TO: **Hon. Anthony J. Scirica, Chair**
Standing Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure

FROM: **W. Eugene Davis, Chair**
Advisory Committee on Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure

SUBJECT: **Report of the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules**

DATE: **December 2, 1998**

I. Introduction

The Advisory Committee on the Rules of Criminal Procedure met on June 21-22, 1999 in Portland, Oregon and on October 7-8, 1999 in Williamsburg, Virginia and took action on a number of proposed amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure. The Minutes of those meetings are included at Attachment B.

II. Action Item—Summary and Recommendation.

Since February 1999, the Committee has been working on restyling the Rules of Criminal Procedure. Those discussions have taken place at the two full Committee meetings, noted, *supra*, and at a series of subcommittee meetings.

This report addresses the proposed changes to Rules 1 through 31. The rules and the accompanying Committee Notes are at Appendix A. The Committee requests that the amendments to those rules be approved for public comment. The Committee envisions that it will present the remainder, Rules 32 through 60, to the Standing Committee at its June 2000 meeting, with a view to publishing all of the Rules for public comment in August 2000.

Recommendation—The Committee recommends that Criminal Rules 1 to 31 be approved and published for public comment.

III. Restyling Project—In General

In 1998, the Committee was informed that following successful completion of the restyling of the Appellate Rules, the Style Subcommittee of the Standing Committee would prepare an initial draft of proposed style changes to the Criminal Rules, with the first installment being presented in late 1998. Professor Stephen Saltzburg, of George Washington University School of Law served later as a consultant to the Style Subcommittee. The Advisory Committee was formed into two separate subcommittees to review the rules as they were completed by the Style Subcommittee.

The first subcommittee met in Washington, D.C. in March 1999 and presented its draft and recommendations on changes to Rules 1 to 9 to the full Committee at its April 1999 meeting in Washington, D.C. A similar process was used for a special Committee meeting in June 1999 in Portland (where drafts to Rules 10 to 22 were discussed) and again at the Committee's regularly scheduled meeting in Williamsburg in October 1999 (where drafts of Rules 23 to 31 were discussed, along with revisions to the previous drafts). The subcommittees have continued to meet and consider proposed amendments to the rules and the Committee Notes. At this point, the Committee has completed its work on Rules 1 through 31 and intends to complete the remainder of the rules by May 2000.

In conducting the restyling project, the Committee has focused on several key points. First, the Committee has attempted to standardize (where possible) key terms and phrases that appear throughout the rules. *See* Rule 1.

Second, the Committee has attempted to avoid any unforeseen substantive changes and has attempted in the Committee Notes to clearly state where the Committee is making what it considers to be a "substantive" change. Where a real question has arisen as to whether a particular change is substantive in nature, the Committee has identified it as such.

Third, in several rules, the Committee has deleted provisions that it believed were no longer necessary or required, usually because the caselaw has evolved since the rule was initially promulgated (or last amended). Whether those constitute substantive changes is not always clear. *See* Rule 4, where the Committee has deleted the reference to whether hearsay may be used to establish probable cause.

Fourth, during the restyling effort, several rules have been completely reorganized to make them easier to read and apply. *See, e.g.,* Rules 11 and 16 In several others, sections from one rule have been transferred to another rule. *See, e.g.*, Rules 4 and 9.

Fifth, in some rules, major substantive changes have been made. *See, e.g.*, Rules 5 and 10 (use of video teleconferencing). Some of those changes have been under discussion for some time but were deferred pending the restyling projects. Still others were identified and included during the project.

IV. Restyling Project—Proposed Substantive Changes in the Rules.

The following discussion focuses on the Rules that include one or more substantive changes, or changes which the Committee believes are likely to generate some debate.

A. Rule 1. Scope; Definitions.

Rule 1 has been entirely revised. The Committee expanded the Rule by incorporating Rule 54, which deals with application of the Rules and includes key definitions. One of the definitions, "magistrate judge" has been changed and may result in a substantive change in the rules. In the current Rules, there are three different definitions for "magistrate judge;" it includes not only United States Magistrate Judges but also district court judges, court of appeals judges, and Supreme Court Justices. And it includes state and local officers who may be authorized to act in a particular case. The Committee believed that the definition in the revised rules should be limited to United States Magistrate Judges, which reflects the current practice of using Magistrate Judges, especially in preliminary matters. As noted in the Committee Note, however, the definition is not intended to restrict the use of other federal judges to perform those functions.

B. Rule 3. The Complaint: Preference for Federal Judicial Officers.

The amendment to Rule 3 makes one substantive change. Currently, Rule 3 requires the complaint to be sworn before a "magistrate judge," which under current Rule 54 could include a state or local judicial officer. Revised Rule 1 no longer includes state and local officers in the definition of magistrate judges for the purposes of these rules. Instead, the definition includes only "United States Magistrate Judges." Rule 3 requires that the complaint be made before a United States Magistrate Judge or before a state or local officer. The revised rule does, however, make a change to reflect prevailing practice and the outcome desired by the Committee—that the procedure take place before a *federal* judicial officer if one is reasonably available. As noted in Rule 1(c), where the rules, such as Rule 3, authorize a magistrate judge to act, any other federal judge may act.

C. Rule 4. Arrest Warrant or Summons on a Complaint:

1. Discretion to Issue Warrant.

There are several substantive changes in the amendments to Rule 4. The first substantive change is in Rule 4(a), which has been amended to provide an element of discretion in those situations when the defendant fails to respond to a summons. Under the current rule, the judge must in all cases issue an arrest warrant. The revised rule provides discretion to the judge to issue an arrest warrant if the attorney for the government does not request that an arrest warrant be issued for a failure to appear.

2. Preference for Federal Judicial Officers.

The second substantive change reflects a preference that the defendant be brought before a *federal* judicial officer, as noted above in Rule 3.

3. Requirement of Prompt Appearance.

A change that may be viewed as a substantive amendment is located in amended Rule 4(b)(1)(C) which requires that the warrant require that the defendant be brought "promptly" before a judge. The Committee believed that this was a more appropriate standard than the current requirement that the defendant be brought before the "nearest available" magistrate judge. This language accurately reflects the thrust of the original rule—time is of the essence more so than distance and that the defendant should be brought with dispatch before a judicial officer. In *County of Riverside v. McLaughlin*, 500 U.S. 44 (1991), the Supreme Court used both terms interchangeably and the Committee intends no change in practice.

4. Production of Arrest Warrant.

Amended Rule 4(c) (currently Rule 4(d)) includes three substantive changes. The first is current Rule 4(d)(3) which provides that the arresting officer is only required to inform the defendant of the offense charged and that a warrant exists, if the officer does not have a copy of the warrant. As revised, Rule 4(c)(3)(A) requires the arresting officer in all instances to inform the defendant of the offense charged and of the fact that an arrest warrant exists. The new rule continues the current provision that the arresting officer need not have a copy of the warrant but if the defendant requests to see it, the officer must show the warrant to the defendant as soon as possible. The rule does not attempt to define any particular time limits for showing the warrant to the defendant.

5. Serving Summons on Organization.

The second substantive changes is in Rule 4(c)(3)(C), which is taken from former Rule 9(c)(1). That provision specifies the manner of serving a summons on an organization. The Committee believed that Rule 4 was the more appropriate location for general provisions addressing the mechanics of arrest warrants and summons. Revised Rule 9 liberally cross-references the basic provisions appearing in Rule 4. Under the amended rule, in all cases in which a summons is being served on an organization, a copy of the summons must be mailed to the organization. Current Rule 9 provides for service upon a corporation by delivering a copy to an authorized agent or by mailing.

6. Returning an Executed Arrest Warrant.

A change is made in Rule 4(c)(4). Current Rule 4(d)(4) states that an unexecuted warrant must be returned to the judicial officer or judge who issued it. Amended Rule 4(c)(4)(A) provides that after a warrant is executed, the officer must return it to the judge before whom the defendant will appear under Rule 5. At the government's request, however, an unexecuted warrant may be returned and canceled by any magistrate judge. The change recognizes the possibility that at the time the warrant is returned, the judicial officer who issued the warrant may not be available.

D. Rule 5. Initial Appearance.

1. Prompt Appearance.

Several changes have been made in Rule 5(a), which governs initial appearances by an arrested defendant before a magistrate judge. The first is a clarifying change (which might be viewed as a substantive change). Revised Rule 5(a)(1) provides that a person making the arrest must bring the defendant "promptly" before a magistrate judge, instead of the current reference to "nearest available" magistrate. This language parallels changes in Rule 4 and reflects the view that time is of the essence.

2. Preference for Federal Judicial Officer.

The amended rule contains a substantive change in that it reflects the stated preference (as in other provisions throughout the rules) that the defendant be brought before a federal judicial officer. Only if a magistrate judge is not available should the defendant be taken before a state or local officer.

3. Video Teleconferencing.

The final substantive change is in new Rule 5(d), which permits video teleconferencing for an appearance under this rule—if the defendant consents. This change reflects the growing practice among state courts to use video teleconferencing to conduct initial proceedings. A similar amendment has been made to Rule 10 concerning arraignments. In amending Rules 5, 10, and 43 (which generally requires the defendant's presence at all proceedings), the Committee was very much aware of the argument that permitting a defendant to appear by video teleconferencing might be considered an erosion of an important element of the judicial process. The Committee nonetheless believed that in appropriate circumstances the court and the defendant should have the option of using video teleconferencing, as long as the defendant consents to that procedure. The question of when it would be appropriate for a defendant to consent is not spelled out in the rule. That is left to the defendant and the court in each case. Nor does the rule specify any particular technical requirements for the video conferencing system to be used.

E. Rule 5.1. Preliminary Hearing in a Felony Case: Authority of Magistrate Judge to Grant Continuance.

Rule 5.1(c) contains a substantive change that creates a conflict between the rule and a federal statute—18 U.S.C. § 3060(c). At its April 1997 meeting, the Committee considered a proposed amendment to Rule 5(c) which would permit magistrate judges to grant continuances where the defendant objects. The original proposal originated in the Federal Magistrate Judges Association, which pointed out that under the current version of Rule 5(c), during an initial appearance before a magistrate judge, that judge is not authorized to grant a continuance over an objection by the defendant; that authority rests only in a federal district judge. The Committee decided to recommend to the Standing Committee that it first propose legislative changes to § 3060(c). The Standing Committee, however, believed it more appropriate to for the Advisory Committee to propose a change to Rule 5(c) through the Rules Enabling Act and remanded the issue to the Advisory Committee. At its October 1997 meeting, the Committee considered the issue and decided not to pursue the issue any further, and reported that position to the Standing Committee at its January 1998 meeting.

The matter was presented to the Judicial Conference during its Spring 1998 meeting. In its summary of actions, the Conference remanded the issue to the Advisory Committee with:

> "instructions to the Rules Committee to propose an amendment to Criminal Rule 5(c) consistent with the amendment 18 U.S.C. § 3060 which has been proposed by the Magistrate Judges Committee."

At its April 1998 meeting, the Advisory Committee reconsidered the proposed amendment and voted unanimously to approve the amendment but not to seek publication of the amendment. The Standing Committee agreed to that position at its June 1998 meeting. The proposal is now a part of the proposed amendments to Rule 5.

The revised rule includes language that expands the authority of a United States Magistrate Judge to grant a continuance for a preliminary hearing conducted under the rule. Currently, the rule authorizes a magistrate judge to grant a continuance only in those cases in which the defendant has consented to the continuance. If the defendant does not consent, then the government must present the matter to a district court judge, usually on the same day. As noted above, the proposed amendment conflicts with 18 U.S.C. § 3060, which tracks the original language of the rule and permits only district court judges to grant continuances when the defendant objects. The Committee believes that this restriction is an anomaly. The Committee also believes that the change will promote judicial economy and that it is entirely appropriate to seek this change to the rule through the Rules Enabling Act procedures. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2072(b). Under those procedures, approval by Congress of this rule change would supersede the parallel provisions in 18 U.S.C. § 3060.

F. Rule 6. The Grand Jury:

1. Challenges to Grand Jurors Before Oath Given.

The first substantive change to Rule 6 is in (b)(1). The last sentence of current Rule 6(b)(1) provides that "Challenges shall be made before the administration of the oath to the jurors and shall be tried by the court." The Committee has deleted that language from the amended rule. The remainder of this subdivision rests on the assumption that formal proceedings have begun against a person, i.e. an indictment has been returned. The Committee believed that although the first sentence reflects current practice that permits a defendant to challenge the composition or qualifications of the grand jurors after the indictment is returned, the second sentence does not comport with modern practice. In other words, a defendant will normally not know the composition or identity of the grand jurors before they are administered their oath. Thus, there is no opportunity to challenge them and have the court decide the issue before the oath is given.

2. Disclosure to Armed Forces Personnel.

Rule 6(e)(3)(D)(iv) is a new substantive provision that addresses disclosure of grand jury information to armed forces personnel where the disclosure is for the purpose of enforcing military criminal law under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. §§ 801-946. Although this issue is not likely to arise with great frequency, existing agreements between the military and the Department of Justice recognize the need for

coordinated investigation and prosecution of federal crimes that may involve military personnel. *See, e.g.,* Department of Defense Directive 5525.7 (January 22, 1985); 1984 Memorandum of Understanding Between Department of Justice and Department of Justice; Memorandum of Understanding Between the Departments of Justice and Transportation (Coast Guard) Relating to the Investigations and Prosecution of Crimes Over Which the Two Departments Have Concurrent Jurisdiction (October 9, 1967).

G. Rule 7. The Indictment and the Information: Deletion of Hard Labor.

There is a potential substantive change in Rule 7 to the extent that the Committee has deleted the references to "hard labor" in the rule. This punishment is no longer found in current federal statutes.

H. Rule 9. Arrest Warrant or Summons on an Indictment or Information:

1. Discretion to Issue Arrest Warrant.

Rule 9(a) has been amended to permit a judge discretion whether to issue an arrest warrant when a defendant fails to respond to a summons on a complaint. Under the current rule, if the defendant fails to appear, the judge *must* issue a warrant. Under the amended version, if the defendant fails to appear and the government requests that a warrant be issued, the judge must issue one. In the absence of such a request, the judge has the discretion whether to do so. This change mirrors language in amended Rule 4(a).

2. Setting Bail on Warrant.

Another substantive amendment has been made in Rule 9(b)(1), which has been amended to delete language permitting the court to set the amount of bail on the warrant. The Committee believes that this language is inconsistent with the 1984 Bail Reform Act. *See United States v. Thomas*, 992 F. Supp. 782 (D. Virgin Islands 1998) (bail amount endorsed on warrant that has not been determined in proceedings conducted under Bail Reform Act has no bearing on decision by judge conducting Rule 40 hearing).

I. Rule 10. Arraignment.

1. Waiver of Presence for Arraignment.

The proposed amendments to Rule 10 create two exceptions to the requirement that the defendant must be personally present in court for an arraignment. The first provides that the court may hold an arraignment in the defendant's absence when the

defendant has waived the right to be present in writing and the court consents to that waiver and the second permits the court to hold arraignments by video teleconferencing. A conforming amendment will also be made to Rule 43, which will be presented to the Standing Committee at its June 2000 meeting.

Although the Committee considered the traditional objections to permitting a defendant to waive a personal appearance, the Committee nonetheless believed that in appropriate circumstances the court, and the defendant, should have the option of conducting the arraignment in the defendant's absence —a procedure used in some state courts. The question of when it would be appropriate for a defendant to waive an appearance is not spelled out in the rule; that decision is left to the defendant and the court. Under the amendment, the defendant must give his or her consent in writing and it must be signed by both the defendant and the defendant's attorney. Finally, the amendment requires that the waiver specifically state that the defendant has received a copy of the charging instrument.

The amendment does not permit waiver of an appearance when the defendant is charged with a felony information. In that instance, the defendant is required by Rule 7(b) to be present in court to waive the indictment. Nor does the amendment permit a waiver of appearance when the defendant is standing mute, or entering a conditional plea, a nolo contendere plea, or a guilty plea. In each of those instances the Committee believed that it was more appropriate for the defendant to appear personally.

The amendment does not permit the defendant to waive the arraignment itself, which may be a triggering mechanism for other rules.

2. Video Teleconferencing for Arraignments.

Rule 10(c) addresses the second substantive change in the rule. That rule would permit the court to conduct arraignments through video teleconferencing. Although the practice is now used in state courts and in some federal courts, Rules 10 and 43 have generally prevented federal courts from using that method for arraignments in criminal cases. *See, e.g., Valenzuela-Gonzales v. United States*, 915 F.2d 1276, 1280 (9th Cir. 1990)(Rules 10 and 43 require personal appearance; thus, pilot program for video teleconferencing not permitted). A similar amendment was proposed by the Committee in 1993 and published for public comment. The amendment was later withdrawn from consideration in order to consider the results of several planned pilot programs for civil cases. Upon further consideration, the Committee believed that the benefits of using video teleconferencing outweighed the costs of doing so. This amendment also parallels a proposed change Rule 5.1(d) that would permit initial appearances to be conducted by video teleconferencing.

In deciding to adopt the amendment, the Committee was persuaded in part by the fact that some districts deal with a very high volume of arraignments of defendants who

are in custody and because of the distances involved, must be transported long distances. That procedure can present security risks to law enforcement and court personnel.

The amendment gives the courts the discretion to decide first, whether to permit video arraignments, and second, what the procedures should be. The Committee was satisfied that the technology has progressed to the point that video teleconferencing can satisfactorily address the concerns raised in the past about the ability of the court and the defendant to see each other and for the defendant and counsel to be in contact with each other.

Unlike the waiver for any appearance whatsoever at an arraignment, noted above, this particular provision would not require that the waiver for video teleconferencing be in writing. Nor does it require that the defendant waive that appearance in person, in open court.

J. Rule 11. Pleas:

1. Advice to Defendant.

Amended Rule 11(b)(1) requires the court to apprise the defendant of his or her rights before accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere. The list is generally the same as that in the current rule except that the reference to parole has been removed and the judge is now required under Rule 11(b)(1)(H) to advise the defendant of the possibility of a fine and special assessment as a part of a maximum possible sentence. Also, the list has been re-ordered.

2. Agreement Not to Bring Charges.

Rule 11(c)(1)(A) includes a substantive change which recognizes a common type of plea agreement —that the government will "not bring" other charges.

K. Rule 12. Pleadings and Pretrial Motions: Deletion of Reference to Local Rules.

Rule 12(c) includes a substantive change. Currently, the rule provides that unless a local rule states otherwise, the court may at the time of the arraignment set deadlines for motions or requests. The Committee has deleted the reference to the "local rule" exception to make it clear that judges should be encouraged to set deadlines for motions. The Committee believed that doing so promotes more efficient case management, especially when there is a heavy docket of pending cases. Although the rule permits some discretion in setting a date for motion hearings, the Committee believed that doing so at an early point in the proceedings would also promote judicial economy.

L. Rule 12.1. Notice of Alibi Defense: Phone Numbers of Alibi Witnesses.

Amended Rule 12.1 includes a new requirement that in providing the names and addresses of alibi and any rebuttal witnesses, the parties must also provide the phone numbers of those witnesses. *See* Rule 12.1(a)(2), Rule 12.1(b)(1), and Rule 12.1(c). The Committee believed that requiring such information would facilitate the ability of counsel to locate and interview those alibi witnesses.

M. Rule 12.2. Notice of Insanity Defense; Mental Examination.

Current Rule 12.2, which addresses the notice requirements for presenting an insanity defense or evidence of mental condition on the merits, has been amended in several respects. As amended, the Rule now addresses the issue of a defendant presenting evidence of his mental condition at a capital sentencing proceeding.

1. Defendant's Notice Requirement.

Under current Rule 12.2(b), a defendant who intends to offer expert testimony on the issue of his or her mental condition on the question of guilt must provide a pretrial notice of that intent. The amendment extends that notice requirement to a defendant who intends to offer expert evidence, testimonial or otherwise, on his or her mental condition during a capital sentencing proceeding. The amendment adopts the view, as several courts have recognized, that the better practice is to require pretrial notice of that intent so that any mental examinations can be conducted without unnecessarily delaying capital sentencing proceedings.

2. Authority to Order Mental Examination of Defendant.

A change to Rule 12.2(c) clarifies the authority of the court to order mental examinations for a defendant. As currently written, the subdivision implies that the trial court has discretion to grant a government motion for a mental examination of a defendant who has indicated under Rule 12.2(a) an intent to raise the defense of insanity. But the corresponding statute, 18 U.S.C. § 4242, requires the court to order an examination if the defendant has provided notice of an intent to raise that defense and the government moves for the examination; the amendment conforms Rule 12.2(c) to the statute. Any examination conducted on the issue of the insanity defense would be conducted in accordance with the procedures set out in the statutory provision.

Although the authority of a trial court to order a mental examination of a defendant who has registered an intent to raise the insanity defense seems clear, the authority under the Rule to order an examination of a defendant who intends only to

present expert testimony on his or her mental condition on the issue of guilt is not as clear. Some courts have concluded that a court may order such an examination. In *United States v. Davis*, 93 F.3d 1286 (6th Cir. 1996), however, the court in a detailed analysis of the issue held that the district court lacked the authority under the rule to order a mental examination of a defendant who had provided notice of an intent to offer evidence on a defense of diminished capacity. The court concluded, however, that the trial court had the inherent authority to order such an examination.

The amendment clarifies that the authority of a court to order a mental examination under Rule 12.2(c) extends to those cases when the defendant has provided notice, under Rule 12.2(b), of an intent to present expert testimony on the defendant's mental condition, either on the merits or at capital sentencing. *See, e.g., United States v. Hall*, 152 F.3d 381 (5th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 119 S. Ct. 1767 (1999).

The amendment to Rule 12.2(c) is not intended to affect any statutory or inherent authority a court may have to order other mental examinations.

3. Disclosure of Results of Mental Examination on Defendant; Reciprocal Disclosure.

The issue of when the results of an examination ordered under Rule 12.2(b)(2) may, or must, be disclosed are addressed in revised Rule 12.2(c)(2). The Supreme Court has recognized that use of a defendant's statements during a court-ordered examination may compromise the defendant's right against self-incrimination. *See Estelle v. Smith*, 451 U.S. 454 (1981) (defendant's privilege against self-incrimination violated when he was not advised of right to remain silent during court-ordered examination and prosecution introduced statements during capital sentencing hearing). But subsequent cases have indicated that the defendant waives the privilege if the defendant introduces expert testimony on his or her mental condition. That view is reflected in Rule 12.2(c) which indicates that the statements of the defendant may be used against the defendant only after the defendant has introduced testimony on his or her mental condition. What the current rule does not address is if, and to what extent, the prosecution may see the results of the examination, which may include the defendant's statements, when evidence of the defendant's mental condition is being presented solely at a capital sentencing proceeding.

The proposed change in Rule 12.2(c)(2) adopts the procedure used by some courts to seal or otherwise insulate the results of the examination until it is clear that the defendant will introduce expert evidence about his or her mental condition at a capital sentencing hearing; i.e., after a verdict of guilty on one or more capital crimes, and a reaffirmation by the defendant of an intent to introduce expert mental-condition evidence in the sentencing phase. Most courts that have addressed the issue have recognized that if the government obtains early access to the accused's statements, it will be required to show that it has not made any derivative use of that evidence.

Except as noted in Rule 12.2(c)(3), the rule does not address the time for disclosing results and reports of any expert examination conducted by the defendant. New Rule 12.2(c)(3) provides that upon disclosure under subdivision (c)(2) of the results and reports of the government's examination, disclosure of the results and reports of the defendant's expert examination is mandatory, if the defendant intends to introduce expert evidence relating to the examination.

4. Introduction of Defendant's Statements.

Rule 12.2(c), as previously written, restricted admissibility of the defendant's statements during the course of an examination conducted under the rule to an issue respecting mental condition on which the defendant "has introduced testimony" — expert or otherwise. As amended, Rule 12.2(c)(4) provides that the admissibility of such evidence in a capital sentencing proceeding is triggered only by the defendant's introduction of expert evidence. The Committee believed that, in this context, it was appropriate to limit the government's ability to use the results of its expert mental examination to instances in which the defendant has first introduced expert evidence on the issue.

5. Sanctions.

Rule 12.2(d) has been amended to extend sanctions for failure to comply with the rule to the penalty phase of a capital case. The selection of an appropriate remedy for the failure of a defendant to provide notice or submit to an examination under subdivisions (b) and (c) is with the court's discretion.

M. Rule 12.3. Notice of Public Authority Defense: Telephone Numbers for Witnesses.

Substantive changes have been made in Rule 12.3(a)(4) and 12.3(b). As in Rule 12.1, the Committee decided to include in the restyled rule the requirement that the parties provide the telephone numbers of any witnesses disclosed under the rule.

N. Rule 15. Depositions.

1. Producing "Data."

In Rule 15(a), the list of materials to be produced has been amended to include the broader term "data" to reflect the fact that in an increasingly technological culture, the information in question may exist in a format not already covered by the more conventional list, such as a book or document.

2. Payment of Expenses.

Rule 15(d), which addresses the payment of expenses incurred by the defendant and the defendant's attorney, has been changed. Under the current rule, if the government requests the deposition, or if the defendant requests the deposition and is unable to pay for it, the court *may* direct the government to pay for travel and subsistence expenses for both the defendant and the defendant's attorney. In either case, the current rule requires the government to pay for the transcript. Under the amended rule, if the deposition was requested by the government, the court *must* require the government to pay subsistence and travel expenses and the cost of the deposition transcript. If the defendant is unable to pay the deposition expenses, the court *must* order the government to pay subsistence, travel, and the deposition transcript costs—regardless of who requested the deposition.

O. Rule 16. Discovery and Inspection: Information Being Used.

Amended Rule 16(b)(1)(B) includes a change that may be substantive in nature. Rule 16(a)(1)(E) and 16(a)(1)(F) require production of specified information if the government intends to "use" the information "in its case-in-chief at trial." The Committee believed that the language in revised Rule 16(b)(1)(B), which deals with a defendant's disclosure of information to the government, should track the similar language in revised Rule 16(a)(1). In Rule 16(b)(1)(B)(ii), the Committee changed the current provision which reads: "the defendant intends to *introduce* as evidence" to the "defendant intends to *use* . . ." The Committee recognized that this might constitute a substantive change in the rule but believed that it was a necessary conforming change with the provisions in 16(a)(1)(E) and (F), noted *supra*, regarding use of evidence by the government.

P. Rule 17. Subpoena: Producing "Data."

A potential substantive change has been made in Rule 17(c)(1); the word "data" has been added to the list of matters that may be subpoenaed. The Committee believed that inserting that term will reflect the fact that in an increasingly technological culture, the information may exist in a format not already covered by the more conventional list, such as a book or document. A similar change has been made in Rule 15, noted above.

