1	TRACY L. WILKISON Acting United States Attorney		
2	SCOTT M. GARRINGER		
3	Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division		
4	ANDREW BROWN (Cal. Bar No. 172009) Assistant United States Attorney		
	Major Frauds Section		
5	312 North Spring Street Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-0102		
6			
7			
8	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10			
11	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 2:20-cr-00520-DMG	
13	Plaintiff,	GOVERNMENT'S SENTENCING POSITION; EXHIBIT	
14	v.		
15	ANDRANIK AMIRYAN,	Hearing: September 17, 2021 3:00pm	
16	Defendant.		
17			
18	MEMORANDUM OF P	OINTS AND AUTHORITIES	
19	The government concurs in the findings of the Presentence		
20	Report with the following exceptions:		
21		TRUCT JUSTICE AND FAILED TO ACCEPT RICATED EMPLOYMENT TO HIDE THAT HE IS	
22	A PROFESSIONAL CRIMINAL	RICATED EMPHOTMENT TO HIDE THAT HE IS	
23	Defendant claims to have worked for AAA Painting and Flooring		
24	for sixteen years. (PSR $\P$ 88, which erroneously lists the business		
25	with two instead of three "A"s). This is a lie designed to conceal		
26	the fact that defendant had no	legitimate employment during that	

period, and actually supported himself through fraud and theft.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendant's purported employer is his brother, Artak Amiryan, who allegedly runs AAA Painting and Flooring out of the home they shared in Sunland--and which the case agent searched pursuant to a federal warrant. During the search at the purported address for AAA Painting and Flooring, agents observed no construction, painting, or flooring equipment or supplies. What the agents did find was an unlicensed marijuana grow on the premises, and communications on defendant's phone regarding PPP loans, money laundering, and other persons' identifying information. (Exh.)

No business or tax records exist to corroborate defendant's claimed employment. EDD, which reports wage income, had no data for defendant for the years checked, which covered 2015 through 2020, even though he said he was employed by AAA Painting and Flooring during that period. Indeed, on defendant's California Franchise Tax Board records, he claims to have been either self-employed or employed at a different "business," Magic Finishing, a shell corporation defendant used in the instant fraud to launder and withdraw in cash funds traceable to fraudulent PPP loans.  $\P\P$  25, 40, 48.) Nor does defendant's brother, Artak Amiryan, the owner of AAA Painting and Flooring, declare income from that purported business on his tax returns: he declared as income on his taxes for the years 2017-2018 wages from the California home health care program given to individuals who assert that they spend their time taking care of the infirm, in this case purportedly defendant's parents, and also claimed to be the owner of a child care business. Indeed, the corporation that defendant claims he worked for during 16 years only formed in 2020 according to California Secretary of State records-just in time to receive a CARES Act PPP loan that

resembled those that defendant fraudulently obtained for ACBA Technologies and European Cabinets Direct Import. (Exh.)

Defendant has a long history not only of fraud and theft generally (PSR  $\P\P$  59-62) but in particular of creating shell companies and even fake invoices. (Exh.)

Defendant could have remained silent about his employment, or he could have admitted that he has supported himself his entire life through fraud and theft. Defendant chose instead to manufacture bogus employment that he could expect his brother to attest to for one purpose: to deceive the Court into believing that he is generally a legitimate working man, albeit one who succumbed to the allure of easy CARES Act money. In fact, defendant has never held verified, legitimate employment, and his criminal record shows how he has actually supported himself for the last 18 years.

Defendant's attempt to deceive the Court regarding his employment affects his guideline range in two ways.

## A. DEFENDANT HAS FAILED TO CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

First, it is the defendant's burden to establish that he has "clearly" accepted responsibility for his offense. United States v. Alexander, 48 F.3d 1477, 1493 (9th Cir. 1995); USSG § 3E1.1(a). By lying in hopes of securing a more lenient sentence, defendant has failed to carry this burden. Indeed, his false statements to Probation could have been charged as crimes in and of themselves.

