		111		. .		•		, 1
Andrews (1997) Andrews (1997)	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L≤10K/T	62	<u>53</u>	40	45	45	37	<u>53</u>	4 2	79	<u>52</u>		4	<u>83</u>	76
N	16		4		3		2			· —	3		3	
U,L≤10K/P	52	43	27	31	41	34	50	38	62	47	84	<u>57</u>	76	67
N	131		49		19		40		27		24		22	
A,L ≤10K/T	91	<u>82</u>	<u> </u>	_	_	_	77	57	_		<u>8/</u>	87		10 1
N	~		0		0		2		<u>U</u>				2	_
-: 10K/P	61	55	42	38	57	43	65	54	72	69	67	71	97	84
	129		41		· <u>19</u>		21	-	25		10		13	-
U,L>10K/T	47	<u>69</u>		_			<u> </u>		3/	64	<u>B</u>	79		_
N	<u>3</u>		$\frac{\mathcal{O}}{2}$		<u> </u>		<u></u>		2				0	
U,L>10K/P	39	48	21_	37	<u>53</u>	47	70	<u>55</u>	87	59	_	76	0	<u>88</u>
N	25		<u>15</u>		3				2		3			
A,L >10K/T	96	73	68	<u>55</u>	95	64	127	7/	<u>75</u>	<u>83</u>	114	104	12/	121
N	11		5		1				2					
A,L>10K/F	68	58	47	47	72	<u>33</u>	73	57	8/	80	//2	79	130	94
<u>N</u>	56		26		9		8		6	· <u></u>	4_		3	
ALL T	72	65	56	51	58	44	77	<u>54</u>	58	69		77	98	23
<u>N</u> -	35		9	-	1 L/			-			6		6	
ALL P	57	49	35	37	54	42	<u>58</u>	45	69	60	83	4	<u>85</u>	75
<u>N</u>	391		131		50		70	-	60		41		<u>39</u>	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: C

		ALL		I .	•	II	•	III		IV	•	V		7 I
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	60	55	40	45	45	37			47	60	36	68	<u>83</u>	76
<u>N</u>	19		4		3		2		3		4	. —	3	_
U/P	51	44	25	32					bt.	48	85	60		<u>68</u>
N	206			·			41		29				23	
A/T	88	76		55		-		<u>62</u>				95		110
N	16		5		1		3		2		$\frac{2}{2}$		3	-
	43	36	4-1	<u>42</u>	62	46	<u>68</u>	<u>55</u>				73		مکا کھ
<u>N</u>	185	· 	67		23		21		3/			_		
L≤10K/T	69	10	<u>40</u>	45	45	37						<u>70</u>		87
N	21		4		3				1		4		5	_
L≤10K/P	56	48		34				100				6/	84	±3
N	310		90						<u>52</u>		34		35	<u></u>
L > 10K/T	78	72	<u>68</u>	<u>55</u>	95	6-1	127	7/		73	_	<u>4/</u>	121	124
N	14		5	-	1				4/07		3	70	1	<u></u>
L>10K/P	59	<u>55</u>				•				73		78	78	93
<u>N</u>	81		41		13		9		9	:	7_		エ	
														
										· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-	
ĥ i	. · · <u></u>							· · · · · · ·	11 % 					

