Money Laundering—18 U.S.C. §§ 1956-57, 1960

Case Outline

Prepared by Stefan D. Cassella
Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

www.assetforfeiturelaw.us

Table of Contents

Money Laundering—18 U.S.C. §§ 1956-57, 1960 i
I. Overview—Purpose of the Money Laundering Statutes 1
II. Transaction 1
A. Transporting property from one place to another is not a transaction; the Government must demonstrate that the defendant affected a disposition of the property: 2
B. But the transfer of property from one person to another is a transaction: 2
C. Transfer between accounts: 3
D. Use of safe deposit box is a transaction: 3
E. But simple possession of criminal proceeds is insufficient to show there was a transaction: 3
F. Exchange of cash for a monetary instrument is a transaction: 4
G. Bank deposit or withdrawal: 4
H. Purchase or sale: 4
I. Posting bail: 4
III. Financial Transaction 4
A. "Movement of funds by wire or other means": 4
B. "Monetary instruments" and "funds": 5
1. Monetary instruments are defined by 18 U.S.C. § 1956(c)(5) to include domestic or foreign currency, traveler's checks, bank checks, personal checks, money orders, and securities in bearer form: 5
2. Funds: 6
D. "Use of a financial institution"—§ 1956(c)(4)(B): 7
E. The financial transaction is the unit of prosecution: 9
F. Compound transactions: 9
G. Multiplicity: 9
H. Duplicity: 10
I. Proof of date of transaction: 12
J. Typical case will involve many financial transactions that could be charged as money laundering: 12

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

IV. Financial Institution 12
A. Use of a financial institution is sufficient to establish that a transaction is a financial transaction, but it is not necessary: 12
B. An individual can be a financial institution: 12
C. Investment companies: 13
V. Interstate Commerce 13
A. The nexus with interstate commerce is both a jurisdictional requirement and an element of the offense 13
B. Use of bank implicates interstate commerce: 13
C. Use of bitcoin, money remitters or other businesses: 15
D. Effect on commerce established by the nature of the SUA offense: 15
E. Effect on commerce shown by the way defendant conceals or disguises funds: 16
F. Satisfying commerce element for transaction occurring outside the United States: 16
G. Cash transactions may affect interstate commerce in some circumstances: 16
H. Effect on commerce shown by later movement of the funds: 17
I. Transporting SUA proceeds before financial transaction takes place: 17
J. Minimal impact sufficient for commercial transactions: 17
K. Conspiracy cases: 18
L. Money laundering statute satisfies the commerce requirement under the Supreme Court's decision in *Lopez*: 19
M. Reopening the Government's case: 19
N. Defendant need not know transaction will affect commerce: 20
VI. Conducting a Financial Transaction 20
A. Initiating or concluding: 20
B. Defendant may be liable for transactions conducted by others: 20
1. Person who directs others to move money is guilty of conducting the financial transaction: 20
2. *Pinkerton* liability: 21
3. But to "knowingly" conduct the transaction, the defendant must know that the third party has conducted it: 22
C. Wire transfers: 22
D. Transfer of title: 23
E. Circumstantial evidence; 23
1. That the defendant is the one who conducted the transaction: 23
2. That defendant knew he was conducting a financial transaction: 23
F. Funneling: 24
VII. Knowledge Requirement 24
A. Defendant need only know property came from "some form" of unlawful activity: 24
B. "Unlawful activity" of which defendant has knowledge must be a felony: 25

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

1. But the defendant need not know it is a felony: 25
2. Not all of the property need be the proceeds of a felony: 26
C. Knowledge may be shown by proof of willful blindness, deliberate ignorance, or conscious avoidance: 26
1. Willful blindness is an alternative way of proving knowledge: 26
2. Evidence of willful blindness: 26
3. It is unclear if the knowledge element includes a duty to investigate: 28
4. Establishing knowledge through willful blindness and circumstantial evidence are not mutually exclusive theories: 28
5. Effect of acquittal on the SUA: 29
D. Knowledge of source of the money generally is obvious where defendant was the perpetrator of the underlying offense: 29
E. Cases where defendant is the perpetrator but argues that he or she did not realize the SUA was illegal: 30
1. If the defendant has the *mens rea* to commit the SUA, he cannot argue lack of knowledge for purposes of money laundering: 30
2. Defendant may have acted in a way that indicated his belief that the conduct was illegal: 30
3. Knowledge that the property was criminally derived may be inferred from the defendant's background and training: 31
4. Reliance on advice of counsel or other third party: 31
5. Obscenity cases: 31
F. Passage of time does not attenuate knowledge: 31
G. Application of *Ratzlaf*: 31
H. Third-party money laundering: Defendant need not be the perpetrator of the SUA: 32
I. Circumstantial evidence of knowledge: 33
Circumstantial evidence may be used to establish the defendant's knowledge of the illegal source of the money whether the defendant is himself the perpetrator of the offense, or is a third party money launderer: 33
1. Money launderer's relationship to the source of the money or knowledge of the source's circumstances: 33
2. Unusual nature of the transaction: 37
3. Use of third parties or other deception; use of codes and unusual secrecy: 39
4. Use of offshore accounts; advanced technology; cryptocurrency: 40
5. Statements or admissions of the money launderer; lies and incredible denials: 41
6. The timing of the transactions: 41
7. Statements by third parties: 42
8. Defendant's participation in crucial events: 42
J. Defendant must have knowledge at the time the financial transaction takes place: 42
K. Particular third parties shown to have had knowledge or to be willfully blind: 43

