

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Federal Bureau of Prisons



PROGRAM STATEMENT
Designation of State Institutions for Service of Federal Sentence

Approved by	 William K. Marshall III Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons
DPI	CPD
Number	5160.06
Date	September 3, 2026

Summary of Changes

Program Statement Rescinded:

- 5160.05, Designation of State Institution for Service of Federal Sentence (1/16/2003)

Changes:

- Adds duties for Designation and Sentence Computation Center (DSCC) staff.
- Adds 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), five factors in the DSCC review for designation of a state institution for service of the federal sentence.
- Adds DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief has final authority to designate a state institution for service of the federal sentence in order to affect commencement of the federal sentence.
- Adds U.S. Supreme Court holdings in *Setser v. United States*, 566 U.S. 231 (2012).
- Adds Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals holdings in *Mangum v. Hallembaek*, 910 F.3d 770 (4th Cir. 2018).
- Adds Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals holdings in *Dotson v. Kizziah*, 966 F.3d 443, 445 (6th Cir. 2020).
- Eliminates duties of Regional Offices in the designation process.
- Eliminates role of Regional Director in granting or denying concurrent designation requests from inmates and states.
- Eliminates requirement for Institution Supplement.
- Eliminates procedure for processing state requests to Regional Offices for the state and federal sentences to be served concurrently.
- Updates procedures for reviewing and processing nunc pro tunc designations for federal offenders in federal or state custody.

1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This program statement is intended to provide instructions for the designation of a state institution for concurrent service of a federal sentence.

This program statement applies only to federally sentenced offenders who may be, or have been, housed in state facilities.

a. Program Objectives.

- The DSCC designates state institutions for concurrent service of a federal sentence to affect commencement of the federal sentence. This will be accomplished through the process of either determining that such a designation is based on the Order, recommendation, or expressed intention of the federal court for the federal sentence to run concurrently with a state sentence, or by determining that a designation is appropriate after reviewing the five factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b).
- The DSCC maintains accurate sentence computation records for inmates serving federal sentences in state institutions.

b. Institution Supplement. None.

2. DESIGNATION AUTHORITY FOR CONCURRENT FEDERAL SENTENCES

a. **Statutory Authority.** 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b) authorizes the Bureau of Prisons (Bureau) to designate the place of imprisonment for inmates who committed the federal offense of conviction on or after November 1, 1987. It states:

“The Bureau may designate any available penal or correctional facility that meets minimum standards of health and habitability established by the Bureau, whether maintained by the Federal Government or otherwise and whether within or without the judicial district in which the person was convicted, that the Bureau determines to be appropriate and suitable, considering-

- (1) the resources of the facility contemplated;
- (2) the nature and circumstances of the offense;
- (3) the history and characteristics of the prisoner;
- (4) any statement by the court that imposed the sentence –
 - (A) concerning the purposes for which the sentence to imprisonment was determined to be warranted; or
 - (B) recommending a type of penal or correctional facility as appropriate; and

(5) any pertinent policy statement issued by the Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994(a)(2) of title 28.

... Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a designation of a place of imprisonment under this subsection is not reviewable by any court.”

For inmates currently serving a sentence for which the date of offense occurred before November 1, 1987, the prior version of 18 U.S.C. § 4082(b) applies, which stated:

“The Attorney General may designate as a place of confinement any available, suitable, and appropriate institution or facility, whether maintained by the Federal Government or otherwise, and whether within or without the judicial district in which the person was convicted and may at any time transfer a person from one place of confinement to another.”

b. Delegation to DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief. The DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief is delegated the Bureau’s authority to designate a state institution for concurrent service of a federal sentence. The DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief’s authority is delegated to the DSCC Operations Managers.

Designating an inmate to a non-federal institution results in the commencement of the federal sentence based on the authority and intent of the federal sentencing court to run the federal sentence concurrently with a state sentence. Following the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Setser v. United States*, 566 U.S. 231(2012), the Bureau does not have the authority to independently determine whether an inmate’s sentence should run consecutively or concurrently with another sentence under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b). For inmates who committed federal offenses before November 1, 1987, the DSCC researches the record and makes a determination regarding concurrency.