D DATA

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: D

		ALL	I			II		III	1	ΙV	V	7	v	I
	FT	GT		GT		GT	FT	GT	FT	GT		GT	**	GT
U,L≤10K/T	66	54	40	45	<u>68</u>	<u>37</u>	52	42	79	52	<u>88</u>	64	<u>83</u>	76
N	15		4/		2		2				3		<u> </u>	
<u>u,L≤10K/P</u>	57	43	3/	3/	<u>52</u>	<u>3 3</u>	52	<u>38</u>			84	<u>57</u>	8/	67
<u>N</u>	1 <u>6</u>		42		15		<u>37</u>				24		<u>20</u>	 ,
$A,L \leq 10K/T$														104
<u>N</u>	5		<u></u>		<u>o</u>				0	-	/	70	2	80
=10K/P			— .					<u>54</u>	23	70	<u> </u>	70	12	<u>0</u> 3
N											9	. —		
U,L>10K/T		69								<u> </u>			2	
<u>N</u>	3		2			47	20	<u></u>	- 67	59				
<u>N</u> U,L>10K/P	<u>51</u> 19	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		27	<u>2</u> 3	<u> </u>			2		3		0	
<u>N</u> A,L >10K/T	· -		10	_										124
		1)		22		<u>Ø7</u>	123		2	<u></u> _		<u> </u>	1	/
<u>N</u> A,L>10K/F	11	=0	5						8/	80	<u> </u>	79	130	94
					<u>81</u>	21	<u>ر ج</u> (2	<u> </u>	٠		4		3	
<u>N</u>	52		23	<u>-</u>	<u>ー</u> フマ	<u> </u>	77	54	58	69	90	77	98	93
ALL T	34	<u>, 63</u>	54 9 41 11	<u>) </u>	<u>/ </u>	-110	5		6	<u> </u>	10		6	
<u>N</u> -	10	2 50	1	77	<u> </u>	(1)	- 59		77	60	95	61	95	75
ALL P	25	7	<u>77</u>	27	<u>デ</u>	72	69	<u>/</u> 3_	12 57	<u> </u>	40		35	
<u>N</u>	27	<i></i>	<u>''</u>		72		<u>~</u>				<u> </u>			- .

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA:

	,	ALL		[II	. 1	III	•	IV	1	7	,	/ Ι
	FT	GT		GT	•	GT		GT	,	•	FT	GT	FT	
U/T	63	56	40	45	<u>8</u> 8	37	52	42	47	60	86	<u>68</u>	<u>83</u>	76
N	13		4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3		2		3		4		3	
<u> </u>	56	44	3L	32	52	36	52	<u>38</u>	<u>ldo</u>	47	85	60	<u>G1</u>	67
N	185		52		18		410		28		27		20	
- A <u>/T</u>	88	76	68	<u>35</u>	95	64	<u>r</u>	<u>62</u>	75	23	97	52	113	110
N	16		5		1_		3		3		2		3	<u></u>
	68	56	50	411	65	46	63	55	79	72	<u>8</u>	73	110	<u>87</u>
N	132		59		. 27		25		29	, ,	13	· · ·	15	
<u>N</u> L≤10K/T	72	61	40	45	<u>69</u>	37	65	49	79	52	26	70	91	<u>87</u>
N N	20		4		2		<u> 4</u>		<u> </u>				<u> </u>	
L≤10K/P	<u>61</u>	48	39	34	<u> 55</u>	39	56	43	7/	28	<u>82</u>	61	92	73
N	286		78		34	 <u></u>	60		49	<u> </u>	<u>33</u>		32	. —
L > 10K/T	78	12	68	55	95	64	127	71	53	73	97	9/	12/	124
N	14		5	. <u> </u>	1		1		4		2			
<u> </u>	67	55	46	4/3	74	52	73	51	83	75	101	78	130	· 94
N N	71		33		11		9		8		王		3	
=									· <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>					
										·. ——				
							·							
						 				· · · · ·				

Cx DATA (probable career
of(endar dropped)

DATA: CX (probable career offendors removed)

		ALL		I		II	• •	III		IV		y		VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L≤10K/T	53	42	38	34	45	<u>37</u>	52	42	79	<u>52</u>	80	64	_	
N	9		2	-	3		2		1	—	1		0	•
U,L≤10K/P				•									84	71
<u>N</u>	80		30		9	-	19		<u>13</u>		7		2	-
$A,L \leq 10K/T$									_		_	_		=
<u>N</u>			0		0	 -			0		0		0	.
A, _OK/P	52	44	40	35	56	40	<u>52</u>	46	60	56	75	<u>68</u>	99	84
<u>N</u>	70		31		· <u>15</u>		_//_		6		3		4	
U,L>10K/T				and the second second					31	64	_		$\frac{-}{\delta}$	
<u>N</u>			•						2			·		
U,L > 10K/P	<u>17</u>	32	17	32	_	_			_	_	_		_	
<u>N</u>	8	· ·	8.		0		0		0		0		0	. —
A,L >10K/T	75	65	68						68	79	114	104		_
<u>N</u>	7		5		0		0			· :	1		$\frac{\mathcal{O}}{}$	
A,L>10K/P	42	43	34	41	51	45	76	50	72	le !	_		=	
<u>N</u>	22		16	·	3		2		1	<u></u>	0		0	
ALL T	60	54	60	49	45	37	58	47	52	64	97	84	_	=
<u>N</u>	19		7		3		3		4		2		0	
		24						_						
<u>N</u>	180		85		27		32		20		10		6	·

