```
THOMAS P. O'BRIEN
     United States Attorney
    CHRISTINE C. EWELL
     Assistant United States Attorney
    Chief, Criminal Division
     RONALD L. CHENG (Cal. State Bar No.: 138892)
    Assistant United States Attorney
     Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes Section
  5
          1200 United States Courthouse
          312 North Spring Street
          Los Angeles, California 90012
Telephone: (213) 894-8644
Facsimile: (213) 894-8601
  6
  7
          E-mail: Ronald.Cheng@usdoj.gov
  8
     Attorneys for Plaintiff
  9
    UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
 10
 11
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12
                   FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13
                               WESTERN DIVISION
 14
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                     ) CR No. 08-1208-JFW
15
                     Plaintiff,
                                       PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT
16
                                       NICHOLAS LAKES
                   v.
17
    NICHOLAS LAKES,
18
       aka Dmitry Livshits,
19
                 Defendant.
20
21
             This constitutes the plea agreement between Nicholas
22
   Lakes, aka Dmitry Livshits ("defendant"), and the United States
23
   Attorney's Office for the Central District of California ("the
24
   USAO") in the above-captioned case. This agreement is limited to
25
   the USAO and cannot bind any other federal, state or local
26
   prosecuting, administrative or regulatory authorities.
27
                                    PLEA
28
             Defendant gives up the right to indictment by a grand
```

1 jury and agrees to plead guilty to a six-count information in the 2 form attached to this agreement or a substantially similar form.

NATURE OF THE OFFENSES

3. In order for defendant to be guilty of counts one and two of the first superseding information, which charge violations of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1030(a)(4), the following must be true:

First, the defendant knowingly accessed without authorization or exceeded authorized access of a computer that (a) was not exclusively for the use of the United States government, but the defendant's access affected the computer's use by or for the United States government or (b) was used in interstate or foreign commerce or communication;

Second, the defendant did so with the intent to defraud;

Third, by accessing the computer without authorization or exceeding authorized access to the computer, the defendant furthered the intended fraud; and

Fourth, the defendant by accessing the computer without authorization or exceeding authorized access to the computer obtained anything of value.

In order for defendant to be guilty of counts three through five of the first superseding information, which charge violations of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341, the following must be true:

3 4

5 б

7 8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

27 28

First, the defendant made up a scheme or plan for obtaining money or property by making false promises or statements, and there was at least one particular false promise or statement that was made;

Second, the defendant knew that the promises or statements were false;

Third, the promises or statements were material, that is they would reasonably influence a person to part with money or property;

Fourth, the defendant acted with the intent to defraud; and

Fifth, the defendant used, or caused to be used, the mails to carry out or attempt to carry out an essential part of the scheme.

A mailing is caused when one knows that the mails will be used in the ordinary course of business or when one can reasonably foresee such use. It does not matter whether the material mailed was itself false or deceptive so long as the mail was used as a part of the scheme, nor does it matter whether the scheme or plan was successful or that any money or property was obtained.

23 ||In addition, defendant may be guilty of these crimes if he aided and abetted their commission. In order for defendant to be 25 guilty of aiding and abetting a crime under Title 18, United 26 States Code, Section 2, the following must be true:

> First, the crime was committed by someone; Second, the defendant knowingly and intentionally

4

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12

13 14

15

18

19

20

aided, counseled, commanded, induced or procured that person to commit each element of the charged crime; and

Third, the defendant acted before the crime was completed.

It is not enough that the defendant merely associated with the person committing the crime, or unknowingly or unintentionally did things that were helpful to that person, or was present at the scene of the crime.

The defendant must have acted with the knowledge and intention of helping that person commit the charged crime.

It is not necessary for the government to prove precisely which defendant actually committed the crime and which defendant aided and abetted.

Defendant admits that defendant is, in fact, guilty of these offenses as described in counts one through five of the first superseding information.

PENALTIES AND RESTITUTION

The statutory maximum sentence that the Court can impose for each violation of Title 18, United States Code, 22 ||Section 1030(a)(4), is: five years imprisonment; a three-year 23 period of supervised release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the 24 gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is 25 greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100. 26 |statutory maximum sentence that the Court can impose for each 27 |violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1341, is: 28 twenty years imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised

1 |release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$100.

3

4

6

10

11

14

- Therefore, the total maximum sentence for all offenses to which defendant is pleading guilty is: 70 years imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised release; a fine of \$1.25 million or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offenses, whichever is greatest; and a mandatory special assessment of \$500.
- The Court will also order forfeiture of the property listed in count six pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), or substitute assets up to the value of that property.
- Defendant understands that defendant will be required to pay full restitution to the victims of the offenses. Defendant agrees that, in return for the USAO's compliance with 17 lits obligations under this agreement, the amount of restitution 18 is not restricted to the amounts alleged in the counts to which 19 defendant is pleading guilty and may include losses arising from 20 |counts dismissed as well as all relevant conduct in connection 21 with those counts. The government informs defendant that the 22 applicable amount of restitution is \$3.5 million, but the parties 23 recognize and agree that this amount could change based on facts 24 that come to the attention of the parties prior to sentencing. 25 |Defendant further agrees that defendant will not seek the 26 discharge of any restitution obligation, in whole or in part, in 27 any present or future bankruptcy proceeding.
 - Supervised release is a period of time following 8.

