March 15, 1993

United States Sentencing Commission
One Columbus Circle, N.E.
Suite 2-500, South Lobby
Washington, DC 20002-8002

Attention: Public Information

Gentlemen:

The U.S. Postal Service respectfully submits its comments on the 1993 proposed guideline amendments. As an overview, we disagree with the proposed guidelines on money laundering (Amendment 20) and the guideline commentary on public trust (Amendment 23), and request the adoption of the proposed amendments submitted by the Postal Service relating to the theft of mail (Amendment 44), and the public trust enhancement for offenses committed by postal employees (Amendment 46). In addition, we strongly urge the Commission to consider the future formulation of a "multiple victim" adjustment guideline (Amendment 45). Our comments are explained more fully in the following:

Proposed Amendment 20, § 2S1.1, § 2S1.2. We disagree with the proposed revisions to the money laundering guideline based on the statutory purpose of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956, 1957. The legislative intent of these statutes is to create a separate crime offense to deter criminals from attempting to profit from their illegal activities and to impose a higher penalty for this type of criminal misconduct. To accomplish this, the statutes prescribe criminal penalties separate from and higher than those of the underlying criminal offense which gave rise to the monies, property or proceeds involved in the money laundering. This legislative intent would in effect be vitiated by the revision to the guideline. Because the underlying offense and the money laundering are two separate crimes, we believe the guidelines should likewise maintain this
separateness and that the concept of "closely related" offenses should not apply. The commentary of the proposed guideline also draws a distinction which is not supported by the legislative intent or statutory definitions of "actual money laundering" as compared to "other money laundering." Simply stated, we believe if the government proves the elements of the statute, the defendant should be sentenced accordingly, without a further analysis of the criminal intent by the sentencing court. In view of our concerns with these proposed amendments, we support the existing guidelines which provide for a separate and higher offense level for money laundering not tied to the offense level of the specified unlawful activity. For the above reasons, the Postal Service endorses the position of the Department of Justice to maintain higher levels for money laundering offenses.

Proposed Amendment 23, § 3B1.3. We disagree with this proposed amendment's application to employees of the Postal Service, and submit in the alternative a revision to the commentary portion of this section which would make the public trust guideline specifically applicable to postal employees (Amendment 46). Historically, postal employees have held a special fiduciary relationship with the American public because their personal correspondence is entrusted to the care and custody of the agency. This special trust is corroborated in the oath of employment and the long-standing federal criminal statutes which relate to the theft or obstruction of mail and embezzlement which apply exclusively to postal employees. In addition, these types of crimes significantly impair the Postal Service function and negatively impact on the public's trust in the institution.

Our proposed revision to the commentary would make the public trust guideline apply to employees of the Postal Service sentenced for theft or obstruction of United States Mail, (18 U.S.C. §§1703, 1709); embezzlement of Postal Service funds (18 U.S.C. §1711); and
theft of Postal Service property (18 U.S.C. §§1707, 641). To make this amendment comport to guideline commentary format, the statute citations are deleted. Application Note 1 is amended by inserting the following paragraph at the end:

"This adjustment, for example, will apply to postal employees who abuse their position to steal or obstruct U.S. Mail, embezzle Postal Service funds, or steal Postal Service property."

It is our opinion the enhancement is justified because these crimes disrupt an important governmental function—the nation’s postal system—as prescribed in § 5K2.7. Moreover, without the offense enhancement provided by § 3B1.3, the monetary value of the property damaged or destroyed may not adequately reflect the extent of the harm caused by the offense under similar rationale discussed in § 2B1.3, comment (n.4). For example, the theft or destruction of mail by employees of the Postal Service necessarily impacts numerous victims, while the total dollar loss may be minimal.

Our proposal clarifies that the special trust relationship a postal employee has with the public and its written correspondence is significantly different from that of the employment relationship of the ordinary bank teller as cited by example in §3B1.3, comment (n.1), of the current guideline. Adoption of our proposed amendment would also provide for consistency in the application of this guideline in light of several court decisions, United States v. Milligan, 958 F.2d 345 (11th Cir. 1992) (court held that a postal clerk who embezzled funds had occupied a position of trust); United States v. Lange, 918 F.2d 707 (8th Cir. 1990) (postal employee who had access to certified and Express Mail was in a position of trust); United States v. Arrington, 765 F. Supp. 945 (N.D.Ill 1991)(a casual mail handler
was not in a trust position), and obviate the need of detailed analysis by the court of the specific duties and responsibilities of the defendant as qualifying the particular position occupied as one of "public trust."