18 U.S.C. § 1001. Criminal conduct during the pendency of sentencing justifies a denial of acceptance of responsibility even when the new criminal conduct is unrelated to the offense of conviction. See United States v. Mara, 523 F.3d 1036, 1037 (9th

Cir. 2008) (affirming district court's denial of acceptance of responsibility where defendant who pled guilty to being a felon in possession of a firearm engaged in an unrelated jailhouse fight before sentencing).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# B. DEFENDANT'S FALSE STATEMENTS FOR THE PRESENTENCE REPORT ALSO CONSTITUTE AN ATTEMPTED OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

An obstruction of justice enhancement applies where the defendant has "provid[ed] materially false information to a probation officer in respect to a presentence" report. USSG § 3C1.1, app. note 4(H). C.f., United States v. Barnes, 125 F.3d 1287, 1292-93 (9th Cir. 1997) (affirming attempted obstruction of justice enhancement against a materiality challenge when the defendant failed to inform the probation officer preparing the PSR about a fourth marriage in which he was subject to a temporary restraining order due to violent conduct to his former spouse because it had the potential to influence sentencing in his offense of fraudulently impersonating a doctor). While the Court could impose the attempted obstruction of justice enhancement by itself, or could withhold the acceptance of responsibility reduction by itself, those adjustments typically go together in a situation like this one. "Conduct resulting in an enhancement under § 3C1.1 (Obstruction . . . of Justice) ordinarily indicates that the defendant has not accepted responsibility. . . . " USSG § 3E1.1, app. note 4.

### II. THE 3553(A) FACTORS: DEFENDANT IS UNUSUALLY HARD TO DETER

Defendant has had many encounters with the criminal justice system from which he could have learned the value of leading a lawabiding life. Instead, defendant appears to have learned all the

```
wrong lessons: how to commit the same crimes on a bigger scale, or
in a more clever way to foil law enforcement. For example,
defendant has been repeatedly removed from this country as an
illegal alien following his convictions. But instead of learning
from his deportation to abide by immigration rules, defendant
learned instead to commit more crimes: he entered a sham marriage
(while still married to his current wife) solely to change his last
name in hopes of thereby illegally re-entering the U.S. while
appearing to be a different person so that his prior record of
deportation would not be associated with his new name. (PSR ¶ 78.)
As a result, he served 14 months in prison for illegal re-entry
after deportation and conviction. (PSR ¶ 62.)
     Similarly, defendant's fraud and theft have increased over
time. His first conviction was for petty theft, for which he has
sentenced to probation and a single day in jail. (PSR ¶ 59.) While
he was still on probation for this offense, he used three fraudulent
credit cards and a check in an attempt to purchase goods worth less
than $1,400, resulting in a prison sentence of two years for
commercial burglary. (PSR ¶ 60.) Also while still on probation for
the petty theft-and while awaiting the resolution of what would turn
out to be his felony commercial burglary conviction mentioned above-
he impersonated at least two persons and fraudulently wired $55,000
```

24 prison sentence for grand theft and publishing and selling documents

out of the bank account of one of them, resulting in a three year

resembling court orders. (PSR  $\P$  61.) Neither of these prison

sentences appears to have deterred defendant who, after all, has now

pleaded guilty to a fraud involving at least \$650,600 in actual

28 losses. (PSR ¶ 28.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

25

26

Defendant's escalating criminality despite prison sentences as long as three years shows that defendant is unusually hard to deter and that only a lengthy sentence could possibly convince him to abandon his criminal career on favor of a lawful one.

#### CONCLUSION

Probation calculated defendant's guideline range as 63-78 months based on a final offense level of 22 and a criminal history category of IV. If the Court finds that defendant willfully attempted to obstruct justice, and failed to accept responsibility, by lying to Probation regarding his employment, then his final offense level would be 27, which corresponds to a guideline range of 100-125 months. Regardless of the Court's ruling on the guidelines, however, the government recommends a more modest sentence of 72 months in prison as justified by the 3553(a) factors, including defendant's escalating criminality, his repeated violations of court supervision, his lack of gainful employment, and his false statements to Probation about his employment. In order to protect

///

	that defendant will re-offend, the
government recommends the maximum term of supervised release, five	
ears.	
Dated: September 1, 2021	Respectfully submitted,
	TRACY L. WILKISON Acting United States Attorney
	SCOTT M. GARRINGER
	Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division
	/s Andrew Brown
	ANDREW BROWN
	Assistant United States Attorney
	Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
7(	ears.