

CORPORATE COUNSEL'S INTERNATIONAL ADVISER

JULY 1, 2011 | NUMBER 314

EXPORT CONTROLS AND SANCTIONS: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

By The Mayer Brown Practices

U.S. export controls and sanctions laws have undergone a number of important developments in the first quarter of 2011. This Review covers key issues related to:

- Cloud computing;

continued on page 2

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR

Dear Subscribers,

According to a recent State Department release, at the Fifth Summit of the Americas in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, President Obama invited all governments, international organizations, private industry, and civil society to deepen Inter-American collaboration by joining the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas (ECPA). ECPA is comprised of more than 40 initiatives and projects led by the United States and other Western Hemisphere governments and civil society institutions, with the support of the Organization of American States, Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank, and others. For more information, please visit www.ecpamericas.org.

In support of ECPA, the U.S. Department of State and USAID announced an open competition for U.S.-based nonprofit organizations and universities. Up to \$5.5 million will be available to promote electrical interconnection and cross-border trade in electricity in Central America as well as in the Andes; clean energy in the Americas; and an Andean Glacier and Water Resources Monitoring Network to promote modeling and information sharing on how glacial retreat will impact water security. The full announcement can be accessed at: <http://www.grants.gov/search/search.do;jsessionid=w6GXNp2Dphz16ZTL4pTpJ3C1rd12rXQg9PzPxchpKJWybQfzzK97!756542808?oppId=97744&mode=VIEW>.

Very truly yours,
Lisa K. Gregory
Principal Attorney Editor

IN THIS ISSUE:

| | |
|--|----|
| Letter from the Editor | 1 |
| Export Controls and Sanctions: Recent Developments | 1 |
| CFUIS Disapproval of Huawei- 3Leaf Systems Deal Puts New Focus on U.S. Controls over Cloud Computing Technology | 2 |
| Certain Cuba Sanctions Restrictions Lifted..... | 3 |
| New Export Control Certification Required For Non-Immigrant Worker Visas..... | 3 |
| President Announces Trade Agency Reorganization Initiative..... | 4 |
| United States Eases Export Controls against India | 4 |
| Conflict Minerals Reporting Requirement | 5 |
| Court of Appeals Upholds Conviction of Professor for Export Control Violations | 6 |
| The United States, United Nations, European Union, and United Kingdom Impose Sanctions on Libya | 6 |
| Justice Department Wins Conviction in First Corporate FCPA Trial | 7 |
| Significant Case | 7 |
| Bribery Scheme..... | 8 |
| Expert Theory Debunked | 8 |
| Updates | 8 |
| Trade | 12 |
| Calendar | 13 |

BOARD OF ADVISERS

Shelly P. Battram

Northwind Professional Institute, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Kenneth A. Cutshaw

Cajun Operating Company, Atlanta, Georgia

John Ellicott

Covington & Burling, Washington, D.C.

Prof. Howard N. Fenton

Ohio Northern University, College of Law, Ada, Ohio

Frank L. Fine

EC Competition Law Advocates, Brussels, Belgium

Eric L. Hirschhorn

Winston & Strawn LLP, Washington, D.C.

Gary Horlick

WilmerHale, Washington, D.C.

Leslie W. Jacobs

Thompson Hine LLP, Cleveland, Ohio

Lawrence W. Newman

Baker & McKenzie, New York, New York

J. Michael Robinson

Fasken Martineau, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Mark Roy Sandstrom

Law Offices of Mark R. Sandstrom, Washington, D.C.

Dennis Unkovic

Meyer, Unkovic & Scott, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Dominique Voillemot

Gide Loyrette Nouel, Brussels, Belgium

Joseph F. Winterscheid

McDermott Will & Emery, Washington, D.C.

Members of the Board of Advisers to CORPORATE COUNSEL'S INTERNATIONAL ADVISER call our attention to items they believe will be of interest to our subscribers. Unless specifically noted, no statement in this newsletter should be attributed to a specific adviser, and adviser's firm or company, or the Board of Advisers as a whole.

© 2011 Thomson Reuters. All rights reserved.

CORPORATE COUNSEL'S INTERNATIONAL ADVISER (ISSN 0898-9907) is published monthly by Thomson Reuters, 610 Opperman Drive, P.O. Box 64526, St. Paul, MN 55164-0526. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to CORPORATE COUNSEL'S INTERNATIONAL ADVISER, 610 Opperman Drive, P.O. Box 64526, St. Paul, MN 55164-0526.

