

Investigating and Auditing Public Corruption and Employee Integrity Matters

Kim R. Widup

U.S. Marshal/Senior Special Agent (Retired)

Instructor



W I D U P
C O N S U L T I N G

Kim R. Widup, Partner
U.S. Marshal Retired

widupconsulting@comcast.net

(312) 446-1568

Widup Consulting, LLC

Thomas Jefferson, Third U.S. President and Author of the Declaration
of Independence

*"FOR HERE WE ARE NOT AFRAID TO FOLLOW TRUTH
WHEREVER IT MAY LEAD..."*

The “Audigator” or the “Invest- auditor” In the Public Corruption World

- It does not matter the title, but it is important to understand the roles of both disciplines when you are part of an Inspectors General Office involved in investigating/auditing of a public corruption (PC) matter
- Many of this nations most significant PC investigations have originated as an audit
- An auditor can have a significant impact on a case if they understand some of the basic needs for an investigation and an investigator needs to understand the audit process
- An investigator and auditor working in concert with each other does not mean that an investigator takes all their financial records and delivers them to the auditor and says “analyze these records, make me a spread sheet, and then give it back when you are done so I understand where all the money flowed and I can lock my guy up”
- Conversely an investigator needs to look at what are the weaknesses in a program, regulation, procedure, etc., that an auditor can incorporate into an audit in order to recommend and effect change into the way the agency does their business

Tools of the Trade

- Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) Quality Standards for Investigations
– November 2011
- GAO Government Auditing Standards – August 2011
- CIGIE Quality Standards for Inspection and Evaluation
– January 2012
- CIGIE Website – www.ignet.gov

Sources of Information

- FINCEN - <http://www.fincen.gov/> can obtain Currency Transaction Reports (CTR) and Suspicious Activity Reports (SAR) for you to use in your investigation. CTR reports are for over \$10K and SAR reports are for aggregate of \$5K
- For Inspectors General - your agency records, available upon demand or by coordinating with the IG of the agency responsible for the records
- Your colleagues IG agency records, if appropriate, are also available upon demand
- NCIC/NLETS, CLEAR, TECS, etc., - know all you can about your subjects
- Americans for Effective Law Enforcement (AELE) data base, housed in Chicago at <http://www.aele.org/index.htm>

Sources of Information (Con't)

- Federal law enforcement agencies (in no particular order)
 - USMS – prisoner and warrant records (JADIS, WIN, PTS)
 - Office of Inspectors General – all Departments and many agencies
 - BOP – inmate records
 - JTTF – Intelligence records (even from the Intel community)
 - DEA – EPIC and others
 - USSS – TAVIS and others
 - US State Dept. – transactions, vouchers, etc.
 - USDA, HUD, DHHS, etc. – benefit records
 - BATFE – gun tracing, explosives, etc.
 - FBI – SPIN records, 302s, Intel, etc.
 - FAA – Aircraft, pilot licensing
 - ICE – Immigration records, TECS for entry into the country, FINS, etc.
 - IRS records – if you can meet the need

Sources of Information (Con't)

- National Internal Affairs Investigators Association (NIAIA) at <http://niaia.us/>
- DOJ – US Attorney’s Manual (USAM) – describes elements of a crime and more. Helps an investigator to know the prosecutors prosecutorial guides (playbook), http://www.justice.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usam/
- Google and other search engines - Zabasearch.com, Paladium.net, etc.
- Web Quick Links Guide for the Intelligence Analyst
- Guide – What to do if the subject of an OIG Investigation
- Financial Disclosure Statements both Public and Confidential
- Private data bases – Choice Point, Accurint, Lexus Nexus and more

**AELE – Americans for Effective Law Enforcement
Chicago, IL**

www.aele.org

Widup Consulting, LLC

C130 and P-3 Orion Aerial Firefighting Aircraft

Investigation was generated from an audit and questioned the “Historic Exchange” and use of 24 C-130 A and 6 P-3 Orions as contract aircraft to the Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

US DOJ Audit of the USMS Protection of the Federal Judiciary and United States Attorneys

An audit is a powerful and important tool, but the auditor and the audit command staff have to always know and think about where will the final report land and who will have the opportunity to obtain and/or read it

The Allegation(s)

- What is the allegation(s) and who does it involve
- What is the source and is it credible –and in the public corruption world what is the motive of the complaint
- Early on involvement of command structure and prosecutorial support
- Who knows - is it in the public arena
- Disclosure and Press Strategy
- Fighting “information is power”
- Action plan/investigative strategy
- In house or outside investigation – pros and cons

Which state is the most crooked Illinois or Louisiana?

