


National Criminal Justice Reference Service

ncjrs

This microfiche was produced from documents received for inclusion in the NCJRS data base. Since NCJRS cannot exercise control over the physical condition of the documents submitted, the individual frame quality will vary. The resolution chart on this frame may be used to evaluate the document quality.



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

Microfilming procedures used to create this fiche comply with the standards set forth in 41CFR 101-11.504.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not represent the official position or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.


National Institute of Justice
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D. C. 20531

5/9/86

REPORT ON APPLICATIONS FOR ORDERS AUTHORIZING OR APPROVING THE INTERCEPTION OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

for the period January 1, 1984
to December 31, 1984

98312



ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES COURTS
WASHINGTON, DC

98312

NCJRS

JUL 6 1985

ACQUISITIONS

Report
On Applications for
Orders Authorizing
Or Approving the
Interception of Wire
Or Oral Communications
(Wiretap Report)

For the Period January 1, 1984

to

December 31, 1984

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been
granted by
Public Domain / US Administrative
Office of the US Courts

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

This report is available for inspection through the Depository Library Service of the Government Printing Office.

Prepared by:
Statistical Analysis and
Reports Division
Administrative Office of the
United States Courts

Washington, DC 20544

April 1985

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE
UNITED STATES COURTS

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20544


JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE U.S. COURTS
on
Applications for Orders Authorizing or
Approving the Interception of Wire or Oral
Communications

In accordance with the Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance provisions of Title III of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO) transmits a report to Congress each April concerning the number of applications for orders authorizing or approving the interception of wire or oral communications. The report summarizes the period from January 1 to December 31, 1984. Included are the number of orders and extensions granted together with a summary and analysis of the data required by law (Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519) to be filed with the AO by Federal judges, state judges, and prosecuting officials.

Sections I and II of the text explain the reporting requirements of the statute and the regulations concerning court authorized electronic surveillance. Section III contains a summary and analysis of the reports submitted by judges, while Section IV summarizes and analyzes the reports submitted by prosecuting officials. Sections V and VI provide supplemental information reported in calendar year 1984 concerning all intercepts authorized since 1969.

The appendix tables list all intercepts reported by judges and prosecuting officials for 1984. Appendix Table A-1 shows reports filed by Federal judges and prosecuting officials. Appendix Table B-1 presents the same information for state judges and state prosecuting officials. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 summarize the supplementary reports submitted by all judges and prosecuting officials concerning additional activity during 1984 as a result of intercepts initially reported in prior years.


Joseph F. Spaniol, Jr.
Deputy Director

April 1985

I. Reporting Requirements of the Statute

The law requires each Federal and state judge to file a written report with the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts (AO) on each application for an order authorizing the interception of a wire or oral communication. Under Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519(1), this report is to be furnished within 30 days of the denial or expiration of the court order (including all extensions). The report includes the name of the applicant, the offense under investigation, the type of interception device, the location of the device, and the duration of the authorized intercept.

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2518(7) now provides for the authorization of electronic surveillance when an emergency situation exists that involves "immediate danger of death or serious physical injury to any person." Previously, emergency situations included only conspiratorial activities threatening the national security interest or conspiratorial activities characteristic of organized crime.

Prosecuting officials who have applied for intercept orders are required to submit reports to the AO in January of each year for each order which terminated during the previous calendar year. These reports contain information relating to the cost of the intercept, the number of days the intercept device was in actual operation, the total number of intercepts, and the number of incriminating intercepts recorded. Results such as trials, convictions, and the number of motions to suppress evidence obtained through use of the intercepts is also included.

The AO is not authorized to collect information concerning the identity of the parties to the interception. Neither the judges' reports nor the prosecuting officials' reports contain names, addresses, or phone numbers of the parties being investigated.

In the following circumstances, electronic surveillance reports to the AO are not required: when an order is issued with the consent of one of the principal parties to the communication, for example, a wire interception to investigate obscene phone calls; when a police officer or police informant is a party to the communication; when a body microphone is used; or when a pen register (a mechanical device attached to telephone lines to record on paper tape all numbers dialed from that line) is used alone.

The report tabulates the number of applications for interceptions which were granted, as reported by judges, as well as the number of authorizations where interception devices were installed, as reported by prosecuting officials. No statistics are available on the number of devices installed for each authorization.

II. Regulations

The Director of the AO initially developed the regulations and reporting forms in November 1968. In January 1981 forms were revised to further simplify reporting requirements. Copies of the regulations, report forms, and the Federal wiretapping statute may be obtained by writing the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, DC, 20544.

Only the Attorney General (or designee) may authorize an application to a Federal judge for an order authorizing interception of wire or oral communications. On the state level, applications may be made only by a prosecuting attorney, "if such attorney is authorized by a statute of the state to make an application to a state court judge of competent jurisdiction." Data on wiretaps terminated during the current year appear in Appendix Tables A-1 and B-1.

Since many wiretap orders are related to large scale criminal investigations which cross county and state boundaries, arrests, trials, and convictions resulting from these interceptions often do not occur within the same year as the installation of the intercept device. Therefore, Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519(2) requires that supplementary reports be filed by prosecuting officials about additional court or police activity occurring as a result of intercepts reported in prior years. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 describe the additional activity reported by prosecuting officials in their supplementary reports.


A total of 31 jurisdictions (the Federal government, the District of Columbia, and 29 states) have laws which authorize courts to issue orders permitting wiretapping and electronic surveillance. During 1984 a total of 24 jurisdictions (including Federal) used electronic surveillance as a tool to investigate criminal activity.

