Case	2:23-cr-00384-ODW
------	-------------------

#:128

REDACTED PLEA AGREEMENT

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 2 of 39 Page ID #:129 1 E. MARTIN ESTRADA United States Attorney FILED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT 2 MACK E. JENKINS Assistant United States Attorney 8/18/2023 3 Chief, Criminal Division THOMAS F. RYBARCZYK (Cal. Bar No. 316124) CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA LINDSEY GREER DOTSON (Cal. Bar No. 266973) 4 CD BY: DEPUTY MICHAEL J. MORSE (Cal. Bar No. 291763) Assistant United States Attorneys 5 Public Corruption and Civil Rights Section 6 1500 United States Courthouse 312 North Spring Street 7 Los Angeles, California 90012 LODGED CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT Telephone: (213) 894-8452/4443/7367 8 Facsimile: (213) 894-0141 8/4/20 E-mail: thomas.rybarczyk@usdoj.gov CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNI BY: CD DEPUTY 9 lindsey.dotson@usdoj.gov michael.morse@usdoj.gov 10 Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. CR 2:23-cr-00384-MEMF 15 Plaintiff, PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA 16 v. 17 ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA, 18 Defendant. 19 20 This constitutes the plea agreement between ROBERT MANUEL 1. 21 NACIONALES TAFOYA ("defendant") and the United States Attorney's 22 Office for the Central District of California ("the USAO") in the 23 investigation of the matter described herein. This agreement is 24 limited to the USAO and cannot bind any other federal, state, local, 25 or foreign prosecuting, enforcement, administrative, or regulatory authorities. 26 27 DEFENDANT'S OBLIGATIONS

28

2. Defendant agrees to:

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 3 of 39 Page ID #:130

Give up the right to indictment by a grand jury and, 1 a. at the earliest opportunity requested by the USAO and provided by the 2 3 Court, appear and plead guilty to a two-count information in the form attached to this agreement as Exhibit A or a substantially similar 4 form, which charges defendant with aiding and abetting Federal 5 6 Program Bribery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 666(a)(2), (2)(a), and 7 Attempting to Evade or Defeat the Payment of Tax, in violation of 8 26 U.S.C. § 7201.

9 b. Not contest the Factual Basis agreed to in this10 agreement.

13

14

15

20

21

22

23

24

11 c. Abide by all agreements regarding sentencing contained12 in this agreement.

d. Appear for all court appearances, surrender as orderedfor service of sentence, obey all conditions of any bond, and obeyany other ongoing court order in this matter.

e. Not commit any crime; however, offenses that would be
excluded for sentencing purposes under United States Sentencing
Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Sentencing Guidelines") § 4A1.2(c) are not
within the scope of this agreement.

f. Be truthful at all times with the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office and the Court.

g. Pay the applicable special assessments at or before the time of sentencing unless defendant has demonstrated a lack of ability to pay such assessments.

Defendant further agrees to cooperate fully with the USAO,
 the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Internal Revenue Service Criminal Investigation, and, as directed by the USAO, any other
 federal, state, local, or foreign prosecuting, enforcement,

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 4 of 39 Page ID #:131

administrative, or regulatory authority. This cooperation requires defendant to:

a. Respond truthfully and completely to all questions that may be put to defendant, whether in interviews, before a grand jury, or at any trial or other court proceeding.

b. Attend all meetings, grand jury sessions, trials or other proceedings at which defendant's presence is requested by the USAO or compelled by subpoena or court order.

c. Produce voluntarily all documents, records, or other tangible evidence relating to matters about which the USAO, or its designee, inquires.

d. If requested to do so by the USAO, act in an undercover capacity to the best of defendant's ability in connection with criminal investigations by federal, state, local, or foreign law enforcement authorities, in accordance with the express instructions of those law enforcement authorities. Defendant agrees not to act in an undercover capacity, tape record any conversations, or gather any evidence except after a request by the USAO and in accordance with express instructions of federal, state, local, or foreign law enforcement authorities.

4. For purposes of this agreement: (1) "Cooperation Information" shall mean any statements made, or documents, records, tangible evidence, or other information provided, by defendant pursuant to defendant's cooperation under this agreement or pursuant to the letter agreement previously entered into by the parties dated May 2, 2023 (the "Letter Agreement"); and (2) "Plea Information" shall mean any statements made by defendant, under oath, at the

28

1

2

3

4

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 5 of 39 Page ID

guilty plea hearing and the agreed to Factual Basis statement in this agreement.

THE USAO'S OBLIGATIONS

5. The USAO agrees to:

a. Not contest the Factual Basis agreed to in this agreement.

b. At the time of sentencing, provided that defendant demonstrates an acceptance of responsibility for the offenses up to and including the time of sentencing, recommend a two-level reduction in the applicable Sentencing Guidelines offense level, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1, and recommend and, if necessary, move for an additional one-level reduction if available under that section.

c. At the time of sentencing, provided that defendant demonstrates an acceptance of responsibility for the offenses up to and including the time of sentencing, recommend a one-level downward variance for defendant's payment of his outstanding tax liability as of August 2021 prior to the filing of any criminal charges in this matter against defendant.

