

*June 20, 2025*

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk of Court

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**v.**

**RONALD MARTIN,**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Criminal No. 4:25-cr-331**

**INFORMATION**

The United States Attorney for the Southern District of Texas charges:

**GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

At all times material to this Information, unless otherwise specified:

1. The Controlled Substances Act (“CSA”) governed the manufacture, distribution, and dispensing of controlled substances in the United States. With limited exceptions for medical professionals, the CSA made it unlawful for any person to knowingly or intentionally manufacture, distribute, or dispense a controlled substance or conspire to do so.

2. The CSA and its implementing regulations set forth which drugs and other substances were defined by law as “controlled substances,” and assigned those controlled substances to one of five schedules (Schedule I, II, III, IV, or V) depending on their potential for abuse, likelihood of physical or psychological dependency, accepted medical use, and accepted safety for use under medical supervision.

3. A controlled substance assigned to “Schedule II” meant that the drug had a high potential for abuse and a currently accepted medical use in treatment in the United States, or the drug had a currently accepted medical use with severe restrictions.

4. Pursuant to the CSA and its implementing regulations:

a. Hydrocodone was classified as a Schedule II controlled substance. Hydrocodone was used to treat severe pain. Hydrocodone, as with other opioids, was highly addictive. Tablets combining 10mg of hydrocodone bitartrate and 325mg of acetaminophen (“hydrocodone 10-325mg”) was sometimes marketed under the brand name Norco. The 10-325mg pill was the highest, short-acting combination-pill form of the drug commercially available, and it had substantial street value and was in high demand on Houston’s black market.

b. “Potentiators,” so-called because they enhanced the high from opioids like hydrocodone, included carisoprodol, a Schedule IV controlled substance classified as a muscle relaxant. Carisoprodol had substantial street value and was in high demand on Houston’s black market.

5. With exceptions not applicable here, only appropriately licensed and registered pharmacies could dispense controlled substances, and only pursuant to legitimate prescriptions filled by an appropriately licensed and registered pharmacist acting in the usual course of his professional practice. *See* 21 C.F.R. §§ 1306.04 and 1306.06. The issuing physician and the pharmacist who filled the prescription for a controlled substance shared a corresponding responsibility for its proper prescribing and dispensing. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 1306.04. In addition, Section 1306.04 instructed that:

[a]n order purporting to be a prescription issued not in the usual course of professional treatment . . . is not a prescription within the meaning and intent of Section 309 of the Act (21 U.S.C. § 829) and the person knowingly filling such a purported prescription, as well as the person issuing it, shall be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the provisions of law relating to controlled substances.

6. Under the CSA, it is unlawful for individuals to knowingly or intentionally distribute and dispense controlled substances via a pharmacy in a manner unauthorized by law, that is, without a legitimate medical purpose or outside the usual course of professional practice.

**DEFENDANT, RELEVANT INDIVIDUALS, AND ENTITIES**

7. Defendant **RONALD MARTIN** owned and operated Ennis Street Pharmacy, located at 12804 Gulf Freeway #200, Houston, Texas (“Ennis”). **RONALD MARTIN** was simultaneously employed as a law enforcement officer in the Houston area.

8. Person 1 was **RONALD MARTIN**’s business partner and a silent owner of Ennis.

9. Person 1 owned and operated Entity 1, a pharmacy staffing business that provided pharmacists and pharmacy technicians to Ennis and other Houston-area pharmacies.

10. Pharmacist 1 and Pharmacist 2, both pharmacists licensed to practice in Texas, worked as pharmacists at Ennis.

11. Entity 1 paid the salaries for Ennis’s employees, including Pharmacist 1 and Pharmacist 2.

**COUNT ONE**

**Conspiracy to Unlawfully Distribute and Dispense Controlled Substances  
(21 U.S.C. § 846)**

12. Paragraphs 1 through 11 of this Information are re-alleged and incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

13. From in or around August 2019, and continuing through in or around September 2020, the exact dates being unknown, in the Houston Division of the Southern District of Texas, and elsewhere, Defendant

**RONALD MARTIN**

knowingly and intentionally combined, conspired, confederated, and agreed with Person 1 and others known and unknown, to violate Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841(a)(1) and

(b)(1)(C), that is, to knowingly and intentionally distribute and dispense mixtures and substances containing detectable amounts of controlled substances, including hydrocodone, a Schedule II controlled substance, while knowing that such distribution and dispensing was unauthorized.