III. Summary and Analysis of Reports by Judges

The appendix tables contain the name of the judge responsible for approval of the original authorization to use electronic surveillance. The data reported for 1984 includes only those orders for which the period of interception terminated during 1984. Nationwide, a total of 801 orders for electronic surveillance were authorized for 1984, 289 by Federal judges and 512 by state judges.

The 289 applications granted by Federal judges represents a 38.9 percent increase over the 208 applications reported last year. The rise in applications approved by Federal judges resulted in an overall increase by 23.6 percent over last year. Only one application for court ordered electronic surveillance was denied. As shown in the accompanying graph, the number of Federal and state applications granted in 1984 continued to increase dramatically. Over 40 percent of all wiretap authorizations approved by state judges occurred in three states, New Jersey with 151 applications; New York with 122; and Florida with 58.

STATE AND FEDERAL INTERCEPT AUTHORIZATIONS
Calendar Years 1968 through 1984



* Reporting period was from June through December 1968.

Source: Administrative Office of the U.S Courts

C. Arrests and Convictions

Table 6 provides the number of persons arrested and convicted as a result of interceptions terminated in 1984. Criminal cases which involved the use of electronic surveillance may still be under active investigation, so results have not yet been reported. Costs, arrests, trials, motions to suppress evidence, and convictions resulting from these interceptions will be reported by prosecutors in future supplementary reports and presented in Appendix Tables A-2 or B-2.

By the end of 1984 a total of 2,393 persons had been arrested as a result of electronic surveillance activity during 1984. Of these, 649 (27.1 percent) were convicted. The state jurisdictions with the most successful interceptions in terms of convictions arising from information gathered by interceptions were Hudson County, New Jersey, where 131 arrests led to 51 convictions; Essex County, Massachusetts where 37 arrests led to 34 convictions; Bergen County, New Jersey where 91 arrests led to 25 convictions; and Suffolk County, New York where 51 arrests led to 25 convictions.

The Federal government's recent crackdown on organized crime accounts for a considerable amount of court-ordered electronic surveillance in the northeastern region of the country. Evidence obtained through the use of wiretaps assisted in leading to the arrest of several organized crime figures in the U.S. and over 200 arrests in Italy. In many cases the use of electronic surveillance has enabled law enforcement officials to immobilize illegal drug operations, and seize narcotics, vehicles, weapons, cash, and property. For example, use of a phone wiretap in the District of Nevada enabled Federal agents to identify and immobilize an international heroin smuggling organization operating out of Pakistan to various cities in the U.S. An intercept in New Jersey enabled agents to monitor the shipping of drugs from Germany into the U.S. which resulted in the seizure of over two dozen 55 gallon drums of benzaldehyde. A phone wiretap in the Southern District of New York resulted in the confiscation of \$1,576,633 in cash along with 10 vehicles, 28 weapons, 3 kilograms of heroin, 1 kilogram of cocaine, and over \$480,000 in jewelry.

V. Summary January 1 through December 31, 1973 through 1983

Table 7 provides a historical summary of information on interceptions which were reported from 1974 through 1984. The table specifies the location of the intercept, the major offense, the average number of persons intercepted, interceptions, and incriminating interceptions. Costs in 1984 were as follows:

Costs of Intercepts	
Reported Cost	Number of Intercepts
Total	744
\$1,000 or less	39
\$1,001 to \$2,000	44
\$2,001 to \$5,000	79
\$5,001 to \$10,000	119
\$10,001 to \$25,000	179
\$25,001 to \$50,000	141
\$50,001 to \$100,000	94
\$100,001 to \$200,000	34
\$200,001 to \$500,000	8
Over \$500,000	7
Average Cost Per Intercept	\$44,976

VI. Supplementary Reports

Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519 requires supplementary reports to be filed by prosecuting officials concerning additional court or police activity occurring as a result of interceptions reported in prior years. This is necessary because many wiretap orders are related to large scale criminal investigations which cross county and state boundaries, arrests, trials, and convictions resulting from these interceptions often do not occur within the same year as reported. Appendix Tables A-2 and B-2 provide detailed data on all supplementary reports submitted in 1983.

During 1984, there were 1,062 arrests, 1,482 convictions, and additional costs of \$786,469 as a result of 491 wiretaps completed in previous years. Table 8 summarizes the additional police and court activity by the year the intercept was terminated and by jurisdiction. Table 9 reflects the total number of arrests and convictions resulting from interceptions terminated in calendar years 1974 through 1984.

Table 1
Jurisdictions with Statutes Authorizing
the Interception of Wire or Oral Communications¹
Effective During the Period
January 1, 1984 to December 31, 1984

Jurisdiction	Statutory Citation ²	Reported Use of Wiretap in 1984
Federal	18:2510 - 2520	Yes
Arizona	13-3007 - 13-3011	Yes
Colorado	16-15-101	Yes
Connecticut	54-41a - 54-41s	Yes
Delaware	11 Del. C. Sect. 1336	Yes
District of Columbia	23:541 - 23:556	No
Florida	934.01 - 934.10	Yes
Georgia	16-11-64	Yes
Hawaii	803-41 - 803-50	Yes
Idaho	18-6701 - 18-6710	Yes
Kansas	22-2514 - 22-2516	Yes
Louisiana ³	15:1301 - 15:1312	No
Maryland	10-401 - 10-401(2)	Yes
Massachusetts	272:99	Yes
Minnesota	626A.01 - 626A.23	Yes
Nebraska	86-701 - 86-707	Yes
Nevada	179.410 - 179.515, NRS 200.620	Yes
New Hampshire	570-A:1 - 570-A:11	Yes
New Jersey	2A:156A-1 - 156A-26	Yes
New Mexico	30-12-2 - 30-12-11	Yes
New York	813-J - 813-M; 814 - 825	Yes
Oklahoma	13:176.7	No
Oregon	133.723 - 133.739	Yes
Pennsylvania	18:5701	Yes
Rhode Island	12-5.1-1 - 12-5.1-16	Yes
South Dakota	23-13A-1 - 23-13A-11	No
Texas	18.20	Yes
Utah	77-54(A)-1 - 77-54(A)-11	No
Virginia	19.2-61	Yes
Washington	9.73.040	No
Wisconsin	968.27 - 968.33	No

¹ Pursuant to provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Title 18, United States Code, Section 2519.

