



U.S. Department of Justice

Criminal Division

Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section

Washington, D.C. 20530

POLICY DIRECTIVE 15-3

TO: Heads of Department Components
United States Attorneys

FROM: M. Kendall Day, Chief *MKD*
Asset Forfeiture and Money *3/3/15*
Laundering Section

SUBJECT: Guidance Regarding the Use of Asset Forfeiture Authorities in Connection with Structuring Offenses

Title 31, United States Code, Section 5324(a) prohibits evasion of certain currency transaction-reporting and record-keeping requirements, including structuring schemes. Generally speaking, structuring occurs when, instead of conducting a single transaction in currency in an amount that would require a report to be filed or record made by a domestic financial institution, the violator conducts a series of currency transactions, willfully keeping each individual transaction at an amount below applicable thresholds to evade reporting or recording. On October 17, 2014, the Internal Revenue Service-Criminal Investigation (IRS-CI) issued guidance on how it will conduct seizures and forfeitures in its structuring cases, and specifically in what it calls “legal source” structuring cases. Pursuant to the IRS guidance, IRS-CI will not pursue seizure and forfeiture of funds associated only with “legal source” structuring unless: (1) there are exceptional circumstances justifying the seizure and forfeiture and (2) the case is approved by the Director of Field Operations.

As part of the Department’s ongoing review of the federal asset forfeiture program, the Department has conducted its own review of forfeiture in structuring cases, including analysis of the new IRS-CI policy. The guidance set forth in this memorandum, which is the result of that review, is intended to ensure that our investigative resources are appropriately and effectively allocated to address the most serious structuring offenses, consistent with Departmental priorities. The guidance applies to all federal seizures for civil or criminal forfeiture based on a violation of the structuring statute, except those occurring after an indictment or other criminal charging instrument has been filed.¹

¹ These guidelines apply to all structuring activity whether it constitutes “imperfect structuring” chargeable under 31 U.S.C. § 5324(a)(1) or “perfect structuring” chargeable under 31 U.S.C. § 5324(a)(3). See *Charging Imperfect Structuring: 31 U.S.C. § 5324(a)(1) or (a)(3) or Both?*, Money Laundering Monitor, at 1 (Oct.-Dec. 2014) (available at [AFMLS Online](#)).

Subject: Guidance Regarding the Use of Asset Forfeiture Authorities in Connection with Structuring Offenses

1. Link to Prior or Anticipated Criminal Activity

If no criminal charge has been filed and a prosecutor has not obtained the approval identified below, a prosecutor shall not move to seize structured funds unless there is probable cause that the structured funds were generated by unlawful activity or that the structured funds were intended for use in, or to conceal or promote, ongoing or anticipated unlawful activity. For these purposes, “unlawful activity” includes instances in which the investigation revealed no known legitimate source for the funds being structured. Also for these purposes, the term “anticipated unlawful activity” does not include future Title 26 offenses. The basis for linking the structured funds to additional unlawful activity must receive appropriate supervisory approval and be memorialized in the prosecutor’s records.²

Where the requirements of the above paragraph are not satisfied, unless criminal charges are filed, a warrant to seize structured funds may be sought from the court only upon approval from an appropriate official, as follows:

- For AUSAs, approval must be obtained from their respective U.S. Attorney. The U.S. Attorney may not delegate this approval authority.³
- For Criminal Division trial attorneys or other Department components not partnering with a U.S. Attorney’s Office, approval must be obtained from the Chief of the Asset Forfeiture and Money Laundering Section (AFMLS). The Chief of AFMLS may not delegate this approval authority.

The U.S. Attorney or Chief of AFMLS may grant approval if there is a compelling law enforcement reason to seek a warrant, including, but not limited to, reasons such as: serial evasion of the reporting or record keeping requirements; the causing of domestic financial institutions to file false or incomplete reports; and violations committed, or aided and abetted, by persons who are owners, officers, directors or employees of domestic financial institutions.

