



Contents -

Volume 4 Issue 3 March 2012

Legislation progress

Police corruption

Community sentences

The US/UK 2003 Extradition Treaty

Drugs and road deaths

Privacy: UK and US

Whitney Houston has died-now follow the money

Confiscation Law Handbook, Bloomsbury Professional, 2011

- Chief Editor: Sally Ramage, Member of the Chartered Institute of Journalists; Society of Editors and Society of Legal Scholars, UK.
- Consultant Editors: Dr Nicholas Ryder, Reader in Law, Head of Commercial Law Research Unit, University of the West of England, UK.
David Selfe, Director, Law School, Liverpool John Moores University, UK.
Roderick Ramage, Consultant Solicitor at Weightmans, LLP
Edward S. A. Wheeler, Principal Desktop IT Manager, Medway Council, UK.
- Design: David. E. Tonkinson, Designer and Online Editor, Poole, UK.

This online issue features two showcase articles. All articles can be bought from The British Library or from Westlaw, Thomson Reuters.

Whitney Houston has died-now follow the money

Sally Ramage

Money Matters: Upcoming film to be released in August 2012

On 11 February, 2012, to the surprise of the world, United States news reports announced that Whitney Houston, the diva singer with the most beautiful voice, had died. Whitney Houston died as a result of accidental drowning; however, according to the coroner's report, heart disease in an advanced stage together with evidence of cocaine use, were contributing factors to her official death by accidental drowning.

Mr. Harvey, is the Beverly Hills Coroner and he gave a press interview in which he said that the results of the autopsy on Whitney Houston's body indicated that the 48 year old Grammy Awards singer had regularly used the illegal substance 'cocaine'. This news was not surprising because it is well known that most of those in pop music industry did so. She is believed to have suffered a heart attack while alone in the bath, before slipping under the water and drowning. It has also been reported in newspapers that one of the symptoms of regular cocaine use is the hardening of the arteries in the body. The beautiful Whitney Houston died on the eve of the Grammy awards, on 11 February 2012, after spending previous days attending a selection of related events. The news confirms that her death was an accident and confirms what the Beverly Hills police had originally announced: that they did not suspect any evidence of other people's criminal wrongs attached to Miss Houston's death.

***Sparkle*- the upcoming movie starring Whitney Houston**

The upcoming movie *Sparkle* is Whitney Houston's final recorded work. It is a remake of a 1976 movie of the same title. The 2012 film *Sparkle* has Howard Rosenman as its executive producer who said that Whitney Houston's acting in the film is genius. The 1976 Warner Bros film *Sparkle* is a period film set in Harlem, New York during the late 1950s and early 1960s and the story follows the rough lives and careers of singer Sparkle Williams and her family and friends. The film story was loosely inspired by the *Supremes*. In the film, the all-female singing group was called Sisters with the three sisters being Sister, Sparkle and Dolores Williams. The female singing group began to find success eventually, but one of the girls, Sister, had by then become a drug addict and her life spiralled out of control, leading to her early death. The new version of the film *Sparkle* is directed by Salim Akil (known for the

television series *The Game*). The new version will follow a similar story line, with Jordin Sparks as the star character, Sparkle, who must find a way to achieve stardom despite the drama surrounding her family. Whitney Houston played Emma, the sisters' mother (the name changed from Effie to Emma in the 2012 film version). The new film *Sparkle*, in which Whitney Houston plays the mother of the three girls, is planned to be released in August 2012 as scheduled, despite the death of Whitney Houston.

Nearly completed new movie

Whitney Houston was due to complete the remake of the cult film, which is set for an August release. Howard Rosenman, who conceived and produced the original film, talks about how the Motown-inspired flick came to the screen in 1976—and Whitney's 'wonderful' performance in the new version.

Whitney Houston had a company, run by Debra Martin Chase and a deal at Warner Bros. from 1995 to 2000. Chase procured the rights to *Sparkle*, and they developed several screenplays, none of which worked. Then the company *Affirm Pictures*, a company owned by Bishop T.D. Jakes, was hired to produce the film. The director of this film was Salim Akil and his wife, Mara Brock Akil, wrote the new screenplay; and the movie is set in 1968 in Detroit. The character of the mother of the three girls, was played by Whitney Houston, and was changed from a housekeeper in the 1976 film to a former R & B singer who gets fed up with the secular life and turns to the church. When her daughters want to leave the bosom of the church and enter the tough world of R & B, she objects. Whitney Houston played her part well in the new movie. In the soon-to-be-released film, Whitney Houston sings a gospel song. The performances and writing were multidimensional and multilayered. Mara and Salim really mined so much conflict, drama, and love among the main characters. The film includes the Curtis Mayfield songs, and R. Kelly wrote several new songs for this film. The re-creation of Detroit in 1968 is inspiring. This film would have been a new surge for Whitney Houston, who was at the height of her powers during the filming. She was said to always arrive on time for rehearsals and knew all the lines. This film would have been a spectacular comeback for Whitney, who was at the height of her powers during the filming.

Potential income from the new movie

Generally today, movies about aspiring singers have had disappointing incomes. For example, in the past two years, films such as *Country Strong*, *Joyful Noise* and *Burlesque* all have underperformed at the box office. Many will want to see the new film *Sparkle* in August 2012, especially because Whitney Houston has died. Through their work, forensic accountants also contribute to police intelligence. They testify to their findings in court. Forensic accountants perform a very important role especially in the music industry when performing stars are so successful that they are unable themselves to keep tabs on their wealth. Through conducting thorough forensic financial analysis of business and personal records, forensic accountants can develop the profiles of individuals or groups identified as participating in suspicious or illegal activity, such as theft. Forensic accountants gather evidence and prepare search warrants/affidavits associated with such financial analysis. When police suspect wrong-doing, forensic accountants often accompany them on interviews of subjects and key witnesses in secure and non-confrontational settings. Their expertise is to

identify and trace funds and interrelated transactions. They are able to compile their findings into financial investigative reports and work with lawyers to recover stolen funds.

Her gifted and most beautiful voice sold hundreds of millions of records

It was widely reported that Ms Whitney Houston, at the time of her death, was ‘destitute and almost penniless’, even after she had earned hundreds of millions of dollars during the past 25 years of her musical career. Her total recorded sales exceeded 170 million and this had placed her in an elite group of female superstars that included Mariah Carey and Celine Dion, both of whom were heavily influenced by her emotional, vibrato-laden style. Whitney Houston was gifted with a most beautiful voice. She had sold more records and received more awards than almost any other female pop star of the twentieth century. Whitney Houston was a gospel-trained singer¹ whose voice lent itself to R&B, pop and ballad styles and she was adept at each style. It was a ballad that provided her biggest hit, a 1992 cover version of Dolly Parton's song titled, *I Will Always Love You*. Her melodramatic rendition featured one of her most powerful vocals. It sold 12 million copies worldwide, making it one of the biggest selling single records of all time.

1993- 2003: Marriage and a baby to care for in this decade

Whitney Houston gravitated to dramatic songs with lyrics about triumphing over the odds. She has been credited with inventing the ‘pop diva genre’ that has inspired singers. She was the first black woman to break through the colour barrier at the all-important MTV, which hitherto had played almost exclusively only placed white artists. Whitney Houston's success made her a wealthy lady. She made no new records between 1993 and 2003 after marrying the not so wealthy or successful singer Bobby Brown, himself burdened with several families to maintain. In 2010, her daughter was 16 years of age and so Ms Whitney Houston embarked on a world musical tour. The newspapers were unrelenting in their criticism and it appeared that the tour was not a great success.