6. The USAO further agrees:

Not to offer as evidence in its case-in-chief in the 20 a. 21 above-captioned case or any other criminal prosecution that may be 22 brought against defendant by the USAO, or in connection with any 23 sentencing proceeding in any criminal case that may be brought against defendant by the USAO, any Cooperation Information. 24 25 Defendant agrees, however, that the USAO may use both Cooperation 26 Information and Plea Information: (1) to obtain and pursue leads to 27 other evidence, which evidence may be used for any purpose, including 28 any criminal prosecution of defendant; (2) to cross-examine defendant

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 6 of 39 Page ID #:133

should defendant testify, or to rebut any evidence offered, or argument or representation made, by defendant, defendant's counsel, or a witness called by defendant in any trial, sentencing hearing, or other court proceeding; and (3) in any criminal prosecution of defendant for false statement, obstruction of justice, or perjury.

b. Not to use Cooperation Information against defendant at sentencing for the purpose of determining the applicable guideline range, including the appropriateness of an upward departure, or the sentence to be imposed, and to recommend to the Court that Cooperation Information not be used in determining the applicable guideline range or the sentence to be imposed. Defendant understands, however, that Cooperation Information will be disclosed to the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office and the Court, and that the Court may use Cooperation Information for the purposes set forth in U.S.S.G. § 1B1.8(b) and for determining the sentence to be imposed.

17 c. In connection with defendant's sentencing, to bring to 18 the Court's attention the nature and extent of defendant's 19 cooperation.

20 If the USAO determines, in its exclusive judgment, d. 21 that defendant has both complied with defendant's obligations under 22 paragraphs 2 and 3 above and provided substantial assistance to law 23 enforcement in the prosecution or investigation of another ("substantial assistance"), to move the Court pursuant to U.S.S.G. 24 25 § 5K1.1 to fix an offense level and corresponding guideline range 26 below that otherwise dictated by the sentencing quidelines, and to recommend a term of imprisonment within this reduced range. 27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

DEFENDANT'S UNDERSTANDINGS REGARDING COOPERATION

7. Defendant understands the following:

Any knowingly false or misleading statement by
 defendant will subject defendant to prosecution for false statement,
 obstruction of justice, and perjury and will constitute a breach by
 defendant of this agreement.

b. Nothing in this agreement requires the USAO or any other prosecuting, enforcement, administrative, or regulatory authority to accept any cooperation or assistance that defendant may offer, or to use it in any particular way.

c. Defendant cannot withdraw defendant's guilty pleas if the USAO does not make a motion pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 5K1.1 for a reduced guideline range or if the USAO makes such a motion and the Court does not grant it or if the Court grants such a USAO motion but elects to sentence above the reduced range.

d. At this time the USAO makes no agreement or representation as to whether any cooperation that defendant has provided or intends to provide constitutes or will constitute substantial assistance. The decision whether defendant has provided substantial assistance will rest solely within the exclusive judgment of the USAO.

e. The USAO's determination whether defendant has
provided substantial assistance will not depend in any way on whether
the government prevails at any trial or court hearing in which
defendant testifies or in which the government otherwise presents
information resulting from defendant's cooperation.

27 ///

28 ///

NATURE OF THE OFFENSES

8. Defendant understands that for defendant to be guilty of the crime charged in Count One of the Information, that is, Federal Program Bribery in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2), he must have committed the crime of Federal Program Bribery and/or aided and abetted in its commission.

9. For defendant to have committed the crime of Federal Program Bribery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2), the following must be true:

10 a. Defendant corruptly gave, offered, or agreed to give
11 something of value to a person;

b. Defendant intended to influence or reward an agent of a local government -- here, the City of Baldwin Park -- in connection with any business, transaction, or series of transactions of that local government involving anything of value of \$5,000 or more; and

16 c. The City of Baldwin Park received, in any one-year 17 period, benefits in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program 18 involving a grant, contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, or 19 other form of Federal assistance.

10. For defendant to have aided and abetted in the commission of Federal Program Bribery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2), the following must be true:

1

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

23

a. Someone else committed Federal Program Bribery;

b. Defendant aided, counseled, commanded, induced, or procured that person with respect to at least one element of Federal Program Bribery;

27 c. Defendant acted with the intent to facilitate Federal28 Program Bribery; and

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 9 of 39 Page ID #:136

Defendant acted before the crime was completed. d.

Defendant understands that for defendant to be quilty of 11. the crime charged in Count Two of the Information, that is, Evasion of Payment of Tax, in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7201, the following must be true:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

Defendant had additional tax due and owing; a.

Defendant made an affirmative attempt to evade or b. defeat payment of income tax due and owing by him; and

In attempting to evade or defeat payment of income tax с. due and owing by him, defendant acted willfully. A defendant acts willfully when defendant knows that federal tax law imposed a duty on defendant and defendant intentionally and voluntarily violates that duty.

PENALTIES

Defendant understands that the statutory maximum sentence 12. that the Court can impose for a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2), including aiding and abetting a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2), is: 10 years' imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

13. Defendant understands that the statutory maximum sentence 23 that the Court can impose for a violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7201 is: five years' imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100. 27

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 10 of 39 Page ID #:137

1 14. Defendant understands, therefore, that the total maximum 2 sentence for both of the offenses to which defendant is pleading 3 guilty is: 15 years' imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised 4 release; a fine of \$500,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss 5 resulting from the offenses, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory 6 special assessment of \$200.

15. Defendant understands that supervised release is a period of time following imprisonment during which defendant will be subject to various restrictions and requirements. Defendant understands that if defendant violates one or more of the conditions of any supervised release imposed, defendant may be returned to prison for all or part of the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the term of supervised release, which could result in defendant serving a total term of imprisonment greater than the statutory maximum stated above.

16. Defendant understands and agrees that the Court: (a) may order defendant to pay restitution in the form of any additional taxes, interest, and penalties that defendant owes to the United States based upon the counts of conviction and any relevant conduct; and (b) must order defendant to pay the costs of prosecution, which may be in addition to the statutory maximum fine stated above.

