



Judicial Security: Comparison of Legislation in the 110th Congress

Nathan James

Analyst in Crime Policy

March 4, 2009

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RL33473

Summary

The 2005 murders of the husband and mother of United States District Judge Joan Lefkow by a disgruntled litigant and the murders of Judge Rowland Barton, his court reporter, a deputy sheriff, and a federal officer in Atlanta, Georgia, focused national attention on the need for increased court security. Data from the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), Pennsylvania's survey of judicial safety, and the New York Office of Court Administration demonstrate that judges are the targets of threats and other aggressive actions. In addition, congressional testimony and a report by the Department of Justice's (DOJ's) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) raise questions about the abilities of the USMS to protect the federal judiciary.

The USMS is the primary agency responsible for the security of the federal judiciary. According to a March 2004 OIG report, USMS routinely failed to assess the threats against federal judges in a timely manner and it has limited ability to collect and share intelligence on threats to the judiciary to appropriate entities. The concerns noted by the OIG may be due, in part, to funding and staffing issues highlighted in recent congressional testimony.

Several bills introduced in the 110th Congress sought to address judicial security. H.R. 660 and S. 378 would have addressed many of the same issues that legislation introduced in the 109th Congress sought to address. On January 7, 2008, H.R. 660 was enacted into law (P.L. 110-177). P.L. 110-177 (1) improves judicial security measures and increases funding for judicial security; (2) amends the criminal code to provide greater protection for judges, their family members, and witnesses; and (3) provides grant funding for states to provide protection for judges and witnesses. Four other bills, H.R. 933, H.R. 3547, S. 79, and S. 456, would have created a short-term witness protection section in the USMS. All four bills would have also created a grant program to provide funding for short-term witness protection programs. Another bill, H.R. 2325, would have, along with amending the criminal code to provide greater protection for federal judges, federal law enforcement officers, and their family members, allowed federal judges and justices, U.S. Attorneys, and any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice whose duties include representing the United States in court to carry firearms.

This report discusses the state of judicial security in the United States and the legislation introduced in the 110th Congress related to judicial security. This report will not be updated.

Contents

Background	1
Current Issues in Judicial Security	1
Court Security	1
Witness Intimidation	3
Legislation in the 110 th Congress	5
The Court Security Improvement Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-177).....	5
Increased Sentences	5
New Federal Grant Programs.....	7
Measures to Protect Judicial Personnel.....	8
Other Legislation in the 110 th Congress	10
Increased Sentences	10
New Federal Grant Programs.....	12
Measures to Protect Judicial Personnel.....	14

Contacts

Author Contact Information	15
----------------------------------	----

Background¹

Two recent events heightened congressional concern about the state of judicial security: the murders of the husband and mother of United States District Judge Joan Lefkow by a disgruntled litigant and the murders of Judge Rowland Barton, his court reporter, a deputy sheriff, and a federal officer in Atlanta, Georgia. The 109th Congress responded by introducing a number of bills. Some pieces of legislation addressed issues of courthouse security and physical security for judges and court personnel, whereas other legislation went beyond courthouse security and physical security for judges and court personnel and addressed issues concerning the integrity of the judicial system in the United States. Legislation has been introduced in the 110th Congress that addresses many of the same issues that were addressed by legislation in the 109th Congress.

This report discusses the state of judicial security in the United States, as well as legislation introduced in the 110th Congress that would enhance judicial security. This report also provides a brief overview of legislation introduced in 109th Congress that would have addressed judicial security. This report, however, does not discuss the agencies involved in providing security for the federal judiciary.

Current Issues in Judicial Security

Court Security

Data suggests that judges, both federal and state, are the targets of threats and other aggressive behavior. Between October 1, 1980, and September 30, 1993, the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) collected information about reports of inappropriate communications, threats, and attacks involving federal judicial officials.² During the 13-year period, 3,096 reports were recorded by the USMS. Approximately 8% of the reports involved inappropriate communications that appeared to be linked to later, more serious actions; 4% involved incidents where court officials were attacked or involved in attacks against others; and another 4% involved incidents where court officials were in danger of being harmed by people who threatened or attempted to take inappropriate actions. More recently, the USMS reported that they received an estimated 700 threats against members of the judiciary each year.³ Of these, about 20 were serious enough to warrant a protective detail and about 12 warranted around-the-clock protection.

Additional data, while more limited, demonstrate that state and local judges face many of the same threats as federal judges. A recent report from the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)

¹ For more information on (1) the roles and responsibilities of federal agencies that provide judicial security, (2) FY2007 judicial security budget requests, and (3) actions taken by the Judicial Conference and the National Center for State Courts to improve judicial security, see CRS Report RL33464, *Judicial Security: Responsibilities and Current Issues*, by (name redacted).

