

**REPORT TO CONGRESS
ON THE ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS
OF THE
PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION
FOR 2017**



**Public Integrity Section
Criminal Division
United States Department of Justice**

**Submitted Pursuant to
Section 603 of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978**

INTRODUCTION

This Report to Congress is submitted pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, which requires the Attorney General to report annually to Congress on the operations and activities of the Justice Department's Public Integrity Section. The Report describes the activities of the Public Integrity Section during 2017. It also provides statistics on the nationwide federal effort against public corruption during 2017 and over the previous two decades.

The Public Integrity Section was created in 1976 in order to consolidate in one unit of the Criminal Division the Department's oversight responsibilities for the prosecution of criminal abuses of the public trust by government officials. Section attorneys prosecute selected cases involving federal, state, or local officials, and also provide advice and assistance to prosecutors and agents in the field regarding the handling of public corruption cases. In addition, the Section serves as the Justice Department's center for handling various issues that arise regarding public corruption statutes and cases.

An Election Crimes Branch was created within the Section in 1980 to supervise the Department's nationwide response to election crimes, such as voter fraud and campaign-financing offenses. The Director of Election Crimes reviews all major election crime investigations throughout the country and all proposed criminal charges relating to election crime.

During the year, the Section maintained a staff of approximately thirty attorneys, including experts in extortion, bribery, election crimes, and criminal conflicts of interest. The Section management included: Raymond Hulser, Chief; AnnaLou Tirol, Principal Deputy Chief and Acting Chief; Joseph P. Cooney, Deputy Chief; John D. Keller, Deputy Chief; Peter M. Koski, Deputy Chief; and Richard C. Pilger, Director, Election Crimes Branch.

Part I of the Report discusses the operations of the Public Integrity Section and highlights its major activities in 2017. Part II describes significant cases prosecuted by the Section in 2017. Part III presents nationwide data regarding the national federal effort to combat public corruption from 1995 through 2017.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I

**OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF
THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION**

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LITIGATION 1

 1. Recusals by United States Attorneys’ Offices 1

 2. Sensitive and Multi-District Cases 2

 3. Federal Agency Referrals 3

 4. Requests for Assistance/Shared Cases 3

B. SPECIAL SECTION PRIORITIES 4

 1. Election Crimes 4

 2. Conflicts of Interest Crimes 6

C. LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE 7

 1. Training and Advice 7

 2. Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors
 General on Integrity and Efficiency 8

 3. Legislative Activities 8

 4. Case Supervision and General Assistance 8

 5. International Advisory Responsibilities 9

PART II

**PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS AND
PROSECUTIONS IN 2017**

INTRODUCTION 10

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH 11

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH 12

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH 14

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT 16

FEDERAL ELECTION CRIMES 20

PART III

**NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

INTRODUCTION22
LIST OF TABLES.....22

TABLE I: Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption in
201723

TABLE II: Progress over the Past Two Decades:
Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption24

TABLE III: Federal Public Corruption Convictions by District
Over the Past Decade26

PART I

OPERATIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR LITIGATION

The work of the Public Integrity Section focuses on public corruption, that is, crimes involving abuses of the public trust by government officials. Most of the Section's resources are devoted to investigations involving alleged corruption by government officials and to prosecutions resulting from these investigations. Decisions to undertake particular matters are made on a case-by-case basis, given Section resources, the type and seriousness of the allegation, the sufficiency of factual predication reflecting criminal conduct, and the availability of federal prosecutive theories to reach the conduct.

Cases handled by the Section generally fall into one of the following categories: recusals by United States Attorneys' Offices, sensitive cases, multi-district cases, referrals from federal agencies, and shared cases. These categories are discussed below.

1. Recusals by United States Attorneys' Offices

The vast majority of federal corruption prosecutions are handled by the local United States Attorney's Office for the geographic district where the crime occurred, a fact demonstrated by the statistical charts in Part III of this Report. At times, however, it may be inappropriate for the local United States Attorney's Office to handle a particular corruption case.

Public corruption cases tend to raise unique problems of public perception that are generally absent in more routine criminal cases. An investigation of alleged corruption by a government official, whether at the federal, state, or local level, or someone associated with such an official, always has the potential of becoming a high-profile case simply because its focus is on the conduct of a public official. In addition, these cases are often politically sensitive because their ultimate targets tend to be politicians or government officials appointed by politicians.

A successful public corruption prosecution requires both the appearance and the reality of fairness and impartiality. This means that a successful corruption case involves not just a conviction but public perception that the conviction was

warranted, not the result of improper motivation by the prosecutor, and is free of conflicts of interest. In a case in which the local conflict of interest is substantial, the local office is removed from the case by a procedure called recusal. Recusal occurs when the local office either asks to step aside, or is asked to step aside by Department headquarters, as primary prosecutor. Federal cases involving corruption allegations in which the conflict is substantial are usually referred to the Public Integrity Section either for prosecution or direct operational supervision.

Allegations involving possible crimes by federal judges almost always require recusals of the local offices for significant policy, as well as practical reasons. Having the case handled outside the local offices eliminates the possible appearance of bias, as well as the practical difficulties and awkwardness that would arise if an office investigating a judge were to appear before the judge on other matters. Thus, as a matter of established Department practice, federal judicial corruption cases generally are handled by the Public Integrity Section.

Similar concerns regarding the appearance of bias also arise when the target of an investigation is a federal prosecutor, a federal investigator, or other employee assigned to work in or closely with a particular United States Attorney's Office. Thus, cases involving United States Attorneys, Assistant United States Attorneys (AUSAs), or federal investigators or employees working with AUSAs in the field generally result in a recusal of the local office. These cases are typically referred to the Public Integrity Section.