17. Defendant understands that, by pleading guilty, defendant may be giving up valuable government benefits and valuable civic rights, such as the right to vote, the right to possess a firearm, the right to hold office, and the right to serve on a jury.
Defendant understands that he is pleading guilty to a felony and that it is a federal crime for a convicted felon to possess a firearm or ammunition. Defendant understands that the convictions in this case

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 11 of 39 Page ID #:138

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

may also subject defendant to various other collateral consequences, including but not limited to revocation of probation, parole, or supervised release in another case and suspension or revocation of a professional license. Defendant understands that unanticipated collateral consequences will not serve as grounds to withdraw defendant's guilty pleas.

Defendant and his counsel have discussed the fact that, and 18. defendant understands that, if defendant is not a United States citizen, the convictions in this case makes it practically inevitable and a virtual certainty that defendant will be removed or deported from the United States. Defendant may also be denied United States citizenship and admission to the United States in the future. Defendant understands that while there may be arguments that defendant can raise in immigration proceedings to avoid or delay removal, removal is presumptively mandatory and a virtual certainty in this case. Defendant further understands that removal and immigration consequences are the subject of a separate proceeding and that no one, including his attorney or the Court, can predict to an absolute certainty the effect of his convictions on his immigration status. Defendant nevertheless affirms that he wants to plead quilty regardless of any immigration consequences that his pleas may entail, even if the consequence is automatic removal from the United States.

FACTUAL BASIS

19. Defendant admits that defendant is, in fact, guilty of the offenses to which defendant is agreeing to plead guilty. Defendant and the USAO agree to the statement of facts provided below and agree that this statement of facts is sufficient to support pleas of guilty to the charges described in this agreement and to establish the

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 12 of 39 Page ID #:139

Sentencing Guidelines factors set forth in paragraph 21 below but is not meant to be a complete recitation of all facts relevant to the underlying criminal conduct or all facts known to either party that relate to that conduct.

A. Background

The City of Baldwin Park, California (the "City") is a local government within the County of Los Angeles, within the Central District of California. The City received in excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program for each of the calendar years 2017 and 2018.

Defendant was the City Attorney for the City from in or around December 2013 until October 2022.

Ricardo Pacheco ("Pacheco") was elected to the City Council for the City in 1997 and held that position until in or around June 2020. He also served as the City's Mayor Pro Tempore from in or around December 2017 to December 2018. In both roles, Pacheco was as an agent of the City.

Person 10¹ was a councilmember on the Compton City Council from
in or around 2013 through 2022.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

B. Marijuana Permit Bribery Schemes

1. Overview of the Bribery Schemes

In or around June 2017, the City started the process of permitting the sale, cultivation, and manufacture of marijuana within the City's limits. Around that same time, Pacheco decided to corruptly solicit bribe payments from companies seeking marijuana development agreements and related permits ("marijuana permits") in the City. In exchange for the payments, Pacheco would agree to

 $^{^{1}\ \}rm A$ legend detailing the names of the masked persons and companies is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 13 of 39 Page ID #:140

assist individuals and companies, using his official City position, with obtaining marijuana permits.

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1

2

2. <u>Intermediary Bribery Scheme</u>

As part of one of Pacheco's bribery schemes, defendant knew that Pacheco was using an intermediary to funnel bribe payments to himself in order to disguise the true nature of the bribe payments. The scheme would operate as follows: a company seeking a marijuana permit would pay the intermediary for supposed "consulting" services, the intermediary would then split a portion of the money with Pacheco, and Pacheco would then vote in favor of the company's desired marijuana permit in exchange for the payment. Pacheco would also agree to use his influence as a City Council member to ensure that other members of the City Council voted in favor of the marijuana permit as well.

15 The intermediary used by Pacheco was Gabriel Chavez ("Chavez"), an individual defendant personally knew from previously using 16 17 Chavez's company's internet-marketing services for defendant's law In the summer of 2017, Pacheco asked defendant to provide him 18 firm. 19 a template of a consulting contract so that Pacheco could provide it to Chavez for his use to solicit bribe payments for Pacheco. 20 21 Defendant complied with Pacheco's request, even though defendant knew 22 Pacheco would be utilizing the consulting contract to solicit bribe 23 payments from companies seeking marijuana permits.

In or around October 2017, defendant recalled that one of the companies that had hired Chavez to work as their "consultant" was upset when one of Chavez's client's applications got pulled from the agenda. Chavez yelled at Pacheco and defendant in a parking lot after a City Council meeting. Defendant cannot recall if he pulled

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 14 of 39 Page ID #:141

the applicant off the agenda, but if he did so, it would have only been at the request of and/or with the support of a City Council member because defendant lacked legal authority to remove an item off the agenda on his own.

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

3. <u>Marijuana Company 2 Bribery Scheme</u>

In 2017, defendant directed Person 10 to contact Pacheco after Person 10 told defendant he wanted to get clients marijuana permits in the City. Defendant was friends with Person 10 and had assisted him in forming his company, Consulting Company 1, in 2016 and used the name of Person 18 to act as its agent, even though defendant never asked Person 18 if he could use his name and Person 18 had no connection to Consulting Company 1.

During the first meeting between defendant, Pacheco, and Person 10 concerning marijuana permits in 2017, Pacheco and Person 10 asked defendant to step away from the conversation. Defendant understood that the reason they asked him to step away was so that Pacheco and Person 10 could discuss a bribery agreement. At some point in late 2017 or early 2018, defendant learned that Person 10 was acting as a "consultant" for Marijuana Company 2 in its effort to get a marijuana permit in the City and that Pacheco had agreed to assist Person 10 in his efforts in exchange for bribe payments.

