
**MONMOUTH COUNTY
UNIFORM POLICY**

**Prosecutorial Review Of
Search Warrant Applications**

Revised: July, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Policy Statement of the New Jersey Attorney General and the New Jersey County Prosecutors' Association Regarding Prosecutorial Review of Search Warrant Applications	3
II. Monmouth County Policy for Implementing the New Jersey Attorney General and the New Jersey County Prosecutors' Association Policy and Attorney General Law Enforcement Directive No. 2002-2 Regarding Prosecutorial Review of Search Warrant Applications	5

APPENDIX

A. MCPO Search Warrant Approval Form	17
B. HIDTA New Jersey Task Force Deconfliction Data Entry Form	18
C. HIDTA New Jersey Task Force Deconfliction Overview	19

I. Policy Statement of the New Jersey Attorney General and the New Jersey County Prosecutors' Association Regarding Prosecutorial Review of Search Warrant Applications

Court authorized searches of dwellings, places of business and automobiles are significant weapons in law enforcement's arsenal for the detection and prosecution of violators of the law. Nevertheless, while the law enforcement community has a continuing obligation to fulfill its prosecutorial mandate, it also recognizes that court authorized searches of dwellings, places of business, and, to a lesser extent, automobiles are significant intrusions which require strict adherence to existing legal and administrative standards. The trial and appellate courts of this State have also consistently maintained "...strict adherence to the protective rules governing search warrants is a critical part of the constitutional armory safeguarding citizens from unreasonable searches and seizures." As the chief law enforcement officers in their jurisdictions, the Attorney General and the County Prosecutors have the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that search warrants are properly and effectively utilized. Their role is both to guard against unreasonable searches and to ensure that the guilty are prosecuted and appropriately punished.

In July 1984, a presentment was issued by a special county grand jury concerning the mistakes made by a local police department in the securing of a search warrant and the subsequent seizure of private property. The warrant and resulting seizure were later found to be improper for a number of reasons. In that instance, had the local police department followed existing county policy requiring review and approval of search warrants by the prosecutor's office, the unfortunate events, which thereafter transpired, would have been avoided. The presentment, therefore, called public attention to the need for strict adherence to a uniform policy requiring search warrant review and approval by prosecuting attorneys.

At virtually the same time as the grand jury was issuing its presentment, the United States Supreme Court decided several cases which placed renewed emphasis on the role of the police officer in the procuring and execution of search warrants. In those cases, the Supreme Court indicated that great deference is to be given to a police officer's assessment of the facial validity of a search warrant and his reasonable reliance thereon where that warrant has been

issued by a court of competent jurisdiction. The enhanced reliance on the police officer's determination as to the existence of probable cause and the propriety of the resulting search highlights the need for the input of legal expertise at the earliest possible time. Such a review will detect any defects in a search warrant application in order that the police may reasonably rely on the contents thereof in executing the warrant.

The increased need for a statewide policy with respect to prosecutorial review of search warrant applications was addressed by the New Jersey County Prosecutor's Association and the Attorney General, through the Division of Criminal Justice. At a meeting on November 7, 1984, the County Prosecutors' Association and the Division of Criminal Justice agreed in principle to the need for a systematic statewide policy of prosecutorial review of search warrant applications. Pursuant thereto, the Attorney General, the Director of the Division of Criminal Justice and the County Prosecutors jointly adopted the following policy statement:

ALL APPLICATIONS FOR SEARCH WARRANTS SHALL BE REVIEWED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OR HIS DESIGNEES, OR THE APPROPRIATE COUNTY PROSECUTOR, OR HIS DESIGNEES, PRIOR TO THEIR SUBMISSION TO COURTS FOR AUTHORIZATION.

In furtherance of this policy and accompanying statement, county and municipal law enforcement officers must obtain authorization from the appropriate County Prosecutor's Office prior to applying to the court for the issuance of a search warrant, be it telephonic or written. State law enforcement officers shall likewise secure approval of warrant applications through either the Division of Criminal Justice or the County Prosecutor's Office, whichever is appropriate. The Division of Criminal Justice and the County Prosecutors' Offices have instituted the necessary procedures to ensure that this statewide policy is effectively implemented.

