Dear Mr. Kick:

This letter responds to your January 13, 2018 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) seeking closing memoranda of OPR’s investigations with substantiated findings during calendar year 2017. OPR received your request on January 16, 2018. It has been assigned request number F18-00040. Please refer to that number in any correspondence pertaining to this matter.

By letter dated January 23, 2018, OPR advised you that it would consult with another Department component regarding the 53 pages responsive to your request. That consultation is now complete, and I have determined 53 pages are appropriate for release with excisions made pursuant to Exemptions 3, 5, 6, and 7(C) of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(b)(3), (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C). Exemption 3 pertains to matters specifically exempted from release by statute, in this instance, Rule 6e, which pertains to grand jury information. Exemption 5 pertains to certain inter- and intra-agency communications protected by the deliberative process privilege. Exemption 6 pertains to material the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of the personal privacy of third parties. Exemption 7(C) pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of the personal privacy of third parties.

For your information, Congress excluded three discrete categories of law enforcement and national security records from the requirements of the FOIA. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(c) (2006 & Supp. IV 2010). This response is limited to those records that are subject to the requirements of the FOIA. This is a standard notification that is given to all our requesters and should not be taken as an indication that excluded records do, or do not, exist.

If you have a question, you may contact OPR’s FOIA Public Liaison at the telephone number and address listed above. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.
If you are not satisfied with my response to this request, you may administratively appeal by writing to the Director, Office of Information Policy (OIP), U.S. Department of Justice, Suite 11050, 1425 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, or you may submit an appeal through OIP’s FOIAonline portal by creating an account on the following web site: https://foiaonline.regulations.gov/foia/action/public/home. Your appeal must be postmarked or electronically transmitted within 90 days of the date of my response to your request. If you submit your appeal by mail, both the letter and the envelope should be clearly marked “Freedom of Information Act Appeal.”

If you are dissatisfied with the result of any appeal you make, judicial review may thereafter be available to you in the United States district court for the judicial district in which you reside, or in which you have your principal place of business, or in the District of Columbia.

Sincerely,

Lyn Hardy
Special Counsel
for Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson  
Director  
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

John V. Geise  
Chief  
Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton  
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into the Conduct of Former AUSA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), Former FAUSA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), AUSA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), and Former (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into the conduct of former Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), former (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), (FAUSA) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), AUSA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C), and former (b)(6) (b)(7)(C).
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded that former AUSA engaged in intentional professional misconduct by:

- (b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
- (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
- (b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
- (b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Finally, OPR concluded that FAUSA did not engage in professional misconduct, OPR concluded, however, that exercised poor judgment.

OPR previously informed AUSA and former of its conclusion that neither engaged in professional misconduct or exercised poor judgment in the matter. OPR has directed to contact John V. Geise, Chief of the Professional Misconduct Review Unit, if has any questions about this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Jay Macklin
   General Counsel
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
   (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson  
Director  
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

John V. Geise  
Chief  
Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton  
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Professional Misconduct Allegations against Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSAs)
Attached is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) final report of investigation pertaining to Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSAs) (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

OPR concluded in its final report that (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (1) committed professional misconduct, when in reckless disregard of their Brady/Giglio obligations, they failed to disclose impeachment information (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (2) committed professional misconduct in violation of Department policy set forth in the U.S. Attorneys Manual (USAM) § 9-5.001, when in reckless disregard of their discovery obligations, they failed to disclose impeachment evidence (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (3) committed professional misconduct in violation of (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) when in reckless disregard of their duty to make diligent efforts to comply with a legally proper discovery request by an opposing party, they failed to disclose impeachment evidence (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (4) committed professional misconduct in violation of (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) when in reckless disregard of their Brady/Giglio obligations, they failed to (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (5) committed intentional professional misconduct in violation of (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) when they knowingly made misrepresentations to the court; and (6) committed intentional professional misconduct in violation of their general duty of candor to the court, when they knowingly failed to (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)
Attachments

cc: Scott Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with attachment)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel, EOUSA
    (with attachment)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

   John V. Geise
   Chief
   Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Allegations of Misconduct against Former Assistant U.S. Attorney

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation regarding the conduct of former Assistant U.S. Attorney.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Finally, OPR concluded that [b](5)(b)(7)(C) exercised poor judgment in failing to [b](5)(b)(6)(b)(7)(C)
Enclosure

cc:  Scott N. Schools
     Associate Deputy Attorney General
     (with enclosure)

     Jay Macklin
     General Counsel
     Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
     (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
       Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Allegations of Professional Misconduct Against
         Assistant U.S. Attorney

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) final Report of Investigation
into allegations that Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) engaged in professional misconduct...

(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)

(b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)
Based on the results of its investigation, OFK found that, although AUSA acted unprofessionally, Rule 6(e), (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) applied. However, Rule 6(e), (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) do not apply, and therefore Rule 6(e), (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) do not apply.
OPR concluded, however, that AUSA acted in reckless disregard of professional obligations by engaging in a pattern of improper conduct in the grand jury.

Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded improper actions constituted reckless professional misconduct.

Enclosure

cc: Jay Macklin
    General Counsel
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
    (with enclosure)

Scott N. Schools
Associate Deputy Attorney General
(with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson  
   Director  
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton  
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation of Assistant United States Attorney into Alleged Discovery Violations
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concludes that AUSA engaged in professional misconduct in violation of Rule of Professional Conduct by acting in reckless disregard of obligation to.
client reasonably informed when failed to (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

directed to contact Professional Misconduct Review Unit Chief Jack V. Geise for information concerning this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (without enclosure)

Jay Macklin
General Counsel
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
(with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

   John V. Geise
   Chief
   Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Professional Misconduct Allegations Against Assistant U.S. Attorney

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation regarding the conduct of Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) by acting in reckless disregard of obligation to

Upon the completion of its investigation, concluded that AUSA committed professional misconduct by acting in reckless disregard of obligation to

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
and has directed to contact Professional Misconduct Review Unit Chief John V. Geise for further information regarding this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
       Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Professional Misconduct Allegations Against Assistant U.S. Attorney

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into allegations that Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) committed professional misconduct.

Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded that did not commit professional misconduct by knowingly or recklessly violating duty of candor to the tribunal.
With respect to the second misconduct allegation, OPR concluded that neither committed professional misconduct nor exercised poor judgment. Thus, OPR concluded that AUSA exercised poor judgment by failing to [redacted].

With respect to the second misconduct allegation, OPR concluded that neither committed professional misconduct nor exercised poor judgment. [redacted.]

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
    Director
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
    Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into the Conduct of AUSA

Enclosed is the final Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into the Conduct of AUSA.
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR determined that AUSA (1) committed professional misconduct in reckless disregard of obligation under USAO policy to obtain authorization from supervisors before suggesting to a cooperating defendant that a further downward departure in sentencing was possible; (2) committed professional misconduct in reckless disregard of obligations under Giglio v. United States, 405 U.S. 150 (1972), and (3) committed professional misconduct in reckless disregard of obligations.
cc: Scott N. Schools
   Associate Deputy Attorney General
   (with enclosure)

   Jay Macklin
   General Counsel
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
   (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
       Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into professional misconduct by Assistant U.S. Attorney

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into the professional misconduct by Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA)
based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that AUSA did not purposefully or knowingly violate Rule of Professional Conduct when, during closing argument, improperly vouched for the government’s witnesses.

OPR nevertheless concluded, however, that AUSA acted in reckless disregard of professional obligations with regard to :

OPR further concluded that AUSA exercised poor judgment and instructed to contact the Professional Misconduct Review Unit for further information.

Enclosures

cc: Scott Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel, EOUSA
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation Into [b](5) [b](6) [b](7) of Assistant U.S. Attorney [b](5) [b](6) [b](7) of
   Assistant U.S. Attorney

Attached is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into
[b](5) [b](6) [b](7) of Assistant U.S. Attorney [b](5) [b](6) [b](7) of Assistant U.S. Attorney
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concludes that AUSA did not commit professional misconduct. OPR found that AUSA did not violate a clear and unambiguous standard when

OPR concludes that AUSA did not violate

Nevertheless, OPR concludes that AUSA exercised extremely poor judgment by failing to

OPR also concludes that AUSA did not engage in professional misconduct by failing to

Nevertheless, OPR concludes that AUSA exhibited poor judgment by failing to

Finally, OPR concludes that AUSA properly handled privileged material
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson  
Director  
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton  
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into professional misconduct by former Assistant U.S. Attorney.
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concludes that violated obligations pursuant to Brady, Giglio, and Napue when failed to actions represented a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that an objectively reasonable attorney would observe in the same situation and thus constituted a reckless disregard of professional obligations.

and directed to contact Professional Misconduct Unit Chief Jack V. Geise for information concerning this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel, EOUSA
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) Trial Attorney (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C), Senior Attorney (b)(6), (b)(7)(C), and Senior Attorney (b)(6), (b)(7)(C).

Attached is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into (b)(6), (b)(7)(C).
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded that Trial Attorney and Senior Attorneys did not commit professional misconduct.

OPR concluded, however, that Trial Attorney and Senior Attorneys exercised poor judgment and
Attachment

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with attachment)

    John V. Geise
    Chief
    Professional Misconduct Review Unit
    (with attachment)
MEMORANDUM

TO: [Redacted]

John V. Geise
Chief
Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into [Redacted] Trial Attorney [Redacted]

The Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) has completed its investigation regarding allegations that U.S. Department of Justice [Redacted] Trial Attorney [Redacted], made unauthorized disclosures of attorney-client privileged information to a third party [Redacted].
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR reached the following conclusions. With respect to the unauthorized disclosures of attorney-client privileged information, OPR concluded that [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) did not engage in professional misconduct but that [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) exercised poor judgment.