DATA: CX

••	•							. •						
		ALL	•	I		II	*	III		IV	•	V		VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	49	46	38	<u>34</u>	45	<u>37</u>	<u>5</u> Z	42	<u>47</u>	60	80	64	_	_
<u>N</u>	11		2		3		2		_3_			· · ·	0	
U/P	38	34	20	27	<u>34</u>	<u> 29</u>	45	32	61	41	<u>68</u>	<u>52</u>	84	ZL
<u>N</u>	88		38		9		19		<u>/3</u>	-	7		2	
A/T	74	64	68	<u>55</u>		=	70	<u>57</u>	68	79	114	104		
<u>N</u>	8		5		6		1		1				0	
	49	44	38	37	55	41	56	47	61	<u>57</u>	<u>75</u>	68	99	84
<u>N</u>	92		47		· <u>18</u>		13		7		3		4	
L≤10¥/T	55	43	38	34	45	37	<u>58</u>	<u>47</u>	79	<u>52</u>	80	64		
N	16		2.		3		3		1	·			0	
_ L≤10K/P	46	39	30.	31	48	36	48	38	60	46	70	56	94	80
<u>N</u>	150		61		<u>24</u>		30		19		10		<u>ط</u>	
L > 10K/T	65	65	68	55	_		_					104		_
N	9		5	-	0		0		3	· <u></u>	1		0	
L>10K/P	35	40	28	38	51	45	76	50	72	61	_			
			100								0		0	
-	<u> </u>	··		***	· .	· ·				•				
											. —		· .	
	-						. ——							

D_X• DATA

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: ₽X

		ALL		I	:	II		III		IV		V.	٠.٦	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L ≤10K/T	59	42	38	34	68	<u>37</u>	<u>52</u>	42	79	<u>52</u>	80	64	_	
<u>N</u>	8		2	· ——	2		2						0	
U,L ≤10K/P	<u>43</u>	34	23	26	38	29	48	32	61	41	68	<u>52</u>	84	71
<u>N</u>	75		27		<u>_8</u>		18	-	13		7	 .	2	
A,L ≤10K/T	70	57	70	<u>S</u>	=	_	_					=		_
			1		-						0		0	
A,L < 10K/P	<u>55</u>	<u>45</u>	46	35	56	40	52	46	60	56	75	68	99	84
<u>N</u>	66		27		· <u>15</u>	 .		. —	6		3		4	
U,L>10K/T	31	64		<u> </u>	_	_			<u>31</u>	64	=		_	
N	2		0		0		0		2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	. —	0	
U.L>10K/P	<u>ZZ</u>	31	<u>22</u>	31		· <u> </u>	=		_	_	_			_
<u>N</u>	6		6		0		0		0		0	, —	0	
A.L >10K/T	<u>75</u>	65	68	22	_		_	_	68	79	114	104	_	_
<u> N</u>	7		5		0		0	· .		-	1		0	
A,L>10K/P	48	43	39	40	77	45	76	50	72	61			_	
<u>N</u>	19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	14	-	2		2		1	<u></u> -	0		0	
ALL T	63	55	60	49	68	<u>37</u>	58	<u>47</u>	<u>52</u>	64	97	84	_	
<u>N</u>	18	·	7		2		3		4		2		0	
3 - 5	48	39	34	32	<u>52</u>	37	51	39	61	<u>4</u> 7	70	56	94	80
		i .												