Q. Rule 24. Trial Jurors: Number of Peremptory Challenges.

Rule 24(b) contains a substantive amendment. For a number of years the Advisory Committee has discussed possible amendments to Rule 24(b) that would

equalize the number of peremptory challenges. In 1990, the Advisory Committee proposed an amendment to Rule 24(b) which would have equalized the number of peremptory challenges—six apiece—for the prosecution and the defense by reducing the number of challenges available to the defense by four. The proposed amendment was approved by the Standing Committee for public comment but when it reviewed the proposal again in February 1991 following that comment period, it rejected the amendment. Until 1998, there was no serious attempt to revisit the issue by either the Advisory Committee or Standing Committee. The Standing Committee's rejection of the proposal in 1991 has generally been used by the Administrate Office and Judicial Conference to convince Congress not to amend Rule 24(b).

Nonetheless, in 1998 the Committee believed that in light of persistent proposals to legislatively amend Rule 24(b) it would be appropriate to revisit the issue. In June 1998, the Standing Committee approved in principle a proposed amendment to Rule 24(b) that would equalize the number of challenges. The amendment tracked the legislative proposal in § 501, Senate Bill 3 (*Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1997*). The change was not published for comment, with the understanding that it could be included in the restyling project.

Accordingly, revised Rule 24(b) equalizes the number of peremptory challenges normally available to the prosecution and the defense in a felony case. Under the amendment, the number of challenges available to the defendant remain the same, ten challenges, and those available to the prosecution's are increased by four. The number of peremptory challenges in capital and misdemeanor cases remain unchanged.

Finally, the rule authorizes the court in multi-defendant cases to grant additional peremptory challenges to the defendants. If the court does so, the prosecution may request additional challenges in a multi-defendant case, not to exceed the total number available to the defendants jointly. But the court is not required in that case to equalize the number of challenges.

R. Rule 26. Taking Testimony: Remote Transmission of Testimony.

A substantive change has been made to Rule 26(b). That amendment permits a court to receive the video transmission of an absent witness if certain conditions are met. Current Rule 26 indicates that normally only testimony given orally in open court will be considered, unless otherwise provided by these rules, an Act of Congress, or any other rule adopted by the Supreme Court. For example, Rule 15 recognizes that depositions, in conjunction with Federal Rule of Evidence 804, may be used to preserve and present testimony if there are exceptional circumstances in the case and it is in the interest of justice to do so.

The revision to Rule 26(b) extends the logic underlying that exception to contemporaneous video testimony of an unavailable witness. The amendment generally parallels a similar provision in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 43.

The Committee believed that permitting use of video transmission of testimony only in those instances when deposition testimony could be used is appropriate. Under the amendment, the proponent of the testimony must establish that there are exceptional circumstances for such transmission. A party against whom a deposition may be introduced at trial will normally have no basis for objecting if contemporaneous testimony is used instead.

The amendment recognizes that there is a need for the trial court to impose appropriate safeguards and procedures to insure the accuracy and quality of the transmission, the ability of the jurors to hear and view the testimony, and the ability of the judge, counsel, and the witness to hear and understand each other during questioning. Deciding what safeguards are appropriate is left to the sound discretion of the trial court.

Finally, the Committee recognized that there might be Confrontation Clause problems but believed that including the requirement of "unavailability" as that term is defined in Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a) will insure that those rights are not infringed. of the witness. *See United States v. Gigante*, *supra* (use of remote transmission of unavailable witness' testimony did not violate confrontation clause).

S. Rule 26.2. Producing a Witness's Statement: Preservation of Statement.

Current Rule 26.2(c) states that if the court withholds a portion of a statement, over the defendant's objection, "the attorney for the government" must preserve the statement. The Committee believed that the better rule would be for the court to simply seal the entire statement as a part of the record, in the event that there is an appeal.

T. Rule 29. Motion for Judgment of Acquittal: Timing of Motion.

A change has been made in Rule 29(c)(1), which addresses the issue of the timing of a motion for acquittal. The amended rule now includes language that the motion must be made within 7 days after a guilty verdict or after the judge discharges the jury, "whichever is later." That change reflects the fact that in a capital case or in case involving criminal forfeiture, for example, the jury may not be discharged until it has completed its sentencing duties.

VI. Restyling Project —Nonsubstantive, Style, Changes.

Every rule included in this package includes what the Committee believes to be nonsubstantive, style, changes. Because the accompanying Committee Notes address those changes, they are not separately discussed in this Report.

VII. Information Items

A. Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Proceedings.

For the last several meetings, the Committee has considered proposed amendments to the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Proceedings. The Committee may have a package of amendments ready for consideration by the Standing Committee at its June 2000 meeting.

B. Rules Governing Attorney Conduct.

At the Committee's meeting in Williamsburg, Virginia in October 1999, Judge Scirica informed the Committee of the latest developments of the proposed rules governing attorney conduct. He noted that at this point, there might be a consensus that if any rules are to be adopted, it would be better to proceed with a single rule, applicable to all proceedings, both trial and appellate. Following some discussion of the issue, there was a consensus that that approach would be appropriate.

C. Rules Governing Electronic Filing.

The Committee is also aware of pending amendments in Civil Rules 5, 6, and 77 concerning electronic filing. Because the Criminal Rules apply the Civil Rules regarding the filing papers and pleadings, *see* Criminal Rule 49, the Criminal Rules Committee is inclined, for now, to let that Committee proceed and not propose any amendments on that issue.

D. Rules Governing Financial Disclosure.

The Committee is aware that there is growing interest in devising a rule that insures that a judge does not inadvertently sit on a case where he or she has a financial interest. Specifically, the Committee understands that the Code of Conduct Committee is addressing the issue and that the current plan is to circulate a proposed Appellate Rule 26.1 as a possible model.

At its recent meeting, the Committee discussed the problems that might arise in the context of a criminal trial. Several members raised the question of whether a judge might be disqualified in a criminal case if he or she has a financial interest in a business entity that is the victim in the case. The Committee ultimately voted to recommend that the appropriate committees address the problem of financial disclosure vis a vis victims in criminal cases.

Attachments:

A. Proposed Amendments to Criminal Rules 1 - 31.
B. Minutes of June 1999 and October 1999 Meetings

Report to Standing Committee
Criminal Rules Committee
December 1999

EXHIBIT A

RULES 1 - 31

PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF PROPOSED REVISION

OF THE

FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

USING

GUIDELINES FOR DRAFTING AND EDITING COURT RULES

DECEMBER 7, 1999

I. SCOPE, PURPOSE, AND CONSTRUCTION	**Title I. Applicability of Rules**
	Rule 1. Scope; Definitions
Rule 1. Scope These rules govern the procedure in all criminal proceedings in the courts of the United States, as provided in Rule 54(a); and, whenever specifically provided in one of the rules, to preliminary, supplementary, and special proceedings before United States magistrate judges and at proceedings before state and local judicial officers. **Rule 54. Application and Exception** (a) **Courts**. These rules apply to all criminal proceedings in the United States District Courts; in the District of Guam; in the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, except as otherwise provided in articles IV and V of the covenant provided by the Act of March 24, 1976 (90 Stat. 263); in the District Court of the Virgin Islands; and (except as otherwise provided in the Canal Zone) in the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; in the United States Courts of Appeals; and in the Supreme Court of the United States; except that the prosecution of offenses in the District Court of the Virgin Islands shall be by indictment or information as otherwise provided by law.	**(a) Scope.** **(1)** ***In General.*** These rules govern the procedure in all criminal proceedings in the United States District Courts, United States Courts of Appeals, and the Supreme Court of the United States. **(2)** ***State or Local Judicial Officer.*** When a rule so states, it applies to a proceeding before a state or local judicial officer. **(3)** ***Territorial Courts.*** These rules also govern the procedure in criminal proceedings in the following courts: (A) the district court of Guam; (B) the district court for the Northern Mariana Islands, except as otherwise provided by law; and (C) the district court of the Virgin Islands, except that the prosecution of offenses in that court must be by indictment or information as otherwise provided by law.

(b) PROCEEDINGS (Rule 54 continued) **(1) Removed Proceedings.** These rules apply to criminal prosecutions removed to the United States district courts from state courts and govern all procedure after removal, except that dismissal by the attorney for the prosecution shall be governed by state law. **(2) Offenses Outside a District or State.** These rules apply to proceedings for offenses committed upon the high seas or elsewhere out of the jurisdiction of any particular state or district, except that such proceedings may be had in any district authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3238. **(3) Peace Bonds.** These rules do not alter the power of judges of the United States or of United States magistrate judges to hold security of the peace and for good behavior under Revised Statutes, § 4069, 50 U.S.C. § 23, but in such cases the procedure shall conform to these rules so far as they are applicable. **(4) Proceedings Before United States Magistrate Judges.** Proceedings involving misdemeanors and other petty offenses are governed by Rule 58.	**(4)** ***Removed Proceedings.*** Although these rules govern all proceedings after removal from a state court, state law governs a dismissal by the prosecution.
(5) Other Proceedings. These rules are not applicable to extradition and rendition of fugitives; civil forfeiture of property for violation of a statute of the United States; or the collection of fines and penalties. Except as provided in Rule 20(d) they do not apply to proceedings under 18 U.S.C. Chapter 403 — Juvenile Delinquency — so far as they are inconsistent with that chapter. They do not apply to summary trials for offenses against the navigation laws under Revised Statutes §§ 4300-4305, 33 U.S.C. §§ 391-396, or to proceedings involving disputes between seamen under Revised Statutes §§ 4079-4081, as amended, 22 U.S.C. §§ 256-258, or to proceedings for fishery offenses under the Act of June 28, 1937, c. 392, 50 Stat. 325-327, 16 U.S.C. §§ 772-772i, or to proceedings against a witness in a foreign country under 28 U.S.C. § 1784.	**(5)** ***Excluded Proceedings.*** Proceedings not governed by these rules include: (A) the extradition and rendition of a fugitive; (B) a civil property forfeiture for the violation of a federal statute; (C) the collection of a fine or penalty; (D) a proceeding under a statute governing juvenile delinquency to the extent the procedure is inconsistent with the statute, unless Rule 20(d) provides otherwise; and (E) a dispute between seamen under 22 U.S.C. §§ 256–58.

(c) Application of Terms. (Rule 54 continued) As used in these rules the following terms have the designated meanings. "Act of Congress" includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in force in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, in Puerto Rico, in a territory or in any insular possession. "Attorney for the government" means the Attorney General, an authorized assistant of the Attorney General, a United States Attorney, an authorized assistant of a United States Attorney, when applicable to cases arising under the laws of Guam the Attorney General of Guam or such other person or persons as may be authorized by the laws of Guam to act therein, and when applicable to cases arising under the laws of the Northern Mariana Islands the Attorney General of the Northern Mariana Islands or any other person or persons as may be authorized by the laws of the Northern Marianas to act therein. "Civil action" refers to a civil action in a district court. The words "demurrer," "motion to quash," "plea in abatement," "plea in bar" and "special plea in bar," or words to the same effect, in any act of Congress shall be construed to mean the motion raising a defense or objection provided in Rule 12. "District court" includes all district courts named in subdivision (a) of this rule.	**(b) Definitions.** The following definitions apply to these rules: **(1)** "Attorney for the government" means: (A) the Attorney General, or an authorized assistant; (B) a United States attorney, or an authorized assistant; (C) when applicable to cases arising under Guam law, the Guam Attorney General or other person whom Guam law authorizes to act in the matter; and (D) any other attorney authorized by law to conduct proceedings under these rules as a prosecutor.
"Federal magistrate judge" means a United States magistrate judge as defined in 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-639, a judge of the United States or another judge or judicial officer specifically empowered by statute in force in any territory or possession, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, to perform a function to which a particular rule relates. "Judge of the United States" includes a judge of the district court, court of appeals, or the Supreme Court. "Law" includes statutes and judicial decisions. "Magistrate judge" includes a United States magistrate judge as defined in 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-639, a judge of the United States, another judge or judicial officer specifically empowered by statute in force in any territory or possession, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or the District of Columbia, to perform a function to which a particular rule relates, and a state or local judicial officer, authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3041 to perform the functions prescribed in Rules 3, 4, and 5.	**(2)** "Court" means a federal judge performing functions authorized by law. **(3)** "Federal judge" means **[Study further possibility of deletion or incorporation into Rule 1(c)]**: (A) a justice or judge of the United States as these terms defined in 28 U.S.C. § 451; (B) a magistrate judge; or (C) a judge confirmed by the United States Senate and empowered by statute in any commonwealth, territory, or possession to perform a function to which a particular rule relates. **(4)** "Judge" means a federal judge or a state or local judicial officer. **(5)** "Magistrate Judge" means a United States magistrate judge as defined in 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-39.

"Oath" includes affirmations. "Petty offense" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 19. "State" includes District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, territory and insular possession. "United States magistrate judge" means the officer authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 631-639.	**(6)** "Oath" includes an affirmation. **(7)** "Organization" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 18. **(8)** "Petty offense" is defined in 18 U.S.C. § 19. **(9)** "State" includes the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States. **(10)** "State or local judicial officer" means: (A) a state or local officer authorized to act under 18 U.S.C. § 3041; and (B) a judicial officer specifically empowered by statute in force in the District of Columbia or in any commonwealth, territory, or possession, to perform a function to which a particular rule relates. **(c) Authority of Justices and Judges of the United States.** When these rules authorize a magistrate judge to act, any other federal judge may also act.

Committee Notes
Rule 1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

Rule 1 is entirely revised and expanded to incorporate Rule 54 which deals with the application of the rules. Consistent with the title of the existing rule, the Committee believed that a statement of the scope of the rules should be placed at the beginning to show readers which proceedings are governed by these rules. The Committee also revised the rule to incorporate the definitions found in Rule 54(c) as a new Rule 1(b).

Rule 1(a) now contains language from Rule 54(b). But language in current Rule 54(b)(2)-(4) has been deleted for several reasons: First, Rule 54(b)(2) refers to a venue statute that governs an offense committed on the high seas or somewhere outside the jurisdiction of a particular district; it is unnecessary and has been deleted because once venue has been established, the Rules of Criminal Procedure automatically apply. Second, Rule 54(b)(3) currently deals with peace bonds; that provision is inconsistent with the governing statute and has therefore been deleted. Finally, Rule 54(b)(4) references proceedings conducted before United States Magistrate Judges, a topic now covered in Rule 58.

Rule 1(a)(5) consists of material currently located in Rule 54(b)(5), with the exception of the references to fishery offenses and to proceedings against a witness in a foreign country. Those provisions were considered obsolete. But if those proceedings were to arise, they would be governed by the Rules of Criminal Procedure.

Rule 1(b) is composed of material currently located in Rule 54(c), with several exceptions. First, the reference to an "Act of Congress" has been replaced with the term "federal statute." Second, the language concerning demurrers, pleas in abatement, etc. has been deleted as being anachronistic. Third, the definitions of "civil action" and "district court" have been deleted. Fourth, the term "attorney for the government" has been expanded to include reference to those attorneys who may serve as special or independent counsel under applicable federal statutes.

Fifth, the Committee added a definition for the term "court" in Rule 1(b)(1). Although that term originally was almost always synonymous with the term "district judge," the term might be misleading or unduly narrow because it may not cover the many functions performed by magistrate judges. *See generally* 28 U.S.C. §§ 132, 636. Additionally, the term does not cover Circuit judges who may be authorized to hold a district court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 291. The proposed definition continues the traditional view that "court" means district judge, but also

reflects the current understanding that magistrate judges act as the "court" in many proceedings.

Sixth, the term "Judge of the United States" has been replaced with the term "Federal Judge." That term includes, as noted in Rule 1(b)(3)(C), federal judges other than Article III judges who may be authorized by statute to perform a particular act specified in the Rules of Criminal Procedure. Seventh, the definition of "Law" has been deleted as being superfluous and possibly misleading because it suggests that administrative regulations are excluded.

Eighth, the current rules include three definitions of "magistrate judge." The term used in amended Rule 1(b)(5) is limited to United States Magistrate Judges. In the current rules the term magistrate judge includes not only United States Magistrate Judges, but also district court judges, court of appeals judges, Supreme Court Justices, and where authorized, state and local officers. The Committee believed that the rules should reflect current practice, i.e. the wider and almost exclusive use of United States Magistrate Judges, especially in preliminary matters. The definition, however, is not intended to restrict the use of other federal judicial officers to perform those functions. Thus, Rule 1(c) has been added to make it clear that where the rules authorize a magistrate judge to act, any other federal judge or justice may act.

Finally, the term "organization" has been added to the list of definitions.

The remainder of the rule has been amended as part of the general restyling of the rules to make them more easily understood. In addition to changes made to improve the clarity, the Committee has changed language to make style and terminology consistent throughout the Criminal Rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 2. Purpose and Construction	Rule 2. Interpretation
These rules are intended to provide for the just determination of every criminal proceeding. They shall be construed to secure simplicity in procedure, fairness in administration and the elimination of unjustifiable expense and delay.	These rules are to be interpreted to provide for the just determination of every criminal proceeding, to secure simplicity in procedure and fairness in administration, and to eliminate unjustifiable expense and delay.

Committee Notes
Rule 2
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 2 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic. No substantive change is intended.

In particular, Rule 2 has been amended to clarify the purpose of the Rules of Criminal Procedure. The words "are intended" have been changed to read "are to be interpreted." The Committee believed that was the original intent of the drafters and more accurately reflects the purpose of the rules.

II. PRELIMINARY PROCEEDINGS	**Title II. Preliminary Proceedings**
Rule 3. The Complaint	**Rule 3. The Complaint**
The complaint is a written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be made upon oath before a magistrate judge.	The complaint is a written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It must be made under oath before a magistrate judge, or, if none is reasonably available, before a state or local judicial officer.

Committee Notes
Rule 3
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 3 is amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic and no substantive change is intended, except as described below.

The amendment makes one substantive change. Currently, Rule 3 requires the complaint to be sworn before a "magistrate judge," which under current Rule 54 could include a state or local judicial officer. Revised Rule 1 no longer includes state and local officers in the definition of magistrate judges for the purposes of these rules. Instead, the definition includes only United States Magistrate Judges. Rule 3 requires that the complaint be made before a United States Magistrate Judge or before a state or local officer. The revised rule does, however, make a change to reflect prevailing practice and the outcome desired by the Committee—that the procedure take place before a *federal* judicial officer if one is reasonably available. As noted in Rule 1(c), where the rules, such as Rule 3, authorize a magistrate judge to act, any other federal judge may act.

Rule 4. Arrest Warrant or Summons Upon Complaint	Rule 4. Arrest Warrant or a Summons on a Complaint
(a) Issuance. If it appears from the complaint, or from an affidavit or affidavits filed with the complaint, that there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant has committed it, a warrant for the arrest of the defendant shall issue to any officer authorized by law to execute it. Upon the request of the attorney for the government a summons instead of a warrant shall issue. More than one warrant or summons may issue on the same complaint. If a defendant fails to appear in response to the summons, a warrant shall issue.	**(a) Issuance.** If the complaint or one or more affidavits filed with the complaint establish probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant committed it, the judge must issue an arrest warrant to an officer authorized to execute it. At the request of the attorney for the government, the judge must issue a summons, instead of a warrant, to a person authorized to serve it. A judge may issue more than one warrant or summons on the same complaint. If a defendant fails to appear in response to a summons, a judge may, and upon request of the attorney for the government must, issue a warrant.
(b) Probable Cause. The finding of probable cause may be based upon hearsay evidence in whole or in part.	
(c) Form. **(1) Warrant.** The warrant shall be signed by the magistrate judge and shall contain the name of the defendant or, if the defendant's name is unknown, any name or description by which the defendant can be identified with reasonable certainty. It shall describe the offense charged in the complaint. It shall command that the defendant be arrested and brought before the nearest available magistrate judge. **(2) Summons.** The summons shall be in the same form as the warrant except that it shall summon the defendant to appear before a magistrate at a stated time and place.	**(b) Form.** **(1)** ***Warrant.*** A warrant must: (A) contain the defendant's name or, if it is unknown, a name or description by which the defendant can be identified with reasonable certainty; (B) describe the offense charged in the complaint; (C) command that the defendant be arrested and promptly brought before a magistrate judge or, if none is reasonably available, before a state or local judicial officer; and (D) be signed by a judge. **(2)** ***Summons.*** A summons is to be in the same form as a warrant except that it must require the defendant to appear before a magistrate judge at a stated time and place.

(d) Execution or Service; and Return. **(1) By Whom.** The warrant shall be executed by a marshal or by some other officer authorized by law. The summons may be served by any person authorized to serve a summons in a civil action. **(2) Territorial Limits.** The warrant may be executed or the summons may be served at any place within the jurisdiction of the United States.	**(c) Execution or Service, and Return.** **(1)** ***By Whom.*** Only a marshal or other authorized officer may execute a warrant. Any person authorized to serve a summons in a federal civil action may serve the summons. **(2)** ***Territorial Limits.*** A warrant may be executed, or a summons served, only within the jurisdiction of the United States.
(3) Manner. The warrant shall be executed by the arrest of the defendant. The officer need not have the warrant at the time of the arrest but upon request shall show the warrant to the defendant as soon as possible. If the officer does not have the warrant at the time of the arrest, the officer shall then inform the defendant of the offense charged and of the fact that a warrant has been issued. The summons shall be served upon a defendant by delivering a copy to the defendant personally, or by leaving it at the defendant's dwelling house or usual place of abode with some person of suitable age and discretion then residing therein and by mailing a copy of the summons to the defendant's last known address.	**(3)** ***Manner.*** (A) A warrant is executed by arresting the defendant. Upon arrest, the officer must inform the defendant of the warrant's existence and of the offense charged. At the defendant's request, the officer must show the warrant to the defendant as soon as possible. (B) A summons is served on a defendant: (i) by personal delivery; or (ii) by leaving it at the defendant's residence or usual place of abode with a person of suitable age and discretion residing at that location and by mailing a copy to the defendant's last known address. (C) A summons to an organization is served by delivering a copy to an officer or to a managing or general agent or to another agent appointed or legally authorized to receive service of process. A copy must also be mailed to the organization's last known address within the district or to its principal place of business elsewhere in the United States.

(4) Return. The officer executing a warrant shall make return thereof to the magistrate judge or other officer before whom the defendant is brought pursuant to Rule 5. At the request of the attorney for the government any unexecuted warrant shall be returned to and canceled by the magistrate judge by whom it was issued. On or before the return day the person to whom a summons was delivered for service shall make return thereof to the magistrate judge before whom the summons is returnable. At the request of the attorney for the government made at any time while the complaint is pending, a warrant returned unexecuted and not canceled or summons returned unserved or a duplicate thereof may be delivered by the magistrate judge to the marshal or other authorized person for execution or service.	**(4)** ***Return.*** (A) After executing a warrant, the officer must return it to the judge before whom the defendant is brought in accordance with Rule 5. At the request of the attorney for the government, an unexecuted warrant must be brought back to and canceled by a magistrate judge or, if none is reasonably available, by a state or local officer. (B) The person to whom a summons was delivered for service must return it on or before the return day. (C) At the request of the attorney for the government, a judge may deliver an unexecuted warrant or an unserved summons or a copy of the warrant or summons to the marshal or other authorized person for execution or service.

Committee Notes
Rule 4
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 4 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic, except as noted below.

The first substantive change is in Rule 4(a), which has been amended to provide an element of discretion in those situations when the defendant fails to respond to a summons. Under the current rule, the judge must in all cases issue an arrest warrant. The revised rule provides discretion to the judge to issue an arrest warrant if the attorney for the government does not request that an arrest warrant be issued for a failure to appear.

Current Rule 4(b), which refers to the fact that hearsay evidence may be used to support probable cause, has been deleted. That language was added to the rule in 1974, apparently to reflect emerging federal case law. *See* Advisory Committee Note to 1974 Amendments to Rule 4 (citing cases). In the intervening years, the case law has become perfectly clear on that proposition. Thus, the Committee believed that the reference to hearsay was no longer necessary. Furthermore, the limited reference to hearsay evidence was misleading to the extent that it might have suggested that other forms of inadmissible evidence could not be considered. For example, the rule made no reference to considering a defendant's prior criminal record, which clearly may be considered in deciding whether probable cause exists. *See, e.g.,* Brinegar v. United States, 338 U.S. 160 (1949) (officer's knowledge of defendant's prior criminal activity). Rather than address that issue, or any other similar issues, the Committee believed that the matter was best addressed in Rule 1101(d)(3), Federal Rules of Evidence. That rule explicitly provides that the Federal Rules of Evidence do not apply to "preliminary examinations in criminal cases, . . . issuance of warrants for arrest, criminal summonses, and search warrants." The Advisory Committee Note accompanying that rule recognizes that: "The nature of the proceedings makes application of the formal rules of evidence inappropriate and impracticable." The Committee did not intend to make any substantive changes in practice by deleting the reference to hearsay evidence.

New Rule 4(b), which is currently Rule 4(c), addresses the form of an arrest warrant and a summons and includes two substantive changes. First, Rule 4(b)(1)(C) requires that the warrant require that the defendant be brought "promptly" before a judge. The Committee believed that this was a more appropriate standard than the current requirement that the defendant be brought

before the "nearest available" magistrate judge. This language accurately reflects the thrust of the original rule, that time is of the essence and that the defendant should be brought with dispatch before a judicial officer in the district. Second, the revised rule states a preference that the defendant be brought before a federal judicial officer.

Rule 4(b)(2) has been amended to require that if a summons is issued, the defendant must appear before a magistrate judge. The current rule requires the appearance before a "magistrate," which could include a state or local judicial officer. This change is consistent with the preference for requiring defendants to appear before federal judicial officers stated in revised Rule 4(b)(1).

Rule 4(c) (currently Rule 4(d)) includes three substantive changes. First, current Rule 4(d)(3) provides that the arresting officer is only required to inform the defendant of the offense charged and that a warrant exists, if the officer does not have a copy of the warrant. As revised, Rule 4(c)(3)(A) requires the arresting officer in all instances to inform the defendant of the offense charged and of the fact that an arrest warrant exists. The new rule continues the current provision that the arresting officer need not have a copy of the warrant but if the defendant requests to see it, the officer must show the warrant to the defendant as soon as possible. The rule does not attempt to define any particular time limits for showing the warrant to the defendant.

Second, Rule 4(c)(3)(C) is taken from former Rule 9(c)(1). That provision specifies the manner of serving a summons on an organization. The Committee believed that Rule 4 was the more appropriate location for general provisions addressing the mechanics of arrest warrants and summons. Revised Rule 9 liberally cross-references the basic provisions appearing in Rule 4. Under the amended rule, in all cases in which a summons is being served on an organization, a copy of the summons must be mailed to the organization.