While it seems like it must be Illinois - according to NBC News (as reported by the New York Times) - it is actually Florida with the highest number of guilty officials. If you compare the number of politicians to constituents the honor goes to North Dakota. The most honest is Nebraska.

Illinois Political Corruption Scorecard

- On the corruption scorecard, Illinois has seen more than 1,000 public officials and businessmen convicted of political corruption since 1971. They include 30 Chicago aldermen and four of the eight last governors.
- Source: <http://www.nbcchicago.com/blogs/ward-room/Will-Blagos-Sentence-Deter-Illinois-Corruption-135241743.html#ixzz1g05wGeiF>

Potential Violations

Criminal and Civil

- Violations of state criminal law
- Violations of federal criminal law
- Administrative violations
- Civil violations
- Law suits
- Public's "right to know"

State of Illinois Potential Public Corruption Criminal Offenses

- Conspiracy – 720 ILCS 5/8-2
- Conspiracy against Civil Rights – 720 ILCS 5/8-2.1
- Attempt – 720 ILCS 5/8-4
- Intimidation – 720 ILCS 5/12-6
- Compelling organization membership of persons – 720 ILCS 5/12-6.1
- Compelling confession or information by force or threat – 720 ILCS 5/12-7
- Stalking – 720 ILCS 5/12-7.3
- Cyberstalking – 720 ILCS 5/12-7.5
- Threatening public officials – 720 ILCS 5/12-10
- Deception – 720 ILCS 5/15-4

Illinois Crimes (Con't)

- Threat (property) - 720 ILCS 5/15-5
- Obtain (prop) - 720 ILCS 5/15-7
- Obtains control (prop) - 720 ILCS 5/15-8
- Governmental property - 720 ILCS 5/15-10
- Theft (including by deception) - 720 ILCS 5/16-1
- Computer Tampering - 720 ILCS 5/16-D3
- Deceptive Practices - 720 ILCS 5/17-1
- False Personation; use of title; solicitation; certain entities – 720 ILCS 5/17-2

Illinois Crimes (Con't)

- Forgery - 720 ILCS 5/17-3
- State Benefits Fraud - 720 ILCS 5/17-6
- Fraudulent schemes and artifices (wire and mail fraud) - 720 ILCS 5/17-24
- Commercial bribery - 720 ILCS 5/29A-1
- Commercial bribe receiving - 720 ILCS 5/29A-2
- Obstructing justice - 720 ILCS 5/31-4
- Obstructing identification - 720 ILCS 5/31-4.5
- Compounding a crime - 720 ILCS 5/32-1
- Perjury - 720 ILCS 5/32-2

Illinois Crimes (Con't)

- Subornation of perjury - 720 ILCS 5/32-3
- Communicating with jurors and witnesses - 720 ILCS 5/32-4
- Tampering with public records - 720 ILCS 5/32-8
- Bribery (o/m) - 720 ILCS 5/33-1
- Failure to report a bribe (o/m) 720 ILCS 5/33-2
- Official misconduct - 720 ILCS 5/33-3

Illinois Crimes (Con't)

- Solicitation misconduct (State gov) – 720 ILCS 5/33-3.1
- Fraud on governmental entity - 720 ILCS 5/46-1.1
- Conspiracy to commit fraud - 720 ILCS 5/46-3
- Organizer of an aggravated fraud conspiracy - 720 ILCS 5/46-4

Potential Federal Corruption Offenses

- Principals (aka aiding and abetting) – 18 USC 2
- Accessory after the fact – 18 USC 3
- Misprision of a felony – 18 USC 4
- Assaulting, resisting or impeding certain officers or employees – 18 USC 111
- Protection of individuals performing certain official duties – 18 USC 119