	*													•
		ALL		I	•	II		III	•	IV		V		VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	54	47	38	34	48	<u>37</u>	<u>52</u>	42	<u>47</u>	60	80	64		_
<u>N</u>	10		2		2		2		3			-	0	
<u>U/P</u>	41	34	23	<u>27</u>	38	<u>29</u>	48	32	61	41	68	52	84	71
<u>N</u>	81		33		8		18		13	, , , , , ,	7		2_	
<u>A/T</u>	74	64	68	<u>55</u>	_		70	57	68	79	114	104		_
<u>N</u>	8		5		0				1	 ,			0	
	54	44	43	37	<u>59</u>	41	56	47	61	<u>57</u>	75	68	99	84
														
L≤10K/T	61	44	38	<u>34</u>	68	<u>37</u>	<u>58</u>	47	79	52	80	64	_	_
N	9		2.		2		3						0	-
L≤10K/P	48	39	34	31	50	36	49	38	60	46	70	56	94	80
<u>N</u>	141		54		23		29		19		10		6	
L > 10K/T	45	65	68	55	_				43	69	114	104		_
N	9		5	· · ·	0		0		3				0	
L > 10K/P	42	40	<u>34</u>	37	77	45	76	50	72	61				
<u>N</u>	25		20		2		2				0		0	
		•												
														
r S									· ·	—				 -

C• DATA

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: →

		ALL		I		II		III		IV _.	•	v	· · · · · ·	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L ≤10K/T	51	45	40	45	45	37	<u>52</u>	42	79	52	80	64	_	
<u>N</u>	_//_		4		3		2	· · · · · · · ·	1			·.	0	
U,L ≤10K/P	<u>42</u>	39	28	31	25	<u>33</u>	48_	38	62	<u>47</u>	68	<u>57</u>	59	71
<u>N</u>	131		47	· · · · ·	15		35	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	20		10		4	
A,L ≤ 10K/T	90	85		_			70	57				_	109	<u>//3</u>
ที	2		0		0		_1_	· ·	<u>D</u>		0		1	
A10K/P	58	50	42	38	57	43	63	52	<u>77</u>	73	87	71_	99	84
N	96		40		· <u>19</u>		15		14		4	·.	4	
U,L>10K/T	31	64			=	_	_		31	64	=		_	
N	2		<u>()</u>		0		0	· ——	2	· .	0		<u> </u>	
U,L>10K/P	39	46	21	37	53	47	70	<u>Σ</u> Σ	104	68	86	76	_	
N	23		15		3		1				3		0	
A,L >10K/T	78	68	48	55	95	64	=		75	83	114	104		_
<u>N</u>	9		5		1		0		2		1		0	
A,L>10K/P	59	54	47	47	73	<u>22</u>	81	59	77	81	74	81	=	
<u>N</u>	45		26		8		5	-	5	<u> </u>	1		0	
ALL T	63	58	56	51	58	44	28	47	<u>58</u>	69	97	84	109	1/3
<u>N</u>							3		5		2			
ATT P						42	55	44	70	61	76	65	79	77
<u> </u>	295	-	128		45		56		40		18		8	

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: C*

	ALL	I		II	*. * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	III		IV		V :		VI
FT	GT F	r GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>u/t</u> 48	48 40	45	45	37	<u>52</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>47</u>	60	80	64	_	_
<u>N</u> 13	4		3		<u>Z</u>		3_				0	· · · ·
<u>U/P</u> 42	40 24	33	29	32	49	39	64	<u>48</u>	72	61	59	71
<u>N</u> 155			18		<u>36</u>		21		13		4	
A/T 80	71 68	<u> 22</u>	95	64	70	57_	75	83	114	104	109	<u>//3</u>
<u>N</u> <u>//</u>	5	· .			1		2			·	1	
<u>. 58</u>	51 44											
<u>n</u> <u>141</u>		<u></u>	27		20		19		5		4	
L≤10:√T <u>57</u>	51 40							52	<u>79</u>	64	109	113
N 13	<u> </u>	· —	3		3	· :				· · · · · · ·	1	. —
L≤10K/P 49	43 34	<u>34</u>	43	38	53	42	68	58	74	61	79	77
<u>N</u> 227	8	7	<u>34</u>		50		34		14		<u>8</u>	
L > 10F/T 69	67 68	55	95	64	_		53	73	114	104	_	
<u>N</u> _//	5		1		0	·	4		1		0	
L>10K/P 52	51 3	43	67	53	79	58	81	79	83	77	_	
N 68	4		11		6		<u>d</u>		4		0	
						-				-		
	-			-		* *						
										· —		

