United States Attorneys Bulletin



Published by Executive Office for United States Attorneys
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Includes

SEMIANNUAL INDEX TO POINTS TO REMEMBER

VOL. 25

July 8, 1977

NO. 14

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

TOT	25 Tu	ly 8, 1977	NO. 14
VOL.		-	
	TABLE	OF CONTENTS	Page
CEMT	ANNUAL INDEX TO POINTS	TO REMEMBER - 1977	273
SEMI	ANNUAL INDEX 10 TOTALD	10 /4	
COMM	ENDATIONS		275
UN EX	TS TO REMEMBER ITED STATES ATTORNEYS' ECUTIVE OFFICE STAFF -	JULY 1977	277 281
GR.	MMONS ENFORCEMENT PROCE AND JURY SUBPOENA FOR T	ELEPHONE TOLL RECORDS	287 287
CASE	NOTES		
	l Division 🔍		
~	Military Pay U. S. v. Larionoff		289
	Social Security (AFDC	Benefits)	
	Batterton v. Francis	<u>i</u>	289
	National Guard Vargas v. Padillo		289
	Government Contracts U. S. v. Lowell		290
Crim	inal Division		
O1 1	Appealability		291
	Abney v. U.S.		291
	Presidential Pardon; S R. Norlan Daughtrey		292
		nuing Criminal Enterprise;	
	Lesser-Included Offe Jeffers v. V. S.	ense	293
Land	and Natural Resources	Division	
Lanu	Jurisdiction	DIVISION	•
	Mason v. U. S.		294
	NEPA	Concerned Citizens v.	
	Train Train	y concerned citizens v.	294
	Offshore Fishing Regul	lation by State	
	Douglas v. Seacoast	Products, Inc.	294

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

VOL.	25
------	----

July 8, 1	9	7	7
-----------	---	---	---

NO. 14

	Page
Marine Resources: Offshore Boundaries <u>Texas</u> v. <u>Louisiana</u>	2 9 5
Navigable Waters <u>Lapeyrouse</u> v. <u>U. S</u> .	295
Indians; Fishing Rights Puget Sound Gillnetters Assoc. v. Donald Moos, State of Washington, Department of Fisheries	2 9 6
NEPA; Section 4 (f) of Highway Act Capital Region Citizens Committee v. Adams	296
Oil and Gas Leasing Marathon Oil Co. v. Kleppe	297
Intervention under Rule 24(a)(2) F.R.Civ.P. Natural Resources Defense Council v. Costle	297
SELECTED CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES	299
APPENDIX: FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE These pages should be placed on permanent file, by Rule, in each United States Attorney's Office Library.	303
Citations for the slip opinions are available on PTS 739-3754	
APPENDIX: FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE These pages should be placed on permanent file, by Rule, in each United States Attorney's Office Library.	307
Citations for the slip opinions are available on PTS 739-3754.	

TO THE THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO

SEMIANNUAL INDEX TO POINTS TO REMEMBER Issues 1-13

Agents' Original Interview Notes, Retention of	25 USAB 76 (No. 6)
Attorney General's Advocacy Institute - General Information	25 USAB 188 (No. 10)
Bulletin Items - Casenote Sections by Assistant United States Attorneys	25 USAB 169 (No. 9)
Case Assignment Slip - Form USA 181	25 USAB 115 (No. 7)
Correspondence with the Civil Division	25 USAB 117 (No. 7)
Counterfeiting, Forged Endorsements on U.S. Obligations	25 USAB 18 (No. 3)
Detainers (See Interstate Agreement on)	
Executive Office Staff - April, 1977	25 USAB 137 (No. 8)
Fisheries Enforcement	25 USAB 80 (No. 6)
Garnishment of Federal Employee Wages, Department of Defense Personnel	25 USAB 20 (No. 3)
U.S. Civil Service Commission Regulations	25 USAB 169 (No. 9)
Indictments, Guides for Drafting	25 USAB 57 (No. 5)
Interstate Agreement on Detainers Act, U.S. v. Kenaan; U.S. v. Rodriquez	25 USAB 46 (No. 4)
U.S. v. Mauro; U.S. v. Sorrell	25 USAB 78 (No. 6)
U.S. v. Scallion	25 USAB 210 (No. 11)
Jencks and Brady Material, Security of	25 USAB 79 (No. 6)
Judgments Against United States, Payment of	25 USAB 75 (No. 6)
JURIS	25 USAB 61 (No. 5)
Notification of Consular Officers Upon Arrest of Foreign Nationals	25 USAB 9 (No. 1)

THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY O

VOL. 25	July 8, 1977				NO	. 14	
Obscenity		25	USAB	19	(No.	3)	
Pleadings: Paper in C.D	. California	25	USAB	17	(No.	3)	
Privacy Act of 1974		25	USAB	58	(No.	5)	
Sèlective Service Violato	ors	25	USAB	76	(No.	6)	
Speedy Trial		25	USAB	18	(No.	3)	
Tax Reform Act of 1976, Regulations Concerns Income Tax Returns Information		25	USAB	45	(No.	4)	
Summons Enforcement (Section 1205)	Proceeding	25	USAB	137	7 (No	. 8]	
Travel - Procedures to M	inimize Travel	25	USAB	241	(No	. 1.	
United States Attorneys 1	Executive Handbook	25	USAB	242	No (No	. 1.	
United States Attorneys' Government Property	Manual,	25 .25	USAB USAB	17 209	(No.) (No	. 3}	
Revised Edition		25	USAB	143	3 (No	. 8	

e a manda a ma

NO. 14

COMMENDATIONS

Assistant United States Attorney Naomi Reice Buchwald, Southern District of New York, has been commended by Richard A. Merrill, Chief Counsel, U. S. Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for her outstanding legal representation of the FDA in the case National Nutritional Foods Assn. v. Califano, and other FDA regulation matters.

Assistant United States Attorney Joseph P. Covington, District of Arizona, has been commended by Leon M. Gaskill, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his diligent and professional work in the successful prosecution of a case involving the largest single theft on the Hopi Indian Reservation.

Assistant United States Attorney David A. Schneider, Eastern Dîstrict of Virginia, has been commended by R. C. Pierce, Postal Inspector in Charge, U. S. Postal Service, for the successful prosecution of an 18-count, mail fraud Medicaid/Medicare case.

United States Attorney Evan L. Hultman and Assistant United States Attorney Robert L. Sikma, Northern District of Iowa; Assistant United States Attorney Lynn E. Crooks, District of North Dakota; Assistant United States Attorney Bruce W. Boyd, District of South Dakota; Assistant United States Attorney Richard E. Vosepka, Jr., District of Minnesota; and Assistant United States Attorney Dale A. Danneman, District of Arizona, have been commended by Clarence M. Kelley, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for their outstanding performance in the successful prosecution of Leonard Peltier for the first-degree murder of FBI Special Agents Jack R. Coler and Ronald A. Williams.

Assistant United States Attorney Terry Smiljanich, Middle District of Florida, has been commended by Richard A. Merrill, Chief Counsel, U. S. Food and Drug Administration, for his fine efforts in the recently concluded criminal prosecution of Southwestern Plasma Center, Inc. The success of this case was crucial to the FDA's on-going regulation of the plasma industry.

Assistant United States Attorney Daniel R. Drake, District of Arizona, has been commended by Leon M. Gaskill, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his efforts in the successful prosecution of a defendant charged with the perpetration of various frauds against numerous victims. This matter had been under FBI investigation for a considerable time.

CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR

First Assistant United States Attorney Sarah E. Barker, Southern District of Indiana, has been commended by United States Attorney James B. Young for her exemplary record of service and performance during her four and one-half year tenure with that office. Mrs. Barker resigned from her position as First Assistant effective July 1.

Assistant United States Attorney Daniel T. Cutler, Northern District of Iowa, has been commended by United States Attorney Evan L. Hultman for the outstanding manner in which he handled the prosecution of a unique major mail fraud and organized crime case. This prosecution ended activities of a widespread organization which had reaped an estimated profit of nearly one million dollars over several years.

United States Attorney Earl J. Silbert, and Assistant United States Attorneys Roger M. Adelman and Robert W. Ogren, District of Columbia, have been commended by Clarence M. Kelley, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for their cooperation and outstanding legal competence in a joint venture of the D. C. Metropolitan Police Department and the FBI in a fictitious, undercover fencing operation.

Assistant United States Attorney Joseph A. Cipollone, Northern District of Ohio, has been commended by Charles R. McKinnon, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his diligent efforts in a civil suit brought against the United States and several present and former FBI employees.

United States Attorney Gerald J. Gallinghouse and Assistant United States Attorney Michaelle F. Pitard, Eastern District of Louisiana, have been commended by William T. Gennetti, Acting General Counsel, U. S. Small Business Administration, for the valuable service they provided to that agency in the pending class action of Dore v. Kleppe:

Assistant United States Attorney Kenneth P. Snoke, Northern District of Oklahoma, has been commended by Kenneth W. Whittaker, Special Agent in Charge, Federal Bureau of Investigation, for his efforts in the successful prosecution of a case resulting in the conviction of the five defendants for violation of the U. S. Copyright laws.

