- Laces broketed and Horry arrivation of chois more

Michael E. Shaheen, Jr.

Special Councel for Intelligence Coordination

Richard L. Thornburgh

Assistant Attorney General

Criminal Division

Typed 11/24/75

RLT: CWD: ELigvh

Recuest of Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights

This is in response to your memorandum of November 12.

1975 requesting the Criminal Division to prepare the response
to the list of questions entitled: Legal Insues Regarding
Violations of FDI Rules (submitted to the Attorney General
by the House Jubcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights).
Car response to the numbered questions are as follows:

K G II. 18 U.S.C. 2071, in partiment part, prohibits the unlawful concentment, removal, mutilation, oblitaration of destruction of any record, paper, document or other thing filed os deposited in any public office or with any public officer of the United States. McInerney v. U.J. 143 F. 729 (D. Mass. 1906)

constitute a violation of 18 U.S.C. 2071 may also constitute a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1505 (obstruction of justice) if the destruction, or other prescribed treatment of the subject record or paper, is for the purpose of influencing, obstructing or impeding the due and proper administration of the law under which a proceeding is being had before a department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which on inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House or any joint committee of the Congress.

U.3. v. Fruchtman 421 F. 2d 1019 (6th Cir. 1970), cert. denied 400 U.S. 649.

III. Any individual who, having taken an oath, knowingly submits a false statement or testifies falsely concerning some material fact, may be

ecords en. Crimes owenberg (2) hornburgh



charged, depending on the forum, with a violation of 18 U.S.C. \$8 1621 (perjury) or 1623 (false statement). Holy v. V.3. 278 F. 24 521 (7th Cir. 1921), Gebhard v. U.S. 422 F. 24 281, 287-288 (9th Cir. 1970), V.S. v. Micoletti, 310 F. 28 359 (7th Cir. 1960)

Perjured testimony or false statements which obstruct, on attempt to obstruct proceedings before departments, agencies and committees may constitute a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1505 (obstruction of justice) even if the gravemen of the obstruction is that the individual perjured himself. U.I. v. Alo 439 F. 2d 731 (2nd Cir. 1971) cert. denied 404 U.S. 850.

An individual, under oath, has the duty to testify truthfully concerning any matter regardless of whether or not that matter [or conduct] is punishable by the federal criminal law. U.S. v. Morchester 190 F. Supp. 548, 569 (D. Mass. 1960).

- IV. 18 U.S.C. § 3282 provides that for non-capital offenses "no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense... unless the indictment is found or the information is instituted within five years next after such offense shall have been committed." The statute of limitations begins to run when the crime is complete; f.e. from the date of the last evert act. U.3. v. Andreas 374 F. Jupp. 402 (D. Minn. 1974). The statute is not tolled by the non-discovery of the offense during the statutory five-year period.
- V. To constitute a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 4 (misprision of felony) it is necessary that an individual take "some affirmative act of concealment . . or other positive act designed to conceal from

Exatton v. V.3. 73 F.20 975 (10th Cir. 1934), U.3. v. King 402 F. 2d 694, 697 (9th Cir. 1968), Meal v. U.3. 102 F. 2d 643 (8th Cir. 1939). Under existing judicial constructions it is not sufficient for the purposes of an 18 U.3.C. § 4 violation that am individual has knowledge of a crime committed by another and remains silent.

and the Office of the Watergate Special Prosecution Force be requested to search their files for
information pertaining to cases involving government employees destroying or removing records,
documents or papers in their custody or from
public offices in connection with the non- disclosure of violations of agency rules or federal
criminal law.