

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
BROWARD DIVISION**

**CASE NO. 21-60211-CR-JEM**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**vs.**

**JERRICA ROSADO,**

**Defendant.**

/

**GOVERNMENT’S SENTENCING MEMORANDUM**

The United States of America, by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby submits this Sentencing Memorandum as to Defendant Jerrica Rosado (the “Defendant”). The Defendant is presently set for sentencing before the Court on December 3, 2021 for her conviction by guilty plea to one count of conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United State Code, Section 371. The offense stems from the Defendant’s facilitation of \$5,479,472 in fraudulent Paycheck Protection Program (“PPP”) loans sought through other conspirators that the Defendant referred to the scheme.

For the reasons set forth herein, the United States respectfully recommends that the Court sentence the Defendant to a term of imprisonment of 37 months, to be followed by three years of supervised release.<sup>1</sup> A sentence of 37 months’ imprisonment represents the bottom of the applicable range of the United States Sentencing Guidelines (the “Guidelines”) as calculated by the United States Probation Office (“Probation”) in the final Presentence Investigation Report,

---

<sup>1</sup> The United States is also seeking forfeiture of \$409,735 and restitution, consistent with the Plea Agreement [ECF No. 34 ¶¶ 13, 17; ECF No. 39-1 at 1 n.1] The Defendant has also agreed to pay a special assessment of \$100 [ECF No. 34 ¶ 5].

disclosed October 22, 2021 [ECF No. 41] (the “PSR”), to which the government has no objection. Furthermore, the sentence recommended herein by the United States will provide punishment for the offense of conviction that is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to accomplish the purposes of sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

## **I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

In early 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic spread across the country and disrupted everyday life, causing illness, death and economic distress, the U.S. government assembled relief programs to help those whose livelihoods were jeopardized. One of those programs was the PPP. Against this backdrop, the Defendant and her co-conspirators participated in a scheme to obtain by fraud millions of dollars in forgivable loans through the PPP, and have done so by conspiring with James Stote (referenced in the Information as “Individual 2”), Devonte Thames (referenced in the Information as “Individual 1”) and others. The Defendant coordinated with Stote and Thames to obtain a fraudulent PPP loan for Thames’ company, with Stote providing falsified documents and submitting the application on the Thames’ behalf in exchange for a kickback from the loan proceeds, while Defendant also received a kickback from the loan proceeds. Defendant coordinated with Stote and additional co-conspirators to facilitate the submission of several additional fraudulent PPP loan applications. To inflate the size of these PPP loans, and the corresponding kickbacks, the conspirators relied on a variety of false statements, including by submitting falsified bank statements and payroll tax forms.

### **A. The CARES Act**

In March 2020, in response to the many challenges presented by the pandemic, Congress passed the CARES ACT, Pub. L. 116-136, which created the PPP. The PPP authorized \$349

billion in forgivable loans to small businesses to be used for payroll, mortgage interest, rent/lease payments, or utilities. In April 2020, Congress authorized an additional \$310 billion for PPP funding. These funds were designed to address the unprecedented crisis facing Americans—especially business owners whose livelihoods were threatened by the public health emergency. PPP funds were designed as a lifeline.

The program was designed to provide funds quickly and easily to qualifying individuals. PPP loans were not dispensed through any government bureaucracy; funds were distributed by banks who had existing relationships with many of the people in need. To apply, individuals submitted an application to a participating financial institution along with supporting documentation as to the business's payroll expenses. The supporting documentation requirement was minimal, and could be satisfied with one year's worth of the company's tax records. If a PPP loan application was approved, the participating financial institution funded the PPP loan using its own monies, which were 100% guaranteed by the Small Business Administration ("SBA").

**B. Overview of Defendant's Conduct**

A more detailed recitation of the facts relating to the scheme are detailed in the Information (ECF No. 25), Defendant's factual proffer statement (ECF No. 33), and the PSR (ECF No. 41).

Beginning in May 2020 through in or around at least July 2020, the Defendant conspired with Stote, Thames, and others to submit and cause the submission of millions of dollars' worth of PPP loan applications.