D. DATA

DATA: P

		ALL		1		II		III		IV		v	•	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U.L \$10K/T	56	45	40	45	68	37	<u>52</u>	42	79	52	80	64		_
<u>N</u>	10		4		2	 	2		1				0	
U.L ≤10K/P	46	39	<u>32</u>	<u>3</u> L	33	31	49	38	62	47	68	<u>57</u>	59	71
<u>N</u>	120		41		1)_		34		20		10		4	.
A,L ≤10K/T	90	<u>85</u>		_	_		70			_			109	113
N	2		<u>D</u>		<u>0</u>				0	-	0			·
A10K/P	61	50	48								4	7.	99	84
<u>N</u>	91		35		12		• .		· .				4	
U,L>10K/T	31	64						_		64			=	_
	2				0			-	2		0		0	
U,L>10K/P	<u>50</u>	48	31	<u>37</u>	<u>53</u>	47	70	<u>55</u>	104	68	86	76	_	=
<u>N</u>	18		10		3		1		1		3	-	0	
A,L >10F/T	78	68	68	22	95	64			75	83	114	104		_
<u>N</u>	9		_5_				0		2				0	
A.L > 10K/P	65	<u>55</u>	53	46	83	57	81	59	77	81	74	81	_	_
<u>N</u>									`	<u>. </u>			0	, <u></u>
ALL T	65	59	56	<u>5/</u>	77	46	58	47	58	69	97	84	109	<u>113</u>
<u>N</u> .	23	1. A. C.	9		3		3		5		2		1	
ATT P	54	46		37	55	42	\$6	44	70	61	76	65	79	77
<u>N</u>	270		109		40		55		40		18		8	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: P

								•						
		ALL		I		II	•	III	• • • •	IV		V		VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	52	48	40	45	68	37	52	42	47	60	80	64		
<u>N</u>	12		4		2		2		3		1		0	
<u>U/P</u>	46	40	31	32	38	35	50	39	64	48	72	61	59	71
<u>N</u>	138		51	· 	14		35		21		13		4	. ——
<u>A/T</u>	80	71	68	<u>55</u>	95	64	70	57	75	83	1/4	104	109	<u>//3</u>
<u>N</u>		· · · ·	5						<u>Z</u>		<u>./</u>			
<u> </u>	62	<u>52</u>	50	41	64	4 7	68	54	77	75	86	73	99	84
<u>N</u>	132		58		26	 -	20		19		5		4	
L≤10VT	62	<u>52</u>	40	45	68	37	58	<u>47</u>	79	<u>52</u>	80	64	109	113
. -		· .	_					and the second second						-
<u>L ≤10K/P</u>	<u>52</u>	44	<u>39</u>	<u>34</u>	49	37	54	42	68	58	74	61	79	77
<u>N</u>						•				*			11. 1 L	
L > 10F/T	69	47	68	55	95	64		_	53	73	1/4	104		
<u>N</u>	11		5				0		4				0	
L>10K/P	60	52	46	43	74	54	79	58	81	79	83	77		
4 M 1											4			
<u> </u>												. <u> </u>		
												<u> </u>	+ <u></u>	
R			·											
Programme Control				•										