Proposed Amendment 44, § 2Bl.1(b)(4). The current guidelines applicable to mail theft are based on the dollar value of the loss. Although the guideline increases the offense level if mail is involved, we do not feel this adequately addresses the seriousness of the offense and its impact on the victims and on the essential governmental function of mail delivery. The proposed amendments take these factors into consideration by initially increasing the offense level to a level 6, and then adding the appropriate level increase corresponding to the total dollar loss associated with the theft. In order to conform with similar guideline language, the amendment should be reworded to read:

"If undelivered United States Mail was taken, increase by two levels. If the offense is less than level 6, increase to level 6."

In addition to this amendment to the mail theft guideline, we have proposed § 2Bl.1(b)(8) to address theft schemes involving large volumes of mail. Frequently, these volume thefts are conducted as a gang-related crime to steal the mail and then fraudulently negotiate or use those items contained within. In most instances, a substantial volume of stolen mail is necessary to obtain a minimal number of checks, credit cards, negotiable instruments or other items of value. The dollar loss of these types of thefts does not accurately reflect the scope of the crime in terms of the number of victims affected and the operations of the government's postal system. Our proposed amendment would address the more serious nature of these schemes to steal large volumes of mail by increasing the offense level to a 14.
March 15, 1993

The Honorable William W. Wilkins, Jr., Chairman
Members of the U.S. Sentencing Commission
United States Sentencing Commission
One Columbus Circle, N.E.
Suite 2-500, South Lobby
Washington, D.C. 20002-8002

Dear Chairman Wilkins and Members of the Commission:

The Edison Electric Institute ("EEI") is grateful for the opportunity to present comments to the Commission on the proposed amendments to the sentencing guidelines.1 EEI is the association of electric companies. Its members serve 99 percent of all customers served by the investor-owned segment of the industry. They generate approximately 78 percent of all the electricity in the country and service 76 percent of all ultimate customers in the nation. Its members are pervasively regulated at the federal and state level in all aspects of their business. These electric utilities range in size from ones employing less than 100 employees to ones employing more than 10,000 employees. Our member companies have a real and direct interest in the content of the proposed amendments to the individual guidelines given enforcement trends toward the prosecution of corporate managers and supervisors.

I. Amendment No. 23, Abuse of Position of Trust

The Commission invites comment on a proposed amendment to § 3B1.3 (Abuse of Position of Trust or Use of Special Skill).2 The proposed amendment attempts to reformulate the definition of what constitutes a "special trust."


2 Amendment No. 23, Notice at 62,842.
EEI believes that the proposed application note focuses too narrowly on a person’s status in the employment context. In relevant part, the proposed note provides that:

"Special trust" refers to a position of public or private trust characterized by professional or managerial discretion (i.e., substantial discretionary judgment that is ordinarily given considerable deference). Persons holding such positions ordinarily are subject to significantly less supervision than an employee whose responsibilities are primarily ministerial in nature.

EEI recommends that the reference to "professional or managerial discretion" be eliminated from the proposed amendment. This reference is likely to confuse a sentencing court because it focuses on employment-related abuses of trust and does not mention non-employment abuses of trust. There are numerous situations where a personal "special trust" is violated (for example, sexual abuse of a child by a relative or clergyperson). But such situations are not reflected in the proposed amendment.

Furthermore, the proposed amendment suggests that persons in professional or managerial positions in companies generally are in positions of trust that would warrant a sentence enhancement, provided that their positions "contributed in some significant way to facilitating the commission or concealment of the offense." This seems too casual a linkage between a person’s status in a company and enhancement of that person’s sentence. At a minimum, there should be some intent by an individual to use a position of special trust to further commission or concealment of an offense before this forms the basis for enhancing their sentence.

The proposed application note also should be clarified to ensure that the provision does not automatically imbue corporate managers with an aura of "special trust." For example, a corporate manager who is responsible for compliance with a particular area of the law should not be in a position of special trust with respect to violations of other areas of the law. The proposed amendment should require that the individual be in a position of special trust directly relevant to the underlying offense before this sentence enhancement is applicable.

Also, the trust should be one owed to the victim of the offense for which a sentence is being imposed, and should be reasonably relied on by the victim in the context of the offense. Corporate managers should not be liable for a perceived
special duty owed to the general public by them or their corporation. The special trust should arise directly between the individual and the victim of the crime before it can lead to sentence enhancement.