2. Sensitive and Multi-District Cases

In addition to recusals, the Public Integrity Section handles other special categories of cases. At the request of the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, the Section handles cases that are highly sensitive and cases that involve the jurisdiction of more than one United States Attorney's Office.

Cases may be sensitive for a number of reasons. Because of its importance, a particular case may require close coordination with high-level Department officials. Alternatively, the case may require substantial coordination with other federal agencies in Washington. The latter includes cases involving classified information that require careful coordination with intelligence agencies. Sensitive cases may also include those that are so politically controversial on a local level that they are most appropriately handled in Washington.

In addition to sensitive cases, this category encompasses multi-district cases, that is, cases involving allegations that cross judicial district lines and, as a result, fall under the jurisdiction of two or more United States Attorneys' Offices. In these cases, the Section occasionally is asked to coordinate the investigation among the various United States Attorneys' Offices, to handle a case jointly with one or more United States Attorney's Office, or, when appropriate, to assume operational responsibility for the entire case.

3. Federal Agency Referrals

In another area of major responsibility, the Section handles matters referred directly by federal agencies concerning possible federal crimes by agency employees. The Section reviews these allegations to determine whether an investigation of the matter is warranted and, ultimately, whether the matter should be prosecuted.

Agency referrals of possible employee wrongdoing are an important part of the Section's mission. The Section works closely with the Offices of Inspector General (OIGs) of the executive branch agencies, as well as with other agency investigative components, such as the Offices of Internal Affairs and the Criminal Investigative Divisions. In addition, the Section invests substantial time in training agency investigators in the statutes involved in corruption cases and the investigative approaches that work best in these cases. These referrals from the various agencies require close consultation with the referring agency's investigative component and prompt prosecutive evaluation.

4. Requests for Assistance/Shared Cases

The final category of cases in which the Section becomes involved is cases that are handled jointly by the Section and a United States Attorney's Office or other component of the Department. At times, the available prosecutorial resources in a United States Attorney's Office may be insufficient to undertake sole responsibility for a significant corruption case. In this situation the local office may request the assistance of an experienced Section prosecutor to share responsibility for prosecuting the case. On occasion, the Section may also be asked to provide operational assistance or to assume supervisory responsibility for a case due to a partial recusal of the local office. Finally, the Public Integrity Section may be assigned to supervise or assist with a case initially assigned to another Department component.

B. SPECIAL SECTION PRIORITIES

In addition to the general responsibilities discussed above, in 2017 the Public Integrity Section continued its involvement in a number of priority areas of criminal law enforcement.

1. Election Crimes

One of the Section's law enforcement priorities is its supervision of the Justice Department's nationwide response to election crimes. The prosecution of all forms of election crime is a high Departmental priority, and headquarters' oversight in this area is designed to ensure that the Department's nationwide response to election crime matters is uniform, impartial, and effective. In 1980, the Election Crimes Branch was created within the Section to handle this supervisory responsibility.

The Election Crimes Branch oversees the Department's handling of all election crime allegations other than those involving federal voting rights, which are handled by the Civil Rights Division. Specifically, the Branch provides advice and guidance on three types of election crime cases: (1) vote frauds, such as vote buying and absentee ballot fraud; (2) campaign-financing crimes, most notably under the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA); and (3) patronage crimes, such as political shakedowns and misuse of federal programs for political purposes. Vote frauds and campaign-financing offenses are the most significant, and most common types of election crimes.

The election-related work of the Section and its Election Crimes Branch falls into the following categories:

a. Consultation and Field Support. Under long-established Department procedures, the Section's Election Crimes Branch reviews all major election crime investigations, including all proposed grand jury investigations and FBI full-field investigations, and all election crime charges proposed by the various United States Attorneys' Offices for legal and factual sufficiency. (United States Attorneys' Manual 9-85.210.) The Branch is also often consulted before a United States Attorney's Office opens a preliminary investigation into a vote fraud allegation, although this is not required.

In the area of campaign-financing crimes, Department procedures require consultation with headquarters before any investigation, including a preliminary investigation, is commenced by a United States Attorney's Office. U.S.A.M. 9-85-

210. The increased coordination with the Section at the initial stage of a criminal investigation of a FECA matter enables the Department to coordinate, when necessary, with another federal agency, the Federal Election Commission, which has civil enforcement authority over FECA violations.

The Section's consultation responsibility for election matters includes providing advice to prosecutors and investigators regarding the application of federal criminal laws to vote fraud, patronage crimes, and campaign-financing crimes, and the most effective investigative techniques for particular types of election offenses. In addition, the Election Crimes Branch helps draft election crime charges and other pleadings when requested.

The majority of the Branch's consultations are in the following two categories: vote fraud, also known as election fraud or ballot fraud; and campaign financing crimes arising under the FECA. During 2017, the Branch assisted in evaluating allegations, helping to structure investigations, and drafting charges for United States Attorneys' Offices around the country in these areas of law enforcement.

b. Litigation. Section attorneys investigate and prosecute selected election crimes, either by assuming total operational responsibility for the case or by handling the case jointly with a United States Attorney's Office or other Department component.

c. District Election Officer Program. The Branch also assists in implementing the Department's long-standing District Election Officer (DEO) Program. This Program is designed to ensure that each of the Department's 94 United States Attorneys' Offices has a trained prosecutor available to oversee the handling of election crime matters within the district and to coordinate district responses with Department headquarters regarding these matters.

The DEO Program involves appointing an Assistant United States Attorney in each federal district to serve a two-year term as a DEO and providing periodic training for the DEOs in the handling of election crime and voting rights matters.