3. COMMENCEMENT OF SENTENCE

After the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief designates a state facility, authority for commencement of a sentence is found in 18 U.S.C. § 3585(a) and § 3568 (repealed). 18 U.S.C. § 3585(a), states:

“A sentence to a term of imprisonment commences on the date the defendant is received in custody awaiting transportation to, or arrives voluntarily to commence service of sentence at, the official detention facility at which the sentence is to be served.”

For inmates currently serving a sentence for which the date of offense occurred before November 1, 1987, 18 U.S.C. § 3568 (repealed), states in part:

“The sentence of imprisonment of any person convicted of an offense shall commence to run from the date on which such person is received at the penitentiary, reformatory, or jail for service of such sentence.”

A federal sentence of imprisonment cannot commence earlier than the date on which it is imposed. Therefore, a state institution can be designated for service of the federal sentence no earlier than the date on which it was imposed.

4. AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL COURTS TO ORDER CONCURRENT SENTENCES

Federal courts have the authority to order a federal term of imprisonment to run consecutively to or concurrently with a state sentence imposed before or after the date the federal sentence is imposed. When a federal court orders or recommends a federal sentence to run concurrently with a state sentence, the Bureau implements this order or recommendation, by designating the state facility as the place to serve the federal sentence (18 U.S.C. § 3621(b)). The Bureau makes every attempt to effectuate the intent of the federal court, while administering sentences in accordance with federal statute and Bureau policy.

a. **Federal Sentence Imposed After a Non-Federal Sentence.** If the federal sentence was imposed after a non-federal sentence had already been imposed, and the federal court did not state whether its term is to run consecutively or concurrently, the Bureau interprets the federal sentence to run consecutively pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a) applies only to federal offenses committed on or after November 1, 1987, and does not apply in situations where the federal sentence is imposed before a non-federal sentence, according to *Setser*:

b. **Federal Sentence Imposed Before a Non-Federal Sentence.** Pursuant to *Setser*, a district court has the authority to order a term concurrent or consecutive to an anticipated state sentence. If the federal sentence was imposed when a state had primary jurisdiction, and the federal Judgment in a Criminal Case (J&C) is silent as to concurrency with a later-imposed state sentence, the Bureau will consider the federal sentence to commence consistent with the statutory language of 18 U.S.C. § 3585(a). The Bureau will update the commencement date if the federal sentencing court subsequently orders or recommends the federal sentence to run concurrently with the non-federal sentence. Refer to Section 5a–c of this program statement for additional information. If the Bureau determines that the designation of the state institution is appropriate after reviewing the five factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), refer to Section 5d of this program statement for additional information.

If the court is silent regarding a previously imposed non-federal sentence but recommends or orders the federal sentence concurrent with the later-imposed, non-federal sentence, the Bureau must still calculate the federal sentence to be served consecutively to the previously imposed non-federal sentence. If the inmate satisfies the previously imposed non-federal sentence term

and continues service of the later-imposed, non-federal sentence, the Bureau will designate the state facility for the concurrent service of the federal sentence on the date the previously imposed non-federal sentence term was satisfied. The Bureau will calculate the federal sentence in accordance with federal statute and attempt to meet the court's intent.

5. CONCURRENT SERVICE OF FEDERAL AND STATE SENTENCES

Concurrent service of federal and non-federal sentences in a non-federal institution occurs when the Bureau designates a non-federal institution for service of the federal sentence. Ordinarily, the reason for selecting the non-federal institution is that primary custody resided with the non-federal jurisdiction and the federal sentencing court intended its sentence be served concurrently with the non-federal sentence.