² Neil Alan Weiner, Donald J. Harris, Frederick S. Calhoun, Victor E. Flango, Donald Hardenbergh, Charlotte Kirschner, Thomas O'Reilly, Robert Sobolevitch, and Brian Vossekuil, "Safe and Secure: Protecting Judicial Officials," *Court Review*, vol. 36, no. 4 (Winter 2000), pp. 26-33.

³ Bethany Broida, "Judges, Officials Hold D.C. Summit on Courthouse Security," *Legal Times*, April 5, 2005, at <http://www.law.com/jsp/article.jsp?id=114160713238>.

discussed data collected by the National Sheriff's Association (NSA).⁴ The NSA data indicated that over the past 35 years:

- 8 state or local judges have been killed;
- 13 state or local judges have been assaulted;
- 3 local prosecutors have been killed;
- 4 local prosecutors have been assaulted;
- 5, if not more, local law enforcement officers have been killed at local courthouses;
- 27 local law enforcement officers have been assaulted at local courthouses;
- 42 court participants have been killed at local courthouses; and
- 53 court participants have been assaulted at local courthouses.⁵

Data about the types of threats Pennsylvania judges face were collected as a part of a "survey of judicial safety."⁶ Of the judges who responded to the survey, 52% reported that they had experienced one or more incidents of "inappropriate communications," "inappropriate approaches," "threatening communications," "physical assaults," or "any threatening actions" in the past year. Thirty-five percent of the respondents reported that they changed their judicial conduct "somewhat" or "a great deal" because either they or one of their associates had experienced one or more threats, inappropriate approaches, or physical assaults. Moreover, New York's Office of Court Administration reported that since 1987, it has handled more than 2,000 reported threats against judges, with more than 1,300 of the reported threats occurring since 1995.⁷

There have been concerns about the ability of the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) to provide security for the federal judiciary.⁸ A Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of the Inspector General (OIG), report on the U.S. Marshal's Judicial Security process found that USMS routinely failed to assess the threats against federal judges in a timely manner.⁹ The OIG found that USMS has limited ability to collect and share intelligence on threats to the judiciary amongst its districts and its representatives on the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) Joint Terrorism Task Forces.¹⁰

⁴ Frederick S. Calhoun and Stephen W. Weston, *Protecting Judicial Officials: Implementing and Effective Threat Management Process*, June 2006, Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, p. 2, available online at <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/213930.pdf>.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Neil Alan Weiner, Donald J. Harris, Frederick S. Calhoun, Victor E. Flango, Donald Hardenbergh, Charlotte Kirschner, Thomas O'Reilly, Robert Sobolevitch, and Brian Vossekuil, "Safe and Secure: Protecting Judicial Officials," *Court Review*, vol. 36, no. 4 (Winter 2000), pp. 26-33.

⁷ The Task Force on Court Security, *Report to the Chief Judge and the Chief Administrative Judge*, October 2005, p. 9, at http://www.nycourts.gov/reports/security/SecurityTaskForce_Report.pdf.

⁸ The USMS is the primary agency responsible for the security of the federal judiciary. Senior inspectors, deputy marshals and court security officers (CSOs) provide security for the judiciary in each of the 94 United States district courts and the District of Columbia courts. Three additional agencies also have security responsibilities for the federal judiciary and include the Department of Homeland Security's Federal Protective Service, the General Services Administration's Public Building Service, and the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

⁹ U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, *Review of the United States Marshals Service Judicial Security Process*, Report number I-2004-004, March 2004, p. ii, at <http://www.usdoj.gov/oig/reports/USMS/e0404/final.pdf>.

¹⁰ Ibid., pp. ii-iii.

The OIG also found that USMS lacked adequate risk-based standards for determining the appropriate means for protecting judges during high-risk trials and for protecting threatened judges while they are not in court.¹¹

In congressional testimony, Judge Jane R. Roth¹² stated that funding and staffing issues at the USMS have decreased its ability to provide adequate protection for the federal judiciary.¹³ Judge Roth noted that on many occasions, the Judicial Conference had found that the USMS did not have adequate staff to protect the judiciary. Judge Roth testified that DOJ had not shared information about USMS staffing levels, but “many United States Marshals report to us that their staffing levels have been significantly reduced.”¹⁴ Judge Roth also questioned whether the law enforcement responsibilities (fugitive apprehension, asset forfeiture, and witness protection) had caused budgetary problems for the Marshals’ judiciary security program because the USMS must serve both the executive and judicial branches. A report that reviewed the protection provided to the federal judiciary by the USMS found “[t]he staffing level of the USMS for protection of the Judiciary has not grown commensurate with operational demands.”¹⁵ Specifically, the USMS is having problems with providing an adequate number of Deputy U.S. Marshals (DUSMs) for judicial security duties.¹⁶

There is federal funding available for state courts; however, with respect to judicial security in state courts, state courts cannot directly apply for such funding.¹⁷ They have to request such funding from the state’s executive branch, which means that state courts must compete with executive branch agencies for federal funding. This has proven to be a barrier for state courts in directly accessing federal funding for court security measures.

