

**ROBERT SCHULTE, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DISTRICT 5
STATUTORY REPORT
PROPERTY FORFEITURE FUND
FOR THE YEAR ENDED
JUNE 30, 2006**

This publication is printed and issued by the State Auditor and Inspector as authorized by 74 O.S. § 212 (E) and 63 O.S. §2-506. Pursuant to 74 O.S. § 3105 (B), six copies have been prepared and distributed at a cost of \$13.28. Copies have been deposited with the Publications Clearinghouse of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries



STATE OF OKLAHOMA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

October 10, 2006

Robert Schulte, District Attorney
District 5

Transmitted herewith is the statutory report for the District Attorney of District 5, Comanche and Cotton Counties, Oklahoma (the District), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006. 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.

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

The Office of the State Auditor and Inspector is committed to serve the public interest by providing independent oversight and to issue reports that serve as a management tool to the state to ensure a government which is accountable to the people of the State of Oklahoma.

Sincerely,



JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introductory Information ii
Statutory Report of State Auditor and Inspector 1
Property Forfeiture Fund Analysis3
Schedule of Findings and Recommendations.....4

INTRODUCTORY INFORMATION

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 substances 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.



STATE OF OKLAHOMA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

Statutory Report

Robert Schulte
District Attorney, District 5
Comanche County Courthouse
Lawton, Oklahoma 73501

For the purpose of complying with 74 O.S. §212 (E) and 63 O.S. §2-506, we have performed each of the following procedures as it relates to the records of the Property Forfeiture Fund for the fiscal year 2006:

- We examined a group of receipts and deposit slips for propriety.
- We reviewed 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. §2-508.C.3.
- For selected cases, the distribution of proceeds of the sale was reviewed to determine the distribution was in accordance with Court order pursuant to 63 O.S. §2-506.K.
- We determined whether expenditures tested were used for enforcement of controlled dangerous substance laws, drug abuse prevention and education in accordance with 63 O.S. §2-506.L.3.
- We determined whether expenditures tested were supported by approved claims, invoices, and independent verification that goods or services paid for were received in accordance with 63 O.S. §2-508.C.3.
- We determined whether the District Attorney prepared and submitted an annual report to the Board of County Commissioners showing the total deposits, total expenditures, beginning and ending balances in accordance with 63 O.S. §2-506.L.3.
- We determined whether expenditures were properly classified and whether the District Attorney reconciles the balance with the County Treasurer monthly in accordance with 63 O.S. §2-508.C.3.

Our engagement was limited to the procedures performed above and was less in scope than an audit performed in accordance with accounting standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on any general-purpose financial statements of Comanche or Cotton County.

Based on our procedures performed, the District is properly receipting and depositing the proceeds of forfeitures; forfeited assets were sold after proper notice at public auction to the highest bidder; the proceeds of forfeitures were distributed as directed by Court orders; expenditures were made for lawful uses; expenditures were supported by approved claims, invoices, and independent verification that goods or services paid for were received; the District Attorney prepared and submitted an annual report to the Board of County Commissioners; expenditures are properly classified and the District Attorney reconciles the balance of the Property Forfeiture Fund with the County Treasurer's records monthly. With respect to the matter of segregation of duties, our finding is presented in the attached schedule of findings and recommendations.

We have included in this report a detailed analysis of the Property Forfeiture Fund.

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jeff A. McMahon". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "J".

JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

August 29, 2006

PROPERTY FORFEITURE FUND ANALYSIS

BEGINNING CASH BALANCE ON JULY 1, 2005		<u>\$ 232,932</u>
INCOME		
Cash forfeited	<u>41,369</u>	
TOTAL INCOME (before distributions)		<u>41,369</u>
DISTRIBUTION TO OTHER AGENCIES		
Cash returned to other agencies	<u>34,191</u>	
TOTAL DISTRIBUTIONS		<u>34,191</u>
EXPENDITURES BY DISTRICT ATTORNEY		
Operating expense	689	
Other	43,460	
DAC	<u>3,059</u>	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES		<u>47,208</u>
ENDING CASH BALANCE ON JUNE 30, 2006		<u>\$ 192,902</u>

SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2004-1 – Segregation of Duties (Repeat Finding)

Criteria: Effective internal controls include employees whose duties are to process cash transactions be separated from the duties of depositing funds, posting bookkeeping records, and reconciling reports of collection activity.

Condition: The District Attorney's secretary writes receipts and prepares the deposit on many of the official depository accounts. Also, one individual prepares, signs, posts, and distributes vouchers.

Recommendation: We recommend that management be aware of the possibility of weakened internal controls when all collection activity duties are the responsibility of one employee. Although it is not feasible to divide these duties to the extent described above, it is desirable to review transactions and cross train employees to perform these duties to provide adequate control over funds collected in each office.

Views of responsible officials and planned corrective actions: Funds were not available to hire more individuals to segregate the secretary's duties. Management has knowledge of office operations and performs a periodic review of operations.