On August 8, 2002, Attorney General Samson issued Attorney General Law Enforcement Direction No. 2002-2. The directive set forth procedures for the approval of search warrant applications, execution of search warrants and for the coordination of investigative activities conducted by multiple law enforcement agencies. The directive became effective September 2, 2002.

II. Monmouth County Policy for Implementing the New Jersey Attorney General and the New Jersey County Prosecutors' Association Policy and Attorney General Law Enforcement Directive No. 2002-2 Regarding Prosecutorial Review of Search Warrant Applications

This policy applies to all applications made to a New Jersey Superior or Municipal Court Judge for issuance of a criminal search warrant and shall apply to all law enforcement agencies operating under the authority of the laws of the State of New Jersey at the State, County and local levels of government. This policy does not apply to applications for administrative search warrants, or for court orders to enter premises to retrieve weapons pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:25-21 (domestic violence) where the weapons to be seized are not believed to be contraband, evidence or an instrumentality of a criminal offense.

No law enforcement officer or agency operating under the authority of the laws of this State at any level of government shall apply to a New Jersey Judge for issuance of a search warrant without first obtaining express authorization from an Assistant County Prosecutor who has been designated in writing by the County Prosecutor to review search warrant applications. Every Assistant Monmouth County Prosecutor has been designated by the County prosecutor to review search warrant applications. (These persons are hereinafter referred to in this policy as "Designated Attorneys"). This rule shall apply to applications for a search warrant made in person pursuant to R. 3:5-3a, as well as to applications for a search warrant that are communicated to a Superior Court Judge by telephone, radio or other means of electronic communication pursuant to R. 3:5-3b.

Questions regarding search warrants or other legal issues should ordinarily be referred to your assigned regional advisor. If your search warrant deals with a specific area of the criminal law such as narcotics, toxic waste, child abuse, etc., you can contact an assistant prosecutor who is assigned to that unit. A list of regional advisors and the assistant prosecutors assigned to specific units is available at your department. If you cannot contact an assistant prosecutor directly, you should contact the main information desk of the Prosecutor's Office at (732) 431-

7160 during office hours. At all other times, you should contact the Monmouth County Radio Room at (732) 577-8700. The radio room personnel will have the designated assistant prosecutor contact your department when you are unable to contact your regional advisor or an assistant prosecutor assigned to a particular area of criminal law.

An Assistant Prosecutor designated to review search warrant applications shall determine the appropriate Judge before whom the application for a search warrant should be made, and shall assist the applicant in contacting the Judge. Whenever practicable, the application for a search warrant should be made to a Superior Court Judge, rather than a Municipal Court Judge, since Superior Court Judges have statewide jurisdiction and their probable cause determinations are entitled to substantial deference by other Superior Court Judges who might hear any ensuing motion to suppress physical evidence. See State v. Kasabuki, 52 N.J. 110 (1968).

Approval of an application to apply to a judge for issuance of a search warrant may be given by a Designated Attorney in writing, electronically (e-mail or facsimile transmission), or orally (by telephone or radio communication). Whenever practicable, the law enforcement officer seeking permission to apply for issuance of a search warrant (hereinafter referred to as an "applicant") should submit to the appropriate Designated Attorney a written copy of the affidavit intended to be submitted to the court in support of issuance of the warrant, along with a completed and signed application form developed by the Monmouth County Prosecutor's Office. Officers requesting a search warrant should note on the bottom of the affidavit the name of the Designated Attorney (assistant prosecutor) with whom he conferred. The words "reviewed by" and the name of the Designated Attorney are sufficient.

When the circumstances make it impracticable for the applicant to submit to the Designated Attorney a copy of a written affidavit and completed application form, the Designated Attorney shall be responsible for making certain that all of the requirements of this policy have been satisfied by means of oral communication with the applicant, and the

Designated Attorney shall make certain that all of the questions appearing on the application form have been answered. If the applicant has prepared a written affidavit intended for submission to a court, but it is not practicable to transmit a copy of the written affidavit to the Designated Attorney for review, the applicant shall read verbatim the text of the affidavit to the Designated Attorney. Where the circumstances reasonably require that the applicant rely on oral testimony in lieu of or to supplement a written affidavit in support of the application for issuance of a search warrant, the Designated Attorney shall require the applicant to provide all information that is intended for presentation to the court by means of oral testimony.