Witness Intimidation

Witness intimidation reduces the likelihood that citizens will engage with the criminal justice system, which could deprive police and prosecutors of critical evidence.¹⁸ Witness intimidation can reduce public confidence in the criminal justice system and it can create the perception that the criminal justice system cannot protect citizens. Witness intimidation can be the result of actual or perceived threats from an offender or his associates, but it can also be the result of more general community norms that discourage residents from cooperating with the police or prosecutors. Witnesses can be intimidated in many ways, including

¹¹ Ibid., p. iv.

¹² Judge Roth is the Chair of the Committee on Security and Facilities, Judicial Conference of the United States.

¹³ Testimony of Judge Jane R. Roth, U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism and Homeland Security, *Secure Access to Justice and Court Protection Act*, hearing on H.R. 1751, 109th Cong., 1st sess., April 26, 2005, H.Hrg. 109-44.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁵ John D. Veatch, Joseph W. James, Terry T. May, Donald E. Williams, and Robert A. Kromer, *Management of the Protection Afforded the Federal Judiciary*, July 14, 2004, a study prepared for the Judicial Security Division, U.S. Marshals Service, pp. 2-4.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Pamela Casey, *A National Strategic Plan for Judicial Branch Security*, p. 11, February 7, 2006, at http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/Res_CtSecu_JudclStrategicPlan.pdf.

¹⁸ Kelly Dedel, *Witness Intimidation*, Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services, July 2006, p. 6, at <http://www.cops.usdoj.gov/mime/open.pdf?Item=1762>.

- implicit threats, looks, or gestures,
- explicit threats of violence,
- actual physical violence,
- property damage, or
- other threats, such as challenges to child custody or immigration status.¹⁹

Threats are more common than actual physical violence, but they can be just as effective in deterring cooperation with police and prosecutors. Some witnesses might experience one incident of intimidation, but others might experience an escalating series of threats and actions that become more violent over time. Other witnesses might not experience intimidation directly, but they believe that they will receive retaliation if they cooperate with law enforcement.

According to a Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) report, “small-scale studies and surveys of police and prosecutors suggest that witness intimidation is pervasive and increasing.”²⁰ The report cites a study of witnesses appearing in criminal courts in Bronx County, New York, which shows that 36% of witnesses had been directly threatened, and of those that were not directly threatened, 57% feared reprisals. The report also states that prosecutors believe that witness intimidation plays a role in 75%-100% of violent crime committed in gang-controlled neighborhoods, but it might be less of a factor in neighborhoods not dominated by gangs and drugs. The report also notes that it is hard to quantify the prevalence of witness intimidation for several reasons. Some reasons include

- crime is under-reported for reasons not related to witness intimidation;
- in cases where a witness is successfully intimidated, neither the crime nor the intimidation is reported;
- victimization surveys and interviews with witnesses whose cases go to trial only capture information from a subset of witnesses; and
- there has been no empirical research on the scope or specific characteristics of community-wide intimidation.

A report from the National Center for Victims of Crime presented data from surveys and interviews of youths in Massachusetts.²¹ The youth surveys and interviews focused on different topics related to gangs and violence, including experiences with gang-related crime and witness intimidation. Thirty-eight percent of survey respondents reported hearing about threats against schoolmates and 28% reported hearing about threats made against neighbors because they reported gang crime. Of the respondents who had reported a gang crime, 12% reported receiving a threat because they reported the crime. The most common way threats were made against schoolmates, neighbors, or the respondents themselves were face-to-face contacts, followed by receiving telephone calls. Respondents reported that half of the threats against schoolmates and

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 3.

²⁰

Ibid., p. 5.

²¹ Julie L. Whitman and Robert C. Davis, *Snitches Get Stitches: Youth, Gangs, and Witness Intimidation in Massachusetts*, National Center for Victims of Crime, 2007, available at <http://www.ncvc.org/ncvc/AGP.Net/Components/documentViewer/Download.aspxnz?DocumentID=42548>.

neighbors they heard about involved beatings, though the researchers warn that this figure might be inflated because respondents were more likely to hear about threats that involved violence. Threats were also delivered through notes, online, and indirectly by stalking the person who reported the crime, vandalizing their property, or socially isolating them.

Legislation in the 110th Congress

In an effort to strengthen court security, the 109th Congress responded with a number of measures that would have affected both the federal and state judicial systems. Similar legislation was introduced in the 110th Congress. H.R. 660 and S. 378 would have addressed many of the same issues that legislation in the 109th Congress sought to address. On January 7, 2008, H.R. 660 was enacted into law (P.L. 110-177). P.L. 110-177 (1) improves judicial security measures and increases funding for judicial security; (2) amends the criminal code to provide greater protection for judges, their family members, and witnesses; and (3) provides grant funding for states to provide protection for judges and witnesses.