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

Defendant also understands that, by pleading guilty, 9. defendant may be giving up valuable government benefits and valuable civic rights, such as the right to vote, the right to possess a firearm, the right to hold office, and the right to serve on a jury.

7

8

12

13

15

20

21

Defendant further understands that the conviction in this case may subject defendant to various collateral consequences, including but not limited to deportation, 16 revocation of probation, parole, or supervised release in another 17 case, and suspension or revocation of a professional license. Defendant understands that unanticipated collateral consequences 19 will not serve as grounds to withdraw defendant's guilty plea.

FACTUAL BASIS

11. Defendant and the USAO agree and stipulate to the 22 statement of facts attached at the end of this plea agreement. 23 |This statement of facts is sufficient to support pleas of guilty 24 to the charges described in this agreement and to establish the 25 sentencing guideline factors set forth in paragraph 15 below. 26 is not meant to be a complete recitation of all facts relevant to 27 the underlying criminal conduct or all facts known to either 28 party that relate to that conduct.

WAIVER OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

12. By pleading guilty, defendant gives up the following rights:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

13

16

17

18

19

21

22

25

- a) The right to persist in a plea of not guilty.
- b) The right to a speedy and public trial by jury.
- c) The right to the assistance of legal counsel at trial, including the right to have the Court appoint counsel for defendant for the purpose of representation at trial. (In this regard, defendant understands that, despite his pleas of quilty, he retains the right to be represented by counsel -- and, if necessary, to have the court appoint counsel if defendant cannot afford counsel -- at every other stage of the proceeding.)
- d) The right to be presumed innocent and to have the burden of proof placed on the government to prove defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
- e) The right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against defendant.
- f) The right, if defendant wished, to testify on defendant's own behalf and present evidence in opposition to the charges, including the right to call witnesses and to subpoena those witnesses to testify.
- g) The right not to be compelled to testify, and, if 23 defendant chose not to testify or present evidence, to have that 24 choice not be used against defendant.

By pleading guilty, defendant also gives up any and all 26 rights to pursue any affirmative defenses, Fourth Amendment or 27 ||Fifth Amendment claims, and other pretrial motions that have been 28 filed or could be filed.

WAIVER OF DNA TESTING

1

25

2 Defendant has been advised that the government has in 3 its possession the following items of physical evidence that could be subjected to DNA testing: Documents and files, cellular 4 telephones, checks, check stamps, and computers seized on 5 September 25, 2008, from 2211 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, 6 California, and 720 Orange Grove Avenue, Apartment 7, Glendale, 7 California. Defendant understands that the government does not intend to conduct DNA testing of any of these items for DNA testing and does not intend to conduct any further DNA testing of those items or any other items. Defendant understands that, before entering quilty pleas pursuant to this agreement, defendant could request DNA testing of evidence in this case. Defendant further understands that, with respect to the offenses to which defendant is pleading quilty pursuant to this agreement, defendant would have the right to request DNA testing of evidence after conviction under the conditions specified in 18 U.S.C. § 3600. Knowing and understanding defendant's right to request DNA testing, defendant voluntarily gives up that right with respect to both the specific items listed above and any other items of evidence there may be in this case that might be amenable to DNA testing. Defendant understands and acknowledges that by giving up this right, defendant is giving up any ability to request DNA testing of evidence in this case in the current proceeding, in any proceeding after conviction under 18 U.S.C. § 3600, and in 26 any other proceeding of any type. Defendant further understands 27 and acknowledges that by giving up this right, defendant will 28 never have another opportunity to have the evidence in this case,

whether or not listed above, submitted for DNA testing, or to \parallel employ the results of DNA testing to support a claim that defendant is innocent of the offenses to which defendant is pleading guilty.

4

5

6

7

16

18

19

23

24

25

SENTENCING FACTORS

- Defendant understands that the Court is required to consider the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1)-(7), including the kinds of sentence and sentencing range established under the United States Sentencing Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Sentencing Guidelines"), in determining defendant's sentence. Defendant further understands that the Sentencing Guidelines are advisory only, and that after considering the Sentencing Guidelines and the other § 3553(a) factors, the Court may be free to exercise its discretion to impose any reasonable sentence up to the maximum set by statute for the crimes of conviction.
- 15. Defendant and the USAO agree and stipulate to the following applicable Sentencing Guidelines factor:

Base Offense Level : 7 [U.S.S.G. § 2B1.1(a)(1)] Defendant and the USAO reserve the right to arque that additional specific offense characteristics (including but not limited to loss and number of victims), adjustments, and departures under the Sentencing Guidelines are appropriate.

- There is no agreement as to defendant's criminal history or criminal history category.
- Defendant and the USAO, pursuant to the factors set 26 forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(6), and (a) (7), further reserve the right to argue for a sentence outside 28 the sentencing range established by the Sentencing Guidelines.

12

13

14

16

18

19

20

23

26

The stipulations in this agreement do not bind either 18. 2 the United States Probation Office or the Court. Both defendant and the USAO are free to: (a) supplement the facts by supplying relevant information to the United States Probation Office and the Court, (b) correct any and all factual misstatements relating to the calculation of the sentence, and (c) argue on appeal and collateral review that the Court's Sentencing Guidelines calculations are not error, although each party agrees to maintain its view that the calculations in paragraph 15 are consistent with the facts of this case.

