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

May 19, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO ALL FEDERAL PROSECUTORS

From: Eric H. Holder, Jr.
Attorney General

Subject: Department Policy on Charging and Sentencing

The reasoned exercise of prosecutorial discretion is essential to the fair, effective, and even-handed administration of the federal criminal laws. Decisions about whether to initiate charges, what charges and enhancements to pursue, when to accept a negotiated plea, and how to advocate at sentencing, are among the most fundamental duties of federal prosecutors. For nearly three decades, the Principles of Federal Prosecution, as reflected in Title 9 of the U.S. Attorneys' Manual, Chapter 27, have guided federal prosecutors in the discharge of these duties in particular and in their responsibility to seek justice in the enforcement of the federal criminal laws in general. The purpose of this memorandum is to reaffirm the guidance provided by those Principles.

Persons who commit similar crimes and have similar culpability should, to the extent possible, be treated similarly. Unwarranted disparities may result from disregard for this fundamental principle. They can also result, however, from a failure to analyze carefully and distinguish the specific facts and circumstances of each particular case. Indeed, equal justice depends on individualized justice, and smart law enforcement demands it. Accordingly, decisions regarding charging, plea agreements, and advocacy at sentencing must be made on the merits of each case, taking into account an individualized assessment of the defendant's conduct and criminal history and the circumstances relating to commission of the offense (including the impact of the crime on victims), the needs of the communities we serve, and federal resources and priorities. Prosecutors must always be mindful of our duty to ensure that these decisions are made without unwarranted consideration of such factors as race, gender, ethnicity, or sexual orientation.

Charging Decisions: Charging decisions should be informed by reason and by the general purposes of criminal law enforcement: punishment, public safety, deterrence, and rehabilitation. These decisions should also reflect the priorities of the Department and of each district. Charges should ordinarily be brought if there is probable cause to believe that a person has committed a federal offense and there is sufficient admissible evidence to obtain and sustain a conviction, unless "no substantial Federal interest" would be served, the person is subject to

"effective prosecution" elsewhere, or there is "an adequate non-criminal alternative to prosecution" [USAM 9-27.200 et seq.].

Moreover, in accordance with long-standing principle, a federal prosecutor should ordinarily charge "the most serious offense that is consistent with the nature of the defendant's conduct, and that is likely to result in a sustainable conviction" [USAM 9-27.300]. This determination, however, must always be made in the context of "an individualized assessment of the extent to which particular charges fit the specific circumstances of the case, are consistent with the purpose of the Federal criminal code, and maximize the impact of Federal resources on crime" [USAM 9-27.300]. In all cases, the charges should fairly represent the defendant's criminal conduct, and due consideration should be given to the defendant's substantial assistance in an investigation or prosecution. As a general matter, the decision whether to seek a statutory sentencing enhancement should be guided by these same principles.

All charging decisions must be reviewed by a supervisory attorney. All but the most routine indictments should be accompanied by a prosecution memorandum that identifies the charging options supported by the evidence and the law and explains the charging decision therein. Each office shall promulgate written guidance describing its internal indictment review process.[1]

Plea Agreements: Plea agreements should reflect the totality of a defendant's conduct. These agreements are governed by the same fundamental principle as charging decisions: prosecutors should seek a plea to the most serious offense that is consistent with the nature of the defendant's conduct and likely to result in a sustainable conviction, informed by an individualized assessment of the specific facts and circumstances of each particular case. Charges should not be filed simply to exert leverage to induce a plea, nor should charges be abandoned to arrive at a plea bargain that does not reflect the seriousness of the defendant's conduct. All plea agreements should be consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution and must be reviewed by a supervisory attorney. Each office shall promulgate written guidance regarding the standard elements required in its plea agreements, including the waivers of a defendant's rights.

Advocacy at Sentencing: As the Supreme Court has recognized, Congress has identified the factors for courts to consider when imposing sentences pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3553. Consistent with the statute and with the advisory sentencing guidelines as the touchstone, prosecutors should seek sentences that reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment, afford deterrence, protect the public, and offer defendants an opportunity for effective rehabilitation. In the typical case, the appropriate balance among these purposes will continue to be reflected by the applicable guidelines range, and prosecutors should generally continue to advocate for a sentence within that range. The advisory guidelines remain important in furthering the goal of national uniformity throughout the federal system. But consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution and given the advisory

[1] This memorandum has no impact on the guidance provided in the September 22, 2003 memorandum and elsewhere regarding "fast-track" programs. In those districts where an approved "fast-track" program has been established, charging decisions and disposition of charges must comply with the Department's requirements for that program.

nature of the guidelines, advocacy at sentencing—like charging decisions and plea agreements—must also follow from an individualized assessment of the facts and circumstances of each particular case. All prosecutorial requests for departures or variances—upward or downward—must be based upon specific and articulable factors, and require supervisory approval. Each office shall provide training for effective advocacy at sentencing.

