



Federal Conspiracy Law: A Brief Overview

Charles Doyle

Senior Specialist in American Public Law

April 30, 2010

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

R41223

CRS Report for Congress

Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

Summary

Zacarias Moussaoui, members of the Colombian drug cartels, members of organized crime, and some of the former Enron executives have at least one thing in common: they all have federal conspiracy convictions. The essence of conspiracy is an agreement of two or more persons to engage in some form of prohibited misconduct. The crime is complete upon agreement, although some statutes require prosecutors to show that at least one of the conspirators has taken some concrete step or committed some overt act in furtherance of the scheme. There are dozens of federal conspiracy statutes. One, 18 U.S.C. 371, outlaws conspiracy to commit some other federal crime. The others outlaw conspiracy to engage in various specific forms of proscribed conduct. General Section 371 conspiracies are punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years; drug trafficking, terrorist, and racketeering conspiracies all carry the same penalties as their underlying substantive offenses, and thus are punished more severely than are Section 371 conspiracies. All are subject to fines of not more than \$250,000 (not more than \$500,000 for organizations), most may serve as the basis for a restitution order, and some for a forfeiture order.

The law makes several exceptions for conspiracy because of its unusual nature. Because many united in crime pose a greater danger than the isolated offender, conspirators may be punished for the conspiracy, any completed substantive offense which is the object of the plot, and any foreseeable other offenses which one of the conspirators commits in furtherance of the scheme. Since conspiracy is an omnipresent crime, it may be prosecuted wherever an overt act is committed in its furtherance. Because conspiracy is a continuing crime, its statute of limitations does not begin to run until the last overt act committed for its benefit. Since conspiracy is a separate crime, it may be prosecuted following conviction for the underlying substantive offense, without offending constitutional double jeopardy principles; because conspiracy is a continuing offense, it may be punished when it straddles enactment of the prohibiting statute, without offending constitutional ex post facto principles. Accused conspirators are likely to be tried together, and the statements of one may often be admitted in evidence against all.

In some respects, conspiracy is similar to attempt, to solicitation, and to aiding and abetting. Unlike aiding and abetting, however, it does not require commission of the underlying offense. Unlike attempt and solicitation, conspiracy does not merge with the substantive offense; a conspirator may be punished for both.

An abridged version of this report without footnotes and most citations to authority is available as CRS Report R41222, *Federal Conspiracy Law: A Sketch*, by Charles Doyle.

Contents

Introduction	1
Background	3
Two or More Persons	4
Agreement	5
One or Many Overlapping Conspiracies	7
Overt Acts	8
Conspiracy to Defraud the United States	8
When Does It End	9
Sanctions	10
Imprisonment and Fines	10
Restitution	11
Forfeiture	12
Relation of Conspiracy to Other Crimes	13
Aid and Abet	13
Attempt	14
Solicitation	15
Procedural Attributes	16
Statute of Limitations	16
Venue	16
Joinder and Severance (One Conspiracy, One Trial)	17
Double Jeopardy and Ex Post Facto	18
Co-conspirator Declarations	19

Contacts

Author Contact Information	21
----------------------------------	----

Introduction

Terrorists, drug traffickers, mafia members, and corrupt corporate executives have one thing in common: most are conspirators subject to federal prosecution.¹ Federal conspiracy laws rest on the belief that criminal schemes are equally or more reprehensible than are the substantive offenses to which they are devoted. The Supreme Court has explained that a “collective criminal agreement – [a] partnership in crime – presents a greater potential threat to the public than individual delicts. Concerted action both increases the likelihood that the criminal object will be successfully attained and decreases the probability that the individuals involved will depart from their path of criminality.”² Moreover, observed the Court, “[g]roup association for criminal purposes often, if not normally, makes possible the attainment of ends more complex than those which one criminal could accomplish. Nor is the danger of a conspiratorial group limited to the particular end toward which it has embarked.”³ Finally, “[c]ombination in crime makes more likely the commission of crimes unrelated to the original purpose for which the group was formed.”⁴ In sum, “the danger which a conspiracy generates is not confined to the substantive offense which is the immediate aim of the enterprise.”⁵ Congress and the courts have fashioned federal conspiracy law accordingly.⁶

¹ Zacarias Moussaoui was convicted of conspiring to commit the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, *United States v. Moussaoui*, 591 F.3d 263, 266 (4th Cir. 2010); Wadih El-Hage was convicted of conspiring to bomb the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, *In re Terrorist Bombings*, 552 F.3d 93, 107 (2d Cir. 2008).

Members of an Atlanta street gang were convicted of conspiring to engage in drug trafficking, among other offenses, *United States v. Flores*, 572 F.3d 1254, 1258 (11th Cir. 2009); motorcycle gang members were convicted of conspiracy to traffic in drugs, *United States v. Deitz*, 577 F.3d 672, 675-76 (6th Cir. 2009).

Dominick Pizzonia was convicted on racketeering conspiracy charges in connection with the activities of the “Gambino organized crime family of La Cosa Nostra,” *United States v. Pizzonia*, 577 F.3d 455, 459 (2d Cir. 2009); Michael Yannotti was also convicted on racketeering conspiracy in connection with activities of the “Gambino Crime Family,” *United States v. Yannotti*, 541 F.3d 112, 115-16 (2d Cir. 2008).

Jeffrey Skilling, a former Enron Corporation executive, was convicted of conspiracy to commit securities fraud and mail fraud, *United States v. Skilling*, 554 F.3d 529, 534 (5th Cir. 2009); Bernanrd Ebbers, a former WorldCom, Inc. executive, was likewise convicted of conspiracy to commit securities fraud, *United States v. Ebbers*, 458 F.3d 110, 112 (2d Cir. 2006).

² *Iannelli v. United States*, 420 U.S. 770, 778 (1975), quoting *Callanan v. United States*, 364 U.S. 587, 593-94 (1961).

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.*

There have long been contrary views, e.g., Sayre, *Criminal Conspiracy*, 35 HARVARD LAW REVIEW 393, 393 (1922) (“A doctrine so vague in its outlines and uncertain in its fundamental nature as criminal conspiracy lends no strength or glory to the law; it is a veritable quicksand of shifting opinion and ill-considered thought”); *Hyde v. United States*, 222 U.S. 347, 387 (1912) (Holmes, J. with Lurton, Hughes & Lamar, JJ.) (dissenting) (“And as wherever two or more have united for the commission of a crime there is a conspiracy, the opening to oppression thus made is very wide indeed. It is even wider if success should be held not to merge the conspiracy in the crime intended and achieved”), both quoted in substantial part in Katyal, *Conspiracy Theory*, 112 YALE LAW JOURNAL 1307, 1310 n. 6 (2003).

⁶ Federal prosecutors have used, and been encouraged to use, the law available to them, *Harrison v. United States*, 7 F.2d 259, 263 (2d Cir. 1925) (“[C]onspiracy, that darling of the modern prosecutor’s nursery”); *United States v. Reynolds*, 919 F.2d 435, 439 (“[P]rosecutors seem to have conspiracy on their word processors as Count I”); Chesney, *Terrorism, Criminal Prosecution, and the Preventive Detention Debate*, 50 SOUTH TEXAS LAW REVIEW 669, 684 (2009) (“What options do prosecutors have in the terrorism-prevention scenario when [other charges] are unavailable for lack of evidence linking the suspect to a designated foreign terrorist organization? One possibility is conspiracy liability”).

The United States Code contains dozens of criminal conspiracy statutes. One, 18 U.S.C. 371, outlaws conspiracy to commit any other federal crime. The others outlaw conspiracy to commit some specific form of misconduct, ranging from civil rights violations to drug trafficking.⁷ Conspiracy is a separate offense under most of these statutes,⁸ regardless of whether conspiracy accomplishes its objective.⁹ The various conspiracy statutes, however, differ in several other respects. A few, including Section 371, require at least one conspirator to take some affirmative step in furtherance of the scheme. Most have no such overt act requirement.¹⁰

Section 371 has two prongs. One outlaws conspiracy to commit a federal offense; a second, conspiracy to defraud the United States. Conspiracy to commit a federal crime under Section 371 requires that the underlying misconduct be a federal crime. Conspiracy to defraud the United States under Section 371 and in several other instances has no such prerequisite.¹¹ Section 371 conspiracies are punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years. Elsewhere, conspirators often face more severe penalties.¹²

These differences aside, federal conspiracy statutes share much common ground because Congress decided they should. As the Court observed in *Salinas*, “When Congress uses well-settled terminology of criminal law, its words are presumed to have their ordinary meaning and definition. [When] [t]he relevant statutory phrase is ‘to conspire,’ [w]e presume Congress intended to use the term in its conventional sense, and certain well-established principles follow.”¹³

These principles include the fact that regardless of its statutory setting, every conspiracy has at least two elements: (1) an agreement (2) between two or more persons.¹⁴ Members of the conspiracy are also liable for the foreseeable crimes of their fellows committed in furtherance of the common plot.¹⁵ Moreover, statements by one conspirator are admissible evidence against all.¹⁶ Conspiracies are considered continuing offenses for purposes of the statute of limitations and venue.¹⁷ They are also considered separate offenses for purposes of sentencing and of challenges

⁷ 18 U.S.C. 241 (civil rights conspiracies); 21 U.S.C. 846 (drug trafficking conspiracies).

⁸ *Iannelli v. United States*, 420 U.S. 770, 777 (1975).

⁹ *United States v. Rehak*, 589 F.3d 965, 971 (8th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Scaffer*, 586 F.3d 414, 423 (6th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Wittig*, 575 F.3d 1085, 1104 (10th Cir. 2009).

¹⁰ *Whitfield v. United States*, 543 U.S. 209, 219 (2005)(18 U.S.C. 1956(h)—conspiracy to commit money laundering—has no overt act requirement); *United States v. Shabani*, 513 U.S. 10, 13-4 (1994)(21 U.S.C. 846—conspiracy to violate the Controlled Substances Act—has no overt act requirement).

¹¹ E.g., 18 U.S.C. 956 (conspiracy in the U.S. to commit certain violent acts overseas, acts which ordinarily are crimes under the laws of the place where they occur but which need not be separate federal crimes for purposes of a prosecution under section 956). Although it is generally known for its proscription against conspiracies to violate other federal laws, Section 371 also outlaws conspiracies to defraud the United States. Conviction under the defraud portion of Section 371 does not require that the underlying misconduct be a separate federal crime.