1999- 2008: criminal defense litigation

On 22 May 2008, eight years after being charged in Hawaii with possession of marijuana, the misdemeanour criminal charges for marijuana possession against Whitney Houston have been dropped. In the year 2000, Houston was caught with a bag of less than a half-ounce of pot and three partially smoked joints at an airport in Hawaii while trying to board a flight. She was not arrested at the airport and was allowed to board the plane with then-husband Bobby Brown after leaving the unfinished ‘joints’ behind. How much did this cost financially?

Cursed by success?

We might think that movie stars, musicians, business moguls, political figures and professional athletes are somehow larger than life, but real life catches up with them just like

¹ Whitney Houston was brought up in Newark, New Jersey, is state in the Northeastern and Middle Atlantic regions of the United States; bordered on the north and east by the state of New York, on the southeast and south by the Atlantic Ocean, on the west by is the Pennsylvania and on the southwest by Delaware. New Jersey most densely populated of the 50 United States.

it does the rest of us. A variety of celebrity arrests happen almost every day, some of them more high profile than others-and the consequences may go beyond a simple arrest in some cases. Negative publicity like that surrounding Mel Gibson's 2006 DUI arrest and his behaviour at the scene can impact a career, and professional athletes have been benched, even released, after their criminal defence attorneys have rested their cases. Similarly, Ms Houston was forced to litigate against the charge of being in possession of an illegal substance; and it took eight years to litigate before the charge was dropped. This incident must have affected her ability to go on tour or even to leave the United States because many countries will not allow entry to someone with a drug charge pending (for eight years- a breach of her human rights and a breach of her ability to have a fair hearing). In 2000, Ms. Houston also found herself embroiled in a water-restriction legal controversy in New Jersey. It seems that the more successful one is, the more people try to shoot them down.

2008 to 2012- civil litigation by stepmother reaches Federal Court

When Whitney Houston's father, John Houston died in 2003, Whitney received one million dollars as the beneficiary of a life insurance policy. Whitney Houston won a litigation case against her step-mother who attempted to have this money given to her in order to pay off the mortgage on the home she lived in over the few years she was married to Miss Houston's elderly father John Houston. Just before Whitney Houston was found dead on 11 February 2011, she has won this litigation against her step mother and her next steps were to foreclose on the property in order to recover the monies she had lent her father to buy this property after he had divorced Whitney Houston's mother to marry the 'cleaner' of their home with whom he was conducting an affair and who he married as soon as his divorce was granted, the new wife Barbara being dozens of years younger than him. When John Houston died, Barbara had inherited the marital home.² Because of that particular loan to her father to buy the new marital home for Barbara and John, Whitney Houston, by law, owned the mortgage on the house. When Whitney refused to credit the life insurance money against the mortgage, Barbara sued. Whitney also brought up the fact that John and Barbara were married shortly after he divorced Whitney's mother. The stepmother's lawsuit was dismissed in late 2010 at which point the stepmother filed an appeal which was dismissed on the fourth week of January 2012 in the Federal Court. This ruling cleared the way for Whitney Houston to proceed with foreclosing on the house. However, by some quirk perhaps, during the week after she won this lawsuit in the Federal Court, Whitney Houston died before having the chance to recover the house from the stepmother.

The step-mother or lawyers attempting to stifle mortgage fraud?

Her step-mother, Barbara Houston, had sued Whitney in 2008. In January 2012, four years later, the Federal Court dismissed the case, two weeks before Ms Houston died. One can image and sympathise because of the tremendous amount of stress that Miss Houston must surely have undergone these past sixteen years; upheaval that marriage brought, then childbirth, then the eight years spent 'caught in a trap', unable to go forward with her career

² Whitney counter-sued, pointing out in a public court record that Barbara met her father while she was a 'custodial care service worker' ('a maid'), cleaning his house. Barbara was 40 years younger than Whitney's dad and starting dating him when he was still married to Whitney's mother. As part of this lawsuit, Whitney also sought a judgment for the mortgage to be repaid, with interest, which totaled about \$1.6 million by then. Barbara and her lawyers brought up several letters, written by various accountants. They argued to the judge that these writings suggested the insurance policy really was meant to repay the mortgage. The problem was that there never was a written agreement between John and Whitney Houston documenting this, and everyone from Whitney's camp denied they had an agreement. Instead, Whitney pointed out that she lent her father lots of money, and this insurance policy meant to repay other loans, not the mortgage money.

with a criminal charge overhanging, defending herself against a possession of drugs charge; then next, a very acrimonious and most probably, very expensive divorce payout which no doubt, she was made to comply with to pay off her ex husband whom she kept for 14 years, and lastly, notwithstanding the shock and grief she suffered from her father's death in 2003, Whitney Houston had to then deal with this extremely serious litigation due to her stepmother, lasting four years, making her dealings with litigators lasting over one decade.

Unrelenting media gossip: spiteful and harsh: perhaps motivated by racism

Celebrity gossip websites published stories in the week following Ms. Houston's death. They claimed that Whitney Houston was almost destitute and it is said that were it not for friends' kindnesses, she would soon be homeless. Whitney Houston's staff denied the rumours, arguing that Houston has just completed the making of a new movie, a remake of the 1976 movie called *Sparkle*, with Jordin Sparks, and it is due to be released in August 2012.

2012, February 11- Whitney Houston's death

Whitney Houston was found underwater in the bathtub of a Beverly Hills hotel suite, authorities said Monday as they continued to investigate her death, including examining prescription drugs found in her room. Authorities have collected several bottles of drugs from Houston's suite at the Beverly Hilton Hotel, law enforcement sources told the *Times*. But the sources stressed that the amount of drugs did not seem unusually large, and it remained unclear whether the drugs had anything to do with her death.

No criminal investigation

Beverly Hills police have officially announced that they have no plans to launch a criminal investigation, nor do they consider that her death was a homicide. Both the Beverly Hills Police Department. It seems astonishing that a millionairess who frequented her doctor was not given a medical examination to reveal arteriosclerosis which is treatable and may even be genetic, as certain races are more prone to this disease than others, irrespective of their nutritional consumption.

2012- Posthumous chart rise

Her untimely death at the age of 48 may send her albums back into the charts, and introduce her music to a generation who hardly knew her. Houston was lauded by other vocalists for her impeccable technique and polish, qualities that elevated her above almost every other star of her era.

The United Kingdom's anti-piracy laws will add to Houston's estate

The Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 1996 created extensive rights for performers by way of amendment to the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. Performers have performer's non-property rights and recording rights. A performer's consent is required to exploit his or her performances. The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 defines 'performance' as a dramatic or musical performance, a reading or recitation of a literary

work, or a performance of a variety act or any similar presentation which is o The Copyright and Related Rights Regulations 1996 introduced extensive new rights for performers by way of amendment to the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. Performers have performer's non-property rights and recording rights. A performer's consent is required to exploit his or her performances. The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 defines "performance" as a dramatic or musical performance, a reading or recitation of a literary work, or a performance of a variety act or any similar presentation which is or so far as it is, a live performance given by one or more individuals. (Section 180 (1)). Therefore, Whitney Houston's funeral; service on Saturday 18 February in Newark Baptist Church qualifies as a performance. Section 180(2) states that:

'A person having contractual recording rights in relation to a performance may take action in respect of any unauthorised recording of such performance'.