With respect to charging decisions, plea agreements, and advocacy at sentencing, the mechanisms established for obtaining supervisory approval should be designed to ensure, as much as possible, adherence to the Principles of Federal Prosecution and the guidance provided by this memorandum, as well as district-wide consistency. Supervisory attorneys selected to review exercises of discretion should be skilled, experienced, and thoroughly familiar with Department and district-specific policies, priorities, and practices. All guidance described above must be shared with the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys upon promulgation.

This memorandum supersedes previous Department guidance on charging and sentencing including the September 22, 2003 memorandum issued by Attorney General John Ashcroft ("Department Policy Concerning Charging Criminal Offenses, Disposition of Charges, and Sentencing"), the July 2, 2004 memorandum issued by Deputy Attorney General James Comey ("Department Legal Positions and Policies in Light of *Blakely v. Washington*"), and the January 28, 2005 memorandum issued by Deputy Attorney General James Comey ("Department Policies and Procedures Concerning Sentencing").

The Deputy Attorney General

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

January 28, 2005

TO: All Federal Prosecutors

FROM: James B. Comey
Deputy Attorney General

SUBJECT: Department Policies and Procedures Concerning Sentencing

## I. INTRODUCTION

The past few months have been a time of change and uncertainty in federal sentencing. Federal prosecutors have had to adapt to a shifting landscape, which you have done with characteristic professionalism and dedication. I thank you and commend you for your flexibility, your creativity and your good humor in these difficult circumstances. The challenges continue. Although the Supreme Court's ruling in *United States* v. *Booker* answered some of the questions raised in *Blakely* v. *Washington*, the sentencing system will continue to be a source of debate and litigation. Throughout, we must remain focused on our principles and our mission, which are clear and enduring.

First, we must do everything in our power to ensure that sentences carry out the fundamental purposes of sentencing. Those purposes, as articulated by Congress in the Sentencing Reform Act, are to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, to provide just punishment, to afford deterrence, to protect the public, and to offer opportunities for rehabilitation to the defendant.

Second, we must take all steps necessary to ensure adherence to the Sentencing Guidelines. One of the fundamental imperatives of the federal sentencing system is to avoid unwarranted disparity among similarly situated defendants. The Guidelines have helped to ensure consistent, fair, determinate and proportional punishment. They have also contributed to historic declines in crime. We must do our part to ensure that the Guidelines continue to set the standard for federal sentencing.

## II. DEPARTMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES CONCERNING SENTENCING

Sentencing is a shared responsibility of the three branches of the federal government. The role of the Executive Branch is to enforce the law by bringing appropriate charges and advocating the consistent application of the Sentencing Guidelines and mandatory minimums, which reflect the judgments Congress has made about appropriate sentences for federal crimes. The following guidance is intended to help you faithfully execute that role in the wake of *Booker*.

### A. *Consistency in charging, pleas, and sentencing*

Federal prosecutors must consult the Sentencing Guidelines at the charging stage, just as federal judges must consult the Guidelines at sentencing. In order to do our part in avoiding unwarranted disparities, federal prosecutors must continue to charge and pursue the most serious readily provable offenses. As set forth in Attorney General Ashcroft's Memorandum on Department Policies and Procedures Concerning Sentencing Recommendations and Sentencing Appeals (July 28, 2003), the "most serious" readily provable offenses are those that would generate the most substantial sentence pursuant to: (1) the Guidelines; (2) one or more applicable mandatory minimums; and/or (3) a consecutive sentence required by statute. One of the fundamental principles underlying the Guidelines is that punishment should be based on the real offense conduct of the defendant. To ensure that sentences reflect real offense conduct, prosecutors must present to the district court all readily provable facts relevant to sentencing.

### B. *Compliance with the Sentencing Guidelines*

Federal prosecutors must actively seek sentences within the range established by the Sentencing Guidelines in all but extraordinary cases. Under the Guidelines, departures are reserved for rare cases involving circumstances that were not contemplated by the Sentencing Commission. Accordingly, federal prosecutors must obtain supervisory authorization to recommend or stipulate to a sentence outside the appropriate Guidelines range or to refrain from objecting to a defendant's request for such a sentence.

### C. *Appeals of unreasonable sentences*

Federal prosecutors must preserve the ability of the United States to appeal "unreasonable" sentences. The Solicitor General will ensure that the Department takes consistent and judicious positions in pursuing sentencing appeals. Accordingly, in any case in which the sentence imposed is below what the United States believes is the appropriate Sentencing Guidelines range (except uncontested departures pursuant to the Guidelines, with supervisory approval), federal prosecutors must oppose the sentence and ensure that the record is sufficiently developed to place the United States in the best position possible on appeal. If a sentence not only is below the Guidelines range, but also, in the judgment of the United States Attorney or component head, fails to reflect the

purposes of sentencing, then the prosecutor should seek approval from the Solicitor General to file an appeal.

