UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Before the SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

RECEIVED
APR 25 2017
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING File No. 3-17856

In the Matter of

JOHN AUSTIN GIBSON, JR.,

Respondent.

DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT'S MOTION AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW SUPPORTING ENTRY OF DEFAULT

I. Introduction

The Division of Enforcement (the "Division"), pursuant to Rule 155(a) and 220(f) of the Commission's Rules of Practice, 17 C.F.R. §§ 201.155(a) and 201.220(f), moves for entry of an Order finding Respondent John Austin Gibson, Jr. in default and determining this proceeding against him upon consideration of the record. The Division sets forth the grounds below.

II. History of the Case

On February 23, 2017, the Commission issued the Order Instituting Proceedings ("OIP") pursuant to Section 15(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Exchange Act") and Section 203(f) of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 ("Advisers Act"). The OIP alleges that Gibson obtained funds by representing to investors that he was a representative of the investment firms MetLife and Allianz and could establish accounts at these firms on investors' behalf. Instead of investing the money, Gibson converted the funds to his own use and sent victims fake account

statements to cover his tracks. These facts led to Gibson's guilty plea in the criminal case against him.

On April 6, 2017, the Law Judge entered an Order requiring Gibson to show cause by April 17, 2017 why the proceeding should not be determined against him by default. That day passed without a response from Gibson.

III. Memorandum of Law

A. Gibson's Criminal Case

On June 8, 2016, the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana filed an information against Gibson charging him with one count of mail fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (D.E. 1, *United States v. Gibson*, No. 2:16-cr-00103 (E.D. La.) ("Gibson") (attached as Exhibit 1)). On July 18, 2016, Gibson pled guilty to the information. (*Id.*, D.E 16 (attached as Exhibit 2)). On March 22, 2017, the district court sentenced Gibson to 18 months imprisonment followed by a three-year term of supervised release, and ordered that he pay \$213,597 in restitution to MetLife and Allianz (who apparently reimbursed the victims). (*Id.*, D.E. 37 (attached as Exhibit 3)).

B. Facts Determined Against Gibson

According to the factual basis for Gibson's plea (*Id.*, D.E. 18 (attached as Exhibit 4)),¹ from 2008 through 2014, Gibson held himself out as a MetLife representative and Allianz agent capable of establishing and monitoring investment accounts with those entities. During this period, Gibson solicited and accepted money from individuals for investment, but instead of

¹Gibson's plea estops him from disputing the facts relevant to this matter. See Don Warner Reinhard, Exchange Act Rel. No. 63720, at 11-12, 2011 WL 121451 (Jan. 14, 2011) (respondent who pleaded guilty "cannot now dispute the accuracy of the findings set out in the Factual basis for Plea Agreement"); Gary M. Kornman, Exchange Act Rel. No. 59403, at 12 & n.34, 2009 WL 367635 (Feb. 13, 2009) (criminal conviction based on guilty plea precludes litigation of issues in Commission proceedings).

setting up accounts, Gibson fraudulently diverted the monies for his own personal use. Gibson sent three victims fraudulent account statements relating to a non-existent accounts with MetLife and Allianz.

C. Entry of Judgment by Default is Appropriate

The facts determined in his criminal case and by Gibson's default² show that the Division is entitled to the relief that it seeks. Section 15(b)(6)(A) of the Exchange Act provides in relevant part:

With respect to any person . . . at the time of the alleged misconduct, who was associated with a broker . . . the Commission, by order, shall censure, place limitations on the activities or functions of such person, or suspend for a period not exceeding 12 months, or bar any such person from being associated with a broker, dealer, investment adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent, or nationally recognized statistical rating organization, or from participating in an offering of penny stock, if the Commission finds, on the record after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that such censure, placing of limitations, suspension, or bar is in the public interest and that such person—

* * * *

(ii) has been convicted of any offense specified in [Exchange Act Section 15(b)(4)(B)] within 10 years of the commencement of the proceedings under this paragraph....

Advisers Act Section 203(f) provides for an identical associational bar (but not a penny stock bar) for a person with a qualifying conviction who at the time of the misconduct was associated with an investment adviser. Each of the requirements of these provisions—timely issuance of the OIP, conviction under a qualifying statute, and misconduct committed while Gibson was associated with a broker or dealer—are satisfied here.

²Under Rule 155(a), a party who fails to file a timely answer "may be deemed to be in default" and the Law Judge "may determine the proceeding against that party upon consideration of the record, including the order instituting proceedings, the allegations of which may be deemed to be true" 17 C.F.R. § 201.155(a).

1. The Division Timely Filed this Action

The Division must commence proceedings under Exchange Act Section 15(b)(6)(A)(ii) and Advisers Act Section 203(f) within 10 years of the criminal conviction. *See Joseph Contorinis*, Exchange Act Rel. No. 72031, at 4-6, 2014 WL 1665995 (Apr. 25, 2014) (10-year limitations period runs from date of conviction, not underlying conduct). Here, Gibson was convicted in 2016, and the OIP was issued in 2017. Therefore, this matter was timely filed.

2. Gibson Was Convicted of a Qualifying Offense

Gibson's mail fraud conviction constitutes a "felony . . . which . . . involves the violation of section . . . 1341 . . . of Title 18," thus triggering the Commission's ability to sanction him under both the Exchange Act and the Advisers Act. *See* Exchange Act Sections 15(b)(4)(B)(iv), 15(b)(6)(A)(ii); Advisers Act Sections 203(e)(2)(D), 203(f).

3. Gibson Was Associated with a Broker and an Investment Adviser at the Time of the Misconduct

Exchange Act Section 15(b)(6)(A) and Advisers Act Section 203(f) each require that Gibson have been a person associated with, respectively, a broker or investment adviser at the time of the misconduct. Here, deemed admitted is the OIP's allegation that Gibson was a Louisiana-registered investment adviser between February 2008 and March 2009 and between October 2007 and March 2009 was associated with MetLife, a dually-registered broker-dealer and investment adviser. The OIP further alleges that after his resignation from MetLife, he continued to act as an unregistered investment adviser. (OIP § II.A.1) Therefore, Gibson is subject to sanction under the Exchange Act and the Advisers Act.

4. Industry and Penny Stock Bars Are Appropriate Sanctions

In determining whether an administrative sanction is in the public interest, the Commission

considers, among other things, the egregiousness of the respondent's actions, the isolated or recurrent nature of the infraction, the degree of scienter involved, the sincerity of the respondent's assurances against future violations, the respondent's recognition of the wrongful nature of his conduct, and the likelihood that the respondent's occupation will present opportunities for future violations.

David R. Wulf, Exchange Act Rel. No. 77411, at 5-6, 2016 WL 1085661 (Mar. 21, 2016) (quotation and alterations omitted). "Absent extraordinary mitigating circumstances, an individual who has been convicted cannot be permitted to remain in the securities industry." Frederick W. Wall, Exchange Act Rel. No. 52467, at 8, 2005 WL 2291407 (Sept. 19, 2005) (quotation omitted); accord Shreyans Desai, Exchange Act Rel. No. 80129, at 6, 2017 WL 782152 (Mar. 1, 2017).

Here, these factors weigh in favor of industry and penny stock bars. First, Gibson's actions were egregious. His conviction establishes that he knowingly and willfully engaged in a scheme to defraud several victims and appropriate their funds for his own use. The statements by victims at his sentencing demonstrates the severe impact of his conduct. (*Gibson*, Trans., 3/22/2017, at 12:10-17:22, 17:24-19:15 (attached as Exhibit 5)

Second, this was not a one-time lapse in judgment: Gibson admitted to a scheme that continued for more than five years. Third, Gibson's level of scienter was extremely high, giving to a criminal conviction.