During the scheme, defendant, Pacheco, and Person 10 met in person on several occasions to discuss marijuana permits for Marijuana Company 2. During these meetings, defendant would provide Person 10 updates on the marijuana permitting process, including the status of Marijuana Company 2's permit. At various points throughout the scheme, including in 2018, Pacheco would complain to defendant that Person 10 had not yet paid him (Pacheco) the bribe money

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 15 of 39 Page ID #:142

promised to him. Defendant would then tell Person 10 that he needed to pay Pacheco the bribes Pacheco requested for Person 10 to get Pacheco's support for the marijuana permits for Marijuana Company 2.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

On April 18, 2018, in accordance with Pacheco's agreement with Person 10, Pacheco voted in favor of Marijuana Company 2's 6 development agreement for marijuana cultivation and manufacturing in its first reading before the City Council. Each development agreement before the City Council required a first and second reading with at least one reading needing to occur at a regularly scheduled City Council meeting. After the first reading, a majority of the City Council would need to vote in favor of the development agreement in order for it to proceed to a second reading. After the second reading, a majority of the City Council would need to vote in favor of the agreement in order for it to pass.

15 To facilitate the bribery scheme between Person 10 and Pacheco, 16 on or about May 26, 2018, acting at Person 10's direction, defendant 17 accepted a \$10,000 check with no payee from representatives of 18 Marijuana Company 2. Person 10 had directed the Marijuana Company 2 19 representatives to provide a \$10,000 check to defendant. After accepting the check, defendant then gave the \$10,000 check to Person 20 21 19 and asked Person 19 to cash it for defendant, which Person 19 did 22 over multiple transactions. Person 19 gave defendant the \$10,000 in 23 cash, which defendant then gave to Person 10 to facilitate the bribery scheme between Person 10 and Pacheco. 24

25 On July 18, 2018, in accordance with his agreement with Person 26 10, Pacheco voted in favor of Marijuana Company 2's development 27 agreement for marijuana cultivation and manufacturing in its second 28 reading.

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 16 of 39 Page ID #:143

In September 2018, Person 10 provided five separate \$10,000 1 checks drawn on the account belonging to Person 12 and asked defendant to cash the checks for him. The payee line on each of the checks was blank. Defendant took the checks and provided them to his brother who arranged for them to be cashed. Defendant gave Person 10 \$44,000 in cash and withheld \$6,000 for his brother. In cashing the checks for Person 10, defendant intended to facilitate the bribery arrangement involving Person 10 and Pacheco.

On December 5, 2018, in accordance with his agreement with Person 10 and after Marijuana Company 2 petitioned to change its location, Pacheco voted in favor of Marijuana Company 2's amended development agreement for marijuana cultivation and manufacturing in its first reading. On December 19, 2018, in accordance with his agreement with Person 10, Pacheco voted in favor of Marijuana Company 2's amended development agreement for marijuana cultivation and manufacturing in its second reading.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

4. Bribery Scheme Involving Person 20

In or around 2017 or 2018, Person 20, a public official, approached defendant and asked him to solicit a bribe payment from a company seeking a marijuana permit in the City using the same intermediary scheme utilized by Pacheco. Defendant selected Person 19 to be the intermediary and "consultant" for Person 20, and Person 19 agreed to partake in the scheme with Person 20.

Defendant then approached Person 21, a consultant, and explained 24 25 that, for Person 21 to obtain a marijuana permit for her client, 26 Person 21 would need to hire Person 19 as a "consultant" for the client seeking the marijuana permit and pay Person 19 \$240,000. 27 28 After negotiating further, Person 21 and the client, a company Person

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 17 of 39 Page ID #144

21 represented, agreed to the contract. Defendant then drew up a contract for \$240,000 and listed Person 19 as a "consultant." Person 20 wanted to receive \$200,000 from the contract and Person 19 to receive the remaining \$40,000.

Person 21 and her client began reconsidering entering the deal and told defendant they did not want to enter the deal. Person 20 and defendant then met with Person 21 and told Person 21 that for her client to get their marijuana permit, Person 21 and her client would have to pay Person 19. Person 21 responded that they would pay the "consulting" contract for Person 19 but not for \$240,000. Person 21 and her client ultimately signed a contract with Person 19.

Defendant later became concerned that Person 21 and/or her client might report the scheme to law enforcement, since they were so resistant to agreeing to the deal in the first instance. Defendant then drafted a notice for Person 19 to notify Person 21 and her client that Person 19 would be canceling his "consulting" contract with them. Defendant then told Person 20 that defendant would not provide him/her the money from contract.

C. Funneling \$30,000 in Cash to Person 20's Campaign

Starting in 2017 and ending in November 2018, Person 20 was running for State elected office. To raise campaign funds, Person 20 asked defendant on two occasions to provide him/her \$15,000 in cash that Person 20 could then funnel to other individuals to make conduit contributions to his/her campaign. Person 20 wanted these small donations to demonstrate to other donors his/her broad support amongst the community. Defendant agreed on both occasions to provide the cash because he believed Person 20 could remove defendant as City

1

2

3

4

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 18 of 39 Page ID #:145

Attorney and understood that Person 20 would provide defendant additional work if he/she were elected to State office.

In or around October 2017, while in the primary for his/her election, Person 20 first asked defendant for \$15,000 in cash. Defendant agreed to provide it and then withdrew \$15,000 from the Tafoya & Garcia, LLP account at Wells Fargo in four transactions between October 25, 2017 and October 26, 2017. Defendant then met with Person 20 and provided him/her the \$15,000 in cash in an envelope.

After Person 20 won his/her primary in June 2018, Person 20 once more solicited \$15,000 in cash from defendant in order to further engage in the conduit contribution scheme described above. Defendant agreed but, before providing the money, wanted assurances from Person 20 that he/she would take care of defendant, protect his job as the City Attorney, and assist defendant financially or professionally in his/her official capacity if he/she obtained State elected office. Person 20 agreed, and defendant withdrew \$15,000 in cash, which he provided to Person 20.