ALL OFFENSE ANALYSIS: COMPARISON OF FT AND GT

A DATA

m mitrigge con in

DATA: A

III IV VI II GT FT GT FT GT FT GT FT GT U,L \$10K/T 61 52 40 45 45 37 52 42 79 52 75 57 83 76 4 25 30 40 33 49 37 62 47 80 56 76 66 42 195 __ 56 __ 27 _ 22 A, L & 1 OK/T 82 67 56 57 99 46 103 64 - -75 87 110 104 6 10K/P 59 54 40 41 56 45 64 54 72 W 70 72 94 82 ___ 3/___ 29 0 _ 0 _ U.L>10K/P 42 4B 22 37 53 47 70 55 87 59 94 77 2 62 54 87 67 117 67 76 96 114 104 121 124 A,L>10K/T 83 74 103 49 50 72 51 73 60 87 98 112 82 118 104 9 10 10 68 49 96 60 61 78 80 71 6 10 56 50 35 39 53 42 58 46 70 63 8 65 85 76 82 69 50 __ 164 __ 58 464

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: A

		ALL		I		II	•	III		IV	•	V	•	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	59	54	40	45	45	37	23	42	47	60	75	60	83	76
N	21		4	·	3		2		3	. .	6		3	
<u>:-</u> U/P	49	43	24	32	4/1	35	50	39	64	48	<u>82</u>	59	73	68
	202		72		24		43		29		3/		23	
	82	70	59	<u>55</u>		60	107	65	76	96	89	92	113	1/0
A/T	33	4	13		3		\mathcal{B}		3	. ·	3		3	
<u>N</u>		57		44	d	47	660	55	75	73		75	99	86
	242		92		34		39		40	. ——	19		18	
=======================================	72	60	<u>50</u>	52	59	39			79	52		65	94	87
L≤10K/T	36	<u> </u>	11		4		3		1		チ		<u>5</u>	
<u>N</u>	54	48		36		40		44	67	5 7	76	6	83	72
L≤10K/P		70	113	<u> </u>	45	. —	7/		55	<u></u>	41		36	
<u>N</u>	364	72		<u></u>	81	====		67		83	97	91		124
L > 10K/T		73		<u>54</u>	<u>04</u>	<u>v +</u>		- 0 /		<u>0</u>)	2			.=
<u>N</u>	18		4				2		5	$\frac{1}{6}$		<u> </u>	94	<u>/</u> ∞
L>10K/P	61	59	40	416		50	47	60		. —		80		<u>/w</u>
<u>N</u>	100		51	-	13		11		1/	-	9		5	
				· <u></u>									· · · <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>	
					· ·									
					· ·					:				· .
			1000											

B DATA

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: B

Model:

		ALL		I		II		III		IV		v	•	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U, L<10/T														
<u>N</u>	17_		4		2		2			· —	5		3	
U, L<10/P	<u>55</u>	42	30	30	49	32	50	37	64	<u>47</u>	80	56	84	67
<u>N</u>	177		46		17		41	÷ .	26		27		<u>Zo</u>	
A, L<10/T	82	67	56	57	99	46	103	64	_		75	87	110	104
<u>N</u>	18		7		1		<u>b</u>		0		2		2	
A. L<10/P														
<u>N</u>												•		
<u>U, L>10/T</u>														
<u>N</u>	3		0		0	. · · · · ·	0		2				0	
U, L>10/P	54	49	32	36	<u>53</u>	47	70	<u>55</u>	87	59	94	77	_	
<u>N</u>	21		11		3		1		2		4		0	
A, L>10/T	83	74	62	<u>54</u>	87	67	117	67	76	96	114	104	121	124
<u>N</u>	15	· .	6		2		2		3_				1	
A, L>10/P	74	43	<u>57</u>	49	80	52	73	60	87	98	112	<u>82</u>	118	104
<u>N</u>	67		30		9		10		9		5		4	
ALL T	75	65	54	<u>53</u>	82	51	96	60	61	78	80	71	98	93
<u>N</u>	<u>53</u>		17	<u> </u>	5		10		6		9		6	
ALL P	61	51	42	39	58	42	<u>58</u>	46	74	63	85	64	94	76
<u>N</u>														