² Includes only those jurisdictions which enacted legislation during or before calendar year 1984.

³ The state statute providing for the authorization of electronic surveillance expired on July 1, 1984.

Table 5
Average Cost Per Order
January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984

Reporting Jurisdiction	Authorized Orders Where Intercepts Installed	Intercept Orders With Cost Reported*	Average Cost Per Order \$
Total	773	744	44,976
Federal	277	272	93,347
Arizona			
Maricopa	2	2	15,335
Colorado			
Arapahoe	1	1	83,668
El Paso	2	2	99,375
Larimer	1	1	73,052
Connecticut			
State Attorney General.....	1	1	1,567
Judicial District of Ansonia-			
Milford	1	1	92,708
Judicial District of Fairfield	6	6	39,858
Judicial District of Litchfield	3	3	3,790
Judicial District of New Haven	1	1	10,810
Judicial District of Stamford-			
Norwalk	5	5	2,124
Judicial District of Tolland	2	2	20,745
Judicial District of Windham	1	1	3,498
Delaware			
State Attorney General.....	1	1	7,500
Florida			
Fourth Judicial Circuit			
(Duvall)	11	NR	NR
Sixth Judicial Circuit			
(Pasco and Pinellas)	5	5	31,351
Ninth Judicial Circuit			
(Orange)	7	7	7,759
Eleventh Judicial Circuit			
(Dade)	13	13	23,010
Twelfth Judicial Circuit			
(Sarasota)	2	NR	NR
Fifteenth Judicial Circuit			
(Palm Beach)	8	8	16,783
Seventeenth Judicial Circuit			
(Broward)	11	9	9,367
Eighteenth Judicial Circuit			
(Brevard)	1	1	12,350
Georgia			
State Attorney General.....	1	1	16,500
Bibb	5	5	15,856
Clayton	1	1	10,000
Cobb	1	1	4,570
Irwin	1	1	12,250
Richmond	2	2	14,325
Hawaii			
Honolulu	2	2	14,604
Kaho			
Ada	2	2	31,311
Kansas			
Johnson	1	1	8,500
Lyon	1	1	17,457
Maryland			
Baltimore City	12	11	24,756
Baltimore County	3	3	9,566
Charles County	1	1	11,049
Howard County	2	2	7,150
Montgomery County	3	3	28,032
Prince George's County	2	2	2,108
Massachusetts			
Essex	1	1	38,208
Middlesex	2	1	32,575
Norfolk	6	6	7,700
Suffolk	3	3	28,256
Minnesota			
Hennepin	2	2	38,634
Nebraska			
Douglas	9	9	18,790
Lancaster	NR	NR	NR

Table 5
Average Cost Per Order
January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984
(Continued)

Reporting Jurisdiction	Authorized Orders Where Intercepts Installed	Intercept Orders With Cost Reported*	Average Cost Per Order \$
Nevada			
Clark	2	2	27,595
Washoe	1	1	1,700
New Jersey			
State Attorney General.....	24	24	15,023
Atlantic	2	2	27,389
Bergen	21	21	5,236
Burlington	3	3	7,478
Camden	1	1	5,917
Cape May	3	3	9,600
Cumberland	2	2	10,950
Essex	14	14	2,462
Gloucester	4	4	7,772
Hudson	37	37	11,232
Mercer	2	2	21,776
Middlesex	5	5	1,363
Monmouth	1	1	34,842
Morris	4	4	3,053
Ocean	4	4	12,464
Passaic	10	10	6,300
Union	9	9	15,980
New Mexico			
Bernalillo	3	3	17,800
New York			
State Attorney General.....	19	19	46,033
Bronx	2	2	50,012
Cattaraugus	NR	NR	NR

Table 7
Summary Report on Authorized Intercepts Granted Pursuant to
Title 18, United States Code, Section 2519
January 1 through December 31, 1974 through 1984