The DEO Program is also a crucial feature of the Department's nationwide Election Day Program, which takes place during the federal general elections held in November of even-numbered years. The Election Day Program ensures that federal prosecutors and investigators are available both at Department headquarters in Washington, DC, and in each district to receive complaints of election

irregularities while the polls are open. As part of the Program, press releases are issued in Washington, DC, and in each district before the November federal elections that advise the public of the Department's enforcement interests in deterring and prosecuting election crimes and protecting voting rights. The press releases also provide contact information for the DEOs, local FBI officials, and Department officials in the Criminal and Civil Rights Divisions at headquarters, who may be contacted on Election Day by members of the public who have complaints of possible vote fraud or voting rights violations.

d. Inter-Agency Liaison with the Federal Election Commission. The Election Crimes Branch is the formal liaison between the Justice Department and the Federal Election Commission (FEC), an independent federal agency that shares enforcement jurisdiction with the Department over willful violations of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA). The FEC has exclusive civil jurisdiction over all FECA violations, while the Department has exclusive criminal jurisdiction over FECA crimes.

e. Inter-Agency Liaison with the Office of Special Counsel. The Branch also serves as the Department's point of contact with the United States Office of Special Counsel (OSC). The OSC has jurisdiction over noncriminal violations of the Hatch Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 1501-1509, 7321-7326, which may also involve criminal patronage crimes that are within the Department's jurisdiction.

2. Conflicts of Interest Crimes

"Conflicts of interest" is a wide-ranging and complex area of law, with many layers of administrative and oversight responsibility. Moreover, the federal criminal conflicts of interest laws overlap to some extent with the sometimes broader ethics restrictions imposed by civil statutes, agency standards of conduct, Presidential orders, and, in the case of attorneys, bar association codes of conduct.

The Public Integrity Section's work in the conflicts area falls into the following categories:

a. Criminal Referrals from Federal Agencies and Recusals. The Section's criminal enforcement role comes into play with respect to a narrow group of conflicts of interest matters, namely, those that involve possible misconduct proscribed by one of the federal conflicts of interest statutes, 18 U.S.C. §§ 203-209. These crimes are prosecuted either by a United States Attorney's Office or by the Public Integrity Section. Conflicts of interest matters are often referred to the

Section by the various federal agencies. If investigation of a referral is warranted, the Section coordinates the investigation with the Inspector General for the agency concerned, the FBI, or both. If prosecution is warranted, the Section prosecutes the case. If a civil remedy may be appropriate in lieu of criminal prosecution, the Section or the Inspector General may refer the case to the Civil Division of the Department of Justice for its review.

b. Coordination. The Public Integrity Section works with the United States Office of Government Ethics (OGE) to coordinate conflicts of interest issues with OGE and other executive branch agencies and offices. The purpose of this coordination is to ensure that the overall legislative and enforcement efforts in this area are both complementary and consistent. OGE has broad jurisdiction over noncriminal conduct by executive branch personnel, as well as the authority to provide guidance concerning the coverage of the federal criminal conflicts of interest statutes. The Section's coordination with OGE ensures that consistent guidance is provided with respect to the overlapping criminal, civil, and administrative interests implicated by the statutory and regulatory restrictions on federal personnel.

C. LEGAL AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

1. Training and Advice

The Public Integrity Section is staffed with specialists who have considerable experience investigating and prosecuting corruption cases. Section attorneys participate in a wide range of formal training events for federal prosecutors and investigators. They are also available to provide informal advice on investigative methods, charging decisions, and trial strategy in specific cases.

The Section also conducts a public corruption seminar, held annually, at the National Advocacy Center. Speakers at this seminar typically include both the Section's senior prosecutors and Assistant United States Attorneys from the field who have handled significant corruption cases. The seminar provides training for federal prosecutors regarding the statutes most commonly used in corruption cases, guidance in the use of the complex and difficult investigative techniques necessary to investigate government corruption, and advice from experienced prosecutors on conducting corruption trials.

2. Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency

Pursuant to the Inspector General Reform Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-409, 122 Stat. 4302 (Oct. 14, 2008), the designee of the Chief of the Public Integrity Section serves as Legal Advisor to the Integrity Committee of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE). The CIGIE is a body composed of the Inspectors General of the various agencies of the executive branch of the federal government. The Integrity Committee of the CIGIE is charged with handling allegations against Inspectors General and senior members of their staff.

In addition, the Integrity Committee is charged with establishing policies and procedures to ensure consistency in conducting administrative investigations. The Committee's procedures, drafted with the assistance of the Public Integrity Section, provide a framework for the investigative function of the Committee. Allegations of wrongdoing by Inspectors General and their senior staff are initially reviewed by an Integrity Committee working group, with assistance from the Public Integrity Section, for potential criminal prosecution. In noncriminal matters, the procedures guide the Committee's process for reviewing or investigating alleged misconduct and for reporting on its findings. The Public Integrity Section also advises the Integrity Committee on matters of law and policy relating to its investigations.

3. Legislative Activities

An important responsibility of the Public Integrity Section is the review of proposed legislation that may affect, directly or indirectly, the investigation and prosecution of public officials and those who seek to corrupt these officials. The Section is often called upon to comment on legislation proposed by Congress, by the Administration, or by other departments of the executive branch; to draft or review testimony for congressional hearings; and to respond to congressional inquiries concerning legislative proposals. On occasion, the Section drafts legislative proposals relating to various corruption matters.

4. Case Supervision and General Assistance

Public corruption cases are often controversial, complex, and highly visible. These factors may warrant Departmental supervision and review of a particular case. On occasion Section attorneys are called upon to conduct a careful review of a sensitive public corruption case, evaluating the quality of the investigative work and the adequacy of any proposed indictments. Based on its experience in this area, the

Section can often identify tactical or evidentiary problems early on and either provide needed assistance or, if necessary, assume operational responsibility for the prosecution.