The Designated Attorney is authorized to deny an application for a search warrant, to approve the application, or to make approval contingent upon some further investigative step, notification and/or consultation with some other law enforcement officer or agency, or such other action to be taken by the applicant that is deemed by the Designated Attorney to be necessary to satisfy all of the requirements of this policy. If the Designated Attorney determines that the application is in any respect deficient or otherwise in need of supplemental investigation or any other action necessary to satisfy the requirements of this policy, the Designated Attorney shall require the applicant to conduct such supplemental investigation or to take such other steps as may be necessary to cure the deficiency or to satisfy the requirements of this policy, and then report back to the Designated Attorney for final authorization before proceeding to submit the application to a judge. Notwithstanding the foregoing, a Designated Attorney is authorized to grant conditional approval contingent upon the satisfaction of some additional step, provided that the Designated Attorney provides clear guidance to the applicant as to the step(s) that must be taken by the applicant and the conditions that must be satisfied before the applicant is authorized to submit the application to a judge. (Example: a Designated Attorney may conditionally approve an application contingent upon the applicant consulting with an appropriate representative from another law enforcement agency that reasonably appears to

have an interest in the target of the investigation or the premises to be searched. In these circumstances, a conditional approval might provide that the applicant is authorized to apply to a court for issuance of the search warrant unless the other law enforcement agency objects to the search.)

The Designated Attorney shall maintain a record of the application (whether denied, approved or conditionally approved), including a copy of the application form (whether prepared by the applicant or by the Designated Attorney in the case of a telephonic application) and any notations made by the Designated Attorney. The application form shall be placed in the prosecuting agency's case file and shall be subject to review and audit by the Attorney General or his designee. After execution, a copy of the Affidavit, Warrant, and the MCPO Search Warrant Approval Form and Return shall be supplied to the Designated Attorney (assistant prosecutor) who reviewed and approved such. These documents shall be supplied within 72 hours of the filing of the Search Warrant Return. Said documents will then be attached to the appropriate form and forwarded by the reviewing assistant prosecutor to the first assistant prosecutor for filing.

In the event that a Designated Attorney declines to approve an application, or conditionally approves the application subject to a condition that has not been satisfied, the applicant or any other person representing the applicant's law enforcement agency shall be prohibited from making an application to any other Designated Attorney without revealing in the successive application the fact that an application had previously been reviewed by another Designated Attorney. This notification requirement shall apply to any successive application involving the same criminal activities or premises to be searched that were involved in the prior application that was not approved.

The law enforcement officer who contacts a Designated Attorney seeking permission to apply to a court for issuance of a search warrant should be the actual affiant or lead case agent

for the investigation (i.e. the officer most likely to be familiar with the scope and details of the investigation and who would therefore be in the best position to be able to answer all of the questions that are required to be addressed pursuant to this policy).

The Monmouth County Prosecutor's Office has developed and disseminated to all law enforcement agencies operating within the County, blank application forms to be completed and submitted by applicants to Designated Attorneys pursuant to this policy. See Appendix A. The applicant shall be required to sign the application form, certifying that all of the information provided to the Designated Attorney is true and accurate to the best of the applicant's knowledge and belief. Where the application is made telephonically, the Designated Attorney shall use the form as a checklist, and shall make certain that the applicant answers every question propounded on the form. Thereafter, the applicant shall be required as soon as practicable to sign the application form that was prepared by the Designated Attorney based upon information orally provided by the applicant to the Designated Attorney.

The Designated Attorney shall be responsible for determining that the application establishes all of the following:

1. An adequately specific and detailed description of all places or premises to be searched;
2. An adequately specific and detailed description of all property to be seized;
3. In the case of telephonic applications to a court pursuant to R. 3:5-3b, the existence of exigent circumstances sufficient to excuse the failure to obtain a written warrant obtained by personally appearing before the judge;
4. Probable cause to justify a search of each place or premises intended to be searched; and
5. Deconfliction has been completed.