This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered; however, this publication was not necessarily 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 authorization to photocopy, please contact the Copyright Clearance Center at 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA (978) 750-8400; fax (978) 646-8600 or West's Copyright Services at 610 Opperman Drive, Eagan, MN 55123, fax (651)687-7551. Please outline the specific material involved, the number of copies you wish to distribute and the purpose or format of the use.

- Cuba sanctions;
- Export control certifications for certain visa applications;
- Trade agency reorganization;
- U.S. export controls against India;
- Conflict minerals reporting;
- Application of export controls to academic research; and
- Libya sanctions.

U.S. and non-U.S. companies alike should be aware of these issues and the potential impact on their global operations.

CFIUS DISAPPROVAL OF HUAWEI-3LEAF SYSTEMS DEAL PUTS NEW FOCUS ON U.S. CONTROLS OVER CLOUD COMPUTING TECHNOLOGY

The U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) recently blocked Chinese telecommunications company Huawei Technologies Ltd. (Huawei) from acquiring the cloud computing related technology of, and hiring employees from, insolvent U.S. firm 3Leaf Systems. On February 18, 2011, Huawei issued a statement that it would not contest CFIUS' recommendation that Huawei withdraw its application to CFIUS for national security clearance of the transaction. The CFIUS action may signal an important development in U.S. control of cloud computing technology and U.S. regulation of foreign investment.

The parties did not seek CFIUS approval before the transaction. According to a Huawei statement, no CFIUS approval was sought because Huawei had timely sought and received approval for its acquisition of 3Leaf Systems technology from the U.S. Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) in the U.S. Department of Commerce. CFIUS did not agree that the BIS actions satisfied the government's concerns with the technology transfers, and it later asked Huawei to submit the deal for national security review.

The CFIUS action came after Senators Jim Webb and Jon Kyl and three other lawmakers wrote Commerce Secretary Gary Locke and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner to question the Administration's stance on the Huawei-3Leaf Systems deal and its regulation of cloud computing. In their February 10, 2010 letter, the legislators asked for a description of "the technology classification process as it relates to the export of resource virtualization or cloud computing technology." They also asked for a description of "the review taken by the Commerce Department that allowed a foreign company, with close ties to the Chinese military, to obtain an export license of this technology."

The CFIUS action and the focus by members of Congress on these issues come as the Department of Commerce is developing its policies on cloud computing. On January 11, 2011, the Department issued guidance stating that “the service of providing computational capacity through grid or cloud computing is not subject to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR), since the service provider is not shipping or transmitting any commodity, software or technology subject to the EAR to the user.” The Department had issued earlier guidance consistent with this position in January 2010.

CFIUS does not issue policy guidance, and its recommendations on the Huawei transactions are not public. However, the disapproval of Huawei's actions may signal that CFIUS views foreign acquisition of U.S. cloud computing technology as raising heightened national security concerns. For the Department of Commerce, though its guidance apparently has not directly dealt with acquisition of the technology for creating and maintaining a cloud computing network, rather than its operation, the CFIUS action and congressional pressure may encourage the Department to tighten its review of cloud computing-related activities.

CERTAIN CUBA SANCTIONS RESTRICTIONS LIFTED

On January 28, 2011, the U.S. Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) amended the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 515 (CACR or Cuba sanctions). The amendments implement policy changes announced by President Obama on January 14, 2011, to continue outreach efforts to the Cuban people. The amended regulations took effect immediately and among other things, authorize general licenses for: (i) certain transactions with Cuban nationals who are permanent residents outside of Cuba, (ii) travel to Cuba in connection with educational and religious activities, and (iii) remittances to Cuba.

Prior to the amendments, the Cuba sanctions broadly prohibited transactions with Cuban nationals no matter where they resided. The amended regulations establish a new general license that authorizes persons in the United States to engage in certain transactions with individual nationals of Cuba who are permanent residents outside of Cuba. The general license is subject to the requirement that U.S. persons obtain from the Cuban national at least two documents issued to the individual by the government authorities of the new country of permanent residence. However, all property in which a Cuban national has an interest that was blocked prior to the later of the date on which the individual took up permanent residence outside of Cuba or January 28, 2011, remains blocked.