The 1886 Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works created a set of rules with a validity extending beyond notional borders. It gives a broad definition of 'literary and artistic works' that applies to every production in the literary, scientific and artistic domain using a variety of expressions. (See Article 2.1). Her funeral service in New Jersey, United States, qualifies for protection. A qualifying country includes any country that is party to the Rome Convention for the Protection of Phonograms.

Treaties that apply to Houston's music and her funeral service

The WIPO Copyright Treaty and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty both extend some provisions of the Berne Treaty and add provisions which offer responses to the challenges brought about by information and communication technologies, meaning that computer programs are protected as literary works; compilations of data and other material constitute intellectual creations; authors of computer programs; cinematographic and phonographic works have the exclusive right of authorising commercial rental of their works; authors have the exclusive right of authorising any communication to the public of their works by wire or wireless means. New Jersey in the United States is therefore a party to the treaties and provides legal remedies to those who alter Rights Management Information, i.e., information which identifies the work of the author, the rights owners, information about the terms and conditions of use, and any numbers and codes that represent such information. States that are party to the treaties make it unlawful to have any device or component incorporated into a device or product in order to circumvent any process or mechanism or system that prevents or inhibits the exploitation of rights of rights holders.

Musical DVDs

The record industry formed the Secure Digital Music Initiative (SDMI), which establishes an open architecture for the delivery of digital music, whether downloaded from the Internet or delivered through other media. This architecture, which may contain watermarks and encryption, includes protections against unauthorized copying of digital music that work across all platforms and media. It is user- friendly and there are several competing compression technologies, containing some form of copyright protection, thereby protecting

the intellectual property rights of its members. But any protection against copying imbedded in the music's digital code ultimately can be undone by those who are proficient enough with the technology. Their objective is to catch the really big offenders, true music pirates who commercially exploit multiple unauthorised copies of music for profit.

Musical sub-licenses after death

Approximately 12 years after musician and bandleader Glenn Miller died in a plane crash, his former lawyer established Glenn Miller Productions Inc. (GMP) with the aim of establishing a business based on the Glenn Miller name, which would, among other things, continue performances of the Glenn Miller Orchestra. Glenn Miller's widow, Helen Miller, served an executive role in the company and licensed to it the right to use the name and likeness of Glenn Miller and his music. GMP operated under this license agreement, executed in 1956, registering the 'Glenn Miller Orchestra' trademark and operating a successful orchestra. Since 1988, GMP has also sublicensed to third parties the right to operate other orchestras called the Glenn Miller Orchestra, with the most current sublicenses in Germany and the United Kingdom. Miller's heirs, the present owners of his intellectual property rights, filed suit in the Central District of California, challenging GMP's ability to sublicense the Glenn Miller mark without their express permission. Although the Central District granted GMP's motion for summary judgment on the ground that plaintiffs' claims were barred by the *doctrine of laches* due to their substantial delay in bringing suit, it nonetheless held that the ban on sublicensing absent the licensor's express consent, already well-established in patent and copyright law, should be extended to licenses of trademarks and rights of publicity. (See the case law of *Miller v Glenn Miller Prods.* 318 F. Supp. 2d 923 (C.D. Cal. 2004)).

21 February 2012: Whitney Houston's chattels to be auctioned

On the day after Whitney Houston was buried in New Jersey, her clothes and chattel were being auctioned. With regard to her estate, which will go to her daughter, it has been reported that Houston has no money left to her daughter as her estate has been ravaged by expenses including massive legal fees. Fifteen of her dresses and some of her jewellery are to be included in the auction. These include the jewellery and dresses from the famous movie *Bodyguard*. The auctioneer from *Julien's Auctions*, Beverly Hills, California, has stated that the expectation is that her pieces will be sold on March 31 and April 1 for 30 times their value. One is reminded of other financial tragedies- such as the financial mistakes and missteps of Michael Jackson, Heath Ledger, Marlon Brando, Princess Diana, and Gary Coleman, for example.

23 February 2012: Whitney Houston's home for sale at 1.75 million US dollars

It was reported that Houston's property consisting of five acres of land and a five bedroom detached house was advertised on www.property.com. The amount of 1.75 million seems very low for a stunning house with a - car garage and motor court parking for 15 more cars. It appears that the executor of her estate is in a great deal of hurry.

Whitney Houston's untimely death clearly presents much larger questions than tax and estate planning ones. Nevertheless, the latter are nothing to sneeze at. In fact, it was only a few

weeks ago that Whitney Houston herself was dealing with a legal ‘mess’ involving the death of her own father. Now there will be a much larger mess over Ms. Houston’s estate.

References

Harvey Brown, ‘Justice: Jenkins v Occidental Chemical Corp’, *National Law Journal*, 21 November 2011.

Ricardo De Aratanha, ‘Fans hold vigil for pop singer Whitney Houston at Leimert Park in Los Angeles’, *Los Angeles Times*, 14 Feb 2012.

Editor, ‘Nancy Grace demands to know who shoved Houston under the water’ *Reuters*, 15 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Whitney Houston dead at age 48’, *Associated Press*, 11 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Whitney Houston's funeral live broadcast’, *CNN*, 18 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Whitney Houston laid to rest in New Jersey’, *Reuters*, 19 February 2012.

Editor, Beverly Hilton Refuses Refund to Guests, *Legal Blogs*, 20 February 2012.

Editor, ‘*The Bodyguard* no longer streaming’, *Legal Blogs*, 20 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Whitney Houston’s possessions to be auctioned’, *Female First*, 20 February 2012, <http://www.femalefirst.co.uk/celebrity/Darren+Julien-228674.htm>

Editor, ‘The saga of Whitney Houston’s last film *Sparkle*’, *Newsweek*, 13 Feb 2012. <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/02/13/the-saga-of-whitney-houston-s-last-movie-sparkle.html>.

Editor, ‘Bobby Brown blames security for exit from Houston funeral’, *Reuters*, 18 February 2012.

Editor, ‘*The Help* wins big at Image Awards; Houston remembered’, *Reuters*, 17 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Defending drugs prosecution in England’ *Los Angeles Times*, 14 February 2012. <http://articles.latimes.com/2012/feb/14/local/la-me-whitney-houston-20120214>

Editor, ‘Celebrity arrest spotlight’, <http://www.totalcriminaldefense.com/news/celebrity-spotlight/default.aspx>

Editor, ‘Loyal Whitney Houston fans pay tribute to fallen star’, *Reuters*, 18 February 2012.

Editor, ‘Newsmakers’, *Texas Lawyer*, 13 February, 2012.

Editor, 'Whitney Houston and the push to legalize drugs: a perspective from the Street and a reality check', *Legal Blogs*, 12 February 2012.

Editor, 'Sunday Morning', *CBS TV*, 12 February 2012.

Editor, 'What can we learn from Whitney Houston's life and death?', *Legal Blogs*, 12 February 2012.

Editor, 'Inadmissible', *New Jersey Law Journal*, 12 February 2012.

Editor, 'Large settlements and verdicts in New Jersey', *New Jersey Law Journal*, 26 August 2011.

Editor, 'Intel hires *Black Eyed Peas will.i.am* as director of creative innovation', *Daily Business Review: Bloomberg News*, 26 January 2011.

Editor, 'Greenberg Traurig Partner represents Whitney Houston in high –profile dispute with NFL', *Associated Press*, 17 May 2007.