Federal Offenses – Con't

- Concealment of assets, false oaths and claims; bribery (bankruptcy) – 18 USC 152
- Embezzlement against estate – 18 USC 153
- Bribery of public officials and witnesses – 18 USC 201
- Restrictions on former officers, employees and elected officials of the executive and legislative branches – 18 USC 207
- Acts affecting a personal financial interest – 18 USC 208
- Salary of Government officials and employees payable only by the United States – 18 USC 209
- Offer to procure appointive public office – 18 USC 210
- Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals – 18 USC 219

Federal Offenses – Con't

- Conspiracy against rights – 18 USC 241
- Deprivation of rights under color of law – 18 USC 242
- Conspiracy to defraud the Government with respect to claims – 18 USC 286
- False, fictitious or fraudulent claims – 18 USC 287
- Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States – 18 USC 371
- Conspiracy to impede or injure officer – 18 USC 372
- Public money, property or records (theft) – 18 USC 641
- Lending, credit and insurance institutions – 18 USC 657
- Property mortgaged or pledged to farm credit agencies – 18 USC 658
- Interstate or foreign shipments by carrier; state prosecutions – 18 USC 659
- Theft or bribery concerning programs receiving Federal funds – 18 USC 666
- “Smokey Bear” character or name – 18 USC 711

Federal Offenses – Con't

- Mailing threatening communications – 18 USC 876
- Making extortionate extensions of credit – 18 USC 892
- Statements or entries generally (false statements) – 18 USC 1001
- Possession of false papers to defraud the United States – 18 USC 1003
- Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information – 18 USC 1028
- Fraud and related activity in connection with access devices – 18 USC 1029
- Fraud and related activity in connection with computers – 18 USC 1030
- Major fraud against the United States – 18 USC 1031
- Mail fraud – 18 USC 1341
- Fictitious address – 18 USC 1342
- Fraud by wire, radio or television – 18 USC 1343

Federal Offenses – Con't

- Tampering with a witness, victim or an informant – 18 USC 1512
- Retaliating against a witness, victim or informant – 18 USC 1513
- Perjury generally – 18 USC 1621
- Subornation of perjury – 18 USC 1622
- False declarations before grand jury or court – 18 USC 1623
- Video voyeurism – 18 USC 1801
- Disclosure of confidential information generally – 18 USC 1905
- Interference with commerce by threats or violence – 18 USC 1951
- Laundering of monetary instruments – 18 USC 1956
- Engaging in monetary transactions in property derived from specified unlawful activity – 18 USC 1957
- Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) – 18 USC 1961/1962

Formal Notification Procedure

- Procedure developed up front
- Follow procedure
- If deviation, document why
- When will you notify target
- When will you notify prosecutor
- Outside sources (feds, other agencies, etc.)
- If Police officer – Uniform Peace Officers Disciplinary Act in play (50 ILCS 725)

Investigative Plan

- Written and approved
- Allegation/Subjects/Venue
- Early Prosecutorial Involvement
- Background (LEADS, files, etc.)
- Supervisory Notification
- Plan and Modifications

Workplace Searches and Authorities

- Search of an Employees Desk
- Search of a computer
- Search Warrant/Consent
- Subpoenas (Grand Jury, Trial, Administrative)

Types of Warnings

Law enforcement officers and other public employees who are interviewed in an investigatory or adversary setting should be advised of the nature of the inquiry.