The amendments to CACR also add general licenses for certain educational and religious activities that had previously required specific licenses from OFAC. A specific license will still be required for any educational or religious activities not authorized under the new general licenses. The new general license for educational activities authorizes accredited U.S. graduate and undergraduate degree-granting academic institutions to engage in travel-related transactions incident to certain educational activities. Students traveling under the general license must carry a letter on official letterhead, signed by a designated representative of the sponsoring U.S. academic institution, stating that the study in Cuba falls within the scope of the general license.

Similarly, the new general license for religious activities authorizes religious organizations located in the United States, including members and staff, to engage in travel-related transactions that are incident to religious activities in Cuba. Under the general license, travelers must engage in a full-time program of religious activities, and donations to Cuba or Cuban nationals are not authorized. In addition, individuals traveling under the general license must carry a letter on official letterhead, signed by a designated representative of the U.S. religious organization, stating that the travel is within the scope of the general license.

Finally, the amended regulations add three general licenses related to remittances to Cuba subject to certain restrictions. These new licenses authorize: (i) remittances of up to \$500 per quarter to any Cuban national, except prohibited officials of the Government of Cuba, or prohibited members of the Cuban Communist Party, to support the development of private businesses, among other purposes; (ii) unlimited remittances to religious organizations in Cuba in support of religious activities; and (iii) remittances to close relatives who are students in Cuba pursuant to an educational license for the purpose of funding transactions authorized by the license under which the student is traveling.

NEW EXPORT CONTROL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR NON-IMMIGRANT WORKER VISAS

Companies seeking visas for their foreign national workers must now certify whether such workers need a deemed export license to access controlled technology and technical data. Effective February 20, 2011, companies petitioning for certain nonimmigrant visas for their employees must certify on Form I-129 that they have reviewed U.S. export control regulations and determined that: (i) a license is not required from either the Department of Commerce or the Department of State to release technology or technical data to the beneficiary; or (ii) if

an export license is required, the company will not release controlled technology to the foreign worker unless and until it has received a license or other authorization to do so. This certification is only required for H-1B, H-1B1, L-1, or O-1A visas.

A deemed export occurs when controlled technology or technical data is released to foreign persons in the United States. A release of technology includes making it available to a foreign person through visual inspection or oral exchange and making it available by practice or application under the guidance of persons with knowledge of the technology. Such releases are deemed to be an export to the foreign person's country of nationality and may require an export license from the Commerce Department or the State Department prior to release.

To determine whether technology or technical data is controlled for export, it must first be classified under the Commerce Control List (CCL) found in the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) or the U.S. Munitions List (USML) contained in the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR). The CCL contains a list of dual-use items that are controlled for export because they have both commercial and military applications. The USML controls items that are directly related to defense and military use. If the technology or technical data is described on the CCL, a license may be required prior to its release to a foreign person in the United States, depending upon such foreign person's most recent country of citizenship or nationality. If the technology is listed on the USML, a license will be required prior to release to any foreign person in the United States. However, the EAR and the ITAR do not control technology or technical data that are "publicly available" or in the "public domain," as those terms are defined by the applicable regulations.

Understanding the deemed export rules, classifying technology under the EAR or the ITAR, and determining whether a license is required to release technology to a particular foreign employee are likely to pose challenges to company personnel unfamiliar with U.S. export controls.

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES TRADE AGENCY REORGANIZATION INITIATIVE

On March 11, 2011, President Obama issued a memorandum assigning a U.S. Chief Performance Officer with the responsibility of leading an effort to create a plan for the restructuring and streamlining of certain federal government agencies. The U.S. Office of Management and Budget's Deputy Director for Management will serve in this role. The reform effort springs from the President's January 25, 2011 State of the Union Address calling for increased competitiveness and innovation through gov-

ernment reform. This effort will focus first on the executive departments and agencies supporting trade, exports, and overall U.S. competitiveness. A new Government Reform for Competitiveness and Innovation Initiative will review the federal agencies and programs involved in trade, exports, and competitiveness by analyzing their scope and effectiveness, areas of overlap and duplication, and cost. Although the memorandum does not specifically identify the agencies falling under this Initiative, they likely will include the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Commerce Department's International Trade Administration, the Department of Energy, the USDA Foreign Agricultural Service, the Small Business Administration, the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, and the Office of Foreign Assets Control.