Four other bills, H.R. 933, H.R. 3547, S. 79, and S. 456, would have created a short-term witness protection section in the USMS. All four bills would have also created a grant program to provide funding for short-term witness protection programs. Another bill, H.R. 2325, would have, along with amending the criminal code to provide greater protection for federal judges, federal law enforcement officers, and their family members, allowed federal judges and justices, U.S. Attorneys, and any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice whose duties include representing the United States in court to carry firearms. Other bills introduced in the 110th Congress that sought to address issues of court security include S. 456, the Gang Abatement and Prevention Act of 2007, and H.R. 2325, the Court and Law Enforcement Officers Protection Act of 2007.

The Court Security Improvement Act of 2007 (P.L. 110-177)

This section discusses provisions of P.L. 110-117 that address judicial security and witness protection. The following section discusses provisions of the six above-referenced bills that address judicial security but are not included in P.L. 110-177.

Increased Sentences

Several provisions in P.L. 110-177 increase sentences for specified offenses, as discussed below.

General Modifications of Federal Murder Crime and Related Crimes²²

P.L. 110-177 increases the maximum penalty from 10 years to 15 years for persons convicted of voluntary manslaughter.²³ For involuntary manslaughter, the maximum penalty increases from six years to eight years.²⁴

²² Section 207 of P.L. 110-177.

²³ 18 U.S.C. § 1112(b).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

Modification of Tampering with a Witness, Victim, or an Informant Offense²⁵

P.L. 110-177 sets forth new penalties relating to the suppression of testimony, communication to relevant officials, or production of official documents in an official proceeding.

- If an offense results in a killing, the offense would be punishable by the sentences prescribed in 18 U.S.C. § 1111 and § 1112.
- If an offense involves attempted murder, or the use or attempted use of physical force, P.L. 110-177 requires imprisonment for not more than 20 years if the offense involves the threatened use of physical force against any person.
- If the offense involves intimidating, threatening, corruptly persuading another person, or attempting to do so, or engaging in misleading conduct toward another person with the intent of (1) preventing the person from testifying, (2) destroying physical evidence, (3) avoiding a summons, or (4) providing information about a possible federal offense, or a violation of parole, probation, or release pending a judicial proceeding, P.L. 110-177 requires a fine, imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both.
- If the offense involves intentionally harassing, or attempting to harass, a person and thereby prevents the person from (1) attending or testifying in an official proceeding, (2) notifying federal officials about a violation or possible violation of any pre- or post-sentencing release, (3) arresting or seeking the arrest of someone in connection with a crime, or (4) causing a criminal prosecution, or a parole or probation revocation hearing to be held, or assisting in such prosecution or hearing, P.L. 110-177 requires a fine, imprisonment for not more than three years, or both.

Modification of Retaliation Offense²⁶

P.L. 110-177 increases the sentence to a maximum term of imprisonment of 30 years for anyone convicted of attempting to kill another person with the intent of retaliating against the person for (1) the attendance of a witness or party at an official proceeding, or any testimony given or any record, document, or other object produced by a witness in an official proceeding, or (2) providing to a law enforcement officer any information relating to the commission or possible commission of a federal offense or a violation of conditions of probation, supervised release, parole, or release pending judicial proceedings.

P.L. 110-177 also increases the sentence for anyone who knowingly engages in, threatens, or attempts to engage in any conduct that causes bodily injury or damage to another person's property with the intent of retaliating against the person from a maximum term of imprisonment of 10 years to 20 years.²⁷

²⁵ Section 205 of P.L. 110-177.

²⁶ Section 206 of P.L. 110-177.

²⁷ This sentence applies if the offender retaliates against the individual for (1) the attendance of a witness or party at an official proceeding, or any testimony given or any record, document, or other object produced by a witness in an official proceeding or (2) providing to a law enforcement officer any information relating to the commission or possible commission of a federal offense or a violation of conditions of probation supervised release, parole, or release pending judicial proceedings.

Clarification of Venue for Retaliation Against a Witness²⁸

P.L. 110-177 permits a prosecution for retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant to be brought in the district where the official proceeding was intended to be affected, or in which the offense occurred.