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

1. Attorneys: 43
2. Bankers: 43
3. Real estate agents: 43
4. Merchants: 43
5. Accountants: 44
L. Sentencing cases: 44
M. Jury's rejection of defendant's testimony: 44
VIII. Proceeds 44
A. Proceeds need not be money: 45
B. Proceeds need not be tangible or actual assets: 46
C. Uncashed check is proceeds: 47
D. Use of a credit card: 47
E. The Government need not trace laundered funds back to a particular offense: 47
F. Parallel and successive transactions: 48
G. Proceeds remain proceeds as they change form: 49
H. Once proceeds, always proceeds: 50
I. The "but for" test may be used to establish that property is SUA proceeds: 50
Property "retained" as a result of the SUA may be "proceeds" of that offense: 50
J. Circumstantial evidence sufficient to show property was SUA proceeds: 51
1. In general: 51
2. The tracing requirement; the timing of the transactions: 54
K. Lack of legitimate income / "net worth" analysis establish proceeds element: 54
L. Positive dog sniff: 57
M. Proceeds of offense committed by third party: 57
N. Transactions involving commingled funds: 57
1. Only part of money involved in the transaction need be derived from SUA; strict tracing through commingled accounts is not required: 57
2. Tracing: 60
O. Property purchased with proceeds of false loan remain SUA proceeds even if loan is repaid: . 60
P. Inconsistent verdicts; acquittal or reversal of conviction on the SUA: 60
1. Inconsistent verdicts or reversal of conviction on the SUA will not bar a money laundering conviction if there were other SUA offenses on which the conviction could have been based: 60
2. It may also stand if the jury could plausibly have found that someone other than the money laundering defendant committed the SUA offense: 62
3. But a money laundering conviction cannot stand if the jury necessarily found that the predicate offense on which the money laundering was based did not occur, or that conviction is reversed: 63
Q. Gross proceeds versus net profits: 64

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

1. Cases holding that *Santos* only applies when the SUA is gambling: 64
2. Cases holding that *Santos* does not apply to a particular SUA: 65
3. Cases holding that "proceeds" always means net profits: 66
4. When the defendant is using the receipts of a crime to promote a new crime, rather than defraying the expenses of the past act, the transaction involves profits: 66
5. Applying *Santos* in concealment cases: 67
6. Applying *Santos* to § 1957: 68
7. Applying *Santos* to a motion to dismiss: 68
8. Given the nature of the SUA, the property may necessarily be "profits": 69
9. Or the Government's proof may establish that, in all events, the property was the profits of the SUA: 70
10. If the transaction is not the payment of an expense of the SUA, but is a discretionary expenditure, it must have involved profits: 71
11. The Fourth and Ninth Circuit Rule: *Santos* applies only if there is a merger: 72
12. The Sixth Circuit Rule: whether *Santos* applies depends on the maximum sentence for the SUA: 74
13. The Fifth Circuit Rule: adopting Justice Stevens' concurring opinion: 75
14. Cases holding that *Santos* precludes a money laundering conviction: 75
14. Application of *Santos* to conspiracies: 76
15. *Santos* does not apply to § 1956(a)(2)(A) cases: 76
16. Application of *Santos* in "sting" cases: 76
17. Retroactive application of *Santos* / § 2255 and 2241 petitions: 77
18. Raising *Santos* for the first time on appeal: 77
19. The plurality opinion in *Santos* defining proceeds as net profits appears to contravene the definition of proceeds in the U.N. Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, which defines proceeds as "any property derived from or obtained, directly or indirectly, through the commission of an offence." 78
20. Pre-*Santos* cases defining proceeds: 78
21. Application of the May 20, 2009 amendment to § 1956(c)(9): 79

R. The SUA offense need not be charged in the indictment: 80
S. Proof of the elements of the SUA offense: 80
T. Congress did not intend to limit application of the money laundering statutes to drug offenses: 81
U. Cases where SUA was not a federal drug offense: 81
V. Special cases: 89

1. Mail and wire fraud and bribery proceeds: 89
2. Food stamp fraud: 90
3. Bank fraud: 90
4. Bankruptcy fraud: 90
5. Securities fraud: 91
6. Interstate Transportation of Stolen Property (ITSP): 91

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

7. Environmental crimes: 91
8. IEPPA and FARA: 91
9. Prescription drugs, drug paraphernalia and analog drugs: 92
10. Proceeds of attempts and conspiracies: 92
11. State SUA offenses: 92
12. Money laundering as an SUA: 93
13. Marijuana cases: 93
W. Foreign SUA offenses: 93
1. The foreign SUAs are listed in 18 U.S.C. § 1956(c)(7)(B): 93
2. Charging the foreign crime; proof of the elements of that offense: 93
3. "Against a foreign nation": 94
4. Extortion and bribery: 95
5. Offenses in the catch-all category relating to multilateral extradition: § 1956(c)(7)(B)(vi): 95
6. Revenue rule: 96
7. Evidentiary issues: 96
8. Pre-trial determination that offense qualifies as an SUA: 96
X. Using domestic SUA to charge money laundering based on foreign conduct: 96
1. Tax offense: 96
2. § 2314: 96
3. Mail and wire fraud: 96
Y. Jury instruction; deference to jury verdict: 96
1. Instruction regarding the SUA: 97
2. Affirming verdict if supported by the evidence: 97
Z. Effect of forfeiture on establishing proceeds element: 97
AA. Effect of amendment to an SUA: 97
IX. Merger Issue 97
A. Money laundering statutes apply to transactions occurring after the underlying criminal activity has generated proceeds: 97
B. Defendant need not have physical possession of the funds for them to be proceeds: 99
C. Property defendant intends to use to commit offense is not proceeds: 100
D. Property may be proceeds of fraud even though defendant has not yet defrauded the victim: 100
E. Where a scheme occurs in several steps, second step may constitute laundering of proceeds of first step even if overall scheme was not yet complete: 101
F. Bribery and kickback schemes: 106
G. Crimes of violence: 107
H. Paying for drugs received on consignment: 107
I. Deposit of check is separate transaction: 107