The Designated Attorney shall determine whether the application relies to any degree

upon a confidential informant or other confidential source of information, or whether the investigation involved the use of a secret surveillance site. In addition to determining whether the confidential source provided reliable information that based upon the totality of the circumstances, constitutes probable cause, the Designated Attorney shall inquire whether the applicant anticipates the need to seek a protective order to preclude eventual disclosure to a defense counsel or any other person of any information that might reveal the identity of the informer or other confidential information source or the location of a surveillance site. In the event that a protective order is necessary and appropriate to protect a confidential source, the Designated Attorney shall take all appropriate steps to make certain that a timely ex parte application is made to the court for a protective order.

Our courts have held that the Fourth Amendment requires that police officers knock and announce their presence and purpose before executing search warrants on premises. In Wilson v. Arkansas, 514 U.S. 927, 115 S.Ct. 1914 (1995), the United States Supreme Court noted at least three types of situations where unannounced entries have been found reasonable under the Fourth Amendment: (1) officer safety; (2) escaped prisoners; and (3) risk of destruction of evidence. In certain situations, a no knock warrant may be applied for if at least one of the above situations is anticipated. The Designated Attorney shall determine from the applicant as to the intended manner of execution of the warrant (i.e., e.g., whether circumstances exist that might justify dispensing with the "knock and announce" rule.) If the applicant indicates a need to execute an unannounced or forcible entry, or to execute the warrant at any time other than during regular business hours, the Designated Attorney shall determine whether there is an adequate factual basis to justify any such proposed method of execution. The Designated Attorney shall take steps to make certain that the issuing judge is advised of these circumstances and is asked to issue a warrant expressly authorizing this manner of entry or execution. Nothing in this policy shall be construed in any way to preclude a law enforcement

officer executing a warrant from making an unannounced or forceful entry without prior judicial approval for such unannounced or forcible entry in the event that the officer at the time of execution becomes aware of unanticipated facts or circumstances that would be sufficient to justify any such unannounced or forcible entry.

A law enforcement officer involved in the application for or execution of a search warrant shall be strictly prohibited from disclosing to a non-law enforcement officer any facts contained in or concerning the application for the warrant, or the fact that a search warrant will or has been sought or executed, unless such disclosure is expressly authorized by the County Prosecutor or his designee. No law enforcement officer shall advise or invite any non-law enforcement officer to attend, participate in or witness the execution of a search warrant, and no law enforcement officer shall permit a non-law enforcement officer to enter a premises during the execution of a warrant, unless the attendance or participation of such non-law enforcement personnel is necessary to ensure the safe and efficient execution of the warrant. (Example: civilian personnel who may be necessary to the safe and efficient execution of a warrant might include landlords, building managers or custodians; locksmiths, child welfare officials (to take custody of minor children who may be present at the scene); or animal control officers (to assist in the control of guard dogs or other animals at the premises to be searched).)

Our courts have held that the method of entry during the execution of a search warrant “is an element of the reasonableness inquiry under the Fourth Amendment”. State v. Johnson, 168 N.J. 608, 616 (2001). While the use of either a “stun grenade” or “flash bang” device does not require prior judicial approval, they should not be used as a matter of routine in the execution of search warrants. State v. Fanelle, 385 N.J. Super. 518 (App. Div. 2006). If such a device is used, the defense may challenge the reasonableness of its use at a suppression hearing. In determining the reasonableness of the method of entry when such a device is utilized by law enforcement, the Court will be analyzing: the risk posed to police officers (when the

police know that the defendants are armed and/or dangerous, this factor will be significant); the knowledge of the presence of innocents, specifically children (this factor will weigh against the use of such devices); and the type of device, its intended use, and its potential for causing injury or damage. Therefore, a decision to utilize one of these devices in making an entry should be made by a supervisor. Prior to making this decision, the supervisor should be informed of the type of flash-bang device that is available, its strength, and the nature of injury or damage that it is capable of causing. The supervisor should also be made aware of the likelihood of the presence of small children at the location where the search is being executed. These factors should be balanced with the risk that the officers are exposed to, by the particular facts that are present in each individual case. In the event that a supervisor authorizes the use of a flash bang device, this information shall be memorialized in the investigative report.