Assault Penalties²⁹

P.L. 110-177 sets forth new penalties for individuals that assault United States officials, United States judges, federal law enforcement officers, or officials whose killing would be a crime under 18 U.S.C. §1114, or their immediate family members, with the intent to impede, intimidate, or interfere with officials, judges, or law enforcement officers while they are engaged in the performance of official duties, or with intent to retaliate against officials, judges, or law enforcement officers on account of their performance of official duties. Under P.L. 110-177, anyone who commits a simple assault punishable under 18 U.S.C. §115 can be fined and sentenced to not more than a year imprisonment. If an assault punishable under 18 U.S.C. §115 involved physical contact with the victim or the intent to commit another felony, the offender can be fined and sentenced to not more than 10 years imprisonment. Under P.L. 110-177, if an assault resulted in bodily injury, the offender can be fined and sentenced to not more than 20 years imprisonment. If an assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in 18 U.S.C. §1365, and including any conduct that, if the conduct occurred in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, would violate 18 U.S.C. §2241 or §2242) or a dangerous weapon was used in relation to the offense, the offender can be fined and sentenced to not more than 30 years imprisonment.

New Federal Grant Programs

Several provisions in P.L. 110-177 create new grant programs, as discussed below.

Grants to States to Protect Witnesses and Victims of Crime³⁰

P.L. 110-177 expands an existing grant program so funds could be used for witness and victim protection. The grant program can provide funds to states, units of local government, and Indian tribes to create and expand witness and victim protection programs in order to prevent threats, intimidation, and retaliation against victims of, and witnesses to, violent crimes. P.L. 110-177 authorizes \$20 million annually for the program for FY2008 through FY2012.

Eligibility of State Courts for Certain Federal Grants³¹

P.L. 110-177 permits the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to make Correctional Options grants to state courts to improve the security for state and local court systems. Priority would be given to state court applicants that have the greatest demonstrated need to provide court security in order

²⁸ Section 204 of P.L. 110-177.

²⁹ Section 208 of P.L. 110-177.

³⁰ Section 301 of P.L. 110-177.

³¹ Sections 302 of P.L. 110-177.

to administer justice. P.L. 110-177 amends current law³² so that 10% of the funds appropriated for Correctional Options grants are awarded to state courts for the purpose of providing court security. The Act would also make state and local courts eligible to receive funding under the Bulletproof Vest Grant program to help pay the cost of providing bulletproof vests to court officers.

P.L. 110-177 permits the Attorney General to require, as appropriate, states, units of local government, and Indian tribes applying for grants to demonstrate that they considered the needs of the judicial branch and consulted with the judicial officer of the highest court of the state, unit, or tribe, and with the chief law enforcement officer of the law enforcement agency responsible for the security needs of the judicial branch.

Grants to States for Threat Assessment Databases³³

P.L. 110-177 creates a new grant program that awards grants to the highest court in the state for the purposes of establishing and maintaining a threat assessment database. P.L. 110-177 defines a threat assessment database as a database through which a state can (1) analyze trends and patterns in domestic terrorism and crime, (2) project the probabilities that specific acts of domestic terrorism or crime will occur, and (3) develop measures and procedures that can effectively reduce the probabilities that those acts will occur. The law also requires the Attorney General to develop a core set of data elements to be used by each state's database so that the information can be effectively shared with other states and the Department of Justice. P.L. 110-177 authorizes \$15 million for each FY for FY2006 through FY2009.

Measures to Protect Judicial Personnel

Several provisions in P.L. 110-177 include measures to protect judicial personnel, as discussed below.

Judicial Branch Security Requirements³⁴

P.L. 110-177 requires the Director of the USMS and the Judicial Conference of the United States to consult with one another on a continuing basis regarding the security requirement of the judicial branch, to ensure that the views of the Judicial Conference regarding security needs for the judiciary are taken into account when determining staffing levels, setting priorities for programs regarding judicial security, and allocating judicial security resources. Under P.L. 110-177, the USMS retains the final authority regarding the security requirements for the judicial branch.

³² 42 U.S.C. § 3762b.

³³ Section 303 of P.L. 110-177.

³⁴ Section 101 of P.L. 110-177.

Additional Amounts for the USMS to Protect the Judiciary³⁵

P.L. 110-177 authorizes an additional \$20 million for each FY2007 to FY2011 for the USMS to provide protection for the judiciary.³⁶ The additional funds are to be used to

- hire entry-level deputy marshals to provide judicial security;
- hire senior-level deputy marshals to investigate threats to the judiciary and provide protective details to members of the judiciary and Assistant U.S. Attorneys; and
- hire senior-level deputy marshals and program analysts and provide secure computer systems for the Office of Protective Intelligence.

Protection Against Malicious Recording of Fictitious Liens Against a Federal Employee³⁷

P.L. 110-177 makes it illegal to file, attempt to file, or conspire to file, in any public record, or in any private record that is generally available to the public, any false lien or encumbrance against the real or personal property of a U.S. employee (as designated in 18 U.S.C. § 1114), on account of the performance of official duties by the employee, knowing or having reason to know that the lien or encumbrance is false, or contains any false, fictitious or fraudulent information. Under P.L. 110-177, individuals convicted of filing a fictitious lien against a federal employee can be fined, sentenced to no more than 10 years in prison, or both.