Summary Item	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984
I. Intercept applications requested	730	704	688	626	572	553	566	589	578	648	802
II. Intercept applications authorized	728	701	686	626	570	553	564	589	578	648	801
Federal	121	108	137	77	81	87	81	106	130	208	289
State	607	593	549	549	489	466	483	483	448	440	512
Average length of original authorization (days)	23	22	23	25	24	24	24	24	26	28	26
Number of extensions	358	172	145	165	133	142	201	208	233	310	377
Average length of extensions (days)	27	24	20	20	21	20	21	24	26	27	26
Location of authorized intercepts:											
Single family dwelling	259	264	276	253	249	241	232	236	273	277	361
Apartment	160	191	159	157	112	152	153	167	133	123	157
Multiple dwelling	59	39	53	31	28	18	17	12	4	9	18
Business	160	138	117	102	125	87	89	107	93	134	111
Business and living quarters and multiple locations	49	45	42	49	33	27	40	33	42	53	74
Not indicated or other	41	24	39	34	23	28	33	34	33	52	80
Major offense specified:											
Arson, explosives and weapons	3	2	4	3	-	-	4	3	-	1	-
Bribery	25	21	24	17	15	4	1	7	2	3	11
Extortion (includes usury and loansharking)	14	27	17	13	14	15	9	7	6	15	9
Gambling	381	408	378	265	241	204	199	156	150	137	186
Homicide and assault	21	16	10	22	25	29	13	33	31	31	30
Larceny and theft	22	5	9	20	7	7	10	7	12	15	9
Narcotics	199	178	190	237	195	250	282	318	333	360	483
Robbery	7	6	8	2	5	6	7	9	1	8	4
Other	56	38	46	47	68	38	39	49	43	58	69
III. Intercept applications installed ¹	694	676	635	601	560	533	524	562	518	602	773
Federal	120	106	136	77	81	87	79	106	129	205	277
State	574	570	499	524	479	446	445	456	389	397	496
For authorized intercepts installed:											
Total number of days in operation	17,887	13,136	11,880	11,930	10,721	11,244	11,939	13,355	13,556	17,147	20,923
Average number of persons intercepted	59	71	54	72	68	59	136	84	58	147	102
Average number of intercepted communications	850	654	662	658	738	866	1,058	848	1,082	1,107	1,209
Average number of incriminating intercepted communications	431	305	272	268	205	252	315	190	209	229	298
Number of authorizations where cost reported	679	671	632	593	539	516	500	552	504	581	744
Average cost where cost reported	\$8,087	\$6,970	\$8,482	\$9,699	\$11,275	\$16,437	\$17,146	\$21,686	\$34,488	\$33,985	\$44,976
Number of orders costing:											
\$ 1,000 or less	128	132	117	74	60	48	39	38	35	25	

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports as a Result of Intercepts
Terminated in Calendar Years 1969 through 1983
(Report as of December 31, 1984)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984				
	Number of Reports	Cost \$	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*
Total All Years	491	786,469	1,062	413	45G,375D,52P
Total 1969 - 1977	-	-	-	-	-
Total 1978	2	100	1	1	-
Arizona Maricopa	1	100	1	1	-
New Jersey Middlesex	1	-	-	-	-
Total 1979	17	-	26	4	11D
Federal	13	-	26	3	10D
Connecticut Judicial District of Hartford (Hartford)	1	-	-	1	-
Judicial District of New Haven (New Haven)	1	-	-	-	1D
New Jersey State Attorney General	2	-	-	-	-
Total 1980	34	-	17	48	-
Federal	1	-	-	-	-
Connecticut Judicial District of Waterbury (New Haven)	1	-	-	-	-
New Jersey State Attorney General	4	-	-	-	-
Bergen	1	-	-	1	-
Essex	2	-	-	-	-
Hudson	11	-	-	1	-
New York Nassau	1	-	-	1	-
Rhode Island State Attorney General	12	-	17	44	-
Virginia State Attorney General	1	-	-	1	-
Total 1981	73	-	116	43	1G,82D,4P
Federal	15	-	67	7	1G,62D,3P
Connecticut Judicial District of Waterbury (New Haven)	1	-	-	-	-
Florida Eleventh Judicial Circuit (Dade)	9	-	1	-	2D,1P
Massachusetts Middlesex	3	-	-	5	-
Nebraska Douglas	1	-	3	3	3D

* Motions: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

Table 8
Summary of Supplementary Reports as a Result of Intercepts
Terminated in Calendar Years 1969 through 1983
(Report as of December 31, 1984)
(Continued)

Report Year and Jurisdiction	Total Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984				
	Number of Reports	Cost \$	Number of Persons Arrested	Number of Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*
1981 (continued)					
New Jersey State Attorney General	16	-	-	2	-
Gloucester	4	-	31	4	-
Hudson	11	-	2	1	2D
Middlesex	3	-	-	-	-
New York State Attorney General	3	-	11	5	9D
Nassau	2	-	-	2	-
Pennsylvania State Attorney General	3	-	-	2	4D
Lycoming	1	-	1	1	-
Rhode Island State Attorney General	1	-	-	11	-
Total 1982	111	55,387	238	159	25G,131D,5P
Federal	16	-	80	11	7G,23D
Maryland Baltimore City	3	-	1	62	51D,5P
Howard	3	-	10	6	4D
Montgomery	2	-	3	7	-
Prince George's	1	-	-	-	3G
Massachusetts Essex	1	-	-	30	-
Middlesex	7	-	-	2	5D
Nebraska Douglas	2	-	68	3	6D
New Jersey State Attorney General	12	-	-	1	-
Atlantic	2	-	-	-	-
Bergen	3	-	-	-	-
Camden	2	-	-	-	-
Essex	3	-	-	-	-
Hudson	17	-	-	-	-
Middlesex	4	-	-	-	1D
Ocean	2	-	-	-	2D
Passaic	1	-	-	-	-
Union	3	-	-	2	1G
New York Nassau	2	-	6	6	-
New York Westchester	3	-	16	2	14G,2D
Pennsylvania State Attorney General	3	-	8	1	1D
Philadelphia	4	-	5	5	12D
Rhode Island State Attorney General	4	-	30	10	-
Texas Bexar	1	-	7	-	-
Galveston	3	-	-	1	-
Lubbock	1	25,738	1	1	-
Randall	1	-	1	-	-
Tarrant	2	29,599	-	1	-
Virginia State Attorney General	1	-	-	3	3D

* Motions: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

Table 9
Arrests and Convictions as a Result of Intercept Orders Installed
Calendar Years 1974 through 1984