Third, a change is made in Rule 4(c)(4). Currently, Rule 4(d)(4) requires that an unexecuted warrant must be returned to the judicial officer or judge who issued it. As amended, Rule 4(c)(4)(A) provides that after a warrant is executed, the officer must return it to the judge before whom the defendant will appear under Rule 5. At the government's request, however, an unexecuted warrant may be returned and canceled by any magistrate judge. The change recognizes the possibility that at the time the warrant is returned, the issuing judicial officer may not be available.

Rule 5. Initial Appearance Before the Magistrate Judge	Rule 5. Initial Appearance
(a) In General. Except as otherwise provided in this rule, an officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint or any person making an arrest without a warrant shall take the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available federal magistrate judge or, in the event that a federal magistrate judge is not reasonably available, before a state or local judicial officer authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3041. If a person arrested without a warrant is brought before a magistrate judge, a complaint, satisfying the probable cause requirements of Rule 4(a), shall be promptly filed. When a person, arrested with or without a warrant or given a summons, appears initially before the magistrate judge, the magistrate judge shall proceed in accordance with the applicable subdivisions of this rule. An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint charging solely a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1073 need not comply with this rule if the person arrested is transferred without unnecessary delay to the custody of appropriate state or local authorities in the district of arrest and an attorney for the government moves promptly, in the district in which the warrant was issued, to dismiss the complaint.	**(a) In General.** **(1)** A person making an arrest must promptly take the arrested person before a magistrate judge or, if none is reasonably available, before a state or local judicial officer. **(2)** When a person arrested without a warrant is brought before the judge, a complaint meeting Rule 4(a)'s requirement of probable cause must be filed promptly. **(3)** An officer making an arrest under a warrant issued upon a complaint charging solely a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1073 need not comply with this rule if the person arrested is transferred without unnecessary delay to the custody of appropriate state or local authorities in the district of arrest and an attorney for the government moves promptly, in the district in which the warrant was issued, to dismiss the complaint.

(c) Offenses Not Triable by the United States Magistrate Judge. If the charge against the defendant is not triable by the United States magistrate judge, the defendant shall not be called upon to plead. The magistrate judge shall inform the defendant of the complaint against the defendant and of any affidavit filed therewith, of the defendant's right to retain counsel or to request the assignment of counsel if the defendant is unable to obtain counsel, and of the general circumstances under which the defendant may secure pretrial release. The magistrate judge shall inform the defendant that the defendant is not required to make a statement and that any statement made by the defendant may be used against the defendant. The magistrate judge shall also inform the defendant of the right to a preliminary examination. The magistrate judge shall allow the defendant reasonable time and opportunity to consult counsel and shall detain or conditionally release the defendant as provided by statute or in these rules. * * * * *	**(b) Felonies.** **(1)** If the offense charged is a felony, the judge must inform the defendant of the following: (A) the complaint against the defendant, and any affidavit filed with it; (B) the defendant's right to retain counsel or to request that counsel be appointed if the defendant cannot obtain counsel; (C) the circumstances under which the defendant may secure pretrial release; (D) any right to a preliminary hearing; and (E) the defendant's right not to make a statement, and that any statement made may be used against the defendant. **(2)** The judge must allow the defendant reasonable opportunity to consult counsel. **(3)** The judge must detain or conditionally release the defendant as provided by statute or these rules. **(4)** A defendant may be asked to plead only under Rule 10.
(b) Misdemeanors and Other Petty Offenses. If the charge against the defendant is a misdemeanor or other petty offense triable by a United States magistrate judge under 18 U.S.C. § 3401, the magistrate judge shall proceed in accordance with Rule 58.	**(c) Misdemeanors.** If a defendant is charged with a misdemeanor, the judge must inform the defendant in accordance with Rule 58(b)(2).
	(d) Video Teleconferencing. Video teleconferencing may be used to conduct an appearance under this rule if the defendant waives the right to be present.

Committee Notes
Rule 5
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 5 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic, except as noted below.

Several changes have been made in Rule 5(a), which governs initial appearances by an arrested defendant before a magistrate judge. The first is a clarifying change; revised Rule 5(a)(1) provides that a person making the arrest must bring the defendant "promptly" before a magistrate judge, instead of the current reference to "nearest available" magistrate. This language parallels changes in Rule 4 and reflects the view that time is of the essence. In *County of Riverside v. McLaughlin*, 500 U.S. 44 (1991), the Supreme Court used both terms interchangeably and the Committee intends no change in practice. A second change is substantive, and reflects the stated preference (as in other provisions throughout the rules) that the defendant be brought before a federal judicial officer. Only if a magistrate judge is not available should the defendant be taken before a state or local officer. The third sentence in current Rule 5(a), which states that a magistrate judge must proceed in accordance with the rule where a defendant is arrested without a warrant or given a summons, has been deleted because it is unnecessary.

Rule 5(b), currently Rule 5(c), has been retitled to more clearly reflect the subject of that subdivision, the procedure to be used if the defendant is charged with a felony. Rule 5(b)(4) has been added to make clear that a defendant may only be called upon to enter a plea under the provisions of Rule 10. That language is intended to reflect and reaffirm current practice.

The remaining portions of current Rule 5(c) have been moved to Rule 5.1, which deals with preliminary hearings in felony cases.

The final substantive change is in new Rule 5(d), which permits video teleconferencing for an appearance under this rule, if the defendant consents. This change reflects the growing practice among state courts to use video teleconferencing to conduct initial proceedings. A similar amendment has been made to Rule 10 concerning arraignments. In amending Rules 5, 10, and 43 (which generally requires the defendant's presence at all proceedings), the Committee was very much aware of the argument that permitting a defendant to appear by video teleconferencing might be considered an erosion of an important element of the judicial process. The Committee nonetheless believed that in

appropriate circumstances the court, and the defendant, should have the option of using video teleconferencing, as long as the defendant consents to that procedure. The question of when it would be appropriate for a defendant to consent is not spelled out in the rule. That is left to the defendant and the court in each case. Nor does the rule specify any particular technical requirements regarding the system to be used.

	Rule 5.1. Preliminary Hearing in a Felony Case
Rule 5(c) Offenses Not Triable by the United States Magistrate Judge. * * * * * A defendant is entitled to a preliminary examination, unless waived, when charged with any offense, other than a petty offense, which is to be tried by a judge of the district court. If the defendant waives preliminary examination, the magistrate judge shall forthwith hold the defendant to answer in the district court. If the defendant does not waive the preliminary examination, the magistrate judge shall schedule a preliminary examination.	**(a) In General.** If charged with a felony, a defendant is entitled to a preliminary hearing before a magistrate judge unless: **(1)** the defendant waives the hearing; **(2)** the defendant is indicted; or **(3)** the government files an information under Rule 7(b).
Such examination shall be held within a reasonable time but in any event not later than 10 days following the initial appearance if the defendant is in custody and no later than 20 days if the defendant is not in custody, provided, however, that the preliminary examination shall not be held if the defendant is indicted or if an information against the defendant is filed in district court before the date set for the preliminary examination.	**(b) Scheduling.** The magistrate judge must hold the preliminary hearing within a reasonable time, but no later than 10 days after the initial appearance if the defendant is in custody and no later than 20 days if not in custody.
With the consent of the defendant and upon a showing of good cause, taking into account the public interest in the prompt disposition of criminal cases, time limits specified in this subdivision may be extended one or more times by a federal magistrate judge. In the absence of such consent by the defendant, time limits may be extended by a judge of the United States only upon a showing that extraordinary circumstances exist and that delay is indispensable to the interests of justice	**(c) Extending the Time.** With the defendant's consent and upon a showing of good cause — taking into account the public interest in the prompt disposition of criminal cases — a magistrate judge may extend the time limits in Rule 5.1(b) one or more times. If the defendant does not consent, the magistrate judge may extend the time limits only on a showing that extraordinary circumstances exist and justice requires the delay.
Rule 5.1. Preliminary Examination. **(a) Probable Cause Finding.** If from the evidence it appears that there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant committed it, the federal magistrate judge shall forthwith hold the defendant to answer in district court. The finding of probable cause may be based upon hearsay evidence in whole or in part. The defendant may cross-examine adverse witnesses and may introduce evidence. Objections to evidence on the ground that it was acquired by unlawful means are not properly made at the preliminary examination. Motions to suppress must be made to the trial court as provided in Rule 12.	**(d) Probable-Cause Finding.** If the magistrate judge finds probable cause to believe an offense has been committed and the defendant committed it, the magistrate judge must promptly require the defendant to appear for further proceedings. The defendant may cross-examine adverse witnesses and may introduce evidence but cannot object to evidence on the ground that it was unlawfully acquired.

(b) Discharge of Defendant. If from the evidence it appears that there is no probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed or that the defendant committed it, the federal magistrate judge shall dismiss the complaint and discharge the defendant. The discharge of the defendant shall not preclude the government from instituting a subsequent prosecution for the same offense.	**(e) Discharging the Defendant.** If the magistrate judge finds no probable cause to believe an offense has been committed or the defendant committed it, the magistrate judge must dismiss the complaint and discharge the defendant. A discharge does not preclude the government from later prosecuting the defendant for the same offense.
(c) Records. After concluding the proceeding the federal magistrate judge shall transmit forthwith to the clerk of the district court all papers in the proceeding. The magistrate judge shall promptly make or cause to be made a record or summary of such proceeding. (1) On timely application to a federal magistrate judge, the attorney for a defendant in a criminal case may be given the opportunity to have the recording of the hearing on preliminary examination made available to that attorney in connection with any further hearing or preparation for trial. The court may, by local rule, appoint the place for and define the conditions under which such opportunity may be afforded counsel.	**(f) Records.** The preliminary hearing must be recorded by a court reporter or by a suitable recording device. A recording of the proceeding may be made available to any party upon request. A copy of the recording and a transcript may be provided to any party upon request and upon payment as required by applicable Judicial Conference regulations.
(2) On application of a defendant addressed to the court or any judge thereof, an order may issue that the federal magistrate judge make available a copy of the transcript, or of a portion thereof, to defense counsel. Such order shall provide for prepayment of costs of such transcript by the defendant unless the defendant makes a sufficient affidavit that the defendant is unable to pay or to give security therefor, in which case the expense shall be paid by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts from available appropriated funds. Counsel for the government may move also that a copy of the transcript, in whole or in part, be made available to it, for good cause shown, and an order may be entered granting such motion in whole or in part, on appropriate terms, except that the government need not prepay costs nor furnish security therefor.	
(d) Production of Statements. (1) In General. Rule 26.2(a)-(d) and (f) applies at any hearing under this rule, unless the court, for good cause shown, rules otherwise in a particular case. (2) Sanctions for Failure to Produce Statement. If a party elects not to comply with an order under Rule 26.2(a) to deliver a statement to the moving party, the court may not consider the testimony of a witness whose statement is withheld.	**(g) Production of Statements.** **(1)** ***In General.*** Rule 26.2(a)-(d) and (f) applies at any hearing under this rule, unless the magistrate judge for good cause, rules otherwise in a particular case. **(2)** ***Sanctions for Failure to Produce Statement.*** If a party disobeys a Rule 26.2(a) order to deliver a statement to the moving party, the magistrate judge must not consider the testimony of a witness whose statement is withheld.

Committee Notes
Rule 5.1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 5.1 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic, except as noted below.

First, the title of the rule has been changed. Although the underlying statute, 18 U.S.C. § 3060, uses the phrase *preliminary examination*, the Committee believes that the phrase *preliminary hearing* is more accurate. What happens at this proceeding is more than just an examination; it includes an evidentiary hearing, argument, and a judicial ruling. Further, the phrase *preliminary hearing* predominates in actual usage.

Rule 5.1(a) is composed of the first sentence of the second paragraph of current Rule 5(c). Rule 5.1(b) includes material currently located in Rule 5(c): scheduling and extending the time limits for the hearing. Although the rule continues to refer to proceedings before a "court," the Committee is aware that in most districts, magistrate judges perform these functions. That point is also reflected in the definition of "court" in Rule 1(b), which in turn recognizes that magistrate judges may be authorized to act.

Rule 5.1(d), addressing the issue of probable cause, contains the language currently located in Rule 5.1(a), with the exception of the sentence, "The finding of probable cause may be based upon hearsay evidence in whole or in part." That language was included in the original promulgation of the rule in 1972. Similar language was added to Rule 4 in 1974. In the Committee Note on the 1974 amendment, the Advisory Committee explained that the language was included to make it clear that a finding of probable cause may be based upon hearsay, noting that there had been some uncertainty in the federal system about the propriety of relying upon hearsay at the preliminary examination. *See* Advisory Committee Note to Rule 5.1 (citing cases and commentary). Federal law is now clear on that proposition. Thus, the Committee believed that the reference to hearsay was no longer necessary. Further, the Committee believed that the matter was best addressed in Rule 1101(d)(3), Federal Rules of Evidence. That rule explicitly states that the Federal Rules of Evidence do not apply to "preliminary examinations in criminal cases,...issuance of warrants for arrest, criminal summonses, and search warrants." The Advisory Committee Note accompanying that rule recognizes that: "The nature of the proceedings makes application of the formal rules of evidence inappropriate and impracticable." The Committee did

not intend to make any substantive changes in practice by deleting the reference to hearsay evidence.

Rule 5.1(c) contains a substantive change. The revised rule includes language that expands the authority of a United States Magistrate Judge to grant a continuance for a preliminary hearing conducted under the rule. Currently, the rule authorizes a magistrate judge to grant a continuance only in those cases in which the defendant has consented to the continuance. If the defendant does not consent, then the government must present the matter to a district court judge, usually on the same day. The proposed amendment conflicts with 18 U.S.C. § 3060, which tracks the original language of the rule and permits only district court judges to grant continuances when the defendant objects. The Committee believes that this restriction is an anomaly and that it can lead to needless consumption of judicial and other resources. Magistrate judges are routinely required to make probable cause determinations and other difficult decisions regarding the defendant's liberty interests, reflecting that the magistrate judge's role has developed toward a higher level of responsibility for pre-indictment matters. The Committee believes that the change in the rule will provide greater judicial economy and that it is entirely appropriate to seek this change to the rule through the Rules Enabling Act procedures. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2072(b). Under those procedures, approval by Congress of this rule change would supersede the parallel provisions in 18 U.S.C. § 3060.

Rule 5.1(e), which deals with the discharge of a defendant, consists of former Rule 5.1(b).

Rule 5.1(f) is a revised version of the material in current Rule 5.1(c). Instead of including detailed information in the rule itself concerning records of preliminary hearings, the Committee opted simply to direct the reader to the applicable Judicial Conference regulations governing records. The Committee did not intend to make any substantive changes in the way in which those records are currently made available.

Finally, although the rule speaks in terms of initial appearances being conducted before a magistrate judge, Rule 1(c) makes clear that a district judge may perform any function in these rules that a magistrate judge may perform.

III. INDICTMENT AND INFORMATION	**Title III. The Grand Jury, The Indictment, and The Information**
Rule 6. The Grand Jury	**Rule 6. The Grand Jury**
(a) Summoning Grand Juries. **(1) Generally.** The court shall order one or more grand juries to be summoned at such time as the public interest requires. The grand jury shall consist of not less than 16 nor more than 23 members. The court shall direct that a sufficient number of legally qualified persons be summoned to meet this requirement. **(2) Alternate Jurors.** The court may direct that alternate jurors may be designated at the time a grand jury is selected. Alternate jurors in the order in which they were designated may thereafter be impanelled as provided in subdivision (g) of this rule. Alternate jurors shall be drawn in the same manner and shall have the same qualifications as the regular jurors, and if impanelled shall be subject to the same challenges, shall take the same oath and shall have the same functions, powers, facilities and privileges as the regular jurors.	**(a) Summoning a Grand Jury.** (1) ***In General.*** When the public interest so requires, the court must order that one or more grand juries be summoned. A grand jury must have 16 to 23 members, and the court must order that enough legally qualified persons be summoned to meet this requirement. (2) ***Alternate Jurors.*** When a grand jury is selected, the court may designate alternate jurors. They must be drawn and summoned in the same manner and must have the same qualifications as regular jurors. Alternate jurors will be impaneled in the sequence in which they are designated. If impaneled, an alternate juror is subject to the same challenges, takes the same oath, and has the same functions, duties, powers, and privileges as a regular juror.
(b) Objections to Grand Jury and to Grand Jurors. **(1) Challenges.** The attorney for the government or a defendant who has been held to answer in the district court may challenge the array of jurors on the ground that the grand jury was not selected, drawn or summoned in accordance with law, and may challenge an individual juror on the ground that the juror is not legally qualified. Challenges shall be made before the administration of the oath to the jurors and shall be tried by the court. **(2) Motion to Dismiss.** A motion to dismiss the indictment may be based on objections to the array or on the lack of legal qualification of an individual juror, if not previously determined upon challenge. It shall be made in the manner prescribed in 28 U.S.C. § 1867(e) and shall be granted under the conditions prescribed in that statute. An indictment shall not be dismissed on the ground that one or more members of the grand jury were not legally qualified if it appears from the record kept pursuant to subdivision (c) of this rule that 12 or more jurors, after deducting the number not legally qualified, concurred in finding the indictment.	**(b) Objections to the Grand Jury or to a Grand Juror.** (1) ***Challenges.*** Either the government or a defendant may challenge the grand jury on the ground that it was not lawfully drawn, summoned, or selected, and may challenge an individual juror on the ground that the juror is not legally qualified. (2) ***Motion to Dismiss an Indictment.*** A party may move to dismiss the indictment based on an objection to the grand jury or on an individual juror's lack of legal qualification, unless the court has previously ruled on the same objection under Rule 6(b)(1). The motion to dismiss is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1867(e). The court cannot dismiss the indictment on the ground that a grand juror was not legally qualified if the record shows that at least 12 qualified jurors concurred in the indictment.

(c) Foreperson and Deputy Foreperson. The court shall appoint one of the jurors to be foreperson and another to be deputy foreperson. The foreperson shall have power to administer oaths and affirmations and shall sign all indictments. The foreperson or another juror designated by the foreperson shall keep record of the number of jurors concurring in the finding of every indictment and shall file the record with the clerk of the court, but the record shall not be made public except on order of the court. During the absence of the foreperson, the deputy foreperson shall act as foreperson.	**(c) Foreperson and Deputy Foreperson.** The court will appoint one juror as the foreperson and another as the deputy foreperson. In the foreperson's absence, the deputy foreperson will act as the foreperson. The foreperson may administer oaths and affirmations and will sign all indictments. The foreperson — or another juror designated by the foreperson — will record the number of jurors concurring in every indictment and will file the record with the district clerk, but the record may not be made public unless the court so orders.
(d) Who May Be Present. **(1) While Grand Jury is in Session.** Attorneys for the government, the witness under examination, interpreters when needed and, for the purpose of taking the evidence, a stenographer or operator of a recording device may be present while the grand jury is in session. **(2) During Deliberations and Voting.** No person other than the jurors, and any interpreter necessary to assist a juror who is hearing or speech impaired, may be present while the grand jury is deliberating or voting.	**(d) Who May Be Present.** (1) ***While the Grand Jury Is in Session.*** The following persons may be present while the grand jury is in session: attorneys for the government, the witness being questioned, interpreters when needed, and a stenographer or operator of a recording device. (2) ***During Deliberations and Voting.*** No person other than the jurors, and any interpreter needed to assist a hearing-impaired or speech-impaired juror, may be present while the grand jury is deliberating or voting.

(e) Recording and Disclosure of Proceedings.	**(e) Recording and Disclosing Proceedings.**
(1) Recording of Proceedings. All proceedings, except when the grand jury is deliberating or voting, shall be recorded stenographically or by an electronic recording device. An unintentional failure of any recording to reproduce all or any portion of a proceeding shall not affect the validity of the prosecution. The recording or reporter's notes or any transcript prepared therefrom shall remain in the custody or control of the attorney for the government unless otherwise ordered by the court in a particular case.	**(1)** ***Recording the Proceedings.*** Except while the grand jury is deliberating or voting, all proceedings must be recorded by a court reporter or by a suitable recording device. The validity of a prosecution is not affected by the unintentional failure to make a recording. Unless the court orders otherwise, an attorney for the government will retain control of the recording, the reporter's notes, and any transcript prepared from those notes.
(2) General Rule of Secrecy. A grand juror, an interpreter, a stenographer, an operator of a recording device, a typist who transcribes recorded testimony, an attorney for the government, or any person to whom disclosure is made under paragraph (3)(A)(ii) of this subdivision shall not disclose matters occurring before the grand jury, except as otherwise provided for in these rules. No obligation of secrecy may be imposed on any person except in accordance with this rule. A knowing violation of Rule 6 may be punished as a contempt of court.	**(2)** ***General Rule of Secrecy.*** Unless these rules provide otherwise, the following persons must not disclose a matter occurring before the grand jury: (A) a grand juror; (B) an interpreter; (C) a court reporter; (D) an operator of a recording device; (E) a person who transcribes recorded testimony; (F) an attorney for the government; or (G) a person to whom disclosure is made under Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii).

(3) Exceptions. (A) Disclosure otherwise prohibited by this rule of matters occurring before the grand jury, other than its deliberations and the vote of any grand juror, may be made to— (i) an attorney for the government for use in the performance of such attorney's duty; and (ii) such government personnel (including personnel of a state or subdivision of a state) as are deemed necessary by an attorney for the government to assist an attorney for the government in the performance of such attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law. (B) Any person to whom matters are disclosed under subparagraph (A)(ii) of this paragraph shall not utilize that grand jury material for any purpose other than assisting the attorney for the government in the performance of such attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law. An attorney for the government shall promptly provide the district court, before which was impaneled the grand jury whose material has been so disclosed, with the names of the persons to whom such disclosure has been made, and shall certify that the attorney has advised such persons of their obligation of secrecy under this rule.	**(3) *Exceptions.*** (A) Disclosure of a grand-jury matter — other than the grand jury's deliberations or any grand juror's vote — may be made to: (i) an attorney for the government for use in performing that attorney's duty; or (ii) any government personnel — including those of a state or state subdivision or of an Indian tribe — that an attorney for the government considers necessary to assist in performing that attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law. (B) A person to whom information is disclosed under Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) may use that information only to assist an attorney for the government in performing that attorney's duty to enforce federal criminal law. An attorney for the government must promptly provide the court that impaneled the grand jury with the names of all persons to whom a disclosure has been made, and must certify that the attorney has advised those persons of their obligation of secrecy under this rule.

(C) Disclosure otherwise prohibited by this rule of matters occurring before the grand jury may also be made— (i) when so directed by a court preliminarily to or in connection with a judicial proceeding; (ii) when permitted by a court at the request of the defendant, upon a showing that grounds may exist for a motion to dismiss the indictment because of matters occurring before the grand jury; (iii) when the disclosure is made by an attorney for the government to another federal grand jury; or (iv) when permitted by a court at the request of an attorney for the government, upon a showing that such matters may disclose a violation of state criminal law, to an appropriate official of a state or subdivision of a state for the purpose of enforcing such law. If the court orders disclosure of matters occurring before the grand jury, the disclosure shall be made in such manner, at such time, and under such conditions as the court may direct.	(C) An attorney for the government may disclose any grand-jury matter to another federal grand jury. (D) The court may authorize disclosure — at a time, in a manner, and subject to any other conditions that it directs — of a grand-jury matter: (i) preliminarily to or in connection with a judicial proceeding; (ii) at the request of a defendant who shows that a ground may exist to dismiss the indictment because of a matter that occurred before the grand jury; (iii) at the request of the government if it shows that the matter may disclose a violation of state or Indian tribal criminal law, as long as the disclosure is to an appropriate state, state-subdivision, or Indian tribal official for the purpose of enforcing that law; or (iv) at the request of the government if it shows that the matter may disclose a violation of military criminal law under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, as long as the disclosure is to an appropriate military official for the purpose of enforcing that law.
(D) A petition for disclosure pursuant to subdivision (e)(3)(C)(i) shall be filed in the district where the grand jury convened. Unless the hearing is ex parte, which it may be when the petitioner is the government, the petitioner shall serve written notice of the petition upon (i) the attorney for the government, (ii) the parties to the judicial proceeding if disclosure is sought in connection with such a proceeding, and (iii) such other persons as the court may direct. The court shall afford those persons a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard.	(E) A petition to disclose a grand jury matter under Rule 6(e)(3)(D)(i) must be filed in the district where the grand jury convened. Unless the hearing is ex parte — as it may be when the government is the petitioner — the petitioner must serve the petition on, and the court must afford a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard to: (i) the attorney for the government; (ii) the parties to the judicial proceeding; and (iii) any other person whom the court may designate.

(E) If the judicial proceeding giving rise to the petition is in a federal district court in another district, the court shall transfer the matter to that court unless it can reasonably obtain sufficient knowledge of the proceeding to determine whether disclosure is proper. The court shall order transmitted to the court to which the matter is transferred the material sought to be disclosed, if feasible, and a written evaluation of the need for continued grand jury secrecy. The court to which the matter is transferred shall afford the aforementioned persons a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard.	(F) If the petition to disclose arises out of a proceeding in another district, the petitioned court must transfer the petition to the other court unless the petitioned court can reasonably determine whether disclosure is proper. If the petitioned court decides to transfer, it must send to the transferee court the material sought to be disclosed, if feasible, and a written evaluation of the need for continued grand-jury secrecy. The transferee court must afford those persons identified in Rule 6(e)(3)(E) a reasonable opportunity to appear and be heard.
(4) Sealed Indictments. The federal magistrate judge to whom an indictment is returned may direct that the indictment be kept secret until the defendant is in custody or has been released pending trial. Thereupon the clerk shall seal the indictment and no person shall disclose the return of the indictment except when necessary for the issuance and execution of a warrant or summons. **(5) Closed Hearing.** Subject to any right to an open hearing in contempt proceedings, the court shall order a hearing on matters affecting a grand jury proceeding to be closed to the extent necessary to prevent disclosure of matters occurring before a grand jury. **(6) Sealed Records.** Records, orders and subpoenas relating to grand jury proceedings shall be kept under seal to the extent and for such time as is necessary to prevent disclosure of matters occurring before a grand jury.	**(4)** ***Sealed Indictment.*** The magistrate judge to whom an indictment is returned may direct that the indictment be kept secret until the defendant is in custody or has been released pending trial. The clerk must then seal the indictment, and no person may disclose the indictment's existence except as necessary to issue or execute a warrant or summons. **(5)** ***Closed Hearing.*** Subject to any right to an open hearing in a contempt proceeding, the court must close any hearing to the extent necessary to prevent disclosure of a matter occurring before a grand jury. **(6)** ***Sealed Records.*** Records, orders, and subpoenas relating to grand-jury proceedings must be kept under seal to the extent and as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a matter occurring before a grand jury. **(7)** ***Contempt.*** A knowing violation of Rule 6 may be punished as a contempt of court.

