



governmentattic.org

"Rummaging in the government's attic"

Description of document:	Department of Justice (DOJ) Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) report on the investigation of abuse of the material witness process, 2007
Requested date:	03-December-2009
Released date:	31-January-2011
Posted date:	21-February-2011
Title of document:	Report of Investigation of Misconduct Allegations Related to the Criminal Investigations and Arrests of Individuals on Material Witness Warrants
Source of document:	Special Counsel for Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts Office of Professional Responsibility 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 3266 Washington, D.C. 20530 OPR.FOIA@usdoj.gov

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Professional Responsibility

*950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 3525
Washington, D.C. 20530
(202)514-3365*

JAN 31 2011

Re: F1000029

This is in further response to your December 3, 2009 Freedom of Information Act request to this Office for a copy of our report on the investigation of abuse of the material witness process. We referred the report to the Executive Office for United States Attorneys and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for consultation. We have received their recommendations. I have determined that the report can be released to you in part. A copy is enclosed.


I am withholding the remaining information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(5), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C), and (b)(7)(D). Exemption (b)(5) permits the withholding of "inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency." Exemption (b)(6) permits the withholding of information about individuals in "personnel and medical files and similar files" when disclosure of such information "would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Exemption (b)(7)(C) allows for the withholding of information compiled for law enforcement purposes the release of which "could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Exemption (b)(7)(D) allows for the withholding of information compiled for law enforcement purposes the release of which "could reasonably be expected to disclose the identity of a confidential source."

If you are not satisfied with this response, you may file an appeal. Pursuant to 28 C.F.R. § 16.9, you must make your appeal in writing and it must be received by the Office of Information Policy within 60 days of the date of this letter. Your letter and envelope should be marked "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION APPEAL" and addressed to:

Director, Office of Information Policy
United States Department of Justice
1425 New York Ave., N.W.
Suite 11050
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Wahowiak', written over the printed name.

Marlene M. Wahowiak

Special Counsel

for Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts

Enclosure

Enclosure



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Professional Responsibility

950 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W. Room 3266
Washington, D.C. 20530


JAN 9 2007

NOTE: THIS REPORT CONTAINS SENSITIVE, CONFIDENTIAL, AND GRAND JURY INFORMATION. DO NOT DISTRIBUTE THE REPORT OR ITS CONTENTS OUTSIDE OF THE OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE CRIMINAL DIVISION, OR THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS WITHOUT THE PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alice S. Fisher
Assistant Attorney General
Criminal Division

Michael A. Battle
Director
Executive Office for United States Attorneys


FROM: H. Marshall Jarrett
Counsel

SUBJECT: Report of Investigation of Misconduct Allegations Related to the Criminal Investigations and Arrests of Individuals on Material Witness Warrants

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

In June 2005, the Human Rights Watch (HRW) and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) published an article entitled "Witness to Abuse: Human Rights Abuses under the Material Witness Law Since September 11." The report asserted that, since the attacks of September 11, 2001, at least seventy men living in the United States – all but one of whom are Muslims – "have been thrust into a Kafkaesque world

of indefinite detention without charges, secret evidence, and baseless accusations of terrorist links." It asserted that Congress enacted the material witness statute in 1984 to enable the government, under narrow circumstances, to secure the testimony of witnesses who might otherwise flee to avoid testifying in a criminal proceeding. According to the report, however, the Department of Justice has improperly used the law, since September 11, to secure the indefinite incarceration of those it wanted to investigate as possible terrorist suspects.

This Office initiated an investigation to review fourteen matters discussed in the HRW/ACLU report.¹ OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C)

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

OPR (b)(5) (6) (7) (C) Based on the results of our investigation, we concluded that the material witness statute was not misused in the cases we reviewed.

I. Overview of the Material Witness Law

The material witness statute, 18 U.S.C. §3144, provides:

If it appears from an affidavit filed by a party that the testimony of a person is material in a criminal proceeding, and if it is shown that it may become impracticable to secure the presence of the person by subpoena, a judicial officer may order the arrest of the person and treat the person in accordance with the provisions of section 3142 of this title. No material witness may be detained because of inability to comply with any condition of release if the testimony of such witness can adequately be secured by deposition, and if further detention is not necessary to prevent a failure of justice. Release of a material witness may be delayed for a reasonable period of time

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

until the deposition of the witness can be taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Section 3142 sets forth conditions for the release or detention of a defendant pending trial. outlines the conditions that may be imposed on the pretrial release of a defendant and requires that a hearing be held to determine whether any conditions might be set that would reasonably assure the defendant's appearance. It also specifically provides that the person has the right to be represented by counsel, or have counsel appointed if he is financially unable to obtain representation. The material witness statute does not contain limitations on the length of time a witness may be detained.