J. Same acts may be charged as money laundering and substantive SUA offense: 108
K. There is no merger issue if the defendant is charged only with a conspiracy: 109
X. Intent To Promote 109
A. Reinvesting proceeds in illegal enterprise: 109
1. Paying salaries and expenses promotes SUA: 109
2. Ordinary expenses that would have been incurred in any event by a legitimate business are not promotion expenses: 112
B. Tribute payments, bribes, and protection money: 113
C. Posting bail: 113
D. Distributing proceeds: 113
E. Using proceeds to facilitate the SUA or keep the scheme going: 114
F. Using proceeds to commit new crime: 116
G. Knowledge that act being promoted is illegal: 117
H. Using proceeds to commit next step in the scheme: 117
I. Using proceeds to "lull" prospective fraud victims or to create an aura of legitimacy promotes SUA offense: 118
J. Transaction intended to avoid detection: 118
K. Financial transaction may constitute money laundering offense and the SUA being promoted: . 119
L. Paying for completed acts can promote future conduct: 120
1. Paying for drugs received on consignment: 120
2. Paying for other completed acts necessary to keep the scheme going: 121
3. Reimbursements: 121
M. *Montoya* theory: Promoting a completed act: 121
1. Intent to promote may relate back to a completed offense: 121
2. Deposit or cashing of check representing proceeds does not promote the antecedent offense: 122
N. The nature of the offense being promoted: 123
1. Offense being promoted need not be a continuing act but may relate to a singular, discrete offense: 123
2. Offense being promoted can be a foreign tax offense: 123
3. Offense being promoted need not be charged in the indictment: 123
4. The offense being promoted need not be a felony: 123
O. *Mens rea* required to prove intent to promote: 124
1. Third party money launderer may be guilty of promoting someone else's offense: 124
2. This applies even to low-level functionaries who have extensive involvement in the organization: 124
3. Distinguishing "intent" from "motive": 124
P. Circumstantial evidence of intent to promote: 125
Q. The intent must exist *at the time* the financial transaction takes place: 126

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

R. Distinguishing concealment cases: 126
1. Concealment is not an element of § 1956(a)(1)(A) offenses: 126
2. *Cuellar* does not apply in promotion cases: 126
XI. Intent To Evade Taxes 127
XII. Conceal or Disguise 127
A. The purpose of the statute: 128
1. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) makes it an offense to conduct a financial transaction knowing that the purpose of the transaction was to "conceal or disguise" the source, location, ownership, nature, or control of SUA proceeds: 128
2. Distinguishing promotion cases: 128
B. Defendant who is not the perpetrator of the SUA need not intend to conceal or disguise, but need only be aware that perpetrator's intent is to conceal or disguise: 128
C. Concealment need not be the only motive in conducting the transaction: 129
D. Circumstantial evidence of concealment: 130
1. Engaging in unusual or convoluted transactions shows knowledge that the purpose of the transaction was to conceal: 130
2. Structuring transactions to conceal: 134
3. Use of shell companies or duplicate bank accounts: 135
4. Use of cash or cryptocurrency: 136
E. Using third party or third party's name: 136
F. Registering vehicle in third party's name: 139
G. Using false name: 140
H. Use of codes; unusual secrecy: 140
I. Payment of "hush money": 141
J. Falsifying nature of the transaction: 141
K. Using real estate transaction to conceal or disguise: 141
L. Use of safe deposit box: 142
M. Sending property abroad: 142
N. Converting proceeds to goods and services: 143
O. Using or converting proceeds to cash: 144
P. Investing proceeds: 144
Q. Commingling funds: 144
R. Giving money to an attorney: 145
S. "Nature, source, location, ownership or control" 145
1. The attributes of the laundered funds are listed in the disjunctive; it is only necessary for the Government to prove the transaction was designed to conceal one of them. 145
2. The Government need not show intent was to conceal or disguise identity; concealing nature source, or location is sufficient: 146
3. The concealment does not have to conceal the funds from the whole world: 148