- If the inquiry is administrative or disciplinary, the **Garrity Warning** is commonly given. Police officers who are interviewed in a disciplinary setting should be warned that they are under investigation for violation of departmental rules, that they are obligated to give statements for internal purposes, and these answers may not be used against them in a criminal proceeding. Garrity v. New Jersey, 385 U.S. 493, 87 S.Ct. 616 (1967)
- If the inquiry is criminal and the officer is under arrest or in custody, the **Miranda Warning** should be given
- If the inquiry is criminal but the officer is not under arrest, the **Reverse Garrity Warning** or **Beckwith Warning** is more appropriate

DISCIPLINARY INTERVIEW ADVICE OF RIGHTS (SAMPLE GARRITY WARNING)

- You are being questioned as part of an official investigation of the Police Department. You will be asked questions specifically directed and narrowly related to the performance of your official duties or fitness for office
- You are entitled to all the rights and privileges guaranteed by the laws and the constitution of this state and the Constitution of the United States, including the right not to be compelled to incriminate yourself (and to have an attorney of your choice present during questioning)*
- If you refuse to testify or to answer questions relating to the performance of your official duties or fitness for duty, you will be subject to departmental charges which would result in your dismissal from the Police Department
- If you do answer, neither your statements nor any information or evidence which is gained by reason of such statements can be used against you in any subsequent criminal proceeding. However, these statements may be used against you in relation to subsequent departmental charges

The (*) asterisk above calls attention to the words appearing in brackets. Some courts have held that there is no "right" to counsel at a disciplinary interview.

REVERSE GARRITY WARNING (D.C. POLICE VERSION)

- You are not under arrest. You are suspected of _____. I am going to advise you of your right as established by the Supreme Court in the cases of Miranda v. Arizona and Garrity v. New Jersey.
- You have the right to remain silent. You are not required to say anything at any time or to answer any questions. If you do make a statement or answer questions, anything you say can be used against you in a court of law
- You have the right to talk to a lawyer for advice before making a statement or answering any questions and you may have a lawyer present with you during questioning if you wish. If you do want a lawyer but cannot afford one, a lawyer will be provided for you. If you want to answer questions now without a lawyer present, you still have the right to stop answering at anytime. You also have the right to stop answering at any time until you talk to a lawyer
- Even though you are an employee of the Police Department and ordinarily you would be required by regulations to answer questions put forth to you by a superior officer regarding your official duties, in this instance those regulations did not apply, and you will not be required to answer. If you do not wish to answer any of these questions, your refusal to answer alone will not subject you to disciplinary action by the Police Department

REVERSE GARRITY WARNING (D.C. POLICE VERSION –Con't)

- Do you understand that I want to question you about criminal matters?
- Do you understand that you do not have to make a statement or answer any questions?
- Do you understand that if you do make a statement or answer questions, anything you say which incriminates you may be used against you in a court of law?
- Do you understand that you have the right to talk to a lawyer and have one present during questioning?
- Do you understand that if you do not wish to make a statement or answer questions, your desire to remain silent alone will not subject you to disciplinary action by the Police Department?
- Do you have any questions concerning the rights I have just explained to you?
- Do you wish to talk to a lawyer?
- Do you wish to answer questions at this time?

Warnings - Con't

Note: Some lawyers have called the Garrity Warning a Reverse Garrity Warning. If the warning informs an employee that he or she must answer questions or face disciplinary action, it is a Garrity Warning. The above Reverse Garrity Warning is given when a voluntary statement is sought and the employee is not in custody; the answers would be admissible in a criminal prosecution.

BECKWITH WARNING **

Anything you say may be used against you as evidence later in an administrative proceeding or any future criminal proceeding involving you. If you refuse to answer the questions posed to you on the grounds that the answer may incriminate you, you cannot be discharged solely for remaining silent. However, your silence can be considered in an administrative proceeding for its evidentiary value that is warranted by the facts surrounding your case.

** This warning, based on Beckwith v. U.S., 425 U.S. 341, 96 S.Ct. 1612, 1976 U.S. Lexis 147 (1976), was adopted by the Federal Services Impasses Panel in Treasury, Bur. of Engrv. v. C-201 NTEU, #99 FSIP 96, 1999 FSIP Lexis 41.

The Beckwith case did not mandate warnings; the 8-1 ruling simply held that a criminal suspect, who was interviewed in his home but not placed under arrest, was not entitled to receive the Miranda warnings.

Kalkines Warning

The *Kalkines* warning is an advisement of rights usually administered federal agents to federal employees and contractors in internal investigations. The *Kalkines* warning compels suspects to make statements or be fired, but also provides suspects with criminal immunity for their statements.

Sample Warning

- You will be asked a number of specific questions concerning your official duties, and you must answer these questions to the best of your ability.
- Failure to answer completely and truthfully may result in disciplinary action, including dismissal.
- Your answers and any information derived from them may be used against you in administrative proceedings.
- However, neither your answers nor any information derived from them may be used against you in criminal proceedings, except if you knowingly and willfully make false statements.

Kalkines Warning- Con't NCIS Example

The Kalkines Supreme Court case forms the basis for the grant of immunity for civilian employees. U.S. Attorneys have authority to grant immunity to civilian personnel. Contact a U.S. Attorney through the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS).

The interviewee:

- May be directed to answer questions or face discipline for refusal to follow direction of supervisor or for failure to cooperate with the investigation.
- No longer has the right to attorney being present.
- May be prosecuted for perjury.
- May face administrative disciplinary actions for underlying offense based on statement.

Elements of the Offense and Applicable Statutes

- Use the U.S. Attorney's Manual as a guide or similar States Attorney Manual if it exists
- Make sure you have all the elements
- Provide sample indictment or complaint
- Don't overreach
- Cite the offense and list the proof

The Prosecutor's "Playbook"

Like all prosecutors, an independent counsel or states attorney can call on a number of techniques and strategies to win indictments and cooperation. A list of some of those techniques follows. Defense lawyers often play their part in the drama by pointing to such methods as examples of prosecutorial excess.

- **"Squeezing and flipping"** -- The prosecutor's classic method of targeting underlings and insiders, securing their cooperation and then "moving up the chain" to the investigation's primary target. Little fish are often traded for big fish, and not the other way around.
- **Charging lesser offenses (a.k.a. "The Al Capone-on-Tax-Evasion Strategy")** -- Prosecuting officials for an offense that is easier to prove than the primary allegations. A popular example: charging targets with false statements on financial disclosures, security clearance forms, or even mortgage applications.
- **Multiplying minor charges** -- Adding minor but related counts to an indictment to increase pressure on a target. Example: an official's allegedly corrupt telephone conversations or fax transmissions are treated as "wire fraud" violations.

The Prosecutors "Playbook" (Cont)

- **Identifying adversaries** -- Searching for whistleblowers and others willing to offer information about a target. Informants may be located using records from prior court cases or employment complaints.
- **"Driving a wedge"** -- A hardball variant of the squeeze-and-flip, in which a son, wife or other family member is threatened with indictment to win guilty pleas or cooperation from a target.
- **Building subpoena pressure** -- Bringing numerous witnesses before a grand jury to breed uncertainty about who is and is not cooperating with government prosecutors, and thus encouraging all to talk.
- **"Collateral Consequences"** -- Reminding potential witnesses and others that corruption convictions can impact all aspects of one's private and professional life, including government pensions and professional licenses.

For more information on these techniques and common defenses employed against them, see the 1988 Department of Justice manual entitled *Prosecution of Public Corruption Cases.*

Comparison of DOJ Internal Affairs Units

(Source = components to DOJ IG, Evaluation and Inspections Division)

	USMS	ATF	DEA	FBI
Staff at the end of FY 2009	4,902	5,071	9,560	32,914
Misconduct allegations received	FY 2008 – 431 FY 2009 = 441	FY 2008 – 379 FY 2009 = 333	FY 2008 – 751 FY 2009 = 629	FY 2008 – 2,579 FY 2009 = 1,408
Investigations conducted by IA units	FY 2008 = 187 FY 2009 = 228	FY 2008 = 89 FY 2009 = 100	FY 2008 = 751 FY 2009 = 629	FY 2008 = 162 FY 2009 = 132
Number/type staff in IA Unit	10 = 7 Invest, 1 Supv and 2 Support	23 = 12 Invest, 3 Use of Force Inv, 3 Supv & 5 Suppt	52 = 29 Invest, 7 Supv and 16 Support	26 = 10 Invest, 4 Supv and 12 Support
Caseload of Inv.	40+ cases	10-15 cases	12 cases	7-8 cases

Offenses other than Criminal

- Code of Conduct
- General Orders
- Ethics Rules
- Policy Rules
- Civil Torts

Office of the Inspector General, USDA

Hotline Flyer

Typical of Cabinet Level Agencies

Widup Consulting, LLC

Final Report

- Know your reader
- Facts and not opinion
- Criminal or Civil or Administrative
- Or a combination thereof
- Distribution
- Will it be released to the public

Report of the Independent Counsel

U.S. Secretary of Agriculture

Washington, DC

Widup Consulting, LLC

Office of the Independent Counsel

Final Report

Monica Lewinsky et al.