(f) Finding and Return of Indictment. A grand jury may indict only upon the concurrence of 12 or more jurors. The indictment shall be returned by the grand jury, or through the foreperson or deputy foreperson on its behalf, to a federal magistrate judge in open court. If a complaint or information is pending against the defendant and 12 persons do not vote to indict, the foreperson shall so report to a federal magistrate judge in writing as soon as possible.	**(f) Indictment and Return.** A grand jury may indict only if at least 12 jurors concur. The grand jury — or its foreperson or deputy foreperson — must return the indictment to a magistrate judge in open court. If a complaint or information is pending against the defendant and 12 jurors do not concur in the indictment, the foreperson must promptly and in writing report the lack of concurrence to the magistrate judge.
(g) Discharge and Excuse. A grand jury shall serve until discharged by the court, but no grand jury may serve more than 18 months unless the court extends the service of the grand jury for a period of six months or less upon a determination that such extension is in the public interest. At any time for cause shown the court may excuse a juror either temporarily or permanently, and in the latter event the court may impanel another person in place of the juror excused.	**(g) Discharge.** A grand jury must serve until the court discharges it, but it may serve more than 18 months only if the court, having determined that an extension is in the public interest, extends the grand jury's service. An extension may be granted for no more than 6 months, except as otherwise provided by statute. **(h) Excuse.** At any time, for good cause, the court may excuse a juror either temporarily or permanently, and if permanently, the court may impanel an alternate juror in place of the excused juror. **(i) Indian Tribe.** Indian tribe means an Indian tribe recognized by the Secretary of the Interior on a list published in the Federal Register under 25 U.S.C. § 479a-1.

Committee Notes
Rule 6
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 6 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic, except as noted below.

The first substantive change is in Rule 6(b)(1). The last sentence of current Rule 6(b)(1) provides that "Challenges shall be made before the administration of the oath to the jurors and shall be tried by the court." That language has been deleted from the amended rule. The remainder of this subdivision rests on the assumption that formal proceedings have begun against a person, i.e. an indictment has been returned. The Committee believed that although the first sentence reflects current practice of a defendant being able to challenge the composition or qualifications of the grand jurors after the indictment is returned, the second sentence does not comport with modern practice. That is, a defendant will normally not know the composition or identity of the grand jurors before they are administered their oath. Thus, there is no opportunity to challenge them and have the court decide the issue before the oath is given.

In Rule 6(d)(1), the term "court stenographer" has been changed to "court reporter." Similar changes have been made in Rule 6(e)(1) and (2). **[The language in Rule 6(d)(2) regarding the presence of interpreters has been approved by the Supreme Court and is now before Congress]**

Rule 6(e) continues to spell out the general rule of secrecy of grand jury proceedings and the exceptions to that general rule. The last sentence in current Rule 6(e)(2), concerning contempt for violating Rule 6, now appears in Rule 6(e)(7). No change in substance is intended.

Rule 6(e)(3)(A)(ii) includes a new provision recognizing the sovereignty of Indian Tribes and the possibility that it would be necessary to disclose grand jury information to appropriate tribal officials in order to enforce federal law. Similar language has been added to Rule 6(e)(3)(D)(iii).

Rule 6(e)(3)(C) consists of language located in current Rule 6(e)(3)(C)(iii). The Committee believed that this provision, which recognizes that prior court approval is not required for disclosure of a grand jury matter to another grand jury, should be treated as a separate subdivision in revised Rule 6(e)(3). No change in practice is intended.

Rule 6(e)(3)(D)(iv) is a new substantive provision that addresses disclosure of grand jury information to armed forces personnel where the disclosure is for the purpose of enforcing military criminal law under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, 10 U.S.C. §§ 801-946. *See, e.g.,* Department of Defense Directive 5525.7 (January 22, 1985); 1984 Memorandum of Understanding Between Department of Justice and Department of Justice; Memorandum of Understanding Between the Departments of Justice and Transportation (Coast Guard) Relating to the Investigations and Prosecution of Crimes Over Which the Two Departments Have Concurrent Jurisdiction (October 9, 1967).

In Rule 6(e)(3)(E)(ii), the Committee considered whether to amend the language relating to "parties to the judicial proceeding" and determined that in the context of the rule, it is understood that the parties referred to are the parties in the same judicial proceeding identified in Rule 6(e)(3)(D)(i).

The Committee decided to leave in subdivision (e) the provision stating that a "knowing violation of Rule 6" may be punished by contempt notwithstanding that, due to its apparent application to the entirety of the Rule, the provision seemingly is misplaced in subdivision (e). Research shows that the provision was added by Congress in 1977 and that it was crafted solely to deal with violations of the secrecy prohibitions in subdivision (e). *See* S. Rep. No. 95-354, p. 8 (1977). Supporting this narrow construction, the Committee found no reported decision involving an application or attempted use of the contempt sanction to a violation other than of the disclosure restrictions in subdivision (e). On the other hand, the Supreme Court in dicta did indicate on one occasion its understanding that the contempt sanction arguably would be available also for a violation of Rule 6(d) relating to who may be present during the grand jury's deliberations. *Bank of Nova Scotia v. United States*, 487 U.S. 250, 263 (1987).

In sum, it appears that the scope of the contempt sanction in Rule 6 is unsettled. Because the provision creates an offense, altering its scope may be beyond the authority bestowed by the Rules Enabling Act, 28 U.S.C. 2071 et seq. *See* 28 U.S.C. 2072(b) (Rules must not "abridge, enlarge, or modify any substantive right"). The Committee decided to leave the contempt provision in its present location in subdivision (e), because breaking it out into a separate subdivision could be construed to support the interpretation that the sanction may be applied to a knowing violation of any of the Rule's provisions rather than just those in subdivision (e). Whether or not that is a correct interpretation of the provision—a matter on which the Committee takes no position—must be determined by caselaw, or resolved by Congress.

[Rule 6(f) language has been approved by the Supreme Court and is now pending at Congress]

Current Rule 6(g) has been divided into two new subdivisions, Rule 6(g), Discharge and Rule 6(h), Excuse.

Rule 6(i) is a new provision defining the term "Indian Tribe," a term used only in this rule.

Rule 7. The Indictment and the Information	Rule 7. The Indictment and the Information
(a) Use of Indictment or Information. An offense which may be punished by death shall be prosecuted by indictment. An offense which may be punished by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or at hard labor shall be prosecuted by indictment or, if indictment is waived, it may be prosecuted by information. Any other offense may be prosecuted by indictment or by information. An information may be filed without leave of court.	**(a) When Used.** **(1)** ***Felony.*** An offense must be prosecuted by an indictment if it is punishable: (A) by death; or (B) by imprisonment for more than one year. **(2) Misdemeanor.** An offense punishable by imprisonment for one year or less may be prosecuted in accordance with Rule 58(b)(1).
(b) Waiver of Indictment. An offense which may be punished by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year or at hard labor may be prosecuted by information if the defendant, after having been advised of the nature of the charge and of the rights of the defendant, waives in open court prosecution by indictment.	**(b) Waiving Indictment.** An offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year may be prosecuted by information if the defendant — in open court and after being advised of the nature of the charge and of the defendant's rights — waives prosecution by indictment.

(c) Nature and Contents. **(1) In General.** The indictment or the information shall be a plain, concise and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged. It shall be signed by the attorney for the government. It need not contain a formal commencement, a formal conclusion or any other matter not necessary to such statement. Allegations made in one count may be incorporated by reference in another count. It may be alleged in a single count that the means by which the defendant committed the offense are unknown or that the defendant committed it by one or more specified means. The indictment or information shall state for each count the official or customary citation of the statute, rule, regulation or other provision of law which the defendant is alleged therein to have violated. **(2) Criminal Forfeiture.** No judgment of forfeiture may be entered in a criminal proceeding unless the indictment or the information provides notice that the defendant has an interest in property that is subject to forfeiture in accordance with the applicable statute.[1] **(3) Harmless Error.** Error in the citation or its omission shall not be ground for dismissal of the indictment or information or for reversal of a conviction if the error or omission did not mislead the defendant to the defendant's prejudice.	**(c) Nature and Contents.** **(1)** ***In General.*** The indictment or information must be a plain, concise, and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged and must be signed by an attorney for the government. It need not contain a formal introduction or conclusion. A count may incorporate by reference an allegation made in another count. A count may allege that the means by which the defendant committed the offense are unknown or that the defendant committed it by one or more specified means. For each count, the indictment or information must give the official or customary citation of the statute, rule, regulation, or other provision of law that the defendant is alleged to have violated. **(2)** ***Criminal Forfeiture.*** No judgment of forfeiture may be entered in a criminal proceeding unless the indictment or the information provides notice that the defendant has an interest in property that is subject to forfeiture in accordance with the applicable statute. **(3)** ***Citation Error.*** Unless the defendant was misled and thereby prejudiced, neither an error in a citation nor a citation's omission is a ground to dismiss the indictment or information or to reverse a conviction.
(d) Surplusage. The court on motion of the defendant may strike surplusage from the indictment or information.	**(d) Surplusage.** On the defendant's motion, the court may strike surplusage from the indictment or information.
(e) Amendment of Information. The court may permit an information to be amended at any time before verdict or finding if no additional or different offense is charged and if substantial rights of the defendant are not prejudiced.	**(e) Amending an Information.** Unless an additional or different offense is charged or a substantial right of the defendant is prejudiced, the court may permit an information to be amended at any time before verdict or finding.
(f) Bill of Particulars. The court may direct the filing of a bill of particulars. A motion for a bill of particulars may be made before arraignment or within ten days after arraignment or at such later time as the court may permit. A bill of particulars may be amended at any time subject to such conditions as justice requires.	**(f) Bill of Particulars.** The court may direct the government to file a bill of particulars. The defendant may move for a bill of particulars before or within 10 days after arraignment or at a later time if the court permits. The government may amend a bill of particulars subject to such conditions as justice requires.

[1]Judicial Conference approved amendment in March 1999. The amendments take effect on December 1, 2000, if approved by the Supreme Court and Congress takes no action otherwise.

Committee Notes
Rule 7
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 7 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic.

The Committee has deleted the references to "hard labor" in the rule. This punishment is not found in current federal statutes.

[Rule 7(c)(2), Criminal Forfeiture, is language approved by the Judicial Conference but not yet by the Supreme Court]

The title of Rule 7(c)(3) has been amended. The Committee believed that potential confusion could arise with the use of the term "harmless error." Rule 52, which deals with the issues of harmless error and plain error, is sufficient to address the topic. Potentially, the topic of harmless error could arise with regard to any of the other rules and there is insufficient need to highlight the term in Rule 7. The focus in the language of (c)(3), on the other hand is specifically on the topic of the effect of an error in the citation of authority in the indictment. That material remains but without any reference to harmless error.

Rule 8. Joinder of Offenses and of Defendants	Rule 8. Joinder of Offenses or Defendants
(a) Joinder of Offenses. Two or more offenses may be charged in the same indictment or information in a separate count for each offense if the offenses charged, whether felonies or misdemeanors or both, are of the same or similar character or are based on the same act or transaction or on two or more acts or transactions connected together or constituting parts of a common scheme or plan.	**(a) Joinder of Offenses.** The indictment or information may charge a defendant in separate counts with 2 or more offenses if the offenses charged — whether felonies or misdemeanors or both — are of the same or similar character, or are based on the same act or transaction, or are connected with or constitute parts of a common scheme or plan.
(b) Joinder of Defendants. Two or more defendants may be charged in the same indictment or information if they are alleged to have participated in the same act or transaction or in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. Such defendants may be charged in one or more counts together or separately and all of the defendants need not be charged in each count.	**(b) Joinder of Defendants.** The indictment or information may charge 2 or more defendants if they are alleged to have participated in the same act or transaction or in the same series of acts or transactions constituting an offense or offenses. The defendants may be charged in one or more counts together or separately. All defendants need not be charged in each count.

Committee Notes
Rule 8
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 8 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 9. Warrant or Summons Upon Indictment or Information	Rule 9. Arrest Warrant or Summons on an Indictment or Information
(a) Issuance. Upon the request of the attorney for government the court shall issue a warrant for each defendant named in an information supported by a showing of probable cause under oath as is required by Rule 4(a), or in an indictment. Upon the request of the attorney for the government a summons instead of a warrant shall issue. If no request is made, the court may issue either a warrant or a summons in its discretion. More than one warrant or summons may issue for the same defendant. The clerk shall deliver the warrant or summons to the marshal or other person authorized by law to execute or serve it. If a defendant fails to appear in response to the summons, a warrant shall issue. When a defendant arrested with a warrant or given a summons appears initially before a magistrate judge, the magistrate judge shall proceed in accordance with the applicable subdivisions of Rule 5.	**(a) Issuance.** The court must issue a warrant — or at the government's request, a summons — for each defendant named in an indictment or named in an information if one or more affidavits accompanying the information establish probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the defendant committed it. More than one warrant or summons may issue for the same defendant. If a defendant fails to appear in response to a summons, the court may, and upon request of the attorney for the government must, issue a warrant. The court must issue the arrest warrant to an officer authorized to execute it or the summons to a person authorized to serve it.
(b) Form. **(1) Warrant.** The form of the warrant shall be as provided in Rule 4(c)(1) except that it shall be signed by the clerk, it shall describe the offense charged in the indictment or information and it shall command that the defendant be arrested and brought before the nearest available magistrate judge. The amount of bail may be fixed by the court and endorsed on the warrant. **(2) Summons.** The summons shall be in the same form as the warrant except that it shall summon the defendant to appear before a magistrate judge at a stated time and place.	**(b) Form.** **(1)** ***Warrant.*** The warrant must conform to Rule 4(b)(1) except that it must be signed by the clerk and must describe the offense charged in the indictment or information. **(2)** ***Summons.*** The summons is to be in the same form as a warrant except that it must require the defendant to appear before the court at a stated time and place.
(c) Execution or Service; and Return. **(1) Execution or Service.** The warrant shall be executed or the summons served as provided in Rule 4(d)(1), (2) and (3). A summons to a corporation shall be served by delivering a copy to an officer or to a managing or general agent or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process and, if the agent is one authorized by statute to receive service and the statute so requires, by also mailing a copy to the corporation's last known address within the district or at its principal place of business elsewhere in the United States. The officer executing the warrant shall bring the arrested person without unnecessary delay before the nearest available federal magistrate judge or, in the event that a federal magistrate judge is not reasonably available, before a state or local judicial officer authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3041.	**(c) Execution or Service; Return; Initial Appearance.** **(1)** ***Execution or Service.*** (A) The warrant must be executed or the summons served as provided in Rule 4(c)(1), (2), and (3). (B) The officer executing the warrant must proceed in accordance with Rule 5(a)(1).

(2) Return. The officer executing a warrant shall make return thereof to the magistrate judge or other officer before whom the defendant is brought. At the request of the attorney for the government any unexecuted warrant shall be returned and cancelled. On or before the return day the person to whom a summons was delivered for service shall make return thereof. At the request of the attorney for the government made at any time while the indictment or information is pending, a warrant returned unexecuted and not cancelled or a summons returned unserved or a duplicate thereof may be delivered by the clerk to the marshal or other authorized person for execution or service.	**(2)** ***Return.*** A warrant or summons must be returned in accordance with Rule 4(c)(4). **(3)** ***Initial Appearance.*** When an arrested or summoned defendant first appears before the court, the judge must proceed under Rule 5.
[(d) Remand to United States Magistrate for Trial of Minor Offenses] (Abrogated Apr. 28, 1982, eff. Aug. 1, 1982).	

Committee Notes
Rule 9
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 9 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Rule 9 has been changed to reflect its relationship to Rule 4 procedures for obtaining an arrest warrant or summons. Thus, rather than simply repeating material that is already located in Rule 4, the Committee determined that where appropriate, Rule 9 should simply direct the reader to the procedures specified in Rule 4.

Rule 9(a) includes a substantive change. It has been amended to permit a judge discretion whether to issue an arrest warrant when a defendant fails to respond to a summons on a complaint. Under the current language of the rule, if the defendant fails to appear, the judge must issue a warrant. Under the amended version, if the defendant fails to appear and the government requests that a warrant be issued, the judge must issue one. In the absence of such a request, the judge has the discretion whether to do so. This change mirrors language in amended Rule 4(a).

A second substantive amendment has been made in Rule 9(b)(1). The rule has been amended to delete language permitting the court to set the amount of bail on the warrant. The Committee believes that this language is inconsistent with the 1984 Bail Reform Act. *See United States v. Thomas*, 992 F. Supp. 782 (D. Virgin Islands 1998) (bail amount endorsed on warrant that has not been determined in proceedings conducted under Bail Reform Act has no bearing on decision by judge conducting Rule 40 hearing).

The language in current Rule 9(c)(1), concerning service of a summons on an organization, has been moved to Rule 4.

IV. ARRAIGNMENT, AND PREPARATION FOR TRIAL	**Title IV. Arraignment and Preparation for Trial**
Rule 10. Arraignment	**Rule 10. Arraignment**
Arraignment shall be conducted in open court and shall consist of reading the indictment or information to the defendant or stating to the defendant the substance of the charge and calling on the defendant to plead thereto. The defendant shall be given a copy of the indictment or information before being called upon to plead.	**(a) In General.** Arraignment must be conducted in open court and must consist of: **(1)** ensuring that the defendant has a copy of the indictment or information; **(2)** reading the indictment or information to the defendant or stating to the defendant the substance of the charge; and then **(3)** asking the defendant to plead to the indictment or information. **(b) Waiving Appearance.** A defendant need not be present for the arraignment if: **(1)** the defendant has been charged by indictment or misdemeanor information; **(2)** the defendant, in a written waiver signed by both the defendant and defense counsel, has waived appearance and has affirmed that the defendant received a copy of the indictment or information and that the plea is not guilty; and **(3)** the court accepts the waiver. **(c) Video Teleconferencing.** Video teleconferencing may be used to arraign a defendant if the defendant waives the right to be arraigned in open court.

Committee Notes
Rule 10
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 10 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Read together, Rules 10 and 43 require the defendant to be physically present in court for the arraignment. *See, e.g., Valenzuela-Gonzales v. United States*, 915 F.2d 1276, 1280 (9th Cir. 1990)(Rules 10 and 43 are broader in protection than the Constitution). The amendments to Rule 10 create two exceptions to that requirement. The first provides that the court may hold an arraignment in the defendant's absence when the defendant has waived the right to be present in writing and the court consents to that waiver. The second permits the court to hold arraignments by video teleconferencing, when the defendant is at a different location. A conforming amendment has also been made to Rule 43.

In amending the rule and Rule 43, the Committee was concerned that permitting a defendant to be absent from the arraignment could be viewed as an erosion of an important element of the judicial process. First, it may be important for a defendant to see and experience first-hand the formal impact of the reading of the charge. Second, it may be necessary for the court to personally see and speak with the defendant at the arraignment, especially when there is a real question whether the defendant really understands the gravity of the proceedings. And third, there may be difficulties in providing the defendant with effective and confidential assistance of counsel if counsel, but not the defendant, appears at the arraignment.

The Committee nonetheless believed that in appropriate circumstances the court, and the defendant, should have the option of conducting the arraignment in the defendant's absence. The question of when it would be appropriate for a defendant to waive an appearance is not spelled out in the rule. That is left to the defendant and the court in each case.

A critical element to the amendment is that no matter how convenient or cost effective a defendant's absence might be, the defendant's right to be present in court stands unless he or she waives that right in writing. Under the amendment, the waiver must be signed by both the defendant and the defendant's attorney. Further, the amendment requires that the waiver specifically state that the defendant has received a copy of the charging instrument.

If the trial court has reason to believe that in a particular case the defendant should not be permitted to waive the right, the court may reject the waiver and require that the defendant actually appear in court. That might be particularly appropriate when the court wishes to discuss substantive or procedural matters in conjunction with the arraignment and the court believes that the defendant's presence is important in resolving those matters.

The amendment does not permit waiver of an appearance when the defendant is charged with a felony information. In that instance, the defendant is required by Rule 7(b) to be present in court to waive the indictment. Nor does the amendment permit a waiver of appearance when the defendant is standing mute, (see Rule 11(a)(4)) or entering a conditional plea, (see Rule 11(a)(2)), a nolo contendere plea, (see Rule 11(a)(3)), or a guilty plea, (see Rule 11(a)(1)). In each of those instances the Committee believed that it was more appropriate for the defendant to appear personally before the court.

It is important to note that the amendment does not permit the defendant to waive the arraignment itself, which may be a triggering mechanism for other rules.

Rule 10(c) addresses the second substantive change in the rule. That provision permits the court to conduct arraignments through video teleconferencing. Although the practice is now used in state courts and in some federal courts, Rules 10 and 43 have generally prevented federal courts from using that method for arraignments in criminal cases. *See, e.g., Valenzuela-Gonzales v. United States*, *supra* (Rules 10 and 43 mandate physical presence of defendant at arraignment and that arraignment take place in open court; thus, pilot program for video teleconferencing not permitted). A similar amendment was proposed by the Committee in 1993 and published for public comment. The amendment was later withdrawn from consideration in order to consider the results of several planned pilot programs for civil cases. Upon further consideration, the Committee believed that the benefits of using video teleconferencing outweighed the costs of doing so. This amendment also parallels an amendment in Rule 5.1(d) that would permit initial appearances to be conducted by video teleconferencing.

The arguments for opposing video teleconferencing of arraignments generally parallel those noted, *supra*, for permitting the defendant to waive the right to be personally brought before a judicial officer. Yet, if one accepts the argument that the defendant may voluntarily waive a personal appearance altogether at the arraignment, the same defendant should be able to consent to an arraignment from a remote location. Further, the Committee was persuaded in part by the fact that some districts deal with a very high volume of arraignments of defendants who are in custody and because of the distances involved, must be transported long distances. That potentially presents security risks to law enforcement and court personnel.

The amendment leaves to the courts the decision first, whether to permit video arraignments, and second, the procedures to be used. The Committee was satisfied that the technology has progressed to the point that video teleconferencing can address the concerns raised in the past about the ability of the court and the defendant to see each other and for the defendant and counsel to be in contact with each other, either at the same location or by a secure remote connection.

Although the rule requires the defendant to waive a personal appearance for an arraignment, the rule does not require that the waiver for video teleconferencing be in writing. Nor does it require that the defendant waive that appearance in person, in open court. It would normally be sufficient for the defendant to waive an appearance while participating through a video teleconference.

Rule 11. Pleas	Rule 11. Pleas
(a) Alternatives. **(1) In General.** A defendant may plead guilty, not guilty, or nolo contendere. If a defendant refuses to plead, or if a defendant organization, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 18, fails to appear, the court shall enter a plea of not guilty. **(2) Conditional Pleas.** With the approval of the court and the consent of the government, a defendant may enter a conditional plea of guilty or nolo contendere, reserving in writing the right, on appeal from the judgment, to review of the adverse determination of any specified pretrial motion. A defendant who prevails on appeal shall be allowed to withdraw the plea.	**(a) Entering a Plea.** **(1)** ***In General.*** A defendant may plead guilty, not guilty, or (with the court's consent) nolo contendere. **(2)** ***Conditional Plea.*** With the consent of the court and government, a defendant may enter a conditional plea of guilty or nolo contendere, reserving in writing the right to have an appellate court review an adverse determination of a specified pretrial motion. A defendant who prevails on appeal may then withdraw the plea.
(b) Nolo Contendere. A defendant may plead nolo contendere only with the consent of the court. Such a plea shall be accepted by the court only after due consideration of the views of the parties and the interest of the public in the effective administration of justice.	**(3)** ***Nolo Contendere Plea.*** Before accepting a plea of nolo contendere, the court must consider the parties' views and the public interest in the effective administration of justice. **(4)** ***Failure to Enter a Plea.*** If a defendant refuses to enter a plea or if a defendant organization fails to appear, the court must enter a plea of not guilty.

(c) Advice to Defendant. Before accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, the court must address the defendant personally in open court and inform the defendant of, and determine that the defendant understands, the following: **(1)** the nature of the charge to which the plea is offered, the mandatory minimum penalty provided by law, if any, and the maximum possible penalty provided by law, including the effect of any special parole or supervised release term, the fact that the court is required to consider any applicable sentencing guidelines but may depart from those guidelines under some circumstances, and, when applicable, that the court may also order the defendant to make restitution to any victim of the offense; and **(2)** if the defendant is not represented by an attorney, that the defendant has the right to be represented by an attorney at every stage of the proceeding, and, if necessary, one will be appointed to represent the defendant; and **(3)** that the defendant has the right to plead not guilty or to persist in that plea if it has already been made, the right to be tried by a jury and at that trial the right to the assistance of counsel, the right to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses, and the right against compelled self-incrimination; and **(4)** that if a plea of guilty or nolo contendere is accepted by the court there will not be a further trial of any kind, so that by pleading guilty or nolo contendere the defendant waives the right to a trial; and **(5)** if the court intends to question the defendant under oath, on the record, and in the presence of counsel about the offense to which the defendant has pleaded, that the defendant's answers may later be used against the defendant in a prosecution for perjury or false statement; and	**(b) Consideration and Acceptance of a Guilty or Nolo Contendere Plea.** **(1)** ***Advising and Questioning the Defendant.*** Before the court accepts a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, the defendant may be placed under oath, and the court must address the defendant personally in open court. During this address, the court must inform the defendant of, and determine that the defendant understands, the following: (A) any statement that the defendant gives under oath may be used against the defendant in a later prosecution for perjury or false statement; (B) the right to plead not guilty, or having already so pleaded, to persist in that plea; (C) the right to a jury trial; (D) the right to be represented by counsel — and if necessary have the court appoint counsel — at trial and at every other stage of the proceeding; (E) the right at trial to confront and cross-examine adverse witnesses, to be protected from compelled self-incrimination, to testify and present evidence, and to compel the attendance of witnesses; (F) the defendant's waiver of these trial rights if the court accepts a plea of guilty or nolo contendere; (G) the nature of each charge to which the defendant is pleading;

(6) the terms of any provision in a plea agreement waiving the right to appeal or to collaterally attack the sentence.	(H) any maximum possible penalty, including imprisonment, fine, special assessment, forfeiture, restitution, and term of supervised release; (I) any mandatory minimum penalty; (J) the court's obligation to apply the sentencing guidelines, and the court's authority to depart from those guidelines under some circumstances; and (K) the terms of any plea-agreement provision waiving the right to appeal or to collaterally attack the sentence.
(d) Insuring That the Plea is Voluntary. The court shall not accept a plea of guilty or nolo contendere without first, by addressing the defendant personally in open court, determining that the plea is voluntary and not the result of force or threats or of promises apart from a plea agreement. The court shall also inquire as to whether the defendant's willingness to plead guilty or nolo contendere results from prior discussions between the attorney for the government and the defendant or the defendant's attorney.	**(2)** ***Ensuring That a Plea Is Voluntary***. Before accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, the court must address the defendant personally in open court and determine that the plea is voluntary and did not result from force, threats, or promises (other than promises in a plea agreement). **(3)** ***Determining the Factual Basis for a Plea***. Before entering judgment on a guilty plea, the court must determine that there is a factual basis for the plea.

