



DISTRICT ATTORNEY DISTRICT 24

Statutory Report

For the period of July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023

Cindy Byrd, CPA
State Auditor & Inspector

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24**

**STATUTORY REPORT
BOGUS CHECK RESTITUTION PROGRAM
SUPERVISION FEE AND SUPERVISION FEE STATE REMITTANCE PROGRAMS
991 FEE AND 991 FEE STATE REMITTANCE PROGRAMS
RESTITUTION AND DIVERSION PROGRAM
DRUG ASSET FORFEITURE PROGRAM**

FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023

This publication, issued by the Oklahoma State Auditor and Inspector's Office as authorized by 74 O.S. § 212.E and 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 991f-1.1, and 63 O.S. § 2-506 has not been printed, but is available on the agency's website (www.sai.ok.gov) and in the Oklahoma Department of Libraries Publications Clearinghouse Digital Prairie Collection (<http://digitalprairie.ok.gov/cdm/search/collection/audits/>) pursuant to 65 O.S. § 3-114.



September 23, 2024

Max Cook, District Attorney
District 24
Creek County Courthouse
Sapulpa, Oklahoma 74066

Transmitted herewith is the statutory report for the District Attorney of District 24, Creek and Okfuskee Counties, Oklahoma (the District) for the period of July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023

A report of this type is critical in nature; however, we do not intend to imply that there were not commendable features in the present accounting and operating procedures of the District.

The goal of the State Auditor and Inspector is to promote accountability and fiscal integrity in state and local government. Maintaining our independence as we provide this service to the taxpayers of Oklahoma is of utmost importance.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the assistance and cooperation extended to our office during our engagement.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Cindy Byrd".

CINDY BYRD, CPA
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Information ii

Statutory Report of State Auditor and Inspector 1

Schedule of Findings and Responses 3

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION

BOGUS CHECK RESTITUTION PROGRAM

The bogus check program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 1982 as a special type of deferred prosecution program and every district attorney is required to operate a bogus check program. The program provides an alternative way to handle bogus check cases without any additional cost to courts, prosecutors, or the state prison system. The primary emphasis of the program is collecting restitution for the victim of the crime, rather than punishing the offender.

Bogus checks are a significant cost to business, a cost that is passed on to the consumer and paid by all citizens and taxpayers in the state. The program offers a manner to address criminal conduct without sending many offenders to state prisons.

SUPERVISION FEE AND SUPERVISION FEE STATE REMITTANCE PROGRAMS

The district attorney supervision fee program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 2005 as an alternative from supervision by the Department of Corrections. When the court imposes a deferred or a suspended sentence for any offense and does not order supervision by the Department of Corrections, the offender shall be required to pay the district attorney a monthly supervision fee. However, the legislation provides that in hardship cases, the district attorney shall expressly waive all or part of the fee.

Beginning on July 1, 2019, a supervision fee state remittance account was created pursuant to 22 O.S. § 991d (2) amended as follows, “Any fees collected by the district attorney pursuant to this paragraph shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund of the State Treasury.” Fees collected at the district offices are deposited monthly with the county treasurer and transferred monthly for annual budgeted appropriations at the state level.

991 FEE AND 991 FEE STATE REMITTANCE PROGRAMS

The district attorney 991 fee program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 2013. If the offender is *not* ordered supervision by the district attorney (as described above) “the offender shall be required to pay a fee to the district attorney’s office during the first two (2) years of probation to compensate the district for the costs incurred during the prosecution of the offender and for the additional work of verifying the compliance of the offender with the rules and conditions of his or her probation.” However, the legislation provides the district attorney may waive any part of this requirement in the best interests of justice.

Beginning on July 1, 2019, a 991 fee state remittance account was created pursuant to 22 O.S. § 991a (1)(ii) amended as follows, “Any fees collected by the district attorney pursuant to this paragraph shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund of the State Treasury.” Fees collected at the district offices are deposited monthly with the county treasurer and transferred monthly for annual budgeted appropriations at the state level.

