

FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

ROOM 174, U.S. COURTHOUSE

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55401

PHONE: (612) 348-1755

(FTS) 777-1755

FAX: (612) 348-1419

(FTS) 777-1419

DANIEL M. SCOTT
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER

SCOTT F. TILSEN

KATHERIAN D. ROE

ANDREW H. MOHRING

ANDREA K. GEORGE

ROBERT D. RICHMAN

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.

United States Sentencing Commission
March 10, 1993
Page 4

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

Office of the
FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Reply to: JACKSONVILLE

H. JAY STEVENS
Federal Public Defender

JACKSONVILLE DIVISION	ORLANDO DIVISION	TAMPA DIVISION	FT. MYERS DIVISION
Post Office Box 4998 311 West Monroe St. - Suite 318 Jacksonville, Florida 32201 Telephone 904 232-3039	Federal Building - Suite 417 30 North Hughey Avenue Orlando, Florida 32801-2229 Telephone 407 648-6338	Timberlake Annex, Suite 1000 501 East Polk Street Tampa, Florida 33602-3945 Telephone 813 228-2715	Barnett Centre - Suite 704 2000 Main Street Ft. Myers, Florida 33901 Telephone 813 334-21188

January 2, 1993

Mr. Michael Courlander
Public Information Specialist
United States Sentencing Commission
One Columbus Circle, N.E.
Suite 2-500, South Lobby
Washington, D.C. 20002-8002

Re: Comment on Dec. 31, 1992 Proposed Amendment 61


Dear Mr. Courlander:

Our office represents Mr. Terry Lynn Stinson in Stinson v. United States, Case No. 91-8685, in which certiorari was granted on November 11, 1991. The Stinson case involves the question whether it is a misapplication of the sentencing guidelines for a court to fail to follow the specific direction of current U.S.S.G. §4B1.2, application n.2, that possession of a firearm by a felon is not a "crime of violence." Proposed amendment 61 would reverse the directive which is the subject of Stinson.

The brief on the merits in Stinson is due January 6, 1993 and oral argument before the Supreme Court is set for March, 1993. The action taken by the Sentencing Commission in announcing this proposed amendment at this time obviously creates uncertainty as to the proper disposition of Stinson. We would request that the proposed amendment be withdrawn until the Supreme Court has ruled in Stinson.

Barring that, we would ask permission to present testimony at the scheduled hearing on March 22, 1993 in Washington. We will further written comment no later than March 15, 1993, as required by the announcement in the Federal Register.

Sincerely,


WILLIAM M. KENT
Assistant Federal Public Defender

WMK:wmk