Editor, 'Not-so-greatest love of all: Whitney Houston countersues her stepmom', *New York Lawyer*, 9 April 2009.

Editor, 'Whitney Houston's last movie *Sparkle* could be released before August', *Daily Herald*, 17 Feb 2012.

<http://www.heraldextra.com/entertainment/people/whitney-houston>.

Lewis Goldshore and Marsha Wolf, 'Controversy swirls around water –use restriction', *New Jersey Law Journal*, 18 November 2002.

Michael Gormley, 'Sony BMG Music agrees \$10 million Payola settlement', *Associated Press*, 26 July 2005.

Laura Haring, 'Voir dire', *New York Law Journal*, 9 February 2012.

Tom Huddleston, 'Firms Line Up for Buffalo Bills Stadium Lease Negotiations', *The American Lawyer*, 13 February 2012.

Peter Kafka, 'Whitney Houston and the great streaming video outrage that didn't happen', *Netflix*, 20 February 2012.

Andrew Keshner, '*Singing Protesters Disrupt Foreclosure Auction at Court*', *New York Law Journal*, 21 February 2012.

Michael Learmonth, 'Let the music play: Bertelsmann and Napster come together', *Law.com*, 31 October 2000.

Andrew Mayoras (2009) *Trial & Heirs: Famous Fortune Fights!*, Washington: Wise Circle Books.

R. Robin McDonald, 'Court probes claim of jury selection errors', *Daily Business Review: Bloomberg News*, 10 May 2010.

R. Robin McDonald, Eleventh Circuit probes defense claims of jury selection errors in major mortgage fraud case (fraud ring forced mortgage foreclosures)', *Daily Business Review: Bloomberg News*, 10 May 2010.

R. Robin McDonald, 'Ten convicted in Georgia's largest mortgage fraud scheme prosecution', *Law.com*, 16 March 2007.

Margaret McHugh, 'Weinsenbeck leads Morris and Sussex Vicinage', *New Jersey Law Journal*, 15 July 2011.

Leah Nollenberger, 'A legal DIVA', *Connecticut Law Tribune*, 12 August 2004.

Anu Prakash, 'Local lawyers follow Houston', *ABC Local News*, 21 Feb 2012.
http://www.wxyz.com/dpp/news/region/oakland_county/local-lawyers-perspective

Sara Randazzo, 'The Churn: Lateral Moves and Promotions in The American Lawyer 200', *The American Lawyer*, 14 February 2012.

Carolyn Sullivan, 'Whitney Houston obituary', *Independent*, 12 Feb 2012.

Sara Whittington 'Whitney', *CBS 60 minutes*, 12 February 2012.

Editor, 'Whitney Houston estate to gain; questions remain', *Daily Herald*, 14 Feb 2012.
<http://www.heraldextra.com>.

Confiscation law handbook

Adrian Eissa and Ruth Barber

Bloomsbury Professional (2011)

ISBN 978-1-84766-707-6

Book review by Sally Ramage

The authors

Adrian Eissa, who practised law as a barrister at Garden Court Chambers, Lincoln's Field, London, is now Director of Highfields Residential Developments Limited, Linden Lodge, 45 Bedford Avenue, Barnet, Hertfordshire, EN5 2ER. Co-author of *Confiscation Law*

Handbook is Ruth Barber, a solicitor and a Director at Frisby Solicitors Limited, a law firm at 26-28 Eastgate Street, Stafford, Staffordshire, ST16 2LZ.

Clarity of writing

Confiscation Law Handbook reminds the reviewer of the saying: ‘*It does exactly what it says on the tin.*’³ This first edition is destined to be updated and republished as the Proceeds of Crime Act evolves. It fills a gap in the marketplace and is sorely needed. It introduces this complex topic to solicitors, barristers and to university law schools.

Confiscation law

Confiscation law is necessary to prohibit criminal drug trafficking, arms trafficking, organised crime, efforts by terrorists to accumulate funds for their purposes, funds from the illegal importation and exportation of endangered animal species, trading in prohibited weapons, pornography, defrauding the government of Value Added Tax (VAT) and excise duties on alcohol and tobacco fraud and so on. The civil procedure so formulated is very smart, in that the confiscation and restraint of the proceeds of crime does not need to be proved ‘beyond all reasonable doubt’, as it must in criminal procedure. Note that under the Limitation Act 1980, amended by s.288 POCA, an action for civil recovery may not be commenced after the expiry of 12 years from the date on which the cause of action accrued (see pages 122-126 of *Confiscation Law Handbook*). POCA, s.288 states:

‘(1) After section 27 of the Limitation Act 1980 (c. 58) there is inserted:

“27A Actions for recovery of property obtained through unlawful conduct etc. (1) None of the time limits given in the preceding provisions of this Act applies to any proceedings under Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (civil recovery of proceeds of unlawful conduct).

(2) Proceedings under that Chapter for a recovery order in respect of any recoverable property shall not be brought after the expiration of the period of twelve years from the date on which the Director’s cause of action accrued. .

(3) Proceedings under that Chapter are brought when (a) a claim form is issued, or, (b) an application is made for an interim receiving order, whichever is the earlier.

(4) The Director’s cause of action accrues in respect of any recoverable property: (a) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of property obtained through unlawful conduct, when the property is so obtained. (b) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of any other recoverable property, when the property obtained through unlawful conduct, which it represents, is so obtained.

(5) If: (a) a person would (but for the preceding provisions of this Act) have a cause of action in respect of the conversion of a chattel, and (b) proceedings are started under that Chapter for a recovery order in respect of the chattel, section 3(2) of this Act does not prevent his asserting on an application under section 281 of that Act that the property belongs to him, or the court making a declaration in his favour under that section.

(6) If the court makes such a declaration, his title to the chattel is to be treated as not having been extinguished by section 3(2) of this Act.

³ Eric Partridge, Tom Dalzell, Terry Victor (2007) *The concise new Partridge dictionary of slang and unconventional English*, London: Routledge. See page 653.

(7) Expressions used in this section and Part 5 of that Act have the same meaning in this section as in that Part. (2) After section 19A of the Prescription and Limitation (Scotland) Act 1973 (c. 52) there is inserted “19B Actions for recovery of property obtained through unlawful conduct etc. (1) None of the time limits given in the preceding provisions of this Act applies to any proceedings under Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (civil recovery of proceeds of unlawful conduct). (2) Proceedings under that Chapter for a recovery order in respect of any recoverable property shall not be commenced after the expiration of the period of twelve years from the date on which the Scottish Ministers’ right of action accrued;

(3) Proceedings under that Chapter are commenced when (a) the proceedings are served, or (b) an application is made for an interim administration order, whichever is the earlier;

(4) The Scottish Ministers’ right of action accrues in respect of any recoverable property: (a) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of property obtained through unlawful conduct, when the property is so obtained; (b) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of any other recoverable property, when the property obtained through unlawful conduct which it represents is so obtained; (5) Expressions used in this section and Part 5 of that Act have the same meaning in this section as in that Part.”

(3) After Article 72 of the Limitation (Northern Ireland) Order 1989 (SI 1989/1339 (N.I. 11)) there is inserted: “72A Actions for recovery of property obtained through unlawful conduct etc. (1) None of the time limits fixed by Parts II and III applies to any proceedings under Chapter 2 of Part 5 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (civil recovery of proceeds of unlawful conduct); (2) Proceedings under that Chapter for a recovery order in respect of any recoverable property shall not be brought after the expiration of the period of twelve years from the date on which the Director’s cause of action accrued; (3) Proceedings under that Chapter are brought when (a) a claim form is issued, or (b) an application is made for an interim receiving order, whichever is the earlier.”