(e) Plea Agreement Procedure. (1) **In General.** The attorney for the government and the attorney for the defendant — or the defendant when acting pro se — may agree that, upon the defendant's entering a plea of guilty or nolo contendere to a charged offense, or to a lesser or related offense, the attorney for the government will: (A) move to dismiss other charges; or (B) recommend, or agree not to oppose the defendant's request for a particular sentence or sentencing range, or that a particular provision of the Sentencing Guidelines, or policy statement, or sentencing factor is or is not applicable to the case. Any such recommendation or request is not binding on the court; or (C) agree that a specific sentence or sentencing range is the appropriate disposition of the case, or that a particular provision of the Sentencing Guidelines, or policy statement, or sentencing factor is or is not applicable to the case. Such a plea agreement is binding on the court once it is accepted by the court. The court shall not participate in any discussions between the parties concerning any such plea agreement.	**(c) Plea Agreement Procedure.** **(1)** ***In General.*** The attorney for the government and the defendant's attorney, or the defendant when proceeding pro se, may discuss and agree to a plea. The court must not participate in these discussions. If the defendant pleads guilty or nolo contendere to either the charged offense or a lesser or related offense, the plea agreement may specify that the attorney for the government will: (A) not bring, or will move to dismiss, other charges; (B) recommend, or agree not to oppose the defendant's request, that a particular sentence or sentencing range is appropriate or that a particular provision of the Sentencing Guidelines, or policy statement, or sentencing factor is or is not applicable (such a recommendation or request does not bind the court); or (C) agree that a specific sentence or sentencing range is the appropriate disposition of the case, or that a particular provision of the Sentencing Guidelines, or policy statement, or sentencing factor is or is not applicable (such a recommendation or request binds the court once the court accepts it).
(2) Notice of Such Agreement. If a plea agreement has been reached by the parties, the court shall, on the record, require the disclosure of the agreement in open court or, upon a showing of good cause, in camera, at the time the plea is offered. If the agreement is of the type specified in subdivision (e)(1)(A) or (C), the court may accept or reject the agreement, or may defer its decision as to the acceptance or rejection until there has been an opportunity to consider the presentence report. If the agreement is of the type specified in subdivision (e)(1)(B), the court shall advise the defendant that if the court does not accept the recommendation or request the defendant nevertheless has no right to withdraw the plea.	**(2)** ***Disclosing a Plea Agreement.*** The parties must disclose the plea agreement in open court when the plea is offered, unless the court for good cause allows the parties to disclose the plea agreement in camera.

(3) Acceptance of a Plea Agreement. If the court accepts the plea agreement, the court shall inform the defendant that it will embody in the judgment and sentence the disposition provided for in the plea agreement.	**(3)** ***Judicial Consideration of a Plea Agreement*** (A) To the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(A) or (C), the court may accept the agreement, reject it, or defer a decision until the court has reviewed the presentence report. (B) To the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(B), the court must advise the defendant that the defendant has no right to withdraw the plea if the court does not follow the recommendation or request. **(4)** ***Accepting a Plea Agreement.*** If the court accepts the plea agreement, it must inform the defendant that to the extent the plea agreement is of the type specified in Rule 11 (c)(1)(A) or (C), the agreed disposition will be included in the judgment.
(4) Rejection of a Plea Agreement. If the court rejects the plea agreement, the court shall, on the record, inform the parties of this fact, advise the defendant personally in open court or, on a showing of good cause, in camera, that the court is not bound by the plea agreement, afford the defendant the opportunity to then withdraw the plea, and advise the defendant that if the defendant persists in a guilty plea or plea of nolo contendere the disposition of the case may be less favorable to the defendant than that contemplated by the plea agreement.	**(5)** ***Rejecting a Plea Agreement.*** If the court rejects a plea agreement containing provisions of the type specified in Rule 11(c)(1)(A) or (C), the court must on the record: (A) inform the parties that the court rejects the plea agreement; (B) advise the defendant personally in open court — or, for good cause, in camera — that the court may not follow the plea agreement and give the defendant an opportunity to withdraw the plea; and (C) advise the defendant personally that if the plea is not withdrawn, the court may dispose of the case less favorably toward the defendant than the plea agreement contemplated.

(5) Time of Plea Agreement Procedure. Except for good cause shown, notification to the court of the existence of a plea agreement shall be given at the arraignment or at such other time, prior to trial, as may be fixed by the court.	**(d)** ***Withdrawing a Guilty or Nolo Contendere Plea.*** A defendant may withdraw a plea of guilty or nolo contendere as follows: **(1)** Before the court accepts a plea of guilty or a plea of nolo contendere, for any, or no, reason. **(2)** After the court accepts a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, but before it imposes sentence if: (A) the court rejects a plea agreement under Rule 11(c)(5); or (B) the defendant can show fair and just reasons for requesting the withdrawal. **(e)** ***Finality of Guilty or Nolo Contendere Plea.*** After the court imposes sentence the defendant may not withdraw a plea of guilty or nolo contendere and the plea may be set aside only on direct appeal or by motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.
(6) Inadmissibility of Pleas, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements. Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, evidence of the following is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the defendant who made the plea or was a participant in the plea discussions: **(A)** a plea of guilty which was later withdrawn; **(B)** a plea of nolo contendere; **(C)** any statement made in the course of any proceedings under this rule regarding either of the foregoing pleas; or **(D)** any statement made in the course of plea discussions with an attorney for the government which do not result in a plea of guilty or which result in a plea of guilty later withdrawn. However, such a statement is admissible (i) in any proceeding wherein another statement made in the course of the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced and the statement ought in fairness be considered contemporaneously with it, or (ii) in a criminal proceeding for perjury or false statement if the statement was made in by the defendant under oath, on the record, and in the presence of counsel.	**(f) Admissibility or Inadmissibility of a Plea, Plea Discussions, and Related Statements**. Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, evidence of the following is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the defendant who made the plea or was a participant in the plea discussions: **(1)** a plea of guilty that was later withdrawn; **(2)** a plea of nolo contendere; **(3)** any statement made in the course of any proceedings under this rule regarding either of the foregoing pleas; or **(4)** any statement made in the course of plea discussions with an attorney for the government which do not result in a plea of guilty or which result in a plea of guilty later withdrawn. However, such a statement is admissible (i) in any proceeding wherein another statement made in the course of the same plea or plea discussions has been introduced and the statement ought in fairness be considered contemporaneously with it, or (ii) in a criminal proceeding for perjury or false statement if the statement was made by the defendant under oath, on the record, and in the presence of counsel.

(f) Determining Accuracy of Plea. Notwithstanding the acceptance of a plea of guilty, the court should not enter a judgment upon such plea without making such inquiry as shall satisfy it that there is a factual basis for the plea.	
(g) Record of Proceedings. A verbatim record of the proceedings at which the defendant enters a plea shall be made and, if there is a plea of guilty or nolo contendere, the record shall include, without limitation, the court's advice to the defendant, the inquiry into the voluntariness of the plea including any plea agreement, and the inquiry into the accuracy of a guilty plea.	**(g) Recording the Proceedings**. The proceedings during which the defendant enters a plea must be recorded verbatim by a court reporter or by a suitable recording device. If there is a guilty plea or a nolo contendere plea, the record must include the inquiries and advice to the defendant required under Rule 11(b) and (c).
(h) Harmless Error. Any variance from the procedures required by this rule which does not affect substantial rights shall be disregarded.	**(h) Harmless Error**. A variance from the requirements of this rule is harmless error if it does not affect substantial rights.

Committee Notes
Rule 11
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 11 has been amended and reorganized as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Amended Rule 11(b)(1) requires the court to apprise the defendant of his or her rights before accepting a plea of guilty or nolo contendere. The list is generally the same as that in the current rule except that the reference to parole has been removed and the judge is now required under Rule 11(b)(1)(H) to advise the defendant of the possibility of a fine and special assessment as a part of a maximum possible sentence. Also, the list has been re-ordered.

Rule 11(c)(1)(A) includes a substantive change which recognizes a common type of plea agreement —that the government will "not bring" other charges.

The Committee considered whether to address the practice in some courts of using judges to facilitate plea agreements. The current rule indicates that "the court shall not participate in any discussions between the parties concerning such plea agreement." Some courts apparently believe that that language acts as a limitation only upon the judge taking the defendant's plea and thus permit other judges to serve as facilitators for reaching a plea agreement between the government and the defendant. *See, e.g., United States v. Torres*, 999 F.2d 376, 378 (9th Cir. 1993) (noting practice and concluding that presiding judge had not participated in a plea agreement that had resulted from discussions involving another judge). The Committee decided to leave the Rule as it is with the understanding that doing so was in no way intended to make any change in the existing law interpreting that provision.

Amended Rules 11(c)(3) to (5) address the topics of consideration, acceptance, and rejection of a plea agreement. The amendments are not intended to make any change in practice. The topics are discussed separately because in the past there has been some question about the possible interplay between the court's consideration of the guilty plea in conjunction with a plea agreement and sentencing and the ability of the defendant to withdraw a plea. *See United States v. Hyde*, 520 U.S. 670 (1997) (holding that plea and plea agreement need not be accepted or rejected as a single unit; "guilty pleas can be accepted while plea agreements are deferred, and the acceptance of the two can be separated in

time."). Similarly, the Committee decided to more clearly spell out in Rule 11(d) and 11(e) the ability of defendant to withdraw a plea. *See United States v. Hyde, supra.*

Finally, Rule 11(e) is a new provision, taken from Rule 32, that addresses the finality of a guilty or nolo contendere plea after the court imposes sentence. The provision makes it clear that it is not possible for a defendant to withdraw a plea after sentence is imposed.

Rule 12. Pleadings and Motions Before Trial; Defenses and Objections.	Rule 12. Pleadings And Pretrial Motions
(a) Pleadings and Motions. Pleadings in criminal proceedings shall be the indictment and the information, and the pleas of not guilty, guilty and nolo contendere. All other pleas, and demurrers and motions to quash are abolished, and defenses and objections raised before trial which heretofore could have been raised by one or more of them shall be raised only by motion to dismiss or to grant appropriate relief, as provided in these rules.	**(a) Pleadings.** Pleadings in criminal proceedings are the indictment, the information, and the pleas of not guilty, guilty, and nolo contendere.
(b) Pretrial Motions. Any defense, objection, or request which is capable of determination without the trial of the general issue may be raised before trial by motion. Motions may be written or oral at the discretion of the judge. The following must be raised prior to trial: **(1)** Defenses and objections based on defects in the institution of the prosecution; or **(2)** Defenses and objections based on defects in the indictment or information (other than that it fails to show jurisdiction in the court or to charge an offense which objections shall be noticed by the court at any time during the pendency of the proceedings); or **(3)** Motions to suppress evidence; or **(4)** Requests for discovery under Rule 16; or **(5)** Requests for a severance of charges or defendants under Rule 14.	**(b) Pretrial Motions.** **(1)** ***In General.*** The parties may raise by pretrial motion any defense, objection, or request that the court can determine without a trial of the general issue. At the court's discretion, a motion may be written or oral. The following must be raised before trial: (A) a motion alleging a defect in the institution of the prosecution; (B) a motion alleging a defect in the indictment or information — but at any time during the proceeding, the court may hear a claim that the indictment or information fails to invoke the court's jurisdiction or to state an offense; (C) a motion to suppress evidence; (D) a Rule 14 motion to sever charges or defendants; and (E) a Rule 16 motion for discovery.

	(2) ***Notice of the Government's Intent to Use Evidence.*** (A) *At the Government's Discretion.* At the arraignment or as soon afterward as practicable, the government may give notice to the defendant of its intent to use specified evidence at trial in order to afford the defendant an opportunity to raise objections to such evidence prior to trial under Rule 12(b)(1). (B) *At the Defendant's Request.* At the arraignment or as soon afterward as practicable, the defendant may, in order to have an opportunity to move to suppress evidence under Rule 12(b)(1), request notice of the government's intent to use (in its evidence in chief at trial) any evidence that the defendant may be entitled to discover under Rule 16.
(c) Motion Date. Unless otherwise provided by local rule, the court may, at the time of the arraignment or as soon thereafter as practicable, set a time for the making of pretrial motions or requests and, if required, a later date of hearing.	**(c) Motion Deadline.** The court may at the arraignment, or as soon afterward as practicable, set a deadline for the parties to make pretrial motions and may also schedule a motion hearing.
(d) Notice by the Government of the Intention to Use Evidence. **(1) At the Discretion of the Government.** At the arraignment or as soon thereafter as is practicable, the government may give notice to the defendant of its intention to use specified evidence at trial in order to afford the defendant an opportunity to raise objections to such evidence prior to trial under subdivision (b)(3) of this rule. **(2) At the Request of the Defendant.** At the arraignment or as soon thereafter as is practicable the defendant may, in order to afford an opportunity to move to suppress evidence under subdivision (b)(3) of this rule, request notice of the government's intention to use (in its evidence in chief at trial) any evidence which the defendant may be entitled to discover under Rule 16 subject to any relevant limitations prescribed in Rule 16.	
(e) Ruling on Motion. A motion made before trial shall be determined before trial unless the court, for good cause, orders that it be deferred for determination at the trial of the general issue or until after verdict, but no such determination shall be deferred if a party's right to appeal is adversely affected. Where factual issues are involved in determining a motion, the court shall state its essential findings on the record.	**(d) Ruling on a Motion.** The court must decide every pretrial motion before trial unless it finds good cause to defer a ruling. The court must not defer ruling on a pretrial motion if the deferral will adversely affect a party's right to appeal. When factual issues are involved in deciding a motion, the court must state its essential findings on the record.

(f) Effect of Failure To Raise Defenses or Objections. Failure by a party to raise defenses or objections or to make requests which must be made prior to trial, at the time set by the court pursuant to subdivision (c), or prior to any extension thereof made by the court, shall constitute waiver thereof, but the court for cause shown may grant relief from the waiver.	**(e) Waiver of a Defense, Objection, or Request.** A party waives any Rule 12(b)(1) defense, objection, or request not raised by the deadline the court sets under Rule 12(c) or by any extension the court provides. For good cause, the court may grant relief from the waiver.
(g) Records. A verbatim record shall be made of all proceedings at the hearing, including such findings of fact and conclusions of law as are made orally.	**(f) Records.** All proceedings at a motion hearing, including any findings of fact and conclusions of law made by the court, must be recorded by a court reporter or a suitable recording device.
(h) Effect of Determination. If the court grants a motion based on a defect in the institution of the prosecution or in the indictment or information, it may also order that the defendant be continued in custody or that bail be continued for a specified time pending the filing of a new indictment or information. Nothing in this rule shall be deemed to affect the provisions of any Act of Congress relating to periods of limitations.	**(g) Defendant's Continued Custody or Release Status.** If the court grants a motion to dismiss based on a defect in the institution of the prosecution, in the indictment, or in the information, it may order the defendant to be released or detained under 18 U.S.C. § 3142 for a specified time until a new indictment or information is filed. This rule does not affect any federal statutory period of limitations.
(i) Production of Statements at Suppression Hearing. Rule 26.2 applies at a hearing on a motion to suppress evidence under subdivision (b)(3) of this rule. For purposes of this subdivision, a law enforcement officer is deemed a government witness.	**(h) Producing Statements at a Suppression Hearing.** Rule 26.2 applies at a suppression hearing under Rule 12(b)(1)(C). In a suppression hearing, a law enforcement officer is considered a government witness.

Committee Notes
Rule 12
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 12 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

The last sentence of current Rule 12(a), referring to the abolishment of "all other pleas, and demurrers and motions to quash" has been deleted as being unnecessary.

Rule 12(b)(2) is composed of what is currently Rule 12(d). The Committee believed that that provision, which addresses the government's requirement to disclose discoverable information for the purpose of facilitating timely defense objections and motions, was more appropriately associated with the pretrial motions specified in Rule 12(b)(1).

Rule 12(c) includes a substantive change. The reference to the "local rule" exception has been deleted to make it clear that judges should be encouraged to set deadlines for motions. The Committee believed that doing so promotes more efficient case management, especially when there is a heavy docket of pending cases. Although the rule permits some discretion in setting a date for motion hearings, the Committee believed that doing so at an early point in the proceedings would also promote judicial economy.

Moving the language in current Rule 12(d) caused the relettering of the subdivisions following Rule 12(c).

Although amended Rule 12(e) is a revised version of current Rule 12(f), the Committee intends to make no change in the current law regarding waivers of motions or defenses.

Rule 12.1. Notice of Alibi	Rule 12.1. Notice of Alibi Defense
(a) Notice by Defendant. Upon written demand of the attorney for the government stating the time, date, and place at which the alleged offense was committed, the defendant shall serve within ten days, or such different time as the court may direct, upon the attorney for the government a written notice of the defendant's intention to offer a defense of alibi. Such notice by the defendant shall state the specific place or places at which the defendant claims to have been at the time of the alleged offense and the names and addresses of the witnesses upon whom the defendant intends to rely to establish such alibi.	**(a) Government's Request for Notice and Defendant's Response.** **(1)** ***Government's Request.*** The attorney for the government may request in writing that the defendant notify the attorney for the government of any intended alibi defense. The request must state the time, date, and place of the alleged offense. **(2)** ***Defendant's Response.*** Within 10 days after the request, or some other time the court directs, the defendant must serve written notice on the attorney for the government of any intended alibi defense. The defendant's notice must state the specific places where the defendant claims to have been at the time of the alleged offense and the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the alibi witnesses on whom the defendant intends to rely.
(b) Disclosure of Information and Witness. Within ten days thereafter, but in no event less than ten days before trial, unless the court otherwise directs, the attorney for the government shall serve upon the defendant or the defendant's attorney a written notice stating the names and addresses of the witnesses upon whom the government intends to rely to establish the defendant's presence at the scene of the alleged offense and any other witnesses to be relied upon to rebut testimony of any of the defendant's alibi witnesses.	**(b) Disclosure of Government Witnesses.** **(1)** ***Disclosure.*** If the defendant serves a Rule 12.1(a)(2) notice, the attorney for the government must disclose in writing to the defendant, or the defendant's attorney, the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the witnesses the government intends to rely on to establish the defendant's presence at the scene of the alleged offense, and any government rebuttal witnesses to the defendant's alibi witnesses. **(2)** ***Time to Disclose.*** Unless the court directs otherwise, the attorney for the government must give notice under Rule 12.1(b)(1) within 10 days after the defendant serves notice of an intended alibi defense under Rule 12.1(a)(2), but no later than 10 days before trial.
(c) Continuing Duty to Disclose. If prior to or during trial, a party learns of an additional witness whose identity, if known, should have been included in the information furnished under subdivision (a) or (b), the party shall promptly notify the other party or the other party's attorney of the existence and identity of such additional witness.	**(c) Continuing Duty to Disclose.** Both the attorney for the government and the defendant must promptly disclose in writing to the other party the name, address, and telephone numbers of any additional witness if: **(1)** the disclosing party learns of the witness before or during trial; and **(2)** the witness should have been disclosed under Rule 12.1(a) or (b) if the disclosing party had earlier known of the witness.

(d) Failure to Comply. Upon failure of either party to comply with the requirements of this rule, the court may exclude the testimony of any undisclosed witness offered by such party as to the defendant's absence from or presence at, the scene of the alleged offense. This rule shall not limit the right of the defendant to testify.	**(d) Exceptions.** For good cause the court may grant an exception to any requirement of Rule 12.1 (a) -(c).
(e) Exceptions. For good cause shown, the court may grant an exception to any of the requirements of subdivisions (a) through (d) of this rule.	**(e) Failure to Comply.** If a party fails to comply with this rule, the court may exclude the testimony of any undisclosed witness regarding the defendant's alibi. This rule does not limit the defendant's right to testify.
(f) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Alibi. Evidence of an intention to rely upon an alibi defense, later withdrawn, or of statements made in connections with such intention, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intention.	**(f) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Intent.** Evidence of an intent to rely on an alibi defense, later withdrawn, or of statements made in connection with that intent, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intent.

Committee Notes
Rule 12.1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 12.1 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Current Rules12.1(d) and 12.1(e) have been switched in the amended rule to improve the organization of the rule.

Finally, the amended rule includes a new requirement that in providing the names and addresses of alibi and any rebuttal witnesses, the parties must also provide the phone numbers of those witnesses. *See* Rule 12.1(a)(2), Rule 12.1(b)(1), and Rule 12.1(c). The Committee believed that requiring such information would facilitate locating and interviewing those witnesses.

Rule 12.2. Notice of Insanity Defense or Expert Testimony of Defendant's Mental Condition	Rule 12.2. Notice of Insanity Defense; Mental Examination
(a) Defense of Insanity. If a defendant intends to rely upon the defense of insanity at the time of the alleged offense, the defendant shall, within the time provided for the filing of pretrial motions or at such later time as the court may direct, notify the attorney for the government in writing of such intention and file a copy of such notice with the clerk. If there is a failure to comply with the requirements of this subdivision, insanity may not be raised as a defense. The court may for cause shown allow late filing of the notice or grant additional time to the parties to prepare for trial or make such other order as may be appropriate.	**(a) Notice of an Insanity Defense.** A defendant who intends to assert a defense of insanity at the time of the alleged offense must notify the attorney for the government in writing within the time provided for filing a pretrial motion, or at any later time the court directs. A defendant who fails to do so cannot rely on an insanity defense. The court may — for good cause — allow the defendant to file the notice late, grant additional trial-preparation time, or make other appropriate orders.
(b) Expert Testimony of Defendant's Mental Condition. If a defendant intends to introduce expert testimony relating to a mental disease or defect or any other mental condition of the defendant bearing upon the issue of guilt, the defendant shall, within the time provided for the filing of pretrial motions or at such later time as the court may direct, notify the attorney for the government in writing of such intention and file a copy of such notice with the clerk. The court may for cause shown allow late filing of the notice or grant additional time to the parties to prepare for trial or make such other order as may be appropriate.	**(b) Notice of Expert Evidence of a Mental Condition.** If a defendant intends to introduce expert evidence relating to a mental disease or defect or any other mental condition of the defendant bearing on either (1) the issue of guilt or (2) the issue of punishment in a capital case, the defendant must — within the time provided for the filing of pretrial motions or at a later time as the court directs — notify the attorney for the government in writing of this intention and file a copy of the notice with the clerk. The court may, for good cause, allow late filing of the notice or grant additional time to the parties to prepare for trial or make any other appropriate order.

(c) Mental Examination of Defendant. In an appropriate case the court may, upon motion of the attorney for the government, order the defendant to submit to an examination pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 4241 or 4242. No statement made by the defendant in the course of any examination provided for by this rule, whether the examination be with or without the consent of the defendant, no testimony by the expert based upon such statement, and no other fruits of the statement shall be admitted in evidence against the defendant in any criminal proceeding except on an issue respecting mental condition on which the defendant has introduced testimony.	**(c) Mental Examination.** **(1)** ***Authority to Order Examination; Procedures.*** If the defendant provides notice under Rule 12.2(a), the court must, upon the government's motion, order the defendant to be examined under 18 U.S.C. § 4242. If the defendant provides notice under Rule 12.2(b) the court may, upon the government's motion, order the defendant to be examined under procedures ordered by the court. **(2)** ***Disclosing Results and Reports of Capital Sentencing Examination.*** The results and reports of any examination conducted solely under Rule 12.2 (c)(1) after notice under Rule 12.2(b)(2) must be sealed and must not be disclosed to any attorney for the government or the defendant unless the defendant is found guilty of one or more capital crimes and the defendant confirms an intent to offer during sentencing proceedings expert evidence on mental condition. **(3)** ***Disclosing Results and Reports of the Defendant's Expert Examination.*** After disclosure under Rule 12.2(c)(2) of the results and reports of the government's examination, the defendant must disclose to the government the results and reports of any examination on mental condition conducted by the defendant's expert about which the defendant intends to introduce expert evidence. **(4)** ***Admitting a Defendant's Statements.*** No statement made by a defendant in the course of any examination conducted under this rule (whether conducted with or without the defendant's consent), no testimony by the expert based on the statement, and no other fruits of the statement may be admitted into evidence against the defendant in any criminal proceeding except on an issue respecting mental condition on which the defendant: (i) has introduced evidence after notice under Rule 12.2(a) or (b)(1), or (ii) has introduced expert evidence after notice under Rule 12.2(b)(2).

(d) Failure to Comply. If there is a failure to give notice when required by subdivision (b) of this rule or to submit to an examination when ordered under subdivision (c) of this rule, the court may exclude the testimony of any expert witness offered by the defendant on the issue of the defendant's guilt.	**(d) Failure to Comply.** If the defendant fails to give notice under Rule 12.2(b) or does not submit to an examination when ordered under Rule 12.2(c), the court may exclude any expert evidence from the defendant on the issue of the defendant's mental disease, mental defect, or any other mental condition bearing on the defendant's guilt or the issue of punishment in a capital case.
(e) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Intention. Evidence of an intention as to which notice was given under subdivision (a) or (b), later withdrawn, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intention.	**(e) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Intention.** Evidence of an intention as to which notice was given under Rule 12.2(a) or (b), later withdrawn, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intention.

Committee Notes
Rule 12.2
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 12.2 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

The substantive changes to Rule 12.2 are designed to address five issues. First, the amendments clarify that a court may order a mental examination for a defendant who has indicated an intention to raise a defense of mental condition bearing on the issue of guilt. Second, the defendant is required to give notice of an intent to present expert evidence of the defendant's mental condition during a capital sentencing proceeding. Third, the amendments address the ability of the trial court to order a mental examination for a defendant who has given notice of an intent to present evidence of mental condition during capital sentencing proceedings and when the results of that examination may be disclosed. Fourth, the amendment addresses the timing of disclosure of the results and reports of the defendant's expert examination. Finally, the amendment extends the sanctions for failure to comply with the rule's requirements to the punishment phase of a capital case.

Under current Rule 12.2(b), a defendant who intends to offer expert testimony on the issue of his or her mental condition on the question of guilt must provide a pretrial notice of that intent. The amendment extends that notice requirement to a defendant who intends to offer expert evidence, testimonial or otherwise, on his or her mental condition during a capital sentencing proceeding. As several courts have recognized, the better practice is to require pretrial notice of that intent so that any mental examinations can be conducted without unnecessarily delaying capital sentencing proceedings. *See, e.g., United States v. Beckford*, 962 F. Supp. 748, 754-64 (E.D. Va. 1997); *United States v. Haworth*, 942 F. Supp. 1406, 1409 (D.N.M. 1996). The amendment adopts that view.

A change to Rule 12.2(c) clarifies the authority of the court to order mental examinations for a defendant. As currently written, the subdivision implies that the trial court has discretion to grant a government motion for a mental examination of a defendant who has indicated under Rule 12.2(a) an intent to raise the defense of insanity. But the corresponding statute, 18 U.S.C. § 4242, requires the court to order an examination if the defendant has provided notice of an intent to raise that defense and the government moves for the examination. The amendment conforms Rule 12.2(c) to the statute. Any examination

conducted on the issue of the insanity defense would thus be conducted in accordance with the procedures set out in the statutory provision.