The circuits that have addressed the issue have held that a grand jury proceeding constitutes a "criminal proceeding" for purposes of the material witness statute.² Before a material witness arrest warrant may issue, the judicial officer must find probable cause to believe that (1) the testimony of a person is material, and (2) it may become impracticable to secure his presence by subpoena.³ The burden of establishing the materiality of a witness's testimony is low. In *Bacon v. United States*, the Ninth Circuit commented that, "[i]n the case of a grand jury proceeding, we think that a mere statement by a responsible official, such as the United States Attorney, is sufficient to satisfy criterion (1)."⁴ However, more than an assertion by the government is required to meet the

² *Bacon v. United States*, 449 F.2d 933 (9th Cir. 1971). See also, *United States v. Awadallah*, 349 F.3d 42 (2d Cir. 2003) *cert. denied*, 125 S. Ct. 861 (2005)(material witness statute authorizes the detention of grand jury witnesses); *In re Grand Jury Material Witness Detention*, 271 F. Supp. 2d 1266 (D. Oregon, 2003) (grand jury proceeding constitutes a criminal proceeding as term used in material witness statute).

³ *Bacon*, 449 F.2d at 943.

⁴ *Bacon*, 449 F.2d at 942. See also, *Awadallah*, 349 F.3d at 65 (holding that FBI agent working closely with prosecutor in a grand jury investigation could also attest to materiality); *United States v. Oliver*, 683 F.2d 224 (7th Cir. 1982)(applying the predecessor of 18 U.S.C. §3144 – §3149).

burden of establishing probable cause that it may be impracticable to secure the witness's testimony by subpoena. "A common sense reading of Section 3144 requires the court to evaluate the material witness' risk of flight, likelihood that the person will appear, and danger to the community or nation."⁵

The law allows detention only for the purpose of and time necessary to obtain the testimony of the witness. It does not authorize the government to detain a criminal suspect for whom there is insufficient probable cause to charge him criminally. In *United States v. Awadallah*, the court stated that it would be improper for the government to use the material witness warrant for other ends, such as the detention of a person suspected of criminal activity for which probable cause had not yet been established.⁶

The statute provides that the witness may be held for a reasonable period of time until the deposition can be taken. Fed. R. Crim. P. 46 provides that, to eliminate unnecessary detention, the court must supervise the detention within the district of any person held as a material witness. In addition, an attorney for the government must provide a bi-weekly report to the court that lists material witnesses held in custody for more than 10 days and states the reasons each witness should not be released with or without a deposition being taken.⁷ These reports are filed under seal in a matter involving a grand jury witness.

⁵ *In re Grand Jury Material Witness Detention*, 271 F. Supp. 2d at 1269.

⁶ 349 F.3d at 59.

⁷ Fed. R. Crim. P 46(h)(1) and (2).

II. Immediate Post 9/11 Arrests

As noted, we investigated fourteen matters in which individuals were arrested immediately following the September 11, 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. Based on the results of our investigation, we concluded that no Department attorney engaged in professional misconduct or exercised poor judgment in connection with these matters.

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

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

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

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


EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

A large rectangular area of the document is completely redacted with a solid black box.

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

A rectangular area of the document is completely redacted with a solid black box.

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

A very large rectangular area of the document is completely redacted with a solid black box, covering the majority of the page's content.

OPR (b)(5)


A rectangular area of the document is completely redacted with a solid black box.

OPR (b)(5) In June 2003, the Office of Inspector General issued a lengthy and thorough report on that subject as it related to detainees after September 11. *The September 11 Detainees: A Review of the Treatment of Aliens Held on Immigration Charges in Connection with the Investigation of the September 11 Attacks.*

EOUSA (b)(3)/F. Rule Crim, P. 6(e) (7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)


EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA withhold pages 8, 9, and 10 in full (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA withhold pages 8, 9, and 10 in full (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA withhold pages 8, 9, and 10 in full (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7) OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)
(D)

OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)

EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)
FBI (b)(6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)
FBI (b)(6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)
FBI (b)(6) (7)(C)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)

FBI (b)(6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)
FBI (b)(6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7) OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)
(D)


) (7)(D)




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



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)
FBI (b)(6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)




OPR (b)(5) (6) (7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



EOUSA (b)(7)(C) (7)(D)



V. Conclusion

Based on the results of our investigation of fourteen matters discussed in the HRW/ACLU report, we concluded that the Department of Justice attorneys involved did not misuse the material witness statute and thus did not commit professional misconduct or exercise poor judgment. Accordingly, we consider this matter to be closed.

cc: David Margolis
Associate Deputy Attorney General

Scott N. Schools
General Counsel, EOUSA

OPR:TKessler:

G:\tkessler\$\Myfiles\Docs\Mat Wit Warrants\Mat Wit Report.wpd

cc: Chron
Kessler
File - C06-0048
Paste-In -
Jarrett
Wish
Birney
Colby
Duncan
Hoopes