The Section also has considerable expertise in the supervision of the use of undercover operations in serious corruption cases. The Section serves on the FBI's Criminal Undercover Operations Review Committee. A number of the Section's senior prosecutors have experience in the practical and legal problems involved in such operations and have the expertise to employ this sensitive investigative technique effectively and to advise law enforcement personnel on its use.

5. International Advisory Responsibilities

The Public Integrity Section actively participates in the area of international law enforcement. The Section regularly provides briefings and training on United States public corruption issues to visiting foreign delegations and continues the efforts of the United States to assist foreign countries in their quest to combat public corruption and election crime in their respective countries. This assistance includes participation in international proceedings and coordination with other components of the Justice Department and the State Department on the Administration's positions in this area.

Section experts continue to address visiting foreign officials in investigations and prosecutions of public corruption. These presentations are generally conducted under the auspices of the State Department's Foreign Visitor Program and the Justice Department's Office of Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance, and Training. During 2017, the Section made presentations to officials from Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Belize, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, the Czech Republic, Egypt, Guatemala, Italy, Kenya, Kosovo, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Malaysia, Namibia, Nigeria, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Serbia, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

PART II

PUBLIC INTEGRITY SECTION INDICTMENTS AND PROSECUTIONS IN 2017

INTRODUCTION

As described in Part I, the Public Integrity Section's role in the prosecution of public corruption cases ranges from sole operational responsibility for the entire case to approving an indictment or to providing advice on the drafting of charges. Part II of the Report provides examples of noteworthy public corruption cases for which the Section had either sole or shared operational responsibility during 2017.

In 2017, the Section's case work resulted in numerous guilty pleas, as well as several trial convictions in Arizona, the District of Columbia, Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Puerto Rico. The Section tried seven cases from April to August 2017, including three cases in May 2017, resulting in the convictions of ten defendants.

The descriptions of the Section's significant cases for calendar year 2017 are separated into categories, based on the branch or level of government affected by the corruption. Election crime cases are grouped separately. Unrelated cases in each category are separated by triple lines. When a conviction but not a sentencing took place in 2017, the sentencing may be reported in this report or in a later year's report.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section has sole responsibility for the investigation and prosecution of federal judges due to the potential appearance issues that might arise if a local United States Attorney's Office were to investigate an allegation of wrongdoing by a judge before whom that United States Attorney's Office appears on a regular basis. The investigation of allegations of criminal wrongdoing in the federal judicial branch is a very sensitive matter. These investigations may involve intrusions into pending federal cases, cooperation from parties or witnesses who are appearing before the court, or potential disruption of the normal judicial process. In addition, the Section must coordinate closely with supervisory judges and the Administrative Office of United States Courts to facilitate the assignment of magistrates and judges from outside of the judicial district to handle requests during the investigation, such as grand jury supervision, or applications for warrants or electronic surveillance. The Public Integrity Section has developed substantial experience and expertise in these matters over the years. During 2017, the Section brought no cases involving the federal judicial branch.

FEDERAL LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section plays a central role in the effort to combat corruption in the federal legislative branch. These cases raise unique issues of inter-branch comity, and they are always sensitive given the high-profile stature of elected officials. The Section has developed substantial expertise regarding the unique protections provided to Members of Congress and their staff by the Speech or Debate Clause set forth in Article I of the Constitution and has worked closely and effectively with House and Senate counsel and the Ethics Committees in both houses. In addition to handling its own cases, the Section routinely provides advice and guidance to prosecutors across the country regarding these sensitive investigations. During 2017, the Section handled a number of cases involving legislative branch corruption, including one described below.

United States v. Corrine Brown, et al., Middle District of Florida

Former U.S. Congresswoman Corrine Brown was convicted by a federal jury in Jacksonville, Florida, on May 11, 2017, for her role in a conspiracy and fraud scheme involving a fraudulent scholarship charity. Brown was convicted on 18 counts of an indictment charging her with participating in a conspiracy involving a fraudulent education charity, concealing material facts on required financial disclosure forms, obstructing the due administration of the internal revenue laws and filing false tax returns. Brown's co-conspirators, Elias "Ronnie" Simmons, Brown's long-time Chief of Staff, and Carla Wiley, the president of the fraudulent charity, previously pleaded guilty to their roles in the education charity scheme on February 8, 2017, and March 3, 2016, respectively.

Evidence at trial showed that between late 2012 and early 2016, Brown participated in a conspiracy and fraud scheme involving One Door for Education – Amy Anderson Scholarship Fund (One Door) in which Brown, Simmons, Wiley and others acting on their behalf solicited more than \$800,000 in charitable donations based on false representations that the donations would be used for college scholarships and school computer drives, among other charitable causes. Donors were misled to believe that One Door was a properly registered 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. Brown, Simmons, Wiley and others used the vast majority of One Door donations for their personal and professional benefit. According to evidence

presented at trial, despite raising over \$800,000 in donations, One Door granted only two scholarships totaling \$1,200. Additionally, the trial evidence demonstrated that Brown failed to disclose the reportable income she received from One Door and falsely claimed deductions on her tax returns for donations that she did not make.

Brown was sentenced to 60 months in prison; Elias “Ronnie” Simmons was sentenced to 48 months in prison; and Carla Wiley was sentenced to 21 months in prison. Brown and Wiley were ordered to forfeit \$654,292.39, and Simmons was ordered to forfeit \$727,964.90. All three defendants were ordered to pay total restitution of \$452,515.87 to victims of the fraud scheme. Brown was ordered to pay an additional \$62,650.99 in restitution to the Internal Revenue Service, and Simmons was ordered to pay an additional \$91,621.38 in restitution to the U.S. House of Representatives.