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

4. The SUA the transaction conceals need not be the SUA that generated the proceeds: 149
T. *Sanders* and cases following *Sanders*: 149
U. Cases distinguishing *Sanders*: 150
W. *Cuellar* and cases distinguishing *Cuellar*: 152
1. Cases applying *Cuellar* to §§ 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) and 1956(a)(2)(B)(i): 152
2. Cases distinguishing *Cuellar*; 153
3. Under *Cuellar*, the manner in which the transaction is conducted may be used to infer the purpose of the transaction: 155
4. A transaction may have more than one purpose: that it was designed for one purpose does not mean it was not also designed to conceal or disguise: 156
5. The typical transfer of drug proceeds via a courier satisfies *Cuellar*: 156
6. § 2255 Cases: 156
7. The design to conceal or disguise must have been in place when the financial transaction occurred: 156
X. Evidence that supports the underlying fraud SUA may also establish intent to conceal or disguise: 156
Y. Evidence that supports knowledge element may also establish knowledge of intent to conceal or disguise: 157
Z. Simple deposit, transportation, or transmission of proceeds does not satisfy conceal or disguise requirement: 158
AA. The Government need not prove defendant knew what was being concealed was SUA proceeds: 158
BB. Willful blindness: 159
CC. Role of the jury: 159
XIII. Intent To Evade Reporting Requirements 159
A violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(1)(B)(ii) is sometimes called "structuring" money laundering, although the object can be any currency reporting offense: 159
A. Mens rea requirement: 159
B. Evidence sufficient to sustain § 1956(a)(1)(B)(ii) conviction: 159
C. Comparison with § 1956(a)(1)(B)(i): 160
D. Purchase of cashier's checks to evade Form 8300 requirement is violation of § 1956(a)(1)(B)(ii): 160
XIV. International Money Laundering Offenses Under § 1956(a)(2) 160
A. Knowledge requirements: 161
1. Knowledge that the transfer was designed to conceal or disguise: 161
2. Knowledge of the source of the money: 161
3. Knowledge that the transfer would cross an international border: 161
B. § 1956(a)(2)(A) does not require proof that property was proceeds of SUA: 161
C. § 1956(a)(2)(A) offense does not merge with SUA being promoted: 162

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

D. Proceeds: 163
1. Section 1956(a)(2)(B)(i) requires proof that property is SUA proceeds. 163
2. The proceeds element in § 1956(a)(2)(B) may be satisfied by the same circumstantial evidence that satisfied the element in § 1956(a)(1) cases: 164
E. Transports, transmits, or transfers: 164
F. The transfer must be to/from a place outside of the United States: 164
1. Compound transfers (transfers that occur in multiple steps): 165
2. But for other purposes, the court may consider the transaction as having sub-parts, so that it may be said to have occurred in the United States, or was a transaction "to" or "from" the U.S.: 165
3. Circumstantial evidence that the transaction crossed an international border: 165
4. Use of a correspondent bank account: 166
G. Intent to promote: 166
H. Conceal or disguise: 167
1. The phrase "designed to conceal or disguise" refers not to the manner of the transportation but to the reason for it: 168
2. Purpose of the transportation may be shown by proof that defendants knew moving money to a particular location would have the effect of concealing or disguising: 168
3. Knowledge of the purpose of the concealment: 168
4. Adverse decisions holding the evidence of concealment insufficient: 169
I. Conspiracy: 169
J. Sting cases under § 1956(a)(2): 169
K. Alternative SUAs: 169
XV. Sting Cases—18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(3) 169
A. Financial transaction: 169
B. *Mens Rea* 170
1. Intent to promote (§ 1956(a)(3)(A)): 170
2. Intent to conceal or disguise (§ 1956(a)(3)(B)): 170
3. Intent to evade reporting requirement (§ 1956(a)(3)(C)): 171
4. Defendant's belief that the money was criminally derived: 171
E. The transaction must involve property that was represented to be SUA proceeds: 171
1. The representation need not be explicit: 171
2. Agent must describe the circumstances from which the proceeds were allegedly derived with sufficient detail to convey that all elements of the underlying offense were satisfied: 173
3. There is no proceeds or knowledge requirements in a sting case: 173
4. Agent's denial, in undercover role, that he or she is a criminal does not negate the representation: 174
5. The agent must be authorized to conduct the investigation: 174
6. Repeating the representation to each codefendant: 174

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

7. Commingled funds: 175
8. The representation is not inadmissible hearsay: 175
9. Any SUA can be the basis for the representation: 175
F. Entrapment: 175
1. Predisposition: 175
2. Inducement: 177
3. Right to present an entrapment defense: 177
4. Entrapment-by-estoppel: 177
5. Jencks Material: 177
G. Outrageous conduct: 177
H. Buy/bust cases: 178
I. Belief: 179
J. Interstate commerce: 179
K. Recovery of sting money: 180
L. Aiding and abetting; attempts: 180
XVI. § 1957 180
A violation of § 1957 is called "financial transaction money laundering": 180
A. Purpose of the statute: 180
B. Relationship to § 1956: 180
1. In general: 181
2. Referring to § 1957 as "money laundering": 182
C. Knowledge requirement: 182
D. Criminally derived property: 182
E. $10,000 requirement: 183
1. Courts giving defendant benefit of presumption that criminal proceeds are not involved in movement of portion of commingled funds: 183
2. Courts allowing conviction as long as transaction involved more than $10,000 in commingled funds: 184
F. Aggregating transactions to reach $10,000: 186
G. Interstate commerce: 187
H. Monetary transaction / financial institution requirement: 187
I. "Engaging in" a monetary transaction / aiding and abetting: 188
J. Simply spending or depositing proceeds violates § 1957: 189
K. Wire transfer of proceeds: 190
L. Deposit of proceeds: 190
M. Withdrawal of proceeds: 190
N. Sale of proceeds: 191
O. Conversion of proceeds to another form: 191

