

**Federal Courts
chair**
Thomas V. Marino, Esq.
Dunnington Bartholow & Miller LLP
1359 Broadway
New York, NY 10018
(212) 682-8811 • Fax (212) 661-7769
email: tmarino@dunnington.com

May 22, 2008

The Honorable John Conyers, Jr.
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Lamar S. Smith
Ranking Member
Committee on the Judiciary
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Howard L. Berman
Chairman
Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet
and Intellectual Property
Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Howard Coble
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet
and Intellectual Property
Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Re: S. 2450, Legislation to Adopt Proposed Federal Rule of Evidence 502

Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Committee on the Federal Courts of the New York County Lawyers' Association ("NYCLA"), we write to express our strong support for S. 2450, legislation that would adopt proposed Federal Rule of Evidence 502 ("FRE 502") concerning the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine.¹ As you know, the Senate passed S. 2450 by unanimous consent on February 27, 2008.

¹ This letter reflects the views and opinions of the Committee on the Federal Courts only. It has not been approved by the Board of Directors of NYCLA and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Association or the Board.



We urge you to support prompt House passage of the legislation.

On February 5, 2007, NYCLA's Board of Directors adopted a report of its Committee on the Federal Courts that addressed FRE 502 (a copy of the prior report is annexed to this letter). However, the Committee's prior report deferred comment pending further study of two issues: (1) selective waiver, particularly when made to government regulatory bodies; and (2) enforceability of confidentiality agreements and orders against non-parties. The selective waiver provision was removed from FRE 502 by the Judicial Conference of the United States and S.2450, as passed by the Senate, did not contain the selective waiver provision.

In urging House passage of S.2450, the Committee on the Federal Courts wishes to address the single remaining issue left open by its prior report, *i.e.*, subdivisions (d) through (f) of FRE 502, on the enforceability of agreements and orders concerning production of privileged material. Collectively, these subdivisions provide that: (1) parties may bind themselves through enforceable agreements concerning the consequences of disclosing privileged communications or information; (2) such agreements are not binding on anyone other than parties to the agreement, unless the agreement is embodied in a court order; and (3) a federal court order embodying an agreement - or issued in the absence of an agreement² - on the effect of disclosure of privileged communications or information governs all persons, whether or not parties to the agreement, in both state and federal courts.³

The burdens of modern discovery have become exponentially greater with the rise of electronically stored information. Millions of documents that formerly might never been generated or, if generated, never preserved, are now stored in

² See Comment on subsection (d) ("Under the rule, a confidentiality order is enforceable whether or not it memorializes an agreement among the parties to the litigation. Party agreement should not be a condition of enforceability of a federal court's order.").

³ The language of the proposed Rule leaves unclear whether a court can retroactively reattach privilege to materials disclosed to the adversary - and, therefore, subject to waiver- before the court issues its order. The Committee believes that allowing a court to "re-privilege" material already disclosed, possibly at a late stage of proceedings such as settlement, encourages sloppy practices. Therefore, the language should be amended to clarify that only disclosures made pursuant to and after the issuance of a court order are protected against waiver.

formats that make selective searches a hit-or-miss proposition and document-by-document review prohibitively expensive, or where not prohibitively expensive in an absolute sense, grossly disproportionate to the stakes in the litigation. For some examples, see Hopson v. City of Baltimore, 232 F.R.D. 228 (D. Md. 2005); Rowe Entertainment, Inc. v. William Morris Agency. 205 F.R.D. 421 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). Even a medium-sized business can now generate and preserve - perhaps in a box of back-up tapes that would have been thrown out long ago if they took up as much room as their paper equivalents - the proverbial warehouse of documents formerly the province of mega-cases.

Much privileged material, like much discovery material generally, is unimportant. The adversary often knows, or could guess, what legal advice would have been given in the situation and what facts the client might have communicated. The incremental value of confirmation might be minimal. When dealing with unprivileged documents, lawyers and clients can weigh the costs of screening against the probable importance of what might slip through a less rigorous and less costly screening process. Where privileged documents are concerned, however, current law makes such a weighing process too risky.

FRE 502 attempts to curb the cost of privilege review by making a judge's order that forbids parties from claiming a privilege waiver merely because their adversaries see privileged documents, under arrangements such as "quick peek" or "clawback" provisions, enforceable against non-parties to a litigation. Under such arrangements, adversaries often see privileged material. Although they cannot make evidentiary use of it, they do obtain whatever insight is to be gained from knowing what the privileged material says. This incentive is probably great enough to prevent the proposed rule from becoming an excuse for sloppy handling of privileged matter. FRE 502 allows lawyers and clients to weigh the cost of screening against the likelihood that revealing privileged material to one's adversary would cause actual harm to their cause.


Further, the party allowing the other party to see privileged material on a nonwaiver basis is not, generally, making affirmative adversarial use of the

privileged material. But for questions of time, expense and difficulty, the party producing the privileged material would just as soon the adversary never saw it at all, and gains nothing from disclosing it, except the savings in time, expense and effort required to find and sequester it. While the affirmative use of voluntarily disclosed material in one case raises issues of fairness when the same material is withheld in related litigation, no fairness issues are involved when parties make decisions about the cost- effectiveness of preventing involuntary disclosure.⁴

⁴ Although the language of the proposed Rule seems to cover deliberate, strategic disclosures of privileged material, as well as anticipated but unintended disclosures incident to mass discovery, we do not believe the Rule is intended to cover such situations and ought not to be so interpreted.

Although the Committee on the Federal Courts had some concerns about the power of a judge to impose non-consensual confidentiality orders, the potential abuse of the provision by parties seeking at a late stage of litigation orders retroactively re-privileging documents produced earlier, and the possibility that the rule would be interpreted to cover strategic, deliberate disclosures, on balance, we recommend adoption of the enforceability provisions.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas V. Marino". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Thomas V. Marino

Chair

Committee on the Federal Courts

Subcommittee on Proposed Federal Rule of Evidence 502

New York County Lawyers' Association - Committee on the Federal Courts:

Clement J. Colucci, Chair

Norman B. Arnoff

Evelyn Konrad

Richard W. Slack

Stephanie G. Wheeler

New York County Lawyers' Association
14 Vesey Street
New York, NY 10007
(212) 267-6646 • Fax: (212) 406-9252
www.nycla.org

**Report of the New York County Lawyers' Association
on Proposed Revisions to
Rule 502 of the Federal Rules of Evidence**

This Report was approved by the Board of Directors of the New York County Lawyers' Association at its regular meeting on February 5, 2007.

On August 10, 2006, the Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure of the Judicial Conference of the United States released for public comment, *inter alia*, a proposed Federal Rule of Evidence ("FRE") 502 dealing with waiver of the attorney-client and work-product privileges. The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules held two public hearings on proposed FRE 502, one in Phoenix on January 12, 2007 and another in New York City on January 29, 2007. The public comment period closes February 15, 2007. This report contains the recommendations of the New York County Lawyers' Association ("NYCLA") on certain aspects of the proposed rule.

A. Proceedings to Date

In January 2006, James Sensenbrenner, then Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, requested the Judicial Conference of the United States to initiate a rulemaking process, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2074, to address the litigation costs and burdens created by the current law on waiver of attorney-client and work-product privileges. Because any proposed rule would deal with the substantive law of privilege, it would eventually require enactment by Congress to become effective. 28 U.S.C. § 2074(b).

The Advisory Committee directed its Reporter, Professor Daniel Capra of Fordham

University School of Law, to prepare a draft rule for its consideration that would address four topics: (1) scope of waiver; (2) inadvertent disclosure; (3) selective waiver, particularly when made to government regulatory bodies; and (4) enforceability of confidentiality agreements and orders. The Advisory Committee circulated the draft rule and Advisory Committee Note to selected judges, regulators, academics and practicing lawyers in advance of its April meeting at Fordham Law School. On April 24, 2006, the Advisory Committee heard testimony and considered written submissions from various persons.

As a result of the comments received at the hearing, the draft was revised, mainly to eliminate language purporting to regulate state rules on waiver as applied in state court proceedings- The Advisory Committee and its liaisons and members of the Civil Rules Committee discussed the revised draft. The Advisory Committee reached agreement on most of the provisions for a proposed FRE 502, leaving undecided whether to recommend for enactment by Congress proposed subdivision (c) dealing with selective waiver, and leaving the proposed but unadopted language in brackets. The Advisory Committee unanimously recommended that the revised draft of proposed FRE 502, including the bracketed language on selective waiver, be released for public comment. The revised draft and Advisory Committee comments are attached as Exhibit A.

B. The Proposed FRE 502

The Committee drafted the proposed FRE 502 to deal with two overarching problems. First, under the current rules, lawyers must spend countless hours, at the client's mounting expense, reviewing ever more voluminous document production - a problem exacerbated by electronic data storage and its related discovery problems - to cull out privileged documents, many of which are insignificant in and of themselves but could lead to the compelled production of other, possibly important, privileged documents. Second, government enforcement agencies often insist on disclosure of privileged information in the course of investigations, which then becomes available to third parties.

The proposed FRE 502 deals with these problems in four ways: (1) limiting the scope of privilege waivers; (2) adopting a uniform standard on inadvertent waivers; (3) allowing selective disclosure to government and regulatory agencies; and (4) making agreements concerning privileged communications enforceable not only among the parties but, with judicial approval, against non- parties.

1. **Scope of Waiver:** Subdivision (a) deals with the scope of a privilege waiver. Under current law, the disclosure of privileged matter often results in a waiver of privilege not only for the matter produced but for other communications concerning the same subject matter. In re Sealed Case, 676 F.2d 793, 809 (D.C. Cir. 1982); Hercules, Inc. v. Exxon Corp., 434 F. Supp. 136,156 (D. Del. 1977). In practice, the application of the general rule is complex and inconsistent, raising issues concerning just what the “same subject matter” is and whether waivers of privileged communications other than those disclosed are fair. In re Grand Jury Proceeding. 78 F.3d 251 (6th Cir. 1996); In re von Bulow. 828 F.2d 94 (2d Cir. 1987).

The generally accepted rationale for regarding waiver of some privileged communications as a waiver of all related privileged communications - however “related” may be defined - is the unfairness of allowing a party to make selective adversarial use of privileged communications. See, 8 Wigmore, Evidence § 2328 at 638 (McNaughton rev, 1961) (“The client’s offer of his own or the attorney’s testimony as to a specific communication . . . is a waiver as to all other communications . . . on the same subject matter. This is so because the privilege of secret consultation is intended only as an incidental means of defense, and not as an independent means of attack, and to use it in the latter character is to abandon it in the former. . . . The client’s offer of his own or the attorney’s testimony as to a part of any communication. . . is a waiver as to the whole of the communication, on the analogy of the principle of completeness.”). See also Teachers Ins. And Annuity Ass’n of America v. Shamrock Broadcasting Co. 521 F. Supp. 638, 641 (S.D.N.Y. 1981) (“When a party discloses part of an otherwise privileged communication, he in fairness

discloses the entire communication, or at least so much of it as will make the disclosure complete and not misleadingly one-sided.”

