

USA M



U.S. Department of Justice
Executive Office for United States Attorneys

United States Attorneys' Bulletin



EXECUTIVE
OFFICE FOR
UNITED
STATES
ATTORNEYS

Published by:

Executive Office for United States Attorneys, Washington, D.C.
For the use of all U.S. Department of Justice Attorneys

William P. Tyson, Director

Editor-in-Chief: Susan A. Nellor FTS 633-4024
Editor: Judith C. Campbell FTS 673-6348

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
COMMENDATIONS.....	69
POINTS TO REMEMBER.....	71
CASENOTES	
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL.....	72
CIVIL DIVISION	
D.C. Circuit Affirms 2.5 MPH Bumpers on Automobiles Instead of 5.0 MPH Bumpers.....	73
Fifth Circuit Holds Ambiguous Term in Flood Insurance Policy Against Flood Insurance Administration.....	74
Seventh Circuit Accepts Argument That Self-Critical Report Is A FOIA Agency Record.....	74
Eighth Circuit Finds Civil Contempt Proceedings Against Secretary of HHS "Inappropriate".....	75
Ninth Circuit Holds Government's Claim As Assignee Not Barred By Idaho Statute of Limitations.....	76
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS.....	77
APPENDIX.....	79

COMMENDATIONS

Assistant United States Attorneys RONALD B. BAKEMAN and KENNETH S. MCHARGH, Northern District of Ohio, were commended by Mr. William H. Webster, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for their successful prosecution of two Cleveland LCN associates.

Assistant United States Attorney JUDITH BARTNOFF, District of Columbia, was commended by Mr. Gerald J. Mossinghoff, Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, for her effective representation in Computer Sciences Corporation v. United States. Ms. BARTNOFF was also commended by Mr. Eugene P. Angrist, Counsel Navy Sea Systems Command, Department of the Navy, for her diligent efforts in the case of Prudential-Maryland Joint Venture Company v. Lehman.

Assistant United States Attorney JOHN D. BATES, District of Columbia, was commended by former Attorney General Griffin B. Bell for his excellent representation in the case of Obadele v. Smith.

Assistant United States Attorneys JOHN OLIVER BIRCH and NEWMAN T. HALVORSON, JR., District of Columbia, were commended by Mr. William J. Jones, Associate General Counsel, Office of Contracts and Property Law, United States Postal Service, for their assistance in Doninger Metal Products Corporation v. United States Postal Service.

Assistant United States Attorneys SUSAN DEIN BRICKLIN and EDWARD T. ELLIS, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, were commended by Mr. John A. Mintz, Assistant Director, Legal Counsel Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for their significant contributions to the successful litigation of Bruce A. Johnston, Jr. v. United States.

Assistant United States Attorney GERALD T. FORD, Southern District of New York, was commended by Mr. John A. Mintz, Assistant Director, Legal Counsel Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his superb performance in defending the United States in Spartacist League v. Attorney General of the United States.

Assistant United States Attorneys DAVID A. KATZ and ALAN I. RUBIN, Central District of California, were commended by Mr. Charles Raymond, United States Postal Inspection Service, Los Angeles Division, for their investigation and prosecution of United States v. McCollum.

Assistant United States Attorney RICHARD B. KENDALL, Central District of California, was commended by Mr. Oliver B. Revell, Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his successful prosecution of United States v. Gwaltney.

Assistant United States Attorney PATRICIA J. KENNEY, District of Columbia, was commended by the Attorney General in a letter to the Director of the Immigration Litigation Section of the Civil Division for her excellent representation in a lawsuit brought by the Hotel and Restaurant Employees Union, Local 25. Ms. KENNEY was also commended by Mr. Thomas Scarlett, Chief Counsel, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, for her excellent work in the case of Council for Responsible Nutrition v. Heckler.

Assistant United States Attorney MANUEL A. MEDRANO, Central District of California, was commended by Mr. Alan D. Walls, Special Agent in Charge, United States Customs Service, for his successful prosecution of United States v. Riveroll-Martinez, United States v. Meneses and United States v. Lozano.

Special Assistant United States Attorney MICHAEL PATRICK, Southern District of New York, was commended by Mr. William Toby, Regional Administrator, Department of Health and Human Services, for his successful representation of the government in the case involving Sheepshead Nursing Home.

Assistant United States Attorney JOHN W. POLK, District of Columbia, was commended by Mr. Jack D. Smith, General Counsel, Federal Communications Commission, for his thorough preparation and knowledgeable presentation of the trial of Bennett v. Fowler, Chairman, FCC.

Assistant United States Attorneys TIMOTHY J. REARDON, III, ROYCE C. LAMBERTH and ROBERT E. L. EATON, JR., District of Columbia, were commended by Mr. Eugene R. Sullivan, General Counsel, Department of the Air Force, for their efficient, professional and successful handling of NBC v. Department of the Air Force.

Assistant United States Attorney DAVID W. WIECHERT, Central District of California, was commended by Mr. S. Clarke Walker of the Bureau of Fraudulent Claims, California Department of Insurance, for his outstanding performance in the prosecution of attorney Roger J. Amman.

Assistant United States Attorney MARY COSTER WILLIAMS, District of Columbia, was commended by Ms. Nancy D. Frame, Assistant General Counsel for Employees and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, for her excellent representation in the case of Chung-Chi Lu v. M. Peter McPherson. Ms. WILLIAMS was

also commended by Mr. Ivan R. Ashley, Director, Equal Opportunity Programs, Agency for International Development, for her excellent and highly professional work in Lu v. Agency for International Development. Also, Ms. WILLIAMS was commended by Mr. Clavin Ninomiya, Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, for her diligent representation in the case of United States v. Furst.