While the authority of a trial court to order a mental examination of a defendant who has registered an intent to raise the insanity defense seems clear, the authority under the Rule to order an examination of a defendant who intends only to present expert testimony on his or her mental condition on the issue of guilt is not as clear. Some courts have concluded that a court may order such an examination. *See, e.g., United States v. Stackpole*, 811 F.2d 689, 697 (1st Cir. 1987); *United States v. Buchbinder*, 796 F.2d 910, 915 (1st Cir. 1986); and *United States v. Halbert*, 712 F.2d 388 (9th Cir. 1983). In *United States v. Davis*, 93 F.3d 1286 (6th Cir. 1996), however, the court in a detailed analysis of the issue concluded that the district court lacked the authority under the rule to order a mental examination of a defendant who had provided notice of an intent to offer evidence on a defense of diminished capacity. The court noted first that the defendant could not be ordered to undergo commitment and examination under 18 U.S.C. § 4242, because that provision relates to situations when the defendant intends to rely on the defense of insanity. The court also rejected the argument that the examination could be ordered under Rule 12.2(c) because this was, in the words of the rule, an "appropriate case." The court concluded, however, that the trial court had the inherent authority to order such an examination.

The amendment clarifies that the authority of a court to order a mental examination under Rule 12.2(c) extends to those cases when the defendant has provided notice, under Rule 12.2(b), of an intent to present expert testimony on the defendant's mental condition, either on the merits or at capital sentencing. *See, e.g., United States v. Hall*, 152 F.3d 381 (5th Cir. 1998), *cert. denied*, 119 S. Ct. 1767 (1999).

The amendment to Rule 12.2(c) is not intended to affect any statutory or inherent authority a court may have to order other mental examinations.

The amendment leaves to the court the determination of what procedures should be used for a court-ordered examination on the defendant's mental condition (apart from insanity). As currently provided in the Rule, if the examination is being ordered in connection with the defendant's stated intent to present an insanity defense, the procedures are dictated by 18 U.S.C. § 4242. On the other hand, if the examination is being ordered in conjunction with a stated intent to present expert testimony on the defendant's mental condition (not amounting to a defense of insanity) either at the guilt or sentencing phases, no specific statutory counterpart is available. Accordingly, the court is given the discretion to specify the procedures to be used. In so doing, the court may certainly be informed by other provisions, which address hearings on a defendant's mental condition. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C. § 4241, et. seq.

Additional changes address the question when the results of an examination ordered under Rule 12.2(b)(2) may, or must, be disclosed. The Supreme Court has recognized that use of a defendant's statements during a court-ordered examination may compromise the defendant's right against self-incrimination. *See Estelle v. Smith*, 451 U.S. 454 (1981) (defendant's privilege against self-incrimination violated when he was not advised of right to remain silent during court-ordered examination and prosecution introduced statements during capital sentencing hearing). But subsequent cases have indicated that the defendant waives the privilege if the defendant introduces expert testimony on his or her mental condition. *See, e.g., Powell v. Texas*, 492 U.S. 680, 683-84 (1989); *Buchanan v. Kentucky*, 483 U.S. 402, 421-24 (1987); *Presnell v. Zant*, 959 F.2d 1524, 1533 (11th Cir. 1992); *Williams v. Lynaugh*, 809 F.2d 1063, 1068 (5th Cir. 1987); *United States v. Madrid*, 673 F.2d 1114, 1119-21 (10th Cir. 1982). That view is reflected in Rule 12.2(c) which indicates that the statements of the defendant may be used against the defendant only after the defendant has introduced testimony on his or her mental condition. What the current rule does not address is if, and to what extent, the prosecution may see the results of the examination, which may include the defendant's statements, when evidence of the defendant's mental condition is being presented solely at a capital sentencing proceeding.

The proposed change in Rule 12.2(c)(2) adopts the procedure used by some courts to seal or otherwise insulate the results of the examination until it is clear that the defendant will introduce expert evidence about his or her mental condition at a capital sentencing hearing; i.e., after a verdict of guilty on one or more capital crimes, and a reaffirmation by the defendant of an intent to introduce expert mental-condition evidence in the sentencing phase. *See, e.g., United States v. Beckford*, 962 F. Supp. 748 (E.D. Va. 1997). Most courts that have addressed the issue have recognized that if the government obtains early access to the accused's statements, it will be required to show that it has not made any derivative use of that evidence. Doing so can consume time and resources. *See, e.g., United States v. Hall, supra*, 152 F.3d at 398 (noting that sealing of record, although not constitutionally required, "likely advances interests of judicial economy by avoiding litigation over [derivative use issue]").

Except as provided in Rule 12.2(c)(3), the rule does not address the time for disclosing results and reports of any expert examination conducted by the defendant. New Rule 12.2(c)(3) provides that upon disclosure under subdivision (c)(2) of the results and reports of the government's examination, disclosure of the results and reports of the defendant's expert examination is mandatory, if the defendant intends to introduce expert evidence relating to the examination.

Rule 12.2(c), as previously written, restricted admissibility of the defendant's statements during the course of an examination conducted under the rule to an issue respecting mental condition on which the defendant "has introduced testimony" — expert or otherwise. As amended, Rule 12.2(c)(4)

provides that the admissibility of such evidence in a capital sentencing proceeding is triggered only by the defendant's introduction of expert evidence. The Committee believed that, in this context, it was appropriate to limit the government's ability to use the results of its expert mental examination to instances in which the defendant has first introduced expert evidence on the issue.

Rule 12.2(d) has been amended to extend sanctions for failure to comply with the rule to the penalty phase of a capital case. The selection of an appropriate remedy for the failure of a defendant to provide notice or submit to an examination under subdivisions (b) and (c) is entrusted to the discretion of the court. While subdivision (d) recognizes that the court may exclude the evidence of the defendant's own expert in such a situation, the court should also consider "the effectiveness of less severe sanctions, the impact of preclusion on the evidence at trial and the outcome of the case, the extent of prosecutorial surprise or prejudice, and whether the violation was willful." *Taylor v. Illinois*, 484 U.S. 400, 414 n.19 (1988) (citing *Fendler v. Goldsmith*, 728 F.2d 1181 (9th Cir. 1983)).

Rule 12.3. Notice of Defense Based upon Public Authority	Rule 12.3. Notice of Public-Authority Defense
(a) Notice by Defendant; Government Response; Disclosure of Witnesses. **(1) Defendant's Notice and Government's Response.** A defendant intending to claim a defense of actual or believed exercise of public authority on behalf of a law enforcement or Federal intelligence agency at the time of the alleged offense shall, within the time provided for the filing of pretrial motions or at such later time as the court may direct, serve upon the attorney for the Government a written notice of such intention and file a copy of such notice with the clerk. Such notice shall identify the law enforcement or Federal intelligence agency and any member of such agency on behalf of which and the period of time in which the defendant claims the actual or believed exercise of public authority occurred. If the notice identifies a Federal intelligence agency, the copy filed with the clerk shall be under seal. Within ten days after receiving the defendant's notice, but in no event less than twenty days before the trial, the attorney for the Government shall serve upon the defendant or the defendant's attorney a written response which shall admit or deny that the defendant exercised the public authority identified in the defendant's notice.	**(a) Notice of Defense and Disclosure of Witnesses.** **(1)** ***Notice in General.*** A defendant who intends to assert a defense of actual or believed exercise of public authority on behalf of a law-enforcement agency or federal intelligence agency at the time of the alleged offense must so notify the attorney for the government in writing and must file a copy of the notice with the clerk within the time provided for filing a pretrial motion, or at any later time the court directs. The notice filed with the clerk must be under seal if the notice identifies a federal intelligence agency under whose authority the defendant claims to have acted. **(2)** ***Contents*** **of Notice.** The notice must contain the following information: (A) the law-enforcement agency or federal intelligence agency involved; (B) the agency member on whose behalf the defendant claims to have acted; and (C) the time during which the defendant claims to have acted with public authority. **(3)** ***Response to Notice.*** The attorney for the government must serve a written response on the defendant or the defendant's attorney within 10 days after receiving the defendant's notice, but no later than 20 days before trial. The response must admit or deny that the defendant exercised the public authority identified in the defendant's notice.

(2) Disclosure of Witnesses. At the time that the Government serves its response to the notice or thereafter, but in no event less than twenty days before trial, the attorney for the Government may serve upon the defendant or the defendant's attorney a written demand for the names and addresses of the witnesses, if any, upon whom the defendant intends to rely in establishing the defense identified in the notice. Within seven days after receiving the Government's demand, the defendant shall serve upon the attorney for the Government a written statement of the names and addresses of any such witnesses. Within seven days after receiving the defendant's written statement, the attorney for the Government shall serve upon the defendant or the defendant's attorney a written statement of the names and addresses of the witnesses, if any, upon whom the Government intends to rely in opposing the defense identified in the notice.	**(4)** ***Disclosing Witnesses.*** (A) *Government's Request.* The attorney for the government may request in writing that the defendant disclose the name, address, and telephone number of each witness the defendant intends to rely on to establish a public-authority defense. The attorney for the government may serve the request when the government serves its response to the defendant's notice under Rule 12.3(a)(1), or later, but must serve the request no later than 20 days before trial. (B) *Defendant's Response.* Within 7 days after receiving the government's request, the defendant must serve on the attorney for the government a written statement of the name, address, and telephone number of each witness. (C) *Government's Reply.* Within 7 days after receiving the defendant's statement, the attorney for the government must serve on the defendant or the defendant's attorney a written statement of the name, address, and telephone number of each witness the government intends to rely on to oppose the defendant's public-authority defense.
(3) Additional Time. If good cause is shown, the court may allow a party additional time to comply with any obligation imposed by this rule.	**(5)** ***Additional Time.*** The court may for good cause allow a party additional time to comply with this rule.
(b) Continuing Duty to Disclose. If, prior to or during trial, a party learns of any additional witness whose identity, if known, should have been included in the written statement furnished under subdivision (a)(2) of this rule, that party shall promptly notify in writing the other party or the other party's attorney of the name and address of any such witness.	**(b) Continuing Duty to Disclose.** Both the attorney for the government and the defendant or the defendant's attorney must promptly disclose in writing to the other party the name, address, and telephone number of any additional witness if: **(1)** the disclosing party learns of the witness before or during trial; and **(2)** the witness should have been disclosed under Rule 12.3(a)(4) if the disclosing party had earlier known of the witness.
(c) Failure to Comply. If a party fails to comply with the requirements of this rule, the court may exclude the testimony of any undisclosed witness offered in support of or in opposition to the defense, or enter such other order as it deems just under the circumstances. This rule shall not limit the right of the defendant to testify.	**(c) Failure to Comply.** If a party fails to comply with this rule, the court may exclude the testimony of any undisclosed witness regarding the public-authority defense. This rule does not limit the defendant's right to testify.

(d) Protective Procedures Unaffected. This rule shall be in addition to and shall not supersede the authority of the court to issue appropriate protective orders, or the authority of the court to order that any pleading be filed under seal.	**(d) Protective Procedures Unaffected.** This rule does not limit the court's authority to issue appropriate protective orders or to order that any filings be under seal.
(e) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Defense Based upon Public Authority. Evidence of an intention as to which notice was given under subdivision (a), later withdrawn, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intention.	**(e) Inadmissibility of Withdrawn Defense Based upon Public Authority.** Evidence of an intention as to which notice was given under Rule 12.3(a), later withdrawn, is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the person who gave notice of the intention.

Committee Notes
Rule 12.3
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 12.3 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

The Committee considered the issue of whether (as currently provided in Rule 12.3) a defendant could invoke the defense of public authority on either an actual or believed exercise of public authority. The Committee ultimately decided that any attempt to provide the defendant with a "right" to assert the defense was not a matter within the purview of the Committee under the Rules Enabling Act. The Committee decided to retain the current language, which recognizes, as a nonsubstantive matter, that if the defendant intends to raise the defense, notice must be given. Thus, the Committee decided not to make any changes in the current rule regarding the availability of the defense.

Substantive changes have been made in Rule 12.3(a)(4) and 12.3(b). As in Rule 12.1, the Committee decided to include in the restyled rule the requirement that the parties provide the telephone numbers of any witnesses disclosed under the rule.

Rule 13. Trial Together of Indictments or Informations	Rule 13. Joint Trial of Separate Cases
The court may order two or more indictments or informations or both to be tried together if the offenses, and the defendants if there is more than one, could have been joined in a single indictment or information. The procedure shall be the same as if the prosecution were under such single indictment or information.	The court may order that separate cases be tried together as though brought in a single indictment or information if all offenses and all defendants could have been joined in a single indictment or information.

Committee Notes
Rule 13
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 13 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 14. Relief from Prejudicial Joinder	Rule 14. Relief from Prejudicial Joinder
If it appears that a defendant or the government is prejudiced by a joinder of offenses or of defendants in an indictment or information or by such joinder for trial together, the court may order an election or separate trials of counts, grant a severance of defendants or provide whatever other relief justice requires. In ruling on a motion by a defendant for severance the court may order the attorney for the government to deliver to the court for inspection *in camera* any statements or confessions made by the defendants which the government intends to introduce in evidence at the trial.	**(a) Relief.** If the joinder of offenses or defendants in an indictment, an information, or a consolidation for trial appears to prejudice a defendant or the government, the court may order separate trials of counts, sever the defendants' trials, or provide any other relief that justice requires. **(b) Defendants' Statements.** Before ruling on a defendant's motion to sever, the court may order the attorney for the government to deliver to the court for in camera inspection any defendants' statements that the government intends to use as evidence.

Committee Notes
Rule 14
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 14 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

The reference to a defendant's "confession" in the last sentence of the current rule has been deleted. The Committee believed that the reference to the "defendant's statements" in the amended rule would fairly embrace any confessions or admissions by a defendant.

Rule 15. Depositions	Rule 15. Depositions
(a) When Taken. Whenever due to exceptional circumstances of the case it is in the interest of justice that the testimony of a prospective witness of a party be taken and preserved for use at trial, the court may upon motion of such party and notice to the parties order that testimony of such witness be taken by deposition and that any designated book, paper, document, record, recording, or other material not privileged, be produced at the same time and place. If a witness is detained pursuant to section 3144 of title 18, United States Code, the court on written motion of the witness and upon notice to the parties may direct that the witness' deposition be taken. After the deposition has been subscribed the court may discharge the witness.	**(a) When Taken.** **(1)** ***In General.*** A party may move that a prospective witness be deposed in order to preserve testimony for trial. The court may grant such motion due to exceptional circumstances in the case and in the interest of justice. If the court orders the deposition to be taken, it may also require the deponent to produce at the deposition any designated book, paper, document, record, recording, data, or other material not privileged. **(2)** ***Detained Material Witness.*** A witness who is detained under 18 U.S.C. § 3144 may request to be deposed by filing a written motion and giving notice to the parties. The court may then order that the deposition be taken and may discharge the witness after the witness has signed under oath the deposition transcript.
(b) Notice of Taking. The party at whose instance a deposition is to be taken shall give to every party reasonable written notice of the time and place for taking the deposition. The notice shall state the name and address of each person to be examined. On motion of a party upon whom the notice is served, the court for cause shown may extend or shorten the time or change the place for taking the deposition. The officer having custody of a defendant shall be notified of the time and place set for the examination and shall, unless the defendant waives in writing the right to be present, produce the defendant at the examination and keep the defendant in the presence of the witness during the examination, unless, after being warned by the court that disruptive conduct will cause the defendant's removal from the place of the taking of the deposition, the defendant persists in conduct which is such as to justify exclusion from that place. A defendant not in custody shall have the right to be present at the examination upon request subject to such terms as may be fixed by the court, but a failure, absent good cause shown, to appear after notice and tender of expenses in accordance with subdivision (c) of this rule shall constitute a waiver of that right and of any objection to the taking and use of the deposition based upon that right.	**(b) Notice.** **(1)** ***In General.*** A party seeking to take a deposition must give every other party reasonable written notice of the deposition's date and location. The notice must state the name and address of each deponent. If requested by a party receiving the notice, the court for good cause may change the deposition's date or location. **(2)** ***To the Custodial Officer.*** A party seeking to take the deposition must also notify the officer who has custody of the defendant of the scheduled date and location.

	(c) Defendant's Presence. **(1)** ***Defendant in Custody.*** The officer who has custody of the defendant must produce the defendant at the deposition and keep the defendant in the witness's presence during the examination, unless the defendant: (A) waives in writing the right to be present; or (B) persists in disruptive conduct justifying exclusion after the court has warned the defendant that disruptive conduct will result in the defendant's exclusion. **(2)** ***Defendant Not in Custody.*** A defendant who is not in custody has the right upon request to be present at the deposition, subject to any conditions imposed by the court. If the government tenders the defendant's expenses as provided in Rule 15(d) but the defendant still fails to appear, the defendant — absent good cause — waives both the right to appear and any objection to the taking and use of the deposition based on that right.
(c) Payment of Expenses. Whenever a deposition is taken at the instance of the government, or whenever a deposition is taken at the instance of a defendant who is unable to bear the expenses of the taking of the deposition, the court may direct that the expense of travel and subsistence of the defendant and the defendant's attorney for attendance at the examination and the cost of the transcript of the deposition shall be paid by the government.	**(d) Expenses.** If the deposition was requested by the government the court may — or if the defendant is unable to bear the deposition expenses the court must — order the government to pay: **(1)** the travel and subsistence expenses of the defendant and the defendant's attorney to attend the deposition, and **(2)** the deposition transcript costs.
(d) How Taken. Subject to such additional conditions as the court shall provide, a deposition shall be taken and filed in the manner provided in civil actions except as otherwise provided in these rules, provided that (1) in no event shall a deposition be taken of a party defendant without that defendant's consent, and (2) the scope and manner of examination and cross-examination shall be such as would be allowed in the trial itself. The government shall make available to the defendant or the defendant's counsel for examination and use at the taking of the deposition any statement of the witness being deposed which is in the possession of the government and to which the defendant would be entitled at the trial.	**(e) How Taken.** Unless these rules or a court order provides otherwise, a deposition must be filed, and it must be taken in the same manner as a deposition in a civil action, except that: **(1)** A defendant may not be deposed without that defendant's consent. **(2)** The scope and manner of the deposition examination and cross-examination must be the same as would be allowed during trial. **(3)** The government must provide to the defendant or the defendant's attorney, for use at the deposition, any statement of the deponent in the government's possession to which the defendant would be entitled at trial.

(e) Use. At the trial or upon any hearing, a part or all of a deposition, so far as otherwise admissible under the rules of evidence, may be used as substantive evidence if the witness is unavailable, as unavailability is defined in Rule 804(a) of the Federal Rules of Evidence, or the witness gives testimony at the trial or hearing inconsistent with that witness' deposition. Any deposition may also be used by any party for the purpose of contradicting or impeaching the testimony of the deponent as a witness. If only a part of a deposition is offered in evidence by a party, an adverse party may require the offering of all of it which is relevant to the part offered and any party may offer other parts.	**(f) Use as Evidence** **(1)** ***Substantive and Impeachment Use.*** If admissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence, a party may use all or part of a deposition — (A) as substantive evidence at a trial or hearing if: (i) the witness is unavailable as defined in Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a); or (ii) the witness testifies inconsistently with the deposition at the trial or hearing; and (B) to impeach the deponent. **(2)** ***Parts of a Deposition.*** If a party introduces in evidence only a part of a deposition, an adverse party may require the introduction of other admissible parts that ought in fairness to be considered with the part introduced. Any party may offer other parts.
(f) Objections to Deposition Testimony. Objections to deposition testimony or evidence or parts thereof and the grounds for the objection shall be stated at the time of the taking of the deposition.	**(g) Objections.** A party objecting to deposition testimony or evidence must state the grounds for the objection during the deposition.
(g) Deposition by Agreement Not Precluded. Nothing in this rule shall preclude the taking of a deposition, orally or upon written questions, or the use of a deposition, by agreement of the parties with the consent of the court.	**(h) Agreed Depositions Permitted.** The parties may by agreement take and use a deposition with the court's consent.

Committee Notes
Rule 15
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 15 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

In Rule 15(a), the list of materials to be produced has been amended to include the expansive term "data" to reflect the fact that in an increasingly technological culture, the information may exist in a format not already covered by the more conventional list, such as a book or document.

The last portion of current Rule 15(b), dealing with the defendant's presence at a deposition, has been moved to amended Rule 15(c).

Rule 15(d), which addresses the payment of expenses incurred by the defendant and the defendant's attorney, has been changed. The Committee discussed the issue of payment of expenses raised in restyled Rule 15(d). Under the current rule, if the government requests the deposition, or if the defendant requests the deposition and is unable to pay for it, the court *may* direct the government to pay for travel and subsistence expenses for both the defendant and the defendant's attorney. In either case, the current rule requires the government to pay for the transcript. Under the amended rule, if the deposition was requested by the government, the court *must* require the government to pay subsistence and travel expenses and the cost of the deposition transcript. If the defendant is unable to pay the deposition expenses, the court *must* order the government to pay subsistence, travel, and the deposition transcript costs—regardless of who requested the deposition.

Rule 15(f)(2) comports with the familiar rule of optional completeness in Federal Rule of Evidence 106. Under that rule, once a party introduces a portion of a item of evidence, the opponent may require the proponent to introduce other parts of the evidence which ought in fairness be considered. In making this change, the Committee intended to make no substantive change and noted that the revision parallels similar language in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 32(a)(4).

Rule 16. Discovery and Inspection	Rule 16. Discovery and Inspection
(a) Governmental Disclosure of Evidence. **(1) Information Subject to Disclosure.** **(A) Statement of Defendant.** Upon request of a defendant the government must disclose to the defendant and make available for inspection, copying, or photographing: any relevant written or recorded statements made by the defendant, or copies thereof, within the possession, custody, or control of the government, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the attorney for the government; that portion of any written record containing the substance of any relevant oral statement made by the defendant whether before or after arrest in response to interrogation by any person then known to the defendant to be a government agent; and recorded testimony of the defendant before a grand jury which relates to the offense charged. The government must also disclose to the defendant the substance of any other relevant oral statement made by the defendant whether before or after arrest in response to interrogation by any person then known by the defendant to be a government agent if the government intends to use that statement at trial. Upon request of a defendant which is an organization such as a corporation, partnership, association, or labor union, the government must disclose to the defendant any of the foregoing statements made by a person who the government contends (1) was, at the time of making the statement, so situated as a director, officer, employee or agent as to have been able legally to bind the defendant in respect to the subject of the statement, or (2) was, at the time of the offense, personally involved in the alleged conduct constituting the offense and so situated as a director, officer, employee, or agent as to have been able legally to bind the defendant in respect to that alleged conduct in which the person was involved.	**(a) Government's Disclosure.** **(1) *Discloseable Information.*** (A) *Defendant's Oral Statement.* Upon request, the government must disclose to the defendant the substance of any relevant oral statement made by the defendant, before or after arrest, in response to interrogation by a person the defendant knew was a government agent if the government intends to use the statement at trial. (B) *Defendant's Written or Recorded Statement.* Upon request, the government must disclose to the defendant, and make available for inspection, copying, or photographing, all of the following: (i) any relevant written or recorded statement by the defendant if: (a) the statement is within the government's possession, custody, or control; and (b) the attorney for the government knows — or through due diligence could know — that the statement exists; (ii) the portion of any written record containing the substance of any relevant oral statement made before or after arrest if the defendant made the statement in response to interrogation by a person the defendant knew was a government agent; and (iii) the defendant's recorded testimony before a grand jury relating to the charged offense.
	(C) *Organizational Defendant.* Upon request, if the defendant is an organization, the government must disclose to the defendant any statement described in Rule 16(a)(1)(A) and (B) if the government contends that the person making the statement:

	(i) was legally able to bind the defendant regarding the subject of the statement because of that person's position as the defendant's director, officer, employee, or agent; or (ii) was personally involved in the alleged conduct constituting the offense and was legally able to bind the defendant regarding that conduct because of that person's position as the defendant's director, officer, employee, or agent.
(B) Defendant's Prior Record. Upon request of the defendant, the government shall furnish to the defendant such copy of the defendant's prior criminal record, if any, as is within the possession, custody, or control of the government, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the attorney for the government.	(D) *Defendant's Prior Record.* Upon request, the government must furnish the defendant with a copy of the defendant's prior criminal record that is within the government's possession, custody, or control if the attorney for the government knows — or through due diligence could know — that the record exists.
(C) Documents and Tangible Objects. Upon request of the defendant the government shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, buildings or places, or copies or portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody or control of the government, and which are material to the preparation of the defendant's defense or are intended for use by the government as evidence in chief at the trial, or were obtained from or belong to the defendant.	(E) *Documents and Objects.* Upon the defendant's request, the government must permit the defendant to inspect and copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, data, photographs, tangible objects, buildings or places, or copies or portions of any of these items, if the item is within the government's possession, custody, or control, and: (i) the item is material to the preparation of the defense; (ii) the government intends to use the item in its case-in-chief at trial; or (iii) the item was obtained from or belongs to the defendant.
(D) Reports of Examinations and Tests. Upon request of a defendant the government shall permit the defendant to inspect and copy or photograph any results or reports of physical or mental examinations, and of scientific tests or experiments, or copies thereof, which are within the possession, custody, or control of the government, the existence of which is known, or by the exercise of due diligence may become known, to the attorney for the government, and which are material to the preparation of the defense or are intended for use by the government as evidence in chief at the trial.	(F) *Reports of Examinations and Tests.* Upon request, the government must permit a defendant to inspect and copy, or photograph the results or reports of any physical or mental examination and of any scientific test or experiment if: (i) the item is within the government's possession, custody, or control; (ii) the attorney for the government knows — or through due diligence could know — that the item exists; and (iii) the item is material to the preparation of the defense or the government intends to use the item in its case-in-chief at trial.