D. Defendant Evades Payment of Taxes

Defendant had control of the bank accounts associated with Tafoya & Garcia, LLP and Tafoya Law Group, APC. At least in or around April 2012 when he received a letter from the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") informing him of a collection for tax years 2007 and 2010, defendant knew he had personal tax liability to the IRS and that the IRS was actively attempting to collect defendant's outstanding tax liability, including penalties and interest. Among the efforts made by the IRS to collect defendant's tax liability included the following: (1) an IRS letter from April 2015 informing

28

1

2

3

4

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 19 of 39 Page ID #:146

him that taxes were still owed for tax year 2013 and that his 1 passport may be denied or revoked; (2) an IRS letter from April 2017 2 3 letter informing him that a levy would be put in place related to tax years 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2014; (3) an IRS letter from November 4 5 2018 informing him of additional tax due and owing for tax year 2015; 6 (4) an IRS letter from March 2019 informing him of his balance due 7 and owing for tax years 2016 and 2017; and (5) an IRS letter from 8 November 2019 informing him of his balance due and owing for tax year 9 2018.

10 From in or around June 2017 through in or around October 2020, 11 in Los Angeles County and elsewhere, defendant willfully and 12 affirmatively attempted to evade and defeat the payment of a substantial part of \$650,626.90 in tax liability. Defendant and the 13 14 USAO agree that \$650,626.90 constitutes the applicable tax loss under 15 U.S.S.G. § 2T1.1(a)(1). To evade payment of these taxes, penalties, 16 and fees, defendant committed the following affirmative acts, among 17 others, the likely effect of each of which would be to mislead or conceal from the IRS defendant's assets and ability to pay 18 19 defendant's outstanding taxes:

• On or about June 14, 2017, defendant transferred \$120,000 from his personal bank account to Person 22, a personal friend in Arizona, for, according to the wire transfer's details line, the "Purchase of Shares;" defendant later directed Person 22 to repay \$100,000 of the \$120,000 payment to Person 23, a relative of defendant;

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

• On or about September 16, 2019, defendant transferred \$150,000 from his Tafoya Law Group, APC bank account via wire transfer to Person 23 to facilitate the purchase of a

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 20 of 39 Page ID #:147

home in Mexico for Person 23 and indicated in the memo line of the wire transfer: "Other home loan repayment;" On or about September 17, 2019, defendant transferred \$50,000 from his personal bank account via wire transfer to Person 23 to facilitate the purchase of a home in Mexico for Person 23 and indicated in the memo line of the wire transfer "loan repayment. Thanks [Person 23];" and On or about December 26, 2019, defendant transferred \$12,889 from his Tafoya & Garcia, LLP bank account via wire transfer to an international title company to facilitate the purchase of a home in Mexico for Person 23. While defendant purchased the home for Person 23, defendant intended

to and has used the home in Mexico he purchased for Person 23. Defendant and USAO agree that defendant owed as of October 2020 \$650,626.90 in restitution related to his evasion of payment of his

taxes and that as of August 2021, defendant paid the restitution owed in connection with this offense.

SENTENCING FACTORS

19 20. Defendant understands that in determining defendant's 20 sentence the Court is required to calculate the applicable Sentencing 21 Guidelines range and to consider that range, possible departures under the Sentencing Guidelines, and the other sentencing factors set 22 forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). Defendant understands that the 23 Sentencing Guidelines are advisory only, that defendant cannot have 24 any expectation of receiving a sentence within the calculated 25 26 Sentencing Guidelines range, and that after considering the 27 Sentencing Guidelines and the other § 3553(a) factors, the Court will 28 be free to exercise its discretion to impose any sentence it finds

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 21 of 39 Page ID #:148

appropriate up to the maximum set by statute for the crimes of conviction.

21. Defendant and the USAO agree to the following applicable Sentencing Guidelines factors:

Count One

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Base Offense Level: 14 U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(a)(2) -More than One Bribe U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(a)(1) +2 -Value of the Bribes U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(b)(2), +6 U.S.S.G § 2B1.1(b)(2)(1)(D) -Involved Elected Public Official +4U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(b)(3) Count Two Base Offense Level: 20 U.S.S.G. § 2T1.1(a)(1), U.S.S.G. § 2T4.1(H) Multi-Count Adjustment +1 U.S.S.G. § 3D1.4(b)

Defendant and the USAO reserve the right to argue that additional specific offense characteristics, adjustments, and departures under the Sentencing Guidelines are appropriate.

22. Defendant understands that there is no agreement as to defendant's criminal history or criminal history category.

23. Defendant and the USAO reserve the right to argue for a sentence outside the sentencing range established by the Sentencing Guidelines based on the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. §§ 3553(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(6), and (a)(7).

WAIVER OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

24. Defendant understands that by pleading guilty, defendant gives up the following rights:

- a. The right to persist in a plea of not guilty.
- b. The right to a speedy and public trial by jury.

c. The right to be represented by counsel -- and if necessary have the Court appoint counsel -- at trial. Defendant understands, however, that, defendant retains the right to be represented by counsel -- and if necessary have the Court appoint counsel -- at every other stage of the proceeding.

d. The right to be presumed innocent and to have the
burden of proof placed on the government to prove defendant guilty
beyond a reasonable doubt.

e. The right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against defendant.

f. The right to testify and to present evidence in opposition to the charges, including the right to compel the attendance of witnesses to testify.

g. The right not to be compelled to testify, and, if defendant chose not to testify or present evidence, to have that choice not be used against defendant.

h. Any and all rights to pursue any affirmative defenses, Fourth Amendment or Fifth Amendment claims, and other pretrial motions that have been filed or could be filed.