Assistant United States Attorney WAYNE P. WILLIAMS, District of Columbia, was commended by United States District Judge Louis F. Oberdorfer and Mr. Frederick P. Hink, Regional Counsel, National Counsel Region, General Services Administration, for his excellent and successful representation in the cases of Vonda L. Brown v. United States Elevator Corporation v. General Services Administration and Vonda L. Brown v. General Services Administration.

Assistant United States Attorney GEORGE H. WU, Central District of California, was commended by Mr. George C. Davis, Assistant General Counsel, Consumer Protection Division, United States Postal Service, for his outstanding work in expeditiously obtaining a Temporary Restraining Order and later a Preliminary Injunction in U.S.P.S. v. Citrus Industries.

POINTS TO REMEMBER

Personnel

Effective January 14, 1985, James J. West was Court Appointed United States Attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Effective January 21, 1985, Stephen M. McNamee was Court Appointed United States Attorney for the District of Arizona.

Effective January 25, 1985, Richard E. Carter resigned as Director of the Office of Legal Education. Mr. Thomas G. Schrup has been appointed as the Acting Director.

Effective February 1, 1985, Dan K. Webb resigned as United States Attorney in the Northern District of Illinois. Mr. Gregory C. Jones has been Court Appointed United States Attorney for the Northern District of Illinois.

Effective February 1, 1985, Donald R. Burkhalter was named Assistant Director for Field Activities.

(Executive Office)

Storage and Destruction of Controlled Substances, USAM 9-101.500,
Amended August 1983

In his memorandum of January 11, 1985, to all United States Attorneys (appended to this Bulletin), Associate Attorney General D. Lowell Jensen stressed the August 1983 amendment to United States Attorneys' Manual 9-101.500, concerning the storage and destruction of controlled substances. The amendment established as Justice Department policy that controlled substances were to be destroyed prior to trial rather than being held for trial. The policy and procedures have not been effectively implemented nationwide, which has created a security and storage problem of crises proportions. Because of this situation, Mr. Jensen has requested the policy on pretrial destruction of all drug seizures, as set forth in his memorandum, be immediately implemented and followed in each United States Attorney's office.

(Executive Office)

United States Attorneys' Manual Bluesheets and Transmittals

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

(Executive Office)

CASENOTES

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR GENERAL

The Solicitor General has authorized the filing of:

A petition for a writ of certiorari in United States v. Squillacote, No. 83-1882 (7th Cir. July 13, 1984). The question presented is whether the court of appeals erred in declining to vacate its judgment for want of subject matter jurisdiction, where appellate jurisdiction lies exclusively with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit under Section 127(a) of the Federal Courts Improvement Act of 1982, 28 U.S.C. §1295(a)(2), on the ground that transferring the action, after it had rendered a decision on the merits, would be inconsistent with policy considerations underlying the Act. The merits of the case, which will not be before the Supreme Court, involve the validity of a pay cap for federal employees in the Senior Executive Service.

A brief as amicus curiae supporting the petitioners in Atascadero State Hospital and California Department of Mental Health v. Douglas James Scanlon, S. Ct. No. 84-351. The question presented is whether Congress intended to abrogate the Eleventh

Amendment immunity of a state that accepts federal funds under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. §794.

A petition for a writ of certiorari in United States v. Benchimol, S. Ct. No. 84-1165. The principal issue is whether the government must explain to the district court its reasons for recommending a particular sentence under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 11(e)(1)(B).

A petition for a writ of certiorari in Weinberger v. Ramirez, No. 83-1950 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 5, 1984). The issue is whether a U.S. citizen can bring a suit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and others, to challenge the confiscation by the Government of Honduras of property owned by a Honduran corporation in Honduras for use as a military training center there. The Chief Justice has granted a stay of proceedings below pending disposition of the petition for a writ of certiorari.

CIVIL DIVISION

D.C. CIRCUIT AFFIRMS DOT'S DECISION TO REQUIRE ONLY 2.5 MPH BUMPERS ON AUTOMOBILES INSTEAD OF 5.0 MPH BUMPERS.

Since 1972 the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) had required automobile bumpers that would withstand an impact of 5.0 MPH without damage. In May 1982 NHTSA determined that 2.5 MPH bumpers best met the criteria of both the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act (Safety Act) and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Cost Savings Act).

In a 2-1 decision the D.C. Circuit has affirmed NHTSA's decision. Judge Scalia, writing for the majority, found that NHTSA's conclusion that the reduction of the 5.0 MPH bumper standard would not have any significant adverse effect on safety was supported by the administrative record. He then went on to conclude that NHTSA's methodology and analysis for determining the cost-benefit of 5.0 MPH bumpers versus 2.5 MPH was reasonable. Judge Scalia looked at each element of the analysis--primary and secondary weight of bumpers, the effectiveness of various bumper systems in limiting damage, and the value of delay and inconvenience for fixing minor damage--and concluded NHTSA's determination in each case was not arbitrary and capricious. Judge Scalia also found that NHTSA's comparison of the costs and benefits of the various alternatives it considered was reasonable.

In a strongly worded dissent, Judge Wright concluded that NHTSA had not given adequate consideration to whether the 2.5 MPH bumper met the standards of the Safety Act; that, in any

event, NHTSA's determination that the reduction in safety would not have a significant effect on safety was not supported by the record; and that NHTSA's cost-benefit analysis--both in basic approach and specific choices made for estimating costs and benefits--was arbitrary and capricious.

Center for Auto Safety v. Peck, ___ F.2d ___, No. 82-1782 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 8, 1985). D. J. # 145-18-1041.