### D. *Reporting of adverse sentencing decisions*

Although the Department has not proposed or endorsed any particular action by Congress or the Sentencing Commission in the wake of *Booker*, we must continuously assess the impact of the Supreme Court's rulings based on accurate, real-time information on sentencing, in order to play an appropriate and effective role in the public debate. The existing requirements for reporting adverse decisions set forth in the U.S. Attorney's Manual remain in effect. In addition, the Executive Office for United States Attorneys is distributing instructions for reporting (1) sentences outside the appropriate Sentencing Guidelines range, and (2) cases in which the district court failed to calculate a Guideline range before imposing an unreasonable sentence. This reporting requirement applies to all United States Attorney's Offices and litigating divisions.

## III. CONCLUSION

I know how hard you work and what credit that work brings to this great institution and this country. Our job is to bring justice to criminals and for their victims. Your ability and dedication will get the job done in these challenging times.

# Department of Justice

**MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2003** **AG**

**[THE BELOW MEMO WAS DISTRIBUTED TO U.S. ATTORNEYS ON SEPTEMBER 22, 2003, AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ANNOUNCED THE POLICY IN MILWAUKEE, WI. REMARKS FROM HIS SPEECH THERE ARE AVAILABLE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SPEECHES PORTION OF THE DOJ WEBSITE.]**

***Memo Regarding Policy On Charging Of Criminal Defendants***

**TO:All Federal Prosecutors**

**FROM:John Ashcroft**

**Attorney General**

**SUBJECT:Department Policy Concerning Charging Criminal Offenses, Disposition of Charges, and Sentencing**

INTRODUCTION

The passage of the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 was a watershed event in the pursuit of fairness and consistency in the federal criminal justice system. With the Sentencing Reform Act's creation of the United States Sentencing Commission and the subsequent promulgation of the Sentencing Guidelines, Congress sought to "provide certainty and fairness in meeting the purposes of sentencing." 28 U.S.C. § 991(b)(1)(B). In contrast to the prior sentencing system – which was characterized by largely unfettered discretion, and by seemingly severe sentences that were often sharply reduced by parole – the Sentencing Reform Act and the Sentencing Guidelines sought to accomplish several important objectives: (1) to ensure honesty and transparency in federal sentencing; (2) to guide sentencing discretion, so as to narrow the disparity between sentences for similar offenses committed by similar offenders; and (3) to provide for the imposition of appropriately different punishments for offenses of differing severity.

With the passage of the PROTECT Act earlier this year, Congress has reaffirmed its commitment to the principles of consistency and effective deterrence that are embodied in the Sentencing Guidelines. The important sentencing reforms made by this legislation will help to ensure greater fairness and to eliminate unwarranted disparities. These vital goals, however, cannot be fully achieved without consistency on the part of federal prosecutors in the Department of Justice. Accordingly, it is essential to set forth clear policies designed to ensure that all federal prosecutors adhere to the principles and objectives of the Sentencing Reform Act, the PROTECT Act, and the Sentencing Guidelines in their charging, case disposition, and sentencing practices.

The Department has previously issued various memoranda addressing Department policies with respect to charging, case disposition, and sentencing. Shortly after the constitutionality of the Sentencing Reform Act was sustained by the Supreme Court in 1989, Attorney General Thornburgh issued a directive to federal prosecutors to ensure that their practices were consistent with the principles of equity, fairness, and uniformity. Several years later, Attorney General Reno issued additional guidance to address the extent to which a prosecutor's individualized assessment of the proportionality of particular sentences could be considered.

The recent passage of the PROTECT Act emphatically reaffirms Congress' intention that the Sentencing Reform Act and the Sentencing Guidelines be faithfully and consistently enforced. It is therefore appropriate at this time to re-examine the subject thoroughly and to state with greater clarity Department policy with respect to charging, disposition of charges, and sentencing. One part of this comprehensive review of Department policy has already been completed: on July 28, 2003, in accordance with section 401(l)(1) of the PROTECT Act, I issued a Memorandum that specifically and clearly sets forth the Department's policies with respect to sentencing recommendations and sentencing appeals. The determination of an appropriate sentence for a convicted defendant is, however, only half of the equation. The fairness Congress sought to achieve by the Sentencing Reform Act and the PROTECT Act can be attained only if there are fair and reasonably consistent policies with respect to the Department's decisions concerning what charges to bring and how cases should be disposed. Just as the sentence a defendant receives should not depend upon which particular judge presides over the case, so too the charges a defendant faces should not depend upon the particular prosecutor assigned to handle the case.

Accordingly, the purpose of this Memorandum is to set forth basic policies that all federal prosecutors must follow in order to ensure that the Department fulfills its legal obligation to enforce faithfully and honestly the Sentencing Reform Act, the PROTECT Act, and the Sentencing Guidelines. This memorandum supersedes all previous guidance on this subject.