¹² The 20-year maximum penalties of section 1956 apply to conspiracies to launder and to the underlying laundering offense alike, 18 U.S.C. 1956(h). The penalties that apply to drug trafficking under 21 U.S.C. 841 (up to life imprisonment) apply with equal force to conspiracies to traffic, 21 U.S.C. 846.

¹³ *Salinas v. United States*, 522 U.S. 52, 63 (1997).

¹⁴ *United States v. Jimenez Recio*, 537 U.S. 270, 274 (2003).

¹⁵ *Pinkerton v. United States*, 328 U.S. 640, 647 (1946).

¹⁶ F.R.Evid. 801(d)(2)(E).

¹⁷ *Toussie v. United States*, 397 U.S. 112, 122 (1970)(statute of limitations begins to run with the last overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy); *Whitfield v. United States*, 543 U.S. 209, 218 (2005)(venue is proper in any district in which an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy was committed).

under the Constitution's ex post facto and double jeopardy clauses.¹⁸ This is a brief discussion of the common features of federal conspiracy law that evolved over the years, with passing references to some of the distinctive features of some of the statutory provisions.

Background

Although it is not without common law antecedents, federal conspiracy law is largely of our own making. It is what Congress provided, and what the courts understood Congress intended. This is not to say that conspiracy was unknown in pre-colonial and colonial England,¹⁹ but simply that it was a faint shadow of the crime we now know. Then, it was essentially a narrow form of malicious prosecution, subject to both a civil remedy and prosecution.²⁰ In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, state courts and legislatures recognized a rapidly expanding accumulation of narrowly described wrongs as "conspiracy." The patchwork reached a point where one commentator explained that there were "few things left so doubtful in the criminal law, as the point at which a combination of several persons in a common object becomes illegal."²¹

Congress, however, enacted few conspiracy statutes prior to the Civil War. It did pass a provision in 1790 that outlawed confining the master of a ship or endeavoring revolt on board.²² This, Justice Story, sitting as a circuit judge, interpreted to include any conspiracy to confine the prerogatives of the master of ship to navigate, maintain, or police his ship.²³ The same year, 1825, Congress outlawed conspiracies to engage in maritime insurance fraud.²⁴ Otherwise, there were no federal conspiracy statutes until well after the mid-century mark.

¹⁸ *Salinas v. United States*, 522 U.S. 52, 65 (1997) ("conspiracy is a distinct evil, dangerous to the public, and so punishable in itself"); *United States v. Felix*, 503 U.S. 378, 390 (1992) ("[T]he commission of the substantive offense and a conspiracy to commit it are separate and distinct offenses ... [a]nd the plea of double jeopardy is no defense to a conviction for both offenses"); *United States v. Munoz-Franco*, 487 F.3d 25, 55 (1st Cir. 2007) ("For 'continuing offenses' such as the bank fraud and conspiracy charges at issue here, however, the critical question is when the conduct ended. As we have explained, where a 'continuing offense' straddles the old and new law ... applying the new is recognized as constitutionally sound. In other words, a conviction for a continuing offense straddling enactment of a statute will not run afoul of the Ex Post Facto clause unless it was possible for the jury, following the court's instructions, to convict 'exclusively' on pre-enactment conduct") (here and hereafter internal citations and quotation marks have been omitted unless otherwise indicated).

¹⁹ See generally, Bryan, *THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENGLISH LAW OF CONSPIRACY* (1909); Winfield, *The History of Conspiracy and Abuse of Legal Process*, CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN ENGLISH LEGAL HISTORY (1921); Sayre, *Criminal Conspiracy*, 35 HARVARD LAW REVIEW 393 (1922).

²⁰ IV BLACKSTONE, *COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND* 136 (1769) (transliteration supplied) ("A conspiracy also to indict an innocent man of felony falsely and maliciously, who is accordingly indicted and acquitted, is a farther abuse and perversion of public justice; for which the party injured may either have a civil action by writ of the conspirators... or the conspirators, for there must be at least two to form a conspiracy, may be indicted at the suit of the king").

²¹ III CHITTY, *A PRACTICAL TREATISE ON THE CRIMINAL LAW* 1138 (3d Am. ed. 1839) noting that conspiracy included combinations "to commence suits against a person with a view to extorting money from him" or "to manufacture a base material in the form and color of genuine indigo, with the intent to sell it as indigo" or to cheat a man "by making him drunk and playing falsely at cards with him, but did not include combinations "to obtain money from a bank by drawing their checks on the bank when they have no funds there" or "to cheat and defraud a man by selling him an unsound horse." Of course, this is not a situation limited to the law of conspiracy.

²² Act of April 30, 1790, ch. IX, §12, 1 Stat. 114 (1790).

²³ *United States v. Hamilton*, 26 Fed.Cas. 259, 260 (C.C.D.Mass. 1825) (No. 15,346).

²⁴ Act of March 3, 1825, ch.65, §23, 4 Stat. 122 (1825) (conspiracy "to cast away, burn, or otherwise destroy, ship or vessel... with intent to injure any person ... that hath underwritten ... any policy of insurance thereon.").

During the War Between the States, however, Congress enacted four sweeping conspiracy provisions, creating federal crimes that have come down to us with little substantive change. The first, perhaps thought more pressing at the beginning of the war, was a seditious conspiracy statute.²⁵ Shortly thereafter, Congress outlawed conspiracies to defraud the United States through the submission of false claim,²⁶ and followed that four years later with a prohibition on conspiracies to violate federal law or to defraud the United States.²⁷

Subsequent conspiracy statutes, though perhaps no less significant, were more topically focused. The Reconstruction civil rights conspiracy provisions,²⁸ the Sherman Act anti-trust provisions,²⁹ and the drug and racketeering statutes³⁰ may be the best known of these. All of them begin the same way—with an agreement by two or more persons.

Two or More Persons

There are no one-man conspiracies.³¹ At common law where husband and wife were considered one, this meant that the two could not be guilty of conspiracy without the participation of some third person.³² This is no longer the case.³³ In like manner at common law, corporations could not be charged with a crime.³⁴ This too is no longer the case. A corporation is criminally liable for the crimes, including conspiracy, committed at least in part for its benefit, by its employees and agents.³⁵ Moreover, a corporation may be criminally liable for intra-corporate conspiracies, as long as at least two of its officers, employees, or agents are parties to the plot.³⁶

²⁵ Act of July 31, 1861, c. 33, 12 Stat. 284 (1861), as amended 18 U.S.C. 2384.

²⁶ Act of March 2, 1863, c.67, §§1, 3, 12 Stat. 696, 698 (1863), as amended, 18 U.S.C. 286.

²⁷ Act of March 2, 1867, c.169, §30, 14 Stat. 484 (1867)(“that if two or more persons conspire either to commit any offence against the laws of the United States, or to defraud the United States in any manner whatever, and one or more of said parties to said conspiracy shall do any act to effect the object thereof, the parties to said conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be liable to a penalty of not less than one thousand dollars and not more than ten thousand dollars, and to imprisonment not exceeding two years. And when any offence shall be begun in one judicial district of the United State and completed in another, every such offence shall be deemed to be committed in either of the said districts, and may be dealt with, inquired of, tried, determined and punished in either of the said district, in the same manner as if it had been actually and wholly committed therein”), as amended 18 U.S.C. 371.

²⁸ Act of April 20, 1871, c. 22, §2, 17 Stat. 13, 14 (1871), as amended, 18 U.S.C. 241.

²⁹ Act of July 2, 1890, c. 647, §§1, 2, 3, 26 Stat. 209 (1890), as amended, 15 U.S.C. 1, 2, 3.

³⁰ P.L. 91-513, Tit. II, §406, 84 Stat. 1265 (1970), as amended, 21 U.S.C. 846, and P.L. 91-452, Tit. IX, §901(a), 84 Stat. 942 (1970), as amended, 18 U.S.C. 1962(d), respectively.

³¹ *Rogers v. United States*, 340 U.S. 367, 375 (1951)(“at least two persons are required to constitute a conspiracy”); *United States v. Dumeisi*, 424 F.3d 566, 580 (7th Cir. 2005)(“the elements of the crime of conspiracy are not satisfied unless one conspires with at least one true co-conspirator”).

³² *Dawson v. United States*, 10 F.2d 106, 107 (9th Cir. 1926).

³³ *United States v. Dege*, 364 U.S. 51, 54-5 (1960).

³⁴ I BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND 464 (1765)(transliteration supplied)(“a corporation cannot commit treason, or felony, or other crime, in it’s corporate capacity: though it’s members, may, in their distinct individual capacities”).

³⁵ *United States v. Singh*, 518 F.3d 236, 249-51 (4th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 20 F.3d 974, 978-80 (9th Cir. 1994).

³⁶ *United States v. Sain*, 141 F.3d 463, 474-75 (3d Cir. 1998); *United States v. Stevens*, 909 F.2d 431, 432-35 (6th Cir. 1990).

Notwithstanding the two-party requirement, no co-conspirator need have been tried or even identified, as long as the government produces evidence from which the conspiracy might be inferred.³⁷ Even the acquittal of a co-conspirator is no defense.³⁸ In fact, a person may conspire for the commission of a crime by a third person though he himself is legally incapable of committing the underlying offense.³⁹

On the other hand, two people may not always be enough. The so-called Wharton's Rule placed a limitation on conspiracy prosecutions when the number of conspirators equaled the number of individuals necessary for the commission of the underlying offense.⁴⁰ Under federal law, the rule "stands as an exception to the general principle that a conspiracy and the substantive offense that is its immediate end do not merge upon proof of the latter."⁴¹ And under federal law, the rule reaches no further than to the types of offenses that birth its recognition—dueling, adultery, bigamy, and incest.⁴²

Agreement

It is not enough, however, to show that the defendant agreed only with an undercover officer to commit the underlying offense, for there is no agreement on a common purpose in such cases.⁴³ As has been said, the essence of conspiracy is an agreement, an agreement to commit some act condemned by law either as a separate federal offense or for purposes of the conspiracy statute.⁴⁴ The agreement may be evidenced by word or action; that is, the government may prove the existence of the agreement either by direct evidence or by circumstantial evidence from which the agreement may be inferred.⁴⁵ "Relevant circumstantial evidence [may] include[]: the joint

³⁷ *United States v. Sanchez-Garcia*, 461 F.3d 939, 946 (8th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Price*, 258 F.3d 539, 545 (6th Cir. 2001); *United States v. Contreras*, 249 F.3d 595, 598 (7th Cir. 2001).