Once a court authorized search has been completely executed, all information concerning the issuance and execution of the warrant, including but not limited to the affidavit filed in support the warrant, shall be treated as if such information and document had been sealed by a court. No information concerning the search or the grounds therefore, or the nature of any evidence found during the execution of the search, shall be revealed by a law enforcement officer to any person other than to another law enforcement officer except as may be expressly authorized by a court of competent jurisdiction, or by the County Prosecutor or his designee, or except as may be expressly required by R. 3:5-5a (which requires the officer taking property under the warrant to give to the person from whom or from whose premises the property is taken a copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken, or else requiring that the copy and receipt be left at the place from which the property was taken). It shall be the responsibility of the County Prosecutor, or, where applicable, the Division of Criminal Justice, to comply with the criminal discovery requirements set forth in R. 3:5-6c and R. 3:13-3f.

Before approving an application for permission to seek issuance of a search warrant, the

applicant shall take reasonable steps to determine whether any other law enforcement agency at any level of government (federal, state, bi-state, county, city, local, or out-of-state agency) has an interest in a target of the investigation or the premises to be searched that might be adversely affected by execution of the warrant.

This is called "Deconfliction". The applicant is also encouraged to utilize all available databases and systems, such as HIDTA¹, ROIC², DICE³, NJDEX⁴, InfoShare⁵, and Case Explorer⁶ to identify agencies that may be able to share information, which will enhance the investigation. It is recognized that some investigative activity is initiated immediately upon some triggering event, such as a patrol arrest, and that immediate police action must take place. In this situation, deconfliction may not be practical. This exemption should never be used to circumvent the deconfliction requirement, as officer safety may be at stake. Certain hypersensitive investigations may also be exempt from deconfliction. These include national security and public/police corruption investigations. As with emergent police action, agencies should be prepared to present a bona fide reason for claiming the exemption.

HIDTA operates between the hours of 6:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. The contact information is printed on the HIDTA New Jersey Task Force Deconfliction Data Entry Form and Deconfliction

¹ The High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) - This program, which was created by Congress with the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, provides assistance to federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies operating in areas determined to be critical drug-trafficking regions of the United States. HIDTA deconfliction was originally designed to track and manage narcotics cases, groups (such as gangs) and events (such as buy/bust operations). The program has been expanded to include an all crimes approach in order to enhance officer safety and communication and cooperation between agencies during such operations.

² New Jersey Regional Intelligence Center (ROIC).

³ Deconfliction Internet Connectivity Endeavor (DICE), formerly Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) Internet Connectivity Endeavor: A database managed by the DEA that supports queries on phone numbers, e-mail addresses, vehicle identification numbers, license plate numbers, and other types of data and information.

⁴ NJDEX (New Jersey Data Exchange) - This is an automated system to query information from multiple participating law enforcement records management systems.

⁵ INFOSHARE - An integrated CAD, Case Management, Document Management, and Records Management system utilized by various police agencies.

⁶ CaseExplorer.Net is a system available to law enforcement to conduct event and target deconfliction. CaseExplore.Net is a web-based case management, criminal intelligence and deconfliction system developed and supported by the Washington/Baltimore CaseExplorer.Net is a system available to law enforcement to conduct event and target deconfliction. CaseExplore.Net is a web-based case management, criminal intelligence and deconfliction system developed and supported by the Washington/Baltimore HIDTA. Case Explorer interfaces with the other two nationally recognized event deconfliction systems, RISSafe and SAFETNet, conducting queries simultaneously through those systems. It provides basic case management features with functionality focused towards information sharing. Case data is deconflicted as it is entered into the system. Notifications are sent for case matches. Cases are entered into the system with relevant people, addresses, numbers, and other supporting information. The system does not allow participants (or staff) to "browse" the entries. You must make a query to obtain a conflict hit or negative result. Conflict "hits" result in automatic notification to all parties to the conflict. In order to be granted remote access to Case Explorer to conduct deconfliction or to utilize the case management or criminal intelligence systems, the accessing agency must complete and sign the CaseExplorer.Net Participation Agreement.

Overview Form. Appendix B and C. For emergency deconfliction requests between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m., weekends and holidays, the applicant shall complete the HIDTA New Jersey Task Force Deconfliction Data Entry Form and forward to the ROIC. Main number 609-963-6900, fax 609-530-3650. Email the completed form at ROIC@gw.njsp.org. Some high volume agencies may also be granted online access through CaseExplorer.Net.

