**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA** | : | **CRIMINAL NO: 26-** |
| **v.** | : | **DATE FILED:** |
| **JOSEPH PIZZO**<br>**TIZIANA TAORMINA** | :<br>:<br>:<br>: | **VIOLATIONS:**<br>**18 U.S.C. § 1349 (conspiracy to commit health care fraud – 1 count)**<br>**18 U.S.C. § 1347 (health care fraud – 3 counts)**<br>**18 U.S.C. § 2 (aiding and abetting)**<br>**Notice of forfeiture** |

**INDICTMENT**

**COUNT ONE**

**THE GRAND JURY CHARGES THAT:**

At all times material to this indictment:

1. Medicaid was a health care benefit program jointly funded by the federal and state governments. Medicaid was overseen by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS"), an agency of the United States Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS"). In Pennsylvania, Medicaid, also known as "Medical Assistance," was also overseen by the Pennsylvania Department of Human Services ("DHS"). A person covered by Medicaid was referred to as a recipient, a consumer, or a beneficiary.

2. CMS allowed states to apply for various Home and Community-Based Services ("HCBS") waiver programs authorized in Section 1915(c) of the Social Security Act. HCBS waiver programs permitted a state to furnish an array of home and community-based services that would assist Medicaid beneficiaries to live in the community and avoid institutionalization. CMS allowed states latitude to design a HCBS waiver program that addressed the specific needs and goals of the state.

3. Pennsylvania designed and received CMS approval for an HCBS waiver program called Community HealthChoices ("CHC"). CHC allowed Medicaid to pay for, among other things, home and community-based personal assistance services for those recipients who otherwise would need to live in a nursing home because of disability. CHC required Medicaid recipients to enroll with a managed care organization ("CHC MCO") to receive long-term services and supports, including personal assistance services, and physical health services, such as obtaining medical care and treatment.

4. Each CHC MCO, including CHC MCO #1, known to the grand jury, was itself a health care benefit program, in that it was a public or private plan or contract, affecting commerce, under which medical benefits, items, and services were provided to individuals.

5. Personal assistance services, also called personal care services, were aimed at helping the recipient to complete tasks of daily living that would have been performed independently if the recipient had no disability, including eating, bathing, toileting, transferring, and personal hygiene. The personal assistance services also included services related to the recipient's medical condition, such as transporting the recipient to and coordinating doctors' appointments and obtaining emergency medical assistance when needed. For Medicaid recipients who could only live outside of an institutional setting with assistance performing activities of daily living, a personal care assistance worker ("PCA") was assigned to provide personal care services paid for by Medicaid.

6. One way to receive personal assistance services was to become a client of a home care agency ("Agency"). The recipient could choose an Agency and could also change to a new Agency at any time. The Agency employed PCAs to supply the personal assistance services for which the recipient had been approved.

7. A recipient could request that an Agency assign a PCA, or alternatively a person of the recipient's choice could seek employment with an Agency in order to provide the services to the recipient. PCAs were not medical professionals and did not require specialized medical training to provide the services. However, PCAs were required to go through a hiring and onboarding process when hired by an Agency.

8. The Agency was responsible for keeping records of all dates and times on which a PCA provided services to a recipient. Personal assistance services were billed by the Agency to the CHC MCO in 15-minute increments or units based on the PCA's reported hours, and the Agency then paid the PCA an hourly rate.

9. The CHC required use of Electronic Visit Verification ("EVV") for personal assistance services. EVV was a technology solution that electronically verified the delivery dates and times of home and community-based services to the recipients of those services. The EVV system captured the following data:

a. Type of service performed;
b. Individual receiving the service;
c. Date of service;
d. Location of service delivery, if completed by computer or mobile device;
e. Individual providing the service; and
f. Time the service began and ended.

42 U.S.C. § 1396b(*l*)(5)(A).

10. Pennsylvania required EVV for billing personal care services. Paper timesheets could serve as a backup for times when EVV was not possible for technical reasons. A PCA was responsible for clocking in and clocking out for each shift using EVV.

11. EVV was performed over telephone lines or via computer or mobile device application, and corrections or edits could be made through a web-based portal. In Pennsylvania, an Agency's EVV data was electronically transmitted to computer servers operated or controlled by a third-party vendor for the CHC MCOs. An Agency typically submitted claims through a vendor. Prior to paying a claim, the CHC MCO compared the claim to the EVV data.