Attorney: Michael F. Hertz (Civil Division) FTS 724-7179.

FIFTH CIRCUIT HOLDS AMBIGUOUS TERM IN FLOOD INSURANCE POLICY MUST BE CONSTRUED AGAINST FLOOD INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION, BUT DENIES EAJA FEE AWARD BECAUSE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION WAS SUBSTANTIALLY JUSTIFIED.

The Flood Insurance Administration ("FIA") refused to pay a claim by a lumber company for damage to the contents of a storage building on the grounds that the H-shaped building, which had walls on only two sides, was not "enclosed" as required by the policy for contents coverage. The district court had held that the loss was not covered by the contract but that the FIA was estopped to deny coverage because it had paid similar claims of the plaintiff in the past.

The Fifth Circuit did not reach the estoppel issue because it held that the term "enclosed" was ambiguous and should, therefore, be construed in favor of the insured to include even a building that was enclosed on as few sides as Hanover's. While we lost this issue, it will have only limited application to other FIA cases since some of the policy language has now been amended to cure the ambiguity. We also avoided a ruling against the government on estoppel grounds. In addition, the court found FIA's position substantially justified and therefore denied an EAJA fee award.

Hanover Building Materials, Inc. v. Giuffrida, ___ F.2d ___, No. 83-1471 (5th Cir. Dec. 17, 1984). D. J. # 145-193-128.

Attorneys: William Kanter (Civil Division) FTS 633-1597;
Christine Whittaker (Civil Division) FTS 633-4096.

SEVENTH CIRCUIT ACCEPTS OUR ARGUMENT THAT A SELF-CRITICAL REPORT ON NUCLEAR REACTORS PREPARED BY GENERAL ELECTRIC AND IN THE POSSESSION OF THE NRC IS A FOIA AGENCY RECORD.

This case involves a document entitled the Reed Report which was prepared internally by General Electric Company and addresses issues concerning nuclear reactors constructed by that company.

The report came into the possession of the NRC during a licensing proceeding, and the NRC treated the document confidentially. An anti-nuclear group, the Prairie Alliance, sought access to the report under the FOIA, and the NRC agreed, after much controversy, to release the document. General Electric brought suit to block disclosure, arguing that the report is not subject to the FOIA because it is not an agency record as defined by that statute, and that even if it is such a record it is exempt from disclosure under Exemption 4. The district court ruled in our favor, concluding that the Reed Report is an agency record and not covered by Exemption 4. The Seventh Circuit has just affirmed this ruling in part, accepting our argument that the report is covered by the FOIA because it was obtained by the agency and was part of the licensing record. However, the court declined to uphold the agency's determination that the report is outside Exemption 4 because the court found that the NRC had not given any explanation for this conclusion. Therefore, the court remanded the matter to the NRC for further consideration, and made clear that the agency was free to hold to its earlier conclusion, but simply must explain it.

General Electric v. NRC, ___ F.2d ___, No. 84-2066 (7th Cir. Dec. 21, 1984). D. J. # 145-191-8.

Attorneys: Leonard Schaitman (Civil Division) FTS 633-3441;
Douglas Letter (Civil Division) FTS 633-3427.

EIGHTH CIRCUIT FINDS "INAPPROPRIATE" CIVIL CONTEMPT
PROCEEDINGS ORDERED AGAINST THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES PERSONALLY.

In Trickel v. Heckler, No. IC 83-3087 (N.D. Iowa) and Devore v. Heckler, No. C 83-2040 (N.D. Iowa), the district court, per Judge Edward McManus, had previously reversed the termination of plaintiffs' Social Security disability benefits, holding that the Social Security Administration had evaluated plaintiffs' complaints of pain in a manner inconsistent with prior rulings of the Eighth Circuit. After remand, the Appeals Council issued new instructions, using a standard form which directed the ALJs to follow the remand instructions of the district court but to adhere to existing agency regulations and rulings in language plaintiffs contended was in conflict with Eighth Circuit precedent and inconsistent with the district court's remand instructions. Without waiting for any final agency action, the plaintiff's moved for order to show cause why the agency should not be held in civil contempt for the Appeals Council's purported disregard of the district court's remand orders.

On June 11, 1984, Judge McManus agreed, issuing an order directing the Secretary of HHS, Margaret M. Heckler, to appear personally in his courtroom in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on June 28, 1984, to show cause why she should not be held in contempt for the alleged failure by her agency to comply with his remand orders. After unsuccessfully urging the district court to reconsider or stay its show cause order, on June 26, 1984, we filed a Motion for an Emergency Stay and a Petition for a Writ of Mandamus with the Eighth Circuit. In the Petition we argued, inter alia, that the June 11, 1984, show cause order was totally unnecessary in light of the settlement proceedings subsequently reached and approved by the Eighth Circuit in Polaski v. Heckler, 739 F.2d 1020 (8th Cir. 1984), in which the Secretary had clarified the law to be applied in future disability proceedings.

On June 26, 1984, the Eighth Circuit issued an emergency stay of the show cause order pending further review. On December 31, 1984, the Eighth Circuit issued an order on the merits of the Petition. Noting its approval of the agreement reached in Polaski, as reaffirmed in an opinion also issued December 31, 1984, and Congress' subsequent enactment of Social Security Disability Benefits Reform Act of 1984, 98 Stat. 1794 (1984), the Eighth Circuit held that "the controversy surrounding the Secretary's action has been resolved and a finding of contempt would be inappropriate." (Order at 4). The court thus denied the Petition, stating, however, that "[w]e are confident that the district court will on receipt of this order vacate its June 11, 1984, order." (Id.).