Conflict confirmation, matches, or system "hits" occur when an event location, target, or other data have been previously entered by another agency having an interest in that location or target. Both entering parties are notified automatically via email by Case Explorer. Each entry is assigned a Case Explorer tracking number (CE#), which is located on the top left of the deconfliction form. This number coincides with the entry made based on the information contained on the deconfliction entry. This number is proof that you conducted the required deconfliction, and will be requested by an Assistant Prosecutor (Designated Attorney) before a warrant is issued.

It is imperative for the querying party to communicate with the conflicting agency. In the event that contact is not made between the submitting individuals, next-line supervisory communication is required. The party that submits the event location or target first does not automatically have primary "rights" to that location or target. Disputes should be resolved amicably by management of the conflicting agencies, recognizing the agencies' equity and resources expended in their investigations and the potential for more significant charges and/or greater public safety impact. The Prosecutor will make the final decision in any dispute that is not resolved at the agency management level.

The applicant shall explain to the Designated Attorney what steps have been taken by the applicant or his agency to determine whether any other law enforcement agency has any interest in the target of his investigation or in the premises to be searched and provide the HIDTA CE#. The Designated Attorney shall not approve the application unless satisfied that

reasonable precautions have been taken, considering the nature of the offense and offender under investigation, to determine whether any other law enforcement agency might be adversely affected by execution of the warrant.

In the event that it reasonably appears that any other law enforcement agency is involved in the investigation, or has an interest in the target of the investigation or in the premises to be searched, the Designated Attorney shall not approve the application unless the applicant certifies that an appropriate representative of such other interested agency (whose name and rank shall be documented) has been consulted and does not object to the execution of the search, or that there is good and sufficient cause to execute the search without first notifying and consulting with such other interested law enforcement agency. In the event that a representative from such other interested law enforcement agency upon notification objects to the execution of a search, the Designated Attorney shall not be authorized to approve the search, but rather shall refer the matter without delay to either the County Prosecutor (in the event that the Designated Attorney is employed by the County Prosecutor and the objecting law enforcement agency is subject to the jurisdiction of the County Prosecutor) or to the Director of the Division of Criminal Justice or his designee (if the objecting law enforcement agency is not subject to the jurisdiction of the County Prosecutor employing the Designated Attorney).

Where it reasonably appears that a target of the investigation or the premises to be searched may be involved in or associated with terrorist activities, the Designated Attorney shall promptly notify the Assistant United States Attorney or other official who has been specifically designated to receive such notification by the United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey.

Where an application is made for a warrant to conduct a search in multiple locations, any one of which is outside the territorial jurisdiction of the applicant's agency or beyond the territorial jurisdiction of an assistant prosecutor reviewing the application, the application shall

not be approved and no search shall be conducted without first notifying and consulting with a representative of the County Prosecutor's Office having jurisdiction over the place to be searched, or a representative of the Division of Criminal Justice. (Example: a search warrant application reviewed by an Assistant Prosecutor of county A involves an intended search of multiple premises, one of which is located in county B. The search of the premises located in county B shall not be conducted without first notifying and consulting with a representative from the County B Prosecutor's Office.) In addition, the local police department having patrol jurisdiction over each and every place or premises to be searched shall be notified of the operation prior to execution of the search unless a Designated Attorney, for good cause shown, determines that notification to the local police department shall only be provided during the execution of the search, or at some later time.