WAIVER OF APPEAL OF CONVICTION

25. Defendant understands that, with the exception of an appeal based on a claim that defendant's guilty pleas were involuntary, by pleading guilty defendant is waiving and giving up any right to appeal defendant's convictions on the offenses to which defendant is pleading guilty. Defendant understands that this waiver includes, but is not limited to, arguments that the statutes to which defendant is pleading guilty are unconstitutional, and any and all claims that

28

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 23 of 39 Page ID #:150

the statement of facts provided herein is insufficient to support defendant's pleas of guilty.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

2

LIMITED MUTUAL WAIVER OF APPEAL OF SENTENCE

26. Defendant agrees that, provided the Court imposes a term of imprisonment within or below the range corresponding to an offense level of 23 and the criminal history category calculated by the Court, defendant gives up the right to appeal all of the following: (a) the procedures and calculations used to determine and impose any portion of the sentence; (b) the term of imprisonment imposed by the Court; (c) the fine imposed by the Court, provided it is within the statutory maximum; (d) to the extent permitted by law, the constitutionality or legality of defendant's sentence, provided it is within the statutory maximum; (e) the term of probation or supervised release imposed by the Court, provided it is within the statutory maximum; and (f) any of the following conditions of probation or supervised release imposed by the Court: the conditions set forth in Second Amended General Order 20-04 of this Court; the drug testing conditions mandated by 18 U.S.C. §§ 3563(a)(5) and 3583(d); and the alcohol and drug use conditions authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3563(b)(7).

27. The USAO agrees that, provided (a) all portions of the sentence are at or below the statutory maximum specified above and (b) the Court imposes a term of imprisonment within or above the range corresponding to an offense level of 23 and the criminal history category calculated by the Court, the USAO gives up its right to appeal any portion of the sentence.

RESULT OF WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA

27 28. Defendant agrees that if, after entering guilty pleas28 pursuant to this agreement, defendant seeks to withdraw and succeeds

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 24 of 39 Page ID #:151

1 in withdrawing defendant's quilty pleas on any basis other than a claim and finding that entry into this plea agreement was 2 3 involuntary, then (a) the USAO will be relieved of all of its obligations under this agreement, including in particular its 4 5 obligations regarding the use of Cooperation Information; and (b) in any investigation, criminal prosecution, or civil, administrative, or 6 7 regulatory action, defendant agrees that any Cooperation Information 8 and any evidence derived from any Cooperation Information shall be 9 admissible against defendant, and defendant will not assert, and 10 hereby waives and gives up, any claim under the United States 11 Constitution, any statute, or any federal rule, that any Cooperation 12 Information or any evidence derived from any Cooperation Information should be suppressed or is inadmissible. 13

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AGREEMENT

This agreement is effective upon signature and execution of 29. all required certifications by defendant, defendant's counsel, and an Assistant United States Attorney.

BREACH OF AGREEMENT

19 30. Defendant agrees that if defendant, at any time after the signature of this agreement and execution of all required 20 21 certifications by defendant, defendant's counsel, and an Assistant 22 United States Attorney, knowingly violates or fails to perform any of 23 defendant's obligations under this agreement ("a breach"), the USAO may declare this agreement breached. For example, if defendant 24 25 knowingly, in an interview, before a grand jury, or at trial, falsely 26 accuses another person of criminal conduct or falsely minimizes defendant's own role, or the role of another, in criminal conduct, 27 28 defendant will have breached this agreement. All of defendant's

14

15

16

17

18

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 25 of 39 Page ID #:152

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

obligations are material, a single breach of this agreement is sufficient for the USAO to declare a breach, and defendant shall not be deemed to have cured a breach without the express agreement of the USAO in writing. If the USAO declares this agreement breached, and the Court finds such a breach to have occurred, then:

a. If defendant has previously entered guilty pleaspursuant to this agreement, defendant will not be able to withdrawthe guilty pleas.

b. The USAO will be relieved of all its obligations under this agreement; in particular, the USAO: (i) will no longer be bound by any agreements concerning sentencing and will be free to seek any sentence up to the statutory maximum for the crimes to which defendant has pleaded guilty; and (ii) will no longer be bound by any agreement regarding the use of Cooperation Information and will be free to use any Cooperation Information in any way in any investigation, criminal prosecution, or civil, administrative, or regulatory action.

c. The USAO will be free to criminally prosecute defendant for false statement, obstruction of justice, and perjury based on any knowingly false or misleading statement by defendant.

21 d. In any investigation, criminal prosecution, or civil, administrative, or regulatory action: (i) defendant will not assert, 22 23 and hereby waives and gives up, any claim that any Cooperation Information was obtained in violation of the Fifth Amendment 24 25 privilege against compelled self-incrimination; and (ii) defendant 26 agrees that any Cooperation Information and any Plea Information, as well as any evidence derived from any Cooperation Information or any 27 28 Plea Information, shall be admissible against defendant, and

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 26 of 39 Page ID #:153

defendant will not assert, and hereby waives and gives up, any claim under the United States Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other federal rule, that any Cooperation Information, any Plea Information, or any evidence derived from any Cooperation Information or any Plea Information should be suppressed or is inadmissible.

COURT AND UNITED STATES PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES OFFICE NOT PARTIES

31. Defendant understands that the Court and the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office are not parties to this agreement and need not accept any of the USAO's sentencing recommendations or the parties' agreements to facts or sentencing factors.