(4) The Director’s cause of action accrues in respect of any recoverable property: (a) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of property obtained through unlawful conduct, when the property is so obtained; (b) in the case of proceedings for a recovery order in respect of any other recoverable property, when the property obtained through unlawful conduct which it represents is so obtained.

(5) If: (a) a person would (but for a time limit fixed by this Order) have a cause of action in respect of the conversion of a chattel, and. (b) proceedings are started under that Chapter for a recovery order in respect of the chattel, Article 17(2) does not prevent his asserting on an application under section 281 of that Act that the property belongs to him, or the court making a declaration in his favour under that section.

(6) If the court makes such a declaration, his title to the chattel is to be treated as not having been extinguished by Article 17(2).

(7) Expressions used in this Article and Part 5 of that Act have the same meaning in this Article as in that Part.’

Revenue and Customs Prosecutions Office

In 2005, there was created a Revenue and Customs Prosecutions Office in the UK This included the Enforcement Task Force, a multi-disciplinary unit comprising Customs and Crown Prosecution Service lawyers, and police and customs officers, all of whom share the responsibility of enforcing confiscation orders. To illustrate how and why the Proceeds of

Crime Act operates as regards confiscation, the reviewer will relate⁴ the following case prosecuted by the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) in the year 2001, as announced on the SFO website in September 2001.⁵

Case study: 'Legal Aid' fraud

Chapter 7 of *Confiscation Law Handbook* is devoted to caselaw; it includes a wealth of cases which illustrate the aims of confiscation; the meaning of the word 'obtains'; benefits; value of goods and drugs; pecuniary advantage; apportionment; money laundering; companies; lifting the corporate veil. This chapter alone is sound reason for the placement of this book in every lawyer's library. Every university law school library must have this book – there is no other introductory, detailed, practical book on confiscation in English law.

Fraud trial at Bristol Crown Court

The reviewer introduces the reader to the case of *R v Tim Robinson and Others* [2001]⁶ to illustrate several facets of confiscation. Tim Robinson was the first defendant in a case in which twenty six others were on trial for 'green form fraud' at Bristol Crown Court. The trial lasted for almost 12 months, and involved complex issues of disclosure, legal privilege and confidentiality. The senior partner of the solicitor's firm *Robinsons' Solicitors* was convicted. He was the solicitor best known for representing convicted murderer Tracie Andrews. Some time after the *Tracie Andrews* was tried for the murder of her boyfriend, Tim Robinson (then in his 60s) was charged, tried and convicted of criminally masterminding a multi-million pound fraud against Legal Services Commission, by fraudulently misusing the Green Form system, the investigation of which began since 1993, years before Tracie Andrews had committed murder. Tim Robinson was convicted of fraud along with 21 of his employees – they had been guilty of the submission of fraudulent Legal Aid forms. It is estimated that, in total, this law firm had claimed for millions of pounds of work that was never done. Tim Robinson was imprisoned in 2004. At Tim Robinson's trial, Bristol Crown Court heard how the long-term fraud centred on the 'Green Forms' used by solicitors' firms to claim for certain types of Legal Aid work.⁷ In the early 1990s, *Robinsons Solicitors*, which had offices in Cheltenham, Gloucester, Bristol and Swindon (but which no longer exists) boasted that it was one of the largest specialist criminal law practices in Britain.⁸ On investigation, police discovered that in a number of the firm's other cases, some solicitors and clerks exaggerated their bills or simply created fictitious non-existent clients, the prosecution told the court during Tim Robinson's court trial.

Police tipped

⁴ Date of birth: 9 April 1969. Tracie Margurite Andrews was convicted of stabbing to death, her boyfriend Lee Harvey and blaming it on a fictitious road rage incident.

⁵ The UK's SFO (as opposed to the New Zealand SFO at <http://www.sfo.govt.nz/>) has its offices at Elm House, 10-16 Elm Street, London, WC1X0BJ. See the UK's SFO website at <http://www.sfo.gov.uk>.

⁶ Tim Robinson was released from prison in 2004, having served half of his seven-year prison sentence.

⁷ The government provides funding for legal aid to help people protect their basic rights and get a fair hearing; access the court process to sort out disputes; and solve problems that contribute to social exclusion. The Legal Services Commission (LSC) administers the legal aid scheme in England and Wales. Note that the UK Ministry of Justice oversees the LSC and the Treasury sets the LSC's annual legal budget.

⁸ The law firm worked on the defence of Tracie Andrews who had murdered her fiancé in 1997, claiming that he had been the victim of a road rage attack. He kept up a continuous pretence of this lie, even down to the detailed description of the man she said had killed her boyfriend and her solicitors broadcast a 'photo-fit' on television and pleaded for anyone who recognised this man, to come forward. Because of her fabrication, the Alvechurch police stopped and interviewed hundreds of drivers over a period of several days in the hope that another driver would remember the alleged killer and his fictitious car.

A whistleblower's report triggered the investigation into this Legal Aid fraud. The exact sum of money defrauded from the Legal Aid Board by this law firm was estimated to be as much as £17 million over the years that the police investigation concentrated on. At the criminal trial, one of Tim Robinson's former employees said that up to 90% of the 'Legal Aid Green Forms' submitted by Robinson's Solicitors Cheltenham office were fraudulent. The prosecution counsel was Ian Glen; Queen's Counsel (QC) who told the court that one of Tim Robinson's employees had said that Tim Robinson was '*a mini-Maxwell, obsessed with power and money*', and it was noted by prosecuting counsel that Tim Robinson had been careful '*not to dirty his own hands*'. Mr Glen said: '*Mr Robinson himself was very careful not to dirty his own hands. He got others to commit the frauds with those Green Forms. It was his fee-earning clerks who did the dirty work.*'⁹

Legal costs of trial over £40 million

Police officers had seized 21 tonnes of documents in this fraud case. Tim Robinson himself was convicted along with 21 of his employees and five employees were acquitted with charges against two other employees ordered by the judge to lie on file. The investigation of this fraud began in April 1993 and with 120 police officers consumed in this fraud investigation, it cost the government many millions of pounds, not including £40 million in legal costs.

Tracing the assets for confiscation purposes

Having established the fraud, the assets had to be traced and the Serious Fraud Office (SFO) traced assets belonging to Tim Robinson or his wife to a total of £1.6 million. The SFO found that Tim Robinson had drawn a sum of £3 million from his firm between the years 1991 to 1999.

Confiscation Orders

The judge imposed a confiscation order on Tim Robinson of £532,275 to be paid as compensation to the Legal Aid agency (now called the Legal Services Commission). The trial judge also imposed an order for Tim Robinson to pay the sum of £500,000 towards prosecution legal costs. See also *R v Szrajber* [1994] Crim LR 543 (on page 94 of *Confiscation Law Handbook*; note that the inadequacy of the available amount is explained on page 104). Robinson was ordered to pay towards prosecution costs because it was known that the amount of monies available could sustain both orders. Note also that Pension Policies can form part of the available monies confiscated if such policies can be realised.

Unsuccessful appeal against conviction

Robinson appealed against his conviction and then his sentence in October 2002, but lost both appeals. Tim Robinson's defence counsel was David Etherington QC.¹⁰ Having been convicted of serious fraud, solicitor Tim Robinson completely ruined his own career, fortunes and reputation and status by abusing his position of trust, committing serious fraud in so doing.