However, OPR concluded that by failing to [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) act in reckless disregard of [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) duty to keep [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) client informed.

However, OPR concluded that [b](6) [b](7)(C) acted in reckless disregard of [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) Departmental obligation to cooperate with OPR’s investigation [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C).

[has directed (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) to contact the Professional Misconduct Review Unit for further information]
Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation of Former Assistant United States Attorney for Failure to Maintain an Active Bar Membership

The Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) has completed its investigation into the failure of former Assistant United States Attorney to maintain an active membership with the State Bar from.
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that engaged in professional misconduct by acting in reckless disregard of statutory and Department obligations to maintain an active membership in at least one state bar when failed to timely pay Bar dues. OPR also concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that engaged in professional misconduct by acting in reckless disregard of the rules prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law when practiced law during the time that was not an active member of the Bar. OPR further concludes by a preponderance of the evidence that committed intentional professional misconduct when Bar membership had been administratively suspended. Finally, did not falsely certify that was an active member of the Bar, and directed to contact Professional Misconduct Review Unit Chief Jack V. Geise for information concerning this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
Associate Deputy Attorney General
(without enclosure)

Jay Macklin
General Counsel
Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
(with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: John V. Geise
   Chief
   Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation regarding Conduct of Former Senior Trial Counsel

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into allegations of misconduct regarding former Senior Trial Counsel [REDACTED]. Based on its investigation, OPR has concluded that [REDACTED] engaged in intentional professional misconduct by violating the duty of candor embodied in the Rules of Professional Conduct and the common law, by purposefully misrepresenting factual information to the court and opposing counsel. [REDACTED]. OPR also concluded that [REDACTED] engaged in intentional professional misconduct when [REDACTED].
and has directed [redacted] to contact Professional Misconduct Review Unit Chief John V. Geise for further information regarding this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into Allegations of Misconduct against Assistant U.S. Attorneys

Enclosed is the Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation regarding the conduct of Assistant U.S. Attorneys (AUSAs) and former AUSA.
(b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(3) Rule 6e, (b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded that AUSA violated constitutional discovery obligations, Department and USAO policies, Rule of Professional Conduct 3.8, and order by failing to disclose material impeachment information to the defendant.

OPR concluded that AUSA did not commit professional misconduct.

Although OPR did not find that AUSA committed professional misconduct, OPR concluded that AUSA exercised extremely poor judgment when

OPR also concluded that AUSA demonstrated a lack of candor to the court in the ex parte motion and hearing when

Specifically, AUSA demonstrated a lack of candor to the court when
OPR determined that a professional misconduct finding was not appropriate.
OPR concluded that former AUSA [b](6) [b](7)(C) did not commit professional misconduct with respect to the government’s violation of its duty to disclose impeachment evidence or with respect to AUSA [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C) lack of candor.

OPR concluded that AUSA [b](6) [b](7)(C) did not commit professional misconduct during involvement with the Giglio issues [b](5) [b](6) [b](7)(C).
Attachment

cc: Jay Macklin
    General Counsel
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
    (w/attachment)

    John V. Geise
    Chief, Professional Misconduct Review Unit
    (w/attachment)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
Director
Executive Office for United States Attorneys

John V. Geise
Chief
Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation of Assistant U.S. Attorney for Failure to Maintain an Active Bar Membership

The Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) has completed its investigation into the failure of Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) to maintain an active bar membership for a period of time.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that engaged in intentional professional misconduct when, in violation of the rules prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law, continued to practice law when was not an active member of a bar. OPR also concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that committed intentional professional misconduct when was not an active member of at least one state bar and not authorized to practice law.

OPR further concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that engaged in professional misconduct by acting in reckless disregard of obligation to maintain an active membership in at least one state bar, in violation of the rules prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law. Finally, OPR concluded by a preponderance of the evidence that committed intentional professional misconduct.
(b)(5) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) and has directed [redacted] to contact the Professional Misconduct Review Unit for further information concerning the disciplinary process.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel, EOUSA
    (with enclosure)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Monty Wilkinson
   Director
   Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys

   John V. Geise
   Chief
   Professional Misconduct Review Unit

FROM: Robin C. Ashton
   Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation into the Conduct of Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA)

Enclosed is the final Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) Report of Investigation into the Conduct of AUSA.
Based on the results of its investigation, OPR concluded that in AUSA committed intentional professional misconduct in violation of obligations under policies, to keep client reasonably informed of and has directed to contact John V. Geise, Chief of the Professional Misconduct Review Unit, if has any questions about this matter.

Enclosure

cc: Scott N. Schools
    Associate Deputy Attorney General
    (with enclosure)

    Jay Macklin
    General Counsel
    Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys
    (with enclosure)