BANK ROBBERY DATA

DATA: B

		ALL		I		II		III		IV		v	•	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
<u>U/T</u>	62	<u>55</u>	40	45	68	<u>37</u>	<u>52</u>	42	47	60	75	60	83	76
<u>N</u>	20	·	4		2		2		3		6		3	•
<u>U/P</u>	<u>55</u>	43	30	31	50			38					84	67
<u>N</u>	198		57		20		42		28		31		20	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<u>A/T</u>	82	70	<u>59</u>	22	9/	60	107	65	76	96	88	92	<u>//3</u>	<u>//0</u>
<u>N</u>	33		13		3		8		3		3		3	-
	67	<u>57</u>	56	44	62	<u>47</u>	66	<u>55</u>	79	74	90	75	105	<u>87</u>
<u>N</u>	223													
L<10/T	74	60	50	52	78	40	91	58	79	52	<u>75</u>	65	94	87
<u>N</u>	<u>35</u>		11		3	· · · · · ·	8		1		7		5	
<u>L<10/P</u>	59	48	38	36	53	40	56	44	71	<u>57</u>	80	61	91	73
<u>N</u>	333		95	-	41		70	· .	<u>55</u>		39		33	
L>10/T	77	73	62	54	87	67	117	67	58	83	97	91	121	124
<u>N</u>	18		<u>_b_</u>		2		2		5		2		1	
L>10/P	69	60	50	45	73	5/	73	60	87	90	104	80	118	104
<u>N</u>	88		41		12	· `.·	<u> //</u>		11		9		4	en e

APPENDIX TO ALL OFFENSE ANALYSIS

A. DATA (probable coreer offender removed)

DATA: A (probable coreer offendors

± - √	1	ALL		I		II		III		IV		V	•	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L≰10K/T	51	45	40	45	45	37	52	12	79	52	63	52		_
N	13		4		_3_					• · ·	3		0	
U,L ≤10K/P	40	38	25	30	25	32	47	37	<u>62</u>	47	63	<u>54</u>	59	71
N	145		54		<u>17</u>		<u>37</u>		20		13		4	
A,L≤10K/T	68	60	56	<u>57</u>	99	46	72	56	_	_		_	109	113
N	12		7				3		0		0		<u></u>	
) _10K/P	56	50	39	40	56	45	63	<u>52</u>	75	68	90	70	91	77
N	132		55		24		22	·	20		6		5	
U,L>10K/T	31	4	_	-	_	_			31	64	_		_	=
<u> </u>	2		0.		0		0		2		0	· 	0	
U,L>10K/P	42	47	22	37	53	47	70	<u>55</u>	104	68	94	77	_	
N	25		16		3				1		4		0	
A,L >10K/T	77	70	62	54	87	67	108	64	76	96	114	104	_	<u> </u>
<u>N</u>	13		6		2	·			3	· ——	1		0	
A,L>10K/P	59	<u>55</u>	49	50	72	53	79	58	<u>75</u>	79	74	81		
N	57	· · · · · ·	35		9		b		6	<u></u>	<u>. 1</u>		0	
ALL T	64	59	54	53	68	49	71	53	61	78	76	45	109	<u>//3</u>
<u>N</u>	40		<u>17</u>		6		6		6		4			
ALL_P	49	46	35	39	49	42	56	45	70	61	75	63	77	74
<u>N</u>	359	· 	160		<u>53</u>		lde		<u>47</u>		24		9	
						•	100	er in the second						