With respect to the fourth and fifth factors, notwithstanding his guilty plea, Gibson has not participated in this matter, thus providing no assurances that he will avoid *future* violations of the law. Although "[c]ourts have held that the existence of a past violation, without more, is not a sufficient basis for imposing a bar, . . . the existence of a violation raises an inference that it will be repeated." *Tzemach David Netzer Korem*, Exchange Act Release No. 70044, at 10 n.50, 2013 WL 3864511 (July 26, 2013) (quotation and alternations omitted). Gibson has offered no

evidence to rebut that inference.

Sixth, although Gibson is serving a 18 month sentence, he will eventually be released,

and unless he is barred from the securities industry he will have the chance to again harm

investors.

Finally, it serves the public interest to collaterally bar Gibson from all association with

the securities industry. Although Gibson's scheme began prior to the July 2010 enactment of the

Dodd-Frank Act, the collateral bars authorized therein may be imposed because his scheme

extended into 2014. See Wayne L. Palmer, Initial Decision Rel. No. 1025, at 7, n.6, 2016 WL

3227658 (June 13, 2016) ("Because a portion of Palmer's misconduct occurred after July 22,

2010 . . . imposing a full collateral bar is not impermissibly retroactive."). Accordingly, the Law

Judge should bar Gibson from the securities industry, even though certain of his conduct

occurred prior to Dodd-Frank's enactment.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, the Division asks the Law Judge to sanction Gibson by

issuing a penny stock bar and barring him from association with any broker, dealer, investment

adviser, municipal securities dealer, municipal advisor, transfer agent or NRSRO.

April 24, 2017

Respectfully submitted.

Andrew O. Schiff

Regional Trial Counsel

Direct Line: (305) 982-6390

schiffa@sec.gov

DIVISION OF ENFORCEMENT

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

801 Brickell Avenue, Suite 1800

Miami, FL 33131

Phone: (305) 982-6300

Fax: (305) 536-4154

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that an original and three copies of the foregoing were filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of the Secretary, 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20549-9303, and that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served by overnight, on this 24th day of April 2017, on the following persons entitled to notice:

The Honorable James E. Grimes Administrative Law Judge Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20549

John Austin Gibson, Jr.

Studio City, CA Pro Se

Andrew O. Schiff
Regional Trial Counsel

U.S. DIST DE COURT LA.

ZOIL JUN - 8 P 3: 30

WILLIAM W. PLEVINS

G

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA



BILL OF INFORMATION FOR MAIL FRAUD

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CRIMINAL NO. 16-103

SECTION:

SECT. R MAG 3

JOHN GIBSON

V.

VIOLATIONS: 18 U.S.C. § 1341

The United States Attorney charges that:

COUNT 1

A. THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

- 1. Beginning in 2008 and continuing through 2014, defendant, JOHN GIBSON, knowingly and willfully devised and intended to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J. As part of the scheme, GIBSON used false and fraudulent pretenses, material misrepresentations, and promises to defraud investors Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J. of monies.
- 2. It was further part of the scheme and artifice to defraud that, from 2008 through 2014, GIBSON solicited funds from Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J by falsely representing that he would use their funds to establish investment accounts at Metlife and Allianz. As a result of his



Process
X Dktd
CtRmDep
Doc. No.____

false representations, GIBSON received approximately \$169,348 in funds from Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J.

- 3. It was further part of the scheme and artifice to defraud that, from 2008 through 2014, GIBSON fraudulently diverted investor funds from Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J. for his own personal use.
- 4. It was further part of the scheme and artifice to defraud that, from 2008 through 2014, GIBSON made materially false representations to Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J. and reassured them that their funds were invested for their benefit in accounts at Metlife and Allianz by creating fictitious and fraudulent account statements and sending those statements to Y.B., P.B., G.B, S.J. and D.J.
- 5. It was further part of the scheme and artifice to defraud that, from 2008 through 2014, GIBSON perpetuated the fraud by sending partial payments back to G.B, S.J. and D.J. to reassure them that their funds were invested for their benefit in accounts at Metlife and Allianz.

B. THE USE OF THE UNITED STATES MAIL

6. On or about August 13, 2014, in the Eastern District of Louisiana and elsewhere, the defendant, JOHN GIBSON, for the purpose of executing and attempting to execute the scheme and artifice to defraud set forth above and for the purpose of obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, did knowingly place in an authorized depository for mail, to be sent and delivered by the Postal Service, a money order in the amount of \$250 as a fictitious withdrawal from a non-existent Allianz account, in order to hide, conceal, and perpetuate his scheme and artifice to defraud, which resulted in a total loss of approximately \$169,348 to his clients.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341.

NOTICE OF FORFEITURE

- 1. The allegations of Count 1 of this Bill of Information are realleged and incorporated by reference as though set forth fully herein for the purpose of alleging forfeiture to the United States of America pursuant to the provisions of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1341 and 981(a)(1)(C), made applicable through Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c).
- 2. As a result of the offense alleged in Count 1, defendant, **JOHN GIBSON**, shall forfeit to the United States pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), made applicable through Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), any and all property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341.
- 3. If any of the property subject to forfeiture, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant:
 - a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;
 - b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third person;
 - c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court:
 - d. has been substantially diminished in value; or
 - e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be subdivided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of said defendant up to the value of the above forfeitable property.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1341 and 981(a)(1)(C), made applicable through Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c).

KENNETH ALLEN POLITE, JR. UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

SEAN TOOMEY

Assistant United States Attorney

La. Bar Roll No. 36055

New Orleans, Louisiana June 8, 2016

No.	

United States District Court

FOR THE

DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA **EASTERN**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

JOHN GIBSON

BILL OF INFORMATION FOR MAIL FRAUD

VIOLATION: 18 U.S.C. § 1341

20 16 Filed

Clerk.

Deputy

SEAN TOOMEY

Assistant Tinited States Attorney

Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 1-1 Filed 06/08/16 Page 1 of 1 PER 18 U.S.C. 3170

DEFENDANT INFORMATION RELATIV	/E TO A CRIMINAL ACTION - IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT
BY: INFORMATION INDICTMENT	CASE NO.
Matter Sealed:	USA vs. Defendant: Defendant: SECT. R MAG 3 Interpreter Required Dialect:
Name of Asst. U.S. Attorney (if assigned) Sean Toomey	Birth
PROCEEDING Name of Complainant Agency, or Person (& Title, if any) Dyisha Morgan-Neal, USPIS	Social Security NumberXXX-XX-8397
person is awaiting trial in another Federal or State Court (give name of court)	DEFENDANT
this person/proceeding transferred from another district per (circle one) FRCrP 20, 21 or 40. Show District this is a reprosecution of charges previously dismissed which were dismissed on motion of: U.S. Atty Defense this prosecution relates to a pending case involving this same defendant. (Notice of Related Case must still be filed with the Clerk.) prior proceedings or appearance(s) before U.S. Magistrate Judge regarding this defendant were recorded under Place of Orleans Parish County	Issue: Warrant Summons Location Status: Arrest Date or Date Transferred to Federal Custody Currently in Federal Custody Currently in State Custody Writ Required Currently on bond Fugitive Defense Counsel (if any): FPD
	This report amends AO 257 previously submitted
OFFENSE CHARGED - U.S.C. CITATION - STATUTORY	MAXIMUM PENALTIES - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR COMMENTS
Total # of Counts_1 (for this defendant only)	
Offense Level (1, 3, 4) Title & Section/ (Petty = 1 / Misdemeanor = 3 / Felony = 4)	Description of Offense Charged Count(s)
	Mail Fraud 1
	•••

NO MAGISTRATE PAPERS WERE FOUND

for

NAME: JOHN GIBSON

Initials: <u>DAS</u>

MINUTE ENTRY VANCE, J. JULY 18, 2016

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CRIMINAL CASE

VERSUS

NO. 16-103

JOHN GIBSON (BOND)

SECTION: R

CASE MANAGER: JAY SUSSLIN

COURT REPORTER: MARY THOMPSON

REARRAIGNMENT

APPEARANCES: JOHN GIBSON, DEFENDANT

TOWNSEND MYERS, COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT

SEAN TOOMEY, ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY

U.S. PROBATION OFFICER

U.S. MARSHALS

Court begins.