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Public Integrity Section frequently receives allegations of corruption in the executive branch from federal law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, the Inspectors General for the various departments and agencies, and United States military investigators. These matters involve a careful balancing of the requirements of a criminal investigation and the operational needs of the executive offices involved. During 2017, the Section handled a number of cases involving executive branch corruption, several of which are described below.

United States v. Christopher Ciccione, et al., Southern District of Florida

Christopher Ciccione, a former U.S. Homeland Security Investigations (HSI) Special Agent, pleaded guilty on November 30, 2017, to accepting bribes in exchange for orchestrating, through multiple misrepresentations to numerous government agencies, the dismissal of a drug trafficking indictment filed against a fugitive Colombian narcotics kingpin.

According to admissions in his plea agreement, Ciccione accepted cash and other things of value and used his official position to cause a drug trafficking indictment against Colombian national Jose Bayron Piedrahita to be dismissed and to obtain official authorization for Piedrahita and his family to enter the United States. Piedrahita and Colombian national Juan Carlos Velasco Cano gave Ciccione approximately \$20,000 in cash, as well as dinner, drinks, and prostitution during an extended hotel stay in Bogota, Colombia, in exchange for official acts that resulted in the dismissal of the indictment against Piedrahita. Velasco pleaded guilty on November 3, 2017, to his role as the intermediary between Ciccione and Piedrahita.

Ciccione admitted that, in furtherance of this scheme to obstruct justice, he misled the U.S. Attorney's Office and HSI management and altered law enforcement records to represent to decision makers that Piedrahita was a "former" suspect of a closed investigation rather than a "current" subject, was "never positively identified," and that his case should be dismissed—all while maintaining contact with Piedrahita. Ciccione also falsified the concurrence of several other federal agents and attempted to parole Piedrahita into the United States. Piedrahita is currently incarcerated in the Republic of Colombia. Velasco was sentenced to 27 months in prison, and Ciccione was sentenced to 36 months in prison.

United States v. Carla Sena, District of New Mexico

On December 5, 2017, Carla Sena, a former procurement officer employed by Sandia Corporation, pleaded guilty to one count of wire fraud and one count of money laundering for orchestrating a scheme to fraudulently obtain a \$2.3 million federal contract. Sena's employer, Sandia Corporation, managed and operated Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), a nuclear research and development facility owned by the federal government under sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Energy.

According to admissions in her plea agreement, in late 2010, Sena managed the bidding process for the award of a multi-million-dollar contract for moving services at SNL. Sena admitted that, in anticipation of the bidding process for this contract, she created the company, New Mexico Express Movers LLC (Movers LLC), to which she eventually awarded the multi-million-dollar contract. In order to conceal her involvement, Sena prepared a bid for Movers LLC containing fraudulent misrepresentations and submitted the bid under the name of an individual who had no knowledge of Movers LLC or Sena's scheme. Sena also admitted that she used her position as a procurement officer with SNL to access inside information and competing bidders' documents that she leveraged in the Movers LLC bid.

As a direct result of Sena's fraudulent scheme, Movers LLC received approximately \$2.3 million in federal funds between May 2011 and April 2016. Sena also admitted that, between October 2011 and April 2015, she transferred via negotiated checks at least \$643,000 of the fraudulently obtained proceeds to businesses owned by her father with the intent to conceal the source and control of those funds and her subsequent personal gain from the proceeds. Sena was sentenced to 30 months in prison.

STATE AND LOCAL CORRUPTION

The Public Integrity Section plays a major role in combating corruption at all levels of government, including corruption relating to state or local public officials. During 2017, the Section handled a number of cases involving state and local corruption, several of which are described below.

United States v. Juan Bravo Fernandez and Hector Martinez Maldonado, District of Puerto Rico

Former Puerto Rico Senator Hector Martinez Maldonado and Juan Bravo Fernandez, the former president of one of the largest private security companies in Puerto Rico, were convicted of bribery in a retrial on May 31, 2017. According to evidence presented at trial, Maldonado began serving as chairman of the Puerto Rico Public Safety Committee in 2005, exercising significant control over legislation related to security and community safety. Bravo was the president and chief executive officer of Ranger American, one of the largest private security firms in Puerto Rico. The jury convicted the defendants for their bribery scheme in which Bravo provided Martinez and Jorge de Castro Font, another former Puerto Rico Senator, with a trip to Las Vegas to watch a championship boxing match in exchange for the Senators' help with legislation favorable to Bravo's business interests.

Documents and evidence presented at trial showed that the trip to Las Vegas included first-class airfare; hotel rooms at the Mandalay Bay Resort and Casino; \$1,000 tickets to the boxing match; and meals, drinks and hotel rooms in Miami for the return trip. On March 2, 2005, the day that Bravo paid for the boxing tickets, Maldonado submitted a bill favorable to Bravo for consideration by the Puerto Rico Senate. The evidence at trial also showed that the hotel reservation was made the day after Maldonado presided over a Public Safety Committee hearing for another favorable bill. The day after the three men returned from their trip to Las Vegas, Maldonado and de Castro Font both cast their vote in support of one of Bravo's bills in the Senate.

United States v. Cason Moreland, Middle District of Tennessee

On March 28, 2017, Cason “Casey” Moreland, a General Sessions Judge in Davidson County, Tennessee, was charged with obstruction of justice through bribery and witness tampering. According to the indictment, the FBI opened a criminal investigation into allegations that Moreland and others solicited, accepted, and extorted things of value in return for performing official acts that benefitted them and their associates.