The President's memorandum requires consultation with the relevant leaders and staff of the departments and agencies, external organizations, and government reform experts on suggested improvements in effectiveness and efficiency. President Obama requested that the Chief Performance Officer submit recommendations within 90 days for presidential and congressional action to restructure and streamline federal government programs focused on trade and competitiveness. This schedule would call for the proposal by around mid-June. The President identified the following principles as guidance for the recommendations: (i) efficient and effective facilitation of U.S. competitiveness; (ii) transparent, understandable, and easily accessible agency programs and requirements; and (iii) reduced inefficiencies and overlapping responsibilities or functions. U.S. companies with international operations should carefully monitor such changes and their potential impact on business efficiencies.

UNITED STATES EASES EXPORT CONTROLS AGAINST INDIA

On January 25, 2011, the U.S. Commerce Department's Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) lifted restrictive export controls on trade with India in the civil space, defense, and other high technology sectors. BIS' new rule implements the November 8, 2010 bilateral understanding between President Obama and Prime Minister Singh of India to expand the two countries' strategic and commercial partnership. Companies doing business with India should be aware of BIS' new rule and its impact on potential trading opportunities.

INDIAN ENTITIES REMOVED FROM THE ENTITY LIST

The new rule removes the following Indian defense and space-related entities from BIS' Entity List.

- Bharat Dynamics Limited (BDL)

- Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO) subordinate entities:
 - » Armament Research and Development Establishment (ARDE);
 - » Defense Research and Development Lab (DRDL);
 - » Missile Research and Development Complex; and
 - » Solid State Physics Laboratory.
- Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO) subordinate entities:
 - » Liquid Propulsion Systems Center;
 - » Solid Propellant Space Booster Plant (SPROB);
 - » Sriharikota Space Center (SHAR); and
 - » Vikram Sarabhai Space Center (VSSC).

Removing these nine Indian entities from the Entity List eliminates the additional dual-use licensing requirements for exports to entities on the List. Exporters, however, must still obtain all necessary authorizations otherwise required under BIS' Export Administration Regulations (EAR) for shipments to these entities.

INDIA REMOVED FROM THREE COUNTRY GROUPS

BIS' new rule removes India from EAR Country Groups listing countries with certain export restrictions imposed for reasons of nuclear nonproliferation (Country Group D:2), chemical & biological weapons (Country Group D:3), and missile technology (Country Group D:4). India's removal from these groups eliminates certain licensing requirements for items such as medical products containing certain pathogens and toxins, and certain rocket systems and unmanned aerial vehicle end uses. In addition, with the removal of India from Country Groups D:2, D:3, and D:4, two license exceptions are now available for exports to India. Specifically, License Exception Baggage (BAG) is available for exports and re-exports of unaccompanied baggage to India, and India now is an eligible destination for re-exports under License Exception Additional Permissive Re-exports (APR).

INDIA ADDED TO ONE COUNTRY GROUP

The new BIS rule adds India to Country Group A:2 of the EAR. Country Group A lists member countries of the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). Although India is not an MCTR member, its placement on the Country Group A:2 list recognizes India's commitment to adhere to the MCTR's export control requirements.

CONFLICT MINERALS REPORTING REQUIREMENT

The recently enacted Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform & Consumer Protection Act amended the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 by including a new provision requiring companies filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to disclose whether their products use conflict minerals. The Act defines such conflict minerals as "columbite-tantalite (coltan), cassiterite, gold, wolframite or their derivatives" and other minerals determined by the U.S. Secretary of State to be financing conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Conflict minerals are commonly used in cell phones, laptops, electronic, medical, and other high-tech products.

While the law does not prohibit companies from using conflict minerals, it aims to discourage such activity by requiring certain companies that use conflict minerals necessary to their manufactured products' functionality or production to annually disclose to the SEC whether any such minerals originated in the DRC or an adjoining country. If so, then the company must submit a certified report to the SEC describing:

- The due diligence measures taken on the source and chain of custody of the minerals, including an independent private sector audit of the report.
- The products manufactured or contracted to be manufactured that are not "DRC conflict free," the country of origin of the conflict minerals, and the facilities used to process the conflict minerals. "DRC conflict free" means the product does not contain minerals that directly or indirectly finance or benefit armed groups in the DRC or a neighboring country.