For all of these reasons, EEI would recommend the following as an alternative to Amendment No. 23:

"Special trust" refers to violation of a duty of trust between the defendant and the victim or victims of an offense for which a sentence is being imposed. The duty of trust may arise from a fiduciary relationship or a position of substantial discretionary judgment that is legitimately given considerable deference by the victim. (In an employment context, such positions ordinarily are subject to significantly less supervision than those held by employees whose responsibilities are primarily ministerial in nature.) For this enhancement to apply, the violation of the duty of trust must have contributed in some significant way to facilitating the commission or concealment of the offense and not merely provided an opportunity that could have been afforded to other persons. Also, the defendant must have intended or known that the victim would rely on the duty of trust, and the victim must in fact have reasonably relied on that duty, in a way that contributed to the commission or concealment of the offense.

II. Issue For Comment No. 24 and Amendments Nos. 31 and 47, Substantial Assistance to Authorities

The Notice also contains an issue for comment and two proposed amendments regarding the elimination from § 5K1.1 of the requirement that the government make a motion requesting a departure from the guidelines before allowing a court to reduce a sentence as a result of substantial assistance by the defendant in the investigation or prosecution of another person. EEI answers the question for comment in the affirmative and supports Amendments Nos. 31 and 47, which would allow the court to consider a departure from the guidelines for substantial assistance provided by a defendant at its own discretion, and urges the

3 Issue For Comment No. 24 and Amendments Nos. 31 and 47, Notice at 62,842, 62,848, and 62,853, respectively.
Commission to adopt the same amendment to § 8C4.1 of the Guidelines, which is the same provision as it applies to organizations.

There is a significant potential for unfairness when the prosecutor is given complete control over substantial assistance departures. Furthermore, the substantial assistance departure is currently the only ground for departure from the guidelines that requires a government motion before the court may consider it. Even if the amendment is adopted and a court is allowed to consider the issue at its own discretion, the government will still be the principal source of evidence regarding whether "substantial assistance" was in fact provided by the defendant. But prosecutors should not have sole discretion whether to raise the issue of substantial assistance for a court's attention, especially given that a prosecutor's exercise of this discretion generally is unreviewable. In order for this section to achieve its goal of encouraging defendants to aid law enforcement authorities in the prosecution of offenses, defendants must perceive that the section will be fairly applied. This requires courts to be able to consider the issue of substantial assistance of their own accord and in response to motions by defendants as well as in response to motions by prosecutors.

On a related subject, the limitations suggested by Issue for Comment No. 24 (i.e., must be a first offender and no violence must be associated with the offense) are unnecessary. Courts should be allowed to consider substantial assistance by defendants in all cases where such assistance has been rendered. First offender status and non-violent nature of the crime should be left as facts to be taken into account at the discretion of the court. They should not be used as a basis for universally limiting consideration of substantial assistance.

As noted above, § 8C4.1 of the Guidelines contains language that applies to the sentencing of organizations analogous to that contained in § 5K1.1, and it contains the identical governmental motion requirement. The purpose of the sections is the same. Therefore, an amendment to one should prompt an amendment to the other, as there is no policy justification for doing otherwise. Thus, EEI urges the Commission to strike the government motion requirement from both § 5K1.1 and § 8C4.1 of the guidelines.

III. Issue For Comment No. 30, Departures

Amendment No. 30 requests comment as to whether the language in Chapter One, Part A4(b) may be read to be overly restrictive of a court's ability to depart
from the guidelines. EEI supports the suggestion made by the Committee on Criminal Law of the Judicial Conference of the United States that the language contained in Part A4(b) should be changed to the extent that it discourages departures by encouraging courts of appeals to find that sentences that depart from the guidelines are "unreasonable."

While the language of Part A4(b) concedes that the initial guidelines will be the subject of refinement over time, and that the departure policy was adopted because "it is difficult to prescribe a single set of guidelines that encompasses the vast range of human conduct potentially relevant to a sentencing decision," the language that follows nevertheless suggests that departures from the guidelines are improper. The courts must be allowed to exercise reasonable judgment with respect to application of the guidelines, and must not be required to adhere inflexibly to specified types of departures and departure levels. At a minimum, EEI recommends that Part A4(b) be amended to strike the last sentence of the fourth paragraph and the last sentence of the fifth paragraph.