I. Department Policy Concerning Charging and Prosecution of Criminal Offenses

A.General Duty to Charge and to Pursue the Most Serious, Readily Provable Offense in All Federal Prosecutions

It is the policy of the Department of Justice that, in all federal criminal cases, federal prosecutors must charge and pursue the most serious, readily provable offense or offenses that are supported by the facts of the case, except as authorized by an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney in the limited circumstances described below. The most serious offense or offenses are those that generate the most substantial sentence under the Sentencing Guidelines, unless a mandatory minimum sentence or count requiring a consecutive sentence would generate a longer sentence. A charge is not "readily provable" if the prosecutor has a good faith doubt, for legal or evidentiary reasons, as to the Government's ability readily to prove a charge at trial. Thus, charges should not be filed simply to exert leverage to induce a plea. Once filed, the most serious readily provable charges may not be dismissed except to the extent permitted in Section B.

B. Limited Exceptions

The basic policy set forth above requires federal prosecutors to charge and to pursue all charges that are determined to be readily provable and that, under the applicable statutes and Sentencing Guidelines, would yield the most substantial sentence. There are, however, certain limited exceptions to this requirement:

1.Sentence would not be affected. First, if the applicable guideline range from which a sentence may be imposed would be unaffected, prosecutors may decline to charge or to pursue readily provable charges. However, if the most serious readily provable charge involves a mandatory minimum sentence that exceeds the applicable guideline range, counts essential to establish a mandatory minimum sentence must be charged and may not be dismissed, except to the extent provided elsewhere below.

2."Fast-track" programs. With the passage of the PROTECT Act, Congress recognized the importance of early disposition or "fast-track" programs. Section 401(m)(2)(B) of the Act instructs the Sentencing Commission to promulgate, by October 27, 2003, a policy statement authorizing a downward departure of not more than 4 levels "pursuant to an early disposition program authorized by the Attorney General and the United States Attorney." Pub. L. No. 108-21, § 401(m)(2)(B), 117 Stat. 650, 675 (2003) (emphasis added). Although the PROTECT Act requirement of Attorney General authorization only applies by its terms to fast-track programs that rely on downward departures, the same requirement will also apply, as a matter of Department policy, to any fast-track program that relies on "charge bargaining" — i.e., an expedited disposition program whereby the Government agrees to charge less than the most serious, readily provable offense. Such programs are intended to be exceptional and will be authorized only when clearly warranted by local conditions within a district. The specific requirements for establishing and implementing a fast-track program are set forth at length in the Department's "Principles for Implementing An Expedited or Fast-Track Prosecution Program." In those districts where an approved "fast-track" program has been established, charging decisions and disposition of charges must comply with those Principles and with the other requirements of the approved fast-track program.

3.Post-indictment reassessment. In cases where post-indictment circumstances cause a prosecutor to determine in good faith that the most serious offense is not readily provable, because of a change in the evidence or some other justifiable reason (e.g., the unavailability of a witness or the need to protect the identity of a witness until he testifies against a more significant defendant), the prosecutor may dismiss the charge(s) with the written or otherwise documented approval of an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney.

4.Substantial assistance. The preferred means to recognize a defendant's substantial assistance in the investigation or prosecution of another person is to charge the most serious readily provable offense and then to file an appropriate motion or motions under U.S.S.G. § 5K1.1, 18 U.S.C. § 3553(e), or Federal Rule of Criminal Rule of Procedure 35(b). However, in rare circumstances, where necessary to obtain substantial assistance in an important investigation or prosecution, and with the written or otherwise documented approval of an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney, a federal prosecutor may decline to charge or to pursue a readily provable charge as part of plea agreement that properly reflects the substantial assistance provided by the defendant in the investigation or prosecution of another person.

5.Statutory enhancements. The use of statutory enhancements is strongly encouraged, and federal prosecutors must therefore take affirmative steps to ensure that the increased penalties resulting from specific statutory enhancements, such as the filing of an information pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 851 or the filing of a charge under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c), are sought in all appropriate cases. As soon as reasonably practicable, prosecutors should ascertain whether the defendant is eligible for any such statutory enhancement. In many cases, however, the filing of such enhancements will mean that the statutory sentence exceeds the applicable Sentencing Guidelines range, thereby ensuring that the defendant will not receive any credit for acceptance of responsibility and will have no incentive to plead guilty. Requiring the pursuit of such enhancements to trial in every case could therefore have a significant effect on the allocation of prosecutorial resources within a given district. Accordingly, an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney may authorize a

prosecutor to forego the filing of a statutory enhancement, but only in the context of a negotiated plea agreement, and subject to the following additional requirements:

a.Such authorization must be written or otherwise documented and may be granted only after careful consideration of the factors set forth in Section 9-27.420 of the United States Attorneys' Manual. In the context of a statutory enhancement that is based on prior criminal convictions, such as an enhancement under 21 U.S.C. § 851, such authorization may be granted only after giving particular consideration to the nature, dates, and circumstances of the prior convictions, and the extent to which they are probative of criminal propensity.

b.A prosecutor may forego or dismiss a charge of a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) only with the written or otherwise documented approval of an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney, and subject to the following limitations:

(i) In all but exceptional cases or where the total sentence would not be affected, the first readily provable violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) shall be charged and pursued.

