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Transmitted herewith is the statutory report for the District Attorney of District 20, Carter, Johnston, Love, Marshall, and Murray County, Oklahoma (the District) for the period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2017.

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,

GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR
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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 bogus check program has been an effective way to address the economic problem caused by bogus checks. The program offers a way to address criminal conduct without sending a large number of offenders to state correctional facilities.

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.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY SUPERVISION PROGRAM

The district attorney supervision 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.

DISTRICT ATTORNEY SUPERVISION 991 PROGRAM

The district attorney supervision 991 program was created by the Oklahoma Legislature in 2013. When 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.

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY DRUG ASSET FORFEITURE PROGRAM**

Most district attorneys in the state have a Drug Asset Forfeiture Fund. 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.

Asset forfeiture is an effective law enforcement tool used by local district attorneys to deprive criminals of their ill-gotten gains by seizing the proceeds of criminal activity and property used to facilitate crime. The proceeds of seized, forfeited assets make a substantial contribution to the investigation and prosecution of drug related offenses.
Statutory Report

Craig Ladd, District Attorney
District 20
Carter County Courthouse
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

For the purpose of complying with 74 O.S. § 212.E and 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 991a (hh), 991.f-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, 2015 through June 30, 2017.

Bogus Check, Supervision, and Supervision 991:
  • 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 (hh), 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 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 all accounts with the County Treasurer's ledgers.
  • Determine whether the District Attorney prepares and submits an annual report to the District Attorneys Council that shows total deposits and total disbursements for the Bogus Check Restitution Program, the Supervision Program and Supervision 991 Program.

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 due notice at 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 if the District Attorney prepared and submitted an annual report to the District Attorneys Council showing the total deposits, 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 program, supervision program, supervision 991 program, restitution and diversion program, and the drug asset forfeiture program 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 Carter, Johnston, Love, Marshall, or Murray County.

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

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

GARY A. JONES, CPA, CFE
OKLAHOMA STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR

October 9, 2017
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RESPONSES

Finding 2017-1 – Inadequate Internal Controls Over Daily Depositing for the 991 Supervision Fee, Supervision Fee, Bogus Check Restitution Fee and Victim Restitution Fund

Condition: Upon inquiry of the District Attorney’s staff and observation of the office policies and procedures, we tested the timely deposit of receipts in each county office of District Attorney 20. The test of ten days of receipts reflected that the offices located in Carter, Murray, and Love County did not always deposit collections daily as specified in the District Attorney’s written policies and procedures as noted below:

991 Supervision Fee
- Four (4) instances were noted of not depositing daily.

Supervision Fee
- Sixty-four (64) instances were noted of not depositing daily.

Bogus Check Restitution Fee
- Six (6) instances were noted of not depositing daily.

Victim Restitution
- Ten (10) instances were noted of not depositing daily.

Cause of Condition: The District is not monitoring its policies and procedures for the process of depositing collections daily in accordance with state statute.

Effect of Condition: This condition resulted in noncompliance with state statute and could result in inaccurate accounting of funds and amounts collected.

Recommendation: The Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector’s Office (OSAI) recommends that management adhere to written policies and procedures for the accounting of program funds.

Management Response:
District Attorney: After investigating the instances where deposits were not made daily, it was determined that many of these failures were related to the hectic “check in” days for probationers and days when the offices were short on staff due to employees either being sick or on vacation. In an effort to make the rule of “daily deposits” more manageable, a new policy has been implemented which would permit any money collected after 3:00 p.m. to be considered “next day’s business” and to be deposited on the next business day. In addition, the office which clearly had the greatest number of failures to make daily deposits, the Carter County office, will now be required to have the District Attorney, an Assistant District Attorney, or the Office Manager initial each days’ deposit to promote accountability and ensure compliance with the “daily deposit” rule.
Criteria: The District 20 Accounting Policies and Procedure for the Office of the District Attorney states in Rule #2, “Any payment receipted…must be deposited daily.”

Additionally, Title 62 O.S. § 517.3B states in part, “The treasurer of every public entity shall deposit daily, not later than the immediately next banking day…”