DEFENDANT'S OBLIGATIONS

- 19. Defendant agrees that he will:
 - a) Plead guilty as set forth in this agreement.
- b) Not knowingly and willfully fail to abide by all sentencing stipulations contained in this agreement.
- c) Not knowingly and willfully fail to: (i) appear for all court appearances, (ii) surrender as ordered for service of sentence, (iii) obey all conditions of any bond, and (iv) obey any other ongoing court order in this matter.
- d) Not commit any crime; however, offenses which would 21 be excluded for sentencing purposes under U.S.S.G. § 4A1.2(c) are 22 |not within the scope of this agreement.
- e) Not knowingly and willfully fail to be truthful at 24 all times with Pretrial Services, the U.S. Probation Office, and 25 the Court.
- f) Pay the applicable special assessments at or before 27 the time of sentencing unless defendant lacks the ability to pay 28 and submits a completed financial statement (form OBD-500) to the

USAO prior to sentencing.

20. Defendant further agrees:

- a) To disclose to law enforcement officials, at a date and time to be set by the USAO, the whereabouts of, defendant's ownership interest in, and all other information known to defendant about, all monies, properties, and/or assets of any kind, derived from or acquired as a result of, or used to facilitate the commission of, defendant's illegal activities, and to forfeit all right, title, and interest in and to such items, specifically including all right, title, and interest in and to funds on deposit in TD Ameritrade account #785221551 in the amount of \$1,140,000.00 ("the subject account funds"), which defendant admits constitute the proceeds of defendant's illegal activity in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1030 and 1341.
- b) To the Court's entry of an order of forfeiture at or before sentencing with respect to these assets and to the forfeiture of the assets.
- c) To take whatever steps are necessary to pass to the United States clear title to the assets described above, including, without limitation, the execution of a consent decree of forfeiture and the completing of any other legal documents required for the transfer of title to the United States.
- d) To request that TD Ameritrade issue a cashier's check made payable to the U.S. Marshals Service for the amount of \$1,140,000.00, the subject account funds. The TD Ameritrade cashier's check representing the subject account funds shall be delivered to the undersigned Assistant United States Attorney within 60 days after the date defendant's plea is accepted by the

court.

- e) Not to contest any administrative forfeiture proceedings or civil judicial proceedings commenced against these assets. With respect to any criminal forfeiture ordered as a result of this plea agreement, defendant waives the requirements of Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 32.2 and 43(a) regarding notice of the forfeiture in the charging instrument, announcements of the forfeiture sentencing, and incorporation of the forfeiture in the judgment. Defendant acknowledges that forfeiture of the assets is part of the sentence that may be imposed in this case and waives any failure by the court to advise defendant of this, pursuant to Rule 11(b)(1)(J), at the time defendant's guilty plea is accepted.
- f) Not to assist any other individual in any effort falsely to contest the forfeiture of the assets described above.
- g) Not to claim that reasonable cause to seize the assets was lacking.
- h) To prevent the disbursement of any and all assets described above if such disbursements are within defendant's direct or indirect control.
- i) To fill out and deliver to the USAO a completed financial statement listing defendant's assets on a form provided by the United States Attorney's Office.
- j) That forfeiture of assets described above shall not be counted toward satisfaction of any special assessment, fine, restitution, or any other penalty the Court may impose, unless the Court determines it has the discretion to order otherwise and does so order.

4

6 7

8 9

10

- 19

- 26

k) To waive all constitutional and statutory challenges to forfeiture of the assets described above on any grounds, including that the forfeiture constitutes an excessive fine or punishment.

THE USAO'S OBLIGATIONS

- If defendant complies fully with all defendant's obligations under this agreement, the USAO agrees:
- a) To abide by all sentencing stipulations contained in this agreement.
- b) At the time of sentencing to move to dismiss the underlying indictment as against defendant. Defendant agrees, however, that at the time of sentencing the Court may consider the underlying indictment in determining the applicable Sentencing Guidelines range, where the sentence should fall within that range, the propriety and extent of any departure from that range, and the determination of the sentence to be imposed after consideration of the Sentencing Guidelines and all other relevant factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).
- c) At the time of sentencing, provided that defendant demonstrates an acceptance of responsibility for the offenses up to and including the time of sentencing, to recommend a two-level 22 reduction in the applicable sentencing guideline offense level, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1, and to recommend and, if necessary, move for an additional one-level reduction if available under 25 that section.
- d) To recommend that defendant be sentenced to a term 27 of imprisonment at the low end of the applicable Sentencing 28 Guidelines imprisonment range provided that the total offense

level as calculated by the Court is 28 or higher. For purposes of this agreement, the low end of the Sentencing Guidelines imprisonment range is that defined by the Sentencing Table in U.S.S.G. Chapter 5, Part A.

BREACH OF AGREEMENT

5

6

15

16

17

19

20

23

- If defendant, at any time after the execution of this agreement, knowingly violates or fails to perform any of defendant's agreements or obligations under this agreement ("a breach"), the USAO may declare this agreement breached. USAO declares this agreement breached at any time following its execution, and the Court finds such a breach to have occurred, then: (a) if defendant has previously entered quilty pleas, defendant will not be able to withdraw the quilty pleas, and (b) the USAO will be relieved of all of its obligations under this agreement.
- Following the Court's finding of a knowing and willful breach of this agreement by defendant, should the USAO elect to pursue any charge that was either dismissed or not filed as a result of this agreement, then:
- a) Defendant agrees that any applicable statute of limitations is tolled between the date of defendant's signing of this agreement and the commencement of any such prosecution or action.
- b) Defendant gives up all defenses based on the statute of limitations, any claim of pre-indictment delay, or any speedy 26 trial claim with respect to any such prosecution, except to the 27 extent that such defenses existed as of the date of defendant's 28 signing this agreement.