In re Margaret M. Heckler, ___ F.2d ___, No. 84-1803 (8th Cir. Dec. 31, 1984). D. J. # 145-16-2481.

Attorneys: Mark W. Pennak (Civil Division) FTS 633-4214;
Deborah R. Kant (Civil Division) FTS 633-3424.

NINTH CIRCUIT HOLDS GOVERNMENT'S CLAIM AS ASSIGNEE OF
INSURANCE POLICY NOT BARRED BY IDAHO STATUTE OF LIMITA-
TIONS.

This action involved a claim by the government as an assignee of a casualty insurance policy held by Union Pacific Railroad. Under the terms of the Teton Dam Disaster Act, the government had paid Union Pacific more than \$5.2 million in compensation for damage to its track resulting from the collapse of the Teton Dam in Idaho in 1976. The government paid the railroad for most of its claim in February, 1977, but did not receive a written assignment of the railroad's rights against its insurer, U.S. Fire Insurance Company, until October, 1978. After the insurer sued the government to recover sums it had paid insurers, that it claimed were properly payable by the government because of its

negligence (an action that the Ninth Circuit dismissed on sovereign immunity grounds in a prior appeal), the government counterclaimed as an assignee of the railroad's rights against the insurer. The district court granted the insurer's motion for summary judgment on the grounds that the counterclaim was barred by the state statute of limitations. It concluded that (1) Idaho's statute of limitations for such actions was one year, (2) the railroad's action was already time barred when the government received its assignment, (3) the six year federal statute of limitations had no effect on an action barred by state law at the time the government acquired its right of action.

The Ninth Circuit has reversed based on our argument that the applicable Idaho statute of limitations prescribed a five year period rather than one year and that the government received its assignment and brought its action within that period. The court rejected the insurer's arguments that the judgment in its favor be affirmed on alternative grounds that would necessitate reformation of the contract of insurance. It remanded the action for further proceedings in the district court.

Industrial Indemnity Insurance Company v. United States,
F.2d _____, No. 83-4282 (9th Cir. Dec. 27, 1984). D. J. #
157-22-229.

Attorneys: Robert Greenspan (Civil Division) FTS 633-5428;
Peter Maier (Civil Division) FTS 633-4052.

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES DECEMBER 21, 1984 - JANUARY 22, 1985

HIGHLIGHTS

Congress convened on January 2, 1985.

The following is a summary of crime-related legislation introduced in the 99th Congress.

Department of Justice Anti-Crime Legislation. We expect to submit to OMB two anti-crime bills within the next two weeks: (1) a substantive anti-crime package and (2) a technical corrections package to "clean-up" the Comprehensive Crime Control Act enacted in October as Pub. L. No. 98-473. The substantive bill will likely include those few parts of the President's Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1983 which were not enacted last year (death penalty, habeas corpus reform, exclusionary rule reform and Federal Tort Claims Act amendments) as well as some new proposals developed by the Department. The technical corrections package

will eliminate duplicative section numbers and other mistakes of a technical nature as well as conforming the Comprehensive Crime Control Act with the Tariff Act and Criminal Fine Enforcement Act which were enacted shortly after the larger crime package.

Defense Legislative Problems. We anticipate that we will once again see Congressional initiatives designed to curb consensual monitoring of telephone conversations (the so-called "Wick wiretap bill"), legislation to restrict law enforcement undercover operations, imposition of an Inspector General on the Department of Justice and measures to weaken federal laws applicable to racketeer influenced corrupt organizations.

Immigration. Representative Roybal has introduced a bill, H.R. 30, which has been described as a "major immigration reform" proposal. It is our understanding that the bill contains an employer sanctions provision that prohibits the knowing hiring of undocumented workers as an unfair immigration related employment practice. Additionally, the bill purportedly contains a legalization provision that uses a January 1, 1982, cut off date.

The Department plans to conduct an extensive review of this proposal.

National Security Information. Congressman Brooks reintroduced his proposed Federal Polygraph Limitation and Anti-Censorship Act as H.R. 39 on January 3. The bill contains a ban on the use of polygraph examinations for pre-employment screening and administrative investigations, pre-publication review agreements with government employees in sensitive positions in the national security area.

H.R. 39 was referred to the House Office and Civil Service Committee, as was the predecessor bill, H.R. 5866, in the 98th Congress. Although the Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported H.R. 5866 out of committee, the measure never reached the House floor. The bill was designed to negate the polygraph and pre-publication review provisions of National Security Decision Directive 84 (NSDD 84). However, much of the impetus for the legislation was removed when the National Security Counsel indefinitely suspended the implementation of the controversial portions of the directive.



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of the Associate Attorney General

The Associate Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

January 11, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO: All United States Attorneys
FROM: *D. Lowell Jensen*
D. Lowell Jensen
Associate Attorney General

In August 1983, an amendment was issued to the United States Attorneys' Manual, Title 9, Section 101.500, concerning the storage and destruction of controlled substances. This amendment established as Justice Department policy that controlled substances were to be destroyed prior to trial rather than being held for trial. This policy was given lengthy and detailed consideration prior to publication. The policy and procedures have not been effectively implemented on a nationwide basis. As a result, the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) is now facing a security and storage problem of crisis proportions. The increase in dollar value of the stored substances as well as the sheer volume of the exhibits being stored has reached the point where a critical security problem now exists.

In a recent report on a DOJ review of DEA property management, the Deputy Assistant Attorney General for Administration provided the following findings concerning the storage of controlled substances:

- vast quantities of drug evidence are being unnecessarily stored at DEA laboratories,
- the problem is "acute," having reached levels "exceeding safe storage capacity," which presents "the possibility of a dangerous or embarrassing occurrence," and
- "timely action by each United States Attorney in approving samplings and subsequent destruction of large quantities is necessary so large volumes of drugs do not have to be stored indefinitely."