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

RESTITUTION AND DIVERSION PROGRAM

The restitution and diversion program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 2001 as a special type of deferred prosecution program. The legislation required that each district attorney create such a program. The purpose of the program is to allow the district attorney the discretion to divert criminal complaints involving property crimes from criminal court and to collect restitution for victims.

The program allows the district attorney's office to receive, disburse, and monitor victim restitution payments. The program offers an alternative way to address criminal conduct.

DRUG ASSET FORFEITURE PROGRAM

The drug asset forfeiture program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 1971. The fund is not subject to fiscal year limitations and is to be used for enforcement of controlled dangerous substance laws, drug abuse prevention and education, and is maintained by the district attorney to be used at his or her discretion for those purposes. The revenues for said fund come from the proceeds of forfeited assets. Any cash, vehicles, real property, or other assets used in the commission of or acquired as a result of a crime as described in the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Act is presumed to be forfeitable.



Statutory Report

Max Cook, District Attorney
District 24
Creek County Courthouse
Sapulpa, Oklahoma 74066

For the purpose of complying with 74 O.S. § 212.E and 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 991a(A)(1), 991f-1.1, and 63 O.S. §§ 2-506, we have performed the following procedures as they relate to the records of the District Attorney's programs for the period of July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2023.

Bogus Check Restitution, Supervision Fee/State Remittance, 991 Fee/State Remittance, and Restitution and Diversion Programs:

- Determine that internal controls are designed and operating over the collections and disbursement process.
- Examine fees to determine that the correct fees are assessed, receipted, and deposited in compliance with 28 O.S. § 153, 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 991a(A)(1), 991f-1.1, and 19 O.S. § 215.11.
- Determine whether disbursements are used to defray the expenses of the District Attorney's office in accordance with 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 991a(A)(1), and 991f-1.1, and whether disbursements are supported by approved claims, invoices, and verification that goods or services paid for were received.
- Determine whether the District Attorney reconciles accounts with the County Treasurer's ledgers.
- Determine whether the District Attorney prepares and submits an annual report to the District Attorneys Council that reflects total collections and total disbursements for the Bogus Check Restitution, Supervision Fee/State Remittance, 991 Fee/State Remittance, and Restitution and Diversion programs.

Drug Asset Forfeiture Program:

- Determine that internal controls are designed and operating over the collections and disbursement process.
- Determine that the District Attorney maintains a true and accurate inventory of all property seized in accordance with 63 O.S. § 2-506.K.
- Review sale documentation for selected cases to determine whether forfeited assets were sold after a public auction to the highest bidder in accordance with 63 O.S. §§ 2-506 and 2-508.
- Review the distribution of proceeds to determine the distribution was in accordance with court orders pursuant to 63 O.S. §§ 2-506.K and 2-508.
- Test disbursements to determine they are supported by approved claims, invoices, and independent verification that goods or services paid for were received.
- Determine whether the District Attorney prepares and submits an annual report to the District Attorneys Council reflecting the total collections, total disbursements, beginning and ending balances in accordance with 63 O.S. § 2-506.L.3.
- Determine if the District Attorney reconciles account balances with the County Treasurer.

All information included in the financial records of the Bogus Check Restitution, Supervision Fee/State Remittance, 991 Fee/State Remittance, Restitution and Diversion, and Drug Asset Forfeiture Programs are the representation of the District Attorney for their respective district.

Our engagement was limited to the procedures performed above and was less in scope than an audit performed in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on any basic financial statement of Creek, or Okfuskee County.

Based on our procedures performed, we have presented our findings in the accompanying schedule.

This report is intended for the information and use of the District Attorney and District management. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.



CINDY BYRD, CPA
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

September 10, 2024

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RESPONSES

Finding 2023-001 – Lack of Internal Controls and Noncompliance Over the Drug Asset Forfeiture Program and Disposition of Seized Property (Repeat Finding)

Condition: As part of the review of District Attorney accounts and records, a test of receipts, disbursements, and review of the drug asset forfeiture case activity and assets was performed. The following weaknesses were noted:

District-wide:

- Formal policies and procedures for the seizure and forfeiture of funds and/or property have not been designed and implemented by the District.
- A forfeiture case summarization and/or inventory listing of seized and/or forfeited property was not maintained.