3

5

6

12

13

15

17

c) Defendant agrees that: (i) any statements made by defendant, under oath, at the guilty plea hearing (if such a hearing occurred prior to the breach); (ii) the stipulated factual basis statement in this agreement; and (iii) any evidence derived from such statements, are admissible against defendant in any such prosecution of defendant, and defendant shall assert no claim under the United States Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other federal rule, that the statements or any evidence derived from any statements should be suppressed or are inadmissible.

LIMITED MUTUAL WAIVER OF APPEAL

24. Defendant gives up the right to appeal any sentence imposed by the Court, including any order of restitution, and the manner in which the sentence is determined, provided that (a) the sentence is within the statutory maximum specified above and is constitutional, and (b) the Court imposes a sentence within or below the range corresponding to a total offense level of 24, and the applicable criminal history category as determined by the Court. Notwithstanding the foregoing, defendant retains any ability defendant has to appeal the Court's determination of 22 defendant's criminal history category and the conditions of 23 supervised release imposed by the Court, with the exception of the following: conditions set forth in General Orders 318, 01-05, 25 and/or 05-02 of this Court; the drug testing conditions mandated 26 by 18 U.S.C. §§ 3563(a)(5) and 3583(d); and the alcohol and drug 27 use conditions authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3563(b)(7), and, subject 28 to the Court's power to modify for good cause shown, the

following conditions.

1

2

3

5

6

11

15

17

1.8

- Defendant shall possess or use computers, computer-related devices, screen/user names, passwords, email accounts, and Internet Service Providers (ISPs) only within the scope of his employment or as otherwise approved by the Probation Office for personal use. After obtaining the Probation Office's approval for possession or use of a particular computer, computer-related device, screen/user name, password, e-mail account, or ISP, defendant need not obtain approval for subsequent use of that particular item;
- b. Computer and computer-related devices include personal computers, personal data assistants (PDAs), Internet appliances, electronic games, cellular telephones, and computer storage media, as well as peripheral equipment, that can access, or can be modified to access, the Internet, electronic bulletin boards, other computers, or similar media;
- Upon commencing supervised release, defendant shall disclose to the Probation Office any computers, computerrelated devices, screen/user names, passwords, email accounts, 20 and Internet Service Providers (ISPs) to which defendant is 21 provided access in connection with defendant's employment. 22 Defendant shall immediately report any changes in defendant's 23 memployment affecting defendant's access and/or use of computers, 24 |computer-related devices, screen/user names, passwords, email 25 accounts, and Internet Service Providers (ISPs);
- đ. All computers, computer-related devices, computer 27 storage media, and peripheral equipment used by defendant shall 28 be subject to search, seizure (including unannounced seizure for

1 | the purpose of search), and the installation of search and/or monitoring software and/or hardware. Nothing in this condition shall be construed to preclude the Probation Office from obtaining consent for search, seizure, and the installation of search and/or monitoring software and/or hardware from defendant's employer, or to grant defendant standing to object to any search, seizure, or monitoring measures to which defendant's employer consents. Defendant shall pay the cost of computer monitoring in an amount not to exceed \$30 per month per device connected to the Internet; and

- е. Except for routine or automatic software additions, deletions, upgrades, updates, installations, repairs, or other modifications, defendant shall not add, remove, upgrade, update, reinstall, repair, or otherwise modify the hardware or software on any computers, computer-related devices, or 16 peripheral equipment approved for defendant's personal use 17 without the prior approval of the Probation Office. Nor shall 18 defendant hide or encrypt files or data. Further, defendant 19 shall, as requested by the Probation Office, provide all billing records, including telephone, cable, Internet, satellite, and similar records.
- The USAO gives up its right to appeal the sentence, 23 |provided that (a) the sentence is within the statutory maximum 24 specified above and is constitutional, and (b) the Court imposes 25 a sentence within or above the range corresponding to a total 26 offense level of 27, and the applicable criminal history category 27 as determined by the Court.

22

3

5

RESULT OF VACATUR, REVERSAL OR SET-ASIDE

1

2

3

5

8

14

15

17

27

28

Defendant agrees that if any count of conviction is vacated, reversed, or set aside, the USAO may: (a) ask the Court to resentence defendant on any remaining counts of conviction, with both the USAO and defendant being released from any stipulations regarding sentencing contained in this agreement, (b) ask the Court to void the entire plea agreement and vacate defendant's guilty pleas on any remaining counts of conviction, with both the USAO and defendant being released from all of their obligations under this agreement, or (c) leave defendant's remaining convictions, sentence, and plea agreement intact. Defendant agrees that the choice among these three options rests in the exclusive discretion of the USAO.

COURT NOT A PARTY

The Court is not a party to this agreement and need not accept any of the USAO's sentencing recommendations or the parties' stipulations. Even if the Court ignores any sentencing recommendation, finds facts or reaches conclusions different from 19 any stipulation, and/or imposes any sentence up to the maximum established by statute, defendant cannot, for that reason, 21 |withdraw defendant's guilty pleas, and defendant will remain 22 bound to fulfill all defendant's obligations under this 23 |agreement. No one -- not the prosecutor, defendant's attorney, 24 or the Court -- can make a binding prediction or promise 25 regarding the sentence defendant will receive, except that it 26 |will be within the statutory maximum.