In furtherance of the conspiracy, the Defendant facilitated the submission of a PPP loan application on behalf of the Berneta E. Thames Foundation ("Thames Foundation") that contained materially false and fraudulent representations. Specifically, on May 26, 2020, Defendant

obtained information from Thames regarding Thames and the Thames Foundation and passed that information to co-conspirators with the understanding that the information would be sent to Stote for preparation of a PPP loan application on behalf of the Thames Foundation. On or about May 28, 2020, Stote submitted to Bank 1, through Bank Processor 1, a PPP loan application package for the Thames Foundation seeking a loan in the amount of \$409,735 (the “Thames Foundation Loan”). The Thames Foundation Loan application documents contained several false and fraudulent representations, including falsified tax forms purporting to have been filed by the Thames Foundatoin and false certifications regarding the number of employees that the Thames Foundation had. Bank Processor 1 approved a PPP loan for the Thames Foundation in the amount of \$491,310, which Bank 1 funded. Thereafter, Defendant provided Thames the wiring instructions for a bank account controlled by Stote to facilitate Thames’ kickback payment to Stote for Stote’s role in preparing the false Thames Foundation Loan application. On or about June 5, 2020, Thames paid a kickback to Stote in the amount of \$61,460. Separately, during an in-person meeting with Thames and as a kickback for Defendant’s role in assisting Thames obtain the fraudulent Thames Foundation Loan, Defendant collected in cash a portion of the Thames Foundation Loan proceeds.

Defendant also recruited others to the conspiracy. In and around June 2020, Thames introduced three individuals to Defendant, who referred these individuals to co-conspirators with the understanding that Stote would prepare fraudulent PPP loan applications on behalf of these individuals. One of these individuals, in fact, received a fraudulent PPP loan through the scheme. Defendant accepted a \$50,000 kickback payment from this individual for Defendant’s role in procuring the fraudulent PPP loan through the scheme.

## II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 15, 2021, the Defendant was charged by complaint with conspiracy to commit wire fraud and bank fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349, wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343, and bank fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1344 [ECF No. 1]. Following waiver of indictment, on July 22, 2021, the Defendant was charged in an Information with conspiracy to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371 [ECF No. 25]. The Defendant pleaded guilty before this Court to the Information pursuant to a written plea agreement on August 26, 2021 [ECF No. 32]. Sentencing is presently scheduled for December 3, 2021.

## III. SENTENCING GUIDELINES CALCULATIONS

As explained below, the United States submits that the Defendant's Total Offense Level is 19. At Criminal History Category IV, this produces an advisory Guidelines range of 46-57 months of imprisonment pursuant to the Sentencing Table in Chapter 5, Part A of the Guidelines.

### A. The PSR Correctly Computes the Offense Level

As set forth in the PSR, Probation computes the Total Offense Level at 21 (PSR ¶¶ 75-84). The United States concurs with the Offense Level computation in the PSR, which is as follows:

Base Offense Level, § 2B1.1(a)(2)	6
Loss greater than \$3,500,000 but less than \$9,500,000, § 2B1.1(b)(1)(J)	18
Acceptance of Responsibility and Timely Notification § 3E1.1(a) and (b)	(3)
<b>Total Offense Level</b>	<b>21</b>

The Defendant does not object to the calculation of the Guidelines.

#### **IV. CONSIDERATION OF SENTENCING FACTORS UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 3553(A)**

Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a), enumerates several factors that the Court shall consider in sentencing a defendant. As addressed in turn below, the 3553(a) factors relevant to the Defendant support the sentence recommended by the United States.

##### **A. Nature and Circumstances of the Offense**

This was a serious offense. In 2020, as the COVID-19 pandemic spread across the country causing illness, death and economic distress, the government created PPP loans to help small business owners and their employees whose livelihoods were jeopardized. The Defendant took advantage of the program by facilitating the submission of false applications for co-conspirators claiming to have employees and payroll that did not exist. Those applications were supported by false tax forms and fictitious bank statements. The Defendant's willful participation in this serious criminal conduct warrants a sentence of imprisonment within the advisory Guidelines range. The United States' recommended sentence at the bottom of the Guidelines range, is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish this goal.

##### **B. History and Characteristics of the Defendant**

The Defendant is a 28-year-old woman who has a high school diploma and attended college but does not have a degree. [ECF No. 41 at ¶ 105]. She is employed as a floor supervisor for Amazon. (*Id.* ¶ 108.) The Defendant is not married and has no children. (*Id.* ¶ 94.) The Defendant has a no criminal history points. (*Id.* ¶ 87.)

The Defendant agreed to plead guilty before being indicted, and thus deserves credit for accepting responsibility early and saving the government considerable resources in preparing for grand jury and a trial. The sentence recommended by the United States reflects such acceptance

because it is within the Guidelines produced by the Offense Level that has been adjusted downward by three levels for acceptance of responsibility pursuant to Section 3E1.1(a) and (b).

