

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

COPY - FILED - GR

August 11, 2016 9:41 AM

CLERK OF COURT
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

SARAH FRANCES BOLHUIS,

Defendant.

1:16-cr-150
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge

FELONY INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges:

COUNT 1
(Wire Fraud)

Beginning no later than in or about July 2006, and continuing to in or about June 2015, in Antrim County and elsewhere, in the Southern Division of the Western District of Michigan,

SARAH FRANCES BOLHUIS

knowingly devised and participated in a scheme and artifice to defraud and to obtain money by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, and transmitted and caused to be transmitted certain writings, signs, signals, and sounds by means of wire communication in interstate commerce for the purpose of executing the scheme and artifice.

1. At all times relevant to this Felony Information, Defendant claimed she owned and operated two financial services companies in Central Lake, Michigan, doing business as American Financial ("AMFI") and TriLogic. Defendant registered AMFI to do business in Antrim County, Michigan, but did not register AFMI or TriLogic with the State of Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs. Defendant also claimed to be associated with a business that operated under the name Prestige Benefits, LLC, which was registered with the State of Michigan.

2. Beginning no later than in or about July 2006, Defendant knowingly devised and participated in a scheme and artifice to defraud and to obtain money belonging to more than 50 individuals, including in Antrim and Kent Counties. It was part of the scheme and artifice to defraud that Defendant made the following false representations and promises to potential and existing clients of AMFI, TriLogic, and Prestige Benefits:

- a. Defendant falsely represented to some prospective clients that she was engaged in the business of providing various financial services and investment loan opportunities.
- b. Defendant falsely represented to some prospective and existing clients that she would use their funds to provide short term loans to businesses and individuals, including adult foster care homes, and distribute profits from those loans to her clients.
- c. Defendant falsely represented to some prospective and existing clients that their principal investment in the short term loans was guaranteed and they could ask for the return of their entire investment.
- d. Defendant falsely represented to some prospective and existing clients that they had the opportunity to earn substantial monthly interest, typically between 3% and 5% per month, on their investments.
- e. Defendant falsely represented to some existing clients that she made “interest” or “fee” payments on their principal investment or loan.
- f. Defendant falsely represented to at least one client that their funds would be invested in silver coins.
- g. Defendant falsely represented to at least two clients that their funds would be

invested in overseas accounts.

- h. Defendant falsely represented to at least one client that she was applying the “interest” the client allegedly earned to pay the client’s monthly home mortgage payment, property taxes, and other financial obligations.

3. In truth and fact, Defendant did not use client money she obtained for extending short term loans to businesses or individuals or to provide other financial services as she had represented.

Instead, Defendant used client money to:

- a. Make payments to a business partner;
- b. Make return-of-principal and “interest” payments to clients;
- c. Pay “finder fees” to individuals who successfully recruited new clients; and
- d. Pay for various personal living and entertainment expenses.

Interstate Wire Communication

4. For the purpose of executing the scheme and artifice to defraud, Defendant transmitted and caused to be transmitted certain writings, signs, signals, and sounds by means of wire communication in interstate commerce. Specifically, and by way of example, on or about October 26, 2012, Defendant caused a client to electronically transfer \$55,000 from Fifth Third Bank account number XXXXXX465 to JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. account number XXXXXX062 by wire transfer.

18 U.S.C. § 1343

COUNT 2
(Money Laundering)

On or about March 1, 2013, in the Southern Division of the Western District of Michigan and elsewhere,

SARAH FRANCES BOLHUIS

knowingly engaged in a monetary transaction, in and affecting interstate commerce, in criminally derived property of a value greater than \$10,000 that was derived from a specified unlawful activity. Specifically, while engaged in the scheme and artifice to defraud described in Count 1 of this Felony Information and incorporated herein by reference, Defendant conducted a withdrawal transaction in the amount of \$25,700 by personal check number 99 drawn on an account in the name of Sarah Bolhuis at JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., a financial institution whose deposits were then insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, to make a partial payment to one of Defendant's victims.

18 U.S.C. § 1957

FORFEITURE ALLEGATION
(Wire Fraud)

The allegations contained in Count 1 of this Information are hereby re-alleged and incorporated by reference for the purpose of alleging forfeitures pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c).

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), upon conviction of wire fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343 as set forth above, the Defendant,

SARAH FRANCES BOLHUIS,

shall forfeit to the United States any property, real or personal, which constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the violation. The property to be forfeited includes the following:

1. MONEY JUDGMENT: A sum of money equal to approximately \$7,559,730, which represents the proceeds the defendant obtained from the offense charged in Count 1.

2. SUBSTITUTE ASSETS: If any of the property described above, 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 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 forfeiture of substitute property pursuant to

21 U.S.C. § 853(p), as incorporated by 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c).

18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C)

28 U.S.C. § 2461(c)

21 U.S.C. § 853(p)

18 U.S.C. § 1343

PATRICK A. MILES, JR.
United States Attorney



CHRISTOPHER M. O'CONNOR
Assistant United States Attorney

Dated: August 11, 2016