All present and ready.

Defendant is sworn and questioned by the Court.

Defendant is present to withdraw former plea of Not Guilty as to Count 1 of the Bill of Information and enters a plea of guilty as to same.

Waiver of Indictment previously signed and filed into the record.

Defendant is cautioned regarding possible prosecution for perjury or false statement if answers to the Court's questions are not truthful.

Defendant is informed of rights to trial by jury or the Court and waives same.

Reading of the Information by the Court to the defendant is waived.

Defendant is informed of the maximum penalties.

JS-10: 00:18



Defendant is informed of the Sentencing Guidelines.

Defendant enters a plea of Guilty.

Plea agreement is disclosed to the Court in letter form, summarized by counsel for the Government, signed by all parties and filed into the record.

Factual basis is signed by all parties and filed into the record.

The Court finds there is a factual basis for the guilty plea in this matter and that the defendant is fully competent to enter a plea of guilty and is pleading guilty knowingly and voluntarily.

The defendant is ADJUDGED GUILTY on plea of Guilty.

PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND TRIAL ARE HEREBY CANCELLED.

ALL PENDING MOTIONS ARE HEREBY SATISFIED AS MOOT.

Pre-Sentence Investigation is ORDERED.

SENTENCING set for WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

Defendant is <u>released on bond</u> to return on the date set for sentencing. Court adjourned.

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16)

Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 1

United States District Court

Eastern District of Louisiana UNITED STATES OF AMERICA JUDGMENT IN A CRIMINAL CASE V. JOHN GIBSON Case Number: 16-103 "R" USM Number: 36855-034 Townsend Myers Defendant's Attorney THE DEFENDANT: 1 of the Bill of Information on July 18, 2016 pleaded guilty to count(s) pleaded nolo contendere to count(s) which was accepted by the court. was found guilty on count(s) after a plea of not guilty. The defendant is adjudicated guilty of these offenses: Title & Section Nature of Offense Offense Ended Count 18:1341 Mail Fraud The defendant is sentenced as provided in pages 2 through of this judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984. ☐ The defendant has been found not guilty on count(s) ☐ Count(s) are dismissed on the motion of the United States. ☐ is It is ordered that the defendant must notify the United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of name, residence, or mailing address until all fines, restitution, costs, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid. If ordered to pay restitution, the defendant must notify the court and United States attorney of material changes in economic circumstances. 3/22/2017 Date of Imposition of Judgment Signature of Judge Sarah S. Vance, U.S. District Judge Name and Title of Judge 3/28/17 Date



Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 37 Filed 03/28/17 Page 2 of 8

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16) Judgment in Criminal Case Sheet 2 — Imprisonment

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

Judgment — Page	2	of	8

IMPRISONMENT
The defendant is hereby committed to the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of:
18 months as to Count 1 of the Bill of Information.
The court makes the following recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:
That the defendant serve his term of imprisonment in a facility near his family in Los Angeles, California.
☐ The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal.
☐ The defendant shall surrender to the United States Marshal for this district:
at a.m. p.m. on as notified by the United States Marshal.
The defendant shall surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons:
☑ before 12:00 p.m. on 5/24/2017 .
as notified by the United States Marshal.
as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Services Office.
RETURN
I have executed this judgment as follows:
Defendant delivered on to
a, with a certified copy of this judgment.
UNITED STATES MARSHAL
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 37 Filed 03/28/17 Page 3 of 8

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16) Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 3 — Supervised Release

Judgment—Page 3 of 8

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

SUPERVISED RELEASE

Upon release from imprisonment, you will be on supervised release for a term of : three years as to Count 1 of the Bill of Information.

MANDATORY CONDITIONS

1. 2. 3.	You must not commit another federal, state or local crime. You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance. You must submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter, as determined by the court. ☐ The above drug testing condition is suspended, based on the court's determination that you pose a low risk of future substance abuse. (check if applicable)
4.	✓ You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer. (check if applicable)
5.	You must comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. § 16901, et seq.) as directed by the probation officer, the Bureau of Prisons, or any state sex offender registration agency in the location where you reside, work, are a student, or were convicted of a qualifying offense. (check if applicable)
6.	☐ You must participate in an approved program for domestic violence. (check if applicable)

You must comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this court as well as with any other conditions on the attached page.

Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 37 Filed 03/28/17 Page 4 of 8

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16)

Judgment in a Criminal Case Sheet 3A — Supervised Release

Judgment—Page 4 of 8

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

STANDARD CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

As part of your supervised release, you must comply with the following standard conditions of supervision. These conditions are imposed because they establish the basic expectations for your behavior while on supervision and identify the minimum tools needed by probation officers to keep informed, report to the court about, and bring about improvements in your conduct and condition.

- You must report to the probation office in the federal judicial district where you are authorized to reside within 72 hours of your release from imprisonment, unless the probation officer instructs you to report to a different probation office or within a different time frame.
- 2. After initially reporting to the probation office, you will receive instructions from the court or the probation officer about how and when you must report to the probation officer, and you must report to the probation officer as instructed.
- 3. You must not knowingly leave the federal judicial district where you are authorized to reside without first getting permission from the court or the probation officer.
- 4. You must answer truthfully the questions asked by your probation officer.
- 5. You must live at a place approved by the probation officer. If you plan to change where you live or anything about your living arrangements (such as the people you live with), you must notify the probation officer at least 10 days before the change. If notifying the probation officer in advance is not possible due to unanticipated circumstances, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours of becoming aware of a change or expected change.
- 6. You must allow the probation officer to visit you at any time at your home or elsewhere, and you must permit the probation officer to take any items prohibited by the conditions of your supervision that he or she observes in plain view.
- 7. You must work full time (at least 30 hours per week) at a lawful type of employment, unless the probation officer excuses you from doing so. If you do not have full-time employment you must try to find full-time employment, unless the probation officer excuses you from doing so. If you plan to change where you work or anything about your work (such as your position or your job responsibilities), you must notify the probation officer at least 10 days before the change. If notifying the probation officer at least 10 days in advance is not possible due to unanticipated circumstances, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours of becoming aware of a change or expected change.
- 8. You must not communicate or interact with someone you know is engaged in criminal activity. If you know someone has been convicted of a felony, you must not knowingly communicate or interact with that person without first getting the permission of the probation officer.
- 9. If you are arrested or questioned by a law enforcement officer, you must notify the probation officer within 72 hours.
- 10. You must not own, possess, or have access to a firearm, ammunition, destructive device, or dangerous weapon (i.e., anything that was designed, or was modified for, the specific purpose of causing bodily injury or death to another person such as nunchakus or tasers).
- 11. You must not act or make any agreement with a law enforcement agency to act as a confidential human source or informant without first getting the permission of the court.
- 12. If the probation officer determines that you pose a risk to another person (including an organization), the probation officer may require you to notify the person about the risk and you must comply with that instruction. The probation officer may contact the person and confirm that you have notified the person about the risk.
- 13. You must follow the instructions of the probation officer related to the conditions of supervision.

U.S. Probation Office Use Only

A U.S. probation officer has instructed me on the conditions specified by the court and has provided me with a written of	opy of this
judgment containing these conditions. For further information regarding these conditions, see Overview of Probation and	d Supervised
Release Conditions, available at: www.uscourts.gov.	

Defendant's Signature				Date

Judgment—Page 5 of 8

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

SPECIAL CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION

In addition, the following special conditions are imposed:

The defendant shall provide complete access to financial information, including disclosure of all business and personal finances, to the United States Probation Officer.

