

**SUGGESTED REVISIONS TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE POLICY CONCERNING
WAIVER OF CORPORATE ATTORNEY-CLIENT AND WORK PRODUCT
PROTECTIONS**

**PREPARED BY THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION TASK FORCE ON
ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE**

FEBRUARY 10, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Heads of Department Components
United States Attorneys

FROM:

DATE:

RE: Guidelines for Determining “Timely and Voluntary Disclosure of Wrongdoing
and Willingness to Cooperate”

This Memorandum amends and supplements the October 21, 2005 memorandum issued by Acting Deputy Attorney General Robert D. McCallum, Jr. (“*McCallum Memorandum*”) concerning Waiver of the Corporate Attorney-Client and Work Product Protections. In general, the *McCallum Memorandum* requires establishment of a review process for federal prosecutors to follow before seeking waivers of these protections. The *McCallum Memorandum* also notes the Department of Justice that “places significant emphasis on prosecution of corporate crimes.”

This Memorandum also amends and supplements the Department’s policy on charging business organizations set forth in the memorandum issued by Deputy Attorney General Larry D. Thompson to Heads of Department Components and United States Attorneys, *Re: Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations* (Jan. 20, 2003) (hereinafter “*Thompson Memorandum*”), reprinted in *United States Attorneys’ Manual*, tit. 9, Crim. Resource Manual, §§ 161-62. As noted in the *McCallum Memorandum*, one of the nine (9) factors that was identified for federal prosecutors to consider under the *Thompson Memorandum* (§ II.A.4.) is “the corporation’s timely and voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and its willingness to cooperate in the investigation of its agents, including, if necessary, the waiver of corporate attorney-client and work product protection.”

In particular, this Memorandum amends the *Thompson Memorandum* by striking the following portion of § II.A.4.: “...including, if necessary, the waiver of corporate attorney-client and work product protection.” As amended, § II.A.4. directs that federal prosecutors consider

Attachment B

“...the corporation’s timely and voluntary disclosure of wrongdoing and its willingness to cooperate in the investigation of its agents.”

This Memorandum also amends § VI.A. of the *Thompson Memorandum* by striking the last clause: “...and to waive attorney-client and work product protection;” and by striking the word “complete” from the third clause preceding “results of its internal investigation.” As amended, that sentence of § VI.A. states: “In gauging the extent of the corporation’s cooperation, the prosecutor may consider the corporation’s willingness to identify the culprits within the corporation, including senior executives; to make witnesses available; and to disclose the results of its internal investigation.”

This Memorandum also amends § VI.B. by striking the fourth paragraph and adding language in its place that recognizes the importance of the attorney-client and work product protections and the adverse consequences that may occur when attorneys within the Department of Justice seek the waiver of these protections. As amended, the fourth paragraph of § VI.B. states:

“The Department of Justice recognizes that the attorney-client privilege and the work-product doctrine are fundamental to the American legal system and the administration of justice. These rights are no less important for an organizational entity than for an individual. The Department further recognizes that an attorney may be an effective advocate for a client, and best promote the client’s compliance with the law, only when the client is confident that its communications with counsel are protected from unwanted disclosure and when the attorney can prepare for litigation knowing that materials prepared in anticipation of litigation will be protected from disclosure to the client’s adversaries. *See Upjohn Co. v. United States*, 449 U.S. 383, 392-393 (1981). The Department further recognizes that seeking waiver of the attorney-client privilege or work-product doctrine in the context of an ongoing Department investigation may have adverse consequences for the organizational entity. A waiver might impede communications between the entity’s counsel and its employees and unfairly prejudice the entity in private civil litigation or parallel administrative or regulatory proceedings and thereby bring unwarranted harm to its innocent public shareholders and employees. *See also* § IX (Collateral Consequences). Attorneys within the Department shall not take any action or assert any position that directly or indirectly demands, requests or encourages an organizational entity or its attorneys to waive its attorney-client privilege or the protections of the work product doctrine. Also, in assessing an entity’s cooperation, attorneys within the Department shall not draw any inference from the entity’s preservation of its attorney-client privilege and the protections of the work product doctrine. At the same time, the voluntary decision by an organizational entity to waive the attorney-client privilege and the work product doctrine shall not be

considered when assessing whether the entity provided effective cooperation.”¹

Section VI. of the *Thompson Memorandum* is further amended and supplemented by adding new subpart C. that states:

“C. In assessing whether an organizational entity has been cooperative under § II.A.4. and § VI.B., attorneys within the Department should take into account the following factors:

“1. Whether the entity has identified for and provided to attorneys within the Department all relevant data and documents created during and bearing upon the events under investigation other than those entitled to protection under the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

“2. Whether the entity has in good faith assisted attorneys within the Department in gaining an understanding of the data, documents and facts relating to, arising from and bearing upon the matter under investigation, in a manner that does not require disclosure of materials protected by the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

“3. Whether the entity has identified for attorneys within the Department the individuals with knowledge bearing on the events under investigation.

“4. Whether the entity has used its best efforts to make such individuals available to attorneys within the Department for interview or other appropriate investigative steps.²

“5. Whether the entity has conducted a thorough internal investigation of the matter, as appropriate to the circumstances, reported on the investigation to the Board of Directors or appropriate committee of the Board, or to the appropriate governing body within the entity, and has made the results of the investigation available to attorneys within the Department in

¹ Notwithstanding the general rule set forth herein, attorneys within the Department may, after obtaining in advance the approval of the Assistant Attorney General of the Criminal Division or his designee, seek materials otherwise protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine if the organization asserts, or indicates that it will assert an advice of counsel defense with respect to the matters under investigation. Moreover, attorneys within the Department also may seek materials respecting which there is a final judicial determination that the privilege or doctrine does not apply for any reason, such as the crime/fraud exception or a waiver. In circumstances described in this paragraph, the attorneys within the Department shall limit their requests for disclosure only to those otherwise protected materials reasonably necessary and which are within the scope of the particular exception.

² Actions by an entity recognizing the rights of such individuals are not inconsistent with this factor.

a manner that does not result in a waiver of the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine.

“6. Whether the entity has taken appropriate steps to terminate any improper conduct of which it has knowledge; to discipline or terminate culpable employees; to remediate the effects of any improper conduct; and to ensure that the organization has safeguards in place to prevent and detect a recurrence of the events giving rise to the investigation.”