IV. Issue For Comment No. 32, First Time Offenders

The Commission has requested comment as to whether it should promulgate an amendment that would allow a court to impose a sentence other than imprisonment in the case of a first offender convicted of a non-violent or otherwise non-serious offense. EEI believes that there should be a specific provision for departures in the sentencing of first offenders of non-violent offenses. Judges need this departure to prevent the possibility of offenders receiving punishment that does not fit the crime. This departure should be accomplished through providing an additional ground for departure in Chapter Five, Part K.

---

4 Issue For Comment No. 30, Notice at 62,848.


7 Issue For Comment No. 32, Notice at 62,848.
V. Amendment No. 45, Multiple Victims

The United States Postal Service requests that the Commission create in Chapter Three, Part A, a new victim-related general adjustment to take into account increased harm caused when there is more than one victim. The proposed amendment is as follows:

If the offense affected more than one victim, increase the offense level by 2 levels. If the offense affected 100 victims or more, increase the offense by 2 levels for every 250 victims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of victims</th>
<th>Increase in offense level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - 99</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-349</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-649</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 650</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Postal Service specifically recommended that this departure be included as a victim-related adjustment applicable to all offenses involving multiple victims rather than limited to specific types of offenses.

First of all, courts need to look to the statute and regulations that define the offense for which a defendant is being sentenced to determine whether "number of victims" is a relevant factor in sentencing. If the statute or regulations identify factors for the court to consider in setting the level of fine or imprisonment for an offense, and do not list "number of victims" as a relevant factor, it may not be appropriate for the court to consider. Furthermore, even if number of victims is a relevant factor, in many cases it will have been addressed by the prosecutor bringing multiple counts against the defendant. For the court to enhance the defendant's sentence based on "number of victims" in such cases would be to penalize the defendant twice for the same conduct.

8 Amendment No. 45, Notice at 62,853.

In addition, EEI is concerned that the proposed amendment would prove too vague and, thus, difficult for sentencing courts to apply. Specifically, the proposed amendment does not define under what circumstances an "affected" party would be deemed a victim or the degree to which a party would have to be "affected" in order to be deemed a victim. In this regard, EEI is particularly concerned about the impact of the proposed amendment on persons convicted of offenses involving the environment. In such cases, more than one individual may be affected by an offense, but this may not correlate to degree of actual harm experienced by any of those individuals, and the effects may be an indirect consequence of the conduct for which the defendant is being sentenced.

Moreover, unlike other adjustments in Chapter 3, Part A -- vulnerable victims, official victims, and restraint of victims -- the proposed amendment deals not with knowing conduct aimed at particular victims but with possible unforeseen impacts on unintended victims. While such an adjustment may be desirable when applied to specific offenses, particularly offenses intended to affect multiple victims, its application across a wide variety of offenses without such constraints would inject an unacceptable degree of uncertainty into the sentencing process.

Therefore, EEI recommends that the Commission reject the proposed amendment as being too broad and ill-defined. At a minimum, the Postal Service should be required to identify the types of offenses directly of concern to it in proposing the amendment, and the amendment should be limited to those types of violations. Also, even as to those types of violations, the Commission needs to provide guidance about who qualifies as a victim. Furthermore, courts should be instructed to consider whether "number of victims" is relevant under the statute and regulations being enforced and given the facts of the case, including the number of counts brought by the prosecutor and the defendant's state of mind in committing the offense.

Thank you for considering our views on these matters.

Very truly yours,

Peter B. Kelsey
March 10, 1993

United States Sentencing Commission  
ATTN: PUBLIC INFORMATION  
One Columbus Circle North East  
Suite 2-500 - South Lobby  
Washington, D.C. 20002-8002  

Re: Comment on Proposed Amendments  

To The Honorable United States Sentencing Commission:  

I write to you, in as brief a form as possible, to express my comments on the proposed amendments in the sentencing guidelines. The fact that I am an assistant federal public defender for approximately 13 years makes me both a well informed and biased source, of which I am sure you are cognizant.

I applaud and encourage the thought and effort made to amend the loss tables and deal with the problem of more "than minimal planning" insofar as it has resulted in disparate treatments and a considerable amount of litigation. With respect to the additional issues for comment in this section, I definitely believe that the loss tables should have fewer and larger ranges in the lower ends. The loss tables at the higher ends are so large as to be beyond my experience and have no opinion as to whether they need adjustment.