When an inmate is sentenced in both federal and state jurisdictions, care must be taken to ensure that he or she is suitable for federal designation. Normally, designating a non-federal institution for the inmate is done when it is consistent with the federal sentencing court's intent. Ordinarily, this intent is made known in one of the following ways:

a. **Court Order.** A sentencing court may order on the J&C, that the federal sentence be served concurrently with a state sentence. The court may clarify its intent by using language similar to:

- "Said sentence to run concurrently with the state sentence the defendant is presently serving."
- "Sentence to run concurrently with sentence imposed under Docket 168-88, San Diego County Court, on May 14, 2008."
- "Sentence is hereby ordered to run concurrently with any other sentence presently being served."
- "Sentence to begin immediately."
- "Said sentence to run concurrently with any state sentence presently being served, or any state sentence imposed in the future."

b. **Court Recommendation of Non-Federal Confinement.** The sentencing court may recommend a non-federal institution as the place of confinement on the J&C. Most J&Cs have a preprinted area for recommendations with language similar to, "The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons..." If the inmate was in primary non-federal custody (i.e., produced in federal court on writ), and the court uses the preprinted phrase and adds the name of a state institution, this will be accepted as a court recommendation for concurrent service. This wording could also appear in the body of the J&C.

c. **Court Order or Recommendation for Concurrent Service of Sentence After Imposition.** The sentencing court may order or recommend concurrent service of the federal sentence at some time after its imposition. This may occur when primary jurisdiction resided with the state and the

court believed that the inmate was in federal custody for service of the federal sentence on the date of imposition.

Pursuant to *Setser*, the Bureau follows court orders or recommendations regarding concurrent service of a federal term regardless of when the court makes the recommendation or issues the order.

d. **Inmate Request.** Occasionally, an inmate may request a nunc pro tunc (i.e., occurring now as though it had occurred in the past) designation. As a result of the decision in *Barden v. Keohane*, 921 F.2d 476 (3rd Cir. 1990), the Bureau considers an inmate's request for credit toward a federal sentence for time spent in state custody and credited to a state sentence, as a request for a nunc pro tunc designation.

(1) In *Barden*, the court held that the Bureau must consider an inmate's request. However, there is no obligation under *Barden* for the Bureau to grant the request by designating a state institution retroactively as the place to serve the federal sentence.

(2) This type of request will be considered regardless of whether the inmate is physically located in either a federal or state institution. Information will be gathered, if available, to include:

- a copy of the federal and state judgments
- the state sentence data record to include jail credit and release dates, and
- any other pertinent information relating to the federal and state sentences.

(3) In making the determination as to whether a designation may be appropriate (e.g., the federal sentence is imposed first and there is no order or recommendation regarding the service of the sentence in relationship to the yet to be imposed state term), the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief will send a letter to the federal sentencing court inquiring as to the court's position regarding a retroactive designation. The appropriate U.S. Attorney's Office and U.S. Probation Office will receive a courtesy copy.

(4) In *Setser*, the United States Supreme Court held that the authority to order a federal sentence concurrent or consecutive to a yet-to-be-imposed state sentence rests with the federal sentencing court, and that 18 U.S.C. § 3584(a) did not apply in situations where the federal sentence was imposed before a non-federal sentence. Furthermore, the Court held in this case that 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b) did not give the Bureau authority to make independent concurrent vs. consecutive determinations.

(5) In *Dotson v. Kizziah*, 966 F.3d 443, (6th Cir. 2020), the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals further clarified that the Bureau must make a designation decision after seeking the position of the federal sentencing court, based on its review of the five factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b),

listed under the Section 2a of this program statement, when a federal district court sentences before a state that has primary jurisdiction, and the federal J&C is silent.

This designation decision effectively determines when the federal sentence commences pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3585(a), and therefore resolves the question as to whether the federal and state sentences are run concurrently or consecutively.

(6) If, after at least 60 days, a response is not received from the federal sentencing court, the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief reviews the five factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b) and makes a designation decision which is documented in the inmate's electronic file. DSCC staff will notify the inmate of the decision in writing and save a copy in the inmate's electronic file. Any response by the federal court will be considered in the review of the five factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), listed under the Section 2a of this program statement.

(7) No letter needs to be written if it is determined that a concurrent designation is not appropriate. If the federal sentencing court has previously ordered, recommended, or made clear its intention for the consecutive service of the federal sentence, a letter to the court will not be needed.

(8) The Bureau will not allow a concurrent designation if the federal sentencing court has already made a determination regarding the order of service of sentence (e.g., the sentencing court ordered the sentence to run consecutively to any other sentence, or custody in operation, during any time in which the inmate requests concurrent designation).