³⁸ *United States v. Lo*, 447 F.3d 1212, 1226 (9th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Johnson*, 440 F.3d 1286, 1294-295 (11th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Morton*, 412 F.3d 901, 904 (8th Cir. 2005).

³⁹ *Salinas v. United States*, 522 U.S. 52, 64 (1997); *United States v. Moussaoui*, 591 F.3d 263, 297 (4th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Zichettello*, 208 F.3d 72, 99 (2d Cir. 2000).

⁴⁰ *United States v. Wright*, 506 F.3d 1293, 1298 n.4 (10th Cir. 2007) ("Wharton's Rule is that an agreement by two persons to commit a particular crime cannot be prosecuted as conspiracy when the crime is of such a nature as to necessarily require the participation of two persons for its commission").

⁴¹ *Iannelli v. United States*, 420 U.S. 770, 781-82 (1975); *United States v. Bornman*, 559 F.3d 150, 156 (3d Cir. 2009).

⁴² *United States v. Bornman*, 559 F.3d at 156 ("In the classic Wharton's Rule offenses – adultery, bigamy, incest, and duelling – the harms attendant upon the commission of the substantive offense are restricted to the parties in the agreement. Hence, Wharton's Rule has no applicability here [to bribery]"); *United States v. Hines*, 541 F.3d 833, 838 (8th Cir. 2008) ("Wharton's Rule ... applies when there is a general congruence of the conspiracy agreement and the completed substantive offense. This general congruence exists when the parties to the agreement are the only persons who participate in commission of the substantive offense, ... the immediate consequences of the crime rest on the parties themselves rather than on society at large, and when the agreement that attends the substantive offense does not appear like to pose the distinct kinds of threats to society that the law of conspiracy seeks to avert").

⁴³ *United States v. Corson*, 579 F.3d 804, 811 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Paret-Ruiz*, 567 F.3d 1, 6 (1st Cir. 2009); *United States v. Williams*, 547 F.3d 1187, 1195 n.7 (9th Cir. 2008).

⁴⁴ *United States v. Jimenez Recio*, 537 U.S. 270, 274 (2003), citing *Iannelli v. United States*, 420 U.S. 770, 777 (1975); *United States v. Corson*, 579 F.3d 804, 810 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Chavez*, 549 F.3d 119, 125 (2d Cir. 2008) ("The essence of any conspiracy, of course, is agreement").

⁴⁵ *United States v. Rodriguez-Velez*, 597 F.3d 32, 39 (1st Cir. 2010); *United States v. Johnson*, 592 F.3d 749, 754-55 (7th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Boria*, 592 F.3d 476, 481 (3d Cir. 2010); *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d 1279, 1287 (10th Cir. 2009).

appearance of defendants at transactions and negotiations in furtherance of the conspiracy; the relationship among codefendants; mutual representation of defendants to third parties; and other evidence suggesting unity of purpose or common design and understanding among conspirators to accomplish the objects of the conspiracy.”⁴⁶

The lower federal appellate courts have acknowledged that evidence of a mere buyer-seller relationship is insufficient to support a drug trafficking conspiracy charge. Some do so under the rationale that there is no singularity of purpose, no necessary agreement, in such cases: “the buyer’s purpose is to buy; the seller’s purpose is to sell.”⁴⁷ Others do so to avoid sweeping mere customers into a large-scale trafficking operation.⁴⁸ Still others do so lest traffickers and their addicted customers face the same severe penalties.⁴⁹ All agree, however, that purchasers may be liable as conspirators when they are part of a large scheme.⁵⁰

Again, in most cases the essence of conspiracy is agreement. “Nevertheless, mere association, standing alone, is inadequate; an individual does not become a member of a conspiracy merely associating with conspirators known to be involved in crime.”⁵¹

⁴⁶ *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d at 1287-288.

⁴⁷ *United States v. Donnell*, 596 F.3d 913, 924-25 (8th Cir. 2010) (“Mere proof of a buyer-seller agreement without any prior or contemporaneous understanding does not support a conspiracy conviction because there is no common illegal purpose: In such circumstances, the buyer’s purpose is to buy; and the seller’s purpose is to sell”); *United States v. Bacon*, 598 F.3d 772, 777 (11th Cir. 2010) (“... the joint objective necessary for a conspiracy conviction is missing where the conspiracy is based simply on an agreement between a buyer and a seller for the sale of drugs”).

⁴⁸ *United States v. Johnson*, 592 F.3d 749, 754 (7th Cir. 2010) (“When the alleged coconspirators are in a buyer-seller relationship, however, we have cautioned against conflating the underlying buy-sell agreement with the drug-distribution agreement that is alleged to form the basis of the charge conspiracy. To support a conspiracy conviction there must be sufficient evidence of an agreement to commit a crime other than the crime that consists of the sale itself”); *United States v. Deitz*, 577 F.3d 672, 680 (6th Cir. 2009) (“Generally, a buyer-seller relationship alone is insufficient to tie a buyer to a [larger] conspiracy because mere sales do not prove the existence of the agreement that must exist for there to be a conspiracy”).

⁴⁹ *United States v. Parker*, 554 F.3d 230, 234-35 (2d Cir. 2009) (“As a literal matter, when a buyer purchases illegal drugs from a seller, two persons have agreed to a concerted effort to achieve the unlawful transfer of the drugs from the seller to the buyer. According to the customary definition, that would constitute a conspiracy with the alleged objective of a transfer of drugs. Our case law, however, has carved out a narrow exception to the general conspiracy rule for such transactions... . [If] an addicted purchaser, who acquired drugs for his own use and without intent to distribute it to others, were deemed to have joined a conspiracy with his seller for the illegal transfer of the drugs from the seller to himself, the purchaser would be guilty of substantially the same crime, and liable for the same punishment, as the seller. The policy to distinguish between transfer of an illegal drug and the acquisition of possession of the drug would be frustrated. The buyer-seller exception thus protects a buyer or transferee from the severe liabilities intended only for transferors”).

⁵⁰ *United States v. Bacon*, 598 F.3d at 777 (“Jamison was highly involved in the drug operation.... Jamison’s drug transactions were larger than those that an ordinary buyer would make... . From this evidence, the jurors could reasonably infer that Jamison was a distributor”); *United States v. Johnson*, 592 F.3d at 754 (“Articulating this principle is somewhat easier than applying it; it is often difficult to determine what proof is sufficient to establish that individuals in a buyer-seller relationship also agreed to distribute drugs. Certain characteristics inherent in any ongoing buyer-seller relationships will also generally suggest the existence of a conspiracy. For example, sales of large quantities or drugs, repeated and/or standardized transactions, and a prolonged relationship between the parties constitute circumstantial evidence of a conspiracy”); *United States v. Parker*, 554 F.3d at 235 (“While providing that the unlawful transfer from seller to buyer cannot serve as the basis for a charge that the seller and buyer conspired with one another to make the illegal transfer from seller to buyer, the rule does not protect either the seller or buyer from a charge they conspired together to transfer drugs if the evidence supports a finding that they shared a conspiratorial purpose to advance other transfers, whether by the seller or by the buyer”).

⁵¹ *Id.* at 1288; see also *United States v. Tran*, 568 F.3d 1156, 1165 9th Cir. 2009).

One or Many Overlapping Conspiracies

The task of sifting agreement from mere association becomes more difficult and more important with the suggestion of overlapping conspiracies. Criminal enterprises may involve one or many conspiracies. Some time ago, the Supreme Court noted that “[t]hieves who dispose of their loot to a single receiver – a single ‘fence’ – do not by that fact alone become confederates: They may, but it takes more than knowledge that he is a ‘fence’ to make them such.”⁵² Whether it is a fence, or a drug dealer, or a money launderer, when several seemingly independent criminal groups share a common point of contact, the question becomes whether they present one overarching conspiracy or several separate conspiracies with a coincidental overlap. In the analogy suggested by the Court, when separate spokes meet at the common hub they can only function as a wheel if the spokes and hub are enclosed within a rim.⁵³ When several criminal enterprises overlap, they are one overarching conspiracy or several overlapping conspiracies depending upon whether they share a single unifying purpose and understanding—one common agreement.⁵⁴

In determining whether they are faced with a single conspiracy or a rimless collection of overlapping schemes, the courts will look for “the existence of a common purpose ... (2) interdependence of various elements of the overall play; and (3) overlap among the participants.”⁵⁵ “Interdependence is present if the activities of a defendant charged with conspiracy facilitated the endeavors of other alleged co-conspirators or facilitated the venture as a whole.”⁵⁶

If this common agreement exists, it is of no consequence that a particular conspirator joined the plot after its inception as long as he joined it knowingly and voluntarily.⁵⁷ Nor does it matter that a defendant does not know all of the details of a scheme or all of its participants, or that his role is relatively minor.⁵⁸

⁵² *Kotteakos v. United States*, 328 U.S. 750, 755 (1946).

⁵³ *Id.* at 754-55 (“As the Circuit Court of Appeals said, there were at least eight, and perhaps more, separate and independent groups, none of which had any connection with any other, though all dealt independently with Brown as their agent. As the Government puts it, the pattern was that of separate spokes meeting at a common center, though, we may add, without the rim of the wheel to enclose the spokes”).

⁵⁴ *United States v. Brown*, 587 F.3d 1082, 1089 (11th Cir. 2009) (“Separate transactions are not necessarily separate conspiracies, so long as the conspirators act in concert to further a common goal. If a defendant’s actions facilitated the endeavors of others co-conspirators, or facilitated the venture as a whole, a single conspiracy is established”); *United States v. Baldridge*, 559 F.3d 1126, 1136 (10th Cir. 2009) (emphasis in the original) (“A single conspiracy does not exist solely because many individuals deal with a common central player. What is required is a *shared* single criminal objective, not just similar or parallel objectives between similarly situated people”).