(E) Expert Witnesses. At the defendant's request, the government shall disclose to the defendant a written summary of testimony that the government intends to use under Rules 702, 703, or 705 of the Federal Rules of Evidence during its case in chief at trial. If the government requests discovery under subdivision (b)(1)(C)(ii) of this rule and the defendant complies, the government shall, at the defendant's request, disclose to the defendant a written summary of testimony the government intends to use on the Rules 702, 703, or 705 as evidence at trial on the issue of the defendant's mental condition. The summary provided under this subdivision shall describe the witnesses' opinions, the bases and the reasons for those opinions, and the witnesses' qualifications.	(G) *Expert Testimony.* Upon request, the government must give to the defendant a written summary of any testimony the government intends to use in its case-in-chief at trial under Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705. The summary must describe the witness's opinions, the bases and reasons for those opinions, and the witness's qualifications.
(2) Information Not Subject to Disclosure. Except as provided in paragraphs (A), (B), (D), and (E) of subdivision (a)(1), this rule does not authorize the discovery or inspection of reports, memoranda, or other internal government documents made by the attorney for the government or any other government agent investigating or prosecuting the case. Nor does the rule authorize the discovery or inspection of statements made by government witnesses or prospective government witnesses except as provided in 18 U.S.C. § 3500.	**(2)** ***Nondisclosable Information.*** Except as Rule 16(a)(1) provides otherwise, this rule does not authorize the discovery or inspection of reports, memoranda, or other internal government documents made by the attorney for the government or other government agent in connection with the investigation or prosecution of the case. Nor does this rule authorize the discovery or inspection of statements made by prospective government witnesses except as provided in 18 U.S.C. § 3500.
(3) Grand Jury Transcripts. Except as provided in Rules 6, 12(i) and 26.2, and subdivision (a)(1)(A) of this rule, these rules do not relate to discovery or inspection of recorded proceedings of a grand jury.	**(3)** ***Grand Jury Transcripts.*** This rule does not apply to the discovery or inspection of a grand jury's recorded proceedings, except as provided in Rules 6, 12(h), 16(a)(1), and 26.2.
[(4) Failure to Call Witness.] (Deleted Dec. 12, 1975)	
(b) The Defendant's Disclosure of Evidence. **(1) Information Subject to Disclosure.** **(A) Documents and Tangible Objects.** If the defendant requests disclosure under subdivision (a)(1)(C) or (D) of this rule, upon compliance with such request by the government, the defendant, on request of the government, shall permit the government to inspect and copy or photograph books, papers, documents, photographs, tangible objects, or copies or portions thereof, which are within the possession, custody, or control of the defendant and which the defendant intends to introduce as evidence in chief at the trial.	**(b) Defendant's Disclosure.** **(1)** ***Discloseable Information.*** (A) *Documents and Objects.* If the defendant requests disclosure under Rule 16(a)(1)(E), and the government complies, then the defendant must permit the government, upon request, to inspect and copy, or photograph books, papers, documents, data, photographs, tangible objects, buildings or places, or copies or portions of any of these items, if: (i) the item is within the defendant's possession, custody, or control; and (ii) the defendant intends to use the item in the defendant's case-in-chief at trial.

(B) Reports of Examinations and Tests. If the defendant requests disclosure under subdivision (a)(1)(C) or (D) of this rule, upon compliance with such request by the government, the defendant, on request of the government, shall permit the government to inspect and copy or photograph any results or reports of physical or mental examinations and of scientific tests or experiments made in connection with the particular case, or copies thereof, within the possession or control of the defendant, which the defendant intends to introduce as evidence in chief at the trial or which were prepared by a witness whom the defendant intends to call at the trial when the results or reports related to that witness' testimony.	(B) *Reports of Examinations and Tests.* If the defendant requests disclosure under Rule 16(a)(1)(F), then upon compliance and the government's request, the defendant must permit the government to inspect and copy, or photograph the results or reports of any physical or mental examination and of any scientific test or experiment if: (i) the item is within the defendant's possession, custody, or control; and (ii) the defendant intends to use the item in the defendant's case-in-chief at trial, or intends to call the witness who prepared the report and the report relates to the witness's testimony.
(C) Expert Witnesses. Under the following circumstances, the defendant shall, at the government's request, disclose to the government a written summary of testimony that the defendant intends to use on the Rules 702, 703, or 705 of the Federal Rules of Evidence as evidence at trial: (i) if the defendant requests disclosure under subdivision (a)(1)(E) of this rule and the government complies, or (ii) if the defendant has given notice under Rule 12.2(b) of an intent to present expert testimony on the defendant's mental condition. This summary shall describe the witnesses' opinions, the bases and reasons for those opinions, and the witnesses' qualifications.	(C) *Expert Testimony.* If the defendant requests disclosure under Rule 16(a)(1)(G), then upon compliance and the government's request, the defendant must give the government a written summary of any testimony the defendant intends to use as evidence at trial under Federal Rules of Evidence 702, 703, or 705. The summary must describe the witness's opinions, the bases and reasons for these opinions, and the witness's qualifications.
(2) Information Not Subject To Disclosure. Except as to scientific or medical reports, this subdivision does not authorize the discovery or inspection of reports, memoranda, or other internal defense documents made by the defendant, or the defendant's attorneys or agents in connection with the investigation or defense of the case, or of statements made by the defendant, or by government or defense witnesses, or by prospective government or defense witnesses, to the defendant, the defendant's agents or attorneys.	**(2)** ***Nondisclosable Information.*** Except for scientific or medical reports, Rule 16(b)(1) does not authorize discovery or inspection of: (A) reports, memoranda, or other documents made by the defendant, or the defendant's attorney or agent, during the case's investigation or defense; or (B) a statement made to the defendant, or the defendant's attorney or agent, by: (i) the defendant; (ii) a government or defense witness; or (iii) a prospective government or defense witness.
[(3) Failure to Call Witness.] (Deleted Dec. 12, 1975)	

(c) Continuing Duty to Disclose. If, prior to or during trial, a party discovers additional evidence or material previously requested or ordered, which is subject to discovery or inspection under this rule, such party shall promptly notify the other party or that other party's attorney or the court of the existence of the additional evidence or material.	**(c) Continuing Duty to Disclose.** A party who discovers additional evidence or material before or during trial must promptly disclose its existence to the other party or the court, if: **(1)** the evidence or material is subject to discovery or inspection under this rule; and **(2)** the other party previously requested, or the court ordered, its production.
(d) Regulation of Discovery. **(1) Protective and Modifying Orders.** Upon a sufficient showing the court may at any time order that the discovery or inspection be denied, restricted, or deferred, or make such other order as is appropriate. Upon motion by a party, the court may permit the party to make such showing, in whole or in part, in the form of a written statement to be inspected by the judge alone. If the court enters an order granting relief following such an ex parte showing, the entire text of the party's statement shall be sealed and preserved in the records of the court to be made available to the appellate court in the event of an appeal.	**(d) Regulating Discovery.** **(1)** ***Protective and Modifying Orders.*** At any time the court may for good cause deny, restrict, or defer discovery or inspection, or grant other appropriate relief. The court may permit a party to show good cause by a written statement that the court will inspect ex parte. If relief is granted, the court must preserve the entire text of the party's statement under seal.
(2) Failure To Comply With a Request. If at any time during the course of proceedings it is brought to the attention of the court that a party has failed to comply with this rule, the court may order such party to permit the discovery or inspection, grant a continuance, or prohibit the party from introducing evidence not disclosed, or it may enter such other order as it deems just under the circumstances. The court may specify the time, place and manner of making the discovery and inspection and may prescribe such terms and conditions as are just.	**(2)** ***Failure to Comply.*** If a party fails to comply with Rule 16, the court may: (A) order that party to permit the discovery or inspection; specify its time, place, and manner; and prescribe other just terms and conditions; (B) grant a continuance; (C) prohibit that party from introducing the undisclosed evidence; or (D) enter any other order that is just under the circumstances.
(e) Alibi Witnesses. Discovery of alibi witnesses is governed by Rule 12.1.	

Committee Notes
Rule 16
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 16 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Current Rule 16(a)(1)(A) is now located in Rule 16(a)(1)(A), (B) and (C). Current Rule 16(a)(1)(B), (C), (D) and (E) have been relettered.

Amended Rule 16(b)(1)(B) includes a change that may be substantive in nature. Rule 16(a)(1)(E) and 16(a)(1)(F) require production of specified information if the government intends to "use" the information "in its case-in-chief at trial." The Committee believed that the language in revised Rule 16(b)(1)(B), which deals with a defendant's disclosure of information to the government, should track the similar language in revised Rule 16(a)(1). In Rule 16(b)(1)(B)(ii), the Committee changed the current provision which reads: "the defendant intends to *introduce* as evidence" to the "defendant intends to *use* the item . . ." The Committee recognized that this might constitute a substantive change in the rule but believed that it was a necessary conforming change with the provisions in 16(a)(1)(E) and (F), noted *supra*, regarding use of evidence by the government.

In amended Rule 16(d)(1), the last phrase in the current subdivision — which refers to a possible appeal of the court's discovery order—has been deleted. In the Committee's view, no substantive change results from that deletion. The language is unnecessary because the court, regardless of whether there is an appeal, will have maintained the record.

Finally, current Rule 16(e), which addresses the topic of notice of alibi witnesses, has been deleted as being unnecessarily duplicative of Rule 12.1.

Rule 17. Subpoena	Rule 17. Subpoena
(a) For Attendance of Witnesses; Form; Issuance. A subpoena shall be issued by the clerk under the seal of the court. It shall state the name of the court and the title, if any, of the proceeding, and shall command each person to whom it is directed to attend and give testimony at the time and place specified therein. The clerk shall issue a subpoena, signed and sealed but otherwise in blank to a party requesting it, who shall fill in the blanks before it is served. A subpoena shall be issued by a United States magistrate judge in a proceeding before that magistrate judge, but it need not be under the seal of the court.	**(a) Content.** A subpoena must state the court's name and the title of the proceeding, include the seal of the court, and command the witness to attend and testify at the time and place the subpoena specifies. The clerk must issue a blank subpoena — signed and sealed — to the party requesting it and that party must fill in the blanks before the subpoena is served.
(b) Defendants Unable to Pay. The court shall order at any time that a subpoena be issued for service on a named witness upon an ex parte application of a defendant upon a satisfactory showing that the defendant is financially unable to pay the fees of the witness and that the presence of the witness is necessary to an adequate defense. If the court orders the subpoena to be issued, the costs incurred by the process and the fees of the witness so subpoenaed shall be paid in the same manner in which similar costs and fees are paid in case of a witness subpoenaed in behalf of the government.	**(b) Defendant Unable to Pay.** Upon a defendant's ex parte application, the court must order that a subpoena be issued for a named witness if the defendant shows an inability to pay the witness's fees and the necessity of the witness's presence for an adequate defense. If the court orders a subpoena to be issued, the process costs and witness fees will be paid in the same manner as those paid for witnesses the government subpoenas.
(c) For Production of Documentary Evidence and of Objects. A subpoena may also command the person to whom it is directed to produce the books, papers, documents or other objects designated therein. The court on motion made promptly may quash or modify the subpoena if compliance would be unreasonable or oppressive. The court may direct that books, papers, documents or objects designated in the subpoena be produced before the court at a time prior to the trial or prior to the time when they are to be offered in evidence and may upon their production permit the books, papers, documents or objects or portions thereof to be inspected by the parties and their attorneys.	**(c) Producing Documents and Objects.** **(1)** A subpoena may order the witness to produce any books, papers, documents, data, or other objects the subpoena designates. The court may direct the witness to produce the designated items in court before trial or before they are to be offered in evidence. When the items arrive, the court may permit the parties and their attorneys to inspect all or part of them. **(2)** On motion made promptly, the court may quash or modify the subpoena if compliance would be unreasonable or oppressive.
(d) Service. A subpoena may be served by the marshal, by a deputy marshal or by any other person who is not a party and who is not less than 18 years of age. Service of a subpoena shall be made by delivering a copy thereof to the person named and by tendering to that person the fee for 1 day's attendance and the mileage allowed by law. Fees and mileage need not be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpoena issued in behalf of the United States or an officer or agency thereof.	**(d) Service.** A marshal, deputy marshal, or any nonparty who is at least 18 years old, may serve a subpoena. The server must deliver a copy of the subpoena to the witness and must tender to the witness one day's witness-attendance fee and the legal mileage allowance. The server need not tender the attendance fee or mileage allowance when the United States, a federal officer, or a federal agency has requested the subpoena.

(e) Place of Service. **(1) In United States.** A subpoena requiring the attendance of a witness at a hearing or trial may be served at any place within the United States. **(2) Abroad.** A subpoena directed to a witness in a foreign country shall issue under the circumstances and in the manner and be served as provided in Title 28, U.S.C., § 1783.	**(e) Place of Service.** **(1)** ***In the United States.*** A subpoena requiring a witness to attend a hearing or trial may be served at any place within the United States. **(2)** ***In a Foreign Country.*** If the witness is in a foreign country, 28 U.S.C. § 1783 governs the subpoena's service.
(f) For Taking Depositions; Place of Examination. **(1) Issuance.** An order to take a deposition authorizes the issuance by the clerk of the court for the district in which the deposition is to be taken of subpoenas for the persons named or described therein. **(2) Place.** The witness whose deposition is to be taken may be required by subpoena to attend at any place designated by the trial court, taking into account the convenience of the witness and the parties.	**(f) Deposition Subpoena.** **(1)** ***Issuance.*** A court order to take a deposition authorizes the clerk in the district where the deposition is to be taken to issue a subpoena for any witness named or described in the order. **(2)** ***Place.*** After considering the convenience of the witness and the parties, the court may order — and the subpoena may require — the witness to appear anywhere the court designates.
(g) Contempt. Failure by any person without adequate excuse to obey a subpoena served upon that person may be deemed a contempt of the court from which the subpoena issued or of the court for the district in which it issued if it was issued by a United States magistrate judge.	**(g) Contempt.** The court may hold in contempt a witness who, without adequate excuse, disobeys a subpoena issued by a federal court in that district.
(h) Information Not Subject to Subpoena. Statements made by witnesses or prospective witnesses may not be subpoenaed from the government or the defendant under this rule, but shall be subject to production only in accordance with the provisions of Rule 26.2.	**(h) Information Not Subject to a Subpoena.** No party may subpoena a statement of a witness or of a prospective witness under this rule. Rule 26.2 governs the production of the statements.

Committee Notes
Rule 17
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 17 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

A potential substantive change has been made in Rule 17(c)(1); the word "data" has been added to the list of matters that may be subpoenaed. The Committee believed that inserting that term will reflect the fact that in an increasingly technological culture, the information may exist in a format not already covered by the more conventional list, such as a book or document.

Rule 17.1. Pretrial Conference	Rule 17.1. Pretrial Conference
At any time after the filing of the indictment or information the court upon motion of any party or upon its own motion may order one or more conferences to consider such matters as will promote a fair and expeditious trial. At the conclusion of a conference the court shall prepare and file a memorandum of the matters agreed upon. No admissions made by the defendant or the defendant's attorney at the conference shall be used against the defendant unless the admissions are reduced to writing and signed by the defendant and the defendant's attorney. This rule shall not be invoked in the case of a defendant who is not represented by counsel.	On its own, or on a party's motion, the court may hold one or more pretrial conferences to promote a fair and expeditious trial. When a conference ends, the court must prepare and file a memorandum of any matters agreed to during the conference. The government may not use any statement made during the conference by the defendant or the defendant's attorney unless it is in writing and signed by the defendant and the defendant's attorney.

Committee Notes
Rule 17.1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 17.1 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Current Rule 17.1 prohibits the court from holding a pretrial conference where the defendant is not represented by counsel. It is unclear whether this would bar such a conference when the defendant invokes the constitutional right to self-representation. *See Faretta v. California*, 422 U.S. 806 (1975). The amended version makes clear that a pretrial conference may be held in these circumstances. Moreover, the Committee believed that pretrial conferences might be particularly useful in those cases where the defendant is proceeding pro se.

V. VENUE	Title V. Venue
Rule 18. Place of Prosecution and Trial	**Rule 18. Place of Prosecution and Trial**
Except as otherwise permitted by statute or by these rules, the prosecution shall be had in a district in which the offense was committed. The court shall fix the place of trial within the district with due regard to the convenience of the defendant and the witnesses and the prompt administration of justice.	Unless a statute or these rules permit otherwise, the government must prosecute an offense in a district in which the offense was committed. The court must set the place of trial within the district with due regard for the convenience of the defendant and the witnesses, and the prompt administration of justice.

Committee Notes
Rule 18
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 18 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 19. Rescinded.	Rule 19. [Rescinded.]

Rule 20. Transfer From the District for Plea and Sentence	Rule 20. Transfer for Plea and Sentence
(a) Indictment or Information Pending. A defendant arrested, held, or present in a district other than that in which an indictment or information is pending against that defendant may state in writing a wish to plead guilty or nolo contendere, to waive trial in the district in which the indictment or information is pending, and to consent to disposition of the case in the district in which that defendant was arrested, held, or present, subject to the approval of the United States attorney for each district. Upon receipt of the defendant's statement and of the written approval of the United States attorneys, the clerk of the court in which the indictment or information is pending shall transmit the papers in the proceeding or certified copies thereof to the clerk of the court for the district in which the defendant is arrested, held, or present, and the prosecution shall continue in that district.	**(a) Consent to Transfer.** A prosecution may be transferred from the district where the indictment or information is pending, or from which a warrant on a complaint has been issued, to the district where the defendant is arrested, held, or present, if: **(1)** the defendant states in writing a wish to plead guilty or nolo contendere and to waive trial in the district where the indictment, information, or complaint is pending, consents in writing to the court's disposing of the case in the transferee district, and files the statement in the transferee district; and **(2)** the United States attorneys in both districts approve the transfer in writing. **(b) Clerk's Duties.** After receiving the defendant's statement and the required approvals, the clerk where the indictment, information, or complaint is pending must send the file, or a certified copy, to the clerk in the transferee district. **(c) Effect of a Not Guilty Plea.** If the defendant pleads not guilty after the case has been transferred under Rule 20(a), the clerk must return the papers to the court where the prosecution began, and that court must restore the proceeding to its docket. The defendant's statement that the defendant wished to plead guilty or nolo contendere is not, in any civil or criminal proceeding, admissible against the defendant.
(b) Indictment or Information Not Pending. A defendant arrested, held, or present, in a district other than the district in which a complaint is pending against that defendant may state in writing a wish to plead guilty or nolo contendere, to waive venue and trial in the district in which the warrant was issued, and to consent to disposition of the case in the district in which that defendant was arrested, held, or present, subject to the approval of the United States attorney for each district. Upon filing the written waiver of venue in the district in which the defendant is present, the prosecution may proceed as if venue were in such district.	

(c) Effect of Not Guilty Plea. If after the proceeding has been transferred pursuant to subdivision (a) or (b) of this rule the defendant pleads not guilty, the clerk shall return the papers to the court in which the prosecution was commenced, and the proceeding shall be restored to the docket of that court. The defendant's statement that the defendant wishes to plead guilty or nolo contendere shall not be used against that defendant.	
(d) Juveniles. A juvenile (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 5031) who is arrested, held, or present in a district other than that in which the juvenile is alleged to have committed an act in violation of a law of the United States not punishable by death or life imprisonment may, after having been advised by counsel and with the approval of the court and the United States attorney for each district, consent to be proceeded against as a juvenile delinquent in the district in which the juvenile is arrested, held, or present. The consent shall be given in writing before the court but only after the court has apprised the juvenile of the juvenile's rights, including the right to be returned to the district in which the juvenile is alleged to have committed the act, and of the consequences of such consent.	**(d) Juveniles.** **(1)** ***Consent to Transfer.*** A juvenile, as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 5031, may be proceeded against as a juvenile delinquent in the district where the juvenile is arrested, held, or present, if: (A) the alleged offense that occurred in the other district is not punishable by death or life imprisonment; (B) an attorney has advised the juvenile; (C) the court has informed the juvenile of the juvenile's rights — including the right to be returned to the district where the offense allegedly occurred — and the consequences of waiving those rights; (D) the juvenile, after receiving the court's information about rights, consents in writing to be proceeded against in the transferee district, and files the consent in the transferee district; (E) the United States attorneys for both districts approve the transfer in writing; and (F) the transferee court approves the transfer. **(2)** ***Clerk's Duties.*** After receiving the juvenile's written consent and the required approvals, the clerk where the indictment or information or complaint is pending or where the alleged offense occurred must send the file, or a certified copy, to the clerk in the transferee district.

Committee Notes
Rule 20
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 20 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Rule 20(d)(2) is new and has been added to parallel a similar provision in Rule 20(b). The new provision rule provides that after the court has determined that the provisions in Rule 20(d)(1) have been completed and the transfer is approved, the file (or certified copy) must be transmitted from the original court to the transferee court.

Rule 21. Transfer From the District for Trial.	Rule 21. Transfer for Trial
(a) For Prejudice in the District. The court upon motion of the defendant shall transfer the proceeding as to that defendant to another district whether or not such district is specified in the defendant's motion if the court is satisfied that there exists in the district where the prosecution is pending so great a prejudice against the defendant that the defendant cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial at any place fixed by law for holding court in that district.	**(a) For Prejudice.** Upon the defendant's motion, the court must transfer the proceeding as to that defendant to another district if the court is satisfied that so great a prejudice against the defendant exists in the transferring district that the defendant cannot obtain a fair and impartial trial there.
(b) Transfer in Other Cases. For the convenience of parties and witnesses, and in the interest of justice, the court upon motion of the defendant may transfer the proceeding as to that defendant or any one or more of the counts thereof to another district.	**(b) For Convenience.** Upon the defendant's motion, the court may transfer the proceeding, or one or more counts, as to that defendant to another district for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice.
(c) Proceedings on Transfer. When a transfer is ordered the clerk shall transmit to the clerk of the court to which the proceeding is transferred all papers in the proceeding or duplicates thereof and any bail taken, and the prosecution shall continue in that district.	**(c) Proceedings on Transfer.** When the court orders a transfer, the clerk must send to the transferee district the file or a certified copy of it, and any bail taken. The prosecution will then continue in the transferee district.
	(d) Time to File a Motion to Transfer. A motion to transfer may be made at or before arraignment or at any other time the court or these rules prescribe.

Committee Notes
Rule 21
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 21 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Amended Rule 21(d) consists of what was formerly Rule 22. The Committee believed that the substance of Rule 22, which addressed the issue of the timing of motions to transfer, was more appropriate for inclusion in Rule 21.

Rule 22. Time of Motion to Transfer	Rule 22. Time to File a Motion to Transfer
A motion to transfer under these rules may be made at or before arraignment or at such other time as the court or these rules may prescribe.	[Transferred to Rule 21(d).]

Committee Notes
Rule 22
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

Rule 22 has been abrogated. The substance of the rule is now located in Rule 21(d).

VI. TRIAL	TITLE VI. TRIAL
Rule 23. Trial by Jury or by the Court	**Rule 23. Jury or Nonjury Trial**
(a) Trial by Jury. Cases required to be tried by jury shall be so tried unless the defendant waives a jury trial in writing with the approval of the court and the consent of the government.	**(a) Jury Trial.** If the defendant is entitled to a jury trial, the trial must be by jury unless: **(1)** the defendant waives a jury trial in writing; **(2)** the government consents; and **(3)** the court approves.
(b) Jury of Less Than Twelve. Juries shall be of 12 but at any time before verdict the parties may stipulate in writing with the approval of the court that the jury shall consist of any number less than 12 or that a valid verdict may be returned by a jury of less than 12 should the court find it necessary to excuse one or more jurors for any just cause after trial commences. Even absent such stipulation, if the court finds it necessary to excuse a juror for just cause after the jury has retired to consider its verdict, in the discretion of the court a valid verdict may be returned by the remaining 11 jurors.	**(b) Jury Size.** **(1)** ***In General.*** A jury consists of 12 persons unless this rule provides otherwise. **(2)** ***Stipulation for a Smaller Jury.*** At any time before the verdict, the parties may, with the court's approval, stipulate in writing that: (A) the jury may consist of fewer than 12 persons; or (B) a jury of fewer than 12 persons may return a verdict if the court finds it necessary to excuse a juror for good cause after the trial begins. **(3)** ***Court Order for a Jury of 11.*** After the jury has retired to deliberate, the court may permit a jury of 11 persons to return a verdict, even without a stipulation by the parties, if the court finds good cause to excuse a juror.
(c) Trial Without a Jury. In a case tried without a jury the court shall make a general finding and shall in addition, on request made before the general finding, find the facts specially. Such findings may be oral. If an opinion or memorandum of decision is filed, it will be sufficient if the findings of fact appear therein.	**(c) Nonjury Trial.** In a case tried without a jury, the court must find the defendant guilty or not guilty. If a party requests before the finding of guilty or not guilty, the court must state its specific findings of fact in open court or in a written decision or opinion.

Committee Notes
Rule 23
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 23 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

In current Rule 23(b), the term "just cause" has been replaced with the more familiar term "good cause," that appears in other rules. No change in substance is intended.

Rule 24. Trial Jurors	Rule 24. Trial Jurors
(a) Examination. The court may permit the defendant or the defendant's attorney and the attorney for the government to conduct the examination of prospective jurors or may itself conduct the examination. In the latter event the court shall permit the defendant or the defendant's attorney and the attorney for the government to supplement the examination by such further inquiry as it deems proper or shall itself submit to the prospective jurors such additional questions by the parties or their attorneys as it deems proper.	**(a) Examination.** **(1)** ***In General.*** The court may examine prospective jurors and may permit the attorneys for the parties to do so. **(2)** ***Court Examination.*** If the court examines the jurors, it must permit the attorneys for the parties to: (A) ask further questions that the court considers proper; or (B) submit further questions that the court may ask if it considers them proper.
(b) Peremptory Challenges. If the offense charged is punishable by death, each side is entitled to 20 peremptory challenges. If the offense charged is punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, the government is entitled to 6 peremptory challenges and the defendant or defendants jointly to 10 peremptory challenges. If the offense charged is punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year or by fine or both, each side is entitled to 3 peremptory challenges. If there is more than one defendant, the court may allow the defendants additional peremptory challenges and permit them to be exercised separately or jointly.	**(b) Peremptory Challenges.** Each side is entitled to the number of peremptory challenges to prospective jurors specified below. The court may allow additional peremptory challenges to multiple defendants, and may allow the defendants to exercise those challenges separately or jointly. **(1)** ***A Crime Punishable by Death.*** Each side has 20 peremptory challenges. **(2)** ***A Crime Punishable by Imprisonment of More Than One Year.*** Each side has 10 peremptory challenges. **(3)** ***A Crime Punishable by Fine, Imprisonment of One Year or Less, or Both.*** Each side has 3 peremptory challenges.