Because of this dangerous situation, I am requesting each of you to implement the following policy on the pretrial destruction of all drug seizures:

In all drug cases, at the arraignment and plea, the trial attorney should file the Notice of Intent to Destroy Controlled Substances unless there are extraordinary circumstances justifying the maintenance of all seized evidence for use at the trial. The determination that there are extraordinary circumstances will be the personal decision of each United States Attorney and should not be redelegated. When such a decision is made, the circumstances shall be documented in writing with copies to the DEA case agent.

The Drug Enforcement Administration supervisory personnel in the field will send to each United States Attorney, every 90 days, a list of cases in which drugs have not been destroyed.

It is incumbent upon you to ensure that this DOJ policy is implemented in a manner which will effectively reduce the amount and value of drugs presently stored by DEA.

Please circulate a copy of this memorandum to all your assistants and take such other steps as you deem advisable to ensure their knowledge of, and compliance with, this policy.

Attachment

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
January 28, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
1-11.240*	TITLE 1	7/31/84	Immunity for the Act of Producing Reports
1-11.400*	TITLE 1	6/21/84	Immunity
1-12.020*	TITLE 1	6/29/84	Pre-Trial Diversion Program
1-12.100	TITLE 1	4/24/84	Eligibility Criteria
1-12.400	TITLE 1	10/12/84	PTD Agreement
1-12.602	TITLE 1	10/12/84	Letter to Offender-- (USA Form 185)
1-12.603	TITLE 1	10/12/84	Agreement--(USA Form 186)
9-2.111	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Declinations
9-2.132 *	TITLE 9	3/21/84	Policy Limitations on Institution of Proceedings--Internal Security Matters
9-2.133	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Policy Limitations on Institution of Proceedings, Consultation Prior to Institution of Criminal Charges
9-2.142(1)(c)(2)(c)	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Dual and Successive Federal Prosecution Policy
9-2.144	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Interstate Agreement on Detainers
9-2.147	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Extradition and Deportation
9-2.149	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Revocation and Naturalization
9-2.151	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Policy Limitations--Prosecutorial and Other Matters, International Matters.

* Approved by Advisory Committee, being permanently incorporated.

** In printing.

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
January 28, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-2.172	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Appearance Bond Forfeiture Judge
9-2.173	TITLE 9	10/26/84	Arrest of Foreign Nationals
9-4.543*	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Subpoenas to Obtain Records Located in Foreign Countries.
9-7.013*	TITLE 9	4/03/84	Procedures for Lawful, Warrantless Interceptions of Verbal Communications
9-7.1000	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Video Surveillance
9-11.220C*	TITLE 9	8/27/84	Obtaining Records to Aid in the Location of Federal Fugitives by Use of All Writs Act
9-11.230*	TITLE 9	4/16/84	Fair Credit Reporting Act and Grand Jury Subpoenas-Discretion of U.S. Attorneys
9-11.250*	TITLE 9	7/9/84	Advice of Rights to Targets and Subjects of Grand Jury Investigations
9-11.270*	TITLE 9	8/10/84	Limitation on Resubpoenaing Contumacious Witness before Successive Grand Juries
9-12.340*	TITLE 9	7/24/84	Forfeiture
9-21.340 to 9-21.350	TITLE 9	3/12/84	Psychological/Vocational Testing; Polygraph Examinations for Prisoner-Witness Candidates
9-27.510	TITLE 9	5/25/84	Opposing Offers to Plead Nolo Contendere

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
January 28, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-38.000*	TITLE 9	4/06/84	Forfeitures
9-42.530	TITLE 9	10/9/84	Dept. of Defense Memorandum of Understanding
9-60.134 to 9-60.135*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Allegations of "Mental Kidnapping" or "Brain- washing" by Religious Cults; "Deprogramming" of Religious Sect Members
9-60.134 to 9-60.135**	TITLE 9	12/14/84	Allegations of "Mental Kidnapping" or "Brain- washing" by Religious Cults; "Deprogramming" of Religious Sect Members
9-60.215*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	"Electronic, Mechanical or Other Device" (18 U.S.C. §2510(5))
9-60.231*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Scope of Prohibitions
9-60.243*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Other Consensual Inter- ceptions
9-60.291*	TITLE 9	3/30/84	Interception of Radio Communications
9-60.400**	TITLE 9	12/31/84	Criminal Sanctions Against Illegal Electronic Surveillance - the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA), 50 U.S.C. §1809
9-61.130 to* 9-61.134	TITLE 9	4/30/84	National Motor Vehicle Theft Act-Dyer Act (18 U.S.C. §§2311-2313)
9-61.640 to* 9-61.642	TITLE 9	4/30/84	Bank Robbery
9-63.132 to* 9-63.133	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Indictment; Death Penalty