**C. Need for the Sentence to Afford Adequate Deterrence to Criminal Conduct and Protect the Public from Further Crimes of the Defendant**

The sentence in this case should address a need for both general and specific deterrence. As to general deterrence, the Eleventh Circuit has explicitly stated that “general deterrence is an important factor in white-collar cases, where the motivation is greed.” *United States v. Hayes*, 762 F.3d 1300, 1308 (11th Cir. 2014). As explained above, this case was motivated by greed at time when millions of Americans were suffering from the economic impact of a global pandemic. As the pandemic spread, so too did fraud related to the PPP program and other programs designed to provide critical economic assistance—especially in the Southern District of Florida. The government’s recommended sentence of imprisonment in this case is thus appropriate to provide both specific and general deterrence. Such a sentence will send a clear message to the Defendant and other offenders that there are serious consequences for defrauding government pandemic relief programs. Indeed, as the pandemic continues to impact small businesses, the PPP loan program remains ongoing. Actors like the Defendant who seek to defraud these programs not only drain the program of limited funding, they make it more difficult for administrators of government and other relief programs to get aid to individuals that qualify for and need it. The Defendant’s sentence will serve as a warning and deterrent to others inclined to exploit pandemic relief programs.

Furthermore, a sentence within the Guidelines range is sufficient to protect the public from future crimes of this Defendant, who has no criminal history points. With this sentence, the government believes the risk of recidivism is low.

**D. Need for the Sentence to Avoid Unwarranted Sentencing Disparities**

The sentence recommended by the United States will not create an unwarranted sentencing disparity. There are two relevant points of comparison to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities: sentences associated with others convicted of PPP related fraud, and the sentences of co-conspirators in this case. While a relatively small number of defendants have been sentenced to date for offenses related to PPP fraud, judges of this Court and of other Districts have imposed sentences with significant terms of imprisonment. *See, e.g., United States v. Ioannis Kralievits*, Case No. 21-20157-CR-Altonaga (S.D. Fla. June 30, 2021) (sentencing cooperating defendant to 19-month term of imprisonment (following reduction pursuant to 5K1.1) in connection with two fraudulent PPP loans totaling approximately \$824,750); *United States v. David Hines*, Case No. 21-20011-CR-Cooke (S.D. Fla. May 12, 2021) (imposing 78-month term of imprisonment for defendant responsible for a loss of \$3.9 million resulting from multiple fraudulent PPP loans); *United States v. Ganell Tubbs*, 20-00193-CR-Miller (E.D. Ark.) (imposing 41-month term of imprisonment for defendant responsible for loss of \$1.9 million resulting from two fraudulent PPP loans).

Seven other conspirators in this scheme have been sentenced. On October 18, 2021, the court sentenced co-conspirator Devonte Thames to 31 months imprisonment, three years of supervised release, and ordered him to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Thames*, Case No. 21-cr-60125-RKA (S.D. Fla.). The sentence was at the bottom of the adjusted Guidelines range after the court granted the government's motion, pursuant to Section 5K1.1, and reduced Thames' sentence by approximately 33%. Meanwhile, on October 13, 2021, the court sentenced co-conspirator Dennes Garcia to 18 months imprisonment (the bottom of the Guidelines range),

three years of supervised release, and ordered him to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Garcia*, Case No. 21-cr-60146 (S.D. Fla.).

In addition, on July 13, 2021, the court sentenced co-conspirator Tiara Walker to one year and one day, three years of supervised release, and ordered her to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Walker*, Case No. 20-cr-60159-RAR (S.D. Fla.). On July 27, 2021, co-conspirator Tonye Johnson was sentenced by the court to 18 months in prison, three years of supervised release, and ordered him to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Johnson*, Case No. 21-CR-60017-RKA (S.D. Fla.). On September 24, 2021, the court sentenced Brian Arnold to time served, three years of supervised release, including one year of home confinement, 600 hours of community service, and ordered him to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Arnold*, No. 21-CR-20331 (S.D. Fla.). Unlike defendants Thames, Walker, and Johnson, the proceeds for Defendant Arnold's fraudulent PPP loan were immediately frozen before he could pay any kickbacks or otherwise spend the funds. On October 8, 2021, the court sentenced Cindi Denton to six months imprisonment, three years of supervised release, including one year of home confinement, and ordered her to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Denton*, No. 21-CR-60171 (S.D. Fla.). Defendants Walker, Johnson, Arnold, and Denton had no criminal history points; they each sought fraudulent PPP loans for their own companies, for less than \$500,000 each, and did not refer others to the scheme.<sup>2</sup> On July 30, 2021, the court sentenced Andre Clark to 33 months imprisonment, three years of supervised release, and ordered him to pay restitution and forfeiture. *United States v. Clark*, Case No. 21-CR-60029 (S.D. Fla.). Defendant Clark sought

---

<sup>2</sup> Notably, however, defendant Johnson tested positive for marijuana during the presentence investigation and attempted to conceal his marijuana use from Probation by using a device to provide urine from someone other than the test taker.

his own fraudulent PPP loan and also referred other conspirators to the scheme, and he did so with a significant criminal history. Defendant Clark's sentence was at the bottom of the Guidelines as calculated by the court, after the court held that a two-level minor role reduction was warranted because Clark ultimately received very little from the scheme, so his Guidelines loss amount greatly exceeded his personal gain.<sup>3</sup>

The intended loss amount of \$5,479,472 attributable to the Defendant is an important measure of her relative culpability as compared to co-conspirators in a scheme involving over 90 fraudulent loan applications and over \$34 million in intended losses. That is, the co-conspirators who led and organized the scheme and were involved in preparing or submitting even more fraudulent loan applications will be responsible for a greater intended loss amounts, and a correspondingly higher advisory Guidelines range under Section 2B1.1. A sentence of 37 months for this Defendant, who is being held responsible only for the loss associated with those she referred to the scheme, will provide a consistent framework for future sentences of co-conspirators in this conspiracy whose Guidelines correlate to the losses for which they are directly responsible.

## V. RESTITUTION & FORFEITURE

Restitution is mandatory in this case pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(a)(1). As set forth in the Plea Agreement [ECF No. 34 ¶ 17], the United States and the Defendant have agreed that the Defendant owes restitution. Restitution is owed joint and severally with the Defendant's co-conspirators charged in at least the following related cases: *United States v. Stote*, 20-4215-MJ-JDG (N.D. Ohio); *United States v. Thames*, 21-60125 (S.D. Fla.); *United States v. Redfern*, 20-

---

<sup>3</sup> Based primarily on his referrals, Clark's loss amount for sentencing purposes was between \$3,500,000 and \$9,500,000. However, Clark ultimately received little money from the scheme, which the sentencing court found to be a significant factor at sentencing.

CR-00340-WO (M.D.N.C.); *United States v. Carlidge*, 20-CR-00340-WO (M.D.N.C.); *United States v. McMiller*, 20-CR-00340-WO (M.D.N.C.); *United States v. Griffin*, 20-CR-00340-WO (M.D.N.C.).

Furthermore, pursuant to the Plea Agreement, the Defendant agreed to a forfeiture money judgment in the amount of \$409,735. (ECF No. 34 ¶ 13; ECF No. 39-1 at 1 n.1.) On October 14, 2021, the Court entered a preliminary order of forfeiture in which the Court entered a forfeiture money judgment of \$409,735 pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(2)(A). (ECF No. 40.)

\* \* \*

**CONCLUSION**

For the forgoing reasons, the United States respectfully recommends that the Court sentence the Defendant to a term of imprisonment of thirty-seven (37) months, to be followed by a term of supervised release of three (3) years. The United States also requests that the Court order restitution, forfeiture, and a special assessment, consistent with the Plea Agreement [ECF No. 34] and the point and authorities discussed herein.

Respectfully Submitted,

JUAN ANTONIO GONZALEZ  
ACTING UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

JOSEPH S. BEEMSTERBOER  
ACTING CHIEF, FRAUD SECTION

By: /s/ Kiran Bhat  
KIRAN BHAT  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Fla. Bar NO. 1008370  
400 North Miami Avenue  
Miami, FL 33131  
Tel: (305) 961-9103  
Fax: (954) 695-0651  
Email: kiran.bhat@usdoj.gov

By: /s/ Philip B. Trout  
PHILIP B. TROUT  
Trial Attorney, Fraud Section  
U.S. Department of Justice  
1400 New York Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20530  
Tel: (202) 616-6989  
Fax: (202) 514-3708  
Email: philip.trout@usdoj.gov

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

**I HEREBY CERTIFY** that on November 29, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF.

*/s/ Philip Trout* \_\_\_\_\_  
Trial Attorney