⁹ Editor, 'Legal Aid scam boss convicted', *BBC News UK*, 29 October 2004. See <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/gloucestershire/3964525.stm>.

¹⁰ Now at 18 Red Lion Court, London.

A partnership firm

Any person is legally capable of forming a partnership with any other person. Companies as well as individuals can, provided their objects clause gives them the power to do so, enter a partnership with other companies or with individuals.

Cessation of partnership

Most partnerships are partnerships at will. This means that no particular period is agreed upon as being the Time during which the partnership is to last. A '*partnership at will*' can be dissolved by notice unless there is an agreement to the contrary. In the case of *Robinsons Solicitors*, those partners convicted of fraud could no longer hold practising certificates from the Law Society of England and Wales, and therefore the partnership *Robinsons Solicitors*¹¹ ceased to exist and cessation accounts as at that date would have been drawn up. Partners who are starting a business or who wish to use a business name should consult the regulations. If they find that their name includes a word covered by the regulations they should first write to the government department or other body which is to be consulted in relation to that word asking it whether it objects. They should then apply to the Secretary of State for approval stating that they have made such a request and enclosing a copy of any reply that they have received from the government department or other body that they have consulted. Any partnership which uses a business name other than one permitted under section 1 Business Names Act 1985, is required to state the name of each partner (together with an address for service in Great Britain) on every business letter, order for goods or services, invoice, receipt and written demand for payment of a debt Section 4(1) (a) Business Names Act 1985). The same information must also be given by a notice in a prominent position at each place of business of the partnership (section 4(1)(b) Business Names Act 1985). The same information must be given in writing to anyone with whom the partnership has had dealings or negotiations and who asks for the information (section 4(2) Business Names Act 1985). This disclosure requirement does not apply to a partnership with more than 20 members provided that none of the partners' names appear (other than as signatories) and provided the letter includes a statement of the address of the principal place of business and a statement that the name and addresses of the partners can be inspected there.¹²

¹¹ It is to be noted that a partnership is entitled to choose any name it wishes. The Act permits the free use of certain names and requires approval of others. If the business of a partnership is carried on under a name, which consists of the surnames of all the partners no restrictions, apply. (Section 1 Business Names Act 1985). This is true also if the names consists of surnames together with permitted additions and nothing else. The permitted additions are the forenames or the initials of the partners, the addition of an S to a surname to signify that there is more than one partner with that same name and/or a statement that the business is being carried on in succession to the business of a former owner.

¹² Minor amendments due to the Companies Act 2006 affect partnerships. The Partnership Act 1890 s4 permits a partnership to have a firm name. The Companies Act 2006 Part 41 Chapter 1 applies to any person carrying on business in the UK and prohibits sensitive words and misleading names. By Chapter 2, s1202, where the firm name is other than those of the partners, the partners' names must be on the partnership's business letters etc, but, s1203, if there are more than twenty partners, it is sufficient to state the principal place of business and that a list of the partners may be inspected there. There is no requirement to display details on websites. These provisions replace the Business Names Act 1985

The partnership deed or agreement

Partners enter into the agreement on the terms that they themselves have negotiated. So they are contractually bound by those terms, as long as those terms do not expressly conflict with the provisions in the Partnership Act 1890. These terms may be enforced by the law in the same way as other contractual terms. Usually the terms are set out in the form of Articles of Partnership and any gaps in the Articles will be filled by reference to the Partnership Act 1890. These terms will be terms about the nature of the business to be transacted; the name of the firm; the capital contributions to be made by individual partners; the drawing up of the business accounts; the method of determining and sharing profits.

The law imposes duties on partners: these are the fiduciary duties of partners. A written agreement is not required for the formation of a partnership. This contrasts with the position of a company where the articles, which have contractual effect under section 18 Companies Act 2006 (section 14 Companies Act 1985). In practice many partnerships decide that the agreement between the partners, as to how the business is regulated, should be in the form of a written agreement. Such an agreement is often called a partnership agreement, a partnership deed or articles of partnership. When writing a partnership deed, it must be borne in mind that many of the provisions in the Partnership Act 1890 are there to regulate the relationship of the partners except to the extent that there is a contrary agreement. The nature of a partnership agreement must depend upon the circumstances.

Points to note when examining a partnership deed are (i) the parties (section 24(7) Partnership Act 1890); (ii) the nature of business (section 24 (8) Partnership Act 1890); (iii) name; and (iv) capital. Provision should be made specifying which property is to be regarded as partnership property and which is to remain the property of individual partners. The Deed should include terms dealing with the dissolution of the partnership and clauses to provide for what is to happen in case of death or retirement of partners. The deed may have terms, which deal with the partners' obligations to the firm (eg confidentiality, loyalty). Also, terms such as that the partners are to give their whole time to the business of the firm or a clause to state that partners must only take up other businesses with the approval of their partners, a clause to prevent each partner from doing business in competition with the firm during the continuance of the partnership, even if the partners are not full-time. Another good clause to have in the deed is a restrictive covenant preventing competition with the firm by a partner after he has left the firm, as long as this clause does not make unreasonable demands. Some of the duties of partners are set out in the Partnership Act 1890 (PA). Section 10 PA states that the liability of partners in regard to torts is joint and several if the wrong sued on are committed in the ordinary course of the partnership business. Section 25 PA states that no majority of partners can expel another partner, unless such power is contained in the partnership agreement. Section 28 PA states that partners must provide true accounts and give full information to the other partners in relation to all things affecting the partnership (see *Law v Law* [1905] All ER 526, CA). Section 29 PA provides that partners must account to the firm for any benefit obtained, without consent, from any transaction relating to the partnership.

Appeal against confiscation

Confiscation can be appealed against under the general rules of appeal to the court of appeal. The appellant can apply for an extension of time. According to Part 2, Order 2003, POCA, the applicant must give notice of appeal and state the grounds for the application. Chapter 6, pages 60 to 74, deals with enforcement, reconsideration of orders and appeals, etc.

Disclosure

Disclosure of confidential banking data based on suspicion of fraud may have had a detrimental effect on the finance industry, although no one has yet studied this issue. In the case of *Macdoel Investments Ltd and Others v Federal Republic of Brazil and Others*¹³ the Court of Appeal¹⁴ lowered the standard of proof to be met before a court will make a pre-action order for disclosure against a third party. 'Third party interests' is such an important topic that it has had a whole chapter devoted to it in *Confiscation Law Handbook*.¹⁵

There has always been scope for the courts to infringe on a bank's duty of confidentiality to its client—the power to order pre-action disclosure against a third party necessarily means that a bank can be required to produce confidential information relating to the affairs of a client engaged in litigation at the order of the court.

In *Macdoel Investments Ltd & Others v Federal Republic of Brazil & Others*¹⁶ however, the Jersey Court of Appeal appears to have dramatically lowered the standard of proof to be met before a court will make a pre-action order for disclosure against a third party. Mere suspicion that the proceeds of fraud are held in a Jersey bank account, rather than a higher standard such as a prima facie case, is now sufficient for the bank to be required to disclose confidential data. Without any obvious consideration for the effect on the finance industry, the Court of Appeal appears to have broken down the banker's door and demanded the key to the vault.