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
January 28, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
9-63.195*	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Protection of Confidentiality of Security Procedures
9-63.460 to* 9-63.490	TITLE 9	5/02/84	Obscene or Harassing Telephone Calls - 47 U.S.C. §223
9-71.400*	TITLE 9	5/25/84	Prosecutive Policy
9-75.000**	TITLE 9	12/10/84	Obscenity
9-75.084	TITLE 9	10/12/84	Comment-Child Pornography Statutes
9-75.091*	TITLE 9	3/28/84	47 U.S.C. §223-Comment
9-75.140*	TITLE 9	3/28/84	Prosecutive Policy
9-75.621	TITLE 9	10/12/84	Exception-Child Pornography Cases
9-130.300	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Prior Authorization Generally
9-131.030	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Consultation Prior to Prosecution
9-131.110	TITLE 9	4/09/84	Hobbs Act Robbery
9-139.202*	TITLE 9	6/29/84	Supervisory Jurisdiction
9-139.220*	TITLE 9	6/29/84	Alternative Enforcement Measures
10-2.800; * 10-9.160	TITLE 10	4/30/84	Notice of Provision for Special Accommodations
10-3.530**	TITLE 10	01/07/85	Payment for Travel Expenses
10-3.560	TITLE 10	12/13/84	Relocation

LISTING OF ALL BLUESHEETS IN EFFECT
January 28, 1985

<u>AFFECTS USAM</u>	<u>TITLE NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SUBJECT</u>
10-4.350*	TITLE 10	7/31/84	Use By United States Attorneys Offices of Forfeited Vehicles and Other Property
10-4.418*	TITLE 10	7/20/84	Maintenance of Attorney- Client Information

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' MANUAL--TRANSMITTALS

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

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 1	A2	9/29/80	6/23/80	Ch. 7, Index to Title 1, Revisions to Ch. 2, 5, 8
	A3	9/23/81	8/3/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 5, 12, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A4	9/25/81	9/7/81	Revisions to Ch. 15, Index to Title 1, Index to USAM
	A5	11/2/81	10/27/81	Revisions to Ch. 5, 7
	A6	3/11/82	12/15/81	Revisions to Ch. 3, 5, 11, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A7	3/12/82	2/9/82	Revisions to Ch. 8, Index to Title 1
	A8	5/6/82	4/27/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 8, Title 1 Index, Index to USAM
	A9	3/9/83	8/20/82	Revisions to Ch. 5, 9, 10, 14
	A10	5/20/83	4/26/83	Revisions to Ch. 11
	A11	2/22/84	2/10/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 2
	A12	3/19/84	2/17/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A13	3/22/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8

* Transmittal is currently being printed.

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 1	A14	3/23/84	3/9 & 3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7, 9
	A15	3/26/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A16	8/31/84	3/02/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A17	3/26/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A18	3/27/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11, 13, 14, 15
	A19	3/29/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12
	A20	3/30/84	3/23/84	Index to Title 1, Table of Contents to Title 1
	A21	4/17/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3
	A22	5/22/84	5/22/84	Revision of Ch. 1-6.200
	AAA1	5/14/84		Form AAA-1
TITLE 2	A2	9/24/81	9/11/81	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A3	1/20/82	11/10/81	Revisions to Ch. 3
	A4	5/17/83	10/1/82	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A5	2/10/84	1/27/84	Complete revision of Title 2-replaces all previous transmittals
	A11	3/30/84	1/27/84	Summary Table of Contents to Title 2
	AAA2	5/14/84		Form AAA-2
TITLE 3	A2	7/2/82	5/28/82	Revisions to Ch. 5

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>Contents</u>
TITLE 3	A3	10/11/83	8/4/83	Complete revision of Title 3-replaces all previous transmittals
	AAA3	5/14/84		Form AAA-3
TITLE 4	A2	7/30/81	5/6/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, 15, Index to Title 4 & Index to USAM
	A3	10/2/81	9/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 1
	A4	3/10/82	8/10/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, Index to Title 4
	A5	10/15/82	5/31/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 12
	A6	4/27/83	2/1/83	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 9, and 12
	A7	4/16/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7, 8, 12
	A8	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 2, 14, 15
	A9	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3
	A10	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A11	4/30/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 9, Index to Title 4
	A12	4/21/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A13	4/30/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A14	4/10/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 13

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 4	A15	3/28/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A16	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11
	AAA4	5/14/84		Form AAA-4
TITLE 5	A2	4/16/81	4/6/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, New Ch. 9, 9A, 9B, 9C, & 9D
	A3	3/22/84	3/5/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1, 2, 3(was 2A)
	A4	3/28/84	3/12/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12 (was 9C)
	A4	undated	3/19/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5 (was Ch. 4), 6, 8
	A5	3/28/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 9, 11 (was 9B)
	A6	3/28/84	3/22/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7
	A7	3/30/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10 (was 9A)
	A8	4/3/84	3/22 & 3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 13, 14, 15, Table of Contents to Title 5
	A11	4/17/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4 (was Ch. 3)
	A12	4/30/84	3/28/84	Index to Title 5
	AAA5	5/14/84		Form AAA-5
	TITLE 6	A2	3/23/84	2/8/84
AAA6		5/14/84		Form AAA-6