Year of Intercepts	Year Reported											Total All Years	
	1974*	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	Number	Percent
Number of Intercepts Authorized and Installed	694	676	635	601	560	533	524	562	518	648	-	-	-
1974													
Arrests	2,162	707	91	19	13	-	-	5	-	-	-	2,997	100.0
Convictions	179	676	413	161	30	9	2	6	-	-	-	1,476	49.2
1975													
Arrests	-	2,234	538	203	53	16	-	9	-	-	-	3,053	100.0
Convictions	-	336	615	412	155	22	2	9	1	-	-	1,552	50.8
1976													
Arrests	-	-	2,189	647	145	26	3	45	1	-	-	3,056	100.0
Convictions	-	-	358	772	246	75	19	36	1	-	-	1,507	49.3
1977													
Arrests	-	-	-	2,191	492	50	10	119	3	-	-	2,865	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	372	502	198	48	97	26	8	-	1,251	43.7
1978													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	1,825	274	106	18	16	42	1	2,282	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	337	303	146	49	22	159	4	1,020	44.7
1979													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	1,717	585	111	44	61	26	2,544	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	368	424	250	108	122	18	1,290	50.7
1980													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,871	637	93	290	17	2,908	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	259	474	310	325	95	1,463	50.3
1981													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,735	558	330	116	2,739	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	248	745	473	143	1,609	58.7
1982													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,725	705	238	2,668	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	453	776	389	1,618	60.6
1983													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,716	664	2,380	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	521	833	1,354	56.9
1984													
Arrests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,393	2,393	100.0
Convictions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	649	649	27.1

* Does not include arrests and convictions which occurred prior to the year in which they were reported.

APPENDIX

Statistical Tables

Table A-1. Reports by Federal Judges and Prosecuting Officials (Department of Justice) pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519, concerning court authorized intercepts of wire or oral communications during the period January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984 by reporting jurisdiction.

Table A-2. Supplementary Reports by Federal Prosecuting Officials (Department of Justice) on additional arrests, trials, and convictions in 1984 as a result of intercepts terminated during calendar years 1978 through 1983 - report as of December 31, 1984. There was no additional activity reported for the years 1969 through 1977.

Table B-1. Reports by State Judges and Prosecuting Officials pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C. Section 2519 concerning court authorized intercepts of wire or oral communications during the period January 1, 1984 through December 31, 1984 by reporting jurisdiction.

Table B-2. Supplementary Reports by State Prosecuting Officials on additional arrests, trials, and convictions in 1984 as a result of intercepts terminated during calendar years 1978 through 1983 - report as of December 31, 1984. There was no additional activity reported for the years 1969 through 1977.

TABLE A-1 •

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS										CALENDAR YEAR 1984										
REPORTS BY JUDGES										REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/Attorney General ¹	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ²	Location ³	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH				Number of Days in Operation ⁴	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	NUMBER OF		COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)					Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁵	Persons Convicted
CALIFORNIA EASTERN																				
14	MacBride/Trott	Narcotics	PW	B	04-10-84	30	1	60		50	40	327	1,988	170	189,000	50,000	17	-	1D	3
15	MacBride/Archer	Narcotics	PW	S	05-01-84	30	-	30		30	32	141	959	82	(Related to No. 14)					
CALIFORNIA CENTRAL																				
16	Gadbois/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	11-08-83	30	2	90		66	29	56	1,882	400	124,913	6,561	(Related to No. 19)			
17	Gadbois/Trott	Narcotics	PW	A	01-27-84	30	-	30		12	16	28	195	3	5,091	475	3	-	-	-
18	Rafeedie/Trott	Narcotics	PW	B	02-10-84	30	-	30		18	41	139	736	4	18,262	11,662	-	-	-	-
19	Rafeedie/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S,A	02-28-84	30	1	60		60	112	94	6,691	981	159,364	10,289	27	-	4D	26
20	Takasugi/Trott	Narcotics	PW	A,B	06-05-84	30	-	30		30	26	68	775	47	62,088	7,883	-	-	-	-
21	Rymer/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	06-19-84	30	1	60		48	58	92	2,760	-	171,080	38,000	-	-	-	-
22	Rymer/Russell	Narcotics	PW	S	06-28-84	30	1	60		60	19	43	1,144	292	61,594	1,900	(Related to No. 25)			
23	Rymer/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	07-25-84	30	1	60		47	30	15	1,410	116	87,056	22,435	15	-	-	2
24	Gadbois/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	08-15-84	30	-	30		10	-	-	-	-	6,945	900	-	-	-	-
25	Gadbois/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	08-24-84	30	-	30		30	18	35	535	130	32,113	1,195	8	-	-	-
26	Waters/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	10-16-84	14	-	14		14	14	9	738	74	34,136	5,700	-	-	-	-

¹ The Attorney General personally approved each of the reported applications and, as authorized by provisions of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2516, specially designated an Assistant Attorney General to authorize its filing.
² TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
³ LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
⁴ NI in this column indicates NEVER