The law further requires that companies post the information disclosed to the SEC on their Web site. The SEC is expected to issue implementing regulations for this provision between August and December 2011. These regulations should provide further clarification how the conflicts mineral reporting requirement will be applied. In the meantime, companies subject to this new provision should prepare for the requisite due diligence, product evaluations, and supply chain reviews. Non-subject companies also should ready themselves for cooperating with business partners who file with the SEC. Companies also should note that the new law does not otherwise widen the existing U.S. sanctions prohibiting certain business transactions with DRC individuals and entities on the Office of Foreign Assets Control's List of Specially Designated Nationals and Blocked Persons (SDN List).

COURT OF APPEALS UPHOLDS CONVICTION OF PROFESSOR FOR EXPORT CONTROL VIOLATIONS

In January 2011, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit upheld the 2008 convictions of John Reece Roth for multiple violations of U.S. export control laws in connection with research he conducted while a professor of electrical engineering at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. *U.S. v. Roth*, 628 F.3d 827 (6th Cir. 2011), petition for cert. filed, 79 U.S.L.W. 3594 (U.S. Apr. 5, 2011). In 2010, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee sentenced Roth to four years in prison for these violations.

Roth was convicted of violating the Arms Export Control Act and associated provisions of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) for unlawfully exporting defense articles and defense services without a license. He had been working on an Air Force contract for the development of plasma actuators for use in controlling the flight of military drone aircraft. Roth took certain technical data associated with that work with him on his laptop computer while traveling to China to lecture at universities there. He also disclosed technical data to two students at the University, one a national of China and the other a national of Iran, who worked with him on the contract.

On appeal, Roth argued that the technical data were not defense articles or defense services because the contract contemplated that the plasma actuators would be tested on commercial aircraft before being used on military aircraft. The Court of Appeals, citing a Seventh Circuit ruling, *U.S. v. Pulungan*, 569 F.3d 326, 328 (7th Cir. 2009), held that the designation of items as defense articles or defense services was not subject to judicial review, but that the court could review whether the information in question about the plasma actuators fell within the ITAR definition of technical data. The court of appeals held that the information did constitute technical data because the ultimate use for which the plasma actuators were being developed was military.

Roth also argued on appeal that the convictions resulting from his travel to China with technical data on his laptop were erroneous because he never opened the electronic file while traveling and could not have known its contents until after his return to the United States. The court of appeals rejected this argument, holding that Roth knew that the information loaded on his laptop included export-controlled technical data, and that taking the technical data to China was a violation of law even if Roth did not show the data to anyone while he was in China.

The *Roth* case underscores how crucial it is that universities, faculty members, and student researchers be familiar with the application of U.S. export control laws in the context of academic research and consulting. Uni-

versities should have in place export control policies that are disseminated to relevant faculty, staff, and students. Appropriate training programs and other safeguards should be instituted to ensure that the policies are effectively implemented. Faculty members should take principal responsibility for export control compliance associated with research and consulting projects that they lead, including responsibility for compliance by students and staff working under their supervision.

As the *Roth* convictions demonstrate, exportation can occur by means of disclosure to foreign nationals even if the nationals are located in the United States, but it can also occur by means of travel with technical data on a laptop even if those technical data remain under the traveler's control. Such activities are commonplace in the academic setting, but they are fraught with potential export control violations and should be undertaken with close attention to the export control laws.

THE UNITED STATES, UNITED NATIONS, EUROPEAN UNION, AND UNITED KINGDOM IMPOSE SANCTIONS ON LIBYA

For an overview of the sanctions imposed by the UN, U.S., EU and UK at the end of February 2011, see Mayer Brown LLP's Legal Update of March 1, 2011. <http://www.mayerbrown.com/publications/article.asp?id=10534&nid=6>. The various sanctions programs continue to develop and additional individuals and entities have been sanctioned.