Protection of Individuals Performing Certain Federal and Other Functions³⁸

P.L. 110-177 makes it illegal to make restricted personal information³⁹ about covered persons,⁴⁰ or a member of the immediate family of the covered person, publicly available. P.L. 110-177 requires an individual to be found guilty of an offense under the section if the individual made the information publicly available (1) with the intent to threaten, intimidate, or incite a crime of violence against the covered individual or an immediate family member, or (2) with the intent and knowledge that the information would be used to threaten, intimidate, or facilitate the commission of a crime of violence against the covered individual or an immediate family member. The law provides for a sentence of not more than five years in prison, a fine, or both for an individual found guilty of a crime under the section.

³⁵ Section 103 of P.L. 110-177.

³⁶ On May 11, 2005, Congress passed an emergency supplemental appropriations bill (P.L. 109-13), which appropriated \$11.9 million for the USMS for increased judicial security outside the courthouse, including home security systems for federal judges, but the funding was only to remain available until September 30, 2006.

³⁷ Section 201 of P.L. 110-177.

³⁸ Section 202 of P.L. 110-177.

³⁹ P.L. 110-177 defines “restricted personal information” as Social Security numbers, home addresses, home phone numbers, mobile phone numbers, personal email, or the home fax number.

⁴⁰ P.L. 110-177 defines “covered persons” as (1) an individual designated in 18 U.S.C. § 1114, (2) a petit juror, witness, or other officer in or of, any court in the U.S. , or an officer who may be serving at any examination or other proceeding before any U.S. magistrate judge or other committing magistrate; (3) an informant or witness in a federal criminal investigation or prosecution; or (4) a state or local officer or employee whose restricted personal information is made publicly available because of the participation in, or assistance provided to, a federal criminal investigation by that officer or employee.

Report on the Security of Federal Prosecutors⁴¹

P.L. 110-177 requires the Attorney General to submit a report about the security of Assistant U.S. Attorneys and other federal attorneys arising from the prosecution of terrorists, violent criminal gangs, drug traffickers, gun traffickers, white supremacists, and those who commit fraud and other white-collar offenses to Congress no later than 90 days after enactment of the Act.

Prohibition of Possession of Dangerous Weapons in Federal Court Facilities⁴²

P.L. 110-177 makes it illegal to possess or bring a “dangerous weapon” into a federal court facility, or to attempt to do so.

Reauthorization of Fugitive Apprehension Task Forces⁴³

P.L. 110-177 reauthorizes the fugitive apprehension task forces that are directed and coordinated by the U.S. Marshals Service. The task forces locate and apprehend fugitives and are composed of members of federal, state, and local law enforcement. P.L. 110-177 authorizes \$10 million each FY for FY2008 through FY2012 for the fugitive apprehension task forces.

Financial Disclosure Reports⁴⁴

P.L. 110-177 extends the provision in current law⁴⁵ that allows for the redaction of information in financial disclosure reports submitted by judges, justices, or judicial officers until December 31, 2011.

Other Legislation in the 110th Congress

This section discusses provisions in S. 378, H.R. 933, S. 79, H.R. 2325, and H.R. 3547 that would have addressed judicial security but are not included in P.L. 110-177.

Increased Sentences

Several provisions in the aforementioned bills would have increased sentences for specified offenses, as discussed below.

⁴¹ Section 401 of P.L. 110-177.

⁴² Section 203 of P.L. 110-177.

⁴³ Section 507 of P.L. 110-177.

⁴⁴ Section 104 of P.L. 110-177.

⁴⁵ Section 105(b) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App).

Special Penalties for Murder, Kidnapping, and Related Crimes Against Federal Judges and Federal Law Enforcement Officers⁴⁶

H.R. 2325 would have created specific penalties for people who commit certain crimes against federal judges or law enforcement officers (as those terms are defined in 18 U.S.C. § 115). The bill would have provided for a fine and imprisonment for any term of years not less than 30 years, or life, or, if death results, the death penalty, for anyone who is convicted of murdering, attempting to murder, or conspiring to murder a federal judge or law enforcement officer. The bill would have required a fine and a term of imprisonment of not less than 15 years, but not more than 40 years, for anyone convicted of committing voluntary manslaughter against a federal judge or law enforcement officer. The bill would have also required a fine and a term of imprisonment of not less than 3 years, but not more than 15 years, for anyone convicted of committing involuntary manslaughter against a federal judge or law enforcement officer. The bill would have provided for a fine and a term of imprisonment for any term of years not less than 30 years, or life, or, if death results, the death penalty, for anyone convicted of kidnapping a federal judge or law enforcement officer.