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 7	A2	6/30/81	6/2/81	Revisions to Ch. 5, Index to Title 7, Index to USAM
	A3	12/4/81	11/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 5
	A4	1/6/84	11/22/83	Complete revision to Title 7-replaces all prior transmittals
	A12	3/3/84	12/22/83	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 7
	AAA7	5/14/84		Form AAA-7
TITLE 8	A1	4/2/84	2/15/84	Ch. 1, 2, Index to Title 8
	A2	6/21/82	4/30/82	Complete revision to Title 8
	A12	3/30/84	2/15/84	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 8'
	AAA8	5/14/84		Form AAA-8
TITLE 9	A2	11/4/80	10/6/80	New Ch. 27, Revisions to Ch. 1, 2, 4, 7, 17, 34, 47, 69, 120, Index to Title 9, and Index to USAM
	A3	6/30/81	4/16/81	Revisions to Ch. 1, 4, 7, 21, 42, 61, 69, 72, 104, Index to USAM
	A4	6/1/81	5/29/81	Revisions to Ch. 4, 7, 70, 78, 90, 121, New Ch. 123, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM
	A5	11/2/81	6/18/81	Revisions to Ch. 4, 8, 20, 47, 61, 63, 65, 75, 85, 90, 100, 110, 120, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A6	12/11/81	10/8/81	Revisions to Ch. 17, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A7	1/5/82	10/8/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 7, 37, 60, 90, 139, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A8	1/13/82	11/24/81	Revisions to Ch. 34, Index to Title 9, Index to USAM
	A9	3/12/82	9/8/82	Revisions to Ch. 11, Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A10	10/6/82	3/29/82	Revisions to Ch. 1, 11, 16, 69, 79, 120, 121, Entire Title 9 Index, Index to USAM
	A11	3/2/83	9/8/82	Revisions to Ch. 120, 121, 122
	A12	9/19/83	5/12/83	Revisions to Ch. 101
	A13	1/26/84	1/11/84	Complete revision of Ch. 132, 133
	A14	2/10/84	1/27/84	Revisions to Ch. 1
	A15	2/1/84	1/27/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8
	A16	3/23/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 135, 136
	A17	2/10/84	2/2/84	Complete revision of Ch. 39
	A18	2/3/84	2/3/84	Complete revision of Ch. 40
	A19	3/26/84	2/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 21
	A20	3/23/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 137, Ch. 138

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A21	3/19/84	2/13/84	Complete revision of Ch. 34
	A22	3/30/84	2/01/84	Complete revision of Ch. 14
	A23	8/31/84	2/16/84	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A24	3/23/84	2/28/84	Complete revision of 65
	A25	3/26/84	3/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 130
	A26	3/26/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 44
	A27	3/26/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 90
	A28	3/29/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 101
	A29	3/26/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 121
	A30	3/26/84	3/19/84	Complete revision of Ch. 9
	A31	3/26/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 78
	A32	3/29/84	3/12/84	Complete revision of Ch. 69
	A33	3/29/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 102
	A34	3/26/84	3/14/84	Complete revision of Ch. 72
	A35	3/26/84	2/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 37
	A36	3/26/84	2/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 41

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A37	4/6/84	2/8/84	Complete revision of Ch. 139
	A38	3/29/84	2/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 47
	A39	3/30/84	3/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 104
	A40	4/6/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 100
	A41	4/6/84	3/9/84	Complete revision of Ch. 110
	A42	3/29/84	3/09/84	Complete revision of Ch. 64
	A43	4/6/84	3/14/84	Complete revision of Ch. 120
	A44	4/5/84	3/21/84	Complete revision of Ch. 122
	A45	4/6/84	3/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 16
	A46	2/30/84	1/16/84	Complete revision of Ch. 43
	A47	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 7
	A48	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A49	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 63
	A50	4/16/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 66
	A51	4/6/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 76, deletion of Ch. 77
	A52	4/16/84	3/30/84	Complete revision of Ch. 85
	A53	6/6/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 4

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A54	7/25/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 11
	A55	4/23/84	4/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 134
	A56	4/30/84	3/28/84	Revisions to Ch. 42
	A57	4/16/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 60, 75
	A58	4/23/84	4/19/84	Summary Table of Contents of Title 9
	A59	4/30/84	4/16/84	Entire Index to Title 9
	A60	5/03/84	5/03/84	Complete revision of Chapter 66
	A61	5/03/84	4/30/84	Revisions to Chapter 1, section .103
	A63	5/11/84	5/9/84	Complete revision to Ch. 7
	A64	5/11/84	5/11/84	Revision to Ch. 64, section .400-700
	A65	5/17/84	5/17/84	Revisions to Ch. 120
	A66	5/10/84	5/8/84	Complete revision to Ch. 131
	A67	5/11/84	5/09/84	Revisions to Ch. 121, section .600
	A68	5/28/84	5/18/84	Revisions to Ch. 104
	A69	5/09/84	5/07/84	Revisions to Ch. 21, section .600
	A70	5/17/84	5/16/84	Revisions to Ch. 43, section .710
	A71	5/21/84	5/21/84	Complete revision of Ch. 20
	A72	5/25/84	5/23/84	Complete revision of Ch. 61

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 9	A73	6/18/84	6/6/84	Complete revision of Ch. 17
	A74	6/18/84	6/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 63
	A75	6/26/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 27
	A76	6/26/84	6/15/84	Complete revision of Ch. 71
	A77	7/27/84	7/25/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	*A78	9/10/84	8/31/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1
	A79	8/02/84	7/31/84	Complete revision of Ch. 18
	A80	8/03/84	8/03/84	Complete revision of Ch. 79
	A81	8/06/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 7
	*A82	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 75
	A83	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 90
	A84	9/10/84	9/7/84	Complete revision of Ch. 2
	A85	7/25/84	2/17/84	Revisions to Ch. 136
	A86	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revisions to Ch. 60
	A88	8/31/84	8/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 12
	*A90	10/10/84	10/01/84	Complete revision of Ch. 73
	*A94	12/20/84	12/14/84	Correction to Ch. 27
	AAA9	5/14/84		Form AAA-9