12. Each CHC MCO received Medicaid funds based on the number of recipients enrolled with that CHC MCO, and each CHC MCO was responsible for paying claims, including claims for personal assistance services submitted by an Agency.

13. Agency #1, known to the grand jury, was a licensed Agency that employed PCAs. Agency #1 was an entity providing personal care services for which payment was made under health care benefit programs, including CHC MCO #1.

14. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA was a PCA who was employed by, and purported to render services through, Agency #1.

15. Defendant JOSEPH PIZZO was a Medicaid recipient who was enrolled in CHC and received medical benefits, items, and services from Medicaid via CHC MCO #1. Defendant PIZZO retained Agency #1 to provide purportedly necessary personal assistance services.

16. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA purported to provide personal assistance services to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO from in or about July 2023 to in or about April 2024, and from in or about July 2024 to in or about May 2026. Defendant TAORMINA was

employed and paid by Agency #1 to provide such services to defendant PIZZO. During at least some of the relevant time period, defendants TAORMINA and PIZZO were engaged in a romantic relationship and, at certain points, were cohabitants.

17. Agency #1 billed CHC MCO #1 and received money from CHC MCO #1 for the personal assistance services purportedly rendered by its employees, including services purportedly rendered by defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO, based on the entries in the EVV system.

18. From at least in or about July 2023 through at least in or about May 2026, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and elsewhere, defendants

**JOSEPH PIZZO and**
**TIZIANA TAORMINA**

conspired and agreed, together and with others known and unknown to the grand jury, to knowingly and willfully execute a scheme and artifice to defraud one or more health care benefit programs, specifically, Medicaid and CHC MCO #1, and to obtain, by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, money and property owned by, and under the custody and control of, Medicaid and CHC MCO #1, in connection with the delivery of and payment for health care benefits, items, and services, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1347.

## MANNER AND MEANS

It was part of the conspiracy that:

19. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA was employed by Agency #1, purporting to provide personal assistance services as a PCA to Medicaid recipient defendant JOSEPH PIZZO.

20. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA falsely represented or caused to be represented that she performed personal assistance services for defendant JOSEPH PIZZO, knowing and intending that such false representations would result in the submission of false and fraudulent claims to Medicaid.

21. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA performed or caused to be performed false and fraudulent clock-ins and clock-outs, generally through EVV, for personal assistance services that she purportedly rendered and provided to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO.

22. Despite purporting to provide personal assistance services to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO and being paid for such services, defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA was engaged in other activities and not the care services she purported to be providing.

23. By performing or causing to be performed such false EVV entries, defendants TIZIANA TAORMINA and JOSEPH PIZZO caused Agency #1 to submit false and fraudulent claims to CHC MCO #1 for those services. CHC MCO #1 paid Agency #1 on those claims, and Agency #1 then paid defendant TAORMINA an hourly rate for the purported services.

24. At times, prior to their cohabitation, defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA walked to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO's residence to make an EVV entry from outside the residence. Defendant TAORMINA did not enter the house and left immediately after clocking in via EVV. Defendant TAORMINA returned to defendant PIZZO's residence at the end of her shift to clock out via EVV from outside and left immediately after making the EVV entry. Defendant TAORMINA was not actually providing personal assistance services to defendant PIZZO, but rather was fraudulently submitting EVV clock-ins and clock-outs in order to be paid for services she did not provide.

25. On certain dates when defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA falsely made EVV entries purporting to provide services, including after defendants TAORMINA and JOSEPH PIZZO began cohabitating, defendant TAORMINA was located in one part of Philadelphia while defendant PIZZO was in other parts of Philadelphia, in another county, or out of the state.

26. Additionally, defendant JOSEPH PIZZO frequently worked a construction job or, at other times, was incarcerated. During those times when defendant PIZZO was on the construction job or incarcerated, defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA made false EVV entries purporting to provide care services to defendant PIZZO.

27. In order to conceal and disguise the scheme, defendants JOSEPH PIZZO and TIZIANA TAORMINA made false representations during in-home evaluations to CHC MCO # 1 employees about defendant PIZZO's health, the care defendant TAORMINA provided to defendant PIZZO, and the amount of care defendant PIZZO needed. Defendants PIZZO and TAORMINA were present together for in-home evaluations performed by CHC MCO #1.