Widup Consulting, LLC

Office of the Independent Counsel

Final Report

David Watkins and Hillary Clinton – Travel Office

Widup Consulting, LLC

Public Service is a Public Trust

Law Enforcement is the face of Public Service

Ronald Tellez
former Blue Island Illinois Police Officer

Convicted of First Degree Murder in a murder for hire scheme

Serving Life in Prison in the Illinois Department of Corrections

Former CPD Officer Joseph Miedzianowski

in December 1998, Chicago police officer Joseph Miedzianowski and 14 others were charged with running a drug distribution ring operating out of northwest Chicago. Described in the press as the most corrupt cop in Chicago's history, Miedzianowski was convicted in U.S. district court in April 2001. A year earlier, another investigation into a crooked law enforcement officer led to the arrest of William A. Hanhardt, a retired chief of detectives for the Chicago Police Department. In October 2000, he and five others were charged by a federal grand jury with masterminding a nationwide jewel theft ring – source FBI

Abraham Lincoln, American President

“LET THE PEOPLE KNOW THE TRUTH

AND THE COUNTRY IS SAFE “

The Independent Counsels during the Clinton Administration

Robert W. Ray – President William J. Clinton; Ralph Lancaster – Alexis Herman, Secretary of Labor; Carol Elder Bruce – Bruce Babbitt, Secretary of the Interior; Donald Smaltz – Alphonso Mike Espy, Secretary of Agriculture; Ken Starr – President William J. Clinton; and David Barrett - Henry Cisneros, Secretary of HUD

Former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture

Booking Photo

Washington, DC

Widup Consulting, LLC

Former Chief of Staff USDA

Booking Photo

Washington, DC

Widup Consulting, LLC

Former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture

With Willie Nelson

Security - Senior Special Agent Kim R. Widup

Widup Consulting, LLC

Trial of Secretary Alphonso “Mike” Espy

First criminal trial of a cabinet member since that of the Secretary of Interior Albert Fall in the Teapot Dome scandal (Harding Administration)

President Clinton

With Don Tyson, CEO, Tyson Foods, Inc.

And Friend

Widup Consulting, LLC

President Clinton and VP Gore

With John Tyson, President

Tyson Foods, Inc.

Widup Consulting, LLC

President Clinton

In Oval Office

With Secretary of Agriculture Mike Espy

Widup Consulting, LLC

President William Jefferson Clinton

How many books can be written about one person?

Over 50 on the investigation

President William Jefferson Clinton

And Monica Lewinsky, former White House Intern

Assistants to President Clinton

White House

Washington, DC

Widup Consulting, LLC

Deputy Assistants to President Clinton

White House

Washington, DC

Widup Consulting, LLC

New York Times Article on 12/27/2000 Meeting with President Clinton

Participants were:

President Clinton

David Kendall, Attorney

Nicole Seligman, Attorney

Beth Nolan, WH Counsel

Robert W. Ray, Independent Counsel

Keith Ausbrook, Deputy IC

Kim R. Widup, Chief of Inv.

White House Visit Set in Motion Clinton Deal to End Inquiry

By NELL A. LEWIS
Published January 24, 2001

Two days after Christmas, President Clinton sat in the White House Map Room and listened in silence as Robert W. Ray, the Whitewater independent counsel, outlined his conditions for ending the investigation into Mr. Clinton's relationship with Monica Lewinsky, lawyers familiar with the event recounted today.

Mr. Ray and two of his associates had visited the White House on a chilly evening to tell Mr. Clinton what he would have to do to avoid the possibility of indictment for his sworn statements about the Lewinsky relationship, said the lawyers, who provided the following detailed account of the meeting.

