

Is Unauthorized Dissemination of a Draft Supreme Court Opinion a Federal Crime?

May 10, 2022

On May 2, 2022, it was first reported that a news organization had obtained a draft Supreme Court majority opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization* and received confirmation from “a person familiar with the court’s proceedings” in the case. The Court subsequently [authenticated](#) the draft opinion, and Chief Justice Roberts ordered an internal investigation. Beyond discussion of the substance of the draft opinion and its implications for the constitutional right recognized in *Roe v. Wade*—and setting aside [potential](#) employment or professional consequences for the person or persons who shared the draft—a [number](#) of [commentators](#) have [questioned](#) whether the act of [providing](#) the draft opinion to a media organization was a federal crime. Several Members of the House Oversight Committee wrote a [letter](#) to the Attorney General on May 3, 2022, calling for, among other things, a Department of Justice investigation and a briefing on “whether criminal charges are being considered against the individual or individuals responsible for this breach.”

Although federal law does prohibit the dissemination of certain kinds of [government information](#)—such as “classified” information related to national security—there does not appear to be a federal criminal statute expressly prohibiting unauthorized sharing of Supreme Court documents like draft opinions. Several laws that have been publicly [referenced](#) in [connection](#) with disclosure of non-public Supreme Court information could apply to particular disclosures depending on the underlying facts, which remain unclear in this instance, but there would be legal hurdles associated with seeking to use any of the referenced laws to prosecute the person or persons who shared the draft opinion in *Dobbs*. The provenance of the disclosure is unknown, so the laws addressed in this Legal Sidebar may or may not apply depending on the facts. Further developments in the Supreme Court marshal’s investigation could also make additional laws relevant (for instance, [18 U.S.C. § 1001](#), which prohibits knowingly and willfully making a materially false statement “in any matter within the jurisdiction of the . . . judicial branch of the Government of the United States,” among other things). As relevant to the disclosure itself, this Legal Sidebar will briefly describe three federal criminal provisions that have been cited by commentators in the context of apparently unauthorized Supreme Court information dissemination and identify some of the potential issues that application of each of those laws could raise.

Congressional Research Service

<https://crsreports.congress.gov>

LSB10741

Pocket Constitution



The Declaration of Independence
The Constitution of the United States
The Bill of Rights
Amendments XI–XXVII
Gettysburg Address



TheCapitolNet

TCNFPC.com

Computer Fraud and Abuse Act: 18 U.S.C. § 1030

Among other things, the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA) makes it a crime to intentionally access a computer *without authorization* or to *exceed authorized access* and obtain information from a financial institution, the federal government, or “any protected computer” (any computer connected to the internet). The term *without authorization* is not further defined in statute, while the term *exceeds authorized access* is defined as “to access a computer with authorization and to use such access to obtain or alter information in the computer that the accesser is not entitled so to obtain or alter[.]” Prior to a recent Supreme Court decision, some courts had read the statute broadly to include accessing a computer or information on a computer to which the person already had authorized access but doing so for a purpose that was not permitted. An example would be an employee accessing a database containing “sensitive personal information” for his personal use despite an employer policy prohibiting use of the database for nonbusiness purposes.

In *Van Buren v. United States*, however, the Supreme Court held that the relevant CFAA provision “covers those who obtain information from particular areas in a computer—such as files, folders, or databases—to which their computer access does not extend,” but it does not “cover those who . . . have improper motives for obtaining information that is otherwise available to them.” As such, as it relates to the disclosure of the draft opinion in *Dobbs*, if the person or persons who shared the opinion obtained it by accessing a computer or area of a computer that was completely “off limits,” such conduct might constitute a violation of the CFAA. While the circumstances of the disclosure remain unknown, if a person or persons who shared the draft were given access to it for work-related purposes, it does not appear that a CFAA charge would be available.

Concealment, Removal, or Mutilation of Certain Documents: 18 U.S.C. § 2071

18 U.S.C. § 2071 prohibits, in part, “willfully and unlawfully . . . remov[ing]” a “record, proceeding, map, book, paper, document, or other thing, filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States” or “with any judicial or public officer of the United States.” Potential application of this provision to the person or persons who shared the Supreme Court draft opinion in *Dobbs* would need to clear several legal hurdles. First, the *mens rea* requirement, that a person acted “willfully and unlawfully,” appears stringent. According to the Ninth Circuit, the standard requires one to act “intentionally, with knowledge that he was breaching the statute.” Second, there is little caselaw on what it means for a record or document to be “filed or deposited” with a relevant officer, though a 1923 Third Circuit opinion interpreting a predecessor statute suggested that a document “deposited” may include one “intrusted to [the] care” of another.