The rationale based on adversarial fairness suggests that inadvertent disclosures ought to be treated differently from intentional disclosures, since the inadvertent production of a privileged communication, not otherwise used for some adversarial advantage by the disclosing party, does not raise fairness issues.⁵¹ Indeed, some courts do treat inadvertent disclosures differently for that very reason. EEOC v. Johnson & Higgins Inc., 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17612 at *35 (S.D.N.Y. 1998)(disclosure of draft affidavit and review of handwritten notes did not waive privilege on other communications when there was no indication that the disclosing party would make adversarial use of the disclosed materials); Koch Materials Co. v. Shore Slurry Seal, Inc., 208 F.R.D. 109,120 (D.N.J. 2002)(inadvertently disclosed materials did not result in subject-matter waiver where disclosing party would make no unfair use of them). But see In re Sealed Case, 877 F.2d 976 (D.C. Cir. 1989)(inadvertent disclosures result in subject-matter waiver).⁶²

The proposed FRE 502(a) makes the adversarial fairness rationale the central focus of any inquiry into the scope of waiver. It provides that presumptively, disclosures of privileged material (whether attorney client or work product) are limited to the very material disclosed *unless* “the undisclosed communication or information concerning the same subject matter ought in fairness to be considered with the disclosed communication or information.”

⁵¹ A related concern is the deliberate production of a document in the reasonable, good faith belief that it is *not* privileged, resulting in a waiver of other, unquestionably privileged communications when a court later takes a broader view of privilege. Sinclair Oil Corp. v. Texaco, Inc., 208 F.R.D. 329 (D. Okla. 2002).

⁶² On the ethical obligations of a lawyer receiving an inadvertently produced privileged communication, see Association of the Bar of the City of New York Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics, Formal Opinion. 2003-4 (2003). Briefly, upon becoming aware that the communication inadvertently reveals privileged matter, the receiving lawyer must cease further review of the communication, promptly notify the sender and follow the sender’s instructions concerning destruction or return. If the receiving lawyer has a good faith belief that the communication may be properly kept and used, it may be submitted to the court for a ruling. To the extent that the receiving lawyer has gained useful knowledge from reviewing the communication before its privileged character became apparent, the lawyer is free to use that knowledge to the extent otherwise permitted by law, but must promptly inform the sending lawyer of receipt of the communication to allow the sending lawyer to take steps to prevent further inadvertent disclosures or to seek whatever remedies may exist concerning the use of knowledge gained.

To judge from the submissions and public comments to date, this provision is not particularly controversial.

Recommendation: We recommend that this provision be adopted. Most disclosure of privileged material is probably inadvertent, and usually happens in discovery, not in motion papers or at trial. The disclosing party usually has no plans to make unfair adversarial use of the privileged matter so produced and, in the absence of such contemplated unfair use, requiring that other materials be produced is an excessive sanction for what is generally nothing more than carelessness. Even worse, the “good sport” who intentionally turns over arguably privileged but often unimportant material based on a narrower view of privilege than a judge might later adopt, is penalized for trying to avoid discovery squabbling by having to disclose other materials clearly privileged, and often important. See footnote 1, supra. The recipient of the privileged matter has the benefit of having learned whatever the privileged matter reveals, even if the recipient does not use it or, indeed, returns it. That is sufficient penalty for careless disclosure and sufficient incentive to prevent it, insofar as it is preventable in mass discovery.

2. Inadvertent disclosure: If proposed FRE 502(a) lowers the stakes in disputes over privilege waivers, proposed FRE 502(b) imposes a uniform standard for determining when an inadvertent disclosure waives privilege in the first place. Proposed 502(b) provides that an inadvertent disclosure of privileged communications or information during federal litigation or administrative proceedings “does not operate as a waiver in a *state* or federal proceeding” (emphasis added), if the inadvertent discloser: (1) took reasonable precautions to prevent disclosure and (2) took reasonably prompt measures upon learning of the disclosure to rectify the error.

Proposed FRE 502(b) reckons the time for taking “reasonably prompt measures” from the time the privilege holder knew or should have known of the disclosure.

Current law is far from uniform, from Circuit to Circuit and even within judicial districts.⁷³ Currently, there are three approaches: (1) strict liability and automatic waiver for inadvertent disclosures, In re Sealed Case, 877 F.2d 976 (D.C. Cir. 1989); International Digital Systems Corp. v. Digital Equipment Corp., 120 F.R.D. 445 (D. Mass. 1988); (2) no waiver for inadvertent disclosures, Gray v. Bicknell, 86 F.3d 1472 (8th Cir. 1996); Helrnan v. Murry's Steaks, Inc., 728 F. Supp. 1099 (D. Del. 1990); and (3), the majority view, familiar in this Circuit, of case-by-case balancing, taking into account the demands of the discovery process and the reasonableness of precautions taken to prevent inadvertent disclosure or limit the harm therefrom. Hydraflow, Inc. v. Endine, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 626 (W.D.N.Y. 1993); Alldread v. City of Grenada, 988 F.2d 1425 (5th Cir. 1993); Hartford Fire Ins. v. Garvey, 109 F.R.D. 323 (N.D. Cal. 1985).

Whatever may be said for any of these three different approaches, it is obviously undesirable to have multiple approaches. Commercial cases of the sort most likely to generate enormous document discovery - both paper and electronic - and pose the greatest risks of inadvertent disclosure are also likely to subject clients to suits in many possible jurisdictions, each with its own rule. It is probably more important to the overall workings of the federal court system and to the ability of litigants to plan their activities that federal courts operate under some uniform rule rather than under any particular rule.

The proposed standard reflects the current majority rule, and the rule practitioners in this Circuit are used to following.

Recommendation: It is important to have a uniform rule. The rule proposed is the majority rule, a middle-of-the-road rule, and the rule to which practitioners in this Circuit are accustomed. We recommend adoption.

3. Selective Waiver: Subdivision (c) of proposed FRE 502 is enclosed in

⁷³ For a particularly stark intra-district conflict, see, Ciba-Geigy Corp. v. Sandoz, Ltd., 916 F. Supp. 404, 410-11 (D.N.J. 1995)(inadvertent disclosure of privileged matter not a waiver because waiver has to be knowing and voluntary) and Koch Materials Co. v. Shore Slurry Seal Inc., 208 F.R.D. 109, 121 (D.N.J. 2002)(inadvertent production was a waiver despite reasonable efforts at prevention).

brackets, reflecting a lack of consensus on what is by far the most controversial aspect of the proposed rule, the consequences of selective waiver to federal government authorities. The Advisory Committee did not itself reach agreement on a recommendation, but included the selective-waiver provision, in brackets, in the draft submitted for public comment.

The practical problem the subdivision is designed to address arises in governmental investigations of corporate targets. The regulator or prosecutor frequently demands that the target waive privilege as a sign of “cooperation.” Client and counsel looking only at the immediate case might have no objection to waiving the privilege in the context of the governmental investigation - or, if they do have objections, they are outweighed by the possible costs of not “cooperating.”

Unfortunately, cases that attract the government’s attention often attract the attention of private litigants, who can be counted on to insist on disclosure to them of any privileged matter disclosed to the government.

Most courts have rejected the concept of “selective waiver,” with the result that disclosures made to the government, even under enormous pressure, waive the privilege as to other, private parties. See, e.g., In re Columbia/HCA Healthcare Corp. Billing Practices Litigation. 239 F.3d 289 (6th Cir. 2002); U.S. v. Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 129 F.3d 681 (1st Cir. 1997); Genentech, Inc. v. U.S. International Trade Commission. 122 F.3d 1409 (Fed. Cir. 1997); Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Republic of the Philippines. 951 F.2d 1414 (3^d Cir. 1991); In re Martin Marietta Corp., 856 F.2d 619 (4th Cir. 1988); Permian Corp. v. U.S.. 665 F.2d 1214 (D.C. Cir. 1981). But see Diversified Industries, Inc. v. Meredith., 572 F.2d 596 (8th Cir. 1978) (voluntary disclosure to SEC does not waive privilege in other cases).

Although the proposed subdivision was designed to meet a problem faced largely by the corporate defense bar, at least some of its representatives in earlier public comments recommended that it not be adopted until a perceived

“culture of waiver” on the part of government officials changed. These commentators thought the proposed subdivision would have the effect of *increasing* the likelihood that government investigators would insist on privilege waivers.

Other commentators thought that the “culture of waiver” would not be affected by the proposed change and would give the pressured corporation protection from at least some of the harm caused by the necessity to waive privilege. Some government officials argued that the proposed change would advance the public interest by easing the cost of cooperating with government investigations.

Since then, however, there have been signs that the “culture of waiver” might change in ways desired by those currently opposing the proposed subdivision. On December 12, 2006, Deputy Attorney General Paul McNulty issued a 19-page memorandum restricting the use of privilege waivers in corporate investigations. (Exhibit B) The details of the new restrictions are beyond the scope of this Report. Senator Arlen Specter has also introduced legislation on the subject. (Exhibit C).

Recommendation: We have not had the benefit of input from persons with experience representing interests that might be expected to oppose this provision, either counsel for plaintiff interests or counsel for individual corporate employees whose interests may conflict, especially in possible criminal prosecutions, with the interest of the corporation. We are hesitant to take a position without the benefit of such input. That persons who would normally be expected to support it oppose it until a perceived “culture of waiver” changes, does not seem to be a persuasive reason for opposition. To the extent that a culture of waiver exists and is undesirable, it exists under the present rule forbidding selective waiver, and government and regulatory officials have not seemed sympathetic to pleas that revelations of privileged matter to them could result in disclosures to private plaintiffs. From the point of view of those who consider that an undesirable consequence, one must weigh the value of protecting privileged materials disclosed to government and

regulatory officials from potential private plaintiffs against the incremental likelihood that those officials will insist on even more disclosures if potential private plaintiffs cannot get them. For persons with such concerns, it seems clear that the gain from the selective-waiver provision much outweighs the likelihood of more demands for disclosure. In any event, recent developments have somewhat mitigated, and may largely eliminate, the “culture of waiver.” If the proposed selective-waiver provision is desirable on its own merits, it should be adopted regardless of the “culture of waiver.” That said, we are unwilling to make a recommendation on the merits without the opportunity to consider the arguments of those who might be expected to oppose the provision, and, therefore, do not make one. We will continue to study the issue.

4. Enforceability of Agreements and Orders: Subdivisions (d) and (e) of proposed FRE 502 deal with the enforceability of agreements and orders concerning production of privileged material. Collectively, they provide that: (1) parties may bind themselves through enforceable agreements concerning the consequences of disclosing privileged communications or information; (2) such agreements are not binding on anyone other than parties to the agreement unless the agreement is embodied in a court order; and (3) a federal court order embodying an agreement on the effect of disclosure of privileged communications or information governs all persons, whether or not parties to the agreement, in both state and federal courts.

It is well established that parties can bind themselves by such agreements, and that such agreements can be enforced by the court. Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC, 216 F.R.D. 280 (S.D.N.Y. 2003); Dowd v. Calabrese, 101 F.R.D. 427 (D.D.C. 1984); U.S. v. United Shoe Machinery, 89 F. Supp. 357 (D. Mass. 1950). Relying on this ability, parties have developed devices such as the “clawback” agreement, allowing parties to retrieve privileged material erroneously produced, and the “quick peek” agreement, allowing an adversary to review documents before any privilege screening, designate documents desired, and let the producing party claim privilege on designated documents despite what would otherwise be a waiver. Both of these devices are designed

to reduce the expense of privilege screening, which will only increase, and probably become less accurate, when massive electronic discovery is involved.

Recommendation: We take no position on adoption of the provision at this time and will continue to study this issue as well.

C. Summary of Recommendations

NYCLA favors adoption of the first two proposed provisions dealing with scope of waiver and inadvertent disclosure and takes no position at this time on the provisions dealing with selective waiver and the enforceability of agreements.