		ALL		I		II		III		IV	•	V	,	VI
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U/T	49	47	40	45	45	37	52	42	47	60	63	52	_	_
<u>N</u>	15		4		3		2		3	·	3		0	·
U/P	41	39	24	32	29	3 <u>4</u>	48	38	<u>·64</u>	48	<u>76</u>	60	59	71
<u>N</u>	170		76	· ·	20		38		21	· ·	17	··	4	
_ A/T	72	65	59	55	91	60	81	58	76	96	114	109	109	<u>//3</u>
N	25		13		3		4		3				1.	
<u> </u>	57	51	43	44	60	47	67	54	75	70	88	7/	91	77
N	189		90	·	33		28	<u> </u>	26		7		5	
L≤10V/T	59	52	50	52	59	<u>39</u>	64	50	79	52	<u>63</u>	52	109	<u>//3</u>
	25				4		5		1		3			
<u>-</u> L≤10K/P	48	44	32	35	43	40	53	43	68	58	72	<u>59</u>	77	74
N	277		109						40	· .	19		9	. .
_ L > 10K/T	70	69	62					64	58	<u>83</u>	114	104	_	
N	15			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					5				0	· .
_ L > 10K/P		52		46		<u>51</u>	78	58	80	77	90	78	<u> </u>	
N	82				1						_5_		0	
<u>.</u>								, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		•				<u> </u>
				 .		•		÷ .						·
		-		- 1	<u> </u>									

B. DATA

DATA: B

	ALL		I		II		III		vi		v			vi
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U,L ≤10K/T	56	45	40	<u>45</u>	68	37	52	42	79	<u>52</u>	43	52		
N	12		4		2		2		<u></u>		_3_		0	
U.L ≤10K/P	45	38	30	30	33	30			1.	,	63	24	59	71
<u>N</u>	131	 .	45		13		36		20		13		4	
A,L≤10K/T	68	60	56	57	99	46	72	56	_		_	_	109	113
Ñ	12		7		1		3		0	-	0			. —
A,OK/P	59	51	45	41	56	<u>45</u>	63	52	75	68	90	70	91	7 7
<u>N</u>	124		47		. 24		22		20		6		5	
U,L>10K/T	31	64	_						31	64	_			=
<u>N</u>	2		0:		<u>D</u> .		0		2	-	0		0	
U.L>10K/P	<u>53</u>	48	32	36	53	47	70	<u>55</u>	104	68	94	77	_	_
N	20		1/-		3	\					4		0	
A,L >10K/T	77	70	62	54	87	67	108	64	76	96	114	104		_
<u>N</u>	13		6		2				3		1		0	 ,
A.L > 10K/P	66	55	57	49	81	54	<u>79</u>	58	<u>75</u>	<u>79</u>	74	81	_	=
<u>N</u>	51		30		8	·	6		6	•	1		0	
ALL T	65	59	54	53	82	5/	71	53	61	78	76	45	109	113
<u>N</u>	39		17		<u>5</u>		6	· · · .	6		4		1	
ALT P	54	46	42	38	54	43	57	45	<u>70</u>	61	75	63	77	74
<u>x</u>													9	

BANK ROBBERY DATA DATA: B ★

	ALL		I		II		III		IV		v		VI	
	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT	FT	GT
U/T	52	48	40	45	68	<u>37</u>	52	42	<u>47</u>	60	43	52		
<u>N</u>	14	· · · · · ·	4		2		2	•	3		3		0	
<u>U/P</u>	46	40	31	3/_	<u>37</u>	33	49	38	64	48	70	60	59	71
<u>N</u>	151		56		16		<u>37</u>		21		17		4	
A/T	72	65	59	22	91	60	81	58	76	96	<u>114</u>	104	109	113
<u>N</u>	25		13		3		4		3					+ 1
	61	52	50	44	62	48	<u>67</u>	<u>54</u>	75	70	88	71	91	77
											and the second			
L≤10VT	62	53	50	5,2	78	40	64	50	79	52	<u>63</u>	52	109	<u>//3</u>
		4.4	-								3		1	· · · · ·
L≤10K/P	52	44	38	<u>35</u>	48	40	<u>54</u>	43	68	<u>58</u>	72	<u>59</u>	77	<u>74</u>
<u>N</u>	255	-	92		37	· —	58		40		19		9	
L > 10 K/T	70	49	62	54	87	<u>67</u>	108	64	58	83	114	104		
<u>N</u>	15		6		2			, <u></u> -	5				0	
L>10K/P	62	53	50	45	73	52	78	58	80	77	90	78	_	
<u>N</u>	71		41				7	·	7		5		0	
					*. * 									
						. .	. :	-	: . · ——	- <u> </u>				