⁵⁵ *United States v. Calderon*, 578 F.3d 78, 89 (1st Cir. 2009); see also *United States v. Franklin*, 561 F.3d 632, 402 (5th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Brown*, 587 F.3d 1082, 1089 (11th Cir. 2009).

⁵⁶ *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d 1279, 1291 (10th Cir. 2009).

⁵⁷ *United States v. Johnson*, 592 F.3d 749, 754 (7th Cir. 2010) (“To convict a defendant of conspiracy, the government must prove that (1) two or more people agreed to commit an unlawful act, and (2) the defendant knowingly and intentionally joined in the agreement”); *United States v. Boria*, 592 F.3d 476, 481 (3d Cir. 2010); *United States v. Franklin*, 561 F.3d at 402.

⁵⁸ *United States v. Reed*, 575 F.3d 900, 924 (9th Cir. 2009) (“Once a conspiracy is established, only a slight connection to the conspiracy is necessary to support conviction. The term slight connection means that a defendant need not have known all the conspirators, participated in the conspiracy from its beginning, participated in all its enterprises, or (continued...)”).

Overt Acts

Conviction under 18 U.S.C. 371 for conspiracy to commit a substantive offense requires proof that one of the conspirators committed an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.⁵⁹ In the case of prosecution under other federal conspiracy statutes that have no such requirement, the existence of an overt act may be important for evidentiary and procedural reasons. The overt act need not be the substantive crime which is the object of the conspiracy, an element of that offense, nor even a crime in its own right.⁶⁰ Moreover, a single overt act by any of the conspirators in furtherance of plot will suffice.⁶¹

Conspiracy to Defraud the United States

Federal law contains several statutes that outlaw defrauding the United States. Two of the most commonly prosecuted are 18 U.S.C. 286, which outlaws conspiracy to defraud the United States through the submission of a false claim, and 18 U.S.C. 371, which in addition to conspiracies to violate federal law, outlaws conspiracies to defraud the United States of property or by obstructing the performance of its agencies. Section 371 has an overt act requirement;⁶² section 286 does not.⁶³ The general principles of federal conspiracy law apply to both.⁶⁴

The elements of conspiracy to defraud the United States under 18 U.S.C. 371 are (1) an agreement of two or more persons; (2) to defraud the United States; and (3) an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy committed by one of the conspirators.⁶⁵ The “fraud covered by the statute reaches any conspiracy for the purpose of impairing, obstructing or defeating the lawful functions of any department of the Government”⁶⁶ by “deceit, craft or trickery, or at least by means that are dishonest.”⁶⁷ The plot must be directed against the United States or some federal

(...continued)

known all its details”); *United States v. Brown*, 587 F.3d at 1089; *United States v. Robinson*, 547 F.3d 632, 642 (6th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Eppolito*, 543 F.3d 25, 47-8 (2d Cir. 2008).

⁵⁹ 18 U.S.C. 371 (“and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy”); *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d 1279, 1287 (10th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Schaffer*, 586 F.3d 414, 422 (6th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Kingrea*, 573 F.3d 186, 195 (4th Cir. 2009).

⁶⁰ *Braverman v. United States*, 317 U.S. 49, 53 (1942); *United States v. Rehak*, 589 F.3d 965, 971 (8th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Soy*, 454 F.3d 766, 768 (7th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Lukens*, 114 F.3d 1220, 1222 (D.C.Cir. 1997).

⁶¹ *United States v. LaSpina*, 299 F.3d 165, 176 (2d Cir. 2002); *United States v. Schlei*, 122 F.3d 944, 975 (11th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Nelson*, 66 F.3d 1036, 1044 (9th Cir. 1995).

⁶² See note 55 and accompanying text.

⁶³ *United States v. Saybolt*, 577 F.3d 195, 202 (3d Cir. 2009); *United States v. Dedman*, 527 F.3d 577, 594 n.7 (6th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Lanier*, 920 F.2d 887, 892 (11th Cir. 1991).

⁶⁴ See generally Goldstein, *Conspiracy to Defraud the United States*, 68 YALE LAW JOURNAL 405 (1958).

⁶⁵ *United States v. Root*, 585 F.3d 145, 157 (3d Cir. 2009); *United States v. World Wide Moving, N.V.*, 411 F.3d 502, 516 (4th Cir. 2005).

⁶⁶ *Tanner v. United States*, 483 U.S. 107, 128 (1987), citing *Dennis v. United States*, 384 U.S. 855, 861 (1966); *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. 60, 66 (1942); *Hammerschmidt v. United States*, 265 U.S. 182, 188 (1924); and *Haas v. Henkel*, 216 U.S. 462, 479 (1910).

⁶⁷ *Glasser v. United States*, 315 U.S. at 66; *Hammerschmidt v. United States*, 265 U.S. at 188; *United States v. Stewart*, 590 F.3d 93, 109 (2d Cir. 2009)(“In order to establish a conspiracy-to-defraud offense under 18 U.S.C. §371 ... a reasonable jury must have been able to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt (1) that the defendants entered into an (continued...)”).

entity; a scheme to defraud the recipient of federal funds is not sufficient.⁶⁸ The scheme may be designed to deprive the United States of money or property, but it need not be so; a plot calculated to frustrate the functions of an entity of the United States will suffice.⁶⁹

In contrast, a second federal statute, 18 U.S.C. 286, condemns conspiracies to defraud the United States of money or property through submission of a false claim.⁷⁰ The elements of a section 286 violation are that “the defendant entered into a conspiracy to obtain payment or allowance of a claim against a department or agency of the United States; (2) the claim was false, fictitious, or fraudulent; (3) the defendant knew or was deliberately ignorant of the claim’s falsity, fictitiousness, or fraudulence; (4) the defendant knew of the conspiracy and intended to join it; and (5) the defendant voluntarily participated in the conspiracy.”⁷¹ Conviction does not require proof of an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.⁷²

When Does It End

Conspiracy is a crime which begins with a scheme and may continue on until its objective is achieved or abandoned.⁷³ The liability of individual conspirators continues on from the time they joined the plot until it ends or until they withdraw.⁷⁴ The want of an individual’s continued active participation is no defense as long as the underlying conspiracy lives and he has not withdrawn.⁷⁵ An individual who claims to have withdrawn bears the burden of establishing either that he took some action to make his departure clear to his co-conspirators or that he disclosed the scheme to

(...continued)

agreement (2) to obstruct a lawful function of the government in this case, the administration and enforcement of the SAMs (3) by deceitful or dishonest means and (4) at least one overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy”).

⁶⁸ *Tanner v. United States*, 483 U.S. 107, 128-32 (1987); *United States v. Mendez*, 528 F.3d 811, 814-15 (11th Cir. 2008).

⁶⁹ *Hammerschmidt v. United States*, 265 U.S. at 188 (“It is not necessary that the government shall be subjected to property or pecuniary loss by the fraud, but only that its legitimate official action and purpose shall be defeated by misrepresentation”); *United States v. Ballistrea*, 101 F.3d 827, 832 (2d Cir. 1996) (This provision not only reaches schemes which deprive the government of money or property, but also is designed to protect the integrity of the United States and its agencies”); *United States v. Dean*, 55 F.3d 640, 647 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (“If the government’s evidence showed that Dean conspired to impair the functioning of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, no other form of injury to the Federal Government need be established for the conspiracy to fall under §371”).

⁷⁰ “Whoever enters into any agreement, combination, or conspiracy to defraud the United States, or any department or agency thereof, by obtaining or aiding to obtain the payment or allowance of any false, fictitious, or fraudulent claim, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both,” 18 U.S.C. 286.

⁷¹ *United States v. Dedman*, 527 F.3d 577, 593-94 (6th Cir. 2008). At least one other circuit also includes a materiality requirement, *i.e.*, the false, fictitious, or fraudulent assertion must be one which naturally have a material effect on the government’s decision to pay or deny the claim, *United States v. Saybolt*, 577 F.3d 195, 201-204 (3d Cir. 2009).

⁷² *United States v. Saybolt*, 577 F.3d 195, 202 (3d Cir. 2009); *United States v. Dedman*, 527 F.3d 577, 594 n.7 (6th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Lanier*, 920 F.2d 887, 892 (11th Cir. 1991).

⁷³ *United States v. Payne*, 591 F.3d 46, 69 (2d Cir. 2010) (“Conspiracy is a continuing offense ... one that involves a prolonged course of conduct; its commission is not complete until the conduct has run its course”); *United States v. Caldwell*, 589 F.3d 1323, 1330 (10th Cir. 2009).

⁷⁴ *United States v. Hodge*, 594 F.3d 614, 619 (8th Cir. 2010); *United States v. Caldwell*, 589 F.3d at 1330; *United States v. Egbert*, 562 F.3d 1092, 1098 (10th Cir. 2009).

⁷⁵ *United States v. Hodge*, 594 F.3d at 619; *United States v. Mangual-Santiago*, 562 F.3d 411, 423 (1st Cir. 2009); *United States v. Eppolito*, 543 F.3d 25, 49 (2d Cir. 2008).

the authorities.⁷⁶ As a general rule, overt acts of concealment do not extend the life of the conspiracy beyond the date of the accomplishment of its main objectives.⁷⁷ On the other hand, the rule does not apply when concealment is one of the main objectives of the conspiracy.⁷⁸

Sanctions

Imprisonment and Fines

Section 371 felony conspiracies are punishable by imprisonment for not more than five years and a fine of not more than \$250,000 (not more than \$500,000 for organizations).⁷⁹ Most drug trafficking, terrorism, racketeering, and many white collar conspirators face the same penalties as those who committed the underlying substantive offense, e.g., 21 U.S.C. 846 (“Any person who ... conspires to commit any offense defined in [the Controlled Substances Act] shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the ... conspiracy”); 18 U.S.C. 2339B (“Whoever knowingly provides material support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization ... or conspires to do so, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both”); 18 U.S.C. 1962(d), 1963(a)(““(d) It shall be unlawful for any person to conspire to violate any of the [racketeering] provisions of subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section.... (a) Whoever violates any provision of section 1962 ... shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for not more than 20 years... or both”); 18 U.S.C. 1349 (“Any person who ... conspires to commit any offense under this chapter [relating to mail fraud, wire fraud, etc.] shall be subject to the same penalties as those prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of ... the conspiracy”).