Although more work would need to be done, I would encourage the Commission to modify the definition and approach to a more than minimal planning enhancement as opposed to building it into the loss table or, alternatively, building it into the loss table further from the bottom ranges, maintaining the lesser enhancement as long as possible and perhaps adding a third and additional level increase at the far end.

With respect to redefining more than minimal planning, I do have some suggestions:

1. Build in a two level decrease for spur of the moment or sudden temptation conduct;
2. Do not provide for multiple victim enhancement until the number of victims has reached an appreciably large level i.e. 15 or 20 and perhaps make this enhancement an additional one or two levels at an additionally large number such as 40 or 50;

3. Require, by example, truly more than the ordinary conduct to commit the offense before an enhancement is added. Few if any types of fraud or theft escape the current definition.

The proposal with respect to U.S.S.G. § 3B1.2 (role in the offense) is also an improvement. I would suggest option one is the most preferable of the options under Note 7 reading as follows: Option 1 is preferred because it affords the sentencing judge the most flexibility in determining whether or not to apply the two level adjustment for minor role and, unlike option 2, does not repeat the Application Note position contained in Note 8 concerning burden of persuasion.

The firearms amendments are mostly technical and it would be useful for the Commission to have a period where it does not amend the firearms guideline. I do believe that an appropriate differentiation can be made between different weapons including weapons that fall within 26 U.S.C. § 5845 and its various subdivisions. Whether the differentiation should be made by different offense levels, by placement of the sentence within a the guideline range, or by a Commission-guided departure, depends on the weapon involved. It would seem that a fully automatic machine gun is different from a sawed-off shotgun which is different from a sawed-off rifle which is different from other weapons such as tear gas "pen guns," all of which are prohibited in Title 26.

I have no great criticism of the proposed amendment § 3B1.3 abuse of position of special trust or use of special skill. However, perhaps the time has come to separate these two concepts into separate adjustment sections. It would seem to me be best to leave special trust as a Chapter 3 adjustment with appropriate illustrations in the application notes rather than adding it as a specific offense characteristic in a hit or miss fashion to various guidelines relating to fraud or embezzlement or in general to the embezzlement guideline. Certainly the proposed amendment is superior to the additional issue for comment, particularly as it relates to deleting the example regarding "ordinary bank tellers".

The proposal relating to 5K1.1 - issue 24 - will apply to very few cases if it is intended to exclude "crimes of violence" where that concept includes drug offenses. It also has limited usefulness because of the exclusion of anyone who is not a "first offender".
At least it should include all category I offenders and perhaps all category I and category II offenders. The injustice which it is intended to address is not related or necessarily related to whether the defendant is category I or category VI, but the proposal is at least some improvement over the current requirement for a government motion.

I should add with respect to § 5K that I have, as have other attorneys, experienced cases in which this proposed amendment could well have made a difference.

With respect to the proposal number 25 relating to § 6B1.2 the idea is commendable. Perhaps a stronger word than "encourages" should be utilized. I would suggest a policy statement that requires the government to make such the disclosures at either option point and provides as a ground for downward departure the intentional failure of the government to do so. Experiences has taught that toothless platitudes rarely modify prosecutorial behavior in an adversary system.

The Commission should act on issue for comment number 40 relating to the mandatory minimum and distinction between cocaine and cocaine base. Significant support exists not only from the interjection of the Commissions expertise, but also other sectors of the criminal justice system for the elimination of this distinction.

Proposed numbers 44, 45 and 46 are all poor ideas, poor policy, and should not result in favorable action. They would increase unwarranted disparities and would not further the purposes of sentencing indicated by Congress.

Proposal number 57 submitted by the Department of Justice should not be acted upon. It is an attempt to accomplish exactly the opposite of what it purports to do. The Department of Justice obviously intends to utilize its proposed amendment, if it becomes the guideline, as the Commission's position which ought to be followed by the Courts in prohibiting attacks on prior convictions. It is my understanding that the Commission wishes to take no position and allow the courts to develop their own procedures. If the Commission does intend to take a position on this procedural question, it should study the matter, invite additional comment, and it is hoped, ultimately recommended that the courts permit collateral attacks on prior convictions utilized to enhance sentences.
I had promised to make this letter brief. There are many other things I could or should say, but will not. I will say that the last two cycles of amendments have been encouraging insofar as they have addressed problems of harshness and not simply been "fixes" of guidelines which appear to be too low to some other components of the criminal justice system.