NO ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS

28. Except as set forth herein, there are no promises,

1 understandings or agreements between the USAO and defendant or defendant's counsel. Nor may any additional agreement, understanding or condition be entered into unless in a writing signed by all parties or on the record in court.

PLEA AGREEMENT PART OF THE GUILTY PLEA HEARING

The parties agree and stipulate that this Agreement will be considered part of the record of defendant's guilty plea hearing as if the entire Agreement had been read into the record of the proceeding.

This agreement is effective upon signature by defendant and an Assistant United States Attorney.

12 AGREED AND ACCEPTED

5

6

10

14

15

16

18

19

13 UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS P. O'BRIEN United States Attorney

RONALD L. CHENG Assistant United States Attorney

I have read this agreement and carefully discussed every part of it with my attorney. I understand the terms of this 21 dagreement, and I voluntarily agree to those terms. My attorney 22 |has advised me of my rights, of possible defenses, of the 23 sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of the 24 |relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the 25 consequences of entering into this agreement. No promises or 26 | inducements have been given to me other than those contained in 27 this agreement. No one has threatened or forced me in any way to 28 enter into this agreement. Finally, I am satisfied with the

1	representation of my attorney in this matter.			
2	At Osh, L			
3	2/19/2009			
4	NICHOLAS LAKES Date Date Defendant			
5	I am Nicholas Lakes' attorney. I have carefully discussed			
6	every part of this agreement with my client. Further, I have			
7	fully advised my client of his rights, of possible defenses, of			
8	the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of the			
9	relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the			
10	consequences of entering into this agreement. To my knowledge,			
11	my client's decision to enter into this agreement is an informed			
12	and voluntary one.			
13	MINDA			
14	GEORGE BUEHLER, ESQ. $\frac{2/19/2vv9}{\text{Date}}$			
15	Counsel for Defendant Nicholas Lakes			
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				

FACTUAL BASIS

1

2

3

5

28

Defendants Nicholas Lakes, also known as Dimitry Livshits, and Viacheslav Berkovich entered into and executed a scheme to defraud trucking brokers and trucking companies through use of the Internet. Using the names of fraudulent companies and false individual identities, defendants Lakes and Berkovich accessed the Safety and Fitness Electronic Records System ("SAFER") Internet website of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration ("FMCSA") of the United States Department of Transportation ("DOT"). The FMCSA provides the SAFER website to the trucking industry to register brokerages and trucking companies and operates the SAFER website on computers that are used in interstate commerce. On June 6, 2005, defendants Lakes and Berkovich, aiding and abetting one another, accessed the SAFER website in excess of authorized access, in that they accessed the website in the false name of "Justin Paltrow" to 17 ||register a fictitious brokerage named "Cargoland Brokerage, Inc." On January 29, 2007, defendant Lakes and Berkovich, aiding and 19 abetting one another, accessed the SAFER website in excess of 20 authorized access, in that they accessed the website to obtain unauthorized access to the registration page for Freight VIT, 22 which was an existing and legitimate company. On both occasions, 23 |defendants Lakes and Berkovich accessed the SAFER website with 24 the intent to use each of these brokerages to bid to transport a 25 | trucking load and collect payment from the original broker and 26 then to "double broker" those jobs to a legitimate trucking company and not pay the trucking company for the work done.

On or about January 15, 2008, defendants Lakes and Berkovich

accessed the website of Internet Truckstop and obtained information about a trucking load being brokered by Stevens Transport, located in Dallas, Texas. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich, in the name of Vega Trucking, agreed with Stevens Transport to transport the load for \$3,400. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich then used the name of Barkfelt Transport to doublebroker the load and agreed with RK Trucking for RK Trucking to transport the load for \$4,000. On or about February 14, 2008, defendants Lakes and Berkovich received in the United States mail 10 at 466 Foothill Blvd., # 268, La Canada, California 91011 (the 11 | "La Canada Address"), a check from Stevens Transport for \$3,390, which was deposited into Vega Trucking account no. xxxxx-67096 at \parallel the Bank of America. Berkovich was the account holder for this Bank of America account. The application for the mailbox at the La Canada address was submitted by a "Michael Selten" with the address 2211 Hyperion Avenue in Los Angeles, California. Berkovich had submitted documentation to the mailbox business at the La Canada Address as a person authorized to collect mail and 19 \parallel was a signatory on the Vega Trucking account. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich never intended to pay RK Trucking for the load that 21 the carrier transported and in fact never paid RK Trucking for 22 the load. On or about January 15, 2008, defendants Lakes and Berkovich 24 accessed the website of Internet Truckstop and obtained 25 information about a trucking load being brokered by RHO 26 Logistics, located in El Paso, Texas. Defendants Lakes and

