Approved: _____
STEVE C. LEE / BRIAN A. JACOBS / JUSTIN ANDERSON
Assistant United States Attorneys

Before: HONORABLE THEODORE H. KATZ
United States Magistrate Judge
Southern District of New York

12 MAG 539

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : COMPLAINT

v. : Violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1349, 1343, 1512

JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," : COUNTY OF OFFENSE: NEW YORK

Defendant. :

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - x

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, ss.:

DONALD M. CHU, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI"), and charges as follows:

COUNT ONE

(Conspiracy To Commit Wire Fraud)

1. From at least in or about 2009 up to and including in or about 2011, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly combined, conspired, confederated and agreed together and with each other to commit wire fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

2. It was a part and object of the conspiracy that JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, and others known and unknown, having devised and intending to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and for obtaining money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, willfully and knowingly would and did transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communication in interstate and foreign commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice.

Overt Acts

3. In furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the illegal object thereof, the following overt acts, among others, were committed in the Southern District of New York:

a. On or about July 10, 2011, in New York, New York, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, instructed a campaign volunteer to imitate the handwriting of campaign donors on donor contribution forms.

b. On or about July 14, 2011, in New York, New York, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, offered to reimburse an individual for a campaign donation.

c. On or about August 17, 2011, in New York, New York, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, reviewed fraudulent contribution forms collected from certain individuals (hereinafter the "Straw Donors") during a fundraising event for a candidate for Citywide elective office in 2013 (the "Candidate").

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349.)

COUNT TWO

(Attempted Wire Fraud)

4. From in or about 2009 up to and including in or about 2011, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, willfully and knowingly having devised and intending to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and for obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, did transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire, radio, and television communication in interstate and foreign commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice and attempting to do so, to wit, HOU and others engaged in a scheme to defraud the City of New York (hereinafter the "City") by using straw donors to attempt to obtain campaign matching funds to support the Candidate's campaign for Citywide elective office.

(Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1349 and 1343.)

COUNT THREE

(Obstruction of Justice)

5. From in or about December 2011, up to and including the present, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, willfully,

knowingly, and corruptly, did obstruct, influence, and impede official proceedings and attempt to do so, to wit, in response to a Grand Jury subpoena, HOU did not provide the Grand Jury with documents that she knew contained information that was responsive to the subpoena in order to conceal that information.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1512(c)(2).)

The bases for my knowledge and the foregoing charge are, in part, as follows:

6. I am a Special Agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (the "FBI"). I have been personally involved in the investigation of this matter. This affidavit is based upon my conversations with law-enforcement agents and others and my examination of reports and records. Because this affidavit is being submitted for the limited purpose of establishing probable cause, it does not include all the facts that I have learned during the course of my investigation. Where the contents of documents and the actions, statements, and conversations of others are reported herein, they are reported in substance and in part, except where otherwise indicated.

Overview Of The Scheme

7. On the basis of the evidence set forth below, there is probable cause to believe that JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, and her co-conspirators, participated in a scheme to defraud the City that involved the use of Straw Donors[1] to funnel multiple large illegal campaign contributions to the Candidate's 2013 campaign for Citywide elective office. Among other things, one object of the scheme was to increase the amount of matching campaign funds the Campaign would receive from the City. On various occasions, certain individuals arranged for multiple Straw Donors to make a series of contributions to the Campaign that were under the $4,950 limit. These Straw Donors would be reimbursed for these contributions by these individuals. As part of this scheme, on behalf of each Straw Donor, a campaign contribution form was filled out containing, among other things, the straw donor's apparent name, address, employment information, the amount donated to the Candidate, and the Straw Donor's purported signature acknowledging that the Straw Donor was not being reimbursed in any manner for making the campaign contribution. The City would rely upon the information contained

---

[1] "Straw Donors" are individuals, who in violation of campaign finance laws, make campaign contributions in their own names with money they have received from other individuals or for which they receive reimbursement from other individuals.

in these fraudulent contribution forms, among other things, in order to determine whether to release matching campaign funds to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Moreover, as part of this scheme, HOU failed to disclose the identities of intermediaries, including those responsible for arranging for the contributions of these straw donors, despite City regulations that required such disclosures to the New York City Campaign Finance Board (hereinafter the "NYCCFB"). Hou also impeded the Government's investigation of this matter by not producing subpoenaed records in an apparent attempt to evade detection.

The City's Matching Campaign Funds Program

8. According to information provided by the NYCCFB, candidates for elective office in the City are eligible to receive funds pursuant to a matching campaign fund program administered by the NYCCFB. The matching campaign funds program provides that for each dollar a New York City resident over 18 years of age contributes to a candidate for Citywide election -- up to a maximum of $175 -- the candidates, if they elect to do so, will receive six dollars in matching funds from the City. Accordingly, each candidate could receive up to a maximum of $1,050 in matching funds per contributor. Currently, individuals are allowed to donate up to $4,950 to candidates running for Citywide elective offices.

9. After reviewing records from the NYCCFB, among other things, I learned that the NYCCFB, through JP Morgan Chase Bank, requires that matching campaign funds from the City are wired from the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, D.C., to the bank account of any campaign based in the City, and that these funds travel through interstate wires before they are available to any Citywide political campaign.

10. The Candidate previously received matching campaign funds in connection with a prior campaign for a Citywide elective office during the 2009 election cycle.[2] A review of the most recent NYCCFB records shows that the Candidate has listed a certain dollar amount in "matching claims"[3] for the 2013 election

---

[2] For purposes of fundraising, an election cycle is the period of time between the last set of elections and the upcoming set of elections in the City. Thus, the 2013 election cycle fundraising period includes the time between the 2009 and the upcoming 2013 Citywide elections. As a matter of reference, the 2009 election cycle fundraising period included the period of time between the 2005 and the 2009 Citywide elections.

[3] The term "matching claims" refers to the amount of (continued...)

cycle.

Overview of HOU's Role in the Scheme

11. Based on my review of records from the NYCCFB and the Candidate, I learned that JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, is presently listed as the Candidate's treasurer for the 2013 election cycle in documents submitted by the Candidate's 2013 campaign for citywide elective office (the "Campaign") to the NYCCFB. According to information provided by the NYCCFB and from conversations with NYCCFB employees, HOU, as treasurer for the Campaign, is responsible for all financial disclosures related to the 2013 Campaign. HOU is responsible for accounting for every expenditure made by the campaign and for every donation made to the Campaign, including ensuring that all donations by individuals to the Campaign are within the maximum allowed by New York City. HOU and the Candidate are the only individuals authorized to submit disclosure statements on behalf of the Campaign. These disclosure statements provide the NYCCFB with a current and accurate accounting of the Campaign's finances, in order to allow the NYCCFB to evaluate, among other things, the Campaign's request for matching funds.

12. Based upon information provided by the NYCCFB, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou" the defendant, is responsible, among other things, for notifying the NYCCFB concerning the identities of "intermediaries" or "bundlers" involved in soliciting and receiving donations for the Campaign. On its website, the NYCCFB defines an "intermediary" or "bundler" as "an individual who solicits, collects or delivers campaign donations from multiple contributors." The NYCCFB further requires campaigns "to notify the NYCCFB when a contribution has been raised through an intermediary." NYCCFB records show that the Campaign did not disclose any "bundlers" or "intermediaries" for the 2013 New York City election cycle until January 17, 2012, despite the fact that the Campaign had been raising funds for the 2013 New York City election cycle since at least in or about December 2009, and the Campaign had raised approximately $2,023,572 as of February 24, 2012.

13. On January 17, 2012, the Campaign disclosed a list of approximately 59 intermediaries to the NYCCFB (the "January 17 Disclosure"). That day, a spokesperson for the Campaign stated to the media, "We believe the lists we filed today are complete and accurate." As set forth in further detail below, the January

---

[3](...continued)
campaign contributions that a campaign currently believes will be eligible for matching funds from the City.

17 Disclosure does not include multiple individuals who appear to qualify as intermediaries, as described in further detail below.

14. As described in further detail below, throughout the course of the investigation, I learned that JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, did the following:

a. instructed a campaign volunteer to imitate the handwriting of campaign donors on donor contribution forms required by the NYCCFB;

b. offered to reimburse an individual for a donation to the Campaign;

c. instructed another campaign volunteer and others not to accept consecutively numbered money orders as donations to the Campaign;

d. discussed with that campaign volunteer ways to conceal information about intermediaries from the NYCCFB;

e. worked closely with individuals who served as intermediaries in connection with multiple events where straw donors were reimbursed for their contributions, and nevertheless failed to disclose to the NYCCFB the involvement of these intermediaries in the Campaign; and

f. impeded the Government's investigation of this matter by not producing subpoenaed records in an apparent attempt to evade detection.

Based upon my training, experience, and familiarity with this investigation, I believe that HOU took these steps, including concealing the identities of intermediaries from the NYCCFB, in order to prevent scrutiny by the NYCCFB of intermediaries who were using straw donors to make contributions to the Campaign that were subject to matching claims.

JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou" Instructs Campaign Volunteer to Imitate Donor Handwriting in Order to Avoid Scrutiny

15. On or about July 6, 2011, a fundraising event was held for the Candidate at a location in Brooklyn, New York (the "Brooklyn Event"). According to documents concerning this event, among other things, I learned that contributions to the Campaign were made at the Brooklyn Event and that campaign contribution forms were collected at or near the time these contributions were made. These campaign contribution forms contained personal

information of contributors, including a contributor's address, contact information, and employer, and also required a signed certification concerning the nature of the contribution, including whether contributions were made from a donor's own funds, among other things.

16. I have spoken with a representative of the NYCCFB. Based on that discussion, I learned that the NYCCFB reviews contribution forms submitted by campaigns, and in the course of that review may notice when the handwriting on multiple contribution forms appears similar. Where the NYCCFB notices that handwriting on multiple contribution forms looks similar, this indicates to the NYCCFB that straw donors may be involved in the corresponding donations. Accordingly, where the NYCCFB notices handwriting on multiple contribution forms that appears to be the same, the NYCCFB generally takes further steps, including contacting the campaign through its treasurer to give the campaign an opportunity to explain the contribution.

17. On or about July 10, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," participated in a series of instant message chats (the "7/10/11 Chats") with a campaign volunteer who was responsible for coordinating the Brooklyn Event ("Campaign Volunteer-1"). During this chat, HOU stated, "fyi, CFB [NYCCFB] auditors look very carefully at the handwriting . . . so if you're doing that, just make sure the handwriting looks as close to the donors [handwriting] as possible. If it [is] too difficult, don't take risk." Shortly thereafter, Campaign Volunteer-1 responded, "gotcha." Based upon my training, experience, and involvement in this investigation, I believe that HOU was instructing Campaign Volunteer-1 to imitate effectively campaign contributor forms for individuals who made contributions at the Brooklyn campaign fundraiser. I also believe that HOU's instruction to "just make sure the handwriting looks as close to the donors as possible," is an instruction for Campaign Volunteer-1 to make it appear as though contributors filled out contributor forms themselves, even when they did not actually do so, by trying to conform handwriting to match the actual handwriting of purported contributors as written on checks or other documents.

18. In an official proceeding conducted in connection with this investigation, wherein Campaign Volunteer-1 was shown a transcript of the 7/10/11 Chats, Campaign Volunteer-1 stated under oath that he was unable to recall the meaning of the 7/10/11 Chats.

JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," Offers to Reimburse an Individual for a Putative Contribution to the Campaign

19. In the course of the investigation, I learned that JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, offered to reimburse

another individual (the "Individual") for making a contribution to the Campaign. Based upon information provided by the Individual, I learned that on or about July 14, 2011, HOU and the Individual had a telephone conversation in which HOU asked the Individual to make a $500 contribution to the Campaign and in which HOU told the Individual that she would reimburse the Individual for this contribution. Telephone records for the Individual that were obtained by law enforcement agents confirm the approximate time and date of the telephone conversation between HOU and the Individual.

20. On or about July 14, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, participated in a series of instant message chats with the Individual (the "7/14/11 Chats"), which began at approximately 12:07 p.m. During these chats, HOU asked, "Can you talk now? Call me if you are [able to talk]." The Individual responded, "Why don't you fill it [campaign contribution form] out for me." HOU then stated, "Yeah I'm thinking of doing the same thing cus [because] there's no time. How are you gonna give me the CC # [credit card number]? here?" The Individual then stated, "Emailed. Check." At this time, approximately 12:38 p.m., the Individual sent HOU an email which contained the Individual's mailing address and a credit card number. Shortly thereafter, the email chat between HOU and the Individual continued. HOU responded, "got it." The Individual asked, "What is this [for]." HOU then stated, "THANK YOU!!!!! I'll mail you out a ck [check] today." The Individual then stated, "Why." HOU responded, "Well... if I end up having to charge it, which is not the case right now then I'll mail you a ck [check]. This is just for back up, to save my ass, if the numbers don't hit one million [internal campaign fundraising target]." The Individual then asked, "Wait are you taking personal funds to pay me?" HOU responded, "don't worry about it. I'm gonna mail it to [Individual's residence]. Whenever you get a chance though, I need [you to] sign that form and send it back to me cus [because] I can't charge your card without a signature."[4] The Individual then asked, "I can send it to you after the fact? How much do you need to charge[?]" HOU then replied, "Thanks." Soon thereafter, HOU stated, "I think we'll be able to hit it [fundraising target]."

21. On or about July 15, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, participated in another series of instant message chats with the Individual (the "7/15/11 Chats"), which began at approximately 11:37 a.m. During these chats, the Individual asked, "Made it?" HOU responded, "YUP!!! Almost

---

[4] As noted above, the contribution form contained a section acknowledging that the donor was not being reimbursed in any manner for making the campaign contribution.

ended up using your CC [credit card number] this morning but we made it over one million." Based upon my training, experience, and involvement in this investigation, I believe that HOU was planning to use the Individual's credit card to make a campaign donation in the Individual's name and then to reimburse the Individual for the putative donation, but ultimately HOU did not use the Individual's credit card because the campaign fundraising target for the Candidate was otherwise attained.

22. On or about July 18, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, participated in a series of instant message chats with the Individual (the "7/18/11 Chats"), which began at approximately 11:37 a.m. During this chat, the Individual asked, "Did you win?" HOU responded, "No we didn't, but we hit our [campaign fundraising] goal... It's impossible to win [against another candidate raising money for citywide political office] since she's been collecting money since 3 years ago and we started in December of 2010 but we're catching up to her." HOU then linked a newspaper article in the course of the email chat which referenced campaign fundraising by the Candidate and others running for city-wide elective office. Later in these chats, HOU stated, "I'm so happy. Thanks a lot. Even tho I didn't get to use yours [credit card number for campaign contribution] this time. But I'm sure I'll use it some day in the future . . ."

JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou" Instructs Another Campaign Volunteer and an Intermediary Not to Accept Consecutively Numbered Money Orders

23. On or about August 7, 2009, a representative of the NYCCFB sent a letter to the Candidate's treasurer for the Candidate's previous campaign for Citywide elective office in 2009. The letter stated, in relevant part, the following:

> The Campaign has reported multiple series of money order contributions detailed in the attachment. The documentation you provided for these contributions shows these are sequentially numbered money orders. The sequencing indicates that the money orders were purchased at the same time and apparently come from a single contributor rather than the reported and documented contributors. Contributions made in the name of another, i.e., funds that are provided by one person, but reported by the campaign as being contributed by a different person, are illegal.
>
> Campaigns are required to report and document contributions accurately and completely. You reported and attempted to document the contributions listed on the attachment as coming

from several contributors when they appear to have come from one contributor. Therefore, the reporting and documentation has preliminarily been determined to be insufficient and requires more explanation.

In order to resolve this withholding on a future payment date the Campaign must provide a detailed explanation of the facts and circumstances surrounding these money order contributions. The Campaign must explain how a number of different contributors happen to have made contributions with sequential money orders.

24. On or about May 5, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, sent an email to an individual who was assisting the campaign ("Intermediary-1"), as described in more detail below, in connection with a fundraising event for May 9, 2011 (the "May 9 Event"). HOU stated in the email, "In terms of money orders, there is no written regulation that we cannot accept them, but we try to avoid accepting them, as they can be problematic later on. For example, if a group of people want to donate money orders with consecutive money order numbers, we cannot accept." As described in further detail below in paragraph 38, numerous straw donors were used in connection with the May 9 Event and had their contributions reimbursed. Further, neither Intermediary-1, nor any other individual who assisted the campaign in collecting donations in connection with the May 9 Event has been disclosed to the NYCCFB as an intermediary.

25. On or about July 10, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, participated in an instant message chat with another campaign volunteer ("Campaign Volunteer-2"). Campaign Volunteer-2 asked HOU, "what's the restrictions on money orders again?" HOU replied, "we can accept $800 MO's [money orders] but only matching up to the first $100[.] BUT that's only if we receive like one MO [money order] out of like a big batch of checks i.e. - if we receive 3 MO's [money orders] with consecutive numbers, then we must return all."

26. Based on my training and experience, I believe that HOU directed Intermediary-1 and Campaign Volunteer-2 not to accept donations made by money order because of the risk that consecutively-numbered money orders could invite scrutiny by the NYCCFB.

JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," and Campaign Volunteer-2 Discuss Concealing Information About Potential Intermediaries

27. I have reviewed donation forms provided by the Campaign in this case, as well as copies of donation forms that

the Campaign filed with the NYCCFB. On numerous original donation forms provided by the Campaign, in the top corner, there is information about the date and location of a fundraising event connected to that donation. In addition, in the top corner of some donation forms, the name or initials of the "host" -- and possible intermediary -- of the fundraising event are written. In the copies of donation forms filed by the Campaign with the NYCCFB, however, the information about the date, location, and host of certain fundraising events in the corner of some forms is covered up with a copy of a donation check or credit card receipt.

28. On or about July 9, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, participated in an instant message chat with Campaign Volunteer-2. In the chat, Campaign Volunteer-2 stated "another reason to cover the top of the cntrb [contribution] form is that [Intermediary-2's] forms have the date and location of the FR [fundraiser]. [H]aving the cntrb [contribution] check or cc receipt can cover that up." HOU replied, "ok." On or about July 10, 2011, HOU and Campaign Volunteer-2 had another instant message chat. In the chat, Campaign Volunteer-2 asked, "how does [the Candidate] feel that the info about FRs [fundraisers] are on some of the cntrb forms?" Campaign Volunteer-2 expressed concern about having "the info about the FRs [fundraisers] to be on the cntrb form, which will eventually be photocopied and submitted to CFB?" HOU replied, "I know what you mean and what your concerns are[.] [The Candidate] never gave me clear instructions on that."

29. Based on my training and experience, and participation in this investigation, I believe that when JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, stated, "I know what you mean and what your concerns are," she meant that she understands the concern with having information about the dates, locations, and hosts of fundraisers disclosed to the NYCCFB, because such disclosure could alert the NYCCFB to the possible use of undisclosed intermediaries, which could in turn alert the NYCCFB to the possible use of straw donors. I further believe that when Campaign Volunteer-2 describes "cover[ing] the top" of the contribution form, she is describing the Campaign's practice of covering up information about the dates locations, and hosts of certain fundraisers using copies of checks and credit card receipts.

The Involvement of JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," In Specific Fundraising Events Where Straw Donors Were Used

The August 17, 2011 Event

30. In the course of this investigation, I learned that a certain individual ("Intermediary-3") and his co-conspirators participated in a scheme to funnel a large illegal

campaign contribution of $16,000 to the Campaign. Among other things, one object of the scheme was to increase the amount of matching campaign funds the Campaign would receive from the City. Specifically, Intermediary-3 received a $16,000 campaign contribution from a single individual, who was actually an undercover FBI agent (the "U/C"), which was in excess of the $4,950 limit on individual contributions. Because this contribution exceeded the $4,950 limit, Intermediary-3 arranged for multiple "straw donors" to make a series of smaller contributions to the Campaign - under the $4,950 limit - totaling $16,000. Intermediary-3 then used the $16,000 he received from the U/C to reimburse the straw donors for their contributions. On behalf of each straw donor, a campaign contribution form was filled out containing, among other things, the Straw Donor's apparent name, address, employment information, the amount donated to the Candidate, and the straw donor's purported signature acknowledging that the straw donor was not being reimbursed in any manner for making the campaign contribution.

31. Based upon the foregoing, among other things, the FBI introduced the U/C to Intermediary-3. The U/C was posing as a businessperson interested in supporting the Candidate. On or about March 24, 2011, the U/C attended a luncheon in New York, New York. At this luncheon, the U/C met Intermediary-3, who provided the U/C with his telephone number. After meeting at this event, the U/C and Intermediary-3 had multiple conversations concerning the U/C making a large campaign contribution to the Candidate's 2013 Campaign that would exceed the maximum allowable individual contribution of $4,950 for a Citywide elective office during the 2013 election cycle. Below are excerpts from some of the conversations between Intermediary-3 and the U/C[5]:

a. On or about July 27, 2011, the U/C met with Intermediary-3 at Intermediary-3's residence in New Jersey. During this meeting, which the U/C recorded with a concealed video camera, Intermediary-3 and the U/C discussed how the U/C could donate $20,000 to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Intermediary-3 informed the U/C that Intermediary-3 could find straw donors to funnel the U/C's contribution to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. During this meeting, the U/C stated, "What do you want? Wire transfer, cash, check?" Intermediary-3 replied, "No,

---

[5] Certain of the conversations described below were in Mandarin Chinese, while others were in English. The descriptions of all these conversations contained in this Complaint, both those in English and those in Mandarin, are the product of preliminary transcriptions and translations. In a few instances, I have also included, in brackets, interpretations of terms and phrases, which interpretations are based on my training, experience, and participation in the investigation.

no, no, have to make all those names [referring to straw donors] . . . have to use their own credit cards and cash, and just behind, we give them cash [meaning reimburse the straw donors] . . . yeah, cannot give them all. That's why I have to play around." Based on my involvement in this investigation, I believe that Intermediary-3 was discussing the manner in which he would use straw donors to funnel $20,000 from the U/C to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Intermediary-3 also informed the U/C that he could arrange a meeting between the U/C and the Candidate during a fundraising event that some of the straw donors would attend.

b. On or about August 1, 2011, Intermediary-3 had a telephone conversation with the U/C about arranging the $20,000 contribution to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. During this call, which the U/C recorded, Intermediary-3 restated that Intermediary-3 would provide straw donors to funnel the U/C's contribution to the Candidate's 2013 campaign and arrange a meeting between the U/C and the Candidate during the week of August 15, 2011. Intermediary-3 informed the U/C that the U/C could provide Intermediary-3 with the $20,000 in cash that week. Intermediary-3 also told the U/C that Intermediary-3 had funneled large campaign contributions through straw donors for the Candidate in the past. Intermediary-3 further stated that, in the past, Intermediary-3 had collected contributions in a similar manner for another local politician, but not to the extent that Intermediary-3 had done for the Candidate.

c. On or about August 15, 2011, Intermediary-3 had a telephone conversation with the U/C. During this conversation, which the U/C recorded, Intermediary-3 stated that he had arranged for the U/C to have a private meeting with the Candidate at a fundraising event for the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Intermediary-3 stated, "We're not going to be many people there . . . about going to be four or five . . . You will, you will have [a] private session with [the Candidate] . . . . No reporter, no many people from staff. I only requested one come [referring to one of the Candidate's staff members (hereinafter "Campaign Staff Member-1")], no one else." Later during the conversation, the U/C asked Intermediary-3, "How's this work? I mean, how's this done before, [Intermediary-3]?" Intermediary-3 replied, "Yeah, usually, I have, I have they a . . . five people [referring to the Straw Donors], they fill out the form [referring to a campaign donor form], and they use, they use their own credit card or check, then, and then we give them the cash [meaning reimburse the Straw Donors]." The U/C then asked, "We give who, [the Candidate] the cash? Or [Campaign Staff Member-1] the cash?" Intermediary-3 responded, "No, no, no. Going to give to me, I give it to those people [referring to the Straw Donors]." Intermediary-3 then stated, "I do have all those peoples' names, mostly my friend[s]." Later, during the same

conversation, Intermediary-3 and the U/C discussed the City's campaign matching funds program. During this portion of the conversation, Intermediary-3 stated, "Match funds, matching funds is on the City's side. Whatever they can raise on [the Candidate's] side, let's say they can raise a million [dollars] . . . the City or the State will match whatever the, the percentage to that."

d. Later during the conversation referenced above in the preceding subparagraph, Intermediary-3 explained to the U/C, "Here's the thing, only [the Candidate] knows it's your [referring to the U/C] event. Legally, legally on the form it's those money from, those everybody's. Whatever, whatever is on the form with their [referring to the Straw Donors'] credit card, with their [referring to the Straw Donors'] check."

e. On or about August 16, 2011, Intermediary-3 and the U/C met at a location in New York, New York. During this meeting, which the U/C recorded with a concealed video camera, Intermediary-3 informed the U/C that Intermediary-3 had some, but not all, of the contribution forms completed for the Straw Donors who would be used to funnel money from the U/C to the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Intermediary-3 stated that in all, 20 straw donors would be used to funnel $16,000 -- $800 per straw donor -- from the U/C to the Candidate's 2013 Campaign. Intermediary-3 further stated that Intermediary-3 wanted the U/C to "personally give [Campaign Staff Member-1]" the completed Straw Donor campaign contribution forms. Intermediary-3 stated, "All these [referring to the Candidate's 2013 campaign contribution forms] tomorrow, I want you personally to give to [Campaign Staff Member-1] . . . and say they came from you [referring to the U/C], from your friends and relatives." Intermediary-3 then explained that if it was just Intermediary-3, the Candidate, and the U/C, it would not look good, so a small number of the 20 Straw Donors would attend the Candidate's 2013 campaign fundraising event in an effort to give it the appearance of being a legitimate fundraising event. Intermediary-3 explained, "Because it's you [referring to the U/C], me, [the Candidate], it don't look good. I need, to have to get a few people [referring to the Straw Donors]. Not all of them . . . five, six people."

f. Later during the conversation referenced above in the previous subparagraph, Intermediary-3 and the U/C again discussed the fact that the Candidate's 2013 campaign could receive matching funds from New York City for these contributions. Intermediary-3 explained to the U/C, "Let's say [the Candidate] can raise a million, the City . . . match 100 percent or . . . 50 percent. Whatever [the Candidate] got up [to] a million [dollars], [the Candidate] can get matching fund half million [dollars], or another million. But detail [of] what percent, I don't know . . . Probably it's a 50 percent." In

response, the U/C asked, "So would those, these contribution[s] would they get matching contribution? Intermediary-3 responded, "Uh, huh [indicating an affirmative response]."

g. On or about August 16, 2011, following the conversation referenced above in the previous two subparagraphs, as well as following subsequent discussions, the U/C provided Intermediary-3 with $16,000 in cash. Referring to the Straw Donors, Intermediary-3 explained to the U/C that "we can only select really good people -- don't know you that well no, never do that." The U/C asked Intermediary-3, "They're [referring to the Straw Donors] willing to do it, no problem whatsoever, they're good for it?" Intermediary-3 responded, "Yeah, legally, in theory, it comes from everybody, but . . . it's your event."

h. On or about August 17, 2011, Intermediary-3 and the U/C met at a location in New York, New York, where JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, was present. The U/C recorded this meeting with a concealed video camera. Based on my review of the video, and my conversations with other law enforcement agents, including the U/C, I learned the following:

i. Intermediary-3 and the U/C met at a location a few blocks away from Intermediary-3's office, and Intermediary-3 showed the U/C multiple completed contribution forms for Straw Donors that were going to be submitted at the fundraising event that evening for the Candidate's 2013 campaign. Intermediary-3 provided to the U/C a copy of each Straw Donor's campaign contribution form, which each contained the name a of Straw Donor.

ii. Intermediary-3 and the U/C walked to another location a few blocks away where Intermediary-3 introduced the U/C to one of the Straw Donors ("Straw Donor-1"). With Intermediary-3's assistance, Straw Donor-1 filled out a campaign contribution form for the Candidate's 2013 campaign and provided Straw Donor-1's credit card information on the form.

iii. Intermediary-3 and the U/C then went to the fundraising event for the Candidate. The U/C observed Intermediary-3 hand another Straw Donor ("Straw Donor-2") cash. Intermediary-3 introduced the U/C to JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant. Intermediary-3 also introduced the U/C to Campaign Staff Member-1, as well as to other Straw Donors who were attending the fundraising event. Intermediary-3 told HOU and Campaign Staff Member-1 that this was "[the U/C's] event." At a prior meeting, Intermediary-3 had informed the U/C that when Intermediary-3 would state "this is [the U/C's] event" to the Candidate, the Candidate would "know what I meant," and would understand that all of the donations made at the event were really coming from "[the U/C's] money."

iv. The U/C handed HOU and Campaign Staff Member-1 the Straw Donors' completed campaign contribution forms that Intermediary-3 had previously given to the U/C. HOU then sat at a table and reviewed these contribution forms along with contribution checks with Intermediary-3, who was standing next to HOU and also reviewing the forms and checks. For approximately eight minutes, HOU and Intermediary-3 discussed the contribution forms and the accompanying checks. At no point during this conversation did HOU discuss these contribution forms with the U/C, who was seated right next to HOU, despite Intermediary-3's prior statement to her that the fundraising event was "[the U/C's] event." At several points, Intermediary-3 made comments to HOU, and HOU made corresponding notations on the forms.

v. Intermediary-3 introduced the U/C to the Candidate and stated that the U/C was a "very good friend." Intermediary-3 further stated, "Tonight is his [the U/C's] event." The Candidate and the U/C then engaged in a brief discussion in which the Candidate asked the U/C about the U/C's business background, and the U/C expressed his desire to assist the Candidate's 2013 campaign.

32. On or about August 17, 2011, and September 14, 2011, donations from the August 17 Event were deposited into the Campaign's account.

33. On or about September 27, 2011, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, sent an email to Intermediary-3. In the email, HOU stated that the check contribution of $800 made by another Straw Donor on August 17, 2011 ("Straw Donor-3"), had bounced. HOU asked Intermediary-3 to ask Straw Donor-3 to issue another check.

34. On or about October 13, 2011, at approximately 11:43 a.m., Intermediary-3 had a telephone conversation with the U/C. During this conversation, which the U/C recorded, the U/C mentioned recent newspaper articles and raised concerns over the previous use of the Straw Donors at the August 17, 2011 fundraising event referenced in Paragraph 31(h). Intermediary-3 referred to the Straw Donors as "my friends." Intermediary-3 also stated that if asked about contributions to the Candidate's 2013 campaign, the U/C should "just decline to comment . . . [say] you have nothing to say." Later during the conversation, the U/C asked whether Intermediary-3's "friends" [referring to the Straw Donors] would know what to say if contacted, to which Intermediary-3 responded, "One thing for sure, they [referring to the Straw Donors] won't say the money's from you [referring to the U/C]."

35. On or about October 20, 2011, Intermediary-3 was interviewed by the FBI. During this interview, Intermediary-3

admitted, among other things, that in or about August 2011, he illegally funneled the money he received from the U/C to the Candidate's campaign through the use of the Straw Donors as described above. Intermediary-3 also admitted that each of the Straw Donors was either a family member, co-worker, or friend of Intermediary-3.

36. On or about November 16, 2011, Intermediary-3 was arrested and charged in a complaint with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349, and attempted wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1349 and 1343. After Intermediary-3's arrest, a spokesperson for the Campaign stated that it intended to return the $16,000 in donations received through Intermediary-3.

37. Intermediary-3 was not listed in NYCCFB campaign records as an "intermediary" or "bundler" for the Candidate, with respect to the 2009 election cycle. Intermediary-3 was not listed as an "intermediary" or "bundler" for the 2013 election cycle, until January 17, 2012, two months after his arrest.

The May 9, 2011 Event and the July 2011 Donations

38. In the course of the investigation, I learned that a certain individual ("Intermediary-4") hosted a fundraising event for the Campaign on or about May 9, 2011 (the "May 9 Event," as previously referred to in Paragraph 24). In connection with this event, Intermediary-4 was assisted by Intermediary-1, referenced above, and another individual ("Intermediary-5") who was Intermediary-1's superior. During this fundraising event, over approximately $50,000 was raised from over approximately 60 individual contributors. Based upon my review of documents relevant to this fundraising event and interviews with Intermediary-1, and Intermediary-5, I learned the following:

a. On or about April 30, 2011, Intermediary-4 sent Intermediary-1 a blank donation form by email.

b. On or about May 2, 2011, Intermediary-1 sent an email to JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, in which he stated that "[Intermediary-4] forwarded us the Form and we will be attending the event. Can you please provide the date, time, and venue of the event so I can confirm with my fellow guests?" On May 3, 2011, Intermediary-1 sent an email to HOU in which he stated, "can we just bring[] the forms along with the check[s] to the event?" HOU replied, by email, "Absolutely. You're more than welcome to do that, just make sure whoever signed on the check, has to also be the signer of the donation form."

c. On or about May 5, 2011, Intermediary-1 sent an email to HOU in which he asked, "Do you accept money order[s]?" As noted above in Paragraph 24, on or about May 5, 2011, HOU sent an email to Intermediary-1 and stated, "In terms of money orders, there is no written regulation that we cannot accept them, but we try to avoid accepting them, as they can be problematic later on. For example, if a group of people want to donate money orders with consecutive money order numbers, we cannot accept."

d. On or about May 7, 2011, Intermediary-1 sent an email to HOU and Intermediary-4 in which he stated, "Here is the guest list for Monday's event." Also on or about May 7, 2011, Hou sent Intermediary-1 another copy of the donation form for the Candidate's campaign.

e. On or about May 9, 2011, HOU emailed Intermediary-1 and stated, "please bring this batch of 'already collected' donation[s] tonight."

f. Following the May 9 Event, on or about May 11, 2011, HOU emailed Intermediary-1 a spreadsheet containing the names of donors and donation amounts from the May 9 Event. In the email, Hou stated, "I have attached the latest revised version of the detailed results from Monday night's event, please review and/or cross reference. Any forms can be either scanned and emailed to" the Campaign's email address, fax number, or Post Office Box, and "[a]ny checks that you've collected after Monday night should be mailed to the PO box as well."

g. On or about May 16, 2011, HOU emailed Intermediary-1 and copied Intermediary-4. HOU stated, "Hi [Intermediary-1], Thanks for the help to recover contributions."

h. On or about July 8, 2011, HOU emailed Intermediary-1. HOU stated, "Thanks again for helping us gather the 9 donations in such a short period of time. Can you take a look at the following problems I identified from the batch and get back to me on them?" HOU then stated, in sum and substance, that the donation forms provided were missing the donors' occupations, in several instances, among other information.

i. On or about August 23, 2011, HOU emailed Intermediary-1 copies of two "Intermediary Statements" (the "8/23/11 E-mail"). HOU wrote, "[p]lease take a look at the attached intermediary statements (total of 2 pages) and please have [Intermediary-5] sign on the bottom of both pages. You can either fax them back to me . . . or scan them and email back to me." The first attachment to the email was an "Intermediary Statement" from the NYCCFB that HOU had filled out in her handwriting. The form listed the "Intermediary's Name" as the

name of Intermediary-5's brother. The form further listed the names of 10 donors from the May 9 Event, each of whom was listed as having donated $800. The form contained the following warning:

> The making of false statements in this document is punishable as a Class E felony pursuant to Section 175.35 of the Penal Law and/or a Class A misdemeanor pursuant to Section 210.45 of the Penal Law.
>
> I hereby affirm that I did not, nor to my knowledge, did anyone else, reimburse any contributor in any manner for his or her contribution and none of the submitted contributions was made by the contributor as a loan.

Following these statements, there is a line for the "Intermediary's Signature." The second form attached to HOU's was also a second "Intermediary Statement," which contained the same information as the first, except that this one listed the names of 8 donors who were also listed in HOU's July 8, 2011 email to Intermediary-1, each of whom was listed as having donated $800.

j. Based upon NYCCFB records, neither Intermediary-4, Intermediary-1, nor Intermediary-5 is listed in NYCCFB campaign records as an "intermediary" or "bundler" for the Campaign, with respect to the 2009 and 2013 election cycles. Neither Intermediary-4, Intermediary-1, nor Intermediary-5 was listed in the January 17 Disclosure. The two Intermediary Statement forms that HOU provided to Intermediary-1 in the name of Intermediary-5's brother were never filed with the NYCCFB. In fact, the Campaign has not to date filed any intermediary statements in connection with donations received at the May 9 Event.

k. Other FBI agents have spoken to Intermediary-5 who stated that s/he reimbursed between 10 and 20 straw donors for their contributions to the Campaign in connection with the May 9 Event. Intermediary-5 also stated that s/he assisted HOU in gathering donations in or about July 2011, and that all of those donations in July were from straw donors who were reimbursed. I have also spoken with Intermediary-1 who confirmed that Intermediary-5 reimbursed a number of straw donors. Other law enforcement agents have also spoken with multiple straw donors who donated at the May 9 Event, who admitted to having their contributions reimbursed.

Additional Fundraising E-Mails

39. On or about October 19, 2009, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, received an e-mail (the "10/19/09 E-mail") from an e-mail account in the name of the individual who served as the treasurer for the Campaign in 2009 (the "2009 Treasurer Account"). The subject line of the 10/19/09 E-mail reads, "tomorrow Cheng [R]ui Lu fund raiser [sic]," and the body of the e-mail stated, "He said will be over 200 people."

40. On or about October 22, 2009, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, sent an e-mail to the 2009 Treasurer Account (the "10/22/09 E-mail"). The subject line read "contribution amount," and the body of the e-mail stated "Chel Dong Chang - $17500," "Hugh Mo - $19800," "Cheng Rui Lu - $12300."

Total Number of Straw Donors Identified To Date

41. As of February 27, 2012, law enforcement agents have identified over approximately forty (40) donations to the Campaign where the Straw Donor and/or an intermediary has indicated that the donation was reimbursed.

HOU's Failure to Produce Subpoenaed Documents

42. A grand jury sitting in the Southern District of New York opened an investigation of suspected fraud in connection with the Campaign's fundraising efforts. Pursuant to that investigation, on or about November 4, 2011, the United States Attorney's Office served a grand jury subpoena (the "November 4 Subpoena") on JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, that requested, among other things, the production of documents, including but not limited to "written and electronic (e-mail) correspondence," regarding the following:

a. "Correspondence with contributors, 'intermediaries,' and 'hosts of events' in relation [to] 'People For [the Candidate]' and 'Friends Of [the Candidate]' during the 2009 and 2013 New York City election cycles;"

b. "Recruitment and retention of 'intermediaries' for 'People For [the Candidate]' during the 2009 New York City election cycle;"

c. "Recruitment and discussions with potential 'intermediaries' for 'Friends of [the Candidate]' for the 2013 New York City election cycle;"

d. "Events held, organized, hosted, or in which contributions were collected by 'intermediaries' for 'People for [the Candidate]' during the 2009 New York City election cycle;"

e. "Events held, organized, hosted, or in which contributions were collected by CHENG RUI LU for [the Candidate] during the 2009 and 2013 New York City election cycles;"

f. "Contributions collected by CHENG RUI LU for [the Candidate] during the 2009 and 2013 New York City election cycles."

g. "Events held, organized, hosted, or in which contributions were collected by JEFFREY WU for [the Candidate] during the 2009 and 2013 New York City election cycles;" and

h. "Contributions collected by JEFFREY WU for [the Candidate] during the 2009 and 2013 New York City election cycles."

43. On or about December 15, 2011, the United States Attorney's Office served a grand jury subpoena on the Campaign (the "December 15 Subpoena") that requested the production of the following:

> [A]ny and all records in your care, custody, possession, and control regarding [the Candidate] and related entities, including but not limited to written and electronic (e-mail) correspondence, instant message "chats," "Google Docs," spreadsheets, notes, memoranda, receipts, schedules, calendars, daily planners, checks, credit card statements, bank statements, and other documents. The production must include, but not be limited to, the following categories:
>
> i. Records relating to campaign contributions;
>
> ii. Records relating to fundraising;
>
> iii. Records reflecting communications about campaign contributions and fundraising;
>
> iv. Records relating to "hosts" of events; and

v. Records relating to fundraising "intermediaries" and/or "bundlers."