Mr. Clinton was told he would have to agree to three conditions. Mr. Ray, sitting across a polished wooden table, said the president would have to agree to some sanction, like the suspension of his law license; to make some statement admitting for the first time that he had testified falsely about his relationship; and to agree not to seek reimbursement for his legal fees as he was entitled to do if not indicted.

On Mr. Clinton's side of the table were David E. Kendall and Nicole K. Seligman, two of his private lawyers, and Beth Nolan, the White House counsel. When Mr. Ray and his two associates, Keith Ausbrook, the deputy independent counsel, and Kim Widup, the chief of investigations, were escorted into the room, there were formal handshakes and polite greetings all around, but no one feigned friendliness.

The meeting between the president and his principal legal adversary, first reported by Time magazine, was the beginning of a process that lasted weeks and culminated in an abrupt and complete settlement of the case last Friday, Mr. Clinton's last full day in office. Mr. Ray had requested the Dec. 27 meeting, in the words of one lawyer, "to set out the bare bones of a settlement."

During the 15-minute presentation, Mr. Clinton did not speak. Both sides had agreed there would be no negotiations at the meeting. No one asked questions and Mr. Ray did not explain his reasons for any of the conditions. Mr. Ray said it would be better to wrap up an agreement before Mr. Clinton left office. But he did not set a deadline for reaching an agreement.

Over the next several weeks, negotiations were conducted between lawyers. Mr. Clinton readily agreed to the suspension of his law license and to forgo reimbursement of legal fees. He had already signaled his willingness to surrender his license for a year or two. He was taken aback when the Arkansas Bar Committee, which had moved to have him disbarred, insisted on a five-year suspension, the lawyers said.

As for the legal fees, he had a legal defense fund in place and it was always his intention that it would eventually cover his legal expenses.

The difficult negotiations were over the wording of the statement in which Mr. Clinton was obliged to admit, in some fashion, more than he had in the past.

In the end, the conflict came down to two sentences. The first was Mr. Clinton's statement that he recognized that he had knowingly violated a federal judge's orders by giving misleading answers about his relationship with Ms. Lewinsky.

Prosecutors wanted Mr. Clinton to say something more, however, and that resulted in the next sentence, in which he acknowledged that "certain of my responses about Ms. Lewinsky were false."

Previously, Mr. Clinton said that while he could understand how those statements could have been misleading to others, they were not false.

Home | Times Topics | Website Contact

Copyright 2011 The New York Times Company | Privacy Policy | Help | Contact Us | Work for Us | Site Map | Index by Keyword

<http://www.nytimes.com/2001/01/24/us/white-house-visit-set-in-11/4/2011>

Independent Counsel Announcement of Settlement with President Clinton

1/19/2001 - Independent Counsel Robert W. Ray
and Chief of Investigations Kim R. Widup

The End of an Era

Office of the Independent Counsel announcement in Washington, DC, on January 19, 2001, bringing the investigation of William Jefferson Clinton to an end.

Widup Consulting, LLC

THE END

Cartoon

Little Rock Newspaper

Widup Consulting, LLC

**Ernest Hemingway – American Novelist, Writer and
Nobel Prize Winner**

“THERE IS NO HUNTING LIKE THE HUNTING OF MAN, AND
WHEN THOSE WHO HAVE HUNTED ARMED MEN LONG ENOUGH
AND LIKED IT, NEVER CARE FOR ANYTHING ELSE THEREAFTER”

Social Media – a new tool of the trade

This photo illustrates the conduct of a subject of a police internal affairs investigation in Illinois who was off work on a workman's compensation on the job injury as her back was too injured to perform her duties as a police officer . Some caring citizen thought the internal affairs investigator should have copies of photos that the officer posted on her Facebook page of her "zip-lining."

QUESTIONS?



United States Marshals Service
Justice Integrity Service



“Thanks for listening and be safe!”

Kim R Widup
U.S. Marshal/Special Agent - Retired

312-446-1568

widupconsulting@comcast.net