TABLE A-1 •

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS										CALENDAR YEAR 1984										
REPORTS BY JUDGES										REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/ Attorney General ¹	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ²	Location ³	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH				Number of Days in Operation ⁴	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	NUMBER OF			COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)				Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁵	Persons Convicted
CALIFORNIA SOUTHERN																				
*27	Nielsen/Archer	Racketeering	PW M/E O ³	B	05-24-83	3	-	3		2	14	3	27	8	15,039	498	13	-	4D,9P	-
28	Turrentine/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	11-18-83	30	1	60		55	21	83	1,146	394	123,285	10,376	28	21	40D	21
29	Enright/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	A	02-21-84	30	-	30		30	26	43	780	330	676,392	698	-	-	-	-
30	Keep/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	B	02-22-84	30	-	30		1	6	6	6	1	2,259	1,091	(Related to No. 146)			
31	Thompson/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	S,A	03-26-84	30	-	30		29	23	25	653	500	28,774	2,047	13	-	5D	13
32	Enright/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	S	04-10-84	30	-	30		30	39	37	1,170	296	680,782	2,115	-	-	-	-
33	Enright/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	06-06-84	30	-	30		30	92	68	2,760	1,080	1,314,130	3,308	-	-	-	-
34	Enright/Archer	Narcotics	PW	S,B	07-19-84	30	-	30		30	280	83	8,400	2,362	1,657,722	4,793	-	-	-	-
35	Enright/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	S,B	09-05-84 (10-15-84) (11-28-84)	30	2	90		90	129	151	11,589	3,823	4,544,338	3,742	-	-	-	-
36	Thompson/Archer	Narcotics	PW	S	09-14-84	30	-	30		30	13	16	390	120	669,062	419	-	-	-	-

¹ The Attorney General personally approved each of the reported applications and, as authorized by provisions of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2516, specially designated an Assistant Attorney General to authorize its filing.
² TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported.
³ LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other.
⁴ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED.
⁵ MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending.

⁵ Hotel

• This wiretap was terminated during 1983. Information about this wiretap is contained in summary Table 8 in the text portion of this report.

TABLE A-1 •

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS										CALENDAR YEAR 1984										
REPORTS BY JUDGES										REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/Attorney General ¹	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ²	Location ³	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH				Number of Days in Operation ⁴	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	NUMBER OF			COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)				Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁵	Persons Convicted
COLORADO																				
37	Finesilver/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	S,A	11-10-83	30	2	90	81	42	100	3,433	1,845		325,662	10,730	-	-	-	-
38	Finesilver/Trott	Narcotics	PW M/E	S	11-16-83	30	1	60	60	43	78	2,596	2,076		338,601	4,539	13	-	-	-
39	Finesilver/Trott	Narcotics	M/E	S	12-13-83	30	-	30	21	5	3	97	1		79,081	1,318	-	-	-	-
40	Finesilver/Archer	Narcotics	M/E	S	12-27-83	30	-	30	12	22	18	266	47		67,999	1,186	-	-	-	-
41	Finesilver/Archer	Narcotics	PW	S	03-16-84	30	-	30	30	26	88	768	117		92,024	19,000	41	-	-	-
42	Finesilver/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	03-27-84	30	-	30	22	31	95	676	82		(Related to No. 41)					
43	Finesilver/Archer	Narcotics	M/E	S	04-10-84	30	-	30	11	36	16	394	9		(Related to No. 41)					
44	Finesilver/Archer	Narcotics	PW M/E	S	06-06-84 (07-06-84)	30	1	60	55	27	26	1,464	695		72,567	1,513	-	-	-	-
45	Finesilver/Archer	Narcotics	PW	S,O ⁵	06-28-84	30	-	30	18	212	70	3,808	3,420		47,783	6,000	40	-	50P	5
46	Finesilver/Trott	Gambling	PW	S,B	11-16-84	30	-	30	30	201	139	6,043	3,684		47,251	4,228	-	-	-	-
CONNECTICUT																				
47	Daly/Trott	Racketeering	M/E	O ⁶	05-31-8	30	2	90	83	4	12	342	5		44,682	10,437	-	-	-	-
48	Burns/Trott	Narcotics	PW	S	08-06-84	30	-	30	30	34	31	1,030	203		29,071	2,775	12	-	2P	-
49	Burns/Trott	Narcotics	PW	O ⁶	08-06-84	30	1	60	34	161	220	5,461	12		57,091	37,360	-	-	-	-

¹ The Attorney General personally approved each of the reported applications and, as authorized by provisions of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2516, specially designated an Assistant Attorney General to authorize its filing.
² TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
³ LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
⁴ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED
^{5</}

TABLE A-1 •

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

¹ The Attorney General personally approved each of the reported applications and, as authorized by provisions of Title 18, U.S.C. Section 2516, specially designated an Assistant Attorney General to authorize its filing.
² TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-wavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
³ LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
⁴ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED
⁵ MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1979
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1979 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					Offense for Which Convicted
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts *	Persons Convicted	
Illinois, Northern	18)	04-02-79	-	7	2	7D	5	Extortion
	19)	05-25-79	-	-	-	-	-	-
Missouri, Eastern	34	11-17-79	-	-	1	-	1	Racketeering
Missouri, Western	35)	05-05-78	-	19	-	3D	4	Racketeering, stolen property
	36)	07-29-78	-	-	-	-	-	-
	38)	09-24-78	-	-	-	-	-	-
	39)	11-10-78	-	-	-	-	-	-
	40)	11-22-78	-	-	-	-	-	-
	42)	01-02-79	-	-	-	-	-	-
	43)	02-02-79	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oklahoma, Northern	44)	02-04-79	-	-	-	-	-	-
	75	12-29-78	-	-	-	-	2	Gambling
	77	01-19-79	-	-	-	-	2	Gambling

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1983
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1980 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*	Persons Convicted	Offense for Which Convicted
Illinois, Northern	28	09-26-80	-	-	-	-	2	Aiding and Abetting