COMMITTEE ON RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE
OF THE
JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544

DAVID F. LEVI
CHAIR

PETER G. MCCABE
SECRETARY

CHAIRS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CARL E. STEWART
APPELLATE RULES

THOMAS S. ZILLY
BANKRUPTCY RULES

LEE H. ROSENTHAL
CIVIL RULES

SUSAN C. BUCKLEW
CRIMINAL RULES

JERRY E. SMITH
EVIDENCERULES

TO: Honorable David F. Levi, Chair
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice
and Procedure

FROM: Honorable Jerry E. Smith, Chair?
Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

DATE: May 15, 2006 (Revised June 30, 2006)

RE: Report of the Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on Evidence Rules met on. April 24th and 25th at Fordham Law School in New York City. The Committee approved one proposed

amendment to the Evidence Rules — ultimately for direct enactment by Congress — with the recommendation that the Standing Committee approve it for release for public comment. The proposal is discussed as an action item in this Report.

* * * * *

II. Action Item

Proposed Rule 502 on Waiver of Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product.

The Evidence Rules Committee has found a number of problems with the current federal common law governing the waiver of attorney-client privilege and work product. One major problem is that significant amounts of time and effort are expended during litigation to preserve the privilege, even when many of the documents are of no concern to the producing party. Parties must be extremely careful, because if a privileged document is produced, there is a risk that a court will find a subject matter waiver that will apply not only to the instant case and document but to other cases and documents as well. Moreover, an enormous amount of expense is put into document production in order to protect against inadvertent disclosure of privileged information, because the producing party risks a ruling that even a mistaken disclosure can result in a subject matter waiver. The Committee has determined that the discovery process would be more efficient and less costly if documents could be produced without risking a subject matter waiver of the attorney-client privilege or work product protection.

Another concern expressed to the Committee by members of the bar involves the production of confidential or work product material by a corporation that is the subject of a government investigation. Most federal courts have held that such a disclosure constitutes a waiver of the privilege, i.e., the courts generally reject the concept that a selective waiver is enforceable. This is a problem because it can deter corporations from cooperating in the first place.

Concerns about the common law of waiver of privilege and work product have been voiced in Congress as well. The Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, by letter dated January 23, 2006, requested the judicial Conference to initiate the rulemaking process to address the litigation costs and burdens created by the current law on waiver of attorney-client privilege and work product protection. The Chairman recognized that while any rule prepared by the Advisory Committee could proceed through the rulemaking process, it would eventually have to be enacted directly by Congress, as it would be a rule affecting privileges. See 28 U.S.C. § 2074(b).

The Committee directed its Reporter and its consultant on privileges to prepare a draft rule for its consideration that would address the problems of subject matter waiver, inadvertent disclosure, enforceability of confidentiality orders, and selective waiver. This draft rule was distributed in advance of the Committee meeting to selected federal judges, state and federal regulators, members of the bar, and academics. On the first day of its April meeting, the Committee held a mini-hearing on the proposed rule 502 and Committee Note, inviting presentations from those who reviewed the rule. (A transcript of the hearing is available from John Rabiej).

Based on comments received at the hearing, the Reporter and consultant revised the draft for consideration by the Committee at its meeting. Most importantly, the draft was scaled back so that it no longer regulates state rules on waiver as applied by state courts. The Committee— together with its liaisons and several members of the Civil Rules Committee invited to attend the meeting — discussed the draft proposal in extensive detail.

The Committee unanimously agreed on the following basic principles, as embodied in the proposed Rule 502:

1. A subject matter waiver should be found only when privilege or work product has already been disclosed, and a further disclosure “ought in fairness” to be required in order to protect against a misrepresentation that

might arise from the previous disclosure.

2. An inadvertent disclosure should not constitute a waiver if the holder of the privilege or work product protection took reasonable precautions to prevent disclosure and took reasonably prompt measures, once the holder knew or should have known of the disclosure, to rectify the error.

3. A provision on selective waiver should be included in any proposed rule released for public comment, but should be placed in brackets to indicate that the Committee has not yet determined whether a provision on selective waiver should be sent to Congress.

4. Parties to litigation should be able to protect against the consequences of waiver by seeking a confidentiality order from the court; and in order to give the parties reliable protection, that confidentiality order must bind non-parties in any federal or state court.

5. Parties should be able to contract around common-law waiver rules by entering into confidentiality agreements; but in the absence of a court order, these agreements cannot bind non-parties.

After substantial discussion, the Evidence Rules Committee unanimously approved the proposed Rule 502 and the accompanying Committee Note for release for public comment. The proposed Rule 502 and Committee Note are attached to this Report as Appendix A.

Recommendation: The Evidence Rules Committee recommends that the proposed Evidence Rule 502 be approved for release for public comment.

* * * * *

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE
FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE^{8*}**

**Rule 502. Attorney-Client Privilege and Work
Product; Limitations on Waiver**

(a) Scope of waiver. — In federal proceedings, the waiver by disclosure of an attorney-client privilege or work product protection extends to an undisclosed communication or information concerning the same subject matter only if that undisclosed communication or information ought in fairness to be considered with the disclosed communication or information.

(b) Inadvertent disclosure. — A disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection does not operate as a waiver in a state or federal proceeding if the disclosure is inadvertent and is made in connection with federal litigation or federal administrative proceedings - and if the holder of the privilege or work product protection took reasonable New material is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through. precautions to prevent disclosure and took reasonably prompt measures, once the holder knew or should have

^{8*}New material is underlined; matter to be omitted is lined through.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

known of the disclosure, to rectify the error, including (if applicable) following the procedures in Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5)(B).

[(c) Selective waiver. — In a federal or state proceeding, a disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection — when made to a federal public office or agency in the exercise of its regulatory, investigative, or enforcement authority — does not operate as a waiver of the privilege or protection in favor of non-governmental persons or entities. The effect of disclosure to a state or local government agency, with respect to non-governmental persons or entities. Is governed by applicable state law. Nothing in this rule limits or expands the authority of a government agency to disclose communications or information to other government agencies or as otherwise authorized or required by law.]^{9**}

^{9**} The bracketing indicates that while the Committee is seeking public comment, it has not yet taken a position on the merits of this provision. Public comment on this "selective waiver" provision will be especially important to the Committee's determination. The Committee is especially interested in any statistical or anecdotal evidence tending to show that limiting the scope of waiver will 1) promote cooperation with government regulators and/or 2) decrease the cost of government investigations and prosecutions.

As the Committee has taken no position on the bracketed provision, it is obvious that there is nothing in the proposed rule that is intended either to promote or deter any attempt by government agencies to seek waiver of

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

(d) Controlling effect of court orders. — A federal court order that the attorney-client privilege or work product protection is not waived as a result of disclosure in connection with the litigation pending before the court governs all persons or entities in all state or federal proceedings, whether or not they were parties to the matter before the court, if the order incorporates the agreement of the parties before the court.

(e) Controlling effect of party agreements. — An agreement on the effect of disclosure of a communication or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection is binding on the parties to the agreement, but not on other parties unless the agreement is incorporated into a court order.

(f) Included privilege and protection. — As used in this rule:

(1) “attorney-client privilege” means the protection provided for confidential attorney-client

privilege or work product. The Committee takes no position on the ongoing debate arising from the Department of justice’s revised principles governing the prosecution of a corporation and the effect of cooperation and voluntary disclosure (Memorandum from Larry D. Thompson, Deputy Attorney General, section VI (January 20, 2003)).

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

communications, under applicable law: and

(2) “work product protection” means the protection for materials prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial, under applicable law.

Committee Note

This new rule has two major purposes:

1) It resolves some longstanding disputes in the courts about the effect of certain disclosures of material protected by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine — specifically those disputes involving inadvertent disclosure and selective waiver.

2) It responds to the widespread complaint that litigation costs for review and protection of material that is privileged or work product have become prohibitive due to the concern that any disclosure of protected information in the course of discovery (however innocent or minimal) will operate as a subject matter waiver of all protected information. This concern is especially troubling in cases involving electronic discovery. *See, e.g., Rowe Entertainment, Inc. v. William Morris Agency*, 205 F.R.D. 421,425- 26 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (finding that in a case involving the production of e-mail, the cost of pre-production review for privileged and work product material would cost one defendant \$120,000 and another defendant \$247,000, and that such review would take months). *See also Report to the Judicial Conference Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure by the Advisory Committee on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*, September 2005 at 27 ("The volume of information and the forms in which it is stored make privilege determinations more difficult and privilege review correspondingly more expensive and time-consuming yet less likely to detect all privileged information."); *Hopson v. City of Baltimore*, 232 F.R.D. 228, 244 (D.Md. 2005) (electronic discovery may encompass "millions of documents" and to insist upon "record-by-record pre-production privilege review, on pain of subject matter waiver, would impose upon parties costs of production that bear no proportionality to what is at stake in the litigation").

The rule seeks to provide a predictable, uniform set of standards under which parties can determine the consequences of a disclosure of communications or information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection.

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

Parties to litigation need to know, for example, that if they exchange privileged information pursuant to a confidentiality order, the court's order will be enforceable. For example, if a federal court's confidentiality order is not enforceable in a state court then the burdensome costs of privilege review and retention are unlikely to be reduced.

The Committee is well aware that a privilege rule proposed through the rulemaking process cannot bind state courts, and indeed that a rule of privilege cannot take effect through the ordinary rulemaking process. *See* 28 U.S.C § 2074(b). It is therefore anticipated that Congress must enact this rule directly, through its authority under the Commerce Clause. *Cf* Class Action Fairness Act of 2005, 119 Stat. 4, PL 109-2 (relying on Commerce Clause power to regulate state class actions).

The rule makes no attempt to alter federal or state law on whether a communication or information is protected as attorney- client privilege or work product as an initial matter. Moreover, while establishing some exceptions to waiver, the rule does not purport to supplant applicable waiver doctrine generally.

The rule governs only certain waivers by disclosure. Other common-law waiver doctrines may result in a finding of waiver even where there is no disclosure of privileged information or work product. *See, e.g., Nguyen v. Excel Corp.*, 197 F.3d 200 (5th Cir. (reliance on an advice of counsel defense waives the privilege with respect to attorney-client communications pertinent to that defense); *Ryers v. Burlison*, 100 F.R.D. 436 (D.D.C. 1983) (allegation of lawyer malpractice constituted a waiver of confidential communications under the circumstances). The rule is not intended to displace or modify federal common law concerning waiver of privilege or work product where no disclosure has been made.

Subdivision (a). The rule provides that a voluntary disclosure generally results in a waiver only of the communication or information disclosed; a subject matter waiver (of either privilege or work product) is reserved for those unusual situations in which fairness requires a further disclosure of related, protected

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

information, in order to protect against a selective and misleading presentation of evidence to the disadvantage of the adversary. *See, e.g., In re von Bulow*, 828 F.2d 94 (2d Cir. 1987) (disclosure of privileged information in a book did not result in unfairness to the adversary in a litigation, therefore a subject matter waiver was not warranted); *In re United Mine Workers of America Employee Benefit Plans Litig.*, 159 F.R.D. 307, 312 (D.D.C. 1994)(waiver of work product limited to materials actually disclosed, because the party did not deliberately disclose documents in an attempt to gain a tactical advantage). The language concerning subject matter waiver — "ought in fairness" — is taken from Rule 106, because the animating principle is the same. A party that makes a selective, misleading presentation that is unfair to the adversary opens itself to a more complete and accurate presentation. *See, e.g., United States v. Branch*, 91 F.3d 699 (5th Cir. 1996) (under Rule 106, completing evidence was not admissible where the party's presentation, while selective, was not misleading or unfair). The rule rejects the result in *In re Sealed Case*, 877 F.2d 976 (D.C.Cir. 1989), which held that inadvertent disclosure of documents during discovery automatically constituted a subject matter waiver.

