

# DOJ announces major changes to corporate criminal enforcement policies

By Brian F. Saulnier, Esq., Mark A. Rush, Esq., Andrew M. Wright, Esq. and David C. Rybicki, Esq.,  
K&L Gates LLP\*

NOVEMBER 8, 2021

## U.S. policy, regulatory, litigation and dispute resolution alert

In a keynote address to the American Bar Association's 2021 National Institute on White Collar Crime, Deputy Attorney General (DAG) Lisa O. Monaco outlined major changes to the U.S. Department of Justice's (DOJ) priorities for white collar enforcement. Monaco focused her presentation on four themes that encapsulate DOJ's tougher approach. These changes highlight the need for companies to focus on their compliance programs and to carefully scrutinize the collateral effects of government investigations and litigation.

### Emphasis on prosecution of individuals

In a return to an Obama-era policy, DAG Monaco announced that in order to obtain corporate cooperation credit, companies must now "identify all individuals involved in the misconduct — not just those substantially involved — and produce all non-privileged information about those individuals' involvement."

*This new requirement to identify all persons involved, however tangentially, in misconduct is part of a broader push by DOJ to ramp up prosecutions of individuals, including corporate executives.*

This move reinstates the policy outlined by then-DAG Sally Yates in the so-called "Yates Memo" of 2015 stating that companies which seek cooperation credit face an all-or-nothing choice: They can identify everyone, from executives to low-level employees, involved in the conduct, or they can forego the substantial benefits of cooperation.

DAG Monaco argued that distinctions between substantial and tangential involvement in corporate criminal misconduct are

"confusing" and that they "afford companies too much discretion in deciding who should and should not be disclosed to the government."

This new requirement to identify all persons involved, however tangentially, in misconduct is also part of a broader push by DOJ to ramp up prosecutions of individuals, including corporate executives.

*For companies negotiating resolutions, 'there is no default presumption against corporate monitors.'*

DAG Monaco conceded that "cases against corporate executives are among some of the most difficult that the department brings," but she expressed a desire to forge ahead with such cases, contending that "the fear of losing" should not deter prosecutions "as long as we act consistent with the Principles of Federal Prosecution." She added that it is "unambiguously this department's first priority in corporate criminal matters to prosecute the individuals who commit and profit from corporate malfeasance."

### Comprehensive examination of all conduct — criminal, civil, and regulatory

DAG Monaco announced that for companies facing investigations involving corporate misconduct, "as of today, the department will review their whole criminal, civil, and regulatory record — not just a sliver of that record." That means, for example, that a company's prior misconduct with respect to environmental compliance or taxes will be evaluated when determining the appropriateness of a resolution to a Foreign Corrupt Practices Act investigation.

DAG Monaco contended that a company's "record of misconduct" — even if unrelated to the present investigation — "speaks directly to a company's overall commitment to compliance programs and the appropriate culture to disincentivize criminal activity."

This move is sure to change the calculus for companies engaged in government litigation or investigations. In particular, the new guidance increases the need to consider collateral consequences

when resolving cases. It also emphasizes the importance of companies taking an across-the-board review of compliance policies and procedures, even in areas that are not part of their core business.

### No presumption against monitorships

Corporate compliance monitors continue to loom large. DAG Monaco explained that for companies negotiating resolutions, “there is no default presumption against corporate monitors.” To the extent that prior DOJ guidance “suggested that monitors would be the exception and not the rule,” DAG Monaco rescinded that guidance.

This renewed focus on monitorships emphasizes that a company’s obligations do not end when a settlement is inked. Instead, all companies, and in particular those with compliance monitors, should implement comprehensive safeguards to protect against future violations.

DAG Monaco added that DOJ has “no tolerance for companies that take advantage of pre-trial diversion by going on to continue to commit crimes, particularly if they then compound their wrongdoing by knowingly hiding it from the government.”

### Tougher standards for NPAs and DPAs

Many companies facing criminal investigations choose to accept responsibility and enter into non-prosecution agreements (NPAs) or deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) with the government.

### About the authors



(L-R) **Brian F. Saulnier** is a partner at **K&L Gates LLP**. Based in the firm’s Pittsburgh and London offices, he advises boards, audit committees, special committees and management on investigation into and defense of bribery- and corruption-related matters, including with respect to voluntary disclosure. He can be reached at [Brian.Saulnier@klgates.com](mailto:Brian.Saulnier@klgates.com).

Partner **Mark A. Rush**, a former assistant U.S. attorney, concentrates his practice on internal investigations, corporate criminal defense, domestic and international internal investigations, corporate criminal defense, False Claims Act defense, and complex commercial litigation. Based in the firm’s Pittsburgh and Washington, D.C., offices, he can be reached at [Mark.Rush@klgates.com](mailto:Mark.Rush@klgates.com). Partner **Andrew M. Wright**, located in the firm’s Washington, D.C. office, guides clients through congressional oversight and investigations-related matters, executive branch compliance, and government enforcement actions. He previously served as a White House lawyer and Congressional committee investigative counsel. His email is [Andrew.Wright@klgates.com](mailto:Andrew.Wright@klgates.com). **David C. Rybicki** is a firm partner based in Washington, D.C. He served from 2017 to 2020 as deputy assistant attorney general in the U.S. Department of Justice’s Criminal Division and previously served as counselor to the attorney general. He may be contacted at [David.Rybicki@klgates.com](mailto:David.Rybicki@klgates.com). All of the authors are members of the firm’s investigations, enforcement, and white collar practice group. K&L Gates associate **Robert Silverblatt** contributed to this article, which was originally published in November 2021 on the K&L Gates website. Republished with permission.

This article was published on Westlaw Today on November 8, 2021.

\* © 2021 Brian F. Saulnier, Esq., Mark A. Rush, Esq., Andrew M. Wright, Esq. and David C. Rybicki, Esq., K&L Gates LLP

This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered, however it may not necessarily have been prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice, and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional. For subscription information, please visit [legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com](https://legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com).