Third Party Pre-Action Disclosure

The leading English case on the court's power to order pre-action disclosure against a third party is *Norwich Pharmacal Co v Customs and Excise Comrs*¹⁷ where Lord Reid held that:

'If through no fault of his own a person gets mixed up in the tortious acts of others so as to facilitate their wrongdoing he may incur no personal liability but he comes under a duty to assist the person who has been wronged by giving him full information and disclosing the identity of the wrongdoers.'

The court has discretion about whether or not it is right that an order should be made in all the circumstances of the case. To grant *Norwich Pharmacal* relief it had to be shown that: a wrong has been carried out, or at least arguably carried out, by a wrongdoer; the plaintiff

¹³ [2007] JCA069.

¹⁴ Note that *MacDoel* was a case in the jurisdiction of Jersey. It can be argued that by this caselaw, the definition of 'reasonable suspicion' has been defined, and has disregarded the rights and interests of third party banks. In the international banking environment, clients value confidentiality, as they still do domestically, and there are many jurisdictions which will still give confidentiality to their clients. This case demonstrates a gross incursion into the privacy offered by Jersey banks and must have greatly concerned Jersey's banking community.

¹⁵ Chapter 9, 'Third Party Interests' (pages 123 to 127).

¹⁶ *Ibid* 10.

¹⁷ [1973] 2 All ER 943, [1973] 3 WLR 164.

intends to assert his legal rights against the wrongdoer; there is the need for an order to enable action to be brought against the wrongdoer; and the defendant or respondent is a person who was mixed up in, or facilitated in, the wrongdoing or has some relationship with the wrongdoer, and is able to provide the information necessary to enable the wrongdoer to be sued.

One of the most commonly encountered applications of the *Norwich Pharmacal* jurisdiction are what are generally called *Bankers Trust* orders, named after the Court of Appeal decision in *Bankers Trust Co v Shapira*.¹⁸ On September 20, 1979, two men presented to the plaintiff bank in New York two cheques, each for half a million dollars purportedly drawn on a bank in Saudi Arabia and made payable to one of the men. The bank paid over the million dollars and on instructions from the two men credited \$600,000 and later \$108,203 to accounts of the two men at the London branch of the D bank, the third defendants. The plaintiff bank reimbursed the bank in Saudi Arabia in the sum of, one million dollars, and on May 20, 1980, issued a writ in one with statement of claim in an action to trace and recover the moneys. The appeal court granted the order sought against the bank, but said that

‘Though the court would not lightly use its powers to order disclosure of full information touching the confidential relationship of banker and customer, such an order was justified even at the early interlocutory stages of an action where plaintiffs sought to trace funds which in equity belonged to them’.

Existing Authorities on ‘third party interests’

Bankers Trust and Arab Monetary Fund v Hashim (No 5) [1992] All ER 911 is a case which directly addresses the question. In *Bankers Trust*, Lord Denning considered to what standard the plaintiff must show that the monies in the accounts were the fruits of wrongdoing and in *Arab Monetary Fund* Mr. Justice Hoffmann, following *Bankers Trust*, addressed the standard to which the plaintiff must demonstrate that the disclosure sought would lead to the location or preservation of the assets. In the *Bankers Trust* context the involvement of the third party, the bank, in the wrongdoing arises from the fact that monies which were the product of the wrongdoing entered the accounts. Unless the funds which entered the accounts actually came from the wrongdoing, then the third party bank against which disclosure is sought will not have had any involvement in the wrongdoing at all. Accordingly, asking whether the funds in the third party accounts or evidenced in the third party documents were from the wrongdoing is equivalent to asking whether the third party was involved in the wrongdoing.

In *Arab Monetary Fund* the court described *Bankers Trust* as an application of the *Norwich Pharmacal* principle in aid of tracing claims. Hoffmann J held that to obtain the information sought “the plaintiff must demonstrate a real prospect that the information may lead to the location or preservation of assets to which he is making a proprietary claim”. On the facts of that case, he found that there was no serious possibility that disclosure of the information would enable the assets to be found and preserved.

¹⁸ 1980] 3 All ER 353, [1980] 1 WLR 1274.

Civil Contempt for breach of restraint order

The Court of Appeal ruled that a breach of restraint order (Part 2POCA) made under the ruling in *OB v SFO*¹⁹ is arguably at issue if say, a defendant breaches the restraint order by spending the money in question, having been acquitted in the criminal court of a proceeds of crime charge. Assuming that the assets in question had been restrained at the Time of the criminal charge against him, and that he proceeded to spend the money after he had been acquitted in the criminal court. Apart from offences by third parties (such as banks) who allowed him to spend his money, he himself would be in civil contempt of the court.

Issues and thoughts on the subject of ‘confiscation’

The United Kingdom (UK) has followed Ireland and has in force the Proceeds of Crimes Act 2002 which confiscates assets from someone the government suspects has obtained such assets through criminal activity. In the UK, punishment for fraud offences consists of imprisonment and also confiscation of the proceeds of fraud wherever possible.²⁰

In England where trusts are often used to protect assets from confiscation, a discretionary trust may be made to pay the creditors when the beneficiaries become bankrupt. As the Proceeds of Crime Bill was being debated in Parliament in 2011, the accountancy industry’s views on the Bill may be summed up thus:

“The ‘‘Proceeds of Crime Bill’’ proposes to make it a criminal offence for accountants not to report any suspicions or dubious transactions to the National Criminal Intelligence Service (NCIS)²¹ as well as the Inland Revenue.²² In response, the ICAEW²³ claims that the ‘‘government plans to crack down on money laundering could be very damaging economically and pose a serious threat to the role of the accountant’’.²⁴

POCA is as much about restorative justice as it is about punishment. For example in a 2003 case, Lee Rosser was handed consecutive prison terms in two trials concerning conspiracies to defraud investors in a ‘malt whisky scheme’ and a ‘millennium champagne scheme’. The

¹⁹ [2012] EWCA Crim 67 (at para.43).

²⁰ For example in a 2003 case, Lee Rosser was handed consecutive prison terms in two trials concerning conspiracies to defraud investors in a ‘malt whisky scheme’ and a ‘millennium champagne scheme’. The UK’s Serious Fraud Office traced his assets and won a confiscation judgement. The court was told that through Rosser’s fraud, the benefit from the fraud of £5 million, but that because he made a large number of cash transactions and his expensive lifestyle, his realisable assets were few. The court nevertheless ordered him to pay £519,000. Contrary to this obvious benefit from the fraud perpetrated, is the case of *R v Olibutan*, The Times, 7 November 2003, the facts of this particular case bore no evidence that the conspirator received any pecuniary advantage from the conspiracy and therefore the confiscation order was quashed.

²¹ Since disbanded.

²² Now HMRC (Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs).

²³ Institute of Chartered Accountants for England and Wales.

²⁴ A quote from <http://www.accountingweb.co.uk>, accessed on 6 June 2001. Note, however, that evidence relating to the involvement of accountancy firms in money laundering is not difficult to find. In a High Court case, Lord Justice Millett pointed the finger at accountants and accountancy firms and said that ‘*Mr. Jackson and Mr. Griffin knew... of no connection or dealings between the Plaintiffs and Kinz or of any commercial reason for the Plaintiffs to make substantial payments to Kinz. They must have realized that the only function which the payee companies or Euro-Arabian performed was to act as ‘‘cut-outs’’ in order to conceal the true destination of the money from the Plaintiffs...to make it impossible for investigators to make any connection between the Plaintiffs and Kinz without having recourse to Lloyds Bank’s records; and their object in frequently replacing the payee company by another must have been to reduce the risk of discovery by the Plaintiffs. Mr. Jackson and Mr. Griffin are professional men. They obviously knew they were laundering money...It must have been obvious to them that their clients could not afford their activities to see the light of the day. Secrecy is the badge of fraud. They must have realized at least that their clients might be involved in a fraud on the plaintiffs’.*

Serious Fraud Office traced his assets and won a confiscation judgment. The court was told that through Rosser's fraud, the benefit from the fraud was £5 million, but because he made a large number of cash transactions and because of his expensive lifestyle, his realisable assets were few. The court nevertheless ordered him to pay £519,000. Contrary to this obvious benefit from the fraud perpetrated, is the case of *R v Olibutan*²⁵. The facts of *Olibutan* bore no evidence that the conspirator received any pecuniary advantage from the conspiracy. Therefore the confiscation order was quashed.