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2 @

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1981
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1981 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*	Persons Convicted	Offense for Which Convicted
Arizona	2	06-02-80	-	-	-	1P	-	-
California, Central	9	05-12-81	-	7	-	1P	-	-
Illinois, Northern	32	07-09-81	-	-	-	-	3	Narcotics, conspiracy
	34	10-01-81	-	26	1	1P	12	Stolen property
Indiana, Northern	35	12-22-80	-	1	-	-	1	Obstruction of justice
Kansas	37)	09-19-79	-	19	-	3D	4	Racketeering, stolen property
	38)	11-26-79						
	39)	12-08-79						
	40)	12-29-79						
(Missouri, Western)	53)	02-02-80						
Kentucky, Western	42	08-14-81	-	5	-	5D	-	-
Louisiana, Eastern	44	04-23-81	-	8	-	1G,54D	1	Obstruction of justice
Nevada	60	11-06-81	-	-	1	-	5	Racketeering
New York, Western	90	12-23-80	-	1	1	-	1	Perjury
Utah	104	09-13-81	-	-	4	-	6	Fraud

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2 @

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1982
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number In 1982 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					Offense for Which Convicted
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*	Persons Convicted	
California, Southern	12	07-30-82	-	-	-	-	2	Narcotics
District of Columbia	17	04-07-82	-	3	1	-	3	Racketeering, tax evasion
Florida, Southern	18	02-05-82	-	6	1	1D	5	Racketeering, conspiracy
Indiana, Northern	25	10-14-82	-	2	-	-	-	-
Iowa, Southern	26	11-16-82	-	6	1	6D	5	Narcotics, conspiracy
Maryland	33	06-01-82	-	-	-	-	2	Racketeering, conspiracy
Michigan, Eastern	50	03-16-82	-	3	-	-	12	Narcotics, conspiracy
	51	03-25-82	-	12	1	2D	22	Narcotics, conspiracy
	52	04-12-82	-	-	1	-	6	Narcotics, conspiracy
Missouri, Western	67	05-04-82	-	19	-	3D	6	Racketeering, stolen property
New York, Southern	76	10-21-81	-	1	1	-	1	Possession of stolen property
	81	01-04-82	-	1	1	-	1	Possession of stolen property
	94	09-15-82	-	6	1	1D	5	Narcotics
	96	10-14-82	-	15	1	1D	3	Narcotics
Ohio, Southern	108	08-20-82	-	6	1	7G,7D	5	Stolen property
Oklahoma, Western	109	02-22-82	-	-	1	2D	5	Narcotics

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2 ②

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1983
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1983 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts *	Persons Convicted	Offense for Which Convicted
Alabama, Northern	1	11-03-82	-	-	1	-	-	-
Alabama, Middle	3	07-25-83	-	1	-	-	1	Narcotics
California, Eastern	15	09-01-83	-	5	-	-	5	Narcotics
California, Central	17	01-05-83	-	7	-	1G,1P	5	Narcotics
	20	10-18-83	-	7	-	2P	-	-
	21	10-21-83	-	2	-	-	-	-
	23	11-23-83	-	-	-	-	4	Counterfeiting, narcotics
	24	11-28-83	-	4	-	-	4	Counterfeiting, narcotics
Colorado	25	12-09-82	-	4	4	-	4	Murder, burglary
Connecticut	28	09-19-83	-	4	-	-	-	-
District of Columbia	30	04-20-83	-	2	1	-	3	Narcotics
Florida, Middle	33	12-09-82	-	4	1	-	4	Narcotics, conspiracy
Florida, Southern (New York, Eastern)	37)	01-05-83	-	1	-	-	6	Theft, conspiracy
	140)	12-07-82	-	-	-	-	-	-
	41	04-04-83	-	-	-	-	3	Conspiracy
	43	07-13-83	-	-	1	6D	2	Kidnapping
	44	07-14-83	-	1	-	1D	1	Kidnapping
Georgia, Northern	46	09-23-83	-	9	-	1P	-	-
	47	01-17-83	-	12	1	5D	11	Narcotics, conspiracy
	50	10-05-83	878	27	-	-	26	Narcotics
	53	02-18-82	-	-	1	-	1	Racketeering
	54	01-18-83	-	-	-	1G	-	-
Illinois, Northern	58	04-05-83	-	-	-	1G	-	-
	60	06-28-83	-	1	1	-	1	Narcotics, conspiracy
	63	08-17-83	-	-	-	-	2	Narcotics
	65	10-25-83	-	-	-	-	2	Narcotics

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE A-2

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1983
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1983 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					Offense for Which Convicted
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*	Persons Convicted	
Illinois, Central	67)	03-07-83	-	-	-	4D	5	Narcotics, conspiracy
	69)	05-09-83	-	-	-	-	-	-
Illinois, Southern	70)	03-07-83	-	28	4	-	42	Narcotics, conspiracy
	71)	03-31-83	-	-	-	-	-	-
	72)	05-31-83	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indiana, Southern	73)	03-14-83	-	6	-	-	30	Narcotics, conspiracy
	74)	04-05-83	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kentucky, Eastern	75	04-11-83	-	-	-	-	20	Narcotics, conspiracy
	79	01-05-83	-	4	2	1D	4	Narcotics, conspiracy
	81	08-10-83	-	5	-	-	3	Racketeering
Louisiana, Eastern	82	11-29-82	-	38	-	-	19	Narcotics
Maryland	86	04-28-83	-	-	2	-	8	Narcotics
Massachusetts	88	04-06-83	-	-	-	17D	12	Narcotics, racketeering
Michigan, Eastern	100	07-01-83	-	13	-	4D,4P	-	-
Missouri, Eastern	109	11-24-82	-	10	-	-	-	-
	112	04-11-83	-	6	-	-	-	-
Missouri, Western	113	10-19-82	-	-	2	-	9	Stolen property
Nevada	115	06-24-83	-	9	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	125	08-16-83	-	5	3	47D	14	Racketeering
	127	10-13-83	-	5	-	1D	7	Narcotics
New York, Eastern	147	06-30-83	-	7	1	-	4	Narcotics, conspiracy
	151	09-15-83	-	2	1	-	3	Narcotics
New York, Southern	155	10-20-82	-	3	2	-	13	Narcotics