Sincerely,

SCOTT F. TILSEN
Assistant Federal Defender

SFT/tmw
March 4, 1993

The Honorable William Wilkins
Chairman
United States Sentencing Commission
One Columbus Circle, N.E.
Suite 2-500, South Lobby
Washington, D.C. 20002-8002

Dear Chairman Wilkins:

On behalf of the more than 12,000 members of the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), we are submitting this comment letter in response to a request for comments that appeared in the December 31, 1992, Federal Register. We have confined our comments to Amendments # 23, 24, 31, 45 and 47.

Amendment # 23 -- Abuse of Position of Trust

It appears the intent of the amendment is to clarify that the Abuse of Position of Trust (Sec. 3B1.3) adjustment should be used only in certain narrow circumstances. As drafted, it is not clear the amendment achieves that goal. We believe the amendment wrongly focuses on the employment sphere to define the process of determining special trust cases. Although there are cases involving defendants who have abused their managerial or professional discretion, there are any number of cases outside the employment realm involving abuse of special trust. For example, sexual abuse of a minor by a "big brother" or "big sister" would clearly violate a special trust as would similar abuse of a parishioner by a clergyman, or a boy scout by his troop leader. None of these examples falls directly within the workplace, yet each plainly implicates relationships of special trust. To use the employment situation as a global explanation of abuse of special trust is, therefore, potentially confusing and could be misleading to a court. As an alternative, we recommend the following.

" ‘Special trust’ refers to a position of public or private trust characterized by substantial discretionary judgment that is ordinarily given considerable deference. Positions of special trust are often within an employment context involving professional or managerial discretion, but may frequently fall outside the employment context. For this section to apply, the position of special trust must have contributed in some substantial way to facilitating the commission or concealment of the offense. This section will apply to a narrow class of
where the trust relationship is special and where breach of that trust is ordinarily met with heightened societal opprobrium."

Amendments # 24, 31 and 47 -- Substantial Assistance to Authorities

Each of these amendments raises the legitimate issue of whether the government should be interposed as a "gatekeeper" between the defendant and the court on questions of fact bearing on sentence administration. At present, the question of whether the defendant has rendered substantial assistance to authorities can be placed before the court if and only if the government so moves. This ground for departure stands alone in requiring a government motion to put the issue before the court.

The NAM believes there is no compelling reason to treat this basis for departure different from all others. Although we are unaware of any empirical evidence suggesting that wrongdoing is occurring to an appreciable degree, the current system holds the potential for abuse. The prosecutor can act arbitrarily and capriciously toward the defendant, and can erect unreasonably high hurdles for agreeing to move for a reduction of sentence. It strikes us that the possibility for abuse is sufficiently great so as not to outweigh any countervailing need to retain the government in the role of "gatekeeper."

It is not sufficient to argue, furthermore, that the exclusive government motion is necessary because the government's testimony is crucial in arriving at a factual determination that the defendant has rendered substantial assistance. Current guidelines provide that "[s]ubstantial weight should be given to the government's evaluation of the extent of the defendant's assistance." Sec. 5K1.1, comment (n.3). There is thus an existing mechanism that assures that departures will occur only in cases where there is sufficient evidence that the defendant has in fact rendered substantial assistance.

To preclude abuse and assure fairness, the court should be permitted in all cases to consider a motion to depart by the defense as well as the government. We therefore believe that either amendment # 31 or 47 will accomplish the goal but that amendment # 24 is overly narrow in its application and would exclude such motions in far too many deserving cases.

Amendment # 45 Multiple Victims

Amendment # 45 would establish a new adjustment based upon the number of persons "affected" by the offense. We oppose its adoption. The language of the amendment is exceedingly and dangerously vague and the amendment introduces a novel concept into sentencing policy that is of questionable wisdom. Is an "affected" party a victim? Can one be "affected" and not be a victim? What is the definition of "affected." Can it entail emotional effects?
Focusing on the consequences of an offense is problematic. Punishment based on unforeseeable outcomes wrongly interjects chance into the criminal justice system and, as a result, undermines the purpose of sentencing guidelines. Cases involving multiple victims are currently, and should continue to be, dealt with by increasing the number of counts leveled against the defendant. See, e.g., Sec. 2N1.1(d)(1)(Tampering With Consumer Products).

We appreciate having the opportunity to comment. If we can be of any assistance in the future, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

James P. Carty
Vice President
Government Regulation
Competition and Small Manufacturing