

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : Hon.
 :
 v. : Crim. No. 13-
 :
 DANIEL CHALET : 18 U.S.C. § 1349

INFORMATION
(Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud)

The defendant having waived in open court prosecution by Indictment, the United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey charges:

BACKGROUND

1. At various times relevant to this Information:
 - a. Defendant Daniel Chalet ("CHALET") resided in or near Bloomfield, New Jersey; and
 - b. The Home Depot ("Home Depot") was the world's largest home improvement retail store and was headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia. Home Depot had thousands of retail locations throughout the United States, including in New Jersey.

THE CONSPIRACY

2. From in or about March 2009 through in or about June 2012, in the District of New Jersey, and elsewhere,

defendant

DANIEL CHALET

did knowingly and intentionally conspire and agree with others, known and unknown, to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud Home Depot, and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, and, for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice to defraud, did transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communications in interstate and foreign commerce, certain writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds, contrary to Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

OBJECT OF THE CONSPIRACY

3. It was the object of the conspiracy for defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators to obtain money and property from Home Depot by fraudulently representing that they had purchased goods that were stolen from Home Depot retail locations and by subsequently returning those stolen goods to Home Depot for Home Depot store credit.

MANNER AND MEANS OF THE CONSPIRACY

4. It was part of the conspiracy that, on hundreds of separate occasions, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators made purchases at various Home Depot retail locations located in New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Delaware, Maryland, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania. The individual items purchased by

defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators were typically high-value items, and the transactions typically totaled in the hundreds of dollars. Defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators used cash, and fraudulently obtained Home Depot store credit, or some combination thereof, to make the purchases. Defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators obtained a valid Home Depot receipt for the goods purchased.

5. It was further part of the conspiracy that, a short time after this initial purchase, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators returned to the same Home Depot retail store where they retrieved a second set of goods that were identical to the items just purchased. Defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators proceeded to a register with the second set of goods. At the register, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators typically purchased a low-value item and, with the receipt from the first transaction, represented to the clerk that they had previously paid for the second set of goods when, in fact, they had not previously paid for this second set of goods. In so doing, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators were permitted to leave the store with the second set of goods, which had never been purchased.

6. It was further part of the conspiracy that defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators went to the same or another Home Depot store with the goods they had previously

"purchased" for the purpose of returning those goods. For the goods actually purchased, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators typically presented a valid receipt and received a refund in the form of cash, or store credit, depending on how the original purchase was made. For the goods that were stolen, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators typically did not present a receipt and obtained Home Depot store credit (a "Non-Receipted Refund"), which defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators then used to make subsequent purchases for the purposes of perpetuating the fraudulent scheme.

7. It was further part of the conspiracy that every time defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators obtained a Non-Receipted Refund in furtherance of the foregoing scheme, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators caused Home Depot to transmit information via interstate wire in order to complete the return and generate store credit.

8. It was further part of the conspiracy that defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators fraudulently altered defendant CHALET's New Jersey driver's license to change the driver's license number displayed on his license in an attempt to ensure that the information entered into Home Depot's system would not trace back to him.

9. As a result of the conspiracy, defendant CHALET and his co-conspirators caused Home Depot to suffer a loss of approximately \$470,511.66.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349.



PAUL J. FISHMAN
United States Attorney