

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF OREGON

FILED 14 APR 14 9 33 AM SD-ORP

IN RE:

AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL RULE OF  
CRIMINAL PROCEDURE 3003

---

Standing Order No: 2014-2

**ORDER**

The following amendments to Local Rule of Criminal Procedure 3003 have been adopted by the Court and are effective this date:

**LR 3003 – Confidentiality of Presentence Report (See Fed. R. Crim. P. 32)**

Disclosure of the presentence report (whether in draft or final form) is made to the government and to the defense, subject to the following limitations:

- (a) The attorney for the government must not provide a copy of the draft or final presentence report in written or electronic form to any person other than the case agents, experts, investigators, or consultants hired by the government and the Financial Litigation Unit of the United States Attorney's Office when a fine or any other financial obligation is imposed.
- (b) The attorney for the defendant must not provide a copy of the draft or final presentence report in written or electronic form to any person other than the defendant, any attorney, experts, investigators, or consultants hired by or assisting the defense. The defendant must not provide a copy of the draft or final presentence report in written or electronic form to any person other than his or her attorney, spouse, registered domestic partner, or parent(s). A defendant who appears *pro se* is considered an "attorney for the defendant" for purposes of this Rule.
- (c) The defendant, the attorney for the defendant, and the government may retain their copies of the presentence report, subject to the limitations on disclosure set forth in this Rule. This Rule does not limit use of copies of the presentence report necessary for litigation or appeal of the case. Any copy of the presentence report used for this purpose must be filed under seal.

The presentence report must remain a confidential court document, disclosure of which is controlled by the Court. Any copies must be marked "Not For Further Disclosure Without Prior Authorization From the Court." A knowing violation of any of the above provisions may be treated as a contempt of Court.

Done on behalf of the Court on April 14, 2014.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ann Aiken", written over a horizontal line.

ANN AIKEN  
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT COURT JUDGE