Subdivision (b). Courts are in conflict over whether an inadvertent disclosure of privileged information or work product constitutes a waiver. A few courts find that a disclosure must be intentional to be a waiver. Most courts find a waiver only if the disclosing party acted carelessly in disclosing the communication or information and failed to request its return in a timely manner. And a few courts hold that any mistaken disclosure of protected information constitutes waiver without regard to the protections taken to avoid such a disclosure. *See generally Hopson v. City of Baltimore*, 232 F.R.D. 228 (D.Md. 2005) for a discussion of this case law.

The rule opts for the middle ground: inadvertent disclosure of privileged or protected information in connection with a federal proceeding constitutes a waiver only if the party did not take reasonable precautions to prevent disclosure and did not make reasonable and prompt efforts to rectify the error. This position is in accord with the majority view on whether inadvertent disclosure is a waiver. *See, e.g., Zapata v. IBP, Inc.*, 175 F.R.D. 574, 576-77 (D. Kan. 1997) (work product);

Hydraflow, Inc. Enidine, Inc., 145 F.R.D. 626, 637 (W.D.N.Y. 1993) (attorney-client privilege); *Edwards v. Whitaker*, 868 F.Supp. 226, 229 (M.D. Tenn. 1994) (attorney-client privilege). The rule establishes a compromise between two competing premises. On the one hand, information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection should not be treated lightly. On the other hand, a rule imposing strict liability for an inadvertent disclosure threatens to impose prohibitive costs for privilege review and retention, especially in cases involving electronic discovery.

The rule refers to “inadvertent” disclosure, as opposed to using any other term, because the word “inadvertent” is widely used by courts and commentators to cover mistaken or unintentional disclosures of information covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work product protection. *See, e.g., Manual for Complex Litigation Fourth* § 11.44 (Federal Judicial Center 2004) (referring to the “consequences of inadvertent waiver”); *Alldread v. City of Grenada*, 988 F.2d 1425, 1434 (5th Cir. 1993) (“There is no consensus, however, as to the effect of inadvertent disclosure of confidential communications.”).

[**Subdivision (c)**. Courts are in conflict over whether disclosure of privileged or protected information to a government agency conducting an investigation of the client constitutes a general waiver of the information disclosed. Most courts have rejected the concept of “selective waiver,” holding that waiver of privileged or protected information to a government agency constitutes a waiver for all purposes and to all parties. *See, e.g., Westinghouse Electric Corp. v. Republic of the Philippines*, 951 F.2d 1414 (3d Cir. 1991). Other courts have held that selective waiver is enforceable if the disclosure is made subject to a confidentiality agreement with the government agency. *See, e.g., Teachers Insurance & Annuity Association of America v. Shamrock Broadcasting Co.*, 521 F. Supp. 638 (S.D.N.Y. 1981). And a few courts have held that disclosure of protected information to the government does not constitute a general waiver, so that the information remains shielded from use by other parties. *See, e.g., Diversified Industries, Inc. v. Meredith*, 572 F.2d 596 (8th Cir. 1977).

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

The rule rectifies this conflict by providing that disclosure of protected information to a federal government agency exercising regulatory, investigative or enforcement authority does not constitute a waiver of attorney-client privilege or work product protection as to non-governmental persons or entities, whether in federal or state court. A rule protecting selective waiver in these circumstances furthers the important policy of cooperation with government agencies, and maximizes the effectiveness and efficiency of government investigations. *See In re Columbia/HCA Healthcare Corp. Billing Practices Litigation*, 293 F.3d 289, 314 (6th Cir. 2002) (Boggs, J., dissenting) (noting that the "public interest in easing government investigations" justifies a rule that disclosure to government agencies of information covered by the attorney-client privilege or work product protection does not constitute a waiver to private parties).

The Committee considered whether the shield of selective waiver should be conditioned on obtaining a confidentiality agreement from the government agency. It rejected that condition for a number of reasons. If a confidentiality agreement were a condition to protection, disputes would be likely to arise over whether a particular agreement was sufficiently air-tight to protect against a finding of a general waiver, thus destroying the predictability that is essential to proper administration of the attorney-client privilege and work product immunity. Moreover, a government agency might need or be required to use the information for some purpose and then would find it difficult or impossible to be bound by an air-tight confidentiality agreement, however drafted. If a confidentiality agreement were nonetheless required to trigger the protection of selective waiver, the policy of furthering cooperation with and efficiency in government investigations would be undermined. Ultimately, the obtaining of a confidentiality agreement has little to do with the underlying policy of furthering cooperation with government agencies that animates the rule.]

Subdivision (d). Confidentiality orders are becoming increasingly important in limiting the costs of privilege review and retention, especially in cases involving electronic discovery. *See Manual for Complex Litigation Fourth* § 11.446 (Federal Judicial Center 2004) (noting that fear of the consequences of waiver “may add

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

cost and delay to the discovery process for all sides" and that courts have responded by encouraging counsel "to stipulate at the outset of discovery to a 'nonwaiver' agreement, which they can adopt as a case-management order.") But the utility of a confidentiality order in reducing discovery costs is substantially diminished if it provides no protection outside the particular litigation in which the order is entered. Parties are unlikely to be able to reduce the costs of pre-production review for privilege and work product if the consequence of disclosure is that the information can be used by non- parties to the litigation.

There is some dispute on whether a confidentiality order entered in one case can bind non-parties from asserting waiver by disclosure in a separate litigation. *See generally Hopson v. City of Baltimore*, 232 F.R.D. 228 (D.Md. 2005) for a discussion of this case law. The rule provides that when a confidentiality order governing the consequences of disclosure in that case is entered in a federal proceeding, according to the terms agreed to by the parties, its terms are enforceable against non-parties in any federal or state proceeding. For example, the court order may provide for return of documents without waiver irrespective of the care taken by the disclosing party; the rule contemplates enforcement of "claw-back" and "quick peek" arrangements as a way to avoid the excessive costs of pre-production review for privilege and work product. As such, the rule provides a party with a predictable protection that is necessary to allow that party to limit the prohibitive costs of privilege and work product review and retention.

Subdivision (e). Subdivision (e) codifies the well-established proposition that parties can enter an agreement to limit the effect of waiver by disclosure between or among them. *See, e.g., Dowd v. Calabrese*, 101 F.R.D. 427,439 (D.D.C. 1984) (no waiver where the parties stipulated in advance that certain testimony at a deposition "would not be deemed to constitute a waiver of the attorney-client or work product privileges"); *Zubulake v. UBS Warburg LLC*, 216 F.R.D. 280, 290 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (noting that parties may enter into "so-called 'claw-back' agreements that allow the parties to forego privilege review altogether in favor of an agreement to return inadvertently produced privilege documents"). Of course such an agreement can bind only the parties to the agreement. The rule makes clear

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

that if parties want protection from a finding of waiver by disclosure in a separate litigation, the agreement must be made part of a court order.

Subdivision (f). The rule's coverage is limited to attorney- client privilege and work product. The limitation in coverage is consistent with the goals of the rule, which are 1) to provide a reasonable limit on the costs of privilege and work product review and retention that are incurred by parties to litigation; and 2) to encourage cooperation with government investigations and reduce the costs of those investigations. These two interests arise mainly, if not exclusively, in the context of disclosure of attorney-client privilege and work product. The operation of waiver by disclosure, as applied to other evidentiary privileges, remains a question of federal common law. Nor does the rule purport to apply to the Fifth Amendment privilege against compelled self-incrimination.

US. Department of Justice

Office of the Deputy Attorney General

The Deputy Attorney General Washington, DC. 20530

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heads of Department Components

United States Attorneys

FROM: Paul J. McNulty

Deputy Attorney General

SUBJECT: Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations

The Department experienced unprecedented success in prosecuting corporate fraud during the last four years. We have aggressively rooted out corruption in financial markets and corporate board rooms across the country, Federal prosecutors should be justifiably proud that the information used by our nation's financial markets is more reliable, our retirement plans are more secure, and the investing public is better protected as a result of our efforts. The most significant result of this enforcement initiative is that corporations increasingly recognize the need for self-policing, self-reporting, and cooperation with, law enforcement Through their self- regulation. efforts, fraud undoubtedly is being prevented, sparing shareholders- from the financial harm accompanying corporate corruption. The Department must continue to encourage these efforts.

Though, much has been accomplished, the work of protecting the integrity of the marketplace continues. As we press forward in. our enforcement duties, it is appropriate that we consider carefully proposals which could make our efforts more effective. I remain convinced that the fundamental principles that have guided our enforcement practices are sound. In particular, our corporate charging principles are not only familiar, but they are welcomed by most corporations in our

country because good corporate leadership shares many of our goals. Like federal prosecutors, corporate leaders must take action to protect shareholders, preserve corporate value, and promote honesty and fair dealing with the investing public.

We have heard from responsible-corporate officials recently about the challenges they face in discharging their duties to the-corporation while responding in a meaningful way to a government investigation. Many of those associated with the corporate legal community have expressed concern that our practices may be discouraging full and candid communications between corporate employees and legal counsel. To the extent this is happening, it was never the intention of the Department for our corporate charging principles to cause such a result.

Therefore, I have decided to adjust certain aspects of our policy in ways that will further promote public confidence in the Department, encourage corporate fraud prevention efforts, and clarify our goals without sacrificing our ability to prosecute these important cases effectively. The new language expands upon the Department's long-standing policies concerning how we evaluate the authenticity of a corporation's cooperation with a government investigation.

This memorandum supersedes and replaces guidance contained in the Memorandum from Deputy Attorney General Larry D. Thompson entitled Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations (January 20, 2003) (the "Thompson Memorandum") and the Memorandum from the Acting Deputy Attorney General Robert D. McCallum, Jr. entitled Waiver of Corporate Attorney-Client and Work Product Protections (October 21, 2005) (the "McCallum Memorandum").

The Deputy Attorney General *Washington, DC. 20530*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heads of Department Components
 United States Attorneys

FROM: Paul J. McNulty
 Deputy Attorney General

SUBJECT: Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations

Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations¹⁰¹

1. Duties of the Federal Prosecutor; Duties of Corporate Leaders

The prosecution of corporate crime is a high priority for the Department of Justice. By investigating wrongdoing and bringing charges for criminal conduct, the Department plays an important role in protecting investors and ensuring public confidence in business entities and in the investment markets in which those entities participate. In this respect, federal prosecutors and corporate leaders share a common goal. Directors and officers owe a fiduciary duty to a corporation's shareholders, the corporation's true owners, and they owe duties of honest dealing to the investing public in connection with the corporation's regulatory filings and public statements. The faithful execution of these duties by corporate leadership serves the same values in promoting public trust and confidence that our criminal prosecutions are designed to serve.

¹⁰¹ While these guidelines refer to corporations, they apply to the consideration of the prosecution of all types of business organizations, including partnerships, sole proprietorships, government entities, and unincorporated associations.