THE COLUMN THE PROPERTY OF THE

POINTS TO REMEMBER

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' MANUAL--BLUESHEETS

The following is a cumulative listing of all current bluesheets which have been issued pursuant to USAM 1-1.550. Those sent to press since the last issue of the Bulletin have been marked with an asterisk. In the future, we will provide this cumulative listing on a quarterly basis. It may be removed from the Bulletin and used as a check list to assure that your U. S. Attorneys' Manual contains all bluesheets in effect. As in the past, we will continue to list in each Bulletin those bluesheets which have been sent to press during each two-week period.

Date	Affects USAM	Subject
Undtd	1-1.200	Authority of Manual; A.G. Order 665-76
9/30/76	1-2.200	Advisory Committee of U.S. Attorneys; Subcommittee on Indian Affairs
6/21/77	1-3.100*	Assigning Functions to the Associate Attorney General
6/21/77	1-3.102*	Assignment of Responsibility to DAG re INTERPOL
6/21/77	1-3.105*	Reorganize and Redesignate Office of Policy and Planning as Office for Improvements in the Administration of Justice
4/22/77	1-3.108	Selective Service Pardons
6/21/77	1-3.113*	Redesignate Freedom of Information Appeals Unit as Office of Privacy and Information Appeals
6/21/77	1-3.301*	Director, Bureau of Prisons; Authority to Promulgate Rules
6/21/77	1-3.402*	U.S. Parole Commission to replace U.S. Board of Parole
Undtd	1-5.000	Privacy Act Annual Fed. Reg. Notice; Errata

VOL. 25		July 8, 1977 NO. 14
<u>Date</u>	Affects USAM	Subject
4/28/77	1-6.200	Representation by Department of Employees: A.G. Order 683-77
5/5/77	1-9.000	Case Processing by Teletype with Social Security Administration
5/25/77	4-4.230	Award of Attorneys' Fees to Prevailing Governmental Defendant in Federal Employment Discrimination Cases
2/18/77	4-6.400	Coordination of Fraud Against the Government Cases (Cross Reference to USAM 9-42.000)
4/18/77	4-12.253	Priority of Liens
6/21/77	4-13.364*	Procedures to be Followed in Case of Suits Against Certain Federal Employees (Swine Flu Immunization Program of 1976)
5/26/77	6-3.181	Order for Entry to Effect Levy
5/31/77	6-3.355	Suits to Review Jeopardy and Termination Assessments Under Section 7429
5/26/77	6-3.380	Suits Against U.S. Officers and Employees; 26 U.S.C. 7217
6/21/77	7-2.000*	Part 25-Recommendations to President on Civil Aeronautic Board Decisions, Pro- cedures for Receiving Comments by Private Parties
6/21/77	8-2.000*	Part 55-Implementation of Provisions of Voting Rights Act re Language Minority Groups (interpretive guidelines)
6/21/77	8-2.000*	Part 42-Coordination of Enforcement of Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs
4/27/77	9-1.202	Supervision and Enforcement Responsibilities for Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act Transferred to the Internal Security Section (Registration Unit)

VOL. 25		July 8, 1977 NO. 14
Date	Affects USAM	Subject
4/27/77	9-1.246	Supervision and Enforcement Responsibilities re Employment of Persons to Appear before Congress or Covernmental Agency transferred to the Internal Security Section (Registration Unit)
4/28/77	9-2.020	Controlled Substance Prosecutions Referral to State or Local Prosecutions
5/5/77	9-2.133	Policy Limitations on Institution of Proceedings: Hobbs Act
6/21/77	9-2.166*	Grand Jury Subpoenas for Telephone Toll Records; Certifications
5/5/77	9-4.205	Mail Covers; Excludability of Evidence Obtained
5/5/77	9-4.541	Guide to Practice Under the Treaty on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Between the United States and Switzerland
6/21/77	9-4.541*	Designation of Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division as Central Authority Under Treaty on Mutual Assistance with Switzerland
6/17/77	9-8.100*	Diversion of Juvenile Cases to State Authorities
6/8/77	9-11.351	Grand Jury; Presence of Government Attorneys
2/18/77	9-42.000	Coordination of Fraud Against the Government Cases
4/13/77	9-42.510	Referral of Social Security Violations
5/5/77	9-75.140	Obscenity: Prosecutive Priority
6/6/77	9-90.320	Communication or Receipt of Classified Information Prohibited; 50 U.S.C. 783(b)
6/6/77	9-90.500	Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976
4/22/77	9-90.700	Selective Service Pardons (Cross Reference to USAM 1~3.108)
6/6/77	9-90.700	Selective Service Act

VOL. 25		July 8, 1977 NO. 14
Date	Affects USAM	Subject
4/28/77	9-101.000	Domestic Operations Guidelines for the Drug Enforcement Administration: Comments on Selected Provisions
5/5/77	9-131.030	Hobbs Act: Authorizing Prosecution

(Executive Office)

NO. 14

EXECUTIVE OFFICE STAFF - JULY, 1977

The following Executive Office rosters reflect a number of recent personnel changes, including the integration of the U.S. Attorneys personnel team from OMF into the Executive Office staff. Copies of the rosters should be made available to all persons in the U.S. Attorneys' Offices who deal directly with Executive Office personnel.