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

P. Use of proceeds to continue scheme: 191
Q. Attorney fee exemption: 191
1. There is a split in the circuits on the scope of the defense: 191
2. § 1957(f)(1) is an affirmative defense: 192
XVII. § 1960 192
A. Money transmitting business: 192
1. § 1960 makes it an offense to conduct an illegal money transmitting business, which is defined as a business operated without a state money transmitting license: 192
2. "On behalf of the public:" 193
3. The purpose of the statute is to prevent the use of MSBs to transfer criminal proceeds: 194
4. The statute is directed at those who operate the business, not mere employees: 194
5. § 1960 is not limited to money remitters or businesses that engage in cash transactions: 194
6. Conviction may be based on any of the violations described in § 1960(b)(1): 195
7. Application to payment processors and crypto exchanges: 195
8. Whether an informal money transmitting business qualifies is unclear: 196
9. Agencies of other businesses: 196
10. Safe Harbor provision: 196
11. Restitution: 196
B. Violation of state law: 197
C. Indictment: 197
D. Mens rea requirement: 198
1. § 1960(b)(1)(A): 198
2. § 1960(b)(1)(B): 199
E. Constitutionality: 199
F. Venue: 200
G. Joinder and severance: 200
H. Jury instructions for § 1960 violations: 200
I. Evidence: 201
1. In general: 201
2. Expert witnesses: 201
J. Sentencing for § 1960 violations: 201
K. Application to foreign businesses: 202
L. Application of § 1960(b)(1)(C): 203
XVIII. Attempt 203
A. Elements of attempt: 203
B. § 1956(a)(1) cases: 203

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

C. § 1956(a)(2) cases: 203
D. § 1956(a)(3) cases: 203
E. Insufficient evidence: 204
XIX. Aiding and Abetting 204
A. Defendant aids and abets money laundering by associating with the illegal financial transaction and seeking to make the criminal conduct succeed: 204
B. Defendant may be guilty of conducting financial transaction conducted by third person: 205
C. Defendant is aider and abettor if he or she participates in the *actus reus* of the crime: 206
D. Evidence sufficient to show defendant intended to aid principals in laundering funds: 206
E. Aiding and abetting attempt: 207
F. Aiding and abetting a sting: 207
G. Aiding and abetting international money laundering: 18 U.S.C. § 1956(a)(2): 207
H. No requirement that principal be convicted: 207
I. Indictment / Probable Cause: 207
J. Misprision of Felony: 208
XX. Conspiracy 208
A. Conspiracy charged under § 1956(h): 208
B. Elements of § 1956(h) conspiracy: 208
1. The courts are very unclear as to the elements of a § 1956(h) conspiracy: 208
2. Proof of the proceeds element: 211
3. Proof of the *mens rea* elements: 211
C. Overt acts: 211
1. § 1956(h) does not require proof of an overt act: 211
2. But the Government may nevertheless allege and prove overt acts: 212
D. Agreement: 212
1. Circumstantial evidence of agreement: 212
2. Agreement must be voluntary: 215
3. Defendant need not personally commit the money laundering violation: 215
4. Defendants need not have actual knowledge of or agree on the details: 215
5. Agreement requires at least two persons with the requisite knowledge: 215
6. Effect of an acquittal on the conspiracy count: 216
7. A defendant may conspire with unknown or anonymous persons: 216
E. Knowledge: 216
1. Most courts hold that knowledge that the money to be laundered is criminally derived is an element of the money laundering conspiracy, but factual impossibility is not a defense: 216
2. But the defendant only has to believe that the money is criminal proceeds: 217
3. Knowledge that the money is criminally derived may be shown by willful blindness: 218

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

4. Knowledge of the purpose of the conspiracy can also be shown by willful blindness: 219
5. Defendant must know the purpose of the agreement is to commit a money laundering offense: 219
6. Coconspirators need not share the same belief as to the source of the money: 219
F. Proceeds being laundered: 219
G. Specific intent: 220
1. Promotion money laundering: 220
2. Concealment money laundering: 221
H. *Pinkerton* liability: 222
I. Proof of a completed money laundering offense is not required: 222
J. Money laundering as part of another conspiracy: 222
1. Money laundering as part of another conspiracy: 222
2. Pickup operation is a money laundering conspiracy: 223
K. Elements of a § 371 conspiracy: 223
L. Overt acts for § 371 conspiracy: 223
M. Sufficiency of the evidence: 224
N. Sting cases: 225
O. Coconspirator statements admissible as statements made during and in furtherance of conspiracy: 226
P. Jury instructions: 226
Q. Multiple objects: 227
R. Multiple financial transactions: 228
S. Multiple *v.* single conspiracy: 228
T. Interstate commerce: 228
U. Statute of limitations: 228
V. "Straddle" conspiracy: 228
W. Maximum penalty: 229
X. Inconsistent verdicts: 229
XXI. Civil Money Laundering Enforcement: 18 U.S.C. § 1956(b) 229
A. Under § 1956(b), the Government may file a civil action against any person who commits an offense under any provision of § 1956(a) or 1957: 230
B. Long-arm jurisdiction: 230
C. Restraining orders and receivers: 230
D Relationship to civil forfeiture: 230
XXII. Indictment 231
A. Multiplicity/duplicity: 231
1. Alternative mental states: 231
2. Multiple SUAs: 233