MONMOUTH COUNTY UNIFORM SEARCH WARRANT APPROVAL FORM

PART I • TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT		
A. GENERAL INFORMATION		
1. Name of Applicant	2. Agency	3. Telephone/Pager No.
4. Target:	5. Person/Place to Be Searched:	
6. Method of Submittal: ☐ Email/Fax ☐ Phone ☐ In Person	7. Is applicant the affiant/lead agent? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
B. CASE INFORMATION		
8. Type of Case (crime suspected):	9. Length of Investigation:	
10. Type of warrant sought: ☐ In Person ☐ Telephonic	11. Previous application involving subject/premises? ☐ Yes ☐ No	
12. Investigation involved confidential informant or source? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
13. Warrant based upon: ☐ Written affidavit ☐ Sworn oral testimony ☐ Both		
14. Are you seeking a "no knock" entry or unusual time for execution? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
C. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION INFORMATION		
15a. Was this a joint investigation or task force case? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
15b. Did any other agency contribute to investigation or supply information? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
15c. If Yes, name of agency:		
16. Does criminal activity/operation extend beyond jurisdiction of applicant's agency? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown		
17. Do you have reason to believe that a target of the current investigation or premises to be searched:		
a) Is a defendant in any pending criminal matter?		☐ Yes ☐ No
b) Is an informant/cooperating witness for any law enforcement agency?		☐ Yes ☐ No
c) Is subject to investigation by another law enforcement agency?		☐ Yes ☐ No
d) Is a target of an investigation conducted by another law enforcement agency?		☐ Yes ☐ No
e) Has ever been detained or questioned by another law enforcement agency?		☐ Yes ☐ No
f) Is the subject of an outstanding warrant or B.O.L.O. bulletin?		☐ Yes ☐ No
g) Is associated with sophisticated criminal enterprise?		☐ Yes ☐ No
h) Is associated with organized crime?		☐ Yes ☐ No
i) Is associated with terrorist activities? (If yes, reviewer must promptly advise U.S. Atty's Ofc.)		☐ Yes ☐ No
j) If Yes to 17(a-i), name of agency:		
D. CERTIFICATION		
18. I certify that all of the information in the Application is true to the best of my knowledge and belief.		
Signature:	Date:	Time:
PART II • COMPLETED BY REVIEWER		
E. LEGAL SUFFICIENCY		
19. Adequate description of place to be searched? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
20. Adequate description of property to be seized? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
21. Exigent circumstances (if telephonic warrant)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		
22. Probable cause for each place to be searched? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
23. Basis for "no knock" or other unusual execution? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A		
F. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION		
24a. Is any place to be searched outside the jurisdiction of the reviewer? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
24b. If yes, has appropriate county prosecutor been notified? ☐ Yes ☐ No		
25a. Does any other agency appear to have an interest in the target/premises? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ CE Number		
25b. Has interested agency been consulted? ☐ Yes ☐ No (Explain reasons for not requiring notification.)		
25c. Name/title of person consulted:		
25d. Does any other agency object to the search? ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, name of agency:		
G. LEGAL REVIEW		
26. Resubmission to reviewer required? ☐ Yes ☐ No	27. Control No. (Assigned by Reviewer)	
28. Reviewing Attorney:	29. Action Taken: ☐ Approved ☐ Denied ☐ Conditional If Conditional, explain:	
30. Judge to be contacted:	31. Approved by Judge: ☐ Yes ☐ No	



HIDTA NEW JERSEY TASK FORCE DECONFLICTION DATA ENTRY FORM

(NJIC Use Only)

EVENT#	CTRL#
CE#	CTRL#
SAFETNet#	

DATE/TIME STAMP

MAIN: 973.776.7070 ~ FAX: 973.776.1322 ~ EMAIL: NJHIDTA@usdoj.gov

**** IF TEXT DOESN'T FIT, USE LOWER CASE ****

BOLD PRINT ARE SOFTWARE REQUIRED FIELDS - FAILURE WILL RESULT IN DELAY OR RETURN

REPORTER INFORMATION

AGENCY/GRP:		CASE#:	
Agency Name & Group/Office			
AGENT/DET:		SSN:	
Rank & full Name			
NY SAFETNet Requirement (only)			
OFFICE#:	CELL#:	EMAIL:	
REQUIRED FIELD	REQUIRED FIELD	REQUIRED FIELD FOR CONFIRMATION - LE ADDRESSES ONLY	
OFFICE FAX:	DISPOSITION:	TYPE OF INVEST:	
REQUIRED FIELD FOR CONFIRMATION	Open, Close, Closed by Arrest	Drugs / Chem / Etc.	

EVENT / STREET OPERATIONS ~ DECONFLICTION

START DATE:	START TIME:	END DATE:	END TIME:
REQUIRED FIELD	REQUIRED FIELD	REQUIRED FIELD	REQUIRED FIELD
ADDRESS:		APT:	CITY:
Number	Street		
STATE:	ZIP:	EVENT:	
		Q / R Day, Day/Week, Surveillance, Warrant, Etc.	