6. MANGUM II EXCEPTION

With the clarification provided in the *Dotson* case, the above-mentioned procedure outlined in Section 5d of this program statement, which includes seeking the position of the federal sentencing court and considering the five factors in 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), applies to all inmate requests for nunc pro tunc designation.

The following is an exception to this standard procedure, based on a Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals decision which was issued before *Dotson*.

a. **Inmate Request.** Pursuant to *Mangum v. Hallembaek*, 910 F.3d 770 (4th Cir. 2018) ("*Mangum II*"), the Bureau must consider requests for a nunc pro tunc designation from inmates sentenced in the Fourth Circuit (Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia) from December 29, 2006, the date of the Fourth Circuit Court decision in *United States v. Smith*, 472 F.3d 222, (4th Cir. 2006), to March 27, 2012, the day before the Supreme Court decision in *Setser v. United States*, 566 U.S. 231(2012).

b. **Mangum II Review.** As stated in *Mangum II*, for the time period noted in the above Section a., a district court judge in the Fourth Circuit did not have the authority to impose a sentence to be served consecutively to a yet-to-be-imposed state sentence based on the binding precedent in *Smith*. *Mangum II* directs that for inmates requesting a nunc pro tunc designation who were sentenced within the Fourth Circuit during the relevant time period, the Bureau is to conduct a full and proper evaluation of all relevant factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b), shall not invoke the views of the federal sentencing court, and shall weigh heavily the state court's desire. *Mangum II* determined that the federal sentencing court's views were legally irrelevant due to the *Smith* decision that was binding at the time of sentencing, and that the Bureau could not weigh these views in its evaluation. Furthermore, the statement of the state court was entitled to more weight "as a matter of law." *Mangum II*, 910 F.3d at 775.

c. **Mangum II Review Determination.** As stated in *Mangum II*, the state court's sentencing preference for concurrency does not bind the Bureau in its analysis for a nunc pro tunc designation. However, it must be clearly indicated what factors would justify overriding a state court's preference for concurrency, to result in the denial of an inmate's request for nunc pro tunc designation. The review and determination will be made by the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief and documented in the inmate's electronic file.

Pursuant to *Setser*, the Bureau will follow court orders or recommendations regarding concurrent service of a federal term regardless of when the court makes the recommendation or issues the order.

7. CONSIDERATIONS IN REVIEWING FOR CONCURRENT DESIGNATIONS

a. **Primary Jurisdiction.** Among other things, primary jurisdiction determines the order in which sentences are served. The sovereign that first arrested the offender has primary jurisdiction over the offender, unless that sovereign relinquishes it by release on bail, dismissal of charges, release to parole, expiration of the sentence, or agreement between the sovereigns. If an inmate has received more than one sentence, DSCC staff first determines which sovereign had primary jurisdiction at the time the federal sentence was imposed.

When it has been determined an inmate was committed improperly to federal custody and primary jurisdiction resides with a state sovereign (i.e., the inmate was under jurisdiction of the federal sentencing court on the basis of a writ of habeas corpus ad prosequendum), DSCC and institution staff will attempt to return the inmate to state custody. A return to the state means that the federal sentence should be considered as not having commenced, since transfer to the Bureau was in error and the inmate should have been returned to the state after federal sentencing as a required condition of the federal writ.

b. **Exclusive Custody.** When it has been determined the state had primary jurisdiction at the time the federal sentence was imposed, DSCC staff next determines whether the inmate is in federal or state custody.

■ **Federal Custody.** If an inmate has released from a state sentence, and is in exclusive federal custody, DSCC staff follow the steps outlined in Section 8 of this program statement.

■ **State Custody.** If an inmate is in exclusive state custody with pending state charges, or in service of the state sentence, DSCC and Regional Office staff follow the steps outlined in Section 9 of this program statement.

c. **Conflicts Between Source Documents.** The J&C and the Statement of Reasons (SOR) are the final expressions of the federal sentence. They control any conflicting information in the Presentence Investigation Report (PSR).

d. **Statutory Prohibitions Against Concurrent Designation.** Concurrent designation is not generally considered when statutory language mandates consecutive service of a sentence. For example, offenses under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c), 18 U.S.C. § 1028A, and 18 U.S.C. § 3146 must be served consecutively. However, if the federal court orders one of these sentences to run concurrently with another term, the Bureau will follow the court's order and correspondence will be sent to advise the court of the statutory prohibition.

