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On February 19, 2016, law professors and attorneys came together to speak about corporate criminal liability in a symposium held on the campus of Stetson University College of Law. On one level, this Symposium brought together the work of eight scholars, all well-versed in the corporate criminal liability area. While another level of this Symposium had practitioners reacting to the presentation of these eight individuals, allowing each of these scholars to reconsider his or her Article in light of the discussion.

Some of the presenters came to the discussion as corporate professors, while others had a scholarly focus related to criminal law and procedure. Two professors, Eli Lederman and Dmitriy Kamensky, offered an international perspective to the discussion. Each of the scholars in this Symposium discussed his or her draft paper, which now forms this law review issue.

This program is a follow-up to a Stetson Law Review Symposium on Corporate Criminal Liability published in a fall 2011 issue. The papers emanating from that issue focused on merits and disadvantages of having a status of corporate criminal liability. It included some articles advocating for corporate criminal liability, and others that expressed concerns, such as the civil liberties implications of corporate...
criminal liability. The initial Corporate Criminal Liability Symposium also examined the concept in light of the then-recent decision Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission and the implications of this case on the Fourth and Fifth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The uniqueness of this 2016 program was that the academics set the groundwork for the discussion with their papers, that then allowed for the reactions of white-collar practitioners, who offered the practical perspective coming from their regularly dealing with clients on issues tied in some way to alleged corporate criminal liability. Mixing the theoretical with the practical provides an important bedrock for understanding the current state of corporate criminal liability and the considerations that are needed for effective legal reform.

Corporate criminal liability has not been static since the first symposium issue. Issues continue to arise as to the viability of treating corporations as persons. There are also discussions about how best to combat corporate criminal liability and who best to prosecute this misconduct. Should the misconduct be regulated through civil action or also be subject to criminal prosecution? Likewise, it is a topic of continual public concern and political debate.

The first panel in Corporate Criminal Liability 2.0 was labeled, "Corporate Criminal Liability: On the Ground and Abroad." Speakers Paul J. Larkin, Sara Sun Beale, Eli Lederman, and Dmitriy Kamensky presented as a part of this panel.


In their Article, All Stick and No Carrot: The Yates Memorandum...
Memorandum and Corporate Criminal Liability, Larkin and Seibler provide a detailed history of corporate criminal liability. They note how the government now shifts the onus to a corporation for the investigation and prosecution of corporate misconduct. They conclude by noting the ramifications of the Yates Memo, particularly its unintended consequences by pitting employees and corporations against each other. They also discuss consequences such as eroding the attorney-client relationship and creating perverse incentives to destroy and shield information.

Professor Sara Sun Beale also looks at the Yates Memo in her article titled, *The Development and Evolution of the U.S. Law of Corporate Criminal Liability and the Yates Memo*. She provides a historical review of corporate criminal law, including examining the 1909 cornerstone case of *New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Co. v. United States*.

The final two articles present an international perspective to this issue. In his Article, Professor Eli Lederman from Israel remarks on U.S. corporate criminal liability, and then tells about the U.K. Bribery Act and how it serves as a model for the Israel Minister of Justice.

Professor Dmitriy Kamensky discusses the recent amendment of quasi-criminal liability in the Criminal Code of Ukraine (CCU) and the importance of research of comparative criminal law.

The luncheon panel was composed of leading white-collar attorneys, namely, John Lauro, Gary Trombley, Morris "Sandy" Weinberg, and Kevin Napper. They added the practitioner perspective to the discussion. Many of the observations at the end of this Introduction arise from this discussion.
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The final panel was titled "Corporate Criminal Liability: Morality and Culpability." It included speakers Lucian Dervan, Joan Macleod Heminway, John P. Anderson, and Ciara Torres-Spelliscy. Professor Lucian Dervan continued the conversation from the first panel in discussing the U.K. Bribery Act. He advocated for amending the Department of Justice's Principles of Prosecution.\textsuperscript{20}

Professors Joan Macleod Heminway and John P. Anderson, both business law professors, focused on insider trading, including a discussion of insider trading by employees of a corporation.\textsuperscript{21} Finally, the last speaker, Professor Ciara Torres-Spelliscy, examined corporate use of slave labor.\textsuperscript{22}

An outgrowth of this program is the constellation of eleven observations regarding current corporate criminal liability policy. These observations try to capture the challenges expressed in the current practice with regard to this area of the law. They are not reflective of an agreement of all the speakers, nor do they capture all the comments made throughout the program. Rather they offer a moderator’s synthesis of eleven reflections that mark the current state of corporate criminal prosecution in the federal system. They are called the Eleven Observations here, not because they are favorable or dispositive in nature, rather, they bring together some of the thoughts expressed during the Symposium that need correction, reflection, or at least some additional study regarding corporate criminal liability.

\textbf{ELEVEN OBSERVATIONS OF CORPORATE CRIMINAL LIABILITY 2.0}

1. Overcriminalization, with its countless statutory and regulatory provisions, including state, federal, and international mandates, has a detrimental effect on eradicating corporate criminal liability as it makes it more difficult for corporations to comply with the law.


2. The erosion of criminal intent within statutes has a detrimental effect on eradicating corporate criminal liability, as it allows business decisions to be considered criminal without notice being given to individuals so that they can comply with the law. It also allows prosecution of business decisions despite there being insufficient moral culpability.

3. Some countries beyond the United States have not approached corporate criminal prosecutions as harshly as the United States federal government.

4. The enormous financial cost of defending a white-collar case places individuals at a disadvantage in maintaining their constitutional rights while presenting a case against the government.

5. The failure to provide sufficient resources to the government in administrative matters and the inadequacy of civil liability remedies detrimentally effects eradicating white-collar criminality.

6. An increased prosecutorial power, including the use of legalized extortion to obtain pleas, deferred prosecutions, non-prosecutions, and civil settlements in civil False Claims Act cases, allows companies to buy their way out of being subject to exclusion, debarment, catastrophic monetary fines, and other forfeitures. An individual’s due process rights may be seriously infringed when the government deputizes companies to work against its corporate constituents.

7. Corporations are obtaining increased power with less oversight and responsibilities, allowing for actions that have far-reaching effects such as human rights violations.

8. The failure to permit corporations a “good faith” defense serves as a roadblock for corporations that attempt to comply with the law but have a rogue employee who deviates from corporate policy.

9. The government currently pits the entity and individuals against each other, which serves as a detriment to them working together to eradicate corporate criminal liability.

10. Corporate criminal liability in the context of insider trading needs serious reexamination.
11. There is a growing distinction in corporate criminal liability between prosecutions against large companies and prosecutions against smaller companies, the latter having less resources to withstand government scrutiny, which may include lengthy and costly government investigations.

Although many may disagree with some of the thoughts expressed here, it is noted that these concerns came from at least one of the individuals who participated in this program. These Eleven Observations provide a strong base for future study and hopefully correction within the legal system. With corporations clearly subject to criminal prosecutions, it is important to continue to study entity liability to determine how best to achieve better corporate compliance, legal enforcement, and most importantly, a decrease of corporate criminal conduct.