

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL NO. 09- _____
v.	:	DATE FILED: _____
PETER D. TRUMAN	:	VIOLATION:
	:	26 U.S.C. § 7206(1) (filing a false tax return - 1 count)

INFORMATION

COUNT ONE

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES THAT:

At all times relevant to this information:

1. Since approximately the 1980s, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN has been employed as a political consultant in Philadelphia and the surrounding area, operating his business under his own name and the name “Dan-Silo Consultants.” Defendant TRUMAN had been involved in politics in the Philadelphia area for more than 40 years and was previously employed as a Philadelphia Police Officer, an elected Pennsylvania State Representative, and the Clerk of the Quarter Sessions of the Philadelphia County Court of Common Pleas.

2. As part of his consulting business, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN promoted himself by announcing that he was able to assist candidates for judicial and other offices in Philadelphia navigate the process of being elected. In exchange for assisting these candidates, defendant TRUMAN charged fees of between \$5,000 and \$25,000.

3. Although defendant PETER D. TRUMAN had few expenses in his political consulting business, from time to time he would pay a portion of these fees to another

political consultant and one-time elected official known to the United States Attorney and referred to here as Person No. 1. Defendant TRUMAN made these payments, which he referred to as “finders’ fees” to Person No. 1 in cash in envelopes at the insistence of Person No. 1. Sometimes these cash payments were as much as \$20,000 at a time.

4. In Philadelphia, committees of the local political parties often require a payment from candidates for judicial office of between \$25,000 to \$35,000 in exchange for the particular local political party’s endorsement. Among other things, the party will promote the endorsed candidate, print sample ballots with the endorsed candidate’s name on it for distribution to voters on and before election day, and convince neighborhood party officials, called ward leaders, to support the endorsed candidate.

5. Because political parties substantially control whether ward leaders will support and work for judicial candidates, candidates for judicial office believe they must either obtain the endorsement of the political party or hire a political consultant like defendant PETER D. TRUMAN or Person No. 1 to improve their chances of being elected. As part of his business, defendant TRUMAN controlled or had substantial influence over leaders of approximately 18 to 19 of the City of Philadelphia’s 69 wards. Defendant TRUMAN and another political consultant who is an elected official known to the United States Attorney and referred to here as Person No. 2, called this group of ward leaders the “New Progressive Alliance,” the NPA, or the “Truman Group.” Using this influence, defendant TRUMAN was able to convince ward leaders to support candidates who paid him a fee and place the name of defendant TRUMAN’s favored candidates on sample ballots issued by ward leaders.

6. Trading on his influence as a political consultant, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN was able to obtain hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees from candidates for elective office in the Philadelphia area. These candidates paid defendant TRUMAN because they believed he would assist them in getting elected to judicial and other office in the Philadelphia area. Between 2001 and 2007, defendant TRUMAN obtained nearly \$700,000 in fees from candidates.

7. Despite obtaining these large fees and having only modest expenses associated with his business, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN reported just a small portion of his income on his federal income tax returns. During the years 2001 through 2005, defendant TRUMAN typically falsely reported less than \$10,000 per year in net income from his business.

8. To conceal his income from the Internal Revenue Service, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN made false statements to the accountant who prepared his tax returns. Defendant TRUMAN would supply his accountant with a handwritten sheet containing false income and expenses figures. Defendant TRUMAN did not provide his accountant with his bank records showing the hundreds of thousands of dollars in deposits in his bank accounts of fees from his political consulting business and concealed cash payments he made to Person No. 1.

9. As a result his tax fraud scheme, defendant PETER D. TRUMAN caused a tax loss to the United States Treasury of more than \$150,000.

10. On or about October 15, 2006, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania,
defendant

PETER D. TRUMAN

willfully made and subscribed a United States income tax return, Form 1040, for the calendar year 2005, which was filed individually and verified by a written declaration that it was made under the penalty of perjury and filed with the Director, Internal Revenue Service Center, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which defendant TRUMAN did not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, in that the return reported gross receipts from his political consulting business of \$24,700, when, as defendant TRUMAN knew, he had approximately \$223,400 of additional taxable income.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7206(1).

MICHAEL L. LEVY
United States Attorney