8. CONCURRENCY CASES IN FEDERAL CUSTODY

a. **Designation.** If an inmate has released from a state sentence, and is in exclusive federal custody, the DSCC may make a "nunc pro tunc" designation to the non-federal institution by using a letter of designation from the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief, as delegated to the DSCC Operations Manager, to be saved in the inmate's electronic file.

b. **Considerations in Sentence Computation.** When a nunc pro tunc designation is made, the DSCC conducts a thorough review of jail credit, as outlined in the sentence computation manuals. Refer to the Program Statements **Sentence Computation Manual (CCCA of 1984)**, **Sentence Computation Manual ("Old Law"-Pre-CCCA-1984)**, and **District of Columbia Sentence Computation Manual**.

By action of a nunc pro tunc designation, the federal sentence may commence either on the date of its imposition, or on a subsequent date.

As part of the designation process, a date is specified nunc pro tunc (i.e., occurring now as though it had occurred in the past) as the effective date the federal sentence will have begun.

Specifying a nunc pro tunc designation ensures that time lost in administrative processing is not passed on to the inmate. This designation allows the federal sentence to commence under 18 U.S.C. § 3585(a).

As the order or recommendation for concurrent service is ordinarily received after the imposition of sentence, the nunc pro tunc designation is normally effective from the date the federal sentence was imposed, unless a later date is entered. If the nunc pro tunc designation results in a date that makes the inmate “past due” for release, such designation will be retroactive to a point in time that the sentence, when calculated in the same manner as any other sentence, results in a release date that gives the institution time for normal release processing.

9. CONCURRENCY CASES IN STATE CUSTODY

a. **Designation and Notification to the United States Marshal Service (USMS).** If an inmate is in exclusive state custody with pending state charges, or in service of the state sentence, the DSCC may make a nunc pro tunc designation to the non-federal institution using a letter of designation to the USMS.

b. **Notification to the Regional Correctional Programs Office (RCPO).** The DSCC notifies the RCPO of the region where the state institution is located when the DSCC Sentence Computation Section Chief, as delegated to the DSCC Operations Manager, designates the state institution for service of the federal sentence. The DSCC will ensure the following are made available to the Regional Office:

- The J&C Order and the SOR.
- The PSR.
- The USM-129, U.S. Marshals Tracking Form.
- The nunc pro tunc letter to the USMS designating the state institution for service of the federal sentence.
- Any other pertinent information.

c. **Sentence Computation.** The DSCC calculates all federal sentences that are running concurrently with state sentences where the inmate is in primary state custody (“state concurrent federal sentences”).

- **Considerations in Sentence Computation.** DSCC staff follow the steps outlined in Section 8b of this program statement.
- **Regional Actions After DSCC Sentence Computation.** Following the calculation of each state concurrent federal sentence, DSCC staff notify the RCPO that the inmate is appropriate to admit in the Bureau inmate information system as a state concurrency case. The RCPO notifies the USMS and the state department of corrections of the inmate’s projected release date and completes all necessary transactions in the Bureau inmate information system.

For inmates whose date of offense for their current commitment occurred before November 1, 1987, the RCPO has final approval authority for state recommendations for Extra Good Time (EGT). EGT awards for inmates in state institutions must be consistent with the requirements for those in federal institutions. Refer to the Program Statements **Sentence Computation Manual (“Old Law”-Pre-CCCA-1984)** and **District of Columbia Sentence Computation Manual**.

The RCPO forwards recommendations for EGT action via email to the DSCC for calculation.

d. **Regional Responsibilities.** Since the inmate is in primary state custody, decisions regarding confinement and classification are at the discretion of state authorities. The RCPO forwards a copy of the DSCC letter to the USMS in the state institution’s district as notification to lodge a detainer.