Director - William B. (Bill) Gray	FTS 739-2121
Secretary to the Director - Sheila C. Joy (All U.S. Attorney personnel actions)	2121
Deputy Director - William P. (Bill) Tyson	2123
Secretary to the Deputy Director - Maureen A. Braswell (Status of all attorney appointments)	2123
Chief, Special Projects - Martha J. Dalby (Reports; handbooks; statistical profiles of U.S. Attorneys' Offices; transition briefing materials; coordination of Field Activities; special assignments)	4238
Management Analyst - Linda J. Fleming (Administrative handbook; special reports; newsletters; transition briefing packages; other special projects)	4238
Clerk-Typist - Joyce T. Wood (U.S. Attorney Offices' statistics; clerical support for Attorney General's Advisory Committee of United States Attorneys and for Special Projects)	4238
Field Activities	
Assistant Director - Ernest R. (Ernie) Bengtson Assistant Director - Edward H. (Ed) Funston (On-site consultation and assistance to U.S. Attorneys on all aspects of operations; special conferences on problem areas of litigation; Departmental program review)	2131 2131
Management Analyst - Patrick C. (Pat) Mc Aloon (On-site consultation and assistance on all adminis- trative aspects of operations; administrative officers' training and handbook)	2131

VOL. 25	July	8,	1977	NO. 14
Secretary - Susan D. (Travel status of Field clerical support for Fi	i Activities			3276
Legal Services				
Assistant Director - Laure (Supervision of all legal s Bulletin, United States Att	ervices, Ur	ite	d States Attorneys'	3276
Secretary to the Assis (Controlled Substance to newsmen; United S States Attorneys' Man	Unit repor tates Attorn	ts;	reports of subpoenas	2080
Attorney - Advisor - 1 (Department Speedy 1 of Information and Pri inquiries; general leg	Trial Coordi .vacy Acts;	inat leg	tor; Freedom	5011
Attorney - Donald (Do (Freedom of Informati research; Congressio	on and Priv	acy	y Acts; JURIS	5011
Secretary - Cynthia J (Freedom of Informati quarterly reports; cl	on and Priv	vacy	y Act files control, for Legal Services)	5011
Attorney General's Advoc	cacy Institu	<u>ite</u>		
Acting Director - Geoffre (Institute training course	ey (Geof) B es; cassette	eau e le	nchamp ending library)	4104
Secretary - Patricia (Institute contact poi Advocacy Institute)				4104
Staff Assistant - Dor (Fiscal operations; 1				2137
Clerk - Dianna Ingr (Training requests; clerical support for	cassette le			2148

programs; Schedule C employees; Special Assistant U.S. Attorneys; experts, consultants; reductions-in-

force; leave policy; awards; suggestions)

SERVED SE

The second secon

VOL. 25	July 8, 1977	NO. 14
(Classification a review, appeals Fair Labor Stan benefits; discip	gement Specialist - Eileen M. Menton and compensation: surveys, Whitten s, supergrades, Factor Evaluation System, adards Act; performance evaluations; line, adverse action, grievances; as for assigned districts - see	4641
(Clerical suppo Management Spo	c - Elizabeth T. (Liza) de Carvalho ort for above two Personnel ecialists; personnel actions for assigned attached listing)	4641
Personnel Clerk	agement Specialist - Anita M. Davis k - Debra J. (Debi) Puckett ons for assigned districts - see	4641 4641
Personnel Assis	assification Specialist - Carrie M. Washingt stant - Gloria J. Allen ons for assigned districts - see ()	on 4641 4641
Personnel Cleri	agement Specialist - Sally S. Ruble k - Scarlitt A. Proctor ions for assigned districts - see	4251 4251
Personnel Cler	agement Specialist - Melinda P. Bell k - Patricia C. (Pattie) Poore ions for assigned districts - see g)	4251 4251

A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE

Anita Davis, PMS

Debi Puckett, PC

Arizona (08) California, Northern (11) California, Central (12) California, Eastern (97) California, Southern (98) Idaho (23) Montana (46) Nevada (48) New Mexico (51) Oregon (65) Texas, Northern (77) Texas, Eastern (78) Texas, Southern (79) Texas, Western (80) Utah (81) Washington, Eastern (85) Washington, Western (86) Wyoming (91)

Sally Ruble, PMS

Scarlitt Proctor, PC

District of Columbia (16) New Jersey (50) New York, Eastern (53) New York, Southern (54)