A prosecutor's duty to enforce the law requires the investigation and prosecution of criminal wrongdoing if *it* is discovered. In carrying out this mission with the diligence and resolve necessary to vindicate the important public interests discussed above, prosecutors should be mindful of the common cause we share with responsible corporate leaders. Prosecutors should also be mindful that confidence in the Department is affected both by the results we achieve and by the real and perceived ways in which we achieve them. Thus, the manner in which we do our job as prosecutors - the professionalism we demonstrate, our resourcefulness in seeking information, and our willingness to secure the facts in a manner that encourages corporate compliance and self-regulation impacts public perception of our mission. Federal prosecutors recognize that they must maintain public confidence in the way in which they exercise their charging discretion, and that professionalism and civility have always played an important part in putting these principles into action.

II. Charging a Corporation: General Principles

A. General Principle: Corporations should not be treated leniently because of their artificial nature nor should they be subject to harsher treatment. Vigorous enforcement of the criminal laws against corporate wrongdoers, where appropriate, results in great benefits for law- enforcement and the public, particularly in the area of white collar crime. Indicting corporations for wrongdoing enables the government to address and be a force for positive change of corporate culture, alter corporate behavior, and prevent, discover, and punish white collar crime.

B. Comment: In all cases involving corporate wrongdoing, prosecutors should consider the factors discussed herein. first and foremost, prosecutors should be aware of the important public benefits that may flow from indicting a corporation in appropriate cases. For instance, corporations are likely to take immediate remedial steps when one is indicted for criminal conduct that is pervasive throughout a particular industry, and thus an indictment often provides a

unique opportunity for deterrence on a massive scale. In addition, a corporate indictment may result in specific deterrence by changing the culture of the indicted corporation and the behavior of its employees. Finally, certain crimes that carry with them a substantial risk of great public harm, e.g., environmental crimes or financial frauds, are by their nature most likely to be committed by businesses, and there may, therefore, be a substantial federal interest in indicting the corporation.

Charging a corporation, however, does not mean that individual directors, officers, employees, or shareholders should not also be charged. Prosecution of a corporation is not a substitute for the prosecution of criminally culpable individuals within or without the corporation. Because a corporation can act only through individuals, imposition of individual criminal liability may provide the strongest deterrent against future corporate wrongdoing. Only rarely should provable individual culpability not be pursued, even in the face of an offer of a corporate guilty plea or some other disposition of the charges against the corporation.

Corporations are "legal persons," capable of suing and being sued, and capable of committing crimes. Under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*, a corporation may be held criminally liable for the illegal acts of its directors, officers, employees, and agents. To hold a corporation liable for these actions, the government must establish that the corporate agent's actions (i) were within the scope of his duties and (ii) were intended, at least in part, to benefit the corporation. In all cases involving wrongdoing by corporate agents, prosecutors should consider the corporation, as well as the responsible individuals, as potential criminal targets.

Agents, however, may act for mixed reasons -- both for self-aggrandizement (both direct and indirect) and for the benefit of the corporation, and a corporation may be held liable as long as one motivation of its agent is to benefit the corporation. See *United States v. Potter*, 463 F.3d 9, 25 (1st Cir. 2006) (stating that the test to determine whether an agent is acting within the scope of employment is whether the agent is performing acts of the kind which he is authorized to perform, and those acts are motivated--at least in part--by an intent to benefit the

corporation), In *United States v. Automated Medical Laboratories*, 770 F.2d 399 (4th Cir. 1985), the Fourth Circuit affirmed a corporation's conviction for the actions of a subsidiary's employee despite its claim that the employee was acting for his own benefit, namely his "ambitious nature and his desire to ascend the corporate ladder." The court stated, "*Partucci* was clearly acting in part to benefit AML since his advancement within the corporation depended on AML's well-being and its lack of difficulties with the FDA." Furthermore, in *United States v. Sun-Diamond Growers of California*, 138 F.3d 961,969-70 (D. C. Cir. 1998), *aff'd on other grounds*, 526 U.S. 398 (1999), the D.C, Circuit rejected a corporation's argument that it should not be held criminally liable for the actions of its vice-president since the vice-president's "scheme was designed to -- and did in fact -- defraud [the corporation], not benefit it." According to the court, the fact that the vice- president deceived the corporation and used its money to contribute illegally to a congressional campaign did not preclude a valid finding that he acted to benefit the corporation. Part of the vice-president's job was to cultivate the corporation's relationship with the congressional candidate's brother, the Secretary of Agriculture. Therefore, the court held, the jury was entitled to conclude that the vice-president had acted with an intent, "however befuddled," to further the interests of his employer. *See also United States v. Cincotta*, 689 F.2d 238. 241-42 (1st Cir, 1982) (upholding a corporation's conviction, notwithstanding the substantial personal benefit reaped by its miscreant agents, because the fraudulent scheme required money to pass through the corporation's treasury and the fraudulently obtained goods were resold to the corporation's customers in the corporation's name).

Moreover, the corporation need not even necessarily profit from its agent's actions for it to be held liable. In *Automated Medical Laboratories*, the fourth Circuit stated:

[B]enefit is not a "touchstone of criminal corporate liability; benefit at best is an evidential, not an operative, fact." Thus, whether the agent's actions ultimately redounded to the benefit of the corporation is less significant than whether the agent acted with the intent to benefit the corporation. The basic

purpose of requiring that an agent have acted with the intent to benefit the corporation, however, is to insulate the corporation from criminal liability for actions of its agents which may be inimical to the interests of the corporation or which may have been undertaken solely to advance the Interests of that agent.or of a party other than the corporation.

770 F.2d at 407 (emphasis added; quoting Old Monastery Co. v. United States, 147 F.2d 905, 908 (4th Cir), cert, denied, 326 U.S. 734 (1945)).

III. Charging a Corporation: Factors to Be Considered

A. General Principle: Generally, prosecutors apply the same factors in determining whether to charge a corporation as they do with respect to individuals. *See* USAM § 9-27,220, *el Seq.* Thus, the prosecutor must weigh all of the factors normally considered in the sound exercise of prosecutorial judgment: the sufficiency of the evidence; the likelihood of success at trial; the probable deterrent, rehabilitative, and other consequences of conviction; and the adequacy of noncriminal approaches. *See id.* However, due to the nature of the corporate "person," some additional factors are present. In conducting an investigation, determining whether to bring charges, and negotiating plea agreements, prosecutors must consider the following factors in reaching a decision as to the proper treatment of a corporate target

1. the nature and seriousness of the offense, including the risk of harm to the public, and applicable policies and priorities, if any, governing the prosecution of corporations for particular categories of crime (see section IV, *infra*);
2. the pervasiveness of wrongdoing within the corporation, including the complicity in, or condonation of, the wrongdoing by corporate management (see section V, *infra*);
3. the corporation's history of similar conduct, including prior criminal,

civil, and regulatory enforcement actions against it (see section VI, *infra*);

4. the corporation's timely and voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and its willingness to cooperate in the investigation of its agents (see section VII, *infra*);
5. the existence and adequacy of the corporation's pre-existing compliance program (see section VIII *infra*);
6. the corporation's remedial actions, including any efforts to implement an effective corporate compliance program or to improve an existing one. to replace responsible management, to discipline or terminate wrongdoers, to pay restitution, and to cooperate with the relevant government agencies (see section IX, *infra*);
7. collateral consequences, including disproportionate harm to shareholders, pension holders and employees not proven personally culpable and impact on the public- arising *from* the prosecution (see section X, *infra*);
8. the adequacy of the prosecution of individuals responsible for the corporation's malfeasance; and
9. the adequacy of remedies such as civil or regulatory enforcement actions (see section XI, *infra*).

B. Comment: In determining whether to charge a corporation, the foregoing factors must be considered. The factors listed in this section are intended to be illustrative of those that should be considered and not a complete or exhaustive list. Some or all of these factors may or may not apply to specific cases, and in some cases one factor may override all others. For example, the nature and seriousness of the offense may be such as to warrant prosecution regardless of the other

factors. In most cases, however, no single factor will be dispositive. Further, national law enforcement policies in various enforcement areas may require that more or less weight be given to certain of these factors than to others. Of course, prosecutors must exercise their judgment in applying and balancing these factors and this process does not mandate a particular result.

In making a decision to charge a corporation, the prosecutor generally has wide latitude in determining when, whom, how, and even whether to prosecute for violations of federal criminal law. In exercising that discretion, prosecutors should consider the following general statements of principles that summarize appropriate considerations to be weighed and desirable practices to be followed in discharging their prosecutorial responsibilities. In doing so, prosecutors should ensure that the general purposes of the criminal law -- assurance of warranted punishment, deterrence of further criminal conduct protection of the public *from* dangerous and fraudulent conduct, rehabilitation of offenders, and restitution for victims and affected communities -- are adequately met, taking into account the special nature of the corporate "person,"

IV. Charging a Corporation: Special Policy Concerns

A. General Principle: The nature and seriousness of the crime, including the risk of harm to the public from the criminal conduct, are obviously primary factors in determining whether to charge a corporation. In addition, corporate conduct, particularly that of national and multi-national corporations, necessarily intersects with federal economic, taxation, and criminal law enforcement policies. In applying these principles, prosecutors must consider the practices and policies of the appropriate Division of the Department, and must comply with those policies to the extent required.

B. Comment: In determining whether to charge a corporation, prosecutors should take into account federal law enforcement priorities as discussed above. *See* USAM § 9-27-230. In addition, however, prosecutors must be aware of the specific policy goals and incentive programs established *by* the

respective Divisions and regulatory agencies. Thus, whereas natural persons may be given incremental degrees of credit (ranging from immunity to lesser charges to sentencing considerations) for turning themselves in, making statements against their penal interest- and cooperating in the government's investigation of their own- and others' wrongdoing, the same approach may not be appropriate in all circumstances with respect to corporations. As- an example, it is entirely proper in many investigations for a prosecutor to consider the corporation's pre-indictment conduct, *e.g.*, *voluntary* disclosure, cooperation, remediation or restitution, in determining whether to seek an indictment. However, this would not necessarily be appropriate in an antitrust investigation, in which antitrust violations, by definition, go to the heart of the corporation's business and for which the Antitrust Division has therefore established a firm policy, understood in the business community, that credit should not be given at the charging stage for a compliance program and that amnesty is available only to the first corporation to make full disclosure to the government. As another example, the Tax Division has a strong preference for prosecuting responsible individuals, rather than entities, for corporate tax offenses. Thus, in determining whether or not to charge a corporation, prosecutors must consult with the Criminal, Antitrust, Tax, and Environmental and Natural Resources Divisions, if appropriate or required.

V. Charging a Corporation: Pervasiveness of Wrongdoing Within the Corporation

A. General Principle: A corporation can only act through natural persons, and it is therefore held responsible for the acts of such persons fairly attributable to it. Charging a corporation for even minor misconduct may be appropriate where the wrongdoing was pervasive and was undertaken by a large number of employees or by all the employees in a particular role within the corporation, *e.g.*, salesmen or procurement officers, or was condoned by upper management. On the other hand, in certain limited circumstances, it may not be appropriate to impose liability upon a corporation, particularly one with a compliance program in place, under a strict *respondeat superior* theory for the single isolated act of a rogue employee. There is, of course, a wide spectrum

between these two extremes, and a prosecutor should exercise sound discretion in evaluating the pervasiveness of wrongdoing within a corporation.