(ii) In cases involving three or more readily provable violations of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c) in which the predicate offenses are crimes of violence, federal prosecutors shall, in all but exceptional cases, charge and pursue the first two such violations.

6.Other Exceptional Circumstances. Prosecutors may decline to pursue or may dismiss readily provable charges in other exceptional circumstances with the written or otherwise documented approval of an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney. This exception recognizes that the aims of the Sentencing Reform Act must be sought without ignoring the practical limitations of the federal criminal justice system. For example, a case-specific approval to dismiss charges in a particular case might be given because the United States Attorney's Office is particularly over-burdened, the duration of the trial would be exceptionally long, and proceeding to trial would significantly reduce the total number of cases disposed of by the office. However, such case-by-case exceptions should be rare; otherwise the goals of fairness and equity will be jeopardized.

II.Department Policy Concerning Plea Agreements

A.Written Plea Agreements

In felony cases, plea agreements should be in writing. If the plea agreement is not in writing, the agreement should be formally stated on the record. Written plea agreements will facilitate efforts by the Department of Justice and the Sentencing Commission to monitor compliance by federal prosecutors with Department policies and the Sentencing Guidelines. The PROTECT Act specifically requires the court, after sentencing, to provide a copy of the plea agreement to the Sentencing Commission. 28 U.S.C. § 994(w). Written plea agreements also avoid misunderstandings with regard to the terms that the parties have accepted.

B.Honesty in Sentencing

As set forth in my July 28, 2003 Memorandum on "Department Policies and Procedures Concerning Sentencing Recommendations and Sentencing Appeals," Department of Justice policy requires honesty in sentencing, both with respect to the facts and the law:

Any sentencing recommendation made by the United States in a particular case must honestly reflect

the totality and seriousness of the defendant's conduct and must be fully consistent with the Guidelines and applicable statutes and with the readily provable facts about the defendant's history and conduct.

This policy applies fully to sentencing recommendations that are contained in plea agreements. The July 28 Memorandum further explains that this basic policy has several important implications. In particular, if readily provable facts are relevant to calculations under the Sentencing Guidelines, the prosecutor must disclose them to the court, including the Probation Office. Likewise, federal prosecutors may not "fact bargain," or be party to any plea agreement that results in the sentencing court having less than a full understanding of all readily provable facts relevant to sentencing.

The current provision of the United States Attorneys' Manual that addresses charging policy and that describes the circumstances in which a less serious charge may be appropriate includes the admonition that "[a] negotiated plea which uses any of the options described in this section must be made known to the sentencing court." See U.S.A.M. § 9-27.300(B); see also U.S.A.M. § 9-27.400(B) ("it would be improper for a prosecutor to agree that a departure is in order, but to conceal the agreement in a charge bargain that is presented to a court as a fait accompli so that there is neither a record of nor judicial review of the departure"). Although this Memorandum by its terms supersedes prior Department guidance on this subject, it remains Department policy that the sentencing court should be informed if a plea agreement involves a "charge bargain." Accordingly, a negotiated plea that uses any of the options described in Section I(B)(2), (4), (5), or (6) must be made known to the court at the time of the plea hearing and at the time of sentencing, i.e., the court must be informed that a more serious, readily provable offense was not charged or that an applicable statutory enhancement was not filed.

C.Charge Bargaining

Charges may be declined or dismissed pursuant to a plea agreement only to the extent consistent with the principles set forth in Section I of this Memorandum.

D.Sentence Bargaining

There are only two types of permissible sentence bargains.

1.Sentences within the Sentencing Guidelines range. Federal prosecutors may enter into a plea agreement for a sentence that is within the specified guideline range. For example, when the Sentencing Guidelines range is 18-24 months, a prosecutor may agree to recommend a sentence of 18 or 20 months rather than to argue for a sentence at the top of the range. Similarly, a prosecutor may agree to recommend a downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility under U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1 if the prosecutor concludes in good faith that the defendant is entitled to the adjustment.

2.Departures. In passing the PROTECT Act, Congress has made clear its view that there have been too many downward departures from the Sentencing Guidelines, and it has instructed the Commission to take measures "to ensure that the incidence of downward departures [is] substantially reduced." Pub. L. No. 108-21, § 401(m)(2)(A), 117 Stat. 650, 675 (2003). The Department has a duty to ensure that the circumstances in which it will request or accede to downward departures in the future are properly circumscribed.

Accordingly, federal prosecutors must not request or accede to a downward departure except in the limited circumstances specified in this memorandum and with authorization from an Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney. Likewise, except in such

circumstances and with such authorization, prosecutors may not simply stand silent when a downward departure motion is made by the defendant.

An Assistant Attorney General, United States Attorney, or designated supervisory attorney may authorize a prosecutor to request or accede to a downward departure at sentencing only in the following circumstances:

a.Substantial assistance. Section 5K1.1 of the Sentencing Guidelines provides that, upon motion by the Government, a court may depart from the guideline range. A substantial assistance motion must be based on assistance that is substantial to the Government's case. It is not appropriate to utilize substantial assistance motions as a case management tool to secure plea agreements and avoid trials.

b."Fast-track" programs. Federal prosecutors may support a downward departure to the extent consistent with the Sentencing Guidelines and the Attorney General's "Principles for Implementing An Expedited or Fast-Track Prosecution Program." The PROTECT Act specifically recognizes the importance of such programs by requiring the Sentencing Commission to promulgate a policy statement specifically authorizing such departures.

c.Other downward departures. As set forth in my July 28 Memorandum, "[o]ther than these two situations, however, Government acquiescence in a downward departure should be, as the Sentencing Guidelines Manual itself suggests, a "rare occurenc[e]." See U.S.S.G., Ch. 1, Pt. A, ¶ (4)(b). Prosecutors must affirmatively oppose downward departures that are not supported by the facts and the law, and must not agree to "stand silent" with respect to such departures. In particular, downward departures that would violate the specific restrictions of the PROTECT Act should be vigorously opposed.

Moreover, as stated above, Department of Justice policy requires honesty in sentencing. In those cases where federal prosecutors agree to support departures, they are expected to identify departures for the courts. For example, it would be improper for a prosecutor to agree that a departure is warranted, without disclosing such agreement, so that there is neither a record of nor judicial review of the departure.

In sum, plea bargaining must honestly reflect the totality and seriousness of the defendant's conduct, and any departure must be accomplished through the application of appropriate Sentencing Guideline provisions.

CONCLUSION

Federal criminal law and procedure apply equally throughout the United States. As the sole federal prosecuting entity, the Department of Justice has a unique obligation to ensure that all federal criminal cases are prosecuted according to the same standards. Fundamental fairness requires that all defendants prosecuted in the federal criminal justice system be subject to the same standards and treated in a consistent manner.

cc: The Acting Deputy Attorney General

The Associate Attorney General

The Solicitor General

The Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division

The Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division

The Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division

The Assistant Attorney General, Environment and Natural Resources Division

The Assistant Attorney General, Tax Division

The Assistant Attorney General, Civil Division

The Director, Executive Office of United States Attorneys

###

03-516

Federal Sentencing Reporter

Volume 6, Number 6

May/June, 1994

***352 RENO BLUESHEET (1993)**

# **1 RENO BLUESHEET ON ON CHARGING AND PLEA DECISIONS

May 1, 1994

October 12, 1993

TO: Holders of U.S. Attorneys' Manual, Title 9

FROM: Janet Reno, Attorney General

RE: Principles of Federal Prosecution

PURPOSE: The purpose of this bluesheet is to clarify the Department's policy concerning the principles that should guide federal prosecutors in their charging decisions and plea negotiations.

As first stated in the preface to the original 1980 edition of the Principles of Federal Prosecution, they have been cast in general terms with a view to providing guidance rather than to mandating results. The intent is to assure regularity without regimentation, to prevent unwarranted disparity without sacrificing flexibility."

It should be emphasized that charging decisions and plea agreements should reflect adherence to the Sentencing Guidelines. However, a faithful and honest application of the Sentencing Guidelines is not incompatible with selecting charges or entering into plea agreements on the basis of an individualized assessment of the extent to which particular charges fit the specific circumstances of the case, are consistent with the purposes of the federal criminal code, and maximize the impact of federal resources on crime. Thus, for example, in determining the most serious offense that is consistent with the nature of the defendant's conduct, that is likely to result in a sustainable conviction," [as set forth in 9-27.310], it is appropriate that the attorney for the government consider, *inter alia,* such factors as the sentencing guideline range yielded by the charge, whether the penalty yielded by such sentencing range (or potential mandatory minimum charge, if applicable) is proportional to the seriousness of the defendant's conduct, and whether the charge achieves such purposes

of the criminal law as punishment, protection of the public, specific and general deterrence, and rehabilitation. Note that these factors may also be considered by the attorney for the government when entering into the plea agreements [9-27.400].

To ensure consistency and accountability, charging and plea agreement decisions must be made at an appropriate level of responsibility and documented with an appropriate record of the factors applied.

END OF DOCUMENT

C

Federal Sentencing Reporter

Volume 6, Number 6

May/June, 1994

***347 THORNBURGH BLUESHEET (1989)**

****1 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**MARCH 13, 1989**

# PLEA POLICY FOR FEDERAL PROSECUTORS

## Plea Bargaining Under the Sentencing Reform Act

May 1, 1994

In January, the Supreme Court decided *Mistretta v. United States* and upheld the sentencing guidelines promulgated by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984. The Act was strongly supported by the Department of Justice, and the Department has defended the guidelines since they took effect on November 1, 1987. Under these guidelines, it is now possible for federal prosecutors to respond to three problems that plagued sentencing prior to their adoption: (1) sentencing disparity; (2) misleading sentences which were shorter than they appeared as a result of parole and unduly generous good time" allowances; and (3) inadequate sentences in critical areas, such as crimes of violence, white collar crime, drug trafficking and environmental offenses. It is vitally important that federal prosecutors understand these guidelines and make them work. Prosecutors who do not understand the guidelines or who seek to circumvent them will undermine their deterrent and punitive force and will recreate the very problems that the guidelines are expected to solve.