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

3. Separate financial transactions: 233
4. Money laundering and the SUA: 233
5. §§ 1956 and 1957: 234
6. §§ 1956(a)(1) and (a)(2): 234
7. § 1956 and structuring: 234
8. Separate conspiracies: 235
9. Attempt and Substantive Act: 235
B. Bill of particulars (Rule 7(f)): 236
1. Cases where request for bill of particulars was denied: 236
2. Cases where request for bill of particulars was granted, at least in part: 237
C. Alleging the SUA: 237
1. Alleging the SUA from which the property was derived: 237
2. Alleging the SUA being promoted 238
3. Alleging the elements of the SUA; specifying specific acts: 238
D. Alleging the way the defendant committed the offense: 240
1. The indictment need not describe the "financial transaction" or "monetary transaction": 240
2. The indictment need not describe the way the defendant concealed or disguised the SUA proceeds: 241
4. Surplusage: 241
E. Alleging the knowledge element: 241
F. Alleging the concealment and promotion elements: 242
G. Alleging willfulness: 242
H. Alleging belief in sting cases: 243
I. Alleging interstate commerce element in the indictment: 243
J. Alleging the $10,000 threshold for § 1957: 244
K. § 1957: 244
1. Alleging the "financial institution" element: 244
2. Attorney fee provision in § 1957(f)(1): 245
L. Alleging aiding and abetting: 245
M. Conspiracy: 245
1. Circuits are divided over what aspect of a money laundering conspiracy must be alleged in the indictment: 245
2. Conspiracy to commit to attempt to commit money laundering; sting offense: 246
3. Overt acts: 247
4. Multiple objects / *duplicity:* 247
N. Motion to dismiss money laundering count: 247
1. Sufficiency of factual allegations: 247

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

2. Pre-Indictment Delay 248
O. Effect of erroneous date, citation, language, or fact: 248
P. Grand Jury / Compliance with DOJ Policies 249
XXIII. Joinder and Severance 249
A. Joinder of counts: 249
B. Joinder of defendants: 250
XXIV. Statute of Limitations 252
A. Statute of limitations runs from date on which money laundering offense is complete: 252
B. Conspiracy: 253
C. Superseding indictment: 254
D. Unnecessary delay: 255
E. Tolling: 255
F. Procedure for raising the defense: 255
1. Jury Instructions: 255
2. Waiver: 256
XXV. Opening Statement / Closing Argument 256
XXVI. Jury Instructions / Special Verdict 256
A. Willfulness: 256
B. Knowledge: 257
1. There are two separate knowledge requirements: that the defendant knowingly conducted the financial transaction, and that he knew the property was the proceeds of criminal activity: 257
2. Jury may be instructed that defendant need only know the property is criminally derived and need not know it is the proceeds of a specified unlawful activity: 257
3. Felony vs. misdemeanor: 258
C. Willful blindness/conscious avoidance: 258
1. Circumstances in which the willful blindness instruction is appropriate: 258
2. Content of the instruction: 260
Courts differ on whether deliberate ignorance requires affirmative acts or if the failure to ask questions in light of red flags is sufficient. 260
3. The willful blindness instruction is appropriate even if there is evidence that the defendant had actual knowledge: 261
D. Reliance on counsel: 262
E. Proceeds: 262
1. Elements of the SUA offense: 262
2. Funds must be proceeds of “specified unlawful activity:” 263
3. Alternative SUAs: 263
4. Commingled funds: 264
5. Describing proceeds of a fraud scheme: 264

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

6. *Santos* instruction: 264
7. Merger Issue: 265
F. Alternative specific intents: 265
1. Jury need not be unanimous as to whether defendant committed concealment or promotion money laundering: 265
2. Jury need not be unanimous as to which SUA generated the proceeds, or was the object of the intent to promote: 266
G. Intent to promote: 266
H. Conceal or disguise: 267
I. Other elements of the money laundering offense: 267
1. Financial transaction / monetary transaction: 267
2. Financial institution: 268
J. Instructions for § 1956(a)(1)(A)(ii): 268
K. $10,000 requirement for § 1957: 268
L. Interstate commerce: 269
M. Conspiracy: 270
1. Mens rea elements: 270
2. Object of the conspiracy: 270
The courts are split on whether the jury must be instructed on the elements of the substantive money laundering offense that is the object of a § 1956(h) conspiracy: . 270
3. Multiple conspiracies: 271
4. Dates of the conspiracy: 271
N. *Pinkerton* instruction: 271
O. Aiding and abetting: 272
P. Variance and constructive amendment: 272
Q. Special verdicts: 273
R. Sting cases: 273
S. Entrapment: 273
T. Cases where money laundering count comprises multiple transactions: 274
1. Venue 274
2. Proving the elements for each transaction: 274
XXVII. Guilty Plea 274
XXVIII. Corporate Criminal Liability 275
XXIX. Sentencing 275
A. In general: 276
1. General deterrence: 276
2. 2001 amendment to § 2S1.1: 276
B. Pre-2001 amendment cases: 276