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 10	A2	11/2/81	8/21/81	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 6, Index to Title 10
	A3	12/1/81	8/21/81	Revisions to Ch. 2
	A4	12/28/81	---	Title Page to Title 10
	A5	3/26/82	1/8/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 6, Index to Title 10
	A6	6/17/82	1/4/82	Revisions to Ch. 4, Index to Title 10
	A7	3/4/83	5/31/82	Revisions to Ch. 2, 3, 5, 6, and New Ch. 9
	A8	4/5/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 1
	A9	4/6/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 7
	A10	4/13/84	3/20/84	Complete revision of Ch. 5
	A11	3/29/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 6
	A12	4/3/84	3/24/84	Complete revision of Ch. 8
	A13	9/4/84	3/26/84	Complete revision of Ch. 10
	A14	4/23/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 4
	A15	4/17/84	3/28/84	Complete revision of Ch. 3, 9
	A16	5/4/84	3/28/84	Index and Appendix to Title 10
	A17	3/30/84	3/28/84	Summary Table of Con- tents to Title 10
	A18	5/4/84	4/13/84	Complete revision to Ch. 2
	A19	5/02/84	5/01/84	Revisions to Chapter 4

<u>TRANSMITTAL AFFECTING TITLE</u>	<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE OF TRANSMITTAL</u>	<u>DATE OF TEXT</u>	<u>CONTENTS</u>
TITLE 10	A20	8/31/84	5/24/84 & 7/31/84	Revisions to Chapter 2
	A21	6/6/84	5/1/84	Corrected TOC Chapter 4 and pages 23, 24
	A22	7/30/84	7/27/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A23	8/02/84	7/31/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	*A24	11/09/84	10/19/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	*A25	11/09/84	10/19/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A26	11/28/84	11/28/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	A27	12/07/84	11/01/84	Revision to Ch. 2
	AAA10	5/14/84		Form AAA-10
TITLE 1-10	A1	4/25/84	4/20/84	Index to USAM

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' LIST

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>U.S. ATTORNEY</u>
Alabama, N	Frank W. Donaldson
Alabama, M	John C. Bell
Alabama, S	J. B. Sessions, III
Alaska	Michael R. Spaan
Arizona	Stephen M. McNamee
Arkansas, E	George W. Proctor
Arkansas, W	W. Asa Hutchinson
California, N	Joseph P. Russoniello
California, E	Donald B. Ayer
California, C	Robert C. Bonner
California, S	Peter K. Nunez
Colorado	Robert N. Miller
Connecticut	Alan H. Nevas
Delaware	Joseph J. Farnan, Jr.
District of Columbia	Joseph E. diGenova
Florida, N	W. Thomas Dillard
Florida, M	Robert W. Merkle, Jr.
Florida, S	Stanley Marcus
Georgia, N	Larry D. Thompson
Georgia, M	Joe D. Whitley
Georgia, S	Hinton R. Pierce
Guam	David T. Wood
Hawaii	Daniel A. Bent
Idaho	William R. Vanhole
Illinois, N	Gregory C. Jones
Illinois, S	Frederick J. Hess
Illinois, C	Gerald D. Fines
Indiana, N	R. Lawrence Steele, Jr.
Indiana, S	John D. Tinder
Iowa, N	Evan L. Hultman
Iowa, S	Richard C. Turner
Kansas	Benjamin L. Burgess
Kentucky, E	Louis G. DeFalaise
Kentucky, W	Ronald E. Meredith
Louisiana, E	John Volz
Louisiana, M	Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr.
Louisiana, W	Joseph S. Cage, Jr.
Maine	Richard S. Cohen
Maryland	J. Frederick Motz
Massachusetts	William F. Weld
Michigan, E	Leonard R. Gilman
Michigan, W	John A. Smietanka
Minnesota	James M. Rosenbaum
Mississippi, N	Glen H. Davidson
Mississippi, S	George L. Phillips
Missouri, E	Thomas E. Dittmeier
Missouri, W	Robert G. Ulrich

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

<u>DISTRICT</u>	<u>U.S. ATTORNEY</u>
Montana	Byron H. Dunbar
Nebraska	Ronald D. Lahners
Nevada	Lamond R. Mills
New Hampshire	Bruce E. Kenna
New Jersey	W. Hunt Dumont
New Mexico	William L. Lutz
New York, N	Frederick J. Scullin, Jr.
New York, S	Rudolph W. Giuliani
New York, E	Raymond J. Dearie
New York, W	Salvatore R. Martoche
North Carolina, E	Samuel T. Currin
North Carolina, M	Kenneth W. McAllister
North Carolina, W	Charles R. Brewer
North Dakota	Rodney S. Webb
Ohio, N	Patrick M. McLaughlin
Ohio, S	Christopher K. Barnes
Oklahoma, N	Layn R. Phillips
Oklahoma, E	Donn F. Baker
Oklahoma, W	William S. Price
Oregon	Charles H. Turner
Pennsylvania, E	Edward S. G. Dennis, Jr.
Pennsylvania, M	James J. West
Pennsylvania, W	J. Alan Johnson
Puerto Rico	Daniel F. Lopez-Romo
Rhode Island	Lincoln C. Almond
South Carolina	Henry Dargan McMaster
South Dakota	Philip N. Hogen
Tennessee, E	John W. Gill, Jr.
Tennessee, M	Joe B. Brown
Tennessee, W	W. Hickman Ewing, Jr.
Texas, N	James A. Rolfe
Texas, S	Daniel K. Hedges
Texas, E	Robert J. Wortham
Texas, W	Helen M. Eversberg
Utah	Brent D. Ward
Vermont	George W. F. Cook
Virgin Islands	James W. Diehm
Virginia, E	Elsie L. Munsell
Virginia, W	John P. Alderman
Washington, E	John E. Lamp
Washington, W	Gene S. Anderson
West Virginia, N	William A. Kolibash
West Virginia, S	David A. Faber
Wisconsin, E	Joseph P. Stadtmueller
Wisconsin, W	John R. Byrnes
Wyoming	Richard A. Stacy
North Mariana Islands	David T. Wood