28. Defendant JOSEPH PIZZO made false and fraudulent representations to CHC MCO #1 that he received insufficient care hours and that he required more care hours. Defendant PIZZO's false and fraudulent representations resulted in a change to defendant PIZZO's approved hours of care. Defendant PIZZO signed false and fraudulent authorizations documenting the changes of care approved by CHC MCO #1, including increased hours of care requested by defendant PIZZO.

29. Defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA in many instances shared the proceeds from Agency #1 with defendant JOSEPH PIZZO.

30. In total, defendants TIZIANA TAORMINA and JOSEPH PIZZO caused Agency #1 to bill CHC MCO #1, and CHC MCO #1 to pay Agency #1, at least approximately $160,415.

**ACTS IN FURTHERANCE OF THE CONSPIRACY**

In furtherance of the conspiracy and to accomplish its object, defendants, and others known and unknown to the grand jury, committed the following acts in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere:

1. On or about January 1, 2024, while defendant JOSEPH PIZZO was incarcerated in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA falsely represented via EVV clock-in and clock-out that she provided personal care services to defendant PIZZO when such services were not provided.

2. On or about June 6, 2025, during an annual certification, defendant JOSEPH PIZZO falsely represented that he experienced severe pain and could not conduct certain activities because he was generally unable to hold or grip items with his right hand.

3. On or about October 4, 2025, while defendant PIZZO traveled throughout various Philadelphia neighborhoods, defendant TIZIANA TAORMINA falsely represented via EVV clock-in and clock-out that she provided personal care services to defendant JOSEPH PIZZO when no such services were not provided.

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

## COUNTS TWO THROUGH FOUR

**THE GRAND JURY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:**

At all times material to this indictment:

1. Paragraphs 1 through 17, 19 through 30, and Acts in Furtherance of the Conspiracy paragraphs 1 through 3 of Count One are incorporated here.

2. On or about the dates listed below, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, and elsewhere, defendants

**JOSEPH PIZZO and**
**TIZIANA TAORMINA**

knowingly and willfully executed, and aided and abetted the execution of, a scheme and artifice to defraud one or more health care benefit programs, specifically, Medicaid and CHC MCO #1, and to obtain, by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, money and property owned by, and under the custody and control of, Medicaid and CHC MCO #1, in connection with the delivery of and payment for health care benefits, items, and services, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1347, each count constituting a separate offense:

| Count | Approx. Purported Date of Service | Approx. Amount |
|---|---|---|
| **2** | January 1, 2024 | $80.70 |
| **3** | October 23, 2025 | $215.20 |
| **4** | October 28, 2025 | $215.20 |

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1347 and 2.

## NOTICE OF FORFEITURE

**THE GRAND JURY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:**

1. As a result of the violations of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1347 and 1349, set forth in this indictment, defendants

**JOSEPH PIZZO and**
**TIZIANA TAORMINA**

shall forfeit to the United States of America any property, real or personal, that constitutes or is derived, directly or indirectly, from gross proceeds traceable to the commission of such offenses.

2. If any of the property subject to forfeiture, as a result of any act or omission of the defendants:

(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;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendants up to the value of the property subject to forfeiture.

All pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(a)(7).

A TRUE BILL:

[redacted]

Salvatore L. Astolfi for
**DAVID METCALF**
**UNITED STATES ATTORNEY**

**LORINDA LARYEA**
**Chief**
**Criminal Division, Fraud Section**

*No.*___________

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Criminal Division

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

vs.

JOSEPH PIZZO
TIZIANA TAORMINA

INDICTMENT

18 U.S.C. § 1349 (conspiracy to commit health care fraud – 1 count)
18 U.S.C. § 1347 (health care fraud – 3 counts)
18 U.S.C. § 2 (aiding and abetting)

[redacted]

Bail, $___________

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

INDICTMENT

DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: 615 Chestnut Street, Suite 1250, Philadelphia, PA 19106-4476

Post Office: Philadelphia County: Philadelphia

City and State of Defendant: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

County: Philadelphia Register number: N/A

Place of accident, incident, or transaction: Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Post Office: Philadelphia County: Philadