



NAAUSA
National Association of
Assistant U.S. Attorneys



June 23, 2026

The Honorable Todd Blanche
Acting Attorney General of the United States
United States Department of Justice
Washington, D.C.

Patrick J. Witt
Executive Director, President's Council of Advisors for Digital Assets
The White House

Re: Law Enforcement Perspectives on Section 604 of the CLARITY Act

Dear Acting Attorney General Blanche and Mr. Witt:

On behalf of the undersigned organizations, representing more than 70,000 prosecutors, sheriffs, chiefs of police, investigators, deputies, officers, and other law enforcement professionals across the United States, we write to thank you for the opportunity to participate in recent discussions regarding HR 3633, the Digital Asset Market Clarity Act (CLARITY Act).

We appreciate the willingness of senior officials from across the Administration—including leadership responsible for legislative affairs, strategic implementation, public safety, technology, science, and digital asset policy—to engage directly with the law enforcement community. The breadth and seniority of participation reflected the significance of this issue and demonstrated a sincere commitment to hearing the perspectives of those responsible for investigating, prosecuting, preventing criminal activity, and protecting victims.

We recognize that establishing a clear and durable regulatory framework for digital assets is an important priority of the Administration that intersects with broader goals related to innovation, technological leadership, economic growth, national security, and public safety. The undersigned organizations support responsible innovation and share the goal of ensuring that the United States remains a global leader in emerging technologies and financial markets, but we also believe innovation and public safety are not mutually exclusive and can advance together.

We represent law enforcement professionals and prosecutors at every stage of the criminal justice process. Our members investigate crimes, identify victims, follow financial trails, recover illicit proceeds, dismantle criminal organizations, prosecute offenders, and seek justice on behalf

of victims and communities. We approach this issue from different responsibilities and perspectives, but with a shared mission of protecting the public and upholding the rule of law. It is from that collective experience that we continue to express concern regarding Section 604 of the CLARITY Act.

Since concerns regarding Section 604 first emerged earlier this year, our organizations have engaged constructively with lawmakers, Administration officials, and stakeholders regarding its potential impact on public safety and criminal enforcement. Throughout that process, the law enforcement community has consistently expressed concern that broad exemptions could create gaps in oversight and accountability that sophisticated criminal actors may exploit. Those concerns have remained consistent because they are rooted in the practical realities faced by investigators and prosecutors, not in opposition to innovation or emerging technologies. While we appreciate the opportunity to continue these discussions, the core concern raised by law enforcement remains unresolved.

Criminal organizations increasingly utilize digital assets to facilitate and conceal unlawful activity, including narcotics trafficking, fraud, child exploitation, ransomware attacks, sanctions evasion, terrorism financing, organized retail crime, and other forms of transnational criminal activity. Law enforcement agencies at every level encounter these threats in the course of their work. Existing investigative authorities and regulatory frameworks play a critical role in helping investigators and prosecutors identify bad actors, follow financial trails, recover assets for victims, and hold offenders accountable.

As currently drafted, Section 604 risks creating gaps in oversight and accountability that could impede those efforts. Our concern is not with individuals who merely write or publish software code, nor with responsible technological innovation. Rather, our concern is with broad exemptions that may shield individuals or entities whose activities facilitate the movement of digital assets, create obstacles to legitimate oversight, or weaken longstanding investigative and enforcement authorities relied upon by law enforcement. Regulatory certainty should not come at the expense of accountability, transparency, victim protection, or public safety.


While Section 604 remains a significant priority concern for the law enforcement community, it is not the only provision in the CLARITY Act that raises public safety and enforcement concerns. Several provisions throughout the bill will reduce transparency, limit accountability, and create gaps in the anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) framework that law enforcement relies upon to identify criminal activity, protect victims, and safeguard national security. In particular, the bill does not establish a comprehensive set of safeguards commonly applied to other financial intermediaries, including suspicious activity monitoring and reporting obligations. At the same time, certain provisions may exempt or exclude categories of participants—including mixers, tumblers, and some decentralized finance (DeFi) businesses—from appropriate regulatory obligations despite the role such

services can play in facilitating the movement or concealment of illicit funds. While the appropriate regulatory treatment of emerging technologies requires careful consideration, no class of market participant should receive a blanket exemption from registration, know-your-customer (KYC), Bank Secrecy Act (BSA), or AML/CFT requirements. A durable regulatory framework must promote innovation while preserving the transparency, accountability, and investigative tools necessary to combat criminal exploitation of digital assets.

The breadth of this coalition—representing federal prosecutors, state prosecutors, sheriffs, chiefs of police, criminal investigators, and other law enforcement professionals—underscores both the significance of the concerns that remain and the broad consensus within the law enforcement community regarding the potential public safety implications of this issue. These organizations bring diverse perspectives, jurisdictions, and responsibilities, yet share a common interest in ensuring that any final regulatory framework appropriately balances innovation with accountability, preserves effective tools to combat illicit activity, and protects the safety and security of the communities they serve.

We stand ready to continue working with the Administration, Congress, and stakeholders to develop a framework that promotes responsible innovation while ensuring law enforcement can continue to protect the communities we serve. Thank you for your continued support of public safety, and we look forward to continued engagement on this important issue.

Sincerely,



Nelson Bunn, Executive Director
National District Attorneys Association (NDAA)



Kaycee Nail, Executive Director
National Association of Assistant United States Attorneys (NAAUSA)



David B. Rausch, President
International Association of Chiefs of Police



Justin Smith, Executive Director & CEO
National Sheriffs' Association