As alleged in the indictment, Moreland became aware of the FBI’s investigation when agents attempted to interview him. Moreland orchestrated a scheme to obstruct and interfere with the federal investigation by using a middleman to offer a witness thousands of dollars to recant statements the witness had made about Moreland. Moreland also conspired with the middleman to plant drugs on the witness in order to destroy the witness’ credibility with law enforcement. Moreland also gave the middleman a fraudulent affidavit purporting to be from the witness and asked the middleman to offer the witness thousands of dollars to sign it.

United States v. Joseph Boeckmann, Eastern District of Arkansas

On October 5, 2017, former Arkansas state judge Joseph Boeckmann pleaded guilty to honest services wire fraud and witness tampering for perpetrating a seven-year long fraud and bribery scheme in which he dismissed cases on his docket in exchange for personal benefits and then bribed a witness in an attempt to obstruct an official investigation into the scheme.

According to admissions made in connection with his plea, Boeckmann served as a district judge for the First Judicial District of Arkansas from 2009 to 2015. In that capacity, he dismissed traffic citations and misdemeanor criminal charges in exchange for acts that he claimed were “community service,” but that actually benefitted Boeckmann himself. In some cases, Boeckmann took official action to order these individuals to perform “community service” and used his access to these individuals to take photographs of them in compromising positions. In other cases, Boeckmann dismissed pending charges in exchange for sexually related conduct. Boeckmann also admitted that, after he learned that he was under investigation, he arranged to pay a witness to change testimony that the witness had previously provided to the Arkansas Judicial Discipline and Disability commission

in order to obstruct the ongoing investigation. Boeckmann was sentenced to 60 months in prison.

United States v. Renee Tartaglione, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

On June 23, 2017, Tartaglione, the former President of the Board of Directors of a nonprofit mental health clinic, was convicted of multiple counts of fraud and theft for an eight-year long scheme to embezzle over two million dollars from the clinic, as well as for filing false tax returns for multiple years that underrepresented her income. According to the evidence presented at trial, Tartaglione used her position as President of the Juniata Community Mental Health Clinic (JCMHC) to defraud and steal money from JCMHC through a series of actions designed to benefit her personally at the expense of the clinic.

Among other things, Tartaglione used a company that she owned to purchase the Philadelphia building that housed the clinic and then repeatedly raised the rent from \$4,500 per month to \$25,000 per month. In 2012, Tartaglione caused the clinic to move to a new building that she also owned and spent clinic funds to renovate the building. Tartaglione then proceeded to lease the building to JCMHC at \$35,000 per month under a lease agreement that was expected to rise to \$75,000 per month, all exorbitant rates that far exceeded the going market rates. None of the rent increases or lease agreements were approved by JCMHC's Board of Directors, and Tartaglione and her co-conspirators created fictitious documents in an attempt to make the transactions appear legitimate.

Tartaglione was sentenced to 82 months in prison. In addition, Tartaglione was ordered to forfeit \$2.4 million in proceeds and pay \$2,076,024 in restitution.

United States v. Antonio Tillmon, Eastern District of North Carolina

In May 2017, Antonio Tillmon, a former police officer with the Windsor, North Carolina Police Department, was found guilty at trial of drug, firearms, and bribery charges. According to evidence presented at trial, Tillmon accepted \$6,500 from undercover FBI agents posing as drug traffickers in return for transporting a total of 30 kilograms of heroin from North Carolina to Maryland on three separate occasions between August 2014 and April 2015. On each occasion, Tillman carried his Windsor Police Department badge and a firearm and was prepared to use his badge and fake documentation to evade interdiction by legitimate law enforcement.

The evidence at trial also showed that Tillmon was poised to participate in a fourth drug run on the day that he was arrested, having brought with him five firearms, including an assault rifle. Fourteen other defendants, 12 of whom were law enforcement or correctional officers, were charged as a result of this investigation. Those defendants all pleaded guilty to various offenses and were sentenced in June 2017 to sentences ranging from six to 195 months in prison. On October 10, 2017, Tillmon was sentenced to 180 months in prison.

FEDERAL ELECTION CRIMES

As described in Part I, during 2017, the Public Integrity Section continued its nationwide oversight of the handling of election crime investigations and prosecutions. Set forth below are examples of the Section's 2017 casework in this area.

United States v. Kenneth Smukler and Donald Jones, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

On October 24, 2017, Kenneth Smukler and Donald Jones, both Philadelphia-area political consultants, were charged for their roles in a scheme to use a political candidate's campaign funds to make illegal contributions to an opponent's campaign in order to secure that opponent's agreement to drop out of a 2012 congressional primary race.

According to allegations in the indictment, Smukler and Jones conspired with former Municipal Court Judge Jimmie Moore, a candidate for the Democratic Party's nomination for the U.S. House of Representatives in 2012, and Moore's campaign manager, Carolyn Cavaness. In or about February 2012, Moore agreed to withdraw from the primary election in exchange for \$90,000 in payments from his opponent's campaign. The payments exceeded the \$2,000 limit on contributions from one campaign to another campaign for primary elections and were paid to a company created by Cavaness for the sole purpose of receiving the funds and using them to repay Moore's campaign debts. The payments to Cavaness' company were routed through political consulting companies run by Jones and Smukler to conceal the nature and source of the funds.

Cavaness and Moore previously pleaded guilty on July 25, 2017, and October 3, 2017, respectively, to causing false statements to the FEC. Jones pleaded guilty on December 8, 2017, to making a false statement to the FBI.

United States v. Adam Victor, Southern District of West Virginia

On April 19, 2017, Adam Victor, a New York businessman, pleaded guilty to making illegal political contributions in the names of others to campaign committees of candidates for U.S. President and U.S. Senate in 2011. According to admissions made in connection with his guilty plea, during the 2011 calendar year, Victor made \$17,500 in aggregated contributions through numerous immediate family members and colleagues to the campaign committee of a candidate for President of the United States and a candidate for a U.S. Senate seat in West Virginia. According to the plea, Victor did not reveal to either candidate that he was the true source of the contributions.