B. Comment: Of these factors, the most important is the role of management. Although acts of even low-level employees may result in criminal liability, a corporation is directed by its management and management is responsible for a corporate culture in which criminal conduct is either discouraged or tacitly encouraged. As stated in commentary to the Sentencing Guidelines:

Pervasiveness [is] case specific and [will] depend on the number, and degree of responsibility, of individuals [with] substantial authority ... who participated in, condoned, or were willfully ignorant of the offense. Fewer individuals need to be involved for a finding of pervasiveness if those individuals exercised a relatively high degree of authority. Pervasiveness can occur either within an organization as a whole or within a unit of an organization. *See* USSG §8C2.5, comment. (n. 4),

VI. Charging a Corporation: The Corporation's Past History

A. General Principle: Prosecutors may consider a corporation's history of similar conduct, including prior criminal, civil, and regulatory enforcement actions against it, in determining whether to bring: Criminal charges.

B. Comment: A corporation, like a natural person, is expected to learn from its mistakes. A history of similar conduct may be probative of a corporate culture that encouraged, or at least condoned, such conduct, regardless of any compliance programs. Criminal prosecution of a corporation may be particularly appropriate where the corporation previously had been subject to non-criminal guidance, warnings, or sanctions, or previous criminal charges, and it either had not taken adequate action to prevent future unlawful conduct or had continued to engage in the conduct in spite of the warnings or enforcement actions taken against it. In making this determination, the corporate structure itself, *e.g.*, subsidiaries or operating divisions, should be ignored, and enforcement actions taken against the

corporation or any of its divisions, subsidiaries, and affiliates should be considered. *See* USSG § 8C2.5(c) & comment.(n. 6).

VII. Charging a Corporation: The Value of Cooperation

A. General Principle: In determining whether to charge a corporation, that corporation's timely and voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and its cooperation with the government's investigation *may* be relevant factors. In gauging the extent of the corporation's cooperation, the prosecutor may consider, among other things, whether the corporation made a voluntary and timely disclosure, and the corporation's willingness to provide relevant evidence and to identify the culprits within the corporation, including senior executives.

B. Comment: In investigating wrongdoing by or within a corporation, a prosecutor is likely to encounter several obstacles resulting from the nature of the corporation itself. It will often be difficult to determine which individual took which action on behalf of the corporation. Lines of authority and responsibility may be shared among operating divisions or departments, and records and personnel may be spread throughout the United States or even among several countries. Where the criminal conduct continued over an extended period of time, the culpable or knowledgeable personnel may have been promoted, transferred, or fired, or they may have quit or retired. Accordingly, a corporation's cooperation may be critical in identifying the culprits and locating relevant evidence. Relevant considerations in determining whether a corporation has cooperated are set forth below.

1. Qualifying for Immunity, Amnesty or Pretrial Diversion

In some circumstances, granting a corporation immunity or amnesty or pretrial diversion may be considered in the course of the government's investigation. In such circumstances, prosecutors should refer to the principles governing non-prosecution agreements generally. *See* USAM § 9-27.600-650. These principles permit a non-prosecution agreement in exchange for cooperation

when a corporation's "timely cooperation appears to be necessary to the public interest and other means of obtaining the desired cooperation are unavailable or would not be effective." Prosecutors should note that in the case of national or multi-national corporations, multi-district or global agreements may be necessary. Such: agreements may only be entered into with the approval of each affected district or the appropriate Department official. *See* USAM §9-27,641.

In addition, the Department, in conjunction with regulatory agencies and other executive branch departments, encourages corporations, as part of their compliance programs, to conduct internal investigations and to disclose their findings to the appropriate authorities. Some agencies, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the Department's Environmental and Natural Resources Division, have formal voluntary disclosure programs in which self-reporting, coupled with remediation and additional criteria, may qualify the corporation for amnesty or reduced sanctions. Even in the absence of a formal program, prosecutors may consider a corporation's timely and voluntary disclosure in evaluating the adequacy of the corporation's compliance program and its management's commitment to the compliance program. However, prosecution and economic policies specific to the industry or statute may require prosecution notwithstanding a corporation's willingness to cooperate. For example, the Antitrust Division offers amnesty only to the first corporation to agree to cooperate. This creates a strong incentive for corporations participating in anti-competitive conduct to be the first to cooperate. In addition, amnesty, immunity, or reduced sanctions may not be appropriate where the corporation's business is permeated with fraud or other crimes.

2. Waiving Attorney-Client and Work Product Protections¹¹²

The attorney-client and work product protections serve an extremely important function in the U.S. legal system. The attorney-client privilege is one of the oldest and most sacrosanct privileges under U.S. law. *See Upjohn v. Untied*

¹¹² The Sentencing Guidelines reward voluntary disclosure and cooperation with a reduction in the corporation's offense level *See* USSG §8C2.5.(g). The reference to consideration of a corporation's waiver of attorney-client and work product protections in reducing a corporation's culpability score in Application Note 12, was deleted effective November 1, 2006. *See* USSG §8C2.5.(g) comment. (n. 12).

States, 449 U.S. 383, 389 (1976). As the Supreme Court has stated "its purpose is to encourage full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and thereby promote broader public interests in the observance of law and administration of justice." *Id* The work product doctrine also serves similarly important interests.

Waiver of attorney-client and work product protections is not a prerequisite to a finding that a company has cooperated in the government's investigation. However, a company's disclosure of privileged information may permit the government to expedite its investigation. In addition, the disclosure of privileged information may be critical in enabling the government to evaluate the accuracy and completeness of the company's voluntary disclosure.

Prosecutors may only request waiver of attorney-client or work product protections when there is a legitimate need for the privileged information to fulfill their law enforcement obligations. A legitimate need for the information is not established by concluding it is merely desirable or convenient to obtain privileged information. The test requires a careful balancing of important policy considerations underlying the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine and the law enforcement needs of the government's investigation.

Whether there is a legitimate need depends upon:

- (1) the likelihood and degree to which the privileged information will benefit the government's investigation;
- (2) whether the information sought can be obtained in a timely and complete fashion by using alternative means that do not require waiver;
- (3) the completeness of the voluntary disclosure already provided; and
- (4) the collateral consequences to a corporation of a waiver.

If a legitimate need exists, prosecutors should seek the least intrusive waiver necessary to conduct a complete *and* thorough investigation, and should follow a step-by-step approach to requesting information. Prosecutors should first request purely factual information, which may or may not be privileged, relating to the underlying misconduct (“Category I”). Examples of Category I information could include, without limitation, copies of key documents, witness statements, or purely factual interview memoranda regarding the underlying misconduct, organization charts created by company counsel, factual chronologies, factual summaries, or reports (or portions thereof) containing investigative facts documented by counsel.

Before requesting that a corporation waive the attorney-client or work product protections for Category I information, prosecutors must obtain written authorization from the United States Attorney who must provide a copy of the request to, and consult with, the Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division before granting or denying the request. A prosecutor's request to the United States Attorney for authorization to seek a waiver must set forth law enforcement's legitimate need for the information and identify the scope of the waiver sought. A copy of each waiver request and authorization for Category I information must be maintained in the files of the United States Attorney. If the request is authorized, the United States Attorney must communicate the request in writing to the corporation.

A corporation's response to the government's request for waiver of privilege for Category information may be considered in determining whether a corporation has cooperated in the government's investigation.

Only if the purely factual information provides an incomplete basis to conduct a thorough investigation should prosecutors then request that the corporation provide attorney-client communications or non-factual attorney work product (“Category II”). This information includes legal advice given to the corporation before, during, and after the underlying misconduct occurred.

This category of privileged information might include the production of

attorney notes, memoranda or reports (or portions thereof) containing counsel's mental impressions and conclusions, legal determinations reached as a result of an internal investigation, or legal advice given to the corporation.

Prosecutors are cautioned that Category I information should only be sought in rare circumstances.

Before requesting that a corporation waive the attorney-client or work product protections for Category II information, the United States Attorney must obtain written authorization from the Deputy Attorney General. A United States Attorney's request for authorization to seek a waiver must set forth law enforcement's legitimate need for the information and identify the scope of the waiver sought. A copy of each waiver request and authorization for Category II information must be maintained in the files of the Deputy Attorney General. If the request is authorized, the United States Attorney must communicate the request in writing to the corporation.

If a corporation declines to provide a waiver for Category II information after a written request from the United States Attorney, prosecutors must not consider this declination against the corporation, in making a charging decision. Prosecutors may always favorably consider a corporation's acquiescence to the government's waiver request in determining whether a corporation has cooperated in the government's investigation.

Requests for Category II information requiring the approval of the Deputy Attorney General do not include:

- (1) legal advice contemporaneous to the underlying misconduct when the corporation or one of its employees is relying upon an advice-of-counsel defense; and
- (2) legal advice or communications in furtherance of a crime or fraud, coming within the crime-fraud exception to the attorney-client privilege,

In these two instances, prosecutors should follow the authorization process established for requesting waiver for Category I information.

For federal prosecutors in litigating Divisions within Main Justice, waiver requests for Category I information must be submitted for approval to the Assistant Attorney General of the Division and waiver requests for Category II information must be submitted by the Assistant Attorney General for approval to the Deputy Attorney General. If the request is authorized, the Assistant Attorney General must communicate the request in writing to the corporation.

Federal prosecutors are not required to obtain authorization if the corporation voluntarily offers privileged documents without a request by the government. However, voluntary waivers must be reported to the United States Attorney or the Assistant Attorney General in the Division where the case originated. A record of these reports must be maintained in the files of that office,

3. Shielding Culpable Employees and Agents

Another factor to be weighed by the prosecutor is whether the corporation appears *to* be protecting its culpable employees and agents. Thus, while cases will differ depending on the circumstances, a corporation's promise of support to culpable employees and agents, *e.g.*, through retaining the employees without sanction for their misconduct or through providing information to the employees about the government's investigation pursuant to a joint defense agreement, may be considered by the prosecutor in weighing the extent and value of a corporation's cooperation.

Prosecutors generally should not take into account whether a corporation is advancing attorneys' fees to employees or agents under investigation and indictment. Many state indemnification statutes grant corporations the power to advance the legal fees of officers under investigation prior to a formal determination of guilt. As a consequence, many corporations enter into contractual

obligations to advance attorneys' fees through provisions contained in their corporate charters, bylaws or employment agreements. Therefore, a corporation's compliance with governing state law and its contractual obligations cannot be considered a failure to cooperate¹²³ This prohibition is not meant to prevent a prosecutor from asking questions about an attorney's representation of a corporation or its employees.¹³⁴

4. Obstructing the Investigation

Another factor to be weighed by the prosecutor is whether the corporation, while purporting to cooperate, has engaged in conduct intended to impede the investigation (whether or not rising to the level of criminal obstruction). Examples of such conduct include: overly broad assertions of corporate representation of employees or former employees; overly broad or frivolous assertions of privilege to withhold the disclosure of relevant non-privileged documents; inappropriate directions to employees or their counsel, such as directions not to cooperate openly and fully with the investigation including, for example, the direction to decline to be interviewed; making presentations or submissions, that contain misleading assertions or omissions; incomplete or delayed production of records; and failure to promptly disclose illegal conduct known to the corporation.