In any event, there is conflicting judicial opinion as to whether the statute applies to the removal of a mere copy of a record or document. In a 2014 decision, the federal district court for the District of Columbia ruled that the statute as a whole extends only to circumstances where a person’s actions with respect to a covered record or document “obliterated information from the public record,” disagreeing with an earlier divided Tenth Circuit opinion. The trial court further wrote that it was “difficult to see how the government could prove that [the defendant] obliterated information from the public record in violation of [the statute] by printing electronically stored documents and then taking the print-outs.” If followed, this decision would seem to exclude application of the statute to the *Dobbs* disclosure, which appears to have involved a photocopy.

Theft or Conversion of Public Property: 18 U.S.C. § 641

Several commentators have asserted that disclosure of the draft opinion in *Dobbs* could violate 18 U.S.C. § 641, which prohibits, in relevant part, embezzling, stealing, purloining, knowingly converting to one’s own use or the use of another, or without authority conveying or disposing of a record or “thing of value

of the United States or of any department or agency thereof.” Application of the statute in this context could raise several legal questions. At the threshold, for instance, the extent to which the statute applies to the judicial branch appears unclear. Although Section 641 has been used to [charge](#) conversion of judicial branch property in the past, the Supreme Court has [held](#) that the terms *department* and *agency*, as used in Title 18, do not extend to the judiciary.

Additionally, courts are divided on whether and to what extent *information* may be considered a “thing of value” under the statute, a prospect that some have suggested may [raise](#) First Amendment concerns. The D.C. Circuit, possibly the federal appellate court of jurisdiction given the Supreme Court’s location, has [held](#) that the statute can apply broadly to intangible property “generally protected as personal property,” such as “computer time and storage,” but it does not appear to have addressed whether it would consider information a form of protected intangible property. It also appears that the Department of Justice has maintained a written [policy](#) that it is “inappropriate to bring a prosecution” under the statute “when: (1) the subject of the theft is intangible property, i.e., government information owned by, or under the care, custody, or control of the United States; (2) the defendant obtained or used the property primarily for the purpose of disseminating it to the public; *and* (3) the property was not obtained” by wiretapping, illegally intercepting correspondence, or illegal entry or trespass. One reason [given](#) for the policy is to “protect[] ‘whistle-blowers.’” Thus, under this policy, a government employee who, for the primary purpose of public exposure of the material, reveals a government document to which he or she gained access lawfully or by non-trespassory means would not be subject to criminal prosecution for the theft.” It appears that the policy was last [updated](#) during a prior Administration. The extent to which the policy is still in force is unclear.

Author Information

Michael A. Foster
Legislative Attorney

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS’s institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Learn how Capitol Hill really works

All of our programs and any combination of their topics can be tailored for custom training for your organization.

For more than 40 years, TheCapitol.Net and its predecessor, Congressional Quarterly Executive Conferences, have been teaching professionals from government, military, business, and NGOs about the dynamics and operations of the legislative and executive branches and how to work with them.

Our training, on-site and online, and publications include congressional operations, legislative and budget process, communication and advocacy, media and public relations, research, testifying before Congress, legislative drafting, critical thinking and writing, and more.

- **Diverse Client Base**—We have tailored hundreds of custom on-site and online training programs for Congress, numerous agencies in all federal departments, the military, law firms, lobbying firms, unions, think tanks and NGOs, foreign delegations, associations and corporations, delivering exceptional insight into how Washington works.™
- **Experienced Program Design and Delivery**—We have designed and delivered hundreds of custom programs covering congressional/legislative operations, budget process, media training, writing skills, legislative drafting, advocacy, research, testifying before Congress, grassroots, and more.
- **Professional Materials**—We provide training materials and publications that show how Washington works. Our publications are designed both as course materials and as invaluable reference tools.
- **Large Team of Experienced Faculty**—More than 150 faculty members provide independent subject matter expertise. Each program is designed using the best faculty member for each session.
- **Non-Partisan**—TheCapitol.Net is non-partisan.
- **GSA Schedule**—TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training: GSA Contract GS02F0192X.

Please see our Capability Statement on our web site at TCNCS.com.

Custom training programs are designed to meet your educational and training goals, each led by independent subject-matter experts best qualified to help you reach your educational objectives and align with your audience.

As part of your custom program, we can also provide online venue, classroom space, breaks and meals, receptions, tours, and online registration and individual attendee billing services.

For more information about custom on-site training for your organization, please see our web site: TCNCustom.com or call us: 202-678-1600, ext 115.



Non-partisan training and publications that show how Washington works.™

PO Box 25706, Alexandria, VA 22313-5706
202-678-1600 • www.thecapitol.net



TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training.
GSA Contract GS02F0192X