For more information about the issues raised in this Review, please contact any of the attorneys listed below:

Simeon M. Kriesberg
+1 202 263 3214
skriesberg@mayerbrown.com

Carol J. Bilzi
+1 202 263 3202
cbilzi@mayerbrown.com

Kristy L. Balsanek
kbalsanek@mayerbrown.com

Dave M. Wharwood
+1 202 263 3353
dwharwood@mayerbrown.com

Margaret-Rose Sales
+1 202 263 3881
msales@mayerbrown.com

Mayer Brown is a leading global law firm serving many of the world's largest companies, including a significant portion of the Fortune 100, FTSE 100, DAX, and Hang Seng Index companies and more than half of the world's largest investment banks. We provide legal services in areas such as Supreme Court and appellate; litigation; corporate and securities; finance; real estate; tax; intellectual property; government and global trade; restructuring, bankruptcy and insolvency; and environmental.

Office Locations:

AMERICAS: Charlotte, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Palo Alto, São Paulo, and Washington D.C.

ASIA: Bangkok, Beijing, Guangzhou, Hanoi, Ho Chi Minh City, Hong Kong, and Shanghai.

EUROPE: Berlin, Brussels, Cologne, Frankfurt, London, Paris Taul & Chequer Advogados in association with Mayer Brown LLP: São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro Alliance Law Firms: Spain (Ramón & Cajal); Italy and Eastern Europe (Tonucci & Partners).

Please visit our Web site for comprehensive contact information for all Mayer Brown offices. www.mayerbrown.com.

Mayer Brown is a global legal services organization comprising legal practices that are separate entities (the Mayer Brown Practices). The Mayer Brown Practices are: Mayer Brown LLP, a limited liability partnership established in the United States; Mayer Brown International LLP, a limited liability partnership incorporated in England and Wales; Mayer Brown JSM, a Hong Kong partnership, and its associated entities in Asia; and Taul & Chequer Advogados, a Brazilian law partnership with which Mayer Brown is associated. "Mayer Brown" and the Mayer Brown logo are the trademarks of the Mayer Brown Practices in their respective jurisdictions.

© 2011. The Mayer Brown Practices. Reprinted with permission.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT WINS CONVICTION IN FIRST CORPORATE FCPA TRIAL

By Brett Wolf

May 11, 2011—After dozens of guilty pleas and other settlements during the past several years, the U.S. Department of Justice has won a conviction in what is believed to be the first-ever jury trial involving a company accused of violating the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA).

Sources said that the victory was a reminder of why most cases never go to trial.

A federal grand jury in California convicted Azusa-based Lindsey Manufacturing Company and two of its top executives, Keith Lindsey, 66, and Steve Lee, 60, on multiple FCPA charges for bribing officials of a Mexican state-owned utility company to win \$19 million in contracts. Lanny Breuer, assistant attorney general, said: "Today's guilty verdicts are an important milestone in our FCPA enforcement efforts. Lindsey Manufacturing is the first company to be tried and convicted on FCPA violations, but it will not be the last. As this prosecution shows, we are fiercely committed to bringing to justice all the players in these bribery schemes: the executives who conceive of the criminal plans, the people they use to pay the bribes, and the companies that knowingly allow these schemes to flourish."

Lindsey Manufacturing is a small, privately held company that makes electricity towers. Lindsey's lawyer, Jan Handzlik of Greenberg Traurig LLP, said the judge overseeing the case is still considering a motion for acquittal based on a lack of evidence. "In any event, the company's conviction won't become final until it is decided on appeal. This could be a year or more from now," he said.

SIGNIFICANT CASE

Richard Cassin, a lawyer who helps clients comply with the FCPA and runs a blog dedicated to the 34-year-old statute which bars American companies from bribing foreign officials, said this case was significant because it was the first in which a company had mounted a defense against criminal FCPA charges. Cassin, who was not involved in the case but followed it closely, said the defendants had offered a "robust challenge," unsuccessfully attempting to have the charges dismissed on the grounds that the FCPA's definition of "foreign officials"—"any officer or employee of a foreign government or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof"—was ambiguous.

Cassin said however that the Department of Justice had always viewed employees of state-owned companies as foreign officials and pointed out that the judge overseeing the Lindsey Manufacturing case had agreed. Cassin said: "Both sides came with their best arguments and the judge decided, apparently quite easily, that the government's arguments were better. This case and in fact the entire historical record of FCPA trials should not give defendants any reason to be optimistic. Judges have upheld the Justice Department's view of the FCPA and juries have shown again in this trial that they do not like foreign bribery."

In March, the Chamber of Commerce told Thomson Reuters that it had hired former attorney general Mi-