Under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 (POCA) a person who has committed a criminal offence benefits from his offending if he obtains property '*as a result of or in connection with*' the commission of the offence (s. 76(4))²⁶ (See caselaw *R v Waya*²⁷, on page 80, *Confiscation Law Handbook*). In a mortgage fraud, for example, the person's benefit is the market value of the property obtained (s.76(7)²⁸ and s.79(2).²⁹) POCA caters for the situation³⁰ whereby a person invests all the property he has unlawfully obtained.

This topic is dealt with in pages 25 to 32 of *Confiscation Law Handbook*.) In such a situation the court calculating the benefit must compare two valuations (s. 80(2))³¹. The first valuation is the market value of the property at the time it was obtained (adjusted for inflation). The second valuation is the market value of '*any property which directly or indirectly represents*' the property obtained (s.80 (3)); in other words the Court must look at the market value of any investment which '*represents*' the property obtained. The defendant's benefit for the purposes of confiscation is the greater of these two valuations. This process operates so that if the value of the investment has increased, the benefit is the value of the investment at the time of the confiscation hearing. But if the value of the investment has decreased, the benefit is the value of the property when originally obtained (adjusted for inflation). This accords with common sense. A person who has invested stolen property and made a profit ought not to be allowed to reap the rewards of such an investment. Equally, a person who has obtained property ought not to escape confiscation merely because he made a bad investment.

It is interesting to note another approach which has been rejected by the Court of Appeal, namely the 'but for' approach. Benefit is the value of property obtained '*as a result of or in connection with the commission of the offence*'. One approach to valuing benefit might be to equate the term '*as a result of*' with '*but for*'. Applying this approach suggests that the defendant obtained the property because of the mortgage funds, '*but for*' which, he could not have bought it. He therefore obtained the property '*as a result of or in connection with*' the fraud and his benefit is the value of the property. This approach suffers from three difficulties: (i) the '*but for*' approach broadens the scope of '*benefit*' and ignores the narrow ambit of the original offence. In a mortgage fraud, the essence of the defendant's conduct is

²⁵ *R v Olibutan* [2003], *The Times*, Nov 7, Court of Appeal, Criminal Division.

²⁶ S.76 (4) states that: '*A person benefits from conduct if he obtains property as a result of or in connection with the conduct.*'

²⁷ [2011] 1 Crim App R (S) 4.

²⁸ POCA, s.76 (7) states that: '*If a person benefits from conduct his benefit is the value of the property obtained.*'

²⁹ POCA, s. 79(2) states (about any property held by a person), that: '*Its value is the market value of the property at that time*'.

³⁰ This is a situation present in a typical mortgage fraud.

³¹ POCA, s.80 (2) states that: '*The value of the property at the material time is the greater of the following (a) the value of the property (at the time the person obtained it) adjusted to take account of later changes in the value of money; (b) the value (at the material time) of the property found under subsection (3).*' Subsection 3 states that: '*The property found under this subsection is as follows. (a) if the person holds the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is that property (b) if he holds no part of the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is any property which directly or indirectly represents it in his hands; (c) if he holds part of the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is that part and any property which directly or indirectly represents the other part in his hands.*'

obtaining mortgage funds dishonestly. The property obtained 'as a result of' the fraud is limited to the mortgage funds.

In the case of *R v May*³² the court said:

'If (say) a defendant applies £10,000 of tainted money as a down-payment on a £250,000 house, legitimately borrowing the remainder, it cannot plausibly be said that he has obtained the house as a result of or in connection with the commission of his offence.'

Secondly, applying the logic of 'but for' reasoning would suggest that the property obtained by the buyer was both the mortgage funds and the house: both were obtained 'as a result of' the offence. In the current example, this would mean that the defendant's benefit was not only the value of the mortgage funds (£600,000) but also the value of the house (£800,000), even though the mortgage funds were used to buy the house.

Another issue is that the 'but for' approach permits benefit to accrue indefinitely. For example, if the defendant subsequently legitimately remortgaged the house, each legitimately obtained mortgage should be added to the value of the criminal property, because 'but for' the original fraudulent mortgage and the purchase of the house, he would not have been in a position to remortgage. Such double counting would offend common sense and in *R v Pattison*,³³ Toulson L.J. said:

'Every school child knows that you cannot have the penny and the sweet. If your mother gives you a penny and you buy a sweet with it, your benefit is a penny's worth and not two penny's worth.'

The third issue with the 'but for' approach is that it is contrary to the valuation provisions in POCA. Under the 'but for' approach, where criminal property has been invested, the investment is property obtained 'as a result of' the commission of the offence. The value of the benefit would simply be the value of the investment, and there would be no need for the detailed valuation provisions contained in POCA, s.80.³⁴

References

Crown Prosecution Service, (2010) 'Confiscation and Ancillary Orders pre-POCA: Proceeds of Crime Guidance', London: Home Office.

³² [2008] AC 1028. at Para. 28.

³³ [2007] EWCA Crim 1536 (at Para. 21).

³⁴ POCA, s.80 states: '(1) This section applies for the purpose of deciding the value of property obtained by a person as a result of or in connection with his criminal conduct; and the material time is the time the court makes its decision. (2) The value of the property at the material time is the greater of the following: - (a) the value of the property (at the time the person obtained it) adjusted to take account of later changes in the value of money. (b) the value (at the material time) of the property found under subsection (3). (3) The property found under this subsection is as follows: (a) if the person holds the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is that property. (b) if he holds no part of the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is any property, which directly or indirectly represents it in his hands; . (c) if he holds part of the property obtained, the property found under this subsection is that part and any property which directly or indirectly represents the other part in his hands. (4) The references in subsection (2) (a) and (b) to the value are to the value found in accordance with section 79.

Crown Prosecution Service, (2012) 'Guidance for prosecutors on the discretion to instigate confiscation proceedings', London: Home Office

Rudi Fortson, (2011) *Misuse of Drugs and Drug Trafficking Offences: Offences, Confiscation and Money Laundering*, London: Sweet & Maxwell.

Printed and published by SALLY RAMAGE®, Copehale, Coppenhall, Stafford, ST18 9BW, UK. Registered as a Newspaper at the Post Office. © SALLY RAMAGE® 2012. All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any material form (including photocopying or storing it in any medium by electronic means and whether or not transiently or incidentally to some others use of this publication) without the written permission of the copyright holder except in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Design and Patents Act 1988 or under the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6-10 Kirby Street, London, England EC1N 8TS. Application for the copyright owner's written permission to reproduce any part of this publication should be addressed to the publisher. Warning: the doing of an unauthorised act in relation to a copyright work may result in both a civil claim for damages and criminal prosecution. ISSN 1758-8421.