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

TABLE A-2 @

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY PROSECUTORS
FOR INTERCEPTS TERMINATED IN CALENDAR YEAR 1983
AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1984

U.S. District Court	A.O. Report Number in 1983 Report	Date of Application	Additional Activity During Calendar Year 1984					Offense for Which Convicted
			Cost (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials Completed	Motions to Suppress Intercepts*	Persons Convicted	
New York, Western	172	02-18-83	-	3	2	-	2	Narcotics, conspiracy
	173)	07-18-83	-	29	-	-	9	Narcotics, conspiracy
	174)	08-12-83						
	176)	09-19-83						
	177)	10-13-83						
	175	08-19-83	-	-	1	-	3	Narcotics, conspiracy
Pennsylvania, Middle	193	03-21-83	-	1	-	-	-	-
Puerto Rico	194	07-10-81	-	12	1	-	16	Theft
South Dakota	197	08-04-83	-	7	6	-	6	Narcotics
Texas, Northern	199	03-18-83	-	-	1	3D	5	Narcotics, conspiracy
Texas, Eastern	200	10-08-83	-	8	-	-	9	Narcotics
Texas, Southern	201)	07-01-83	-	9	-	-	1	Firearms violation
	202)							
Washington, Western	206	06-27-83	-	4	-	-	6	Narcotics
West Virginia, Southern	208	04-08-83	-	-	-	-	3	Narcotics, conspiracy

*MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE B-1

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

STATE ARIZONA

CALENDAR YEAR 1984

REPORTS BY JUDGES									REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/ Official Authorizing Application	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ¹	Location ²	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH			Number of Days in Operation ³	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	NUMBER OF		COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)				Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁴	Persons Convicted
MARICOPA COUNTY																			
1	Seidel/Collins	Theft	PW	S	07-20-84	30	-	30	29	51	-	1,493	128	27,473	2,287	-	-	-	-
2	Seidel/Collins	Theft	PW	B	08-09-84	16	-	16	8	17	-	132	6	3,197	350	-	-	-	-

¹ TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
² LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
³ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED
⁴ MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE B-1

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

STATE COLORADO

CALENDAR YEAR 1984

REPORTS BY JUDGES									REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/ Official Authorizing Application	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ¹	Location ²	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH			Number of Days in Operation ³	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	Persons Intercepted	NUMBER OF		COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)				Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁴	Persons Convicted
ARAPAHOE COUNTY																			
1	Kelley/Gallagher	Narcotics	PW	S	02-08-84	30	-	30	13	97	39	1,259	184	83,668	7,893	24	6	3D,1P	18
EL PASO COUNTY																			
1	Elliott/Russel	Narcotics	PW	S	06-15-84	30	1	60	60	173	43	10,403	446	198,750	27,100	23	-	-	-
2	Elliott/Russel	Narcotics	PW	S	07-24-84	30	-	30	19	11	43	213	19	(Related to No. 1)					
LARIMER COUNTY																			
1	Newton/VanMeveren	Narcotics	PW M/E	S	03-07-84	30	1	60	60	43	141	2,609	122	73,052	4,473	-	-	-	-

¹ TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
² LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
³ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED
⁴ MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

TABLE B-1

REPORTS CONCERNING COURT AUTHORIZED INTERCEPTS OF WIRE OR ORAL COMMUNICATIONS PURSUANT TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, SEC. 2519

STATE CONNECTICUT

CALENDAR YEAR 1984

REPORTS BY JUDGES									REPORTS BY PROSECUTING OFFICERS										
A.O. Report Number	Judge/ Official Authorizing Application	Offense Specified	Type of Intercept ¹	Location ²	Date of Application and (Amendments)	AUTHORIZED LENGTH			Number of Days in Operation ³	Average Number of Intercepts per Day	NUMBER OF			COSTS		NUMBER OF			
						Original Order (Days)	Number of Extensions	Total Length (Days)			Persons Intercepted	Intercepts	Incriminating Intercepts	Total (\$)	Other than Manpower (\$)	Persons Arrested	Trials	Motions to Suppress Intercepts ⁴	Persons Convicted
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF TOLLAND (Tolland County)																			
1	Brennan, Daly Bieluch/Caldwell	Narcotics	PW	S	03-08-84	15	1	30	30	5	45	158	72	34,914	1,242	9	-	-	8
2	Daly, Hamner Corrigan/Caldwell	Gambling	PW	S	03-26-84	15	-	15	15	17	14	253	172	6,575	860	3	-	-	3
JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF WINDHAM (Windham County)																			
1	Brennan, Bieluch Daly/Gaucher	Gambling	PW	S	03-06-84	15	-	15	5	42	8	208	154	3,498	670	2	2	-	2

¹ TYPE: PW = Phone wire; M/E = Microphone-eavesdrop; O = Other; NR: Not Reported
² LOCATION: S = Single family dwelling; A = Apartment; M = Multiple dwelling; B = Business location; O = Other
³ NI in this column indicates NEVER INSTALLED
⁴ MOTIONS: G = Granted; D = Denied; P = Pending

