

Statoil ASA

Case ID:

ST-334

Case Cluster :

Statoil ASA

Jurisdiction of Settlement:

United States

Jurisdiction of Settlement / Enforcement Agency:

Department of Justice

Jurisdiction of Foreign Public Official(s) :

Iran

Year of Settlement:

2006

Month/Day of Settlement (or Notes):

10/13

Other Jurisdictions of Settlement:

Norway

Settlement with Individual or Legal Person?:

Legal Person

Type of Settlement:

Criminal

Legal Form of Settlement:

Deferred Prosecution Agreement

Monetary Sanctions (Types):

Criminal Fine

Total Monetary Sanctions (US\$):

\$10,500,000.00

Criminal Fine/Penalty (US\$) :

\$10,500,000

Monetary Sanctions Returned / Ordered Returned (US\$):

\$0

UNCAC Articles(s) Implicated:

Art.16

Art.23

Art.26

OECD Anti-Bribery Convention Articles Implicated:

Art. 1, Art. 2, Art. 7, Art. 8

Offenses - Alleged:

Bribery of Foreign Officials

Offenses - Settled:

Bribery of Foreign Officials

Public Procurement Contract / SOE Involved?:

Yes

Summary:

According to the June 2011 United States Report to the OECD, "In 2001 and 2002, Statoil

sought to expand its business internationally, and focused specifically on Iran as a country in which to secure oil and gas development rights. At the time, Iran was awarding contracts for the development of the South Pars field, one of the largest natural gas fields in the world. In 2001, Statoil developed contacts with an Iranian government official who was believed to have influence over the award of oil and gas contracts in Iran. Following a series of negotiations with the Iranian official in 2001 and 2002, Statoil entered into a -- consulting contract? with an offshore intermediary company. The purpose of that consulting contract -- which called for the payment of more than \$15 million over 11 years -- was to induce the Iranian official to use his influence to assist Statoil in obtaining a contract to develop portions of the South Pars field and to open doors to additional Iranian oil and gas projects in the future. Two bribe payments totaling more than \$5 million were actually made by wire transfer through a New York bank account, and Statoil was awarded a South Pars development contract that was expected to yield millions of dollars in profit." (Source: US Report to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "Steps taken to implement and enforce the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions," Information as of May 31, 2011, Statoil ASA Case Summary at 112-113.)

Sources :

US Report to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, "Steps taken to implement and enforce the OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions," Information as of May 31, 2011, Statoil ASA Case Summary at 112-113, accessed at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/18/8/42103833.pdf>.
US v. Statoil ASA, Case No. 1:06-cv-00960-RJH-1 (SDNY), Information filed October 13, 2006, accessed at <http://www.justice.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/cases/statoil-asa-inc/10-13-09statoil-information.pdf>; Deferred Prosecution Agreement accessed at <http://www.justice.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/cases/statoil-asa-inc/10-09-06statoil-agree.pdf>. See also, US Dept. of Justice Press Release, "U.S. Resolves Probe against Oil Company that Bribed Iranian Official," October 13, 2006, accessed at <http://www.justice.gov/usao/nys/pressreleases/October06/statoildeferredprosecutionagreementpr.pdf>.