Linklaters

May 2017

U.S. Attorney General Releases New DOJ Charging and Sentencing Policy – Little Impact Anticipated for White Collar Cases and FCPA Pilot Program

On May 12, 2017, U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions issued a two-page memorandum setting forth a new charging and sentencing policy for the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ") (the "Sessions Memo," available here). Except in limited circumstances, the new policy directs federal prosecutors to charge criminal defendants with "the most serious, readily provable offense," and requires them to disclose to the sentencing court "all facts that impact the sentencing guidelines or mandatory minimum sentences." The new policy rescinds a memorandum that former Attorney General Eric Holder issued on August 12, 2013 (the "Holder Memo," available here), which instructed federal prosecutors to "conduct an individualized assessment of the extent to which charges fit the specific circumstances of the case."

While the Sessions Memo is likely to have a material impact in drug and violent crime cases, its effect on white-collar cases is less clear. Indeed, white-collar cases involve complex questions of intent, and the most "serious, readily provable offense" will likely continue to be subject to prosecutorial judgment and discretion. Importantly, DOJ has already issued a statement that the "[t]he [Foreign Corrupt Practices Act] pilot program is not affected by the new department charging and sentencing policy, as any potential exception made as part of the program would comply with the approval requirements laid out in the memo."^{2,3}

The U.S. Sentencing Guidelines are non-binding rules that set forth a uniform sentencing policy for defendants convicted in the federal court system, which judges must consider in determining a criminal defendant's sentence (available here). While not binding, they substantially influence the sentences imposed.

The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act Pilot Program (the "FCPA Pilot Program"), which began in April 2016, allows for companies that voluntarily self-report misconduct to obtain up to a 50% reduction in fines. We have previously written about the FCPA Pilot Program (available here), and DOJ's commitment to continue the program past its original one-year term while under review (available here)

Adam Dobrik, New sentencing policy won't affect FCPA pilot programme, Global Investigations Review (May 12, 2017) (available here).

Linklaters

Under the Sessions Memo, any decision to depart from the new charging policy must be approved by a United States Attorney, Assistant Attorney General, or a designated supervisor, and the reasons must be set forth in writing.

Experienced practitioners may notice similarities between the Sessions Memo and previous guidance issued by Attorney General John Ashcroft in the early 2000s. In a memorandum dated September 22, 2003 (the "Ashcroft Memo," available here), Ashcroft similarly ordered prosecutors to "charge and pursue the most serious, readily provable offense or offenses that are supported by the facts of the case."

However, the Sessions Memo potentially provides prosecutors with more flexibility than the Ashcroft Memo. Unlike the Ashcroft Memo, the Sessions Memo acknowledges that exceptions to the general policy of charging the most serious offense can be made in appropriate circumstances. The Ashcroft Memo, on its face, strictly limited such exceptions. That said, the Ashcroft Memo was interpreted and implemented differently in different U.S. Attorneys' Offices and DOJ litigating components. Some followed it to the letter; others interpreted the policy as having implicit exceptions in cases where charging the most serious offense was too harsh. Like with the Ashcroft Memo, the full impact of the Sessions Memo will not be appreciated until we gain a sense of how different United States Attorneys' Offices and DOJ litigating components interpret and implement the policy over time.

Companies should carefully monitor the implementation of the Sessions Memo, and if faced with an investigation, should remind prosecutors that the Sessions Memo still provides discretion in charging and sentencing decisions.

 $Authors: Matthew \ Axelrod, \ Lance \ Croffoot-Suede, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ and \ Michael \ Pilchern \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ and \ Michael \ Pilchern \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ and \ Michael \ Pilchern \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Tween, \ Caitlin \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Potratz, \ Adam \ Lurie, \ Douglas \ Potratz, \ Adam \$

This publication is intended merely to highlight issues and not to be comprehensive, nor to provide legal advice. Should you have any questions on issues reported here or on other areas of law, please contact one of your regular contacts, or contact the editors.

© Linklaters LLP. All Rights reserved 2016

Linklaters LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC326345. It is a law firm authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority. The term partner in relation to Linklaters LLP is used to refer to a member of Linklaters LLP or an employee or consultant of Linklaters LLP or any of its affiliated firms or entities with equivalent standing and qualifications. A list of the names of the members of Linklaters LLP and of the nonmembers who are designated as partners and their professional qualifications is open to inspection at its registered office, One Silk Street, London EC2Y 8HQ, England or on www.linklaters.com.

Please refer to www.linklaters.com/regulation for important information on Linklaters LLP's regulatory position.

We currently hold your contact details, which we use to send you newsletters such as this and for other marketing and business communications.

We use your contact details for our own internal purposes only. This information is available to our offices worldwide and to those of our associated firms.

If any of your details are incorrect or have recently changed, or if you no longer wish to receive this newsletter or other marketing communications, please let us know by emailing us at marketing.database@linklaters.com.

Contacts

For further information, please contact:

Matthew Axelrod

Partner

(+1) 202 654 9264

matthew.axelrod@linklaters.com

Lance Croffoot-Suede

Partner

(+1) 212 903 9261

lance.croffoot-suede@linklaters.com

Adam Lurie

Partner

(+1) 202 654 9227

adam.lurie@linklaters.com

Douglas Tween

Partner

(+1) 212 903 9072

douglas.tween@linklaters.com

Caitlin Potratz

Associate

(+1) 202 654 9240

caitlin.potratz@linklaters.com

Michael Pilcher

Law Clerk

(+1) 212 903 9031

michael.pilcher@linklaters.com

Linklaters LLP 1345 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10105

Telephone (+1) 212 903 9000 Facsimile (+1) 212 903 9100

Linklaters.com