

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)
 v.)
) Crim. No. 06-00071-JD
EDWARD LEWIS BROWN and)
ELAINE ALICE BROWN,)
)
 Defendants.)

GOVERNMENT'S OBJECTION TO DEFENDANTS' NOTICE
AND MOTION FOR A BILL OF PARTICULARS

The government hereby opposes the motion of defendants Edward Brown and Elaine Brown for a bill of particulars. The indictment sufficiently sets forth the facts on which the charges are based and there is therefore no grounds for a bill of particulars. Accordingly, the government respectfully requests that the Court deny defendant Brown's motion.

In support of its opposition, the government states as follows:

1. On April 5, 2006, a federal grand jury handed down an indictment charging both defendants with one count of conspiracy to defraud the United States in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, one count of conspiracy to structure financial transactions also in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371 and one substantive count of structuring financial transactions to avoid the currency transaction reporting requirements in violation of 31 U.S.C. §§ 5324(a)(3) and 5325.
2. The indictment further charges defendant Elaine Brown with five counts of tax evasion in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7201, eight counts of failing to collect employment taxes in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7202 and one additional substantive count of structuring in violation of 31 U.S.C. §§ 5324(a)(3) and 5325.

3. The defendants made their initial appearances and were arraigned before United States Magistrate Judge James R. Muirhead on May 24, 2006, and pleaded not guilty to all counts.
4. The trial is presently scheduled for the trial period beginning October 3, 2006.
5. The defendants filed a motion for a bill of particulars on June 26, 2006.
6. A bill of particulars must be granted only if the accused, in the absence of a more detailed specification, will be disabled from preparing a defense, caught by unfair surprise at trial or hampered in seeking the shelter of the Double Jeopardy clause of the Fifth Amendment. United States v. Sepulveda, 15 F.3d 1161, 1192-93 (1st Cir. 1993).
7. Requiring a bill of particulars is subject to the sound discretion of the Court and the denial of a request for a bill of particulars will be reversed only if it constitutes an abuse of discretion. United States v. Hallock, 941 F.2d 36, 40 (1st Cir. 1991).
8. The defendants assert that the indictment is insufficient and, in a manner more akin to interrogatories in civil cases, request specification of hundreds of facts listed over approximately 18 pages.
9. Each count in the equally lengthy indictment, however, specifies time, place and circumstances and properly alleges all of the elements of the charged offense.
10. In other words the indictment specifies sufficient facts to ensure that the defendants are not materially hampered in their trial preparation, that there is no unfair surprise and that the defendants are adequately protected from being from being subjected to double jeopardy. ¹
11. Accordingly, the defendants are not entitled to the relief that they seek.

¹ In addition, it should be noted that the government is providing the defendants with open file discovery and much of the information the defendants seek in their motion is reflected in those materials.

For the reasons set forth herein, the government respectfully requests that the defendants' motion for a bill of particulars be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS P. COLANTUONO
United States Attorney

By: /s/ William E. Morse
William E. Morse
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Bar No. 421934 (D.C.)
Office of the U.S. Attorney
53 Pleasant St., 3rd Floor
Concord, New Hampshire 03301
(603) 225-1552

Dated: July 17, 2006

Certificate of Service

I, William E. Morse, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was served this date by sending a copy by regular U.S. mail to Elaine A. Brown and Edward Brown, each at 401 Center of Town Road, Plainfield, New Hampshire 03781.

Dated: July 17, 2006

/s/ William E. Morse