The United States Sentencing Guidelines greatly influence the sentences for federal crimes. Federal courts are bound to impose a sentence within the statutory maximums and minimums. Their decision of what sentence to impose within those boundaries, however, must begin with a determination of the sentencing recommendation under the guidelines.⁸⁰ Reasonableness standards govern review of their sentencing decisions,⁸¹ and a sentence within the Sentencing Guideline range is presumed reasonable.⁸²

⁷⁶ *United States v. Gonzalez*, 596 F.3d 1228, 1234 (10th Cir. 2010)(“The defense of termination by withdrawal requires that the defendant show that he or she has done some act to disavow or defeat the purpose of the conspiracy. Affirmative acts inconsistent with the object of the conspiracy and communicated in a manner reasonably calculated to reach co-conspirators have generally been regarded as sufficient to establish withdrawal”); *United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d 641, 673 (8th Cir. 2008)(“To withdraw from a conspiracy at common law, a conspirator must show not only that he ceased activities in furtherance of the conspiracy, but also that he either made a ‘clean breast’ to the government or else communicated the fact of withdrawal to his co-conspirators in a manner reasonably calculated to reach them”); *United States v. Eppolito*, 543 F.3d at 49.

⁷⁷ *United States v. Bornman*, 559 F.3d 150, 153 (3d Cir. 2009), citing *Grunewald v. United States*, 353 U.S. 391, 413 (1957); *United States v. Turner*, 548 F.3d 1094, 1097 (D.C. Cir. 2008).

⁷⁸ *United States v. Upton*, 559 F.3d 3, 10 (1st Cir. 2009); *United States v. Weaver*, 507 F.3d 178, 185-86 (3d Cir. 2007).

⁷⁹ 18 U.S.C. 371, 3571. An offender may be fined twice of the amount of the gain or loss associated with the offense, even when such a fine would exceed the otherwise applicable \$250,000/\$500,000 maximums, 18 U.S.C. 3571(b)(2), (d).

⁸⁰ *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. 38, 49 (2007).

⁸¹ *Gall v. United States*, 552 U.S. at 46, citing *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220, 260-62 (2005).

⁸² *Rita v. United States*, 551 U.S. 338, 347 (2007).

The Sentencing Guidelines system is essentially a scoring system. Federal crimes are each assigned a numerical base offense level and levels are added and subtracted to account for the various aggravating and mitigating factors in a particular case. Thus, for example, providing material support to a terrorist organization, 18 U.S.C. 2339B, has a base offense level of 26, which may be increased by 2 levels if the support comes in the form of explosives, U.S.S.G. §2M5.3(a), (b) and may be increased or decreased still further for other factors. The guidelines designate six sentencing ranges of each total offense level; the appropriate range within the six is determined by extent of the offender's criminal record. For instance, the sentencing range for a first-time offender with a total offense level of 28 would be imprisonment for between 78 and 97 months (Category I); while the range for an offender in the highest criminal history category (Category VI) would be imprisonment for between 140 and 175 months.⁸³

The base offense level for conspiracy is generally the same as that for the underlying offense, either by operation of an individual guideline, for example, U.S.C. §2D1.1 (drug trafficking), or by operation of the general conspiracy guideline, U.S.S.C. §2X1.1. In any event, conspirators who play a leadership role in an enterprise are subject to an increase of from 2 to 4 levels, U.S.S.G. §3B1.1, and those who play a more subservient role may be entitled to reduction of from 2 to 4 levels, U.S.S.G. §3B1.2. In the case of terrorism offenses, conspirators may also be subject to a special enhancement which sets the minimum total offense level at 32 and the criminal history category at VI (regardless of the extent of the offender's criminal record), U.S.S.G. §3A1.4.⁸⁴

The Sentencing Guidelines also address the imposition of fines below the statutory maximum. The total offense level dictates the recommended fine range for individual and organizational defendants. For instance, the fine range for an individual with a total offense level of 28 is \$12,500 to \$125,000, U.S.C. §5E1.2. The recommended fine range for an organization with a total offense level of 28 is \$6,300,000 (assuming the loss or gain associated with the organization offense exceeds the usual \$500,000 ceiling), U.S.S.G. §8C2.4.

Restitution

A conspirator's liability for restitution is a matter of circumstance. Most conspiracy statutes do not expressly provide for restitution, but in most instances restitution may be required or permitted under any number of grounds. As a general rule, federal law requires restitution for certain offenses and permits it for others. A sentencing court is generally required to order a defendant to make restitution following conviction for a crime of violence or for a crime against property (including fraud), 18 U.S.C. 366A(a), (c). Those entitled to restitution under Section 3663A include those "directly and proximately harmed" by the crime of conviction and "in the case of an offense that involves as an element a scheme, conspiracy, or pattern of criminal activity, any person directly harmed by the defendant's criminal conduct in the course of the scheme, conspiracy or pattern," 18 U.S.C. 3663A(b).⁸⁵

⁸³ U.S.S.G. Sentencing Table.

⁸⁴ E.g., *United States v. Stewart*, 590 F.3d 93, 136 (2d Cir. 2009) ("The district court initially calculated Yousry's Guidelines range based on a total offense level of 28 criminal history category of I, for a range of 78 to 97 months. According to the government, Yousry's applicable Guidelines range should have been enhanced in accordance with the terrorism enhancement provided by the Guidelines, U.S.S.G. §3A1.4. The district court concluded to the contrary that the terrorism enhancement did not apply to Yousry because he did not act with the requisite state of mind.).

⁸⁵ *United States v. Farish*, 535 F.3d 815, 826 (8th Cir. 2008) ("If the jury had clearly convicted Farish of conspiracy to (continued...)")

Otherwise, a court is permitted to order restitution (a) following conviction for an offense prescribed under title 18 of the United States Code or for drug trafficking, 18 U.S.C. 3663;⁸⁶ (b) as a condition of probation or supervised release, 18 U.S.C. 3563(b)(2), 3583(d); or (c) pursuant to a plea agreement, 18 U.S.C. 3663(a)(3), 3663A(c)(2).⁸⁷

Forfeiture

The treatment of forfeiture in conspiracy cases is perhaps even more individualistic than restitution in conspiracy cases. The general criminal forfeiture statute, 18 U.S.C. 982, authorizes confiscation for several classes of property as a consequence of a particular conspiracy conviction, for example, 18 U.S.C. 982(a)(2)(calling for the confiscation of proceeds realized from “a violation of, or a conspiracy to – (A) section ... 1341, 1343, 1344 of this title [relating to mail, wire and bank fraud], affecting a financial institution”); 18 U.S.C. 982(a)(8)(calling for the confiscation of proceeds from, and property used to facilitate or promote, “an offense under section ... 1341, or 1343, or of a conspiracy to commit such an offense, if the offense involves telemarketing”).

In the case of drug trafficking, forfeiture turns on the fact that it is authorized for any Controlled Substance Act violation, 21 U.S.C. 853,⁸⁸ of which conspiracy is one, 21 U.S.C. 846. The same can be said of racketeering conspiracy provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1962(d).⁸⁹

(...continued)

commit arson at the Diamond Lake Road West home, then the district court’s entire restitution order would have been appropriate”); *United States v. Brock-Davis*, 504 F.3d 991, 999 (9th Cir. 2007)(“Even were the law of restitution not more expansive for convictions for conspiracy than for other crimes, the district would not have committed error [in ordering restitution pursuant to a conspiracy conviction].... Finally, [omission] in the indictment is immaterial ... *United States v. Boyd*, 222 F.3d 47, 50 (2d Cir. 2000)(finding restitution payable under the MVRA [18 U.S.C. 3663A] ‘by all convicted co-conspirators in respect of damage suffered by all victims of a conspiracy, regardless of the facts underlying courts of conviction in individual prosecutions’”).

⁸⁶ *United States v. Gutierrez-Avascal*, 542 F.3d 495, 498 (5th Cir. 2008)(“The language of [21 U.S.C. 846] is clear: those convicted of a conspiracy are subject to the same punishment as the target of that conspiracy. It is undisputed that a district court, in its discretion, has authority under [18 U.S.C. 3663] to order a defendant convicted under § 841 to pay restitution. The same authority exists, under the express terms of § 846, against those who conspire to commit that crime”); *United States v. Lanzotti*, 205 F.3d 951, 958 (7th Cir. 2000)(“In other words, the burden is on the defendant to show why restitution [under 18 U.S.C. 3663] is not warranted... Lanzotti, as a member of the conspiracy, is liable for the actions of his co-conspirators, which includes restitution where appropriate. *United States v. Brewer*, 983 F.2d 181, 185 (10th Cir. 1993); *United States v. Chaney*, 964 F.2d 437, 452-53 (5th Cir. 1992)”).

⁸⁷ *United States v. Elson*, 577 F.3d 713, 724-25 (6th Cir. 2009)(“Elson’s plea agreement explicitly provides that Elson will ‘pay restitution to victims of the conspiracy to defraud orchestrated by Richard D. Schultz (J.A. 209), which is an offense different from his offense conviction – conspiracy to obstruct a grand jury investigation.... Accordingly, the district court properly ordered Elson to pay restitution to the victims of the conspiracy to defraud Schultz’s creditors”).

⁸⁸ 21 U.S.C. 853(a)(“Any person convicted of a violation of this subchapter [the Controlled Substances Act]... shall forfeit ... (1) any property constituting... any proceeds... the result of such violation; (2) any ... property used ... to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, such violation...”).

⁸⁹ 18 U.S.C. 1963(a)(“Whoever violates any provision of section 1962 ... shall forfeit to the United States... (3) any property constituting... any proceeds ... obtained ... from racketeering activity ... in violation of section 1962”).