28 Logistics to transport the load for \$3,500. Defendants Lakes and

27 Berkovich, in the name of Vega Trucking, agreed with RHO

1 Berkovich then used the name of Barkfelt Transport to doublebroker the load and agreed with Reno and Company for Reno and Company to transport the load for \$4,300. On or about February ||12, 2008, defendants Lakes and Berkovich received in the United States mail at the La Canada Address a check from RHO Logistics for \$3,325, which was deposited into Vega Trucking account no. xxxx-3797 at East West Bank. Berkovich was the account holder for the East West account and, on September 25, 2008, had blank checks for the account in his residence at 2211 Hyperion Avenue in Los Angeles, California. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich never intended to pay Reno and Company for the load that the carrier transported and in fact never paid Reno and Company for the load. On or about May 21, 2008, defendants Lakes and Berkovich accessed a loadboard website and obtained information about a trucking load being brokered by Coyote Logistics, located in Lake Forest, Illinois. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich, in the name of Ligit Transportation, agreed with Coyote Logistics to transport the load for \$2,100. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich then used the name of Loadbook, Inc., to double-broker the load and agreed with Charles Baker Trucking for Charles Baker Trucking to 21 ||transport the load for \$2,600. On or about July 9, 2008, 22 defendants Lakes and Berkovich received in the United States mail 23 at 5150 Broadway Street, # 303, San Antonio, Texas 78201, a check 24 from Coyote Logistics \$2,100, which was deposited into Legit 25 Transportation account no. xxxxx-77515 at Bank of America. 26 Berkovich was the account holder for this Bank of America 27 account. Defendants Lakes and Berkovich never intended to pay

12

13

28 Charles Baker Trucking for the load that the carrier transported

and in fact never paid Charles Baker Trucking for the load.

On September 25, 2008, agents of the DOT/Office of Inspector General served federal search warrants at the residence of defendant Berkovich at 2211 Hyperion Avenue in Los Angeles, Calfornia, and the residence of defendant Lakes at 720 Orange Grove Ave., Apartment 7, Glendale, California. In each residence, agents found computers that were active and displayed applications relating to trucking loads. Subsequently, agents found on each computer documents relating to the Stevens/RK Trucking, RHO Logistics/Reno and Company, and Coyote Logistics/Charles Baker Trucking transactions described above.

The government contends that monies derived from the fraud scheme total at least \$2.4 million. At least \$1,140,000 from accounts pertaining to fraudulent brokerage companies were ultimately placed into TD Ameritrade account #785221551, an account controlled by defendant Lakes.

```
1
  2
  3
  4
  5
  6
  7
  8
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
  9
                  FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 10
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 11
                                          CR No. 08-1208(A)-JFW
 12
               Plaintiff,
                                           FIRST
                                          SUPERSEDING
13
                    v,
                                          INFORMATION
    NICHOLAS LAKES,
14
                                           [18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(4):
      aka Dmitry Livshits, and
                                          Computer Fraud; 18 U.S.C.
15
    VIACHESLAV BERKOVICH,
                                           § 1341: Mail Fraud;
                                          18 U.S.C. § 2: Aiding and
16
              Defendants.
                                          Abetting and Causing an
                                          Act to be Done; 18 U.S.C.
17
                                          § 981(a)(1)(C), 21 U.S.C.
                                          § 853(p) and 28 U.S.C.
18
                                          § 2461(c): Criminal
                                          Forfeiturel
19
20
         The United States Attorney charges:
21
                         INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS
         At all times relevant to this Superseding Information:
22
23
                         ENTITIES AND INDIVIDUALS
24
                         DEFENDANT NICHOLAS LAKES
25
         1.
              Defendant NICHOLAS LAKES, also known as ("aka") Dmitry
26
    Livshits (hereinafter "defendant LAKES") was an individual
27
28 WLH:RLC
```

residing in Glendale, California, within the Central District of California.

2. Defendant LAKES possessed at least one computer at his residence and accessed the Internet from a digital subscriber line ("DSL") located there.

VIACHESLAV BERKOVICH

- 3. Defendant VIACHESLAV BERKOVICH (hereinafter "BERKOVICH") was an individual residing in Los Angeles, California, within the Central District of California.
- 4. Defendant Berkovich possessed at least one computer at his residence and accessed the Internet from a DSL line located there.

SAFERSYS

- 5. SAFER is the abbreviated name of the Safety and Fitness Electronic Records System, which is accessible through Safersys.org or safer.fmcsa.dot.gov, which are addresses for an Internet website maintained by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration ("FMCSA") of the United States Department of Transportation. The FMCSA requires brokers and motor carriers, including trucking companies, to register on SAFER and provide information that includes the business name, business address, and business telephone number.
- 6. At the times relevant to this Superseding Information, a user was required to provide a name and a valid credit card number on the SAFER System website before the system would allow the user to change registration information for a company that was registered on the system.

LOADBOARDS

7. "Loadboards" are Internet websites that advertise available loads that are available for transport. Brokers typically list loads available for carriers to transport, and carriers make bids to carry those loads. "Loadboards" include Internet Truckstop, DAT Connect.com and Getloaded.

COMPUTER TERMINOLOGY

Domain Name Server ("DNS")

1 |

8. A "domain name" identifies where on the Internet a domain, or computer, is located. Domain names typically are easy-to-recall words or phrases as opposed to numerical Internet Protocol ("IP") addresses, which are used by computers to identify addresses on the Internet. A "domain name server" ("DNS") translates domain names to IP addresses and vice versa. Domain name servers maintain central lists of domain names and associated IP addresses. When computer users look for a particular domain by inputting the appropriate domain name, the computer seeks out a domain name server to translate or "map" the domain name to the appropriate IP address. The request is then relayed to other domain name servers on the Internet until the appropriate IP address is found.