Cause of Condition: The District Attorney's office has not established policies and procedures to ensure the status of civil forfeiture cases and the disposition of property inventory are properly documented and maintained.

Effect of Condition: This condition resulted in noncompliance with state statute and could affect case activity and the location and/or disposition of seized/forfeited property.

Recommendation: The Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector's Office (OSAI) recommends that management establish policies and procedures for the maintenance and documentation of forfeiture cases. Implementing this recommendation would ensure that all employees are aware of their duties and responsibilities and that the program is properly accounted for and complies with state statute. Such policies should include the following:

- Guidelines for the oversight and documentation of case file maintenance and status of forfeited and pending forfeiture inventory.

Further OSAI recommends the District Attorney adhere to 63 O.S. §2-506 K, concerning the maintenance of forfeited and pending forfeiture inventory of the District.

Management Response:

District Attorney: The Auditor's concern alleges we do not keep a case summarization and/or inventory of property seized and forfeited under the Uniform Controlled Dangerous Substances Act (hereafter UCSDA). Although we agree the law requires a true and accurate inventory, we find no law that requires a separate summarization of the inventory. We meet the statutory burden placed upon this office since we do maintain an accurate inventory of the property seized and forfeited. We further contend that because the auditor was able to check, audit and even visually inspect all property requested and noted in our

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

inventories demonstrates that this office does fulfill the statutory requirement relating to keeping of accurate inventories. No form has been promulgated for this and therefore we believe the request for an additional summarization exceeds what is statutorily required. Our inventories do meet our statutory burden.

Auditor Response: We respectfully recommend the District Attorney establish policies and procedures for the maintenance and documentation of forfeiture cases. Implementing this recommendation would ensure that all employees are aware of their duties and responsibilities and that the program is properly accounted for and complies with state statute and applicable regulations.

The District did not provide our office evidence of inventory documents to ensure that all seized and forfeited property were properly accounted for and safeguarded. In addition, the District has not established or implemented written policies and procedures for the process and safeguarding of drug asset forfeiture civil cases and assets. At this time, seizing agencies retain the property and currency until a judgment is rendered by the court. Once ordered forfeited, the agency will bring the money to the District Attorney's office for deposit. Forfeited property is remitted to the District upon judgement and stored until sold at public auction.

Criteria: The United States Government Accountability Office's *Standards for Internal Control in the Federal Government* (2014 version) aided in guiding our assessments and conclusion. Although this publication (GAO Standards) addresses controls in the federal government, this criterion can be treated as best practices and may be applied as a framework for an internal control system for state, local, and quasi-governmental entities.

The GAO Standards – Principle 10 – Design Control Activities – 10.03 states in part:

Appropriate documentation of transactions and internal control

Management clearly documents internal controls and all transactions and other significant events in a manner that allows the documentation to be readily available for examination. The documentation may appear in management directives, administrative policies, or operating manuals, in either paper or electronic form. Documentation and records are properly managed and maintained.

The GAO Standards Section 2 – Establishing an Effective Internal Control System - OV2.24 states:

Safeguarding of Assets

Management designs an internal control system to provide reasonable assurance regarding prevention or prompt detection and correction of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of an entity's assets.

**MAX COOK, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 24
STATUTORY REPORT
FOR THE PERIOD OF JULY 1, 2021 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2023**

The GAO Standards – Section 2 – Objectives of an Entity - OV2.23 states in part:

Compliance Objectives

Management conducts activities in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. As part of specifying compliance objectives, the entity determines which laws and regulations apply to the entity. Management is expected to set objectives that incorporate these requirements.

Furthermore, 63 O.S. § 2-506 K states in part, “Property taken or detained under this section shall not be repleviable, but shall be deemed to be in the custody of the office of the district attorney of the county wherein the property was seized, subject only to the orders and decrees of the court or the official having jurisdiction thereof; said official shall maintain a true and accurate inventory and record of all such property seized under the provisions of this section...”

O·K·L·A·H·O·M·A
S·A·I
STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR



Cindy Byrd, CPA | State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd., Room 123, Oklahoma City, OK 73105 | 405.521.3495 | www.sai.ok.gov