Relation of Conspiracy to Other Crimes

Conspiracy is a completed crime upon agreement, or upon agreement and the commission of an overt act under statutes with an overt act requirement. Conviction does not require commission of the crime that is the object of the conspiracy.⁹⁰ On the other hand, conspirators may be prosecuted for conspiracy, for any completed offense which is the object of the conspiracy, as well as for any foreseeable offense committed in furtherance of the conspiracy.⁹¹

Aid and Abet

Anyone who “aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures” the commission of a federal crime by another is punishable as a principal, that is, as though he had committed the offense himself, 18 U.S.C. 2. If the other agrees and an overt act is committed, they are conspirators, each liable for conspiracy and any criminal act committed to accomplish it. If the other commits the offense, they are equally punishable for the basic offense. “Typically, the same evidence will support both a conspiracy and an aiding and abetting conviction.”⁹² The two are clearly distinct, however, as the Ninth Circuit has noted:

The difference between the classic common law elements of aiding and abetting and a criminal conspiracy underscores this material distinction, although at first blush the two appear similar. Aiding and abetting the commission of a specific crime, we have held, includes four elements: (1) that the accused had the specific intent to facilitate the commission of a crime by another, (2) that the accused had the requisite intent to commit the underlying substantive offense, (3) that the accused assisted or participated in the commission of the underlying substantive offense, and (4) that the principal committed the underlying offense. As *Lopez* emphasized, the accused generally must associate] himself with the venture ... participate[] in it as something he wish[es] to bring about, and [sought by] his action to make it succeed.

By contrast, a classic criminal conspiracy as charged in 18 U.S.C. § 371 is broader. The government need only prove (1) an agreement to engage in criminal activity, (2) one or more overt acts taken to implement the agreement, and (3) the requisite intent to commit the substantive crime. Indeed, a drug conspiracy does not even require commission of an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.

Two distinctions become readily apparent after a more careful comparison. First, the substantive offense which may be the object in a § 371 conspiracy need not be completed. Second, the emphasis in a § 371 conspiracy is on whether one or more overt acts was undertaken. This language necessarily is couched in passive voice for it matters only that a co-conspirator commit the overt act, not necessarily that the accused herself does so. In an aiding and abetting case, not only must the underlying *substantive offense* actually be completed by someone, but the accused must take some action, a *substantial step*, toward

⁹⁰ *United States v. Jimenez Recio*, 537 U.S. 270, 274 (2003)(the conspiratorial “agreement is a distinct evil, which may exist and be punished whether or not the substantive offense ensues”); *United States v. Mincoff*, 574 F.3d 1186, 1198 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Eppolito*, 543 F.3d 25, 47 (2d Cir. 2008).

⁹¹ *Pinkerton v. United States*, 328 U.S. 640, 646-47 (1946); *Callanan v. United States*, 364 U.S. 587, 593 (1961); *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d 1279, 1291 (10th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Simmons*, 581 F.3d 582, 587 (7th Cir. 2009).

⁹² *United States v. Rodriguez*, 553 F.3d 380, 391 (5th Cir. 2008).

associating herself with the criminal venture. *United States v. Hernandez-Orellana*, 539 F.3d 994, 1006-1007 (9th Cir. 2008)(emphasis in the original).

Attempt

Conspiracy and attempt are both inchoate offenses, unfinished crimes in a sense. They are forms of introductory misconduct that the law condemns lest they result in some completed form of misconduct.⁹³ Federal law has no general attempt statute.⁹⁴ Congress, however, has outlawed attempt to commit a number of specific federal offenses.⁹⁵ Like conspiracy, a conviction for attempt does not require the commission of the underlying offense.⁹⁶ Both require an intent to commit the contemplated substantive offense.⁹⁷ Like conspiracy, the fact that it may be impossible to commit the target offense is no defense to a charge of attempt to commit it.⁹⁸ Unlike conspiracy, attempt can be committed by a single individual.⁹⁹ Attempt only becomes a crime when it closely approaches a substantive offense. Conspiracy becomes a crime far sooner. Mere acts of preparation will satisfy the most demanding conspiracy statute, not so with attempt.¹⁰⁰ Conspiracy requires no more than an overt act in furtherance; attempt, a substantial step to completion.¹⁰¹ Moreover, unlike a conspirator, an accused may not be convicted of both attempt and the underlying substantive offense.¹⁰²

⁹³ *United States v. Rehak*, 589 F.3d 965, 971 (8th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Iribé*, 564 F.3d 1155, 1160 (9th Cir. 2009).

⁹⁴ *United States v. Douglas*, 525 F.3d 225, 251 (2d Cir. 2008).

⁹⁵ E.g., 18 U.S.C.32(b)(4)(attempts to sabotage commercial aircraft), 33 (attempts to sabotage commercial motor vehicles); 37(a) (attempted violation at international airports), 43(a)(2)(C)(attempted violence directed at animal enterprises), 81 (attempted arson within the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States), 175 (attempt use of biological weapons), 351(c)(attempted murder or kidnapping of a Member of Congress), 1512 (attempted obstruction of justice), 1956 (attempted money laundering). There are dozens of other attempt statutes in title 18 of the United States Code and many others scattered throughout the other titles.

⁹⁶ *United States v. Macias-Valencia*, 510 F.3d 1012, (9th Cir. 2007)(“conspiracy and attempt are inchoate crimes that do not require completion of the criminal objective”); *United States v. Vigil*, 523 F.3d 1258, 1267 (10th Cir. 2008)(attempt)(“We do not require that a defendant be on the verge of committing the specific act, rather the law allows criminal liability to attach at some point prior to the last proximate act”); *United States v. Rehak*, 589 F.3d at 971 (conspiracy)(“The crime of conspiracy is complete on the agreement to violate the law implemented by one or more overt acts... and it is not dependent on the success or failure of the planned scheme”).

⁹⁷ *United States v. Wahlstrom*, 588 F.3d 538, 543 (8th Cir. 2009)(attempt); *United States v. Bristol-Martir*, 570 F.3d 29, 39 (1st Cir. 2009)(attempt); *United States v. Boria*, 592 F.3d 476, 481 (3d Cir. 2010)(“To establish a charge of conspiracy, the Government must show ... (2) an intent to achieve a common illegal goal”).

⁹⁸ *United States v. Rehak*, 589 F.3d at 971 (“Factual impossibility is not a defense to an inchoate offense such as conspiracy or attempt”); *United States v. Coté*, 504 F.3d 682, 687 (7th Cir. 2007)(attempt); *United States v. Williams*, 547 F.3d 1187, 1197 (9th Cir. 2008)(conspiracy).

⁹⁹ *United States v. Iribé*, 564 F.3d at 1160 (“Each of those crimes contains an element that the other does not: Conspiracy does not require a ‘substantial step,’ while attempt does not require an ‘agreement’”).

¹⁰⁰ *United States v. DeMarce*, 564 F.3d 989, (8th Cir. 2009)(“The requisite elements of attempt are: 1) an intent... and 2) conduct constituting a substantial step toward the commission of the substantive offense which strongly corroborates the actor’s criminal intent. A substantial step goes beyond ‘mere preparation’...”); *United States v. Barrow*, 568 F.3d 215, 219 (“We have defined a ‘substantial step’ as ‘conduct which strongly corroborates the firmness of [the] defendant’s criminal attempt.’ ‘Mere preparation’ is not enough”); *United States v. Morris*, 549 F.3d 548, 550 (7th Cir. 2008)(“The ‘substantial step’ [required for conviction of attempt] toward completion is the demonstration of dangerousness, and has been usefully described as ‘some overt act adapted to, approximating, and which in the ordinary and likely course of things will result in, the commission of the particular crime’”).

¹⁰¹ *United States v. Iribé*, 564 F.3d at 1160.

¹⁰² *United States v. Rivera-Relle*, 333 F.3d 914, 921 n.11 (9th Cir. 2003)(“Unlike conspiracy, the prosecution may not obtain convictions for both the completed offense and the attempt if the attempt has in fact been completed. the attempt (continued...)”).

An individual may be guilty of both conspiring with others to commit an offense and of attempting to commit the same offense, either himself or through his confederates.¹⁰³ In some circumstances, he may be guilty of attempted conspiracy. Congress has outlawed at least one example of an attempt to conspire in the statute which prohibits certain invitations to conspire, that is, solicitation to commit a federal crime of violence, 18 U.S.C. 373.

Solicitation

Section 373 prohibits efforts to induce another to commit a crime of violence “under circumstances strongly corroborative” of intent to see the crime committed, 18 U.S.C. 373(a). Section 373’s crimes of violence are federal “felon[ies] that [have] as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against property or against the person of another,” *id.*¹⁰⁴ Examples of “strongly corroborative” circumstances include “the defendant offering or promising payment or another benefit in exchange for committing the offense; threatening harm or other detriment for refusing to commit the offense; repeatedly soliciting or discussing at length in soliciting the commission of the offense, or making explicit that the solicitation is serious; believing or knowing that the persons solicited had previously committed similar offenses; and acquiring weapons, tools, or information or use in committing the offense, or making other apparent preparations for its commission.”¹⁰⁵ As is the case of attempt, “[a]n individual cannot be guilty of both the solicitation of a crime and the substantive crime.”¹⁰⁶ Although the crime of solicitation is complete upon communication with the requisite intent, renunciation prior to commission of the substantive offense is a defense.¹⁰⁷ The offender’s legal incapacity to commit the solicited offense himself, however, is not a defense.¹⁰⁸

(...continued)

is an offense included in the completed crime, and, therefore, cannot support a separate conviction and sentence”).

¹⁰³ *United States v. Iribe*, 564 F.3d at 1161 (“Here, Defendant conspired to commit an actual kidnapping. He also committed a substantial step toward kidnapping. Thus, he was properly convicted of both conspiring to kidnap and attempting to kidnap”).

¹⁰⁴ *United States v. Korab*, 893 F.2d 212, 215 (9th Cir. 1989) (“Section 373(a) encompasses only solicitations of federal felonies”).

¹⁰⁵ *United States v. Hale*, 448 F.3d 971, 983 (7th Cir. 2006), citing *United States v. McNeil*, 887 F.2d 448, 450 (3d Cir. 1989).

¹⁰⁶ *United States v. Korab*, 893 F.3d 212, 213 (9th Cir. 1989).

¹⁰⁷ 18 U.S.C. 373(b) (“It is an affirmative defense to a prosecution under this section that, under circumstances manifesting a voluntary and complete renunciation of his criminal intent, the defendant prevented the commission of the crime solicited. A renunciation is not “voluntary and complete” if it is motivated in whole or in part by a decision to postpone the commission of the crime until another time or to substitute another victim or another but similar objective. If the defendant raises the affirmative defense at trial, the defendant has the burden of proving the defense by a preponderance of the evidence”).