(c) Alternate Jurors. (1) *In General.* The court may empanel no more than 6 jurors, in addition to the regular jury, to sit as alternate jurors. An alternate juror, in the order called, shall replace a juror who becomes or is found to be unable or disqualified to perform juror duties. Alternate jurors shall (i) be drawn in the same manner, (ii) have the same qualifications, (iii) be subject to the same examination and challenges, and (iv) take the same oath as regular jurors. An alternate juror has the same functions, powers, facilities and privileges as a regular juror. (2) *Peremptory Challenges.* In addition to challenges otherwise provided by law, each side is entitled to 1 additional peremptory challenge if 1 or 2 alternate jurors are empaneled, 2 additional peremptory challenges if 3 or 4 alternate jurors are empaneled, and 3 additional peremptory challenges if 5 or 6 alternate jurors are empaneled. The additional peremptory challenges may be used to remove an alternate juror only, and the other peremptory challenges allowed by these rules may not be used to remove an alternate juror. (3) *Retention of Alternate Jurors.* When the jury retires to consider the verdict, the court in its discretion may retain the alternate jurors during deliberations. If the court decides to retain the alternate jurors, it shall ensure that they do not discuss the case with any other person unless and until they replace a juror during deliberations. If an alternate replaces a regular juror after deliberations have begun, the court shall instruct the jury to begin its deliberations anew.	**(c) Alternate Jurors.** **(1)** ***In General.*** The court may impanel up to 6 alternate jurors to replace any jurors who are unable to perform or who are disqualified from performing their duties. **(2)** ***Procedure.*** (A) Alternate jurors must have the same qualifications and be selected and sworn in the same manner as any other juror. (B) Alternate jurors replace jurors in the same sequence in which the alternates were selected. An alternate juror who replaces a juror has the same authority as the other jurors. **(3)** ***Retention of Alternate Jurors.*** The court may retain alternate jurors after the jury retires to deliberate. The court must ensure that a retained alternate does not discuss the case with anyone until that alternate replaces a juror or is discharged. If an alternate replaces a juror after deliberations have begun, the court must instruct the jury to begin its deliberations anew. **(4)** ***Peremptory Challenges.*** Each side is entitled to the number of additional peremptory challenges to prospective alternate jurors specified below, which may be used only to remove alternate jurors. (A) *One or Two Alternates to be Impaneled.* One additional peremptory challenge. (B) *Three or Four Alternates to be Impaneled.* Two additional peremptory challenges. (C) *Five or Six Alternates to be Impaneled.* Three additional peremptory challenges.

Committee Notes
Rule 24
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 24 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

In restyling Rule 24(a), the Committee deleted the language that authorized the defendant to conduct voir dire of prospective jurors. The Committee believed that the current language was potentially ambiguous and could lead one incorrectly to conclude that a defendant, represented by counsel, could personally conduct voir dire or additional voir dire. The Committee believed that the intent of the current provision was to permit a defendant to participate personally in voir dire only if the defendant was acting pro se. Amended Rule 24(a) refers only to attorneys for the parties, i.e. the defense counsel and the attorney for the government, with the understanding that if the defendant is not represented by counsel, the court may still, in its discretion, permit the defendant to participate in voir dire. In summary, the Committee intends no change in practice.

Rule 24(b) contains a substantive amendment. The revised rule now equalizes the number of peremptory challenges normally available to the prosecution and the defense in a felony case. Under the amendment, the number of challenges available to the defendant remain the same, ten challenges, and those available to the prosecution's are increased by four. The number of peremptory challenges in capital and misdemeanor cases remain unchanged.

In 1976, the Supreme Court adopted and forwarded to Congress amendments to Rule 24(b) which would have reduced and equalized the number of peremptory challenges. Under the proposed change, each side would have been entitled to 20, 5, and 3 challenges, respectively in capital, felony, and misdemeanor cases. *See* Order, Amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, 44 U.S.L.W. 4549 (1976). Congress ultimately rejected the proposed changes but recommended that the Judicial Conference study the matter further. Congress's chief concern was that in most federal courts, the trial judge conducts the voir dire, thus making it more difficult for the parties to identify biased jurors. *See* S. Rep. 354, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 9, reprinted in [1977] U.S. Code Cong. & Ad. News 1477, 1482-83. In 1990, the Advisory Committee on Criminal Rules

proposed an amendment to Rule 24(b) which would have provided that in a felony case each side would be entitled to 6 peremptory challenges; that result would have been reached by reducing the number available to the defendant by four. The Standing Committee ultimately rejected that amendment in 1991. Since then, however, some members of Congress have indicated a willingness to reconsider the number of peremptory challenges available in a felony case. *See* Senate Bill 3 (*Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1997*) (would have equalized the number of challenges at 10 for each side).

The proposed amendment equalizes the number of peremptory challenges for each side without reducing the number available to the defense. While increasing the number of challenges might, in some cases, require more jurors in the initial pool, the Committee believed that equalizing the number of challenges is desirable.

Finally, the rule authorizes the court in multi-defendant cases to grant additional peremptory challenges to the defendants. If the court does so, the prosecution may request additional challenges in a multi-defendant case, not to exceed the total number available to the defendants jointly. The court, however, is not required to equalize the number of challenges where additional challenges are granted to the defendant.

Rule 25. Judge; Disability	Rule 25. Judge's Disability
(a) During Trial. If by reason of death, sickness or other disability the judge before whom a jury trial has commenced is unable to proceed with the trial, any other judge regularly sitting in or assigned to the court, upon certifying familiarity with the record of the trial, may proceed with and finish the trial.	**(a) During Trial.** Any judge regularly sitting in or assigned to the court may complete a jury trial if: **(1)** the judge before whom the trial began cannot proceed because of death, sickness, or other disability; and **(2)** the judge completing the trial certifies familiarity with the trial record.
(b) After Verdict or Finding of Guilt. If by reason of absence, death, sickness or other disability the judge before whom the defendant has been tried is unable to perform the duties to be performed by the court after a verdict or finding of guilt, any other judge regularly sitting in or assigned to the court may perform those duties; but if that judge is satisfied that a judge who did not preside at the trial cannot perform those duties or that it is appropriate for any other reason, that judge may grant a new trial.	**(b) After a Verdict or Finding of Guilty.** **(1)** After a verdict or finding of guilty, any judge regularly sitting in or assigned to a court may complete the court's duties if the judge who presided at trial cannot perform those duties because of absence, death, sickness, or other disability. **(2)** The successor judge may grant a new trial if satisfied that: (A) a judge other than the one who presided at the trial cannot perform the post-trial duties; or (B) a new trial is necessary for some other reason.

Committee Notes
Rule 25
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 25 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 25(b)(2) addresses the possibility of a new trial when a judge determines that no other judge could perform post-trial duties or when the judge determines that there is some other reason for doing so. The current rule indicates that those reasons must be "appropriate." The Committee, however, believed that a better term would be "necessary," because that term includes notions of manifest necessity. No change in meaning or practice is intended.

Rule 26. Taking of Testimony	Rule 26. Taking Testimony
In all trials the testimony of witnesses shall be taken orally in open court, unless otherwise provided by an Act of Congress, or by these rules, the Federal Rules of Evidence, or other rules adopted by the Supreme Court.	**(a) In General.** In all trials the testimony of witnesses must be taken in open court, unless otherwise provided by an Act of Congress or by rules adopted under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2072-77. **(b) Transmitting Testimony from Different Location.** In the interest of justice, the court may authorize contemporaneous video presentation in open court of testimony from a witness who is at a different location if: (i) the requesting party establishes compelling circumstances for such transmission; (ii) appropriate safeguards for the transmission are used; and (iii) the witness is unavailable within the meaning of Rule 804(a) of the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Committee Notes
Rule 26
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 26 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

A substantive change has been made to Rule 26(b). That amendment permits a court to receive the video transmission of an absent witness if certain conditions are met. As currently written, Rule 26 indicates that normally only testimony given orally in open court will be considered, unless otherwise provided by these rules, an Act of Congress, or any other rule adopted by the Supreme Court. An example of a rule which provides otherwise is Rule 15. That Rule recognizes that depositions may be used to preserve testimony if there are exceptional circumstances in the case and it is in the interest of justice to do so. If the person is "unavailable" under Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a), then the deposition may be used at trial as substantive evidence. The amendment to Rule 26(b) extends the logic underlying that exception to contemporaneous video testimony of an unavailable witness. The amendment generally parallels a similar provision in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 43.

The Committee believed that permitting use of video transmission of testimony only in those instances when deposition testimony could be used is a prudent and measured step. The proponent of the testimony must establish that there are exceptional circumstances for such transmission. A party against whom a deposition may be introduced at trial will normally have no basis for objecting if contemporaneous testimony is used instead. Indeed, the use of such transmitted testimony is in most regards superior to other means of presenting testimony in the courtroom. The participants in the courtroom can see for themselves the demeanor of the witness and hear any pauses in the testimony, matters which are not normally available in non-video deposition testimony. Although deposition testimony is normally taken with all counsel and parties present with the witness, those are not absolute requirements. *See, e.g., United States v. Salim*, 855 F.2d 944, 947-48 (2d Cir. 1988) (conviction affirmed where deposition testimony used although defendant and her counsel were not permitted in same room with witness, witness' lawyer answered some questions, lawyers were not permitted to question witness directly, and portions of proceedings were not transcribed verbatim).

The Committee recognized that there is a need for the trial court to impose appropriate safeguards and procedures to insure the accuracy and quality of the transmission, the ability of the jurors to hear and view the testimony, and the ability of the judge, counsel, and the witness to hear and understand each other during questioning. *See, e.g., United States v. Gigante*, 166 F.3d 75 (2d Cir. 1999). Deciding what safeguards are appropriate is left to the sound discretion of the trial court.

The Committee believed that including the requirement of "unavailability" as that term is defined in Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a) will insure that the defendant's Confrontation Clause rights are not infringed. In deciding whether to permit contemporaneous transmission of the testimony of a government witness, the Supreme Court's decision in *Maryland v. Craig*, 497 U.S. 836 (1990) is instructive. In that case, the prosecution presented the testimony of a child sexual assault victim from another room by way of one-way closed circuit television. The Court outlined four elements which underlie Confrontation Clause issues: (1) physical presence; (2) the oath; (3) cross-examination; and (4) the opportunity for the trier-of-fact to observe the witness' demeanor. *Id.* at 847. The Court rejected the notion that a defendant's Confrontation Clause rights could be protected only if all four elements were present. The trial court had explicitly concluded that the procedure was necessary to protect the child witness, i.e., the witness was psychologically unavailable to testify in open court. The Supreme Court noted that any harm to the defendant resulting from the transmitted testimony was minimal because the defendant received most of the protections contemplated by the Confrontation Clause, i.e., the witness was under oath, counsel could cross-examine the absent witness, and the jury could observe the demeanor of the witness. *See also United States v. Gigante*, *supra* (use of remote transmission of unavailable witness' testimony did not violate confrontation clause).

Although the amendment is not limited to instances such as those encountered in *Craig*, it is limited to situations when the witness is unavailable for any of the reasons set out in Federal Rule of Evidence 804(a). Whether under particular circumstances a proposed transmission will satisfy some, or all, of the four protective factors identified by the Supreme Court in *Craig*, is a decision left to the trial court.

Rule 26.1. Determination of Foreign Law	Rule 26.1. Foreign Law Determination
A party who intends to raise an issue concerning the law of a foreign country shall give reasonable written notice. The court, in determining foreign law, may consider any relevant material or source, including testimony, whether or not submitted by a party or admissible under the Federal Rules of Evidence. The court's determination shall be treated as a ruling on a question of law.	A party who intends to raise an issue of foreign law must provide the court and all parties with reasonable written notice. Issues of foreign law are questions of law, but in deciding such issues a court may consider any relevant material or source — including testimony — without regard to the Federal Rules of Evidence.

Committee Notes
Rule 26.1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 26.1 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 26.2. Production of Witness Statements	Rule 26.2. Producing a Witness's Statement
(a) Motion for Production. After a witness other than the defendant has testified on direct examination, the court, on motion of a party who did not call the witness, shall order the attorney for the government or the defendant and the defendant's attorney, as the case may be, to produce, for the examination and use of the moving party, any statement of the witness that is in their possession and that relates to the subject matter concerning which the witness has testified.	**(a) Motion to Produce.** After a witness other than the defendant has testified on direct examination, the court, on motion of a party who did not call the witness, must order the attorney for the government or the defendant and the defendant's attorney, as the case may be, to produce, for the examination and use of the moving party, any statement of the witness that is in the possession and that relates to the subject matter of the witnesses's testimony.
(b) Production of Entire Statement. If the entire contents of the statement relate to the subject matter concerning which the witness has testified, the court shall order that the statement be delivered to the moving party.	**(b) Producing the Entire Statement.** If the entire statement relates to the subject matter of the witness's testimony, the court must order that the statement be delivered to the moving party.
(c) Production of Excised Statement. If the other party claims that the statement contains privileged information or matter that does not relate to the subject matter concerning which the witness has testified, the court shall order that it be delivered to the court in camera. Upon inspection, the court shall excise the portions of the statement that are privileged or that do not relate to the subject matter concerning which the witness has testified, and shall order that the statement, with such material excised, be delivered to the moving party. Any portion of the statement that is withheld from the defendant over the defendant's objection must be preserved by the attorney for the government, and, if the defendant appeals a conviction, must be made available to the appellate court for the purpose of determining the correctness of the decision to excise the portion of the statement.	**(c) Producing A Redacted Statement.** If the party who called the witness claims that the statement contains information that is privileged or does not relate to the subject matter of the witness's testimony, the court must inspect the statement in camera. After excising any privileged or unrelated portions, the court must order delivery of the redacted statement to the moving party. If the defendant objects to an excision, the court must preserve the entire statement with the excised portion indicated, under seal, as part of the record.
(d) Recess for Examination of Statement. Upon delivery of the statement to the moving party, the court, upon application of that party, may recess the proceedings so that counsel may examine the statement and prepare to use it in the proceedings.	**(d) Recess to Examine a Statement.** The court may recess the proceedings to allow time for a party to examine the statement and prepare for its use.
(e) Sanction for Failure to Produce Statement. If the other party elects not to comply with an order to deliver a statement to the moving party, the court shall order that the testimony of the witness be stricken from the record and that the trial proceed, or, if it is the attorney for the government who elects not to comply, shall declare a mistrial if required by the interest of justice.	**(e) Sanction for Failure to Produce or Deliver a Statement.** If the party who called the witness disobeys an order to produce or deliver a statement, the court must strike the witness's testimony from the record. If the attorney for the government disobeys the order, the court must declare a mistrial if justice so requires.

(f) Definition. As used in this rule, a "statement" of a witness means: **(1)** a written statement made by the witness that is signed or otherwise adopted or approved by the witness; **(2)** a substantially verbatim recital of an oral statement made by the witness that is recorded contemporaneously with the making of the oral statement and that is contained in a stenographic, mechanical, electrical, or other recording or a transcription thereof; or **(3)** a statement, however taken or recorded, or a transcription thereof, made by the witness to a grand jury.	**(f) Definition.** As used in this rule, a witness's "statement" means: **(1)** a written statement that the witness makes and signs, or otherwise adopts or approves; **(2)** a substantially verbatim, contemporaneously recorded recital of the witness's oral statement that is contained in any recording or any transcription of a recording; or **(3)** the witness's statement to a grand jury, however taken or recorded, or a transcription of such a statement.
(g) Scope of Rule. This rule applies at a suppression hearing conducted under Rule 12, at trial under this rule, and to the extent specified: **(1)** in Rule 32(c)(2) at sentencing; **(2)** in Rule 32.1(c) at a hearing to revoke or modify probation or supervised release; **(3)** in Rule 46(i) at a detention hearing; **(4)** in Rule 8 of the Rules Governing Proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 2255; and **(5)** in Rule 5.1 at a preliminary examination.	**(g) Scope.** This rule applies at trial, at a suppression hearing under Rule 12, and to the extent specified in the following rules: **(1)** Rule 5.1 (preliminary hearing); **(2)** Rule 32(c)(2) (sentencing); **(3)** Rule 32.1(c) (hearing to revoke or modify probation or supervised release); **(4)** Rule 46(i) (detention hearing); and **(5)** Rule 8 of the Rules Governing Proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 2255.

Committee Notes
Rule 26.2
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 26.2 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

Current Rule 26.2(c) states that if the court withholds a portion of a statement, over the defendant's objection, "the attorney for the government" must preserve the statement. The Committee believed that the better rule would be for the court to simply seal the entire statement as a part of the record, in the event that there is an appeal.

Also, the terminology in Rule 26.2(c) has been changed. The rule now speaks in terms of a "redacted" statement instead of an "excised" statement. No change in practice is intended.

Finally, the order of the list of proceedings has been placed in numerical order in Rule 26.2(g).

Rule 26.3. Mistrial	Rule 26.3. Mistrial
Before ordering a mistrial, the court shall provide an opportunity for the government and for each defendant to comment on the propriety of the order, including whether each party consents or objects to a mistrial, and to suggest any alternatives.	Before ordering a mistrial, the court must give each defendant and the government an opportunity to comment on the propriety of the order, to state whether that party consents or objects, and to suggest alternatives.

Committee Notes
Rule 26.3
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 26.3 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 27. Proof of Official Record	Rule 27. Proof of Official Record
An official record or an entry therein or the lack of such a record or entry may be proved in the same manner as in civil actions.	A party may prove an official record, an entry in such a record, or the lack of a record or entry in the same manner as in a civil action.

Committee Notes
Rule 27
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 27 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 28. Interpreters	Rule 28. Interpreters
The court may appoint an interpreter of its own selection and may fix the reasonable compensation of such interpreter. Such compensation shall be paid out of funds provided by law or by the government, as the court may direct.	The court may select, appoint, and fix the reasonable compensation for an interpreter. The compensation must be paid from funds provided by law or by the government, as the court may direct.

Committee Notes
Rule 28
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 28 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 29. Motion for Judgment of Acquittal	Rule 29. Motion for Judgment of Acquittal
(a) Motion Before Submission to Jury. Motions for directed verdict are abolished and motions for judgment of acquittal shall be used in their place. The court on motion of a defendant or of its own motion shall order the entry of judgment of acquittal of one or more offenses charged in the indictment or information after the evidence on either side is closed if the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction of such offense or offenses. If the defendant's motion for judgment of acquittal at the close of the evidence offered by the government is not granted, the defendant may offer evidence without having reserved the right.	**(a) Before Submission to the Jury.** After the government closes its evidence or after the close of all the evidence, the court on the defendant's motion must enter a judgment of acquittal of any offense as to which the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction. The court may on its own consider whether the evidence is insufficient to sustain a conviction. If the court denies a motion for judgment of acquittal at the close of the government's evidence, the defendant may offer evidence without having reserved the right to do so.
(b) Reservation of Decision on Motion. The court may reserve decision on a motion for judgment of acquittal, proceed with the trial (where the motion is made before the close of all the evidence), submit the case to the jury and decide the motion either before the jury returns a verdict or after it returns a verdict of guilty or is discharged without having returned a verdict. If the court reserves a decision, it must decide the motion on the basis of the evidence at the time the ruling was reserved.	**(b) Reserving Decision.** The court may reserve decision on a motion for judgment of acquittal, proceed with the trial (where the motion is made before the close of all the evidence), submit the case to the jury and decide the motion either before the jury returns a verdict or after it returns a verdict of guilty or is discharged without having returned a verdict. If the court reserves decision, it must decide the motion on the basis of the evidence at the time the ruling was reserved.
(c) Motion After Discharge of Jury. If the jury returns a verdict of guilty or is discharged without having returned a verdict, a motion for judgment of acquittal may be made or renewed within 7 days after the jury is discharged or within such further time as the court may fix during the 7-day period. If a verdict of guilty is returned the court may on such motion set aside the verdict and enter judgment of acquittal. If no verdict is returned the court may enter judgment of acquittal. It shall not be necessary to the making of such a motion that a similar motion has been made prior to the submission of the case to the jury.	**(c) After Jury Verdict or Discharge.** **(1)** ***In General.*** A defendant may move for judgment of acquittal, or renew such a motion, within 7 days after a guilty verdict or after the court discharges the jury, whichever is later, or within any other time the court fixes during the 7-day period. **(2)** ***Ruling on Motion.*** If the jury has returned a guilty verdict, the court may set aside the verdict and enter an acquittal. If the jury has failed to return a verdict, the court may enter judgment of acquittal. **(3)** ***No Prior Motion.*** A defendant is not required to move for judgment of acquittal before the court submits the case to the jury as a prerequisite for making such a motion after jury discharge.

(d) Same: Conditional Ruling on Grant of Motion. If a motion for judgment of acquittal after verdict of guilty under this Rule is granted, the court shall also determine whether any motion for a new trial should be granted if the judgment of acquittal is thereafter vacated or reversed, specifying the grounds for such determination. If the motion for a new trial is granted conditionally, the order thereon does not affect the finality of the judgment. If the motion for a new trial has been granted conditionally and the judgment is reversed on appeal, the new trial shall proceed unless the appellate court has otherwise ordered. If such motion has been denied conditionally, the appellee on appeal may assert error in that denial, and if the judgment is reversed on appeal, subsequent proceedings shall be in accordance with the order of the appellate court.	**(d) Conditional Ruling on a Motion for a New Trial.** **(1)** ***Motion for a New Trial.*** If the court enters a judgment of acquittal after a guilty verdict, the court must also conditionally determine whether any motion for a new trial should be granted if the judgment of acquittal is later vacated or reversed. The court must specify the reasons for that determination. **(2)** ***Finality.*** The court's order conditionally granting a motion for a new trial does not affect the finality of the judgment of acquittal. **(3)** ***Appeal.*** (A) *Grant of a Motion for a New Trial.* If the court conditionally grants a motion for a new trial, and an appellate court later reverses the judgment of acquittal, the trial court must proceed with the new trial unless the appellate court orders otherwise. (B) *Denial of a Motion for a New Trial.* If the court conditionally denies a motion for a new trial, an appellee may assert that the denial was erroneous. If the appellate court later reverses the judgment of acquittal, the trial court must proceed as the appellate court directs.

Committee Notes
Rule 29
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 29 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only, except as noted below.

In Rule 29(a), the first sentence abolishing "directed verdicts," has been deleted because it is unnecessary. The rule continues to recognize that a judge may sua sponte enter a judgment of acquittal.

Rule 29(c)(1) addresses the issue of the timing of a motion for acquittal. The amended rule now includes language that the motion must be made within 7 days after a guilty verdict or after the judge discharges the jury, whichever occurs later. That change reflects the fact that in a capital case or in case involving criminal forfeiture, for example, the jury may not be discharged until it has completed its sentencing duties. The court may still set another time for the defendant to make or renew the motion, if it does so within the seven-day period.

Rule 29.1. Closing Argument	29.1. Closing Argument
After the closing of evidence the prosecution shall open the argument. The defense shall be permitted to reply. The prosecution shall then be permitted to reply in rebuttal.	Closing arguments proceed in the following order: (a) the government argues; (b) the defense argues; and (c) the government rebuts.

Committee Notes
Rule 29.1
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 29.1 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 30. Instructions	Rule 30. Jury Instructions
At the close of the evidence or at such earlier time during the trial as the court reasonably directs, any party may file written requests that the court instruct the jury on the law as set forth in the requests. At the same time copies of such requests shall be furnished to all parties. The court shall inform counsel of its proposed action upon the requests prior to their arguments to the jury. The court may instruct the jury before or after the arguments are completed or at both times. No party may assign as error any portion of the charge or omission therefrom unless that party objects thereto before the jury retires to consider its verdict, stating distinctly the matter to which that party objects and the grounds of the objection. Opportunity shall be given to make the objection out of the hearing of the jury and, on request of any party, out of the presence of the jury.	**(a) In General.** Any party may request in writing that the court instruct the jury on the law as specified in the request. The request must be made at the close of the evidence or at any earlier time that the court reasonably directs. When the request is made, the requesting party must furnish a copy to every other party. **(b) Ruling on a Request.** The court must inform the parties before closing arguments how it intends to rule on the requested instructions. **(c) Time for Giving Instructions.** The court may instruct the jury before or after the arguments are completed, or at both times. **(d) Objections to Instructions.** A party who objects to any portion of the instructions or to a failure to give a requested instruction must inform the court of the specific objections and the grounds for the objection before the jury retires to deliberate. An opportunity must be given to object out of the jury's hearing and, on request, out of the jury's presence.

Committee Notes
Rule 30
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 30 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 30(d) has been changed to clarify what, if anything, counsel must do to preserve error regarding an instruction or failure to instruct. The rule retains the requirement of a contemporaneous and specific objection (before the jury retires to deliberate). As the Supreme Court recognized in *Jones v. United States*, 119 S.Ct. 2090, 2102 (1999), read literally, current Rule 30 could be construed to bar any appellate review when in fact a court may conduct a limited review under a plain error standard. The topic of plain error is not addressed in Rule 30; it is already covered in Rule 52. No change in practice is intended by the amendment.

Rule 31. Verdict	Rule 31. Jury Verdict
(a) Return. The verdict shall be unanimous. It shall be returned by the jury to the judge in open court.	**(a) Return.** The jury must return its verdict to a judge in open court. The verdict must be unanimous.
(b) Several Defendants. If there are two or more defendants, the jury at any time during its deliberations may return a verdict or verdicts with respect to a defendant or defendants as to whom it has agreed; if the jury cannot agree with respect to all, the defendant or defendants as to whom it does not agree may be tried again.	**(b) Partial Verdicts, Mistrial, and Retrial.** **(1)** ***Multiple Defendants.*** If there are multiple defendants, the jury may return a verdict at any time during its deliberations as to any defendant as to whom it has agreed. **(2)** ***Multiple Counts.*** If the jury cannot agree on all counts as to any defendant, the jury may return a verdict on those counts as to which it has agreed. **(3)** ***Mistrial and Retrial.*** If the jury cannot agree on a verdict as to all counts, the court may declare a mistrial as to those counts. The government may retry any defendant on any count as to which the jury could not agree.
(c) Conviction of Less Offense. The defendant may be found guilty of an offense necessarily included in the offense charged or of an attempt to commit either the offense charged or an offense necessarily included therein if the attempt is an offense.	**(c) Lesser Offense or Attempt.** A defendant may be found guilty of any of the following: **(1)** an offense necessarily included in the offense charged; **(2)** an attempt to commit the offense charged; or **(3)** an attempt to commit an offense necessarily included in the offense charged, if the attempt is an offense in its own right.
(d) Poll of Jury. After a verdict is returned but before the jury is discharged, the court shall, on a party's request, or may on its own motion, poll the jurors individually. If the poll reveals a lack of unanimity, the court may direct the jury to deliberate further or may declare a mistrial and discharge the jury.	**(d) Jury Poll.** After a verdict is returned but before the jury is discharged, the court must on a party's request, or may on its own, poll the jurors individually. If the poll reveals a lack of unanimity, the court may direct the jury to deliberate further or may declare a mistrial and discharge the jury.
(e) Criminal Forfeiture. [Abrogated][2]	**(e) Criminal Forfeiture.** [Abrogated]

[2] Judicial Conference approved amendment in March 1999. The amendments take effect on December 1, 2000, if approved by the Supreme Court and Congress takes no action otherwise.

Committee Notes
Rule 31
December 1, 1999

COMMITTEE NOTE

The language of Rule 31 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Criminal Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only.

Rule 31(b) has been amended to clarify that a jury may return partial verdicts, either as to multiple defendants or multiple counts, or both. *See, e.g., United States v. Cunningham*, 145 F.3d 1385, 1388-89 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (partial verdicts on multiple defendants and counts). No change in practice is intended.