Carrie Washington, S&CS

Gloria Allen, PA

Arkansas, Eastern (09) Arkansas, Western (10) Colorado (13) Illinois, Northern (24) Illinois, Eastern (25) Illinois, Southern (26) Indiana, Northern (27) Indiana, Southern (28) Iowa, Northern (29) Iowa, Southern (30) Kansas (31) Kentucky, Eastern (32) Kentucky, Western (33) Michigan, Eastern (39) Michigan, Western (40) Minnesota (41) Missouri, Eastern (44) ` Missouri, Western (45) Nebraska (47) North Dakota (59) Oklahoma, Northern (62) Oklahoma, Eastern (63) Oklahoma, Western (64) South Dakota (73) Wisconsin, Eastern (89) Wisconsin, Western (90)

and the second second

VOL. 25

Melinda Bell, PMS

Patty Poore, PC

Vermont (82)

Virginia, Eastern (83) Virginia, Western (84)

West Virginia, Northern (87) West Virginia, Southern (88)

Connecticut (14). Delaware (15) Georgia, Northern (19) Georgia, Middle (20) Georgia, Southern (21) Maine (36) Maryland (37) Massachusetts (38) New Hampshire (49) New York, Northern (52) New York, Western (55) North Carolina, Eastern (56) North Carolina, Middle (57) North Carolina, Western (58) Ohio, Northern (60) Ohio, Southern (61) Pennsylvania, Eastern (66) Pennsylvania, Middle (67) Pennsylvania, Western (68) Rhode Island (70) South Carolina (71) Tennessee, Eastern (74) Tennessee, Middle (75) Tennessee, Western (76)

Eileen Menton, PMS

Elizabeth Decarvalho, PC

Alabama, Northern (01) Alabama, Middle (02) Alabama, Southern (03) Alaska (06) Canal Zone (92) EOUSA (00) Florida, Northern (17) Florida, Middle (18) Florida, Southern (C4) Guam (93) Hawaii (22) Louisiana, Eastern (34) Louisiana, Middle (95) Louisiana, Western (35) Mississippi, Northern (42) Mississippi, Southern (43) Puerto Rico (69) Virgin Islands (94)

(...plus all personnel
programs material.)

(Executive Office)

SUMMONS ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS

The Internal Revenue Service is attempting to maintain comprehensive statistics concerning the issuance and enforcement of administrative summonses, which reflect the new procedures required by the Tax Reform Act of 1976. The purpose of this notice is to serve as a reminder that petitions for enforcement of administrative summonses should be filed promptly and copies of the petitions, which reflect the date of filing, should be provided to this office and to Regional Counsel, Internal Revenue Service, without delay. Likewise, copies of findings, opinions or orders concerning enforcement should be supplied to this office and to Regional Counsel as soon as available. See USAM 6-3.200.

(Tax Division)

GRAND JURY SUBPOENAS FOR TELEPHONE TOLL RECORDS

As detailed in Criminal Division Memo No. 796, dated February 20, 1974, it is the Bell System policy to notify a subscriber that his telephone toll records have been subpoenaed, unless the government certifies a need to postpone notification. At the expiration of an original or subsequent 90-day period of non-disclosure under a certification or re-certification, the Bell System policy was to make disclosure only to subscribers specifically requesting disclosure. This policy has recently been changed, effective June 15, 1977.

The Bell System will continue to follow the former policy of non-disclosure, absent a request from the subscriber, in respect to any subpoena or summons received prior to June 15, 1977, even though the certification period expires after that date.

In regard to a subpoena or summons received on or after June 15, 1977, accompanied by a certification, the company will notify the subscriber of the release of his toll records within five days after the lapse of the certification or re-certification period. The notification will be given automatically, whether or not the subscriber asks for the information.

The subject of grand jury subpoenas for telephone toll records is discussed in USAM 9-2.166.

(Criminal Division)

CIVIL DIVISION Assistant Attorney General Barbara Allen Babcock

<u>United States v. Larionoff,</u> U.S. (Sup. Ct. No. 76-413, decided June 13, 1977). DJ 147-15-509

Military Pay

The Supreme Court, by a 5-4 vote, affirmed a decision of the District of Columbia Circuit requiring the Navy to pay "variable reenlistment bonuses" averaging \$2,000 to \$3,000 to a class of approximately 30,000 servicemen, but not on the grounds of the D. C. Circuit opinion. The D. C. Circuit had held that the servicemen had a contractual right to the VRB's, and that insofar as the Navy interpreted its own regulations on VRB-entitlement to deprive the servicemen of this right, the Navy's interpretation was impermissible. The Supreme Court held that the servicemen's right to the VRB's was purely a statutory, rather than a contractual, matter, and it further accepted the Navy's interpretation of its own regulations concerning VRB-entitlement. However, the Court went on to hold that the regulations themselves were inconsistent with the controlling statutes, and that the servicemen were entitled to the VRB's under those statutes.