5. Offering Cooperation: No Entitlement to Immunity

Finally, a corporation's offer of cooperation does not automatically entitle it to immunity from prosecution, A corporation should not be able to escape liability merely by offering up its directors, officers, employees, or agents as in lieu of its

¹²³ In extremely rare cases, the advancement of attorneys' fees may be taken into account when the totality of the circumstances show that it was intended to impede a criminal investigation. In these cases, fee advancement is considered with many other telling facts to make a determination that the corporation is acting improperly to shield itself and its culpable employees from government scrutiny, *See discussion in* Brief of Appellant-United States, *United States v. Smith and Watson*, No. 06-3999-cr (2d Cir. Nov. 6, 2006). Where these circumstances exist, approval must, be obtained from the Deputy Attorney General before prosecutors may consider this factor in their charging decisions. Prosecutors should follow the authorization process established for waiver requests of Category II information (see section VII-2, *infra*).

¹³⁴ Routine questions regarding the representation states of a corporation and its employees, including how and by whom attorneys' fees are paid, frequently arise the course of an investigation. They may be necessary to assess other issues, such as conflict-of-interest. Such questions are appropriate and this guidance is not intended to prohibit such inquiry.

own prosecution, Thus, a corporation's willingness to cooperate is merely one relevant factor, that needs to be considered in conjunction with the other factors, particularly those relating to the corporation's past history and the role of management in the wrongdoing.

VIII. Charging a Corporation: Corporate Compliance Programs

A. General Principle: Compliance programs are established by corporate management to prevent and to detect misconduct and to ensure that corporate activities are conducted in accordance with all applicable criminal and civil laws, regulations, and rules. The Department encourages such corporate self-policing, including voluntary disclosures to the government of any problems that a corporation discovers on its own. However, the existence of a compliance program *is* not sufficient, in and of itself, to justify not charging a corporation for criminal conduct undertaken by its officers, directors, employees, or agents. Indeed, the commission of such crimes in the face *of* a compliance program may suggest that the corporate management is not adequately enforcing its program. In addition, the nature of some crimes, e.g., antitrust violations, may be such that national law enforcement policies mandate prosecutions of corporations notwithstanding the existence of a compliance program.

B. Comment: A corporate compliance program, even one specifically prohibiting the very conduct in question, does not absolve the corporation from criminal liability under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*. See *United States v. Basic Construction Co.*, 711 F.2d 570 (4th Cir. 1983) ("[A] corporation may be held criminally responsible for antitrust violations committed by its employees if they were acting within the scope of their authority, or apparent authority, and for the benefit of the corporation, even if... such acts were against corporate policy or express instructions."). In *United States v. Potter*, 463 F.3d 9, 25-26 (1st Cir, According to the court, a corporation cannot "avoid liability by adopting abstract rules" that forbid its agents from engaging in illegal acts; "even a specific directive to an agent or employee or honest efforts to police such rules do not automatically free the company for the wrongful acts of agents." Similarly, in *United States v.*

Hilton Hotels Corp., 467 F.2d 1000 (9th Cir. 1972), *cert. denied*, 409 U.S. 1125 (1973), the Ninth Circuit affirmed antitrust liability based upon a purchasing agent for a single hotel threatening a single supplier with a boycott unless it paid dues to a local marketing association, even though the agent's actions were contrary to corporate policy and directly against express instructions from his superiors. The court reasoned that Congress, in enacting the Sherman Antitrust Act, "intended to impose liability upon business entities for the acts of those to whom they choose to delegate the conduct of their affairs, thus stimulating a maximum effort by owners and managers to assure adherence by such agents to the requirements of the Act."¹⁴⁵ It concluded that "genera policy statements" and even direct instructions from the agent's superiors were not sufficient; "Appellant could not gain exculpation by issuing general instructions without undertaking to enforce those instructions by means commensurate with the obvious risks." *See also United States v. Beusch*, 596 F.2d 871, 878 (9th Cir. 1979) ("[A] corporation may be liable for the acts of its employees done contrary to express instructions and policies, but... the existence of such instructions and policies may be considered in determining whether the employee in fact acted to benefit the corporation."); *United States v. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.*, 433 F.2d 174 (3rd Cir. 1970) (affirming conviction of corporation based upon its officer's participation in price-fixing scheme, despite corporation's defense that officer's conduct violated its "rigid anti-fraternization policy" against any socialization (and exchange of price information) with its competitors; "When the act of the agent is within the scope of his employment or his apparent authority, the corporation is held legally responsible for it, although what he did may be contrary to his actual instructions and maybe unlawful.").

While the Department recognizes that no compliance program can ever prevent all criminal activity by a corporation's employees, the critical factors in evaluating any program are whether the program is adequately designed for

¹⁴⁵ Although this case and *Basic Construction* are both antitrust cases, their reasoning applies to other criminal violations. In the *Hilton* case, for instance, the Ninth Circuit noted that Sherman Act violations are commercial offenses, "usually motivated by a desire to enhance profits," thus, bringing the case within the normal rule that a "purpose to benefit the corporation is necessary to bring the agent's acts within the scope of Ms employment." 467 F.2d at 1006 & n4. In addition, in *United States v. Automated Medical laboratories*, 770 F.2d 399,406 n,5 (4th Cir, 1985), the Fourth Circuit stated "that Basic Construction states a generally applicable rule on corporate criminal liability despite the fact that it addresses violations of the antitrust laws."

maximum effectiveness in preventing and detecting wrongdoing by employees and whether corporate management is enforcing the program or is tacitly encouraging or pressuring employees to engage in misconduct to achieve business objectives. The Department has no formal guidelines for corporate compliance programs. The fundamental questions any prosecutor should ask are: "Is the corporation's compliance program well designed?" and "Does the corporation's compliance program work?" In answering these questions, the prosecutor should consider the comprehensiveness of the compliance program; the extent and pervasiveness of the criminal conduct; the number and level of the corporate employees involved; the seriousness, duration, and frequency of the misconduct; and any remedial actions taken by the corporation, including restitution, disciplinary action, and revisions to corporate compliance programs.¹⁵⁶ Prosecutors should also consider the promptness of any disclosure of wrongdoing to the government and the corporation's cooperation in the government's investigation. In evaluating compliance programs, prosecutors may consider whether the corporation has established corporate governance mechanisms that can effectively detect and prevent misconduct. For example, do the corporation's directors exercise independent review over proposed corporate actions rather than unquestioningly ratifying officers' recommendations; are the directors provided with information sufficient to enable the exercise of independent judgment, are internal audit functions conducted at a level sufficient to ensure their independence and accuracy and have the directors established an information and reporting system in the organization reasonably designed to provide management and the board of directors with timely and accurate information sufficient to allow them to reach an informed decision regarding the organization's compliance with the law. *In re: Caremark*, 698 A. 2d 959 (Del. Ct Chan. 1996).

Prosecutors should therefore attempt to determine whether a corporation's compliance program is merely a "paper program" or whether it was designed and implemented in an effective manner. In addition, prosecutors should determine whether the corporation has provided for a staff sufficient to audit, document, analyze, and utilize the results of the corporation's compliance efforts. In addition,

¹⁵⁶ For a detailed review of these and other factors concerning corporate compliance programs, see USSG § 8B2.1

prosecutors should determine whether the corporation's employees are adequately informed about the compliance program and are convinced of the corporation's commitment to it. This will enable the prosecutor to make an informed decision as to whether the corporation has adopted and implemented a truly effective compliance program that, when consistent with other federal law enforcement policies, may result in a decision to charge only the corporation's employees and agents.

Compliance programs should be designed to detect the particular types of misconduct most likely to occur in a particular corporation's line of business. Many corporations operate in complex regulatory environments outside the normal experience of criminal prosecutors. Accordingly, prosecutors should consult with relevant federal and state agencies with the expertise to evaluate the adequacy of a program's design and implementation. For instance, state and federal banking, insurance, and medical boards, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Securities and Exchange Commission have considerable experience with compliance programs and can be very helpful to a prosecutor in evaluating such programs. In addition, the Fraud Section of the Criminal Division, the Commercial Litigation Branch of the Civil Division, and the Environmental Crimes Section of the Environment and Natural Resources Division can assist U.S. Attorneys' Offices in finding the appropriate agency office and in providing copies of compliance programs that were developed in previous cases.

IX. Charging a Corporation: Restitution and Remediation.

A, General Principle: Although neither a corporation nor an individual target may avoid prosecution merely by paying a sum of money, a prosecutor may consider the corporation's willingness to make restitution and steps already taken to do so. A prosecutor may also consider other remedial actions, such as implementing an effective corporate compliance program, improving an existing compliance program, and disciplining wrongdoers, in determining whether to charge the corporation.

B, Comment: in determining whether or not a corporation should be prosecuted, a prosecutor may consider whether meaningful remedial measures have been taken, including employee discipline and full restitution. A corporation's response to misconduct says much about its willingness to ensure that such misconduct does not recur. Thus, corporations that fully recognize the seriousness of their misconduct and accept responsibility for it should be taking steps to implement the personnel, operational, and organizational changes necessary to establish an awareness among employees that criminal conduct will not be tolerated. Among the factors prosecutors should consider and weigh are whether the corporation appropriately disciplined the wrongdoers and disclosed information concerning their illegal conduct to the government.

Employee discipline is a difficult task for many corporations because of the human element involved and sometimes because of the seniority of the employees concerned. While corporations need to be fair to their employees, they must also be unequivocally committed, at all levels of the corporation, to the highest standards of legal and ethical behavior. Effective internal discipline can be a powerful deterrent against improper behavior by a corporation's employees, in evaluating a corporation's response to wrong doing, prosecutors may evaluate the willingness of the corporation to discipline culpable employees of all ranks and the adequacy of the discipline imposed. The prosecutor should be satisfied that the corporation's focus is on the integrity and credibility of its remedial and disciplinary measures rather than on the protection of the wrongdoers.

In addition to employee discipline, two other factors used in evaluating a corporation's remedial efforts are restitution and reform. As with natural persons, the decision whether or not to prosecute should not depend upon the target's ability to pay restitution. A corporation's efforts to pay restitution even in advance of any court order is, however, evidence of its "acceptance of responsibility" and consistent with the practices and policies of the appropriate Division of the Department entrusted with enforcing specific criminal laws, may be considered in determining whether to bring criminal charges. Similarly, although the inadequacy

of a corporate compliance program is a factor to consider when deciding whether to charge a corporation, that corporation's quick recognition of the flaws in the program and its efforts to improve the program are also factors to consider.

X. Charging a Corporation: Collateral Consequences

A. General Principle: Prosecutors may consider the collateral consequences of a corporate criminal conviction in determining whether to charge the corporation with a criminal offense,

B. Comment: One of the factors in determining whether to charge a natural person or a corporation is whether the likely punishment is appropriate given the nature and seriousness of the crime. *In* the corporate context, prosecutors may take into account the possibly substantial consequences to a corporation's officers, directors, employees, and shareholders, many of whom may, depending on the size and nature (*e.g.*, publicly vs. closely held) of the corporation and their role in its operations, have played no role in the criminal conduct, have been completely unaware of it, or have been wholly unable to prevent, it. Prosecutors should also be aware of non-penal sanctions that may accompany a criminal charge, such as potential suspension or debarment from eligibility for government contracts or federal funded programs such as health care. Whether or not such non-penal sanctions are appropriate or required in a particular case is the responsibility of the relevant agency, a decision that will be made based on the applicable statutes, regulations, and policies.