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

1. Downward departure rejected: 276
2. Downward departure granted: 279
3. The Third Circuit's peculiar detour: 280
4. Appellate review of refusal to depart: 282
5. Effect of the forfeiture on departure: 282
6. Effect of proposed amendments: 283
7. Application of *Koon*: 283
8. Application of *Apprendi* to sentence for money laundering offense: 284
9. Knowledge that proceeds constituted unlawful activity: 284

C. Grouping: 284
1. Effective November 1, 2001, the money laundering offense groups with the SUA: 284
2. Pre-2001 amendment cases holding money laundering and SUA do not group: 285
3. Pre-2001 amendment cases grouping money laundering with SUA: 288
4. Grouping money laundering counts with each other: 289
5. Grouping money laundering counts with other offenses: 289
6. § 2255 challenge to grouping: 290
7. Effect of 2001 amendment: 290

D. Double counting: 290
E. Choice of guideline: 291
1. Where indictment alleges alternative specific intents: 291
2. Self-money laundering versus third party money laundering: 291
F. Disparate treatment of codefendants: 291
G. Amount of money involved in scheme: 292
1. Calculating the amount involved for purposes of determining the offense level: 292
2. Including commingled funds in amount laundered: 294
3. Amount involved in underlying SUA or uncharged offenses may be used to calculate sentence: 294
4. Relevant conduct: 296
5. Amount of money attributable to defendant: 297
6. Effect of jury's determination of amount involved for forfeiture purposes: 299
7. Application of *Santos*: 299

H. Sentencing manipulation/entrapment: 299
I. Attempt: 300
J. Conspiracy and RICO: 300
K. Multiple-object conspiracy: 301
L. Reduction for incomplete offense: 302
M. Consecutive sentences: 302
N. Effect of guidelines generally: 302

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

1. Post-*Booker* sentencing with advisory guidelines: 302
2. Sixth Circuit post-*Booker* analysis: 304
3. Version of sentencing guidelines in effect: 305
4. Effect of amendments in general: 306
O. Retroactive application of drug enhancement: 306
P. Special skill/position of trust; in the business of money laundering: 307
1. Special skill/position of trust: 307
2. In the business of money laundering: 308
Q. Acceptance of responsibility: 308
R. Role in the offense enhancement (§ 3B1.1): 309
S. Role in the offense reduction (§ 3B1.2): 312
T. Sophisticated laundering enhancement: 314
U. Application of drug enhancement: 315
V. Application of obstruction of justice enhancement: 316
W. Firearms enhancement: 318
X. Application of 2-level enhancement in § 1957 cases: 318
Y. Application of "safety valve" provision (§ 5C1.2): 319
Z. Restitution: 319
AA. Fines: 319
BB. Pre-2001 enhancement for promotion: 320
CC. Double jeopardy in sentencing: 320
DD. Effect of *Santos* on sentencing for money laundering and the SUA: 320
EE. Application of § 1956 specific offense characteristic (§ 2S1.1(b)(2)(B)): 320
FF. Application of 4-level enhancement under § 5K2.0: 320
GG. Resentencing: 320
1. Remand: 320
2. First Step Act: 321
HH. No additional penalty for § 1956(h) conspiracy if underlying offense was § 1957: 321
XXX. Double Jeopardy and Estoppel 321
A. Money laundering and the SUA: 321
B. Money laundering and structuring: 322
C. §§ 1956 and 1957: 322
D. Subsections of 1956: 322
E. Money laundering and CMIR offenses: 323
F. Money laundering and bulk cash smuggling: 323
G. Money laundering and § 1960: 323
H. Substantive money laundering and conspiracy: 323
I. Money laundering conspiracy and conspiracy to commit SUA: 323

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

J. Money laundering and civil forfeiture: 324
K. Separate money laundering transactions: 324
L. Resentencing: 324
M. Collateral estoppel: 324
N. Judicial Estoppel: 324
XXXI. Ex Post Facto Clause 324
XXXII. Extradition 325
XXXIII. Jurisdiction 326
A. Extraterritorial jurisdiction: 326
1. Under § 1956(f), the United States has extraterritorial jurisdiction over a money laundering offense committed by a U.S. citizen: 326
2. The United States also has jurisdiction over conduct by a foreign person in violation of §§ 1956 and 1957 that occurs in part in the United States; 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(f) and 1957(d)(1): 326
3. Extraterritorial jurisdiction based on "focus" of the foreign offense: 328
4. The financial transaction requirement in § 1956(c)(4) is satisfied for a wholly foreign transaction if the defendant's conduct affected foreign commerce or the transaction involved a foreign bank: 328
5. Conspiracies: 328
6. Extraterritorial jurisdiction over the SUA: 328
7. RICO 329
8. Challenging extraterritorial jurisdiction: 329
B. Jurisdiction over state-regulated businesses: 329
XXXIV. Venue 330
Venue is a question for the jury, which must find venue by a preponderance of the evidence. 330
A. Venue is proper in the district where the financial transaction was conducted: 330
B. A money laundering offense may not be prosecuted in the district where only the SUA occurred: 331
C. § 1956(i)(1)(B), effective October 26, 2001, provides that a money laundering prosecution may be brought in any district where prosecution for the SUA could be brought "if the defendant participated in the transfer of the proceeds of the SUA from that district to the district where the financial or monetary transaction" took place. This codified the *dicta* in *Cabrales* on that point. 331
1. Post-2001 cases: 331
2. Pre-2001 cases: 332
3. § 1956(i)(1)(B) is constitutional: 333
C. Compound transactions: 333
E. Reporting violations: 334
F. Conspiracies: 334
1. § 1956(i)(2) provides that a prosecution for an attempt or conspiracy to violate § 1956 or 1957 may be brought in the district where venue would lie for the completed offense, or where any overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy occurred. 334