Attorney: Neil H. Koslowe (Civil Division), FTS 739-5325

Batterton v. Francis, U.S. (Sup. Ct. Nos. 75-1181, 1182, decided June 20, 1977). DJ 145-10-390

Social Security (AFDC Benefits)

The Supreme Court, accepting our <u>amicus</u> position, has just reversed the Fourth Circuit and has upheld the validity of an HEW regulation (45 C.F.R. 233.100(a)(1)) which permits states to determine whether to make eligible for AFDC the children of strikers, the children of persons who voluntarily quit their jobs, and the children of persons discharged for misconduct. The Court held that HEW's interpretation was consistent with the statute.

Attorney: Donald Etra (Civil Division) FTS 739-4785

Vargas v. Padillo, F.2d (C.A. 1, No. 76-1243, decided June 2, 1977). DJ 35-65-11

National Guard

The First Circuit has just upheld the propriety of a regulation preventing general officers in the National Guard from being employed by the Guard as civilian technicians. Vargas, who had been so employed while a colonel in the Guard, was promoted to general, and upon his promotion was informed that he must relinquish his job as civilian technician. Affirming the district

menturen etter eikinestikaan eikistestijast "askarintiideisa eikidisteska viistaa atte aastatumisessissiste ajapa eas

court, the court of appeals held the regulation rationally promotes its stated purpose of insuring the availablility of general officers for service in the event of mobilization.

Attorney: Allen Sachsel (Civil Division) FTS 739-4102

<u>United States v. Lowell</u>, F.2d (C.A. 6, Nos. 75-2341, 2342, decided June 7, 1977). DJ 105-37-134

Government Contracts

In <u>United States</u> v. <u>Yazell</u>, 382 U.S. 341 (1966), the Supreme Court ruled that the Texas law of coverture precluded the United States from recovering upon a loan made to Mr. and Mrs. Yazell by executing upon the separate property of the wife. The Supreme Court, however, specifically left open the question of whether Congress had the constitutional power, by statute, to override such state law. The Sixth Circuit has now accepted the Government's position that Congress does have such power. Under the powers authorized by 15 U.S.C. §634, the Small Business Administration issued a regulation (13 C.F.R. §101.1(d)) providing that "persons negotiating loans shall not be entitled to claim or assert any local immunity to defeat the obligation such party incurred in obtaining or assuring such Federal benefit or assistance." On the strength of this regulation, the Court ruled that Michigan's coverture law was inapplicable to SBA loan contracts, and that the SBA could therefore execute on the property of Michigan wives.

Attorney: Mark Mutterperl (Civil Division) FTS 739-3159

CRIMINAL DIVISION Assistant Attorney General Benjamin R. Civiletti

Abney v. United States, U.S. 45 U.S.L.W. 4594 (No. 75-6521, June 9, 1977)

Appealability

STREET, AND STREET, AND LANGUAGE CONTRACTOR OF STREET, AND STREET,

The Court held that a defendant may immediately appeal a pretrial order denying a motion to dismiss the indictment on double jeopardy grounds, because the order constitutes a "final decision" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. 1291 (which grants courts of appeals jurisdiction to review all "final decisions", both civil and criminal, of the district courts). In reaching this conclusion, the Supreme Court employed this analysis: A pretrial order rejecting a double jeopardy claim is a "final decision" because (1) it is "a fully consummated decision", that is, "a complete, formal and, in the trial court, a final rejection" of the claim; (2) the claim is "collateral to, and separable from, the principal issue" to be presented at trial -that is, whether the accused is guilty; and (3) "the rights conferred on a criminal accused by the Double Jeopardy Clause would be significantly undermined if appellate review of double jeopardy claims were postponed until after conviction and sentence."

The court also held that the court of appeals in this case had erred in entertaining, in addition to the double jeopardy claim, the claim that the indictment failed to state an offense. As to all other claims which can be raised prior to trial, the question whether an appeal from an adverse ruling may be taken immediately -- thereby delaying commencement of trial -- is left open by the court's decision. If the order denying the claim is a "final decision" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. 1291, an immediate appeal is permissible. While it is unlikely that many claims will withstand the above analysis used by the Court in making this determination, immediate appeals from pretrial orders may flourish until this area of the law becomes more settled. Given this potential for delay, it may be desirable to file a motion to expedite the appeal when appeals are taken from adverse pretrial orders. When the appealability issue is insubstantial, a motion to dismiss the appeal would seem to be appropriate.