Internet Hosting Companies

9. Internet hosting companies provide individuals or businesses with large scale access to the Internet through the use of computers large enough to provide one or more services to other computers on the Internet. These large computers are commonly referred to as "servers." Use of a server often is combined with access to a larger network of computers. The

services of Internet hosting companies enable customers to conduct activity on the Internet, such as the ability to operate web sites, administer networks, or run e-mail systems.

Internet Protocol Address

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

An "Internet Protocol Address" or "IP address" is a unique numeric address used by computers on the Internet. IP address is designated by a series of four numbers, each in the range 0-255, separated by periods (e.g., 121.56.97.178). Every computer connected to the Internet must be assigned an IP address so that Internet traffic sent from and directed to that computer may be directed properly from its source to its destination. Most Internet Service Providers ("ISPs") control a range of IP addresses, which they assign to their subscribers. No two computer networks on the Internet can have the same IP address at the same time. Thus, at any given moment, an IP address is unique to the computer network to which it has been assigned.

Internet Service Providers

ISPs offer their customers access to the Internet using telephone or other telecommunications lines. ISPs provide Internet e-mail accounts that allow users to communicate with other Internet users by sending and receiving electronic messages through their ISPs' servers. ISPs remotely store electronic files on behalf of their customers and may provide other services unique to each particular ISP.

Server

12. A "server" is a centralized computer that provides services for other computers connected to it via a network. The other computers attached to a server sometimes are called

"clients." In a large company, it is common for individual employees to have client computers at their desktops. When the employees access their e-mail, or access files stored on the network itself, those files are pulled electronically from the server, where they are stored, and are sent to the client's computer via the network. In larger networks, it is common for servers to be dedicated to a single task. For example, a server that is configured so that its sole task is to support a World Wide Web site is known simply as a "web server."

Uniform Resource Locator ("URL")

13. The "Uniform Resource Locator" or "URL" is the unique address that identifies a computer or web page on the Internet for routing purposes, such as http://www.cnn.com.

COUNTS ONE THROUGH TWO

[18 U.S.C. §§ 1030(a)(4), 2]

14. The United States Attorney repeats and re-alleges all of the introductory allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Superseding Information.

THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

- 15. Beginning in or about January 2007 and continuing through on or about September 25, 2008, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH (collectively, "defendant LAKES and BERKOVICH"), together with others known and unknown to the United States Attorney, knowingly and with the intent to defraud, devised, participated in, and executed a scheme to defraud individuals and companies with whom defendants and their coschemers dealt over the Internet, as to material matters, and to obtain money and property from those individuals and companies by means of material false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, and the concealment of material facts.
- 16. The fraudulent scheme was carried out in substance in the following manner:
- a. Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers used the Internet to access the SAFER System website and registered their own trucking and transportation brokerage companies, such as Cargoland Brokerage, Inc., Progressive Trucking, Vega Trucking, and Barkfelt Transport. In fact, defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers did not

operate any trucking and transportation brokerage business and intended to defraud brokers of the transportation fee.

1.

- b. Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers used the Internet to access the SAFER System website and changed registration information for unrelated trucking and brokerage companies already registered in the SAFER System to create the impression that the unrelated companies were affiliated with defendants' companies. In doing so, defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers would enter on the SAFER System for the unrelated companies telephone numbers and e-mail addresses that in fact belonged to them and did not belong to the unrelated companies.
- c. Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers accessed loadboards in the names of their companies and posed as carriers. After finding a load on a loadboard that was advertised by a broker, defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers then entered into a contract with the broker to transport the advertised load. Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers never informed the broker that it was their intention to "double broker" the load to another carrier and collect the transportation fee, without paying any sum to the actual carrier.
- d. Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers then posed as a broker, sometimes in the name of a different company, and accessed the same or different loadboard to advertise, or "double-broker" the same load to a carrier.

 Defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers never informed

the carrier that they had no intention of paying the negotiated transportation fee to the carrier.

- e. After the carrier with whom defendants and their co-schemers contracted to transport the load completed the trucking job, defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and their co-schemers would collect the trucking fee from the original broker and refuse to pay the carrier to whom they had "double-brokered" the load.
- 17. To execute the above-described scheme, defendants LAKES, BERKOVICH, and co-schemers known and unknown to the United States Attorney knowingly participated in and aided and abetted the following materially false and misleading acts, among others, in the Central District of California and elsewhere:

Stevens Transport/RK Trucking

- a. On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed the Internet Truckstop website.
- b. On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, in the name of Vega Trucking, agreed with broker Stevens Transport to transport a load for \$3,400.
- c. On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed the Internet Truckstop website and, in the name of Barkfelt Transport, advertised the load they had agreed to carry for Stevens Transport.
- d. On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH agreed with carrier RK Trucking for RK Trucking to transport the load for \$4,000.

4

5 б

7

8

9 10

12

13

11

14 15

16 17

18

20

19

21 22

23 24

26

25

27

28

On or about February 14, 2008, defendants LAKES e. and BERKOVICH received Bank of America check # 380165 from Stevens Transport for \$3,390.

RHO Logistics/Reno and Company

- On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed the Internet Truckstop website.
- On or about January 15, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, in the name of Vega Trucking, agreed with broker RHO Logistics to transport a load for \$3,500.
- h. On or about January 16, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed the Internet Truckstop website and, in the name of Barkfelt Transport and advertised the load they had agreed to carry for RHO Logistics.
- i. On or about January 16, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, in the name of Barkfelt Transport, agreed with carrier Reno and Company for Reno and Company to transport the load for \$4,300.
- On or about February 12, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH received East West Bank check # 31097 from RHO Logistics for \$3,325.

