

STATUTORY REPORT

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 6
BOGUS CHECK RESTITUTION PROGRAM
SUPERVISION PROGRAM
PROPERTY FORFEITURE PROGRAM**

For the year ended July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015



Oklahoma State
Auditor & Inspector
Gary A. Jones, CPA, CFE

**JASON HICKS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 6**

**STATUTORY REPORT
BOGUS CHECK RESTITUTION PROGRAM
SUPERVISION PROGRAM
PROPERTY FORFEITURE PROGRAM**

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED
JULY 1, 2014 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2015**

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 Collection, pursuant to 74 O.S. § 3105.B.



Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405.521.3495 • Fax: 405.521.3426

October 21, 2015

Jason Hicks, District Attorney
District 6
Stephens County Courthouse
Duncan, Oklahoma 73533

Transmitted herewith is the statutory report for the District Attorney of District 6, Stephens, Caddo, Grady, and Jefferson Counties, Oklahoma (the District) for the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

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, appearing to read "Gary A. Jones".

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Information ii
Statutory Report of State Auditor and Inspector 1
Schedule of Findings and Responses 3

INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION

BOGUS CHECK 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 6 has elected not to participate in this program.

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 PROPERTY FORFEITURE PROGRAM

Most district attorneys in the state have a Property 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

**JASON HICKS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 6
STATUTORY REPORT
JUNE 30, 2015**

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.



Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector

2300 N. Lincoln Blvd. • State Capitol, Room 100 • Oklahoma City, OK 73105 • Phone: 405.521.3495 • Fax: 405.521.3426

Statutory Report

Jason Hicks, District Attorney
District 6
Stephens County Courthouse
Duncan, Oklahoma 73533

For the purpose of complying with 74 O.S. § 212.E and 22 O.S. §§ 114, 991d, 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 fiscal year ended June 30, 2015.

Bogus Check and Supervision Programs:

- Determine that internal controls are designed and operating over the collections and expenditures 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, 991f-1.1, and 19 O.S. § 215.11.
- Determine whether expenditures 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 expenditures 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 expenditures for the Bogus Check Restitution Program, the Supervision Program, and Restitution and Diversion Program.

Property Forfeiture Program:

- Determine that internal controls are designed and operating over the collections and expenditures 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 expenditures 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 expenditures, 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, and the property 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 Stephens, Caddo, Grady, and Jefferson 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 the County Officials. However, this report is a matter of public record and its distribution is not limited.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Gary A. Jones".

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

October 21, 2015

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RESPONSES

Finding 2015-1 – Inadequate Segregation of Duties Over the Bogus Check Restitution Fee, Supervision Fee, and Property Forfeiture Programs (Repeat Finding)

Condition: Based on inquiries and observation in the District Attorney’s office in Jefferson County, we noted the following:

- **Property Forfeiture**
One employee has the ability to issue receipts, post receipts to the computer system, and prepare deposits. No one other than the preparer reviews the reconciliations to ensure accuracy of the amounts reconciled.

- **Bogus Check Restitution Fee**
One employee has the ability to issue receipts, post receipts to the computer system, and prepare deposits. No one other than the preparer reviews the reconciliations to ensure accuracy of the amounts reconciled.

- **Supervision Fee**
One employee has the ability to issue receipts, post receipts to the computer system, and prepare deposits. No one other than the preparer reviews the reconciliations to ensure accuracy of the amounts reconciled.

Cause of Condition: Policies and procedures have not been designed and implemented to properly separate key accounting functions.

Effect of Condition: A single person having responsibility for more than one area of recording, authorization, custody of assets, and execution of transactions could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, clerical errors, or misappropriation of funds not being detected in a timely manner.

Recommendation: The Oklahoma State Auditor & Inspector’s Office (OSAI) recommends management be aware of these conditions and realize that concentration of duties and responsibilities in a limited number of individuals is not desired from a control point of view. The most effective controls lie in management’s oversight of office operations and a periodic review of operations. OSAI recommends management provide segregation of duties so that no one employee is able to perform all accounting functions. In the event that segregation of duties is not possible due to limited personnel, OSAI recommends implementing compensating controls to mitigate the risks involved with a concentration of duties. Compensating controls would include separating key processes and/or critical functions of the office, and having management review and approve accounting functions.

Management Response: We are aware of this issue. In Jefferson County, because of the limited number of personnel, the District Attorney's Office now relies on compensating controls and management review of accounting functions.

Criteria: Demonstration of accountability and stewardship are goals used in evaluating management's accounting for funds. A basic component of adequate internal controls is the segregation of duties so that one individual cannot perpetuate and conceal errors and irregularities in the normal course of his/her duties. No one individual should have the ability to authorize transactions, have physical custody of assets, and record transactions.

Finding 2015-2 – Supervision Program Expenditures

Condition: Of the eight Supervision Program expenditures tested at Caddo County, seven instances were noted where the voucher was not supported with a claim and invoice or certified receipt.

Cause of Condition: Policies and procedures have not been designed and implemented to ensure all expenditures are supported with proper documentation.

Effect of Condition: This condition could result in unrecorded transactions, misstated financial reports, undetected errors, or misappropriation of funds.

Recommendation: OSAI recommends the District Attorney implement procedures to maintain claims, invoices, and certified receipt of goods/services.

Management Response: This has been corrected. We will keep claims and invoices for all expenditures.

Criteria: Effective internal controls require that management properly implement procedures to ensure that all expenditures are supported with claims and invoices.



OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR & INSPECTOR
2300 N. LINCOLN BOULEVARD, ROOM 100
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73105-4896

WWW.SAI.OK.GOV