The defendant shall not apply for, solicit or incur any further debt, included but not limited to loans, lines of credit or credit card charges, either as a principal or cosigner, as an individual or through any corporate entity, without first obtaining written permission from the United States Probation Officer.

The defendant shall pay any restitution that is imposed by this judgment.

The defendant shall maintain full-time, legitimate employment and not be unemployed for a term of more than 30 days unless excused for schooling, training, or other acceptable reasons. Further, the defendant shall provide documentation including, but not limited to pay stubs, contractual agreements, W-2 Wage and Earning Statements, and other documentation requested by the United States Probation Officer. If unemployed, the defendant shall participate in employment readiness programs, as approved by the probation officer.

As directed by the probation officer the defendant shall participate in an approved cognitive behavioral therapeutic treatment program and abide by all supplemental conditions of treatment. The defendant shall contribute to the cost of this program to the extent that the defendant is deemed capable by the United States Probation Officer.

Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 37 Filed 03/28/17 Page 6 of 8 Judgment in a Criminal Case

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16)

Sheet 5 — Criminal Monetary Penalties

Judgment Page	6	of	8

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

The defendant must pay the total criminal monetary penalties under the schedule of payments on Sheet 6.

то	TALS \$	Assessment 100.00	JVTA Asso \$ 0.00	essment*	Fine \$ 0.00	Restitu \$ 213,5	
	The determina after such dete	ation of restitution in termination.	s deferred until	An	Amended Ji	adgment in a Criminal	Case (AO 245C) will be entered
囟	The defendant	must make restitut	ion (including com	munity restitut	ion) to the fol	lowing payees in the an	ount listed below.
	If the defendar the priority or before the Uni	nt makes a partial p der or percentage p ted States is paid.	ayment, each payee ayment column bel	e shall receive a low. However	an approximat , pursuant to 1	ely proportioned payme 8 U.S.C. § 3664(i), all	ent, unless specified otherwise in nonfederal victims must be paid
	ne of Payee etlife c/o Robe	ort Hill		Total Los	<u>s**</u> 38,876.51	Restitution Ordered \$88,876.51	Priority or Percentage
	1 U.S. Highwa	ay 22 West					
Bri	idgewater, Ne	w Jersey 08807		a gelogia kana Selakuran	The second of the following		
	ianz Life c/o L 0140627	orie Wells		\$12	24,720,84	\$124,720.84	
57	01 Golden Hil	ls Drive					
		nnesota 55416					
		in the state of th				ver a	
TO?	ΓALS	s	213,59	7.35 s		213,597.35	
	Restitution an	nount ordered purs	uant to plea agreem	ent \$			
	fifteenth day a	after the date of the		t to 18 U.S.C.	§ 3612(f). Al		ine is paid in full before the s on Sheet 6 may be subject
Ø	The court dete	ermined that the de	fendant does not ha	ive the ability	to pay interest	and it is ordered that:	
	the intere	st requirement is w	aived for the	fine 🗹 1	restitution.		
	☐ the intere	st requirement for	the 🗌 fine	□ restitution	n is modified a	s follows:	

^{*} Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114-22.

** Findings for the total amount of losses are required under Chapters 109A; 110, 110A, and 113A of Title 18 for offenses committed on or after September 13, 1994, but before April 23, 1996.

Sheet 5A — Criminal Monetary Penalties

Judgment—Page 7 of

8

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

2

ADDITIONAL TERMS FOR CRIMINAL MONETARY PENALTIES

It is the finding of this Court that the defendant is not able to pay a fine. Accordingly, no fine shall be imposed; however, in accordance with 18 U.S.C. § 3663A, restitution in the amount of \$213,597.35 shall be paid to the following victims in the following amounts:

Metlife, c/o Robert Hill, 501 U.S. Highway 22 West, Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807 (\$88,876.51)

Allianz Life, c/o Lorie Wells, #20140627, 5701 Golden Hills Drive, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416 (\$124,720.84)

The payment of restitution shall begin while the defendant is incarcerated. Upon release, any unpaid balance shall be paid at a rate of \$100 per month. The payment is subject to increase or decrease, depending on the defendant's ability to pay. Any payment made that is not payment in full shall be divided proportionately among the victims. The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest on the restitution. The Court will waive the interest requirement in this case.

Payments shall be made payable to the Clerk, United States District Court, and are to be forwarded to the following address:

U.S.CLERK'S OFFICE ATTN.: FINANCIAL SECTION 500 POYDRAS STREET ROOM C151 NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA 70130

The U.S. Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. Probation Office, and the U.S. Attorney's Office are responsible for enforcement of this order.

AO 245B (Rev. 11/16)

Sheet 6 - Schedule of Payments

Judgment — Page	8	of	 8	

DEFENDANT: JOHN GIBSON CASE NUMBER: 16-103 "R"

SCHEDULE OF PAYMENTS

Hav	ing a	ssessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalties is due as follows:
Α		Lump sum payment of \$ due immediately, balance due
		not later than , or in accordance with C, D, E, or F below; or
В		Payment to begin immediately (may be combined with \square C, \square D, or \square F below); or
C		Payment in equal (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of \$ over a period of (e.g., months or years), to commence (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after the date of this judgment; or
D		Payment in equal (e.g., weekly, monthly, quarterly) installments of \$ over a period of (e.g., months or years), to commence (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisonment to a term of supervision; or
Е		Payment during the term of supervised release will commence within (e.g., 30 or 60 days) after release from imprisonment. The court will set the payment plan based on an assessment of the defendant's ability to pay at that time; or
F	Ø	Special instructions regarding the payment of criminal monetary penalties:
		\$100.00 Special Assessment is due immediately
Unle the p	ess th	e court has expressly ordered otherwise, if this judgment imposes imprisonment, payment of criminal monetary penalties is due during d of imprisonment. All criminal monetary penalties, except those payments made through the Federal Bureau of Prisons' Inmate Responsibility Program, are made to the clerk of the court.
		ndant shall receive credit for all payments previously made toward any criminal monetary penalties imposed.
	Join	nt and Several
	Def and	endant and Co-Defendant Names and Case Numbers (including defendant number), Total Amount, Joint and Several Amount, corresponding payee, if appropriate.
	The	defendant shall pay the cost of prosecution.
	The	defendant shall pay the following court cost(s):
Ø	Fo	defendant shall forfeit the defendant's interest in the following property to the United States: orfeiture of the defendant's rights, title and interest in certain property may be ordered insistent with the plea agreement and Bill of Information.
		s shall be applied in the following order: (1) assessment, (2) restitution principal, (3) restitution interest, (4) fine principal, (5) fine (6) community restitution, (7) JVTA assessment, (8) penalties, and (9) costs, including cost of prosecution and court costs.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * CRIMINAL NO. 16-103

v. * SECTION: "R"

JOHN GIBSON

FACTUAL BASIS

If this case were to proceed to trial, the United States would prove, beyond a reasonable doubt, through credible testimony and reliable evidence, the following facts:

In or around 2008 and continuing through 2014, the defendant, **JOHN GIBSON**, represented himself as a MetLife representative and Allianz agent capable of establishing and monitoring investment accounts with those entities.

In or around 2008 and continuing through 2014, the defendant, GIBSON, solicited and accepted money from individuals to be invested with Metlife and Allianz, but instead of setting up accounts with Metlife and Allianz in those individuals' names, GIBSON fraudulently diverted the monies for his own personal use.

In or around 2008, GIBSON approached S.J. and D.J. and suggested that they would benefit from investing in a Metlife account that GIBSON could establish and



monitor. Relying on GIBSON's representations, S.J. and D.J. delivered a check in the amount of \$15,000 to GIBSON. GIBSON did not create an account with Metlife on behalf of S.J. and D.J. and instead fraudulently kept the funds for his own personal use.

Between 2008 and 2011, GIBSON sent G.B. false and fraudulent account statements corresponding to the non-existent Metlife account via the United States Mail.

In or around 2010, S.J. and D.J. began to ask **GIBSON** to release their funds because they needed those monies to supplement their living expenses. In order to perpetuate the fraud, **GIBSON** agreed to release the funds and sent G.B. several checks as partial payments to S.J. and D.J. via the United States Mail.

In or around March 2009, GIBSON approached Y.B. and P.B. and suggested that Y.B. and P.B. would benefit from moving investment monies then held with Prudential into a Metlife account that GIBSON would set up and monitor. Relying on GIBSON's representations, G.B. delivered a check in the amount of \$75,000 to GIBSON. GIBSON did not create an account with Metlife on behalf of Y.B. and P.B. and instead fraudulently kept the funds for his own personal use.

Between 2009 and 2014, **GIBSON** sent Y.B. and P.B. false and fraudulent account statements via the United States Mail corresponding to the non-existent Metlife account.

In or around March 2014, Y.B. and P.B. began to ask GIBSON to release their funds because they needed those monies to supplement their living expenses. GIBSON agreed to release the funds, but never in fact returned any money to Y.B. and P.B.

In or around October 2009, GIBSON approached G.B. and suggested that G.B. would benefit from moving investment monies then held with Prudential into an Allianz account that GIBSON would set up and monitor. Relying on GIBSON's representations,

G.B. delivered a check in the amount of \$79,348 to GIBSON. GIBSON did not create an account with Allianz on behalf of G.B. and instead fraudulently kept the funds for his own personal use.

Between 2009 and 2014, GIBSON sent G.B. false and fraudulent account statements corresponding to the non-existent Allianz account via the United States Mail.

In or around March 2014, G.B. began to ask **GIBSON** to release his funds because he needed those monies to supplement his living expenses. In order to perpetuate the fraud, **GIBSON** agreed to release the funds and sent G.B. several money orders as partial payments via the United States Mail.

From 2008 through 2014, in the Eastern District of Louisiana and elsewhere, the defendant, JOHN GIBSON, for the purpose of executing and attempting to execute the scheme and artifice to defraud set forth above and for the purpose of obtaining money and property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, as set forth above, did unlawfully, willfully, and knowingly utilized the United States Mail; to wit, and solely as examples: on or about March 31, 2012, and in furtherance of the scheme to defraud, GIBSON mailed Y.B. and P.B. a false and fraudulent account statement corresponding to the non-existent Metlife account via the United States Mail; on or about August 13, 2014, in furtherance of the scheme to defraud, GIBSON mailed G.B. a money order in the amount of \$250.00 as a fictitious withdrawal from the non-existent Allianz account; in or about 2011, in furtherance of the scheme to defraud, GIBSON mailed S.J. and D.J. a check in the amount of \$1,000.00 as a fictitious withdrawal from the non-existent Metflife account.

Case 2:16-cr-00103-SSV-DEK Document 18 Filed 07/18/16 Page 4 of 4

In summary, all of the evidence introduced at trial would establish the elements of the offense and prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Moreover, the above described statement is not intended to constitute a complete statement of all facts and evidence of the defendant's guilt in this case, but rather is a minimum statement of facts necessary to establish a factual predicate for the guilty plea.

READ AND APPROVED:

JOHN GIBSON

Defendant

TOWNSEND MYERS (date

Counsel for Defendant

SEAN TOOMEY (date

Assistant U.S. Attorney

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA						
3	**************************************						
4	VS. March 22, 2017						
5	JOHN GIBSON Section R						
6	************						
7	REPORTER'S OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF THE SENTENCING HEARING						
8	BEFORE THE HONORABLE SARAH S. VANCE						
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE						
10	**************						
11	ADDEADANCEC						
12	APPEARANCES:						
13	For the Government: MR. SEAN M. TOOMEY						
14	U.S. Attorney's Office 650 Poydras Street						
15	Suite 1600 New Orleans, LA 70130						
16							
17	For the Defendant: MR. TOWNSEND M. MYERS Townsend M. Myers, APLC						
	700 Camp Street						
18	Suite 213 New Orleans, LA 70130						
19							
20	Official Court Reporter: Lanie M. Smith, RPR, CRR						
21	500 Poydras Street, B-275 New Orleans, Louisiana 70130						
22	(504) 589-7782						
23							
24							
25	Proceedings reported using computerized stenotype; transcript produced via computer-aided transcription.						



1

2

3

4

5

.

09:51AM

6 7

8

9

09:51AM 10

11

13

14

12

09:52AM 15

16

17 18

19

09:52AM 20

21

22

23

24

09:52AM 25

PROCEEDINGS

(Call to order of the court.)

THE COURTROOM MANAGER: First up on the Court's criminal document, criminal case 16-103, USA versus

John Gibson.

Mr. Gibson, please step up to the podium.

Counsel, please make your appearances for the record.

MR. TOOMEY: Good morning, Your Honor. Sean Toomey on behalf of the United States.

MR. MYERS: Good morning, Your Honor. Townsend Myers appearing on behalf of and with John Gibson.

THE COURT: This matter is before the Court for sentencing. Is there any reason that sentence cannot be imposed at this time?

MR. MYERS: Not by the defense, Your Honor.

MR. TOOMEY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'll begin by there was a Rule 11(c)(1)(C) plea agreement in this case in which the defendant agreed to plead guilty to Count 1 of the bill of information and in return the government agreed not to charge him with any other violations of Federal law that he may have committed in the Eastern District of Louisiana provided that he truthfully informed the government of those crimes before pleading guilty.

1.

. .

The government also agreed to seek a three-point 1 offense level reduction for timely acceptance of responsibility 2 and agreed that the correct loss amount for the purposes of 3 calculating the defendant's guideline sentencing range is 4 between \$95,000 and \$150,000. 5 09:52AM The Court accepts the plea agreement because it 6 adequately reflects the seriousness of the offense, avoids the 7 uncertainty of trial and does not undermine the statutory 8 purposes of sentencing. You forgot you had that in there? 09:53AM 10 MR. TOOMEY: I'm sorry, Your Honor. I'm looking at the 11 12 plea agreement now. THE COURT: It's on the first page, I think. 13 (Brief pause in the proceedings.) 14 09:53AM 15 THE COURT: Do y'all have a different one? 16 MR. MYERS: Your Honor, Record Document No. 19. not see that language in terms of the dollar amounts. 17 THE COURT: Yeah. And we went over this at the 18 rearraignment as a (c)(1)(C) plea agreement because you agreed 19 09:53AM 20 to the loss amount which is the sentencing factor. I apologize, Your Honor (Reviewing). 21 MR. TOOMEY: (Brief pause in the proceedings.) 22 23 THE COURT: You want to go look at it? What?

24

09:54AM 25

MR. TOOMEY: The Court just provided me with

Record Document 19. I don't see that language, Your Honor.

I do

09:55AM 09:55AM 10 09:55AM 15 09:55AM 20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: It's not in the one that's in the record? No.

Where did we get this?

MR. TOOMEY: Maybe if we could pass this, Your Honor; and let me just review this briefly.

THE COURT: Well, which one --

MR. TOOMEY: I don't recall another plea agreement, Your Honor.

Because we have one. I have one that I'm THE COURT: looking at right now dated June 24th. You must have come in with another one.

MR. MYERS: If I could clarify, Your Honor. I believe that is the case that there had been an earlier discussion about a plea along those lines, but that that had been submitted as a draft plea agreement and it was supplemented by the plea agreement that Counsel is referencing as Record Document Number 19. So I would agree that that language was not in the plea agreement that we signed.

Then we're going to have to take a THE COURT: Okav. break for me to read this because --

MR. TOOMEY: I'll note, Your Honor, that I have reviewed the presentence report and I do not believe the presentence report reflects the --

THE COURT: It doesn't and that's why I was wondering what planet you guys were on because I had a different plea

09:56AM 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

23

24

10:34AM 25

agreement in my materials and I didn't realize that there was a different one than the one we had in the file on the --

> I apologize for the confusion. MR. TOOMEY:

THE COURT: No, it's probably on my end. You just need to give me some time. We're going to take a break and do another sentencing, and we'll come back and do this one.

> Thank you, Judge. MR. TOOMEY:

> > (Court is in recess.)

THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Criminal case 16-103, USA versus John Gibson.

THE COURT: All right. We had started this proceeding a few minutes ago and I had the wrong plea agreement and I just want to put on the record and make sure that we're all on the same page that the proper plea agreement was the plea agreement submitted dated July 18, 2016; is that correct?

MR. TOOMEY: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. MYERS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And that plea agreement did not have an agreement as to the proper loss amount for the purposes of quideline calculations?

MR. MYERS: That's correct, Your Honor.

Yes, ma'am. MR. TOOMEY:

Then why don't we just start from the THE COURT: beginning on this hearing and whatever happened before is noted as an error and we'll proceed.

MR. MYERS: If I could also, Your Honor, I failed to 1 also mention in addition to obviously Mr. Gibson who is present 2 in court beside me: his wife, Angelle, is here; his mother, 3 Winda Christopher; and his two children are also here in the 4 audience. I just wanted to make that a part of the record as 5 10:35AM well. 6 Thank you. This matter is before the Court 7 THE COURT: for sentencing. Is there any reason that sentence cannot be 8 imposed at this time? 9 MR. TOOMEY: No. Your Honor. 10:35AM 10 MR. MYERS: No, Your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Gibson, have you received a copy of the 12 13 presentence investigation report? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: I understand that neither the government 10:35AM 15 nor the defendant has any objections to the report; is that 16 17 right? MR. TOOMEY: Yes, Your Honor. 18 MR. MYERS: That's right, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Since there are no objections to the 10:35AM 20 report, is it correct for me to state that there are no errors, 21 corrections, alterations, additions or objections that either 22 the government or the defendant wishes to make to the report? 23 MR. TOOMEY: That's correct, Your Honor. 24

MR. MYERS: That's correct.

10:35AM 25

1 2

3

4

10:36AM

6 7

5

8 9

10:36AM 10

11

12 13

14

10:36AM 15

16

17

18 19

10:36AM 20

21

22

23

24

10:36AM **25**

THE COURT: Since there are no objections to the presentence investigation report, the Court adopts its statements of fact and orders the report, except for the sentencing recommendation, filed under seal.

Mr. Gibson, you've been found guilty of one count of mail fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341. There was a Rule 11(c)(1)(A) plea agreement in this case in which the defendant agreed to plead guilty to Count 1 of the bill of information. In return the government agreed not to charge the defendant with any violations of Federal law that he may have committed in the Eastern District of Louisiana, provided that he truthfully inform the government of those crimes prior to pleading guilty. The government also agreed to seek a three-point offense level reduction for timely acceptance of responsibility.

Has there been such a motion?

MR. TOOMEY: Your Honor, at this time I would make that motion orally.

THE COURT: All right. The motion is granted.

The Court accepts the plea agreement because it adequately reflects the seriousness of the offense, avoids the uncertainty of trial and does not undermine the statutory purposes of sentencing.

I have consulted the United States Sentencing
Guidelines and determined that the advisory sentencing range is

. 2

10:37AM

10:37AM 10

10:38AM 15

10:38AM 20

10:38AM 25

as follows: You have a total offense level of 14, a criminal history category of I, which indicates a guideline range of 15 to 21 months imprisonment; a fine range of 4,000 to \$427,194.70; restitution in the amount of \$213,597.35 and a \$100 special assessment.

The defendant has moved for a downward departure from the guideline range or in the alternative for a downward variance. The Court is prepared to rule on that.

First, the Court addresses the defendant's argument that his offense was aberrant behavior and that he is entitled to a departure under Section 5K.2.20 of the sentencing guidelines. Under that section, the Court may depart downward only if the defendant committed a single criminal occurrence or single criminal transaction that was committed without significant planning, was of limited duration and represents a marked deviation by the defendant from an otherwise law-abiding life.

Although the defendant does not have a criminal record, that is not enough to qualify for a departure under this section. As detailed in the factual basis, the defendant defrauded several individuals over a period of more than five years. This is far from the sort of spontaneous and seemingly thoughtless act that constitutes aberrant behavior under Fifth Circuit precedent and the Court therefore finds that a departure for aberrant behavior is not warranted.

10:38AM

10:39AM 10

10:39AM 15

•

10:39AM 20

10:39AM 25

Next the Court addresses the defendant's argument that a departure under Section 5H1.5 is warranted for his employment record.

Under the sentencing guidelines and Fifth Circuit precedent, the defendant's employment record is not ordinarily relevant in determining whether a departure is warranted. A departure is warranted only when this characteristic is present to an exceptional degree.

The PSR states that the defendant works from home as a clinical research associate, but the mere fact that the defendant is employed is not enough to warrant a departure.

Accordingly the Court finds that the defendant's employment record is not sufficiently exceptional to warrant a departure.

The defendant also argues that he's entitled to a departure under 5H1.6 for family ties and responsibilities.

The defendant is married with two daughters. Under the sentencing guidelines, family ties and responsibilities are not ordinarily relevant in determining whether a sentence should be imposed outside the applicable guideline range. The issue is whether the defendant's family ties and responsibilities are sufficiently exceptional to justify a downward departure.

The guidelines instruct that in determining whether a departure for family responsibilities is warranted, the Court shall ascertain whether the defendant serving a

10:40AM

10:40AM 10

10:40AM 15

10:40AM 20

10:41AM 25

sentence within the applicable guideline range will cause substantial, direct and specific loss of essential caretaking or essential financial support to the defendant's family. The loss of caretaking or financial support substantially exceeds the harm ordinarily incident to incarceration for a similarly-situated defendant. The loss of caretaking or financial support is one for which no effective remedial or ameliorative programs are reasonably available making the defendant's caretaking or financial support irreplaceable and the departure effectively will address the loss of caretaking or financial support.

Here the defendant has made no showing that the loss of caretaking and financial support for his family resulting from a guideline sentence substantially exceeds the harm ordinarily incident to incarceration for a similarly-situated defendant. Many defendants are married and have children. The defendant provides no reason why his wife cannot provide financial and caretaking support or why this care or support cannot be supplemented by private or public assistance.

Accordingly the Court finds that the defendant's family responsibilities are not sufficient to warrant a departure.

The Court also addresses his argument that his charitable and civic contributions warrant a departure. In

1. •

2

3

10:41AM

6 7

5

8 9

10:41AM 10

11

12

13

14

10:42AM 15

16

17

18

19

10:42AM 20

21

22

23

24

10:42AM 25

support the defendant points to his degree in theology and his 100 hours of community service with Uplifting Kids charity.

Guideline Section 5H1.11 instructs that civic, charitable or public service activities and similar prior good works are not ordinarily relevant in determining whether a departure is warranted. Although defendant's charitable work is admirable, the Court finds consistent with Section 5H1.11 that this work does not warrant a departure. That's 5H1.11.

For these reasons, the defendant's motion for a departure is denied. As for the variance motion, the Court may grant a downward variance; but the Court finds that a downward variance is not warranted in this case. Selecting a non-quideline sentence is within the discretion of the sentencing court. In imposing a sentence sufficient but not greater than necessary, the Court considers not only the defendant's history and characteristics; but also numerous other factors, including the nature and circumstances of the offense; the need for the sentence to reflect the seriousness of the offense; the need to promote respect for the law; the need to deter criminal conduct and the need to protect the public from further crimes by the defendant. The defendant's crimes, although nonviolent, are serious. The Court finds that the sentencing guidelines accurately reflect the seriousness of the defendant's crime. Although the defendant has no criminal history, that fact is incorporated into the sentencing

10:42AM

10:43AM 10

10:43AM 15

10:43AM 20

10:44AM 25

calculation. The defendant is employed, has family obligations and has performed charitable work; but none of these factors are present to an unusual degree.

Accordingly the motion for a downward variance is denied.

Are there any victims who would like to be heard?

MR. TOOMEY: Yes, Your Honor, I believe there are.

THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Good morning, ma'am. If you would just state your name for the record, please.

MS. GOSIN: Good morning, Judge. My name is Lillian Baham Gosin. I am the daughter of Poleate Baham who is 90 years old and the late Yvonne Baham. They're victims of Mr. Gibson.

If you don't mind, I'm going to read my statement just for the sake of nerves and getting through it.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MS. GOSIN: Judge, I'm the one who discovered that Mr. Gibson stole money from my parents. Mr. Gibson is the husband of my niece Angelle. I love my niece; and as I have explained to her mother, my oldest sister, when the theft was first discovered, my position has always been that who Angelle chose to live her life with was totally her business and not mine. It was only after Mr. Gibson went into my parent's home and stole money from them that I involved myself, not in Angelle's life, but in what he had done to my parents.

10:44AM

10:44AM 10

10:44AM 15

10:45AM 20

10:45AM 25

I was living and working in Denver at the time; however, I was coming home on an average of once a month. My husband was still living and working here so we went back and forth. Each time that I was home, I visited my parents. It was on one of those occasions that my mom, dad and I were in my mom's bedroom. She was too weak to get out of bed that day. She looked up at me and said to me, "Lillian, I don't understand why we can't get our money. We want our money."

I responded, "What money? What are you talking about, Mom?"

She said that she had been trying to contact

Angelle's husband because they had invested money with him, but
that he was not calling them back. She told me that they
always have problems getting their statements and each time
they would talk to my sister and eventually a statement would
show up.

At that time she told my daddy to go get them. She said, "Go get the letters."

He came back, and he laid about 20 letters on the bed. I opened the letters and could not believe what I was looking at. At first glance, the statements looked like MetLife forms; but it became very clear very fast that these were made-up forms. I spent hours with my parents that day showing them that the letters were fake and trying to console them at the same time. I explained to them that the postmarks

10:45AM 5

10:46AM 10

10:46AM 15

10:46AM 20

10:47AM 25

_

on the envelope indicated they came from a different address than the MetLife address on the so-called statements. I explained to them that I would look into this for them.

I contacted my daughter, Lindsey, who is an attorney. I contacted my youngest sister, Lawanna, because I knew that she had some financial experience and knowledge. The three of us examined the documents. We found where Mr. Gibson used an account number. We contacted MetLife and learned that Mr. Gibson never invested any money in my parent's name; that the account was not real and that, in fact, we learned that on the day that Mr. Gibson went to my parent's house; convinced them to take their money out of a legitimate account with Prudential and taking a loss in doing so; turning over the money to him; that that day, he did not even possess the necessary license to invest their money.

It became obvious that Mr. Gibson walked into my parent's house with the intent to steal from them. It became obvious that Mr. Gibson took my parent's money and moved away to California, never intending to invest my parent's money.

Needless to say, this resulted in chaos within the family. I remember standing in Office Depot faxing documents to MetLife in an attempt to recoup their losses. At the same time I was on the phone with one of my sisters who was crying and telling me that pursuing this could kill Daddy because after all the years of protecting his stuff, for him to

10:47AM

10:47AM 10

10:47AM 15

10:48AM 20

10:48AM 25

realize that someone walked in and stole his money was going to kill him. This was very stressful.

But I; along with my daughter Lindsey and Lawanna, my sister, continued to work through the agonizing situation and were able to recoup some of my parent's losses. I want to make it clear that the recoup funds came from MetLife insurance and not from Mr. Gibson. He has never returned a penny.

My parents worked hard for everything they had.

My daddy entered the service in World War II at the age of 15.

My daddy and mama married in the early Fifties and worked to make a living during some very difficult and challenging times.

It was not easy for people of color.

My mama told me that when they were living in New Orleans, she went to work at a candy store and the owner told her that since she was a pretty colored girl, she needed to stand in the window showing pralines to the people passing by to draw customers.

My daddy who loves coffee told me that when he was in the Navy, the Red Cross volunteers would give coffee to the German prisoners of war and not the colored soldiers.

Now, I'm saying that to demonstrate to the Court how hard it was for my parents to acquire their honest money.

Regardless of the injustices that they had to endure, they were always proud and eager to talk about how blessed they were to

10:48AM

10:48AM 10

10:49AM 15

10:49AM 20

10:49AM 25

be able to take care of themselves and that they would never have to rely on their children financially in their old age as they would say.

It took a lot of prayers. They are both devout Catholics. It took the love that they have for each other and their children to outweigh the injustices.

Now, it is my opinion that anyone who can walk into the home of their wife's grandparents -- a grandmother stricken with Parkinson's and a grandfather in his Eighties who is trying to be the primary caretaker of his wife -- and steal their hard-earned money, that person, Mr. Gibson, does not have a conscience. It is not going to change.

Mr. Gibson is someone that doesn't understand the term "honest living," and he doesn't understand the true value of money. My parents did. They prayed hard; worked hard; were responsible, honest people. They raised a family of seven children and provided a good home through a lot of sacrificing.

Mr. Gibson sees money for who has it and what will it take for him to get some of someone else's hard-earned money for nothing. It is my opinion that he will not change.

There will be other victims of Mr. Gibson.

This brings me to my last point. Soon after my Mama passed in February 2016, my daddy and I were taking care of some of his business at the bank. After leaving the bank, while driving, I noticed that my daddy was quiet and sad. I

2

3

4

10:50AM 5

6

7

8

9

10:50AM 10

11

12

13 14

10:50AM 15

16

17

18

19

10:50AM 20

21

22

23

24

10:51AM 25

asked him what was on his mind. I thought he was going to say that he missed Mama and that he didn't understand why she had to die because that was a conversation we were having on a daily basis and I would talk to him about her being in heaven and being safe and not having to suffer anymore and those type of things.

But that wasn't on his mind after leaving the bank that day. He turned to me and he said this and this is his words, "I'm just thinking about all the old people that don't have somebody like you. They probably have money somewhere that they have forgotten about or someone has stolen from them that they could never get back."

He told me that he wanted me to know that he appreciated everything that I had done for him and Mama and what I was doing to help him. This is why I'm standing here in front of you because if I could have influence to prevent just one more elderly person from being a victim of Mr. Gibson, I have honored my parents.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'm really sorry this has happened to your family.

 ${\tt MS.~GOSIN:}~{\tt Yes,}~{\tt it~was~devastating.}~{\tt Thank~you.}$

THE COURT: I'm sure it was.

MR. TOOMEY: This is Mr. Gary Baham. He's one of the victims in this case, and he has already provided a letter to

the Court.

Is there anything in addition you would like to tell the Court?

MR. BAHAM: No, not really.

MS. SMITH: I'm Yvonne Smith. I'm Gary's sister, and I was going to read his letter on his behalf because it's too difficult for him.

THE COURT: Fine.

MS. SMITH: "My name is Gary Baham, and I have been financially ruined. I worked for the same employer for more than 30 years; and after losing my job due to being laid off, I thought I properly invested my retirement savings, but instead it was stolen from me. For years I was told that my investment was gaining me enormous returns when all the while I had no investment at all. I received false financial statements and constant reassurances from John Gibson that my money was secure and that the longer that I left it in this account, the gains would be extraordinary. I have paid back taxes and penalties because the money that I thought that I was investing was instead spent, not by me, but all the IRS knew is that it wasn't invested properly in order for me to receive tax exemptions. The IRS knew more than I did.