32. Defendant understands that both defendant and the USAO are free to: (a) supplement the facts by supplying relevant information to the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office and the Court; (b) correct any and all factual misstatements relating to the Court's Sentencing Guidelines calculations and determination of sentence; and (c) argue on appeal and collateral review that the Court's Sentencing Guidelines calculations and the sentence it chooses to impose are not error, although each party agrees to maintain its view that the sentencing calculations set forth above are consistent with the facts of this case. This paragraph permits both the USAO and defendant to submit full and complete factual information to the United States Probation and Pretrial Services Office and the Court, even if that factual information may be viewed

8

9

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 27 of 39 Page ID #:154

as inconsistent with the Factual Basis or Sentencing Factors agreed to in this agreement.

33. Defendant understands that even if the Court ignores any sentencing recommendation, finds facts or reaches conclusions different from those agreed to, and/or imposes any sentence up to the maximum established by statute, defendant cannot, for that reason, withdraw defendant's guilty pleas, and defendant will remain bound to fulfill all defendant's obligations under this agreement. Defendant understands that no one -- not the prosecutor, defendant's attorney, or the Court -- can make a binding prediction or promise regarding the sentence defendant will receive, except that it will be within the statutory maximum.

NO ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS

14 34. Defendant understands that, except as set forth herein, 15 there are no promises, understandings, or agreements between the USAO 16 and defendant or defendant's attorney, and that no additional 17 promise, understanding, or agreement may be entered into unless in a 18 writing signed by all parties or on the record in court.

19 /// 20 ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

21 ///

22

23

24

25

26

27

	12:57 AM Fedex Office 5201 Page 2 of 4 Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 28 of 39 Page ID #:155		
1 2 3 4	<u>PLEA AGREEMENT PART OF THE GUILTY PLEA HEARING</u> 35. The parties agree that this agreement will be considered part of the record of defendant's guilty plea hearing as if the entire agreement had been read into the record of the proceeding.		
5 6 7	AGREED AND ACCEPTED UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8 9 10 11	E. MARTIN ESTRADA United States Attorney Chornes 8/4/2023 THOMAS F. RYBARCZYK Date		
12 13 14	MICHAEL J. MORSE Assistant United States Attorneys ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA Defendant		
15 16 17 18	MARK WERKSMAN Attorney for Defendant ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA		
19 20 21	<pre>/// /// /// ///</pre>		
22 23 24			
25 26 27			
28	27		

8/2/2023 12:57 AM Fedex Office 5201 Page 3 of 4 Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 29 of 39 Page ID

#:156

1

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT

2 I have read this agreement in its entirety. I have had enough time to review and consider this agreement, and I have carefully and 3 thoroughly discussed every part of it with my attorney. I understand 4 5 the terms of this agreement, and I voluntarily agree to those terms. I have discussed the evidence with my attorney, and my attorney has 6 7 advised me of my rights, of possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or 8 at trial, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), 9 of relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences 10 of entering into this agreement. No promises, inducements, or 11 representations of any kind have been made to me other than those 12 contained in this agreement. No one has threatened or forced me in 13 any way to enter into this agreement. I am satisfied with the 14 representation of my attorney in this matter, and I am pleading 15 quilty because I am quilty of the charges and wish to take advantage 16 17 of the promises set forth in this agreement, and not for any other

111 22 23 111

111 24

26

27

28

25

reason.

Defendant

ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES

8/1/23

TAFOYA

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY

2 I am ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA's attorney. I have 3 carefully and thoroughly discussed every part of this agreement with 4 my client. Further, I have fully advised my client of his rights, of 5 possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or at trial, of the sentencing 6 7 factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of relevant Sentencing 8 Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this 9 agreement. To my knowledge: no promises, inducements, or 10 representations of any kind have been made to my client other than 11 those contained in this agreement; no one has threatened or forced my 12 client in any way to enter into this agreement; my client's decision to enter into this agreement is an informed and voluntary one; and 13 14 the Factual Basis set forth in this agreement is sufficient to support my client's entry of guilty pleas pursuant to this agreement. 15

1

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MARK WERKSMAN Attorney for Defendant ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA 8/2/2023

Date

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 31 of 39 Page ID #:158

EXHIBIT A

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 #:159	Filed 12/05/24 Page 32 of 39 Page ID				
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	CR No.				
Plaintiff,	<u>I N F O R M A T I O N</u>				
V.	[18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2):				
ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA,	Federal Program Bribery; 26 U.S.C. § 7201: Evasion				
Defendant.	of Payment of Tax]				
The United States Attorney cha	arges:				
INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS					
At times relevant to this Information:					
1. The City of Baldwin Park, California (the "City") was a					
local government located in Los Angeles County within the Central					
District of California. The City received in excess of \$10,000 under					
federal programs in both 2017 and 2018.					
2. The City was governed, in part, by its City Council, which					
adopted legislation, set policy, adjudicated issues, and established					
the budget for the City.					
3. The City Council was comprised of four City Council members					
and a mayor, all of whom were elected at large by the City's					
registered voters.					
	FOR THE CENTRAL DIS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, v. ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA, Defendant. The United States Attorney cha INTRODUCT At times relevant to this Info 1. The City of Baldwin Park, local government located in Los And District of California. The City r federal programs in both 2017 and 2 2. The City was governed, ir adopted legislation, set policy, ad the budget for the City. 3. The City Council was comp and a mayor, all of whom were elect				

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 33 of 39 Page ID #:160

4. Ricardo Pacheco ("Pacheco") was first elected to the City Council in 1997 and held that elected position until 2020. He also previously served as the City's Mayor Pro Tempore. In both roles, Pacheco was an agent of the City.

5. Person 10 was an elected official who agreed to represent Marijuana Company 2 in its pursuit of a marijuana permit from the City.

Defendant ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA was the City
 Attorney for the City from in or around December 2013 until October
 2022. Defendant TAFOYA was a resident of Covina, California.

7. Defendant TAFOYA had control of the bank accounts associated with Tafoya & Garcia, LLP and Tafoya Law Group, APC.

8. Beginning at least in or around April 2012, defendant TAFOYA knew that he had personal tax liability to the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") when the IRS actively attempted to collect defendant TAFOYA's outstanding tax liability, including penalties and interest, which totaled approximately \$650,626.90 as of October 2020.

9. Defendant TAFOYA subsequently paid the tax liability he owed in August 2021.

10. These Introductory Allegations are incorporated into each count of this Information.

COUNT ONE

[18 U.S.C. §§ 666(a)(2), 2(a)]

A. THE SCHEME

1. In or around June 2017, the City started the process of permitting the sale, cultivation, and manufacture of marijuana within the City's limits. Shortly thereafter, Pacheco decided to corruptly solicit bribe payments from companies seeking marijuana development agreements and related permits ("marijuana permits") in the City. In exchange for the payments, Pacheco would agree to assist and assist the companies, using his official City position, with obtaining marijuana permits.

2. In 2017, defendant ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA directed Person 10 to Pacheco after Person 10 told defendant TAFOYA he wanted to get clients marijuana permits in the City. Defendant TAFOYA understood at the time he referred Person 10 to Pacheco that Pacheco would solicit bribe payments from Person 10.

3. At some point in late 2017 or early 2018, defendant TAFOYA
learned that Person 10 was acting as a "consultant" for Marijuana
Company 2 in its effort to get a marijuana permit in the City and
Pacheco had agreed to assist Person 10 in his efforts in exchange for
bribe payments.

4. During the scheme, defendant TAFOYA, Pacheco, and Person 10
met in person on several occasions to discuss marijuana permits for
Marijuana Company 2. Defendant TAFOYA would provide Person 10
updates on the marijuana permitting process, including the status of
Marijuana Company 2's permit. At various points throughout the
scheme, including during 2018, Pacheco would complain to defendant
TAFOYA that Person 10 had not yet paid him the bribe money promised

3

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 35 of 39 Page ID #:162

to Pacheco. Defendant TAFOYA would then tell Person 10 that he needed to pay Pacheco the bribes Pacheco requested for Person 10 to get Pacheco's support for the marijuana permits for Marijuana Company 2.

5. To help conceal and facilitate the bribery scheme between Person 10 and Pacheco, Person 10 asked defendant TAFOYA on at least two occasions to cash checks from Marijuana Company 2 and provide the cash back to Person 10. Defendant TAFOYA agreed to the requests, cashed the checks, and returned cash to Person 10.

B. THE BRIBERY

6. Beginning in or around August 2017 and continuing to in or around December 2018, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendant TAFOYA, aiding and abetting Pacheco, Person 10, and others, corruptly gave, offered, and agreed to give something of value to a person, namely, at least \$54,000 in cash from Marijuana Company 2 to Person 10, intending to influence and reward Pacheco, an agent of the City, in connection with a business, transaction, and series of transactions of the City having a value of \$5,000 or more, specifically, the City's approval and awarding of marijuana development agreements and related permits.

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

COUNT TWO

[26 U.S.C. § 7201]

1. From in or around June 2017 through in or around October 2020, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendant ROBERT MANUEL NACIONALES TAFOYA, a resident of Los Angeles County, California, willfully and affirmatively attempted to evade and defeat the payment of a substantial part of \$650,626.90 in taxes and additions to taxes then due and owing by defendant TAFOYA to the United States of America, specifically, penalties and interest, for the calendar years 2007, 2010, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018, which had been assessed against defendant TAFOYA, by committing the following affirmative acts, among others, the likely effect of each of which would be to mislead or conceal defendant TAFOYA's assets and ability to pay defendant TAFOYA's outstanding taxes from the IRS:

a. On or about June 14, 2017, defendant TAFOYA transferred \$120,000 from his personal bank account to Person 22, a personal friend in Arizona, for, according to the wire transfer's details line, the "Purchase of Shares;" defendant TAFOYA later directed Person 22 to repay \$100,000 of the \$120,000 payment to Person 23, a relative of defendant TAFOYA;

b. On or about September 16, 2019, defendant TAFOYA transferred \$150,000 from his Tafoya Law Group, APC bank account via wire transfer to Person 23 to facilitate the purchase of a home in Mexico for Person 23;

c. On or about September 17, 2019, defendant TAFOYA transferred \$50,000 from his personal bank account via wire transfer

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

	Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW E	Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 #:164	Page 37 of 39 Page ID	
1	to Person 23 to facili	tate the purchase of a ho	ome in Mexico for	
2	Person 23; and			
3	d. On or a	bout December 26, 2019, c	defendant TAFOYA	
4	transferred \$12,889 from his Tafoya & Garcia, LLP bank account via			
5	wire transfer to an international title company to facilitate the			
6	purchase of a home in Mexico for Person 23.			
7				
8		E. MARTIN EST	RADA	
9		United States	Attorney	
10				
11		MACK E. JENKI	NS	
12		Assistant Uni Chief, Crimina	ted States Attorney al Division	
13		LINDSEY GREER		
14 15			ted States Attorney Corruption and Section	
16		THOMAS F. RYB		
17			ted States Attorney tion and Civil n	
18		MICHAEL J. MO		
19			ted States Attorney tion and Civil n	
20		Nigilis Deetio.		
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
		6		

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 38 of 39 Page ID #:165

EXHIBIT B

Case 2:23-cr-00384-ODW Document 27-1 Filed 12/05/24 Page 39 of 39 Page ID #:166