

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA §  
v. §  
JASE DEPAUL GAUTREAUX §  
aka Jase Dixon, Lamarcus Dixon, §  
Jase Wingate §

Criminal No. **4:21-cr-47**

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges:

United States Courts  
Southern District of Texas  
FILED

INTRODUCTION

FEB 04 2021

At all times material herein:

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

**A. The Defendant**

1. JASE DEPAUL GAUTREAUX, also known as Jase Dixon, Lamarcus Dixon, and Jase Wingate, was a resident of Houston, Texas, in the Southern District of Texas.

**B. Overview of the Paycheck Protection Program**

2. The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (“CARES”) Act is a federal law enacted in or around March 2020 and designed to provide emergency financial assistance to the millions of Americans who are suffering the economic effects caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. One source of relief provided by the CARES Act was the authorization of up to \$349 billion in forgivable loans to small businesses for job retention and certain other expenses, through a program referred to as the Paycheck Protection Program (“PPP”). In or around April 2020, up to \$310 billion in additional PPP funding was authorized by Congress.

3. The PPP allowed qualifying small businesses and other organizations to receive loans with a maturity of 2 years and an interest rate of 1%. PPP loan proceeds must be used by

businesses on payroll costs, interest on mortgages, rent, and utilities. The PPP allowed the interest and principal to be forgiven if businesses spent the proceeds on these expenses within a set period of time and used a certain portion of the PPP loan funds towards payroll expenses. The amount of PPP funds a business could receive was determined by the number of employees employed by the business and their average payroll costs for a period of eight weeks. Businesses applying for a PPP loan had to provide documentation showing their payroll expenses.

4. A PPP loan application had to be processed by a participating lender. If a PPP loan application was approved, the participating lender funded the PPP loan using its own monies, which were 100% guaranteed by Small Business Administration (“SBA”). Data from the application, including information about the borrower, the total amount of the loan, and the listed number of employees, was transmitted by the lender to the SBA in the course of processing the loan.

5. PPP loan proceeds had to be used by the business on certain permissible expenses—payroll costs, interest on mortgages, rent, and utilities. The PPP allowed the interest and principal on the PPP loan to be entirely forgiven if the business spent the loan proceeds on these expense items within a designated period of time after receiving the proceeds and used a certain amount of the PPP loan proceeds on payroll expenses.

### **C. Relevant Banks and Lenders**

6. Bank 1 was an approved SBA lender based in Utah. Bank 1 participated as a lender in the PPP. Bank 1 received a PPP loan application on behalf of ENI Marketing Inc.

7. Bank 2 was a federally insured financial institution based in Virginia.

8. Bank 3 was a federally insured financial institution based in Virginia.

### **D. Overview of the Scheme**

9. In or around April 2020, GAUTREAUX submitted a materially fraudulent PPP loan

application to Bank 1. In this application, GAUTREAUX falsified his identity, misrepresented the number of employees and payroll expenses of the entities seeking the loan, and made numerous other false and misleading statements.

**E. Purposes of the Scheme**

10. The purpose of the scheme was to enrich GAUTREAUX by enabling GAUTREAUX to obtain money from the federal government that would not have been provided to him if he had provided truthful information on the PPP loan applications.

**F. Execution of the Scheme**

11. It was part of the scheme that on or about April 29, 2020, in the Southern District of Texas, Defendant submitted a PPP application to Bank 1 on behalf of an entity called “ENI Marketing Inc.” Defendant’s submission of the PPP application caused a wire to be sent from the Southern District of Texas to a location outside of the State of Texas. This application sought a PPP loan in the amount of \$1,626,250. This application contained several false and fraudulent statements, including the following:

- a. The PPP Defendant identified an individual with the initials J.P. as the 100% owner of ENI Marketing Inc, but J.P. actually had no connection with ENI Marketing Inc. or the PPP application.
- b. The application noted that ENI Marketing Inc. had 10 employees and monthly payroll expenses of \$650,000. In reality, ENI Marketing Inc. was a subsidiary of Eni S.p.A., a multinational energy conglomerate based in Rome, Italy. ENI Marketing Inc. forfeited the right to do business in Texas in 1999. ENI Marketing Inc. had no employees and no payroll expenses.
- c. The application listed ENI Marketing Inc.’s business address as an apartment in

Houston that is known to be the residence of Defendant. This is not the actual business address of ENI Marketing Inc. or any Eni-related entity.

12. Defendant also provided falsified federal tax forms as part of the PPP application package.

13. At the time of the PPP application, Defendant had no affiliation with ENI Marketing Inc. or any Eni-related entity.

14. Application 1 was approved, and Bank 1 funded the loan.

15. On or about May 8, 2020, Bank 1 deposited the loan amount of \$1,626,250 into a bank account controlled by Defendant at Bank 2.

16. On or about May 11, 2020, Defendant transferred \$700,000 of this PPP money from his account at Bank 2 into an account he controlled at Bank 3. This transfer was initiated by Defendant from a location in Houston, in the Southern District of Texas.

17. Also on or about May 11, 2020, subsequent to the deposit of the \$700,000, two checks were written from the Bank 3 account to purchase two used Cadillacs. One check was for \$10,300; the other was for \$14,200. Both of these vehicles were purchased in the Houston area, in the Southern District of Texas.

**COUNT 1**

**ENGAGING IN A MONETARY TRANSACTION IN CRIMINALLY DERIVED  
PROPERTY  
(18 U.S.C. § 1957)**

18. The allegations in paragraphs 1-19 are incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein.


19. On or about May 11, 2020, in the Southern District of Texas, the defendant,

**JASE DEPAUL GAUTREAUX,  
also known as Jase Dixon, Lamarcus Dixon, and Jase Wingate,**


knowingly engaged and attempted to engage in a monetary transaction in criminally derived property of a value greater than \$10,000, and which was derived from the specified unlawful activity of wire fraud, namely, the Defendant transferred \$700,000 in criminally derived proceeds from an account at Bank 2 to an account at Bank 3.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1957.

RYAN PATRICK  
United States Attorney

By:   
Jim McAlister  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Southern District of Texas

DANIEL S. KAHN  
Acting Chief, Fraud Section

By:   
Timothy A. Duree  
Assistant Deputy Chief  
Criminal Division, Fraud Section