**Purpose of the Conspiracy**

14. It was the purpose of the conspiracy for **RONALD MARTIN** and his coconspirators, known and unknown, to unlawfully enrich themselves by, among other things: (a) distributing and dispensing hydrocodone and carisoprodol without a legitimate medical purpose and outside the scope of professional practice; (b) generating large profits from selling controlled substances; and (c) diverting the proceeds from those controlled substance sales for the personal use and benefit of **RONALD MARTIN** and his coconspirators.

**Manner and Means of the Conspiracy**

The manner and means by which **RONALD MARTIN** and others known and unknown sought to accomplish the purpose and object of the conspiracy included, among other things:

15. Ennis maintained a Texas Pharmacy License from the Texas State Board of Pharmacy (“TSBP”) and a registration with U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”).

16. For hydrocodone customers, Ennis dealt exclusively in cash. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 charged approximately \$2 per hydrocodone pill.

17. Ennis distributed and dispensed hydrocodone and carisoprodol, often in combination, to individuals posing as patients. The purported patients were often brought to Ennis by “runners”—street-level drug traffickers who purchased hydrocodone and carisoprodol from Ennis and resold it on the black market. Such distribution and dispensing was unauthorized.

18. From in or around 2017, until in or around November 2019, **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 employed Pharmacist 1 as Ennis’s pharmacist in charge (“PIC”).

19. In or around October 2018, the TSBP issued a warning letter to **RONALD MARTIN** regarding controlled substance dispensing at Ennis. TSBP warned **RONALD MARTIN** that Ennis was dispensing “prescriptions for controlled substances that potentially lacked a valid medical need or legitimate therapeutic purpose[.]”

20. **RONALD MARTIN** also received, from the TSBP, a document titled “Texas State Board of Pharmacy ‘Red Flags’ Checklist for Pharmacies *YOU MIGHT BE A PILL MILL IF...*” (the “Red Flags Checklist”).

21. In or around August 2019, law enforcement executed a search warrant at Ennis. Starting after the search warrant, and continuing into November 2019, **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 paused dispensing controlled substances from Ennis. Beginning in November 2019, however, **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 resumed dispensing hydrocodone and carisoprodol from Ennis, and operated Ennis in a similar way to how it operated before August 2019.

22. Ennis continued dispensing hydrocodone to many of the same purported patients, brought to Ennis by runners. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 knew and intended such dispensing was unauthorized.

23. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 knew and intended that many of the red flags identified on the Red Flags Checklist were present at Ennis.

24. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 set a quota of how many hydrocodone prescriptions Ennis would dispense every day. The quota ranged from six to eight hydrocodone prescriptions per day.

25. In or around February 2020, **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 hired Pharmacist 2 as Ennis's PIC.

26. Pharmacist 2 filled prescriptions for hydrocodone and carisoprodol that Pharmacist 2, **RONALD MARTIN**, and Person 1 knew and intended were not authorized—they knew that the prescriptions were not issued for a legitimate medical purpose by physicians acting within the usual course of professional practice, but nevertheless dispensed them unlawfully.

27. From in or around November 2019, and continuing into September 2020, **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1, through Ennis, distributed and dispensed approximately 113,031 pills of hydrocodone 10-325mg and 73,506 pills of carisoprodol 350mg. Hydrocodone and carisoprodol made up approximately 99% of the controlled substance pills dispensed from Ennis. Of those hydrocodone pills dispensed after November 2019, approximately 11,634 were to purported patients who had also received hydrocodone pills from Ennis before August 2019.

28. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 split the proceeds from the illegal cash sales of the hydrocodone and carisoprodol acquired through Ennis to runners.

29. **RONALD MARTIN** and Person 1 agreed not to publicly disclose Person 1's ownership of Ennis.

All in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Section 846.

**NOTICE OF CRIMINAL FORFEITURE**  
**(21 U.S.C. § 853)**

30. The allegations contained in Count 1 of this Information are hereby realleged and incorporated by reference for the purpose of alleging forfeitures pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853.

31. Pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853, upon conviction of an offense in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841 and 846, Defendant

**RONALD MARTIN**

shall forfeit to the United States of America any property constituting, or derived from, any proceeds obtained, directly or indirectly, as the result of such offenses and any property used, or intended to be used, in any manner or part, to commit, or to facilitate the commission of, the offenses.


32. If any of the property described above, as a result of any act or omission of Defendant:

- 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
- e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty,

the United States of America shall be entitled to a money judgment and forfeiture of substitute property pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p).

NICHOLAS J. GANJEI  
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

LORINDA LARYEA  
ACTING CHIEF  
FRAUD SECTION, CRIMINAL DIVISION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

  
DEVON HELFMEYER  
TRIAL ATTORNEY  
FRAUD SECTION, CRIMINAL DIVISION  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE