



Criminal Resource Manual

- CRM 1-499
CRM 500-999
CRM 1000-1499
CRM 1500-1999
CRM 2000 - 2500
Criminal Resource Manual 2001-2099
Criminal Resource Manual 2101-2199
Criminal Resource Manual 2201-2299
Criminal Resource Manual 2301-2399
Criminal Resource Manual 2401-2499
2401. Investigative Jurisdiction Generally
2402. Hobbs Act -- Generally
2403. Hobbs Act -- Extortion By Force, Violence, Or Fear
2404. Hobbs Act -- Under Color Of Official Right
2405. Form Indictment -- Interference With Commerce By Extortion Consisting Of Threats, Violence Or Fear (18 U.S.C. 1951)
2406. Form Indictment -- Interference With Commerce By Robbery (18 U.S.C. 1951)
2407. Labor Management Relations Act -- 29 U.S.C. 186
2408. Form Indictment -- Solicitation Or Receipt Of Prohibited Payment By Labor Union Official In Private Sector (Taft-Hartley) (186(a)(1) And (d)(2) Based On 186(a)(2)) -- 29 U.S.C. 186
2409. Form Indictment -- Prohibited Payment To Labor Union Official In Private Sector (Taft-Hartley) (186(a)(2) And (d)(2)) -- 29 U.S.C. 186
2410. Form Indictment -- Solicitation Or Receipt Of Bribery Payment By Labor Union Official In The Private Sector; Labor-Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley) (29 U.S.C. 186(b)(1) And (d)(2) Based On 186(a)(4)) -- 29
2411. Form Indictment -- Bribery Of Labor Union Official In The Private Sector; Labor-Management Relations Act (Taft-Hartley) (186(a)(4) And (d)(2)) -- 29 U.S.C. 186
2412. Decisions And Matters Involving 29 U.S.C. 186 (Taft-Hartley Act Sec. 302)
2413. Outline Of 29 U.S.C. 186 (Taft-Hartley Act Sec. 302)
2414. 29 U.S.C. 501(c) -- Embezzlement And Theft From Labor Unions In The Private Sector; 18 U.S.C. 664 -- Embezzlement And Theft From Employee Benefit Plans In The Private Sector
2415. Investigative Jurisdiction -- 29 U.S.C. 501(c) And 18 U.S.C. 664
2416. Form Indictment -- Embezzlement And Theft Of Labor Union Assets In The Private Sector -- (29 U.S.C. 501(c))
2417. Form Indictment -- Embezzlement And Theft From An Employee Pension Or Welfare Benefit Plans Or A Fund Connected With Such Plans -- (18 U.S.C. 664)
2418. 29 U.S.C. 501(c) Decisions
2419. 18 U.S.C. 664 Decisions
2420. Employee Benefit Plan Kickbacks -- 18 U.S.C. 1954
2421. Investigative Jurisdiction
2422. Bribery And Graft Affecting Employee Benefit Plans -- 18 U.S.C. 1954
2423. Form Indictment -- Solicitation And Receipt Of Bribery And Graft Affecting Employee Pension Or Welfare Plan In The Private Sector -- (18 U.S.C. 1954)
2424. Form Indictment -- Offer And Gift Of Bribery And Graft Payments Affecting Employee Pension Or Welfare Plan In The Private Sector -- (18 U.S.C. 1954)
2425. Employee Benefit Plan Kickbacks -- (18 U.S.C. 1954)
2426. Decisions Involving 18 U.S.C. 1954
2427. Employee Retirement Income Security Act Of 1974 (ERISA) -- 29 U.S.C. 1001 Et Seq.
2428. Investigative Jurisdiction
2429. Failure To Perform ERISA Reporting And Disclosure -- 29 U.S.C. 1131 (ERISA Section 501)
2430. Elements Of Proof For 29 U.S.C. 1131 And ERISA Obligations
2431. Form Indictment -- 29 U.S.C. 1131
2432. Coercive Or Fraudulent Interference With ERISA Rights -- 29 U.S.C. 1141
2433. Form Indictment -- 29 U.S.C. 1141
2434. Investigative Jurisdiction -- 29 U.S.C. 439
2435. Investigative Jurisdiction -- 18 U.S.C. 1027
2436. Form Indictment -- Falsification Of Annual Financial Report Filed By Labor Union In The Private Sector (29 U.S.C. 439(b))
2437. Form Indictment -- Falsification, Concealment Or Destruction Of Financial Records Required To Be Kept By Labor Union In The Private Sector (29 U.S.C. 439(c))
2438. Form Indictment -- False Statements And Concealment Of Facts In Employee Benefit Plan Records Or Reports
2439. Decisions Related To 18 U.S.C. 1027
2440. 29 U.S.C. 530 -- The Statute
2441. Form Indictment -- Deprivation Of Member's Rights Pertaining To Internal Labor Union Affairs In The Private Sector By Actual Or Threatened Violence (29 U.S.C 530)
2442. General Discussion Of Statutes
2443. Investigative Jurisdiction
2444. Content Of Notice Concerning Convicted Individuals
2445. LMRDA Disability Elements Of Proof
2446. ERISA Disability Elements Of Proof
2447. Form Indictment -- Intentional Prohibited Service By Convicted Individual For Sentences Entered After October 12, 1984
2448. Form Indictment -- Intentional And Knowing Permitting Of Prohibited Service By Convicted Individuals Sentenced After October 12, 1984
2449. Relief By Reduction Of The Length Of Disability
2450. Relief By Exemption From Disability In A Particular Prohibited Position
2451. Litigating Authority Before The U.S. Parole Commission
2452. Relief By Full Restoration Of Citizenship Rights Revoked As The Result Of A Disqualifying Conviction
2453. Alternative Relief To 29 U.S.C. 504 And 1111
2454. The Railway Labor Act (RLA) -- 45 U.S.C. 151, Et Seq.
2455. Investigative Jurisdiction
2456. 29 U.S.C. 201 TO 219 - Fair Labor Standards Act
2457. 29 U.S.C. Sec. 162 -- Interference With National Labor Relations Board Agent
2458. Use Of Arson Or Explosives When A Labor Dispute Is Involved -- 18 U.S.C. 844(f)
2459. 49 U.S.C. 80501 (formerly 15 U.S.C. 1281 And 1282 Transferred Effective July 5, 1994) Damage To Property Being Transported In Interstate Or Foreign Commerce
2460. 29 U.S.C. 461 And 463 -- Labor Organization Under Trusteeship
2461. Bonding Of Officers And Employees Of Labor Organizations -- 29 U.S.C. 502
2462. Loans To Union Officers And Payment Of Fines -- 29 U.S.C. 503
2463. Transportation Of Strikebreakers -- 18 U.S.C. 1231
2464. Coordination Of Parallel Criminal, Civil, And Administrative Proceedings
2465. Instructions On Final Injunction On Prosecutions Under The Communications Decency Act
2466. Injunction -- Communications Decency Act
2467. Keeney Memorandum -- Recent Amendments To The Federal Child Pornography And Abuse Statutes -- 18 U.S.C. 2252A
2468. Enforcement Actions Under Current Section 1128B(a)(6) Of The Social Security Act
2469. Obscenity/Sexual Exploitation -- Request To Re-export
2470. General History Of Aiding And Abetting
2471. 18 U.S.C. § 2
2472. Statutory History
2473. Case Law
2474. Elements Of Aiding And Abetting
2475. Intent
2476. 18 U.S.C. 2 Is Not An Independent Offense
2477. Charging Aiding And Abetting
2478. What Is Not Aiding And Abetting
2479. What Is Not Required To Prove Aiding And Abetting
2480. Attempt To Aid And Abet
2481. Aiding And Abetting An Attempted Crime
2482. Pinkerton Vs. Aiding And Abetting
2483. Conspiracy To Aid And Abet?

This is archived content from the U.S. Department of Justice website. The information here may be outdated and links may no longer function. Please contact webmaster@usdoj.gov if you have any questions about the archive site.

2482. PINKERTON VS. AIDING AND ABETTING

A defendant in a case charging a conspiracy may be liable for each of the substantive counts charged in an indictment under three separate theories:

- 1. Actual commission of the crime;
2. Participation in the crime as an aider or abettor;
3. Liability under a Pinkerton theory.

United States v. Aldsworth, 867 F.Supp. 980, 987 (D. Kan. 1994). The government may prove liability under any alternative theory, and the jury will not return a verdict indicating the precise manner in which the defendant committed the crime. Id. Furthermore, a jury finding that one is guilty of aiding and abetting a crime is not the equivalent of a finding of a conspiratorial agreement. United States v. Palozale, 71 F.3d 1233, 1237 (6th Cir. 1995). There is no requirement that there be an agreement in order to convict one of aiding and abetting. United States v. Frazier, 880 F.2d 878, 886 (6th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 1023, 110 S.Ct. 1142, 107 L.Ed.2d 1046 (1990). Conspiracy to commit a crime and aiding and abetting in the commission are distinct offenses. Id. See also United States v. Superior Growers Supply, 982 F.2d 172, 178 (6th Cir. 1992).

The Pinkerton rule was pronounced in Pinkerton v. United States, 328 U.S. 640, 66 S.Ct. 1180, 90 L.Ed. 1489 (1946). Walter and Daniel Pinkerton were brothers who were charged with violations of the Internal Revenue Code. The indictment alleged the Pinkertons committed one conspiracy count and the ten substantive counts. A jury found each of them guilty of the conspiracy and several of the substantive counts. The main issue arose from the facts that there was no evidence to show Daniel Pinkerton participated directly in the commission of the substantive offenses although there was evidence showing these substantive offenses were in fact committed by Walter Pinkerton in furtherance of the unlawful agreement or conspiracy existing between the brothers. Id., 328 U.S. at 645, 66 S.Ct. at 1183.

The question was submitted to the jury on the theory that each brother could be found guilty of the substantive offenses if it was found at the time those offenses were committed the brothers were parties to an unlawful conspiracy and the substantive offenses were, in fact, committed in furtherance of it. Id. Daniel Pinkerton was not indicted as an aider or abettor, nor was his case submitted to the jury on that theory. Id. at n.6.

Daniel argued United States v. Sall, 116 F.2d 745 (3d Cir. 1940), in support of his contention that participation in the conspiracy is not in itself enough to sustain a conviction for the substantive offense even though it was committed in furtherance of the conspiracy. Id., 328 U.S. at 646, 66 S.Ct. at 1183. Sall held that, in addition to evidence that the offense was in fact committed in furtherance of the conspiracy, evidence of direct participation in the commission of the substantive offense or other evidence from which participation might fairly be inferred was necessary. Id.

The Supreme Court took a different view. It noted the facts showed a continuous conspiracy with no evidence that Daniel attempted to withdraw from it. Id. Therefore, he continued to offend. Id. So long as the partnership in crime continues, the partners act for each other in carrying it forward, and an overt act of one partner may be the act of all without any new agreement specifically directed to that act. Id., 328 U.S. at 647, 66 S.Ct. at 1184. The criminal intent to do an illegal act by one of the conspirators in furtherance of the unlawful project is established by the formation of the conspiracy. Id. Each conspirator instigates the commission of the crime. Id. The unlawful agreement contemplated what was done in the substantive acts, the substantive crimes were performed in the execution of the enterprise. Id.

Similar to the rule of aiding and abetting, the overt acts of one partner in a conspiracy is attributable to all partners. Id. The court concluded that if an overt act, which is an essential ingredient to a conspiracy, can be supplied by one conspirator, then likewise the same or other acts in furtherance of the conspiracy should be attributable to the others for the purpose of holding them responsible for the substantive offenses(s). Id.

The court did note that a different result would arise if the substantive offense committed by one of the conspirators was not, in fact, done in furtherance of the conspiracy, did not fall within the scope of the unlawful project, or was merely a part of the ramifications of the plan which could not be reasonably foreseen as a necessary or natural consequence of the unlawful agreement. Id.

The rule of Pinkerton does service where the conspiracy is one to commit offenses of the character described in the substantive charges. Nye & Nissen, 336 U.S. at 620, 69 S.Ct. at 770. Aiding and abetting has a broader application. Id. It makes a defendant a principal when he consciously shares in any criminal act whether or not there is a conspiracy. Id. And if a conspiracy is also charged, it makes no difference so far as aiding and abetting is concerned whether the substantive offense is done pursuant to the conspiracy. Id. Pinkerton is narrow in its scope. Aiding and abetting rests on a broader base. It states a rule of criminal responsibility for acts which one assists another in performing. Id. The fact that a particular case might conceivably be submitted to the jury on either theory is irrelevant. It is sufficient if the proof adduced and the basis on which it was submitted were sufficient to support the verdicts. Id.

See also Chapter 24 of Federal Narcotics Prosecutions (OLE 1999) for a further discussion of Pinkerton liability.

[updated April 1999]