This memorandum cannot convey all that federal prosecutors need or should want to know about how to use the guidelines, and it is not intended to invalidate more specific policies which are consistent with this statement of principles and may have been adopted by some litigating divisions to govern particular offenses. This memorandum does, however, set forth basic departmental policies to which all of you will be expected to adhere. The Department consistently articulated these policies during the drafting of the guidelines and the period in which their constitutionality was tested. Compliance with these policies is essential if federal criminal law is to be an effective deterrent and those who violate the law are to be justly punished.

## PLEA BARGAINING

### Charge Bargaining

Charge bargaining takes place in two settings, before and after indictment. Consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution in Chapter 27 of Title 9 of the United States Attorneys' Manual, a federal prosecutor should initially charge the most serious, readily provable offense or offenses consistent with the defendant's conduct. Charges should not be filed simply to exert leverage to induce a plea, nor should charges be abandoned in an effort to arrive at a bargain that fails to reflect the seriousness of the defendant's conduct.

Whether bargaining takes place before or after indictment, the Department policy is the same: any departure from the guidelines should be openly identified rather than hidden between the lines of a plea agreement. It is inevitable that in some cases it will be difficult for anyone other than the prosecutor and the defendant to know whether, prior to indictment, the prosecutor bargained in conformity with the Department's policy. The Department will monitor, together with the Sentencing Commission, plea bargaining, and the Department will expect plea bargains to support, not undermine, the guidelines.

**2 Once prosecutors have indicted, they should find themselves bargaining about charges which they have determined are readily provable and reflect the seriousness of the defendant's conduct. Should a prosecutor determine in good faith after indictment that, as a result of a change in the evidence or for another reason (e.g., a need has arisen to protect the identity of a particular witness until he testifies against a more significant defendant), a charge is not readily provable or that an indictment exaggerates the seriousness of an offense or offenses, a plea bargain may reflect the prosecutor's reassessment. There should be a record, however, in a case in which charges originally brought are dropped.

**Sentence Bargaining**

There are only two types of sentence bargains. Both are permissible, but one is more complicated than the other. First, prosecutors may bargain for a sentence that is within the specified guideline range. This means that when a guideline range is 18-24 months, you have discretion to agree to recommend a sentence of 18 or 20 months rather than to argue for a sentence at the top of the range. Similarly, you may agree to recommend a downward adjustment of two levels for acceptance of responsibility if you conclude in good faith that the defendant is entitled to the adjustment.

Second, you may seek to depart from the guidelines. This type of sentence bargain always involves a departure and is more complicated than a bargain involving a sentence within a guideline range. Departures are discussed more generally below.

Department policy requires honesty in sentencing; federal prosecutors are expected to identify for U.S. District Courts departures when they agree to support them. For example, it would be improper for a prosecutor to agree that a departure is in order, but to conceal the agreement in a charge bargain that is presented to a court as a fait accompli so that there is neither a record of nor judicial review of the departure.

In sum, plea bargaining, both charge bargaining and sentence bargaining, is legitimate. But, such *348 bargaining must honestly reflect the totality and seriousness of the defendant's conduct and any departure to which the prosecutor is agreeing, and must be accomplished through appropriate guideline provisions.

**Readily Provable Charges**

The basic policy is that charges are not to be bargained away or dropped, unless the prosecutor has a good faith doubt as to the government's ability readily to prove a charge for legal or evidentiary reasons. It would serve no purpose here to seek to further define readily provable." The policy is to bring cases that the government should win if there were a trial. There are, however, two exceptions.

First, if the applicable guideline range from which a sentence may be imposed would be unaffected, readily provable charges may be dismissed or dropped as part of a plea bargain. It is important for you to know whether dropping a charge may affect a sentence. For example, the multiple offense rules in Part D of Chapter 3 of the guidelines and recent changes to the relevant conduct standard set forth in 1B1.3(a)(2) will mean that certain dropped charges will be counted for purposes of determining the sentence, subject to the statutory maximum for the offense or offenses of conviction. It is vital that federal prosecutors understand when conduct that is not charged in an indictment or conduct that is alleged in counts that are to be dismissed pursuant to a bargain may be counted for sentencing purposes and when it may not be. For example, in the case of a defendant who could be charged with five bank robberies, a decision to charge only one or to dismiss four counts pursuant to a bargain precludes any consideration of the four uncharged or dismissed robberies in determining a guideline range, unless the plea agreement included a stipulation as to the other robberies. In contrast, in the case of a defendant who could be charged with five counts of fraud, the total amount of money involved in a fraudulent scheme will be considered in determining a guideline range even if the defendant pleads guilty to a single count and there is no stipulation as to the other counts.