Covote Logistics/Charles Baker Trucking

- k. On or about May 21, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed a loadboard website.
- l. On or about May 21, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, in the name of Ligit Transportation, agreed with broker Coyote Logistics to transport a load for \$2,100.
- On or about May 21, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH accessed the Getloaded website and, in the name of

- Loadbook, Inc., advertised the load they had agreed to carry for Coyote Logistics.
- n. On or about May 21, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, in the name of Loadbook, Inc., agreed with carrier Charles Baker Trucking for Charles Baker Trucking to transport the load for \$2,600.
- o. On or about July 9, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH received Bank of America check # 25080 from Coyote Logistics for \$2,100.

Activity on September 25, 2008

1 i

1.7

p. On or about September 25, 2008, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH were linked together by a computer connection between their residences. Defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH had each accessed an Internet loadboard website and were each operating a Transcore Freight software program used to track truckloads.

ACCESSING OF A PROTECTED COMPUTER

18. On or about the following dates, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, and others known and unknown to the United States Attorney, aiding and abetting one another, knowingly and with the intent to defraud accessed without authorization and exceeded any authorized access to a protected computer, specifically, servers belonging to the FMCSA, to further an intended fraud and obtain things of value, that is, by accessing the SAFER System website and registering companies and changing information for previously-registered companies, accessing loadboards as one of those companies to enter into

transportation contracts with brokers to carry freight for a fee, and accessing loadboards to enter into a second set of transportation contracts with other trucking companies to carry those loads but which companies defendants did not intend to pay.

1 |

COUNT	DATE	UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS
ONE	6/6/05	Accessed SAFER System website in the name of "Justin Paltrow" to register Cargoland Brokerage, Inc.
TWO	1/29/07	Accessed SAFER System website in the name of "Justin Paltrow" to change registration information for Freight VIT

COUNTS THREE THROUGH FIVE

[18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 2]

19. The United States Attorney repeats and re-alleges all of the introductory allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 13 of this Superseding Information.

THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

- 20. Beginning in or about January 2007 and continuing through on or about September 25, 2008, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, together with others known and unknown to the United States Attorney, knowingly and with the intent to defraud, devised, participated in, and executed a scheme to defraud individuals and companies with whom defendants and their co-schemers dealt over the Internet, as to material matters, and to obtain money and property from those individuals and companies by means of material false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, and the concealment of material facts.
- 21. The fraudulent scheme was operated and was carried out, in essence, as set forth in paragraphs 16 and 17 of this First Superseding Information.

USE OF THE MAILS

22. On or about the dates set forth below, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendants LAKES and BERKOVICH, for the purpose of executing and attempting to execute the above-described scheme to defraud, willfully caused the following items to be placed in an authorized depository for mail matter to be sent and delivered by

the United States Postal Service according to the directions thereon:

COUNT	DATE	ITEM MAILED
THREE	2/12/08	Mailing of check from RHO Logistics, in El Paso, Texas, to Vega Trucking, in La Canada, California.
FOUR	2/14/08	Mailing of check from Stevens Transport, in Dallas, Texas, to Vega Trucking, in La Canada, California.
FIVE	7/9/08	Mailing of check from Coyote Logistics, in Lake Forest, Illinois, to Ligit Transportation, in Los Angeles, California.

COUNT SIX

1 |

[18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), 21 U.S.C. § 853(p) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)]

- 23. The United States Attorney repeats and re-alleges all of the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 22 of this Superseding Information.
- 24. Pursuant to Title 18, United States Code,
 Section 981(a)(1)(C), Title 21, United States Code, Section 853,
 and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), upon
 conviction for any of the offenses in Counts One through Five of
 this foregoing Superseding Information, defendant NICHOLAS LAKES
 shall forfeit to the United States:
- a. any and all property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to such offense, including all funds on deposit in TD Ameritrade account #785221551; and
- b. a sum of money equal to the total value of all property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to such offense.
- 25. Pursuant to Title 21, United States Code,
 Section 853(p), as incorporated by Title 28, United States Code,
 Section 2461(c), defendant NICHOLAS LAKES, if so convicted, shall
 forfeit substitute property, up to the value of the money and
 property described in the preceding paragraph, if, by any act or
 omission of the defendant, the property described therein, or any
 portion thereof, (a) cannot be located upon the exercise of due
 diligence; (b) has been transferred or sold to, or deposited
 with, a third party; (c) has been placed beyond the jurisdiction

```
of the court; (d) has been substantially diminished in value; or
   1 |
      (e) has been commingled with other property that cannot be
   2
  3
     divided without difficulty.
  4
  5
  6
     THOMAS P. O'BRIEN
  7
     United States Attorney
  8
     CHRISTINE C. EWELL
     Assistant United States Attorney
 10
     Chief, Criminal Division
 11
     WESLEY L. HSU
     Assistant United States Attorney
     Chief, Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes Section
 12
 13
     MARK KRAUSE
     Assistant United States Attorney
    Deputy Chief, Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes Section
 14
15
    RONALD L. CHENG
    Assistant United States Attorney
16
    Cyber and Intellectual Property Crimes Section
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```