Attorney: Shirley Baccus-Lobel (Criminal Division)

FTS 739-3191

R. Norlan Daughtrey, et al. v. Jimmy Carter, et al., F.Supp. (D.D.C. Civ. Action No. 77-0187, May 11, 1977)

Presidential Pardon; Standing

On January 21, 1977, President Carter issued Proclamation 4483, 42 Fed. Reg. 4307, granting an unconditional pardon to all persons who may have committed certain offenses between August 4, 1964 and March 28, 1973 in violation of the Military Selective Service Act, and Executive Order No. 11967, 42 Fed. Reg. 4393, implementing the Proclamation, which provides, among other things, that certain persons eligible for the pardon who otherwise would be precluded from reentering the United States under 8 U.S.C. \$1182(a)(22) by reason of having committed any violation of the Military Selective Service Act shall be permitted to reenter the United States on the same basis as any other alien.

On February 2, 1977, plaintiffs, including seven recipients of the Congressional Medal of Honor and two Congressmen, filed this suit for declaratory and injunctive relief against the President and the Attorney General to set aside the Proclamation and Executive Order asserting that they violated 8 U.S.C. §1182(a)(22) which prohibits the reentry into the United States of all persons, including American citizens, who departed or remained outside the United States for purpose of avoiding military service.

The court, Judge Howard F. Corcoran, on the Government's motion, dismissed the action under Rule 12(b)(1), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on the ground that plaintiffs had not shown any injury to them from the Proclamation and Executive Order and, therefore, they lacked standing to maintain the action. The court did not reach the Government's contention that plaintiffs' interpretation of 8 U.S.C. §1182(a)(22) to include American citizens would render this statute unconstitutional under the Eighth Amendment.

Attorneys: Benjamin C. Flannagan (Criminal Division) FTS 739-3032

Lubomyr M. Jachnycky (Criminal Division) FTS 739-2305

<u>Jeffers v. United States</u>, <u>U.S.</u>, 45 U.S.L.W. 4691 (No. 75-1805, June 16, 1977)

Double Jeopardy; Continuing Criminal Enterprise; Lesser-Included Offense

In Jeffers v. United States, the Supreme Court, in a plurality opinion, assumed without deciding that the continuing criminal enterprise statute (21 U.S.C. 848), which proscribes in pertinent part, a person's acting "in concert with five or more other persons" to commit a series of narcotics offenses, requires proof of a criminal agreement as an essential element, and, hence, is a greater offense to the lesser-included offense of conspiracy to violate the narcotics laws (21 U.S.C. 846). Although adhering to rule (announced the same day in the State case of Brown v. Ohio) that the Double Jeopardy Clause prohibits the government from trying a defendant for a greater offense following his conviction for a lesser offense (or vice-versa), no such Double Jeopardy violation was found in Jeffers even Instead, the though successive prosecutions were involved. plurality decision held that under the circumstances of the case an exception to the Double Jeopardy prohibition arose when the defendant was "solely responsible for the successive prosecutions" by "expressly ask[ing] for separate trials on the greater and lesser offenses" or by "fail[ing] to raise the issue that one offense might be a lesser included offense of the other." However, even though successive prosecutions and convictions were proper, the Court further held that cumulative punishments for violations of Sections 846 and 848 were not contemplated by Congress and accordingly remanded the case for re-sentencing.

oversement and the second seco

Attorney: Robert J. Erickson (Criminal Division) FTS 739-3795

LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION Acting Assistant Attorney General James W. Moorman

Jurisdiction.

Alleging violations of NEPA, Mason had filed suit in district court attacking an FCC order which authorized the establishment of an earth satellite communications relay system. The court of appeals affirmed the district court's dismissal for lack of jurisdiction, holding that under the FCC Act, exclusive jurisdiction to review that agency's orders rests with a court of appeals upon the timely filing of a petition for review. Neither NEPA nor the APA altered that jurisdictional limitation.

Attorney: Peter R. Steenland (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-2813.

Mid-Shiawassee County Concerned Citizens v. Train, F.2d (C.A. 6, No. 76-1646, decided May 9, 1977). DJ 90-1-4-1156.

National Environmental Policy Act.

The Sixth Circuit affirmed the district court's holding that EPA's negative declaration that a proposed sewage treatment facility in Owosso, Michigan, would not have significant adverse environmental impacts was supported by the administrative record. In so doing, the Sixth Circuit joined the Second, Fourth and Seventh Circuits in establishing an "arbitrary and capricious" standard of review for negative assessments. Led by the Fifth Circuit, the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Circuits have applied a "reasonableness" test to an agency decision not to require an EIS. The D.C. Circuit will consider whether the proposed action "arguably" has an adverse environmental impact.

Attorneys: Thomas M. Woods (E.D. Mich.), FTS 226-6175; Peter Haller (Environmental Protection Agency), 755-8108.