¹⁰⁸ 18 U.S.C. 373(c) (“It is not a defense to a prosecution under this section that the person solicited could not be convicted of the crime because he lacked the state of mind required for its commission, because he was incompetent or irresponsible, or because he is immune from prosecution or is not subject to prosecution”).

Procedural Attributes

Statute of Limitations

The statute of limitations for most federal crimes is five years, 18 U.S.C. 3282.¹⁰⁹ The five-year limitation applies to the general conspiracy statute, 18 U.S.C. 371, and to the false claims conspiracy statute, 18 U.S.C. 286. Section 371 requires proof of an overt act;¹¹⁰ section 286 does not.¹¹¹ For conspiracy offenses with an overt act requirement like those under Section 371, the statute of limitations begins with completion of the last overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy.¹¹² For conspiracy offenses with no such requirement like those under section 286, the statute of limitations begins with the abandonment of the conspiracy or the accomplishment of its objectives.¹¹³

Venue

The presence or absence of an overt act requirement makes a difference for statute of limitations purposes. For venue purposes, it apparently does not. The Supreme Court has observed in passing that “this Court has long held that venue is proper in any district in which an overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy was committed, even where an overt act is not a required element of the conspiracy offense.”¹¹⁴ The lower federal appellate courts are seemingly of the same view, for they have found venue proper for a conspiracy prosecution wherever an overt act occurs—under overt act statutes and non-overt act statutes alike.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ A few crimes, such as certain terrorism and child abuse offenses have special longer statute of limitations, e.g., 18 U.S.C. 3283, 3286. Capital offenses may be tried at any time, 18 U.S.C. 3281.

¹¹⁰ 18 U.S.C. 371 (“... and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy...”); *United States v. Wardell*, 591 F.3d 1279, 1287 (10th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Schaffer*, 586 F.3d 414, 422 (6th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Kingrea*, 573 F.3d 186, 195 (4th Cir. 2009).

¹¹¹ *United States v. Saybolt*, 577 F.3d 195, 202 (3d Cir. 2009); *United States v. Dedman*, 527 F.3d 577, 594 n.7 (6th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Lanier*, 920 F.2d 887, 892 (11th Cir. 1991).

¹¹² *United States v. Bornman*, 559 F.3d 150, 153 (3d Cir. 2009)(prosecution under Section 371)(“For a conspiracy indictment to fall within the statute of limitations, it is incumbent on the Government to prove that at least one overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy was performed within five years of the date the Indictment was returned”); *United States v. Thompson*, 518 F.3d 832, 857 (10th Cir. 2008)(prosecution under Section 371); *United States v. Useni*, 516 F.3d 634, 656 (7th Cir. 2008)(same).

¹¹³ *United States v. Seher*, 562 F.3d 1344, 1364 (11th Cir. 2009)(prosecution under 18 U.S.C. 1956(h) which has no overt act requirement)(“The government satisfies the requirements of the statute of limitations for a non-overt act conspiracy if it alleges and proves that the conspiracy continued into the limitations period. A conspiracy is deemed to continue as long as its purposes have neither been abandoned nor accomplished, and no affirmative showing has been made that it has terminated”); *United States v. Yannotti*, 541 F.3d 112, 123 (2d Cir. 2008) (prosecution under 18 U.S.C. 1962(d) a non-overt act statute); *United States v. Saadey*, 393 F.3d 669, 677 (6th Cir. 2005)(same).

¹¹⁴ *Whitfield v. United States*, 543 U.S. 209, 218 (2005).

¹¹⁵ *United States v. Brodie*, 534 F.3d 259, 273 (D.C. Cir. 2008); *United States v. Nichols*, 416 F.3d 811, 824 (8th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Geibel*, 369 F.3d 682, 696 (2d Cir. 2004)(each of these cases involves conspiracy under 18 U.S.C. 371 which carries an overt act requirement); *United States v. Morales*, 445 F.3d 1081, 1084 (8th Cir. 2006); *United States v. Haire*, 371 F.3d 833, 838 (D.C. Cir. 2004); *United States v. Carbajal*, 290 F.3d 277, 289 (5th Cir. 2002) (each of these cases involves conspiracy under 21 U.S.C. 846 which does not include an overt act requirement).

Joinder and Severance (One Conspiracy, One Trial)

Three rules of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure govern joinder and severance for federal criminal trials. Rule 8 permits the joinder of common criminal charges and defendants.¹¹⁶ Rule 12 insists that a motion for severance be filed prior to trial.¹¹⁷ Rule 14 authorizes the court to grant severance for separate trials as a remedy for prejudicial joinder.¹¹⁸

The Supreme Court has pointed out that “[t]here is a preference in the federal system for joint trials of defendants who are indicted together. Joint trials play a vital role in the criminal justice system. They promote efficiency and serve the interests of justice by avoiding the scandal and inequity of inconsistent verdicts.”¹¹⁹ In conspiracy cases, a “conspiracy charge combined with substantive counts arising out of that conspiracy is a proper basis for joinder under Rule 8(b).”¹²⁰ Moreover, “the preference in a conspiracy trial is that persons charged together should be tried together.”¹²¹ In fact, “it will be the rare case, if ever, where a district court should sever the trial of alleged co-conspirators.”¹²² The Supreme Court has reminded the lower courts that “a district court should grant a severance under Rule 14 only if there is a serious risk that a joint trial would compromise a specific trial right of one of the defendants, or prevent the jury from making a reliable judgment about guilt or innocence.”¹²³ The Court noted that the risk may be more substantial in complex cases with multiple defendants, but that “less drastic measures, such as limiting instructions, often will suffice to cure any risk of prejudice.”¹²⁴ Subsequently lower

¹¹⁶ “(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.** 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,” F.R.Crim.P. 8.

¹¹⁷ “The following must be raised before trial: ... (D) a Rule 14 motion to sever charges or defendants,” F.R.Crim.P. 12(b)(3)(D). If the motion is denied, the courts will require that the motion be renewed at the close of the presentation of evidence or it will be considered waived, *United States v. Williams*, 553 F.3d 1073, 1079 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Sullivan*, 522 F.3d 967, 981 (9th Cir. 2008).

¹¹⁸ “(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) Defendant’s Statements. Before ruling on a defendant’s motion to sever, the court may order an attorney for the government to deliver to the court for in camera inspection any defendant’s statement that the government intends to use as evidence,” F.R.Crim.P. 14.

¹¹⁹ *Zafiro v. United States*, 5056 U.S. 534, 537 (1993).

¹²⁰ *United States v. Williams*, 553 F.3d 1073, 78-79 (7th Cir. 2009).

¹²¹ *United States v. Zapata*, 546 F.3d 1179, 1191 (10th Cir. 2008); *United States v. Lewis*, 557 F.3d 601, 609 (8th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Saunders*, 553 F.3d 81, 85 (1st Cir. 2009); *United States v. Wilson*, 481 F.3d 475, 482 (7th Cir. 2007).

¹²² *United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d 641, 658 (8th Cir. 2008).

¹²³ *Zafiro v. United States*, 506 U.S. at 539; see also *United States v. Lewis*, 557 F.3d at 609 (“To demonstrate the severe and compelling prejudice necessary to show that the court abused its discretion in denying severance, a defendant must show that his defense was irreconcilable with that of the codefendant or that the jury was unable to compartmentalize the evidence”).

¹²⁴ *Zafiro v. United States*, 506 U.S. at 539.

federal appellate court opinions have emphasized the curative effect of appropriate jury instructions.¹²⁵

Double Jeopardy and Ex Post Facto

Because conspiracy is a continuing offense, it stands as an exception to the usual ex post facto principles. Because it is a separate crime, it also stands as an exception to the usual double jeopardy principles.

The ex post facto clauses of the Constitution forbid the application of criminal laws which punish conduct that was innocent when it was committed or punishes more severely criminal conduct than when it was committed.¹²⁶ Increasing the penalty for an ongoing conspiracy, however, does not offend ex post facto constraints as long as the conspiracy straddles the date of the legislative penalty enhancement.¹²⁷

The double jeopardy clause of the Fifth Amendment declares that no person shall “be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb.”¹²⁸ This prohibition condemns successive prosecutions, successive punishments, and successive use of charges rejected in acquittal.¹²⁹

For successive prosecution or punishment, the critical factor is the presence or absence of the same offense. Offenses may overlap, but they are not the same crime as long as each requires proof of an element that the other does not.¹³⁰ Since conspiracy and its attendant substantive offense are ordinarily separate crimes—one alone requiring agreement and the other alone requiring completion of the substantive offense—the double jeopardy clause poses no impediment to successive prosecution or to successive punishment of the two.¹³¹

Double jeopardy issues arise most often in a conspiracy context when a case presents the question of whether the activities of the accused conspirators constitute a single conspiracy or several

¹²⁵ *United States v. Williams*, 553 F.3d 1073, 1079 (7th Cir. 2009) (“[T]he district court gave a limiting instruction both before the presentation of the evidence and again at closing arguments that the jury should consider the evidence regarding each defendant separately. Such instructions are normally sufficient to cure any possibility of prejudice”); *United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d at 658 (“As a practical matter, disparity among the defendant s in extent of involvement and culpability is commonplace in conspiracy cases and does not alone show the kind of prejudice that would require a district court to sever, rather than to respond with some less drastic measure such as a curative instruction”); *United States v. Reyeros*, 537 F.3d 270, 286 (3d Cir. 2008) (“Even if there were some risk of prejudice, here it is of the type that can be cured with proper instructions, and juries are presumed to follow their instructions”).

¹²⁶ U.S. Const. Art.I, §§9, 10; *Stogner v. California*, 539 U.S. 607, 612 (2003).

¹²⁷ *United States v. Julian*, 427 F.3d 471, 482 (7th Cir. 2005) (“It is well established that a statute increasing a penalty with respect to a criminal conspiracy which commenced prior to, but was continued beyond the effective date of the statute, is not *ex post facto* as to that crime”); *United States v. Valladares*, 544 F.3d 1257, 1270-271 (11th Cir. 2008);

¹²⁸ U.S. Const. Amend. V.