PART III

NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS

INTRODUCTION

The tables in this section of the Report reflect data that is compiled from annual nationwide surveys of the United States Attorneys' Offices and from the Public Integrity Section.

As discussed in Part I, most corruption cases are handled by the local United States Attorney's Office in the district where the crime occurred. However, on occasion, outside prosecutors are asked either to assist the local office on a corruption case, or to handle the case entirely as a result of recusal of the local office due to a possible conflict of interest. The figures in Tables I through III include all public corruption prosecutions within each district including cases handled by the United States Attorneys' Offices and the Public Integrity Section.*

LIST OF TABLES

- TABLE I:** Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption in 2017
- TABLE II:** Progress Over the Past Two Decades: Nationwide Federal Prosecutions of Public Corruption
- TABLE III:** Federal Public Corruption Convictions by District Over the Past Decade

*Prior to 2017, Tables I through III included cases only from the United States Attorneys' Offices.

TABLE I
NATIONWIDE FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS
IN 2017

Federal Officials	
Charged	383
Convicted	334
Awaiting Trial	169

State Officials	
Charged	63
Convicted	68
Awaiting Trial	53

Local Officials	
Charged	223
Convicted	208
Awaiting Trial	150

Others Involved	
Charged	194
Convicted	227
Awaiting Trial	149

Totals	
Charged	863
Convicted	837
Awaiting Trial	521

TABLE II

**PROGRESS OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES:
FEDERAL PROSECUTIONS BY UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES
OF CORRUPT PUBLIC OFFICIALS**

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007
FEDERAL OFFICIALS										
Charged	442	480	441	502	478	479	424	445	463	426
Convicted	414	460	422	414	429	421	381	390	407	405
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	85	101	92	131	119	129	98	118	112	116
STATE OFFICIALS										
Charged	91	115	92	95	110	94	111	96	101	128
Convicted	58	80	91	61	132	87	81	94	116	85
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	37	44	37	75	50	38	48	51	38	65
LOCAL OFFICIALS										
Charged	277	237	211	224	299	259	268	309	291	284
Convicted	264	219	183	184	262	119	252	232	241	275
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	90	95	89	110	118	106	105	148	141	127
PRIVATE CITIZENS INVOLVED IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION OFFENSES										
Charged	364	302	256	266	249	318	410	313	295	303
Convicted	278	306	242	261	188	241	306	311	266	249
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	128	89	109	121	126	139	168	136	148	179
TOTALS										
Charged	1174	1,134	1,000	1,087	1,136	1,150	1,213	1,163	1,150	1,141
Convicted	1014	1,065	938	920	1,011	868	1,020	1,027	1,030	1,014
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	340	329	327	437	413	412	419	453	439	487

TABLE II (continued)

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
FEDERAL OFFICIALS											
Charged	518	425	422	412	381	337	364	458	354	383	8,634
Convicted	458	426	397	392	369	315	364	402	326	334	7,926
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	117	107	103	110	108	113	111	153	170	169	X
STATE OFFICIALS											
Charged	144	93	168	93	100	133	80	123	139	63	2,169
Convicted	123	102	108	143	78	119	109	97	125	68	1,957
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	61	57	105	41	68	68	33	66	74	53	X
LOCAL OFFICIALS											
Charged	287	270	296	282	319	334	231	259	234	223	5,394
Convicted	246	257	280	276	295	303	252	200	213	208	4,761
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	127	148	146	127	135	149	100	135	148	150	X
PRIVATE CITIZENS INVOLVED IN PUBLIC CORRUPTION OFFENSES											
Charged	355	294	298	295	278	330	241	262	255	194	5,878
Convicted	302	276	251	296	318	300	264	205	222	227	5,309
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	184	161	200	191	144	169	106	150	177	149	X
TOTALS											
Charged	1304	1082	1184	1082	1078	1134	916	1102	982	863	22,075
Convicted	1129	1061	1036	1107	1060	1037	989	904	886	837	19,953
Awaiting Trial as of 12/31	489	473	554	469	455	499	350	504	569	521	X

TABLE III

**UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS' OFFICES
FEDERAL PUBLIC CORRUPTION CONVICTIONS
BY DISTRICT OVER THE PAST DECADE**

U.S. Attorney's Office	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
Alabama, Middle	3	5	1	9	8	9	8	6	2	4	55
Alabama, Northern	17	18	11	14	13	12	11	13	8	7	124
Alabama, Southern	0	5	3	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	12
Alaska	8	1	9	4	4	2	1	4	4	1	38
Arizona	20	19	16	18	34	40	29	18	8	18	220
Arkansas, Eastern	4	2	11	7	12	4	3	10	14	15	82
Arkansas, Western	1	1	6	1	3	0	2	3	0	1	18
California, Central	41	43	29	27	39	19	66	53	32	23	372
California, Eastern	9	15	12	20	4	4	10	12	14	12	112
California, Northern	3	2	3	3	7	3	9	12	8	12	62
California, Southern	5	9	0	2	39	37	10	7	10	13	132
Colorado	4	14	6	6	9	3	2	0	3	1	48
Connecticut	5	2	4	0	8	13	9	6	0	0	47
Delaware	7	1	1	2	3	5	0	1	0	2	22
District of Columbia	66	28	41	39	47	18	15	8	7	10	279
Florida, Middle	51	30	18	24	25	20	28	27	10	24	257
Florida, Northern	3	27	13	3	9	8	9	14	8	9	103
Florida, Southern	12	12	21	13	28	21	27	42	38	26	240
Georgia, Middle	7	3	0	11	11	9	10	11	2	6	70
Georgia, Northern	15	21	32	32	27	11	33	22	67	24	284
Georgia, Southern	2	1	5	2	4	7	4	1	4	5	35
Guam & NMI	3	6	3	5	1	2	3	10	1	0	34
Hawaii	2	1	0	3	2	0	4	5	0	2	19