44. On or about November 17, 2011, a judicially-authorized search warrant (the "Warrant") was issued and executed for e-mails, chats, and other communications stored in the e-mail account of JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant (the "Hou Account").

45. On or about December 9, 2011, January 9, 2012, and January 24, 2012, the Campaign produced, on behalf of JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, documents responsive to the November 4 Subpoena and the December 15 Subpoena (collectively, the "Subpoenas"). As explained in greater detail below, many of the e-mails described in the preceding paragraphs were not produced by HOU or on HOU's behalf pursuant to the Subpoenas, even though those documents were clearly within the scope of the demand set forth in the Subpoenas.

a. The 10/19/09 E-mail and 10/22/09 E-mail were not produced, even though they (a) were present in the Hou Account as of November 17, 2011,[6] and (b) contain statements about events hosted by Cheng Rui Lu and contributions collected by Cheng Rui Lu, two categories of information specifically requested by the November 4, 2011 Subpoena. Notably, Cheng Rui Lu was not listed among the intermediaries disclosed by the Campaign to the NYCCFB on January 18, 2012.[7]

---

[6] The Warrant was executed on or about November 17, 2011.

[7] It is notable that these e-mails were produced on behalf of the 2009 Treasurer pursuant to subpoenas served on him/her in connection with this investigation, including the December 15 Subpoena. The Campaign has not represented to the Government, and I am aware of no reason to believe, that 2009 Treasurer's production of these e-mails was meant to satisfy HOU's obligation to produce them, particularly in light of the production of overlapping e-mails on behalf of both the 2009 Treasurer and HOU in response to the Subpoenas. Indeed, a January 9, 2012 cover letter provided by counsel for the Campaign suggests that the e-mails were compiled separately, noting that the 2009 Treasurer's "emails span from July 2006 to the date of the subpoena. Ms. Hou's emails span from November 2010 to the date of the subpoena. The emails are in separate Redwelds marked [2009 Treasurer] Emails and Jia Hou Emails that were created for this production."

b. The 7/10/11 Chats between HOU and the Campaign Volunteer, in which HOU advised, "make sure the handwriting looks as close to the donors [handwriting] as possible," among other things, were not produced. These chats were not produced even though they (a) were present in the Hou Account as of November 17, 2011, and (b) contain "communications about campaign contributions and fundraising," a category of information specifically requested by the December 15 Subpoena.

c. The 7/14/11 Chat, 7/15/11 Chat, and 7/18/11 Chat between HOU and the Individual, in which HOU obtained permission to charge a bogus campaign contribution on the Individual's credit card and to otherwise make it appear that the Individual had made a bona fide monetary contribution to the Campaign were not produced. These chats were not produced though they (a) were present in the Hou Account as of November 17, 2011, and (b) contain "communications about campaign contributions and fundraising," a category of information specifically requested by the December 15 Subpoena.

d. On or about December 8, 2011, HOU produced several e-mails between herself and Intermediary-1 regarding the 5/9/11 Event, as being responsive to the November 4 Subpoena's request for documents pertaining to the fundraising activities of Intermediary-4, but the 8/23/11 E-mail was not among the e-mails produced. The 8/23/11 E-mail was not produced even though it (a) was present in the Hou Account as of November 17, 2011, and (b) contains statements about an event hosted by Intermediary-4 and correspondence with contributors, intermediaries, and hosts of events -- two categories of information specifically requested by the November 4, 2011 Subpoena.

46. In a letter dated February 13, 2012, JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, indicated through counsel for the Campaign that she had complied in providing all emails and instant message chats relevant to the Subpoenas. In particular, the letter states that HOU "went through every e-mail from November 2010 to the date of the subpoena and printed all non-privileged campaign related e-mails. The e-mails were produced

on January 9, 2012." In addition, the letter states that HOU reviewed "all G-chat conversations" in her e-mail account and "printed campaign related conversations produced from that search. Cross-checking indicated a small number of conversations had inadvertently been omitted. Ms. Hou forwarded those conversations, which were printed, and produced on January 26, 2012."

WHEREFORE, deponent prays that a warrant be issued for the arrest of JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou," the defendant, and that she be imprisoned or bailed, as the case may be.

DONALD M. CHU
Special Agent
Federal Bureau of Investigation

Sworn to before me this
28th day of February, 2012

S/ Theodore H Katz

HONORABLE THEODORE H. KATZ
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CR 12 (Rev. 5/03)

WARRANT FOR ARREST

United States District Court	DISTRICT: SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou"	DOCKET NO. 12 MAG 539 — MAGISTRATE'S CASE NO.
	NAME AND ADDRESS OF INDIVIDUAL TO BE ARRESTED: JIA HOU, a/k/a "Jenny Hou"
WARRANT ISSUED ON THE BASIS OF: ☐ Order of Court ☐ Indictment ☐ Information X Complaint	DISTRICT OF ARREST
TO: UNITED STATES MARSHAL OR ANY OTHER AUTHORIZED OFFICER	CITY

YOU ARE HEREBY COMMANDED to arrest the above-named person and bring that person before the United States District Court to answer to the charge(s) listed below.

DESCRIPTION OF CHARGES

wire fraud conspiracy, attempt to commit wire fraud, obstruction of justice

IN VIOLATION OF	UNITED STATES CODE TITLE: 18	SECTION: 1349, 1343, 1512
BAIL	OTHER CONDITIONS OF RELEASE	
ORDERED BY: THEODORE H. KATZ UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	SIGNATURE (FEDERAL JUDGE/U.S. MAGISTRATE): S/	DATE ORDERED: FEB 28 2012
CLERK OF COURT: SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	(BY) DEPUTY CLERK	DATE ISSUED

RETURN

This warrant was received and executed with the arrest of the above-named person.

DATE RECEIVED	NAME AND TITLE OF ARRESTING OFFICER	SIGNATURE OF ARRESTING OFFICER
DATE EXECUTED		

Note: The arresting officer is directed to serve the attached copy of the charge on the defendant at the time this warrant is executed.