If the U.S. Attorney or Chief of AFMLS approves the warrant, the prosecutor must send a completed “Structuring Warrant Notification Form” to AFMLS by e-mail at AFMLS.Structuring@usdoj.gov. A copy of that form is attached.

These requirements are effective immediately. For any case in which seizure was effected prior to the issuance of this memorandum, the forfeiture may continue so long as it otherwise comports with all other applicable law and Department policy.

² In order to avoid prematurely revealing the existence of the investigation of the additional unlawful activity to the investigation’s targets, there is no requirement that the evidence linking the structured funds to the additional unlawful activity be memorialized in the seizure warrant application.

³ Although this authority is ordinarily non-delegable, if the U.S. Attorney is recused from a matter or absent from the office, the U.S. Attorney may designate an Acting United States Attorney to exercise this authority, in the manner prescribed by regulation. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 0.136.

Subject: Guidance Regarding the Use of Asset Forfeiture Authorities in Connection with Structuring Offenses

2. No Intent to Structure

There may be instances in which a prosecutor properly obtains a seizure warrant but subsequently determines that there is insufficient admissible evidence to prevail at either civil or criminal trial for violations of the structuring statute or another federal crime for which forfeiture of the seized assets is authorized. In such cases, within seven (7) days of reaching this conclusion, the prosecutor must direct the seizing agency to return the full amount of the seized money. Once directed, the seizing agency will promptly initiate the process to return the seized funds.

3. 150-Day Deadline

Within 150 days of seizure based on structuring, if a prosecutor has not obtained the approval discussed below, a prosecutor must either file a criminal indictment or a civil complaint against the asset.⁴ The criminal charge or civil complaint can be based on an offense other than structuring. If no criminal charge or civil complaint is filed within 150 days of seizure, then the prosecutor must direct the seizing agency to return the full amount of the seized money to the person from whom it was seized by no later than the close of the 150-day period. Once directed, the seizing agency will promptly initiate the process to return the seized funds.

With the written consent of the claimant, the prosecutor can extend the 150-day deadline by 60 days. Further extensions, even with consent of the claimant, are not allowed, unless the prosecutor has obtained the approval discussed below.

An exception to this requirement is permissible only upon approval from an appropriate official as follows:

- For AUSAs, approval must be obtained from their respective U.S. Attorney. The U.S. Attorney may not delegate this approval authority, except as discussed in footnote 3, *supra*.
- For Criminal Division trial attorneys or other Department components not partnering with a U.S. Attorney's Office, approval must be obtained from the Chief of AFMLS. The Chief of AFMLS may not delegate this approval authority.

If additional evidence becomes available after the seized money has been returned, an indictment or complaint can still be filed.

4. Settlement

Settlements to forfeit and/or return a portion of any funds involved in a structuring investigation, civil action, or prosecution, must comply with the requirements set forth in the *Asset Forfeiture Policy Manual* and the *United States Attorneys' Manual*. See *Asset Forfeiture*

⁴ This deadline does not apply to administrative cases governed by the independent time limits specified by the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act.

Subject: Guidance Regarding the Use of Asset Forfeiture Authorities in Connection with Structuring Offenses

Policy Manual (2013), Chap. 3; *United States Attorneys' Manual* § 9-113.000 *et seq.* In addition, settlements must be in writing, include all material terms, and be signed by a federal prosecutor. Informal settlements, including those negotiated between law enforcement and private parties, are expressly prohibited.

This memorandum is intended solely as a guide to the exercise of investigative and prosecutorial discretion, and does not alter in any way the Department's authority to enforce federal law. Neither the guidance herein nor any state or local law provides a legal defense to a violation of federal law, including any civil or criminal violation of 31 U.S.C. § 5324(a). This memorandum is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any rights, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any matter civil or criminal. It applies prospectively to the exercise of prosecutorial discretion in future cases and does not provide defendants or subjects of enforcement action with a basis for reconsideration of any pending civil action or criminal prosecution.