The RCPO sends the letter and the Public Information Inmate Data from the applicable Bureau inmate management system via mail or electronic mail to:

- The appropriate state department of corrections.
- The USMS in the sentencing district.
- The U.S. Parole Commission (USPC), if appropriate.

The Public Information Inmate Data from the applicable Bureau inmate management system is also mailed to the inmate.

If an update is required to a state concurrency sentence computation, the RCPO provides all appropriate documentation to the DSCC.

e. **Regional File Maintenance.** The RCPO maintains an electronic file on each state concurrency case containing:

- The J&C Order and the SOR.
- The PSR.
- The USM-129.
- The nunc pro tunc letter from the DSCC to the USMS designating the state institution for service of the federal sentence.
- A copy of the certified Sentence Data Computation Sheet.
- Any other pertinent information.

If the inmate satisfies the federal sentence, prior to the expiration of the state sentence, the RCPO saves case documents including but not limited to, copies of release certificates, as well as notifications to state authorities, the USMS, the U.S. Probation Office, and the USPC, in the Electronic Inmate Central File (e-ICF). Concurrency files are kept in the Regional Office until the sentence expires. If the inmate is eligible for parole, the RCPO sends to the USPC:

- The J&C Order and the SOR.
- The USM-129.
- The PSR.
- The nunc pro tunc letter to the USMS designating the state institution for service of the federal sentence.
- A copy of the Sentence Data Computation Sheet.
- Any other pertinent information.

f. **Monitoring.** The RCPO establishes a system to monitor release dates of concurrent sentences so that timely notification is made to state authorities, the USMS, and the USPC, if necessary. This may be done using a release roster from the applicable Bureau inmate management system, a log, or any other method that enables the RCPO to monitor release dates.

The USPC prepares certificates for inmates scheduled for release on parole. The RCPO ensures that any parole certificates received on a state concurrency case are accurate, and discrepancies are reported to the USPC. Normally, the RCPO prepares the mandatory release and special parole term certificates.

For the completion of any other release paperwork refer to the Program Statement **Correctional Systems Manual**.

A term of supervised release that follows a federal sentence does not commence until the inmate is released from all periods of confinement. When an inmate has a term of supervised release and the federal sentence expires before the state term, the RCPO asks the state authorities to notify the U.S. Probation Office 30 days before release from state custody. The RCPO forwards a courtesy copy of the request to the U.S. Probation Office.

g. **Release.** The DSCC conducts a release audit of all state concurrent federal sentences 24 months before the inmate's projected release date.

If an inmate is released from the non-federal jurisdiction before the statutory release or parole date of the federal term of imprisonment, the USMS assumes custody. The USMS may request designation from the DSCC 30 days before assuming custody. The RCPO ensures all inmate files (Central, Medical, and J&C) are made available to the designated federal institution.

If the federal term expires before the inmate's release from the non-federal jurisdiction, the RCPO notifies the state department of corrections, the USMS, and the USPC if necessary. The RCPO completes release documentation pertaining to the confinement portion of the federal sentence. Upon receiving the release notification, the USMS withdraws the detainer.

REFERENCES

Program Statements

Correctional Systems Manual

Sentence Computation Manual (CCCA of 1984)

Sentence Computation Manual (“Old Law”-Pre-CCCA-1984)

District of Columbia Sentence Computation Manual

Federal Statutes

18 U.S.C. § 3621(b)

18 U.S.C. § 4082(b)

18 U.S.C. § 3585(a)

18 U.S.C. § 3568

18 U.S.C. § 3584(a)

18 U.S.C. § 924(c)

18 U.S.C. § 1028A

18 U.S.C. § 3146

Case Law

Barden v. Keohane, 921 F.2d 476 (3rd Cir. 1990)

United States v. Smith, 472 F.3d 222 (4th Cir. 2006)

Setser v. United States, 566 U.S. 231 (2012)

Mangum v. Hallembaek, 910 F.3d 770 (4th Cir. 2018)

Dotson v. Kizziah, 966 F.3d 443 (6th Cir. 2020)

Other References

Five Factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b)

Records Retention Requirements

Requirements and retention guidance for records and information applicable to this program are available in the Records and Information Disposition Schedule (RIDS) on the Bureau’s intranet site.