"When I contacted my investment agent,

John Gibson, I was told that he would notify the IRS and

provide them with any documentation that they would need. The

10:51AM

10:51AM 10

10:51AM 15

10:52AM 20

10:52AM 25

. . .

result was obviously that I still had a big tax bill. 1 "I have been cited by the city to make repairs to 2 my house and do not have the money to do that. I am 65 years 3 old, and do not know how I am going to make it to the next day. 4 "I pray that this Court will order full 10:52AM 5 restitution to me and all the victims of this horrendous 6 fraud." 7 And if I may for the record state that I am 8 Gary's sister and my parents also were affected and my niece 9 and my oldest sister whom I love dearly and I love my niece and 10:53AM 10 her children. And it is a further indication of the enormous 11 pain that this has caused our family. 12 I must also add that I've seen the painful, real 13 consequences that my brother continues to suffer every day 14 10:53AM 15 because of the defendant's actions. Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you. Again, I'm really sorry that 16 this happened to you. I think it's outrageous. 17 Is there anybody else? 18 MR. TOOMEY: No. Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: There's somebody in the back. 10:53AM 20 MR. MYERS: That's Mr. Gibson's wife who wanted to 21 speak on his behalf, Your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: Briefly.

24

10:53AM 25

MS. GIBSON: Hi, Your Honor. As you see, this affected

my family; and I hate that it did. I pray that they can

. . .

10:54AM

10:54AM 10

10:55AM 15

10:55AM 20

10:55AM 25

forgive him. I pray that you'll show mercy on him because it does impact me and my children for him if he gets prison time. We do count on his income and it would be devastating, especially to our three-year-old and I just pray that you can show him some mercy and that my family can forgive him. That's all I have to say.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Gibson, is there anything you want to say?

THE DEFENDANT: I would just like to say that,

Your Honor, this happened in 2009 and I know my wife's family

mentioned that I cannot change but, Your Honor I have changed.

And I have not touched any money since 2009. I'm a hard worker

and I turned my life around and I work every day to provide for

my wife, our newborn baby and our son.

I know what I did was wrong, Your Honor. Before this even came to court, I made restitution to the victims myself. I tried to do the best that I could, and then MetLife went ahead and reimbursed the victims for the amount that they had invested with me.

This has caused so much pain to my family and my wife and my kids that, Your Honor, we're just trying to put the pieces back together. And I just ask for your mercy that I can continue to provide for my family; continue to be a good citizen, Your Honor and continue to be a better man.

THE COURT: Counsel, is there anything you want to say?

10:56AM

10:56AM 10

10:56AM 15

10:56AM 20

10:57AM 25

MR. MYERS: No, Your Honor. I would rest on what I submitted to the Court.

THE COURT: All right. Does the government have anything?

MR. TOOMEY: Your Honor, I think we've already submitted our position. I do want to, again, just note for the Court that this is a horrible case. It's a tragedy all around.

But I do recognize that this defendant did come forward immediately via a bill of information and accepted responsibility. It doesn't mitigate and take away from the obvious horrific conduct and the damages he's caused to obviously his own family, but I do think it's appropriate to acknowledge that from the government.

THE COURT: All right. I get the impression that the defendant wants to act like, you know, nothing happened. I mean, that to go forward and say, "I'm sorry" and act like nothing happened and that's not the way it works. And a lot of this pain was caused by him, the pain on his wife was caused by him.

So I just don't understand how somebody could do something to these hard-working people who struggled their whole lives to be independent and save money and to steal from them like that is just beyond my imagination to conceive.

But in any event, I've considered the advisory guidelines and all the factors set forth in Section 3553(a) and

find it appropriate to give the defendant a sentence within the quideline range.

It is the judgment of the Court that the defendant John Gibson is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 18 months.

10:57AM

The Court imposes this sentence because it's sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the statutory purposes of sentencing. Specifically the sentence adequately reflects the seriousness of the offense, the need for deterrence and to promote respect for the law and the

defendant's acceptance of responsibility.

10:57AM 10

10:58AM 15

10:58AM 20

10:58AM 25

The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay a fine and no fine shall be imposed. Restitution is mandatory. The defendant owes a total of \$213,597.35 in restitution. Restitution in the amount of \$124,720.84 is owed to Allianz Life and restitution in the amount of \$88,876.51 is owed to MetLife. The payment of restitution shall began while the defendant is incarcerated. Upon his release, any unpaid balance will be paid at the rate of \$100 a month. This payment is subject to increase or decrease depending on the defendant's ability to pay. The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest on the restitution. The Court, therefore, will waive the interest requirement.

Upon your release from imprisonment, you shall be

10:59AM

10:59AM 10

10:59AM 15

10:59AM 20

11:00AM 25

placed on supervised release for a term of three years. Withir 72 hours of your release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, you shall report in person to the probation office in the district where you're released.

While you're on supervised release, you shall not commit any federal, state or local crime and you shall not possess a firearm or other dangerous weapon. You shall not possess a controlled substance, you shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample, and you shall comply with the mandatory and standard conditions of supervised release adopted by this Court.

In addition, I impose the following special conditions: You shall participate in an approved cognitive behavioral therapeutic treatment program and abide by all supplemental conditions of treatment. You shall contribute to the cost of the program to the extent you're deemed capable by the probation officer; the financial disclosure condition and the financial restriction condition which are imposed as a result of the nature of the offense; the defendant shall pay the restitution imposed by this judgement; the defendant shall maintain full-time employment.

It's further ordered that the defendant shall immediately pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100.

Mr. Gibson, in your plea agreement you waived

11:00AM 11:00AM 10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

11:00AM 15

19

17

18

11:01AM 20

21 22

23

24

11:01AM 25

your right to challenge your conviction or your sentence except on direct appeal of any sentence that's imposed in excess of the statutory maximum. Because the sentence I imposed is below the statutory maximum, you have no right to directly appeal your sentence or conviction; but you may have a right to bring a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel in an appropriate proceeding.

I'm going to order you to self-surrender. How much time do you need?

MR. MYERS: Could we have 60 days, Your Honor?

THE COURT: In 60 days.

MR. MYERS: And may I also request to the extent that the Court is able to make the request, Mr. Gibson's family and children are in Los Angeles, California. If the Bureau of Prisons would consider placement -- I guess that would be the Southern District of California.

THE COURT: California is the Central District of California, I think.

MR. MYERS: Los Angeles. You are right.

THE COURT: All right. The Court will recommend that the defendant be designated in a facility close to his family in the Central District of California.

THE COURTROOM MANAGER: Self-surrender date is May 24th, Judge.

THE COURT: All right.

	1	All right. Mr. Gibson, if you don't surrender
	2	yourself at the place and on the date designated in this order,
	3	you can be prosecuted for contempt of court which would result
	4	in another conviction and sentence. Do you understand that?
11:01AM	5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
	6	THE COURT: Is there anything further?
	7	MR. TOOMEY: No, Your Honor.
	8	THE COURT: All right.
	9	MR. MYERS: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
11:01AM	10	THE COURTROOM MANAGER: All rise.
	11	(WHEREUPON, the proceedings were adjourned.)
	12	* * *
	13	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
	14	I, Lanie M. Smith, CRR, RPR, Official Court Reporter, United States District Court, Eastern District of
	15	Louisiana, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability and
	16	understanding, from the record of the proceedings in the above-entitled and numbered matter.
	17	
	18	<u>/s/ Lanie M. Smith</u> Official Court Reporter
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that an original and three copies of the foregoing were filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission, Office of the Secretary, 100 F Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20549-9303, and that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served by overnight, on this 24th day of April 2017, on the following persons entitled to notice:

The Honorable James E. Grimes Administrative Law Judge Securities and Exchange Commission 100 F Street, N.E. Washington, D.C. 20549

John Austin Gibson, Jr.

Pro Se

Studio City, CA

Andrew O. Schiff
Regional Trial Counsel