**3 Second, federal prosecutors may drop readily provable charges with the specific approval of the United States Attorney or designated supervisory level official for reasons set forth in the file of the case. This exception recognizes that the aims of the Sentencing Reform Act must be sought without ignoring other, critical aspects of

the federal criminal justice system. For example, approval to drop charges in a particular case might be given because the United States Attorney's office is particularly overburdened, the case would be time-consuming to try, and proceeding to trial would significantly reduce the total number of cases disposed of by the office.

To make guidelines work, it is likely that the Department and the Sentencing Commission will monitor cases in which charges are dropped. It is important, therefore, that federal prosecutors keep records justifying their decisions not to go forward with readily provable offenses.

**Departures Generally**

In Chapter 5, Part K of the guidelines, the Commission has listed departures that may be considered by a court in imposing a sentence. Some depart upwards and others downwards. Moreover, 5K2.0 recognizes that a sentencing court may consider a departure that has not been adequately considered by the Commission. A departure requires approval by the court. It violates the spirit of the guidelines and Department policy for prosecutors to enter into a plea bargain which is based upon the prosecutor's and the defendant's agreement that a departure is warranted, but that does not reveal to the court the departure and afford an opportunity for the court to reject it.

The Commission has recognized those bases for departure that are commonly justified. Accordingly, before the government may seek a departure based on a factor other than one set forth in Chapter 5, Part K, approval of United States Attorneys or designated supervisory officials is required, after consultation with the concerned litigating Division. This approval is required whether or not a case is resolved through a negotiated plea.

**Substantial Assistance**

The most important departure is for substantial assistance by a defendant in the investigation or prosecution of another person. Section 5K1.1 provides that, upon motion by the government, a court may depart from the guidelines and may impose a non-guideline sentence. This departure provides federal prosecutors with an enormous range of options in the course of plea negotiations. Although this departure, like all others, requires court approval, prosecutors who bargain in good faith and who state reasons for recommending a departure should find that judges are receptive to their recommendations.

**Stipulations of Fact**

The Department's policy is only to stipulate to facts that accurately represent the defendant's conduct. If a prosecutor wishes to support a departure from the guidelines, he or she should candidly do so and not stipulate to facts that are untrue. Stipulations to untrue facts are unethical. If a prosecutor has insufficient facts to contest a defendant's effort to seek a downward departure or to claim an adjustment, the prosecutor can say so. If the presentence report states facts that are inconsistent with a stipulation in which a prosecutor has joined, it is desirable for the prosecutor to object to the report or to add a statement explaining the ***349** prosecutor's understanding of the facts or the reason for the stipulation.

****4** Recounting the true nature of the defendant's involvement in a case will not always lead to a higher sentence. Where a defendant agrees to cooperate with the government by providing information concerning unlawful activities of others and the government agrees that self-incriminating information so provided will not be used against the defendant, section 1B1.8 provides that the information shall not be used in determining the applicable guideline range, except to the extent provided in the agreement. The existence of an agreement not to use information should be clearly reflected in the case file, the applicability of section 1B1.8 should be documented, and the incriminating information must be disclosed to the court or the probation officer, even though it may not be used in determining a guideline sentence.

**Written Plea Agreements**

In most felony cases, plea agreements should be in writing. If they are not in writing, they always should be formally stated on the record. Written agreements will facilitate efforts by the Department and the Sentencing

Commission to monitor compliance by federal prosecutors with Department policies and the guidelines. Such agreements also avoid misunderstandings as to the terms that the parties have accepted in particular cases.

**Understanding the Options**

A commitment to guideline sentencing in the context of plea bargaining may have the temporary effect of increasing the proportion of cases that go to trial, until defense counsel and defendants understand that the Department is committed to the statutory sentencing goals and procedures. Prosecutors should understand, and defense counsel will soon learn, that there is sufficient flexibility in the guidelines to permit effective plea bargaining which does not undermine the statutory scheme.

For example, when a prosecutor recommends a two level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility (e.g., from level 20 to level 18), judicial acceptance of this adjustment will reduce a sentence by approximately 25%. If a comparison is made between the top of one level (e.g., level 20) and the bottom of the relevant level following the reduction (e.g., level 18), it would show a difference of approximately 35%. At low levels, the reduction is greater. In short, a two level reduction does *not* mean two months. Moreover, the adjustment for acceptance of responsibility is substantial, and should be attractive to defendants against whom the government has strong cases. The prosecutor may also cooperate with the defendant by recommending a sentence at the low end of a guideline range, which will further reduce the sentence.

It is important for prosecutors to recognize while bargaining that they must be careful to make all appropriate Chapter Three adjustments-e.g., victim related adjustments and adjustments for role in the offense.

**Conclusion**

With all available options in mind, and with full knowledge of the availability of a substantial assistance departure, federal prosecutors have the tools necessary to handle their caseloads and to arrive at appropriate dispositions in the process. Honest application of the guidelines will make sentences under the Sentencing Reform Act fair, honest, and appropriate.

END OF DOCUMENT