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
Idaho	1	1	0	3	6	4	1	3	4	1	24
Illinois, Central	6	6	0	2	1	6	10	0	1	4	36
Illinois, Northern	43	47	46	30	36	45	18	16	30	25	336
Illinois, Southern	7	5	6	9	7	18	4	3	4	5	68
Indiana, Northern	9	10	4	4	25	15	7	7	10	5	96
Indiana, Southern	5	8	8	2	7	8	10	5	10	4	67
Iowa, Northern	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	4	3	2	15
Iowa, Southern	9	4	11	1	3	2	2	2	6	2	42
Kansas	5	4	5	9	8	4	2	2	0	2	41
Kentucky, Eastern	22	22	28	25	19	12	15	10	17	15	185
Kentucky, Western	6	19	6	13	13	3	4	3	3	6	76
Louisiana, Eastern	26	20	26	29	29	20	10	12	16	14	202
Louisiana, Middle	3	10	4	13	4	5	7	9	3	9	67
Louisiana, Western	10	14	25	9	19	25	4	6	22	9	143
Maine	8	5	1	4	2	2	3	4	5	0	34
Maryland	39	32	21	58	26	47	38	31	23	80	395
Massachusetts	19	28	27	19	13	22	18	16	17	19	198
Michigan, Eastern	20	7	14	18	17	19	13	4	25	20	157
Michigan, Western	13	11	16	6	0	0	6	2	9	7	70
Minnesota	7	13	6	8	0	6	5	4	5	3	57
Mississippi, Northern	13	13	9	4	9	11	8	3	4	3	77
Mississippi, Southern	4	2	15	13	0	7	10	8	3	6	68
Missouri, Eastern	22	16	11	10	11	10	10	5	6	3	104
Missouri, Western	9	8	14	4	10	0	9	6	12	11	83
Montana	8	7	10	5	2	5	27	8	26	19	117

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
Nebraska	8	2	4	2	3	3	4	3	6	8	43
Nevada	0	7	4	6	6	2	6	0	0	1	32
New Hampshire	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
New Jersey	49	44	47	28	27	30	33	23	28	21	330
New Mexico	6	9	7	4	4	2	10	12	4	6	64
New York, Eastern	14	12	12	10	13	5	9	28	8	12	123
New York, Northern	10	2	3	3	5	1	0	4	2	1	31
New York, Southern	9	9	12	24	21	13	13	19	20	15	155
New York, Western	15	15	10	15	18	7	19	17	18	18	152
North Carolina, Eastern	4	4	9	10	4	10	6	13	15	5	80
North Carolina, Middle	1	3	7	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	14
North Carolina, Western	12	2	2	2	0	7	2	4	2	4	37
North Dakota	4	0	6	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	17
Ohio, Northern	29	49	65	28	16	8	11	18	13	12	249
Ohio, Southern	8	7	0	3	9	11	9	12	1	0	60
Oklahoma, Eastern	8	0	3	11	9	14	11	10	4	12	82
Oklahoma, Northern	3	12	2	2	5	3	4	4	5	0	40
Oklahoma, Western	11	10	9	11	12	5	7	6	4	9	84
Oregon	3	5	1	7	2	3	4	3	0	1	29
Pennsylvania, Eastern	15	20	23	23	30	29	36	27	26	26	255
Pennsylvania, Middle	16	16	25	7	7	0	1	14	3	14	103
Pennsylvania, Western	5	5	6	7	10	10	6	8	3	8	68
Puerto Rico	37	28	17	130	30	19	47	13	41	13	375
Rhode Island	2	1	3	8	2	8	4	3	0	1	32

TABLE III (continued)

U.S. Attorney's Office	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Totals
South Carolina	8	7	2	11	2	5	7	3	6	0	51
South Dakota	11	8	9	8	9	3	1	6	1	15	71
Tennessee, Eastern	16	7	4	8	10	8	11	8	4	2	78
Tennessee, Middle	1	4	3	1	9	4	0	5	7	5	39
Tennessee, Western	5	10	14	8	12	18	8	21	9	10	115
Texas, Eastern	10	5	4	2	0	3	6	3	4	4	41
Texas, Northern	23	41	17	19	28	27	39	48	49	18	309
Texas, Southern	64	26	23	43	26	83	29	11	3	12	320
Texas, Western	15	27	27	24	47	53	28	29	30	33	313
Utah	5	3	1	2	1	3	2	0	2	1	20
Vermont	5	0	2	5	3	1	1	1	0	0	18
Virgin Islands	2	0	7	3	0	5	2	1	0	0	20
Virginia, Eastern	72	57	60	57	41	53	34	40	32	32	478
Virginia, Western	2	5	2	0	0	3	5	8	4	3	32
Washington, Eastern	5	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	7	1	15
Washington, Western	7	3	8	5	7	5	7	5	9	7	63
West Virginia, Northern	2	2	6	4	4	7	18	3	3	3	52
West Virginia, Southern	4	2	3	1	3	4	4	2	1	4	28
Wisconsin, Eastern	6	4	5	5	8	6	4	5	3	2	48
Wisconsin, Western	0	5	2	5	6	7	5	2	4	6	42
Wyoming	1	2	1	5	3	3	0	0	0	0	15