SUBJECT / CASE INFORMATION ~ DECONFLICTION

NAME:					
First	Middle	Last			
SEX:	Hair:	Eyes:	Height:	Weight:	Race:
					Wt, Ht, Build, Hair Color
NATIONALITY:			DOB:	SSN#	
Country of Birth					
FBI#:	State ID:				
ADDRESS:		APT:	CITY:		
Number	Street				
STATE:	ZIP:	ALIAS:	DOB:	SSN#:	
		NY SAFETNet Requirement			
Group Name:			Phone#:	Cell ☐	Hardline ☐
Gang, Company or Organization Affiliation			Phone#:	Cell ☐	Hardline ☐

VEHICLE

Year:	Make:	Mod:	Color:
Plate:	State:	Vin:	

COMMERCIAL VEHICLE

Year:	Make:	Mod:	Color:
Plate:	State:	DOT:	Vin:

(NJIC Use Only)

Analyst Name:	Date Completed:
---------------	-----------------

Event Conflict: Yes ☐ No ☐	Subject Conflict: Yes ☐ No ☐	Event#:	CE#:
Conflict Det/Agent:	Dept/Agency:	Ph#:	
COMMENTS:			

80 MULBERRY STREET - NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102 ~ TELEPHONE 973-776-7070 ~ FAX 973-776-1322 ~ EMAIL NJHIDTA@usdoj.gov

01.21.2011



NEW JERSEY INTELLIGENCE CENTER DECONFLICTION OVERVIEW

“EVENT” DECONFLICTION

A. FILL-IN TIPS - “EVENT” DECONFLICTION (STREET OPERATIONS)

- Event samples: Buys/Arrest/Controlled delivery/Search & Fugitive warrants/knock & talk, etc.
- **Events expire from the system after 30 days (NOT SUBJECT TO DECONFLICTION) unless updated by the submitting agency.**
- Event Address/Subject deconflicts automatically with the entire Deconfliction System.
- Radius of an event (Spatial Awareness)- “street op’s safety zone” Generally, one to two block radius.

RESULTS - “EVENT” DECONFLICTION (STREET OPERATIONS)

- PROVIDES FOR OFFICER SAFETY
- IDENTIFIES CASE DUPLICATION

“SUBJECT” DECONFLICTION

B. FILL-IN TIPS - SUBJECT DECONFLICTION (CASE INFORMATION)

- Enter all available SUBJECT pedigree information on the form.
- A partial or incomplete name must be associated with an address, DOB or SSN before it can be entered into the system.
- **Subject/Case Data with inactivity for 12 months will be closed, and are NOT SUBJECT TO DECONFLICTION,** unless updated by the submitting agency.
- Address, Telephone, and Automobile data can be entered without a subject name.
- Providing the zip code will increase the accuracy of our mapping.

RESULTS - SUBJECT DECONFLICTION (CASE INFORMATION)

- STORES & RETRIEVES “PERSON” “PLACE” & “THING” INFORMATION.
- DETECTS DUPLICATE INVESTIGATIVE EFFORTS.
- SEARCH FOR MATCHES IN NATIONAL AND STATE DATABASES
- CASE INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL AND CANNOT BE VIEWED BY ANY OTHER AGENCIES.

C. CONFLICT NOTIFICATION

- TELEPHONE NOTIFICATION TO ALL CONTRIBUTORS OF MATCHING INFORMATION.
- INFORMATION RELEASED IS LIMITED TO: AGENCY NAME, MATCHING FIELDS, REFERENCE NUMBER, CONTACT NAME AND PHONE NUMBER.
- PARTICIPATING AGENCIES SHOULD CONTACT EACH OTHER FOR MORE DETAILED INFORMATION. (MAKE THE CALL.....STAY SAFE).

YOUR COOPERATION IS ESSENTIAL IN KEEPING THE WORK ENVIRONMENT SAFE, EFFECTIVE AND SECURE

Main # 973.776.7070 ~ Fax: 973.776.1322 ~ Email: NJHIDTA@usdoj.gov