Douglas v. Seacoast Products, Inc., U.S. (S.Ct. No. 75-1255, decided May 23, 1977). DJ 90-4-30.

Offshore Fishing Regulation by State.

The Court, generally adopting the position that the United States had taken in its amicus brief, denied the

jurisdiction of the State of Virginia to discriminate against noncitizens and nonresidents fishing under a Federal license to engage in the coastal fisheries. The Court also determined that the coastal states did not possess title to the fishery resources within their waters under the Submerged Lands Act or any other theory and generally cautioned the states not to discriminate against noncitizens and nonresidents.

Attorney: Ralph J. Gillis (Formerly of the Land and Natural Resources Division).

Texas v. Louisiana, U.S. U.S. (S.Ct. No. 36, Original, decided May 16, 1977). DJ 90-1-5-1339.

Marine Resources: Offshore Boundaries.

The Supreme Court entered a decree in this case adopting the boundary between Texas and Louisiana, including the boundary of the States in the Gulf of Mexico proposed by the United States. The offshore boundary affects the rights of the Federal Government as well as the States in an area of submerged lands known to contain valuable oil and gas deposits.

Attorney: Michael W. Reed (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-2779.

<u>Lapeyrouse</u> v. <u>United States</u>, <u>F.Supp.</u> (C.Cls. No. 214-75, decided May 23, 1977). DJ 90-1-23-1852.

Navigable Waters.

meneral meneral de la respectable de la respectable de la companyación de la companyación de la companyación d

Plaintiff, suing under a special act of Congress, sought \$350,000 for alleged damages to oyster beds resulting from dredging by the Corps of Engineers. The trial judge awarded plaintiffs a reduced judgment of \$16,021 because the government was able to show that the damage was not as extensive as claimed and that much of it was from other causes.

Attorney: Geoffrey A. Mueller (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-3797.

ere en des sersia estados en estados de estados de entración de entrac

Puget Sound Gillnetters Association v. Donald Moos, State of Washington, Department of Fisheries, P.2d (Wash. S.Ct. No. 44401, en banc, decided June 8, 1977).

DJ 90-2-0-670.

Indians; Fishing Rights.

The court held that the Washington Department of Fisheries lacked authority under state law to allocate the fish catch between Indians and non-Indians since the Department could regulate only in the interests of conservation. As a consequence, Judge Boldt's order, directing the Department to allocate to the Indians the opportunity to catch up to 50% of the harvestable fish by giving them extra fishing days, was unenforceable.

Attorney: Edmund B. Clark (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-2748.

Capital Region Citizens Committee v. Adams, F.2d (C.A. 2, Nos. 77-6027 and 6031, decided June 1, 1977).

DJ 90-1-4-502.

National Environmental Policy Act; Section 4(f) of Highway Act.

This case involved a shotgun-style attack on an EIS for a highway between Albany and Binghamton, New York. The EIS and "4(f)" statements were allegedly deficient in discussing air pollution, secondary development, alternatives to the road (especially more rail use), park lands, and segmentation. Also challenged was the amount of federal EIS participation, the use of a contractor to draft the EIS, and the navigability of the Susquehanna River at the point of highway crossing. Finally, Capital Citizens objected to disposition by summary judgment. The court of appeals affirmed the district court based on its own review of the volumninous documents of record.

Attorney: Edmund B. Clark (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-2748.

Marathon Oil Co. v. Kleppe , F.2d (C.A. 10, No. 76-1230, decided June 7, 1977). DJ 90-18-1097.

Oil and Gas Leasing.

The court of appeals affirmed the Wyoming district court's order setting aside two related IBLA decisions on the royalties owed the United States by lessees operating under unitization agreements. The court of appeals ruled that the language of the unit agreement in one case, and the Secretary's graduated royalty computation regulation incorporated by reference in the unit agreement in the other case, permitted the lessee to count water injection wells for production-perwell calculations (to determine the royalty rate), even though these injection wells were located outside the area that participated in the production proceeds.

Attorney: John J. Zimmerman (Land and Natural Resources Division), FTS 739-4519.

Natural Resources Defense Council v. Costle, F.2d (C.A. D.C. Nos. 76-1664 and 1665, decided June 15, 1977). DJ 90-5-1-5-23.

Intervention under Rule 24(a)(2) F.R.Civ.P.

The District Court Circuit held that, in proceedings to implement a settlement agreement that requires EPA to initiate rulemaking proceedings which will lead to future regulations controlling discharges of toxic pollutants in the nation's waters, the district court abused its discretion under Rule 24(a)(2), F.R.Civ.P., in denying intervention to rubber and chemical companies, even though they had waited until the eve of settlement before seeking intervention.

Attorney: Jacques B. Gelin (Land and Natural Resources Division) FTS 739-2762.