Penalties for Certain Assaults⁴⁷

H.R. 2325 would have increased the penalty from a fine, 8 years imprisonment, or both to a fine, 15 years imprisonment, or both for anyone who forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with a U.S. government employee (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1114) while the employee is engaged in or on account of the employee's performance of official duties, or for anyone who forcibly assaults or intimidates any former U.S. government employee on account of the employee's performance of official duties during the employee's time of service, if the person's actions constitute assault other than simple assault. The bill would have increased the penalty from a fine, 15 years imprisonment, or both to a fine, 20 years imprisonment, or both for anyone who uses a deadly or dangerous weapon to commit one of the above described assaults, or who inflicts bodily injury while committing one of the above described assaults. The bill would have also set forth specific penalties for assaults against federal judges and law enforcement officers. The bill would have required a fine and imprisonment for not less than 2 years, but not more than 10 years, for an assault against a federal judge or law enforcement officer that resulted in bodily injury (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1365). The bill would have required a fine and imprisonment for not less than 5 years, but not more than 15 years, for an assault against a federal judge or law enforcement officer that resulted in substantial bodily injury (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 113). The bill would have provided for a fine and imprisonment of not less than 10 years, but not more than 25 years, if the offender used or possessed a dangerous weapon during an assault against a federal judge or law enforcement officer, or if the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 2119(2)). The bill would have also required that any penalty imposed for assaulting a federal judge or law enforcement officer be in addition to any other punishment imposed for other criminal conduct during the same criminal episode.

⁴⁶ Section two of H.R. 2325.

⁴⁷ Section four of H.R. 2325.

Special Penalties for Retaliating Against a Federal Judge or Federal Law Enforcement Officer by Murdering or Assaulting a Family Member⁴⁸

H.R. 2325 set forth specific penalties for anyone that (1) assaults, kidnaps, or murders, or attempts or conspires to kidnap or murder, or threatens to assault, kidnap, or murder a member of the immediate family of a federal judge or law enforcement officer; (2) threatens to assault, kidnap, or murder a federal judge or law enforcement officer; or (3) assaults, kidnaps, or murders, or attempts or conspires to kidnap or murder, or threatens to assault, kidnap, or murder, any person who formerly served as a federal judge or law enforcement officer or the immediate family member of any person who formerly served as a federal judge or law enforcement officer, with the intent to impede, intimidate, or interfere with a federal judge or law enforcement officer while engaged in the performance of official duties, or with the intent to retaliate against a federal judge or law enforcement officer on account of the performance of official duties. In the case of murder, attempted murder, conspiracy to murder, or manslaughter, the bill would have provided for the same penalty as the penalty specified in 18 U.S.C. § 1114(b). In the case of kidnapping, attempted kidnapping, or conspiracy to kidnap, the bill would have provided for the same penalty as the penalty specified in 18 U.S.C. § 1201(a). In the case of assault, the bill would have provided for the same penalty as the penalty specified in 18 U.S.C. § 111. In the case of a threat, the bill would have provided for a penalty of a fine and imprisonment of not less than 2 years, but not more than 10 years. The bill would have also required that any penalty imposed would be in addition to any other punishment imposed for other criminal conduct during the same criminal episode.

New Federal Grant Programs

Several provision in the aforementioned bills would have created new grant programs, as discussed below.

Short-term State Witness Protection Section⁴⁹

H.R. 933, H.R. 3547, S. 79, and S. 456 would have amended Chapter 37 of Title 28 by adding a new section, which would have established a Short-term State Witness Protection Section within the USMS. Under all of the bills, the proposed Short-term State Witness Protection Section would have provided protection for witnesses in state and local trials involving homicide or other major violent crimes pursuant to cooperative agreements with state and local prosecutors' offices and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. H.R. 933 would have also allowed the Short-term State Witness Protection Section to provide protection for witnesses in state and local trials involving serious drug offenses.

Under H.R. 933 and S. 79, the Short-term State Witness Protection Section would have been required to give priority in awarding grants (see next section) and providing services to prosecutors' offices in states with an average of not less than 100 murders per year during the five-year period immediately proceeding an application for protection. Under H.R. 3547 and S. 456, the Short-term State Witness Protection Section would have been required to give priority in awarding grants and providing services to prosecutors' offices in states with an average of not less

⁴⁸ Section five of H.R. 2325.

⁴⁹ Section two of H.R. 933 and S. 79, section 306 of H.R. 3547, and section 308 of S. 456.

than 100 murders per year and that include a city, town, or township with an average violent crime rate that is above the national average during the five-year period immediately preceding an application for protection.

Short-term State Witness Protection Grants⁵⁰

H.R. 933, H.R. 3547, S. 79, and S. 456 would have also authorized a grant program to provide funding for short-term witness protection. H.R. 933 would have allowed the Attorney General to make grant awards for short-term witness protection to state and local district attorneys offices and the U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia. H.R. 933 would have allowed the Attorney General to make grant awards to state and local district attorneys only in states with an average of not less than 100 murders per year during the most recent five-year period. H.R. 933 would have allowed the Attorney General to make awards to state and local district attorneys offices for the purpose of providing short-term witness protection to witnesses in trials involving homicide or a serious violent felony or serious drug offense.⁵¹ S. 79 would have allowed the Attorney General to make grant awards to state and local criminal prosecutors' offices and the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia that are located in a state with an average of not less than 100 murders per year during the most recent five-year period. S. 79 would have allowed the Attorney General to make grant awards to prosecutors' offices for the purpose of providing short-term protection to witnesses in trials involving homicide or serious violent felonies.⁵² Under H.R. 933 and S. 79, grants awarded to prosecutors' offices could have been used to provide protection to witnesses or the grant award can be credited, pursuant to a cooperative agreement, to the Short-term State Witness Protection Section for providing protection to witnesses.

The grant program that would have been authorized by H.R. 3547 and S. 456 is similar to the one that would have been authorized by H.R. 933 and S. 79, with a few exceptions. Under H.R. 3547 and S. 456, the Attorney General could have awarded grants to state and local criminal prosecutors' offices, or to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia for identifying witnesses in need of protection or for providing short-term protection to witnesses in trials involving homicide or serious violent felonies.⁵³ H.R. 3547 and S. 456 would not have limited the Attorney General to making grants under the proposed program to state and local district attorneys in states with an average of not less than 100 murders per year during the most recent five-year period. Under H.R. 3547 and S. 456, grants awarded to prosecutors' offices could have been used to identify witnesses in need of protection, provide protection to witnesses (including tattoo removal services), or the grant award could be credited, pursuant to a cooperative agreement, to the Short-term State Witness Protection Section for providing protection to witnesses.

H.R. 933, H.R. 3547, S. 79, and S. 456 would have authorized \$90 million annually for FY2008 through FY2010 to make grants for short-term witness protection.

⁵⁰ Section three of H.R. 933 and S. 79, section 306 of H.R. 3547, and section 308 of S. 456.

⁵¹ H.R. 933 would have defined "serious violent felony" or "serious drug offense" as having the meaning given to it in 18 U.S.C. § 3559(c)(2).

⁵² S. 79 would have defined "serious violent felony" as having the meaning given to it in 18 U.S.C. § 3559(c)(2).

⁵³ H.R. 3547 and S. 456 would have defined "serious violent felony" as having the meaning given to it in 18 U.S.C. § 3559(c)(2).

Witness Protection Services⁵⁴

Both H.R. 3547 and S. 456 would have made it so that in cases where a state requests the Attorney General to provide temporary protection to a witness (pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §3521(e)), the state would not have to reimburse the Attorney General for the costs of providing protection if the witness is a part of an investigation or prosecution that in any way relates to crimes of violence committed by a criminal street gang, as defined under the laws of the state seeking assistance.

Expansion of the Federal Witness Relocation and Protection Program⁵⁵

Both H.R. 3547 and S. 456 would have expanded the circumstances under which the Attorney General can provide for the relocation and protection of witnesses or potential witnesses in federal or state cases pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3521 to include witnesses or potential witnesses in cases against criminal street gangs, serious drug offenses, or homicide.

Measures to Protect Judicial Personnel

Several provisions in the aforementioned bills would have included measures to protect judicial personnel, as discussed below.

Protection of Family Members⁵⁶

S. 378 would have allowed information about the individual to be redacted from financial disclosure reports, as require under current law,⁵⁷ if releasing the information would put the family members of justices, judges and judicial officers in danger. Under current law financial disclosure reports submitted by judges, justices, or judicial officers can have information redacted if the Judicial Conference, in consultation with the USMS, believes that revelation of the information could put the individual in danger.

Authority of Federal Judges and Prosecutors to Carry Firearms⁵⁸

H.R. 2325 would have allowed federal judges and justices, U.S. Attorneys, and any other officer or employee of the Department of Justice whose duties include representing the United States in court to carry firearms. The bill would have required the Attorney General to issue regulations on how this provision is to be carried out. The bill would have also allowed current and retired Amtrack Police Department officers and current and retired law enforcement or police officers of the executive branch of the federal government to carry concealed firearms, so long as they meet certain requirements specified in law.⁵⁹ The bill would have also modified the requirements that retired law enforcement officers must meet in order to carry a concealed firearm.

⁵⁴ Section 308 of H.R. 3547 and section 309 of S. 456.

⁵⁵ Section 309 of H.R. 3547 and section 310 of S. 456.

⁵⁶ Section 102 of S. 378.

⁵⁷ Title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App).

⁵⁸ Section three of H.R. 2325.

⁵⁹ See 18 U.S.C. § 926B and 18 U.S.C. § 926C.

Author Contact Information

(name redacted)
Analyst in Crime Policy
[redacted]@crs.loc.gov, 7-....

EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.