¹²⁹ *United States v. Dixon*, 509 U.S. 688, 696 (1993) (“The prohibition applies both to successive punishments and to successive prosecutions for the same offense”); *Yeager v. United States*, 129 U.S. 2360, 2366 (2009) (“[T]he Double Jeopardy Clause precludes [as collateral estoppel] the Government from relitigating any issue that was necessarily decided by a jury’s acquittal in a prior trial”); *United States v. Wittig*, 575 F.3d 1085, 1100-101 (10th Cir. 2009) (“[W]hen the only way the government can prove one of the elements of a conspiracy offense is to prove the same facts decided against it in a prior trial on a substantive offense, collateral estoppel bars the attempt”).

¹³⁰ *Rutledge v. United States*, 517 U.S. 292, 297 (1996).

¹³¹ *United States v. Felix*, 503 U.S. 378, 391 (1992); *United States v. Yearwood*, 518 F.3d 220, 223 (4th Cir. 2008).

overlapping conspiracies. Multiple conspiracies may be prosecuted sequentially and punished with multiple sanctions; single conspiracies must be tried and punished once. Asked to determine whether they are faced with one or more than one conspiracy, the courts have said they inquire whether:

1. the *locus criminis* [place] of the two alleged conspiracies is the same;
2. there is a significant degree of *temporal overlap* between the two conspiracies charged;
3. there is an overlap of personnel between the two conspiracies (including unindicted as well as indicted co-conspirators);
4. the over acts charged [are related];
5. the *role played* by the defendant [relates to both];
6. there was a common goal among the conspirators;
7. whether the agreement contemplated bringing to pass a continuous result that will not continue without the continuous cooperation of the conspirators; and
8. the extent to which the participants overlap[ped] in [their] various dealings.¹³²

Co-conspirator Declarations

At trial, the law favors the testimony of live witnesses—under oath, subject to cross examination, and in the presence of the accused and the jury—over the presentation of their evidence in writing or through the mouths of others. The hearsay rule is a product of this preference. Exceptions and definitions narrow the rule’s reach. For example, hearsay is usually defined to include only those out-of-court statements which are offered in evidence “to prove the truth of the matter asserted.”¹³³

Although often referred to as the exception for co-conspirator declarations, the Federal Rules of Evidence treats the matter within its definition of hearsay. Thus, Rule 801(d)(2)(E) of the Federal Rules provides that an out-of-court “statement is not hearsay if ... (2) The statement is offered against a party and is ... (E) a statement by a coconspirator of a party during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy.”

To admit a co-conspirator declaration into evidence under the Rule, a “court must find: (1) the conspiracy existed; (2) the defendant was a member of the conspiracy; and (3) the co-conspirator made the proffered statements in furtherance of the conspiracy.”¹³⁴ The court, however, may receive the statement preliminarily subject to the prosecution’s subsequent demonstration of its

¹³² *United States v. Rigas*, 584 F.3d 594, (3d Cir. 2009)(emphasis in the original); see also, *United States v. Wheeler*, 535 F.3d 446, 449 (6th Cir. 2008)(citing factors [1] through [4] in addition to the statutory offenses charged in the indictments)

¹³³ F.R.Evid. 801(c).

¹³⁴ *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d 320, 335 (6th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Flores*, 572 F.3d 1254, 1264 (11th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Harris*, 585 F.3d 394, 398 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Mitchell*, 596 F.3d 18, 23 (1st Cir. 2010).

admissibility by a preponderance of the evidence.¹³⁵ As to the first two elements, a co-conspirator's statement without more is insufficient; there must be "some extrinsic evidence sufficient to delineate the conspiracy and corroborate the declarant's and the defendant's roles in it."¹³⁶ As to the third element, "[a] statement is in furtherance of a conspiracy if it is intended to promote the objectives of the conspiracy."¹³⁷ A statement is in furtherance, for instance, if it describes for the benefit of a co-conspirator the status of the scheme, its participants, or its methods.¹³⁸ Bragging, or "mere idle chatter or casual conversation about past events," however, are not considered statements in furtherance of a conspiracy.¹³⁹

Under some circumstances, evidence admissible under the hearsay rule may nevertheless be inadmissible because of Sixth Amendment restrictions. The Sixth Amendment provides, among other things, that "[i]n all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right ... to be confronted with the witnesses against him." The provision was inspired in part by reactions to the trial of Sir Walter Raleigh, who argued in vain that he should be allowed to confront the alleged co-conspirator who had accused him of treason.¹⁴⁰ Given its broadest possible construction, the confrontation clause would eliminate any hearsay exceptions or limitations.¹⁴¹ The Supreme Court in *Crawford v. Washington* explained, however, that the clause has a more precise reach. The clause uses the word "witnesses" to bring within its scope only those who testify or whose accusations are made in a testimonial context. In a testimonial context, the confrontation clause permits use at trial of prior testimonial accusations only if the witness is unavailable and only if the accused had the opportunity to cross examine him when the testimony was taken.¹⁴² The Court elected to "leave for another day any effort to spell out a comprehensive definition of 'testimonial,'"¹⁴³ but has suggested that the term includes "affidavits, depositions, prior testimony, or confessions [,and other] statements that were made under circumstances which would lead an objective witness reasonably to believe that the statement would be available for use at a later trial."¹⁴⁴

¹³⁵ *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d at 335; *United States v. Dowdell*, 595 F.3d 50, 74 (1st Cir. 2010).

¹³⁶ *United States v. Mitchell*, 596 F.3d at 23; *United States v. Liera*, 585 F.3d 1237, 1245-246 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Benson*, 591 F.3d 491, 502 (6th Cir. 2010).

¹³⁷ *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d at 338; *United States v. Flores*, 572 F.3d at 1264.

¹³⁸ *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d at 338; *United States v. Alviar*, 573 F.3d 526, 545 (7th Cir. 2009) ("In conspiracy cases statements that are part of the information flow between conspirators intended to help each perform his role satisfy the 'in furtherance' requirement of Rule 801(d)(2)(E)"); *United States v. Flores*, 572 F.3d at 1264.

¹³⁹ *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d at 338.

¹⁴⁰ *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. 36, 44, 52 (2004) ("One of Raleigh's trial judges later lamented that the justice of England has never been so degraded and injured as by the condemnation of Sir Walter Raleigh. Through a series of statutory and judicial reforms, English law developed a right of confrontation that limited these abuses.... Raleigh's trial has long been thought as a paradigmatic confrontation violation").

¹⁴¹ "If taken literally, the Clause would bar all hearsay, or at least all hearsay uttered by a declarant unavailable for examination at trial," Trachtenberg, *Coconspirator*, "Coventurers," and the Exception Swallowing the Hearsay Rule, 61 HASTINGS LAW JOURNAL 581, 637 (2010).

¹⁴² *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. at 68 ("Where nontestimonial hearsay is at issue, it is wholly consistent with the Framers' design to afford the States [and Congress] flexibility in their development of hearsay law ... as would an approach that exempted such statements from Confrontation Clause scrutiny altogether. Where testimonial evidence is at issue, however, the Sixth Amendment demands what the common law required: unavailability and a prior opportunity for cross-examination").

¹⁴³ *Id.*

¹⁴⁴ *Melendez-Diaz v. Massachusetts*, 129 S.Ct. 2527, 2531 (2009), quoting *Crawford v. Washington*, 541 U.S. at 51-2 (2004).

Since *Crawford*, the lower federal courts have generally held that the confrontation clause poses no obstacle to the admissibility of the co-conspirator statements at issue in the cases before them, either because the statements were not testimonial;¹⁴⁵ were not offered to establish the truth of the asserted statement;¹⁴⁶ or because the clause does not bar co-conspirator declarations generally.¹⁴⁷

Author Contact Information

Charles Doyle
Senior Specialist in American Public Law
cdoyle@crs.loc.gov, 7-6968

¹⁴⁵ *United States v. Hyles*, 521 F.3d 946, 960 (8th Cir. 2008) (“Neither ... were ... formal statements, nor were [the] statements elicited in response to government interrogation. In other words, they did not bear testimony. Therefore, *Crawford* is inapplicable”); *United States v. Spotted Elk*, 548 F.3d 641, 662 (8th Cir. 2008) (“Blue Bird’s reported utterance was not a statement of fact, but a proposal of a future course of action (i.e., what to say in the future), uttered not to any official, but to a co-defendant. Blue Bird’s reported words were not testimonial, and therefore Frogg’s account of them could not have violated Spotted Elk’s Sixth Amendment rights”); *United States v. US Infrastructure, Inc.*, 576 F.3d 1195, 1209 (11th Cir. 2009) (“Given that McNair’s statement to Dawson was part of a private conversation, it is ‘nontestimonial’ within the meaning of *Crawford*, and *Crawford*’s strict Confrontation Clause requirements do not apply”).

¹⁴⁶ *United States v. Cesareo-Ayala*, 576 F.3d 1120, 1127-128 (10th Cir. 2009) (“The government contends that Mendez’ statements in the two conversations are not hearsay and do not implicate the Confrontation Clause because they were not offered in evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted. We agree”); *United States v. Brown*, 560 F.3d 754, 765 (8th Cir. 2009) (“Because Williams’s statement was not admitted for the truth of the matter asserted, it does not implicate the confrontation clause”).

¹⁴⁷ *United States v. Hargrove*, 508 F.3d 445, 449 (7th Cir. 2007) (“Under Rule 801(d)(2)(E) the statements of coconspirators made during the course and in furtherance of the conspiracy are considered admissions by a party opponent and are not hearsay. The use of this sort of evidence does not implicate the Confrontation Clause”); *United States v. Singh*, 494 F.3d 653, 659 (8th Cir. 2007) (“[C]o-conspirators’ statements made in furtherance of a conspiracy and admitted under Rule 801(d)(2)(E) are generally non-testimonial and, therefore, do not violate the Confrontation Clause as interpreted by the Supreme Court”); but see *United States v. Warman*, 578 F.3d 320, 346 (6th Cir. 2009) (“[S]tatements of a confidential informant are testimonial in nature and therefore, may not be offered by the government to establish the guilt of an accused absent an opportunity for the accused to cross-examine the informant”).