2. A act in furtherance of the SUA is an overt act in furtherance of the money laundering conspiracy: 335
3. *Cabrales* does not bar prosecution in the district where the underlying SUA took place if an act in furtherance of the SUA was also an overt act in furtherance of the § 1956(h) conspiracy: 336
4. All co-conspirators may be prosecuted in the district where any one of them committed an overt act: 337
G. Manufactured venue: 337
H. Alleging venue / Procedure for challenging venue: 338
I. Waiver of venue: 339
J. Venue for international money laundering offense committed outside the U.S.: 339
XXXV. Release on Bail 339
A. Speedy Trial / Pretrial Release 339
B. Release pending appeal 341
XXXVI. Constitutionality 341
A. Knowledge requirement not unconstitutionally vague or overbroad: 341
B. §§ 1956(a)(1), (2), and (3) are not unconstitutionally vague; proof of scienter plainly required: 341
C. §§ 1956(a)(1)(B)(i) and (ii) are not unconstitutionally vague because the Government has to prove specific intent to conceal or disguise or to evade reporting requirements: 341
D. Substantive due process: 342
E. § 1956(a)(3) not unconstitutional: 342
F. § 1957 not unconstitutionally vague: 342
G. Phrase "involves the proceeds of" not unconstitutionally vague: 343
H. Definition of proceeds is not unconstitutionally vague: 343
I. Commerce clause: 343
J. Constitutional challenges cannot be raised for the first time on appeal: 343
XXXVII. Legislative History 344
Legislative history may be used to determine if Congress though a given SUA could generate proceeds or could be promoted: 344
XXXVIII. Department of Justice Guidelines 344
A. Guidelines in U.S. Attorneys' Manual convey no substantive rights on defendants: 344
B. Undercover operations: 344
C. Enforcement of money laundering where marijuana is legal: 345
XXXIX. Attorney Prosecutions / Disqualification 345
A. Prosecution of an attorney for money laundering: 345
B. Disqualification of counsel: 345
C. Disbarment: 345
XL. Attorney's Fees / Hyde Amendment 345
XLI. Treaty Violations / Diplomatic Immunity / Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act 346

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

XLII. Authority To Investigate 346
XLIII. Grand Jury Subpoenas 346
A. Subpoenas for bank records: 346
1. § 5313(g): 347
2. Subpoenas for Foreign Bank Records: 347
B. Subpoena to defense attorney: 347
XLIV. Admissibility of Evidence 347
A. Transactions illustrating the scope of the offense: 347
B. Acts outside the statute of limitations: 348
C. Business records: 348
D. Summary chart: 349
E. Expert testimony: 349
1. In general: 349
2. Cryptocurrency: 352
3. Protective Orders: 352
4. Evidence of money laundering admissible in non-money laundering cases: 352
F. Agent's testimony: 352
G. Cross-examination of agent: 353
H. Dog sniff: 353
I. Evidence of other crimes: 354
1. Rule 404(b): 354
Charging money laundering can expand the scope of admissible evidence at trial because it may be relevant to the proceeds and *mens rea* elements: 354
2. Evidence admissible under Rule 404(b) to prove the SUA: 355
3. Rule 403: 355
J. Tax Returns: 355
K. Character evidence: 355
L. Co-conspirator exception to the hearsay rule: 355
M. Conduct occurring overseas: 356
N. Admissibility of money laundering evidence to prove the SUA: 356
O. Preserving testimony under Rule 15: 356
XLV. Constitutional Violations 356
A. *Brady* violations: 356
B. Selective prosecution: 357
C. Vindictive prosecution: 357
XLVI. Search and Seizure 357
A. Border searches / *Miranda* warnings: 357
1. Border searches generally: 357

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC

2. Non-routine border searches require "reasonable suspicion": 358
B. Probable cause for search warrant: 358
1. The court must view the totality of the evidence to determine if there is probable cause to believe that a money laundering offense has been committed: 358
2. There must also be probable cause to believe the relevant evidence will be found in the place to be searched; but evidence of money laundering is rarely stale: 359
3. Cryptocurrency: 360
C. Particularity: Describing the property to be seized: 360
1. In general: 360
2. Cell phones: 361
D. Execution of the warrant: 361
E. Electronic surveillance / electronic records: 361
1. Warrants for stored electronic communications: 361
2. Non-Disclosure orders: 362
3. Sanctions: 362
F. Currency seizures without a warrant: 362
G. *Terry* stop: 363
H. GPS Tracking Device: 363
I. *Miranda* warnings: 363
J. Standing: 363
K. Extraterritorial Searches: 363
L. Suppression of property seized for forfeiture: 363
XLVII. Suspicious Activity Reports 364
XLVIII. Consequences of Money Laundering Conviction 364
A. Removal of aliens; denaturalization: 364
B. Plea Agreement: 365
XLIX. Money Laundering Modalities 365
A. Examples of Trade-Based Money Laundering: 365
XLX. Money Laundering as Object of Travel Act or RICO 365

 © Asset Forfeiture Law, LLC