Virtually every conviction of a corporation, like virtually every conviction of an individual, will have an impact on innocent third parties, and the mere existence of such an effect is not sufficient to preclude prosecution of the corporation. Therefore, in evaluating the severity of collateral consequences, various factors already discussed, such as the pervasiveness of the criminal conduct and the adequacy of the corporation's compliance programs, should be considered in determining the weight to be given to this factor. For instance, the balance may tip in favor of prosecuting corporations in situations where the scope

of the misconduct in a case is widespread and sustained within a corporate division (or spread throughout pockets of the corporate organization). In such-cases, the possible unfairness of visiting punishment for the corporation's crimes upon shareholders may be of much less concern where those shareholders have substantially profited, even unknowingly, from widespread or pervasive *criminal* activity. Similarly, where the top layers of the corporation's management or the shareholders of a closely-held corporation were engaged in or aware of the wrongdoing and the conduct at issue was accepted as a way of doing business for an extended period, debarment may be deemed not collateral, but a direct and entirely appropriate consequence of the corporation's wrongdoing.

The appropriateness of considering such collateral consequences and the weight to be given them may depend on the special policy concerns discussed in section III. *supra*.

XI. Charging a Corporation: Non-Criminal Alternatives

A. General Principle: Non-criminal alternatives to prosecution often exist and prosecutors may consider whether such sanctions would adequately deter, punish, and rehabilitate a corporation that has engaged in wrongful conduct. In evaluating the adequacy of non-criminal alternatives to prosecution, *e.g.*, civil or regulatory enforcement actions, the prosecutor may consider all relevant factors, including:

1. the sanctions available under the alternative means of disposition;
2. the likelihood that an effective sanction will be imposed; and
3. the effect of non-criminal disposition on federal law enforcement interests,

B. Comment: The primary goals of criminal law are deterrence, punishment and rehabilitation. Non-criminal sanctions may not be an appropriate response to

an egregious violation, a pattern of wrongdoing, or a history of non-criminal sanctions without proper remediation. In other cases, however, these goals may be satisfied without the necessity of instituting criminal proceedings. In determining whether federal criminal charges are appropriate, the prosecutor should consider the same factors (modified appropriately for the regulatory context) considered when determining whether to leave prosecution of a natural person to another jurisdiction or to seek non-criminal alternatives to prosecution. These factors include: the strength of the regulatory authority's interest; the regulatory authority's ability and willingness to take effective enforcement action; the probable sanction if the regulatory authority's enforcement action is upheld; and the effect of a non-criminal disposition on federal law enforcement interests. *See* USAM §§ 9-27.240, 9-27.250.

XII. Charging a Corporation: Selecting Charges

A. General Principle: Once a prosecutor has decided to charge a corporation, the prosecutor should charge, or should recommend that the grand jury charge, the most serious offense that is consistent with the nature of the defendant's conduct and that is likely to result in a sustainable conviction.

B. Comment: Once the decision to charge *is* made, the same rules as govern charging natural persons apply. These rules require "a faithful and honest application of the Sentencing Guidelines" and an "individualized assessment of the extent to which particular charges fit the specific circumstances of the case, are consistent with the purposes of the federal criminal code, and maximize the impact of federal resources on crime." *See* USAM § 9-27.300. In making this determination, "it is appropriate that the attorney for the government consider, *inter alia*, such factors as the sentencing guideline range yielded by the charge, whether the penalty yielded by such sentencing range ... is proportional to the seriousness of the defendant's conduct, and whether the charge achieves such purposes of the criminal law as punishment, protection of the public, specific and general deterrence, and rehabilitation." *See* Attorney General's Memorandum, dated October 12, 1993.

XIII. Plea Agreements with Corporations

A. General Principle: In negotiating plea agreements with corporations, prosecutors should seek a plea to the most serious, readily provable offense charged. In addition, the terms of the plea agreement should contain appropriate provisions to ensure punishment, deterrence, rehabilitation, and compliance with the plea agreement in the corporate context. Although special circumstances may mandate a different conclusion, prosecutors generally should not agree to accept a corporate guilty plea in exchange for non-prosecution or dismissal of charges against individual officers and employees.

B. Comment: Prosecutors may enter into plea agreements with corporations for the same reasons and under the same constraints as apply to plea agreements with natural persons. *See* USAM §§ 9-27.400-500. This means, *inter alia*, that the corporation should be required to plead guilty to the most serious, readily provable offense charged. As is the case with individuals, the attorney making this determination should do so "on the basis of an individualized assessment of the extent to which particular charges fit the specific circumstances of the case, are consistent with the purposes of the federal criminal code, and maximize the impact of federal resources on crime. In making this determination, the attorney for the government considers, *inter alia*, such factors as the sentencing guideline range yielded by the charge, whether the penalty yielded by such sentencing range ... is proportional to the seriousness of the defendant's conduct, and whether the charge achieves such purposes of the criminal law as punishment, protection of the public, specific and general deterrence, and rehabilitation." *See* Attorney General's Memorandum, dated October 12, 1993. In addition, any negotiated departures from the Sentencing Guidelines must be justifiable under the Guidelines and must be disclosed to the sentencing court. A corporation should be made to realize that pleading guilty to criminal charges constitutes an admission" of guilt and not merely a resolution of an inconvenient distraction from its business. As with natural persons, pleas should be structured so that the corporation may not later "proclaim lack of culpability or even complete

innocence." *See* USAM §§- 9-27.420(b)(4), 9-27.440,9-27.500. Thus, for instance, there should be. placed upon the record a sufficient factual basis for the. plea to prevent later corporate assertions of innocence.

A corporate plea agreement should also contain provisions that recognize the nature of the corporate "person" and ensure that the principles of punishment, deterrence, and rehabilitation are met. In the corporate context, punishment and deterrence are generally accomplished by substantial fines, mandatory restitution, and institution of appropriate compliance measures, including, if necessary, continued judicial oversight or the use of special masters. *See* USSG §§ 8BI.1, *seq.* *In* addition, where the corporation is a government contractor, permanent or temporary debarment may be appropriate. Where the corporation was engaged in government contracting fraud, a prosecutor may not negotiate away an agency's right to debar or to list the corporate defendant.

In negotiating a plea agreement, prosecutors should also consider the deterrent value of prosecutions of individuals within the corporation, Therefore, one factor that a prosecutor may consider in determining whether to enter into a plea agreement is whether the corporation is seeking immunity for its employees and officers or whether the corporation is willing to cooperate in. the investigation of culpable individuals. Prosecutors should rarely negotiate away individual criminal liability in a corporate- plea.

Rehabilitation, of course, requires that the corporation undertake to be law-abiding in the future. It is, therefore, appropriate to require the corporation, as a condition of probation, to implement a compliance program or to reform an existing one. As discussed above, prosecutors may consult with the appropriate state and federal agencies and components of the Justice Department to ensure that a proposed compliance program is adequate and meets industry standards and best practices. *See* section VIII, *supra*,

In plea agreements in which the corporation agrees to cooperate, the prosecutor should ensure that the cooperation is complete- and truthful. To do so,

the prosecutor may request that the corporation waive attorney-client and work product protection, make employees and agents available for debriefing, disclose the results of its internal investigation, file appropriate certified financial statements, agree to governmental or third-party audits, and take whatever other steps are necessary to ensure that the full scope of the corporate wrongdoing is disclosed and that the responsible culprits are identified and, if appropriate, prosecuted. See generally section VII, *supra*.

This memorandum provides only internal Department of Justice guidance. It is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any rights, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any matter civil or criminal. Nor are any limitations hereby placed on otherwise lawful litigative prerogatives of the Department of justice.

109TH CONGRESS

2D SESSION

S. _____

To provide appropriate protection to attorney-client privileged communications and attorney work product.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPECTER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on _____

A BILL

To provide appropriate protection to attorney-client privileged communications and attorney work product.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Attorney-Client Privilege Protection Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Justice is served when all parties to litigation are represented by experienced diligent counsel.

(2). Protecting attorney-client privileged communications from compelled disclosure fosters voluntary compliance with the law.

(3). To serve the purpose of the attorney-client privilege, attorneys and clients must have a degree of confidence that they will not be required to disclose privileged communications.

(4). The ability of an organization to have effective compliance programs and to conduct comprehensive internal investigations is enhanced when there is clarity and consistency regarding the attorney-client privilege.

(5). Prosecutors, investigators, enforcement officials, and other officers or employees of Government agencies have been able to, and can continue to, conduct their work while respecting attorney-client and work product protections and the rights of individuals, including seeking and discovering facts crucial to the investigation and prosecution of organizations.

(6). Despite the existence of these legitimate tools,

the Department of Justice and other agencies have increasingly employed tactics that undermine the adversarial system of justice, such as encouraging organizations to waive attorney-client privilege and work product protections to avoid indictment or other sanctions.

(7). An indictment can have devastating consequences on an organization, potentially eliminating the ability of the organization to survive post-indictment or to dispute the charges against it at trial.

(8). Waiver demands and other tactics of Government agencies are encroaching on the constitutional rights and other legal protections of employees.

(9). The attorney-client privilege, work product doctrine, and payment of counsel fees shall not be used as devices to conceal wrongdoing or to cloak advice on evading the law.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to place on each agency clear and practical limits designed to preserve the attorney-client privilege and work product protections available to an organization and preserve the constitutional

rights and other legal protections available to employees of such an organization.

SEC. 3. DISCLOSURE OP ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE OR ADVANCEMENT OF COUNSEL FEES AS ELEMENTS OF COOPERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3013 the following:

“§3014. Preservation of fundamental legal protections and rights in the context of investigations and enforcement matters regarding organizations

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) ATTORNEY-CLIENT privilege.—The term ‘attorney-client privilege’ means the attorney-client privilege as governed by the principles of the common law, as they may be interpreted by the courts of the United States in the light of reason and experience, and the principles of article V of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

“(2) ATTORNEY WORK PRODUCT.—The term ‘attorney work product’ means materials prepared by or

at the direction of an attorney in anticipation of litigation, particularly any such materials that contain a mental impression, conclusion, opinion, or legal theory of that attorney.

“(b) IN General.—In any Federal investigation or criminal or civil enforcement matter, an agent or attorney of the United States shall not—

“(1) demand, request, or condition treatment on the disclosure by an organization, or person affiliated with that organization, of any communication protected by the attorney-client privilege or any attorney work product;

“(2) condition a civil or criminal charging decision relating to a organization, or person affiliated with that organization, on, or use as a factor in determining whether an organization, or person affiliated with that organization, is cooperating with the Government—

“(A) any valid assertion of the attorney-client privilege or privilege for attorney work product;

“(B) the provision of counsel to, or

contribution to the legal defense fees or expenses of, an employee of that organization;

“(C) the entry into a, joint defense, information sharing, or common interest agreement with an employee of that organization if the organization determines it has a common interest in defending against the investigation or enforcement matter;

“(D) the sharing of information relevant to the investigation or enforcement matter with an employee of that organization; or

“(E) a. failure to terminate the employment of or otherwise sanction any employee of that organization because of the decision by that employee to exercise the constitutional rights or other legal protections of that employee in response to a Government request; or “(3) demand or request that an organization, or person affiliated with that organization, not take any action described in paragraph (2).

"(c) INAPPLICABILITY.—Nothing in this Act shall prohibit an agent or attorney of the United States from

requesting or seeking any communication or material that such agent or attorney reasonably believes is not entitled to protection under the attorney-client privilege or attorney work product doctrine.

“(d) VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURES.—Nothing in this Act is intended to prohibit an organization from making, or an agent or attorney of the United States from accepting, a voluntary and unsolicited offer to share the internal investigation materials of such organization.”.

(b). CONFORMING AMENDMENT,—The table of sections for chapter 201 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“3014.Preservation of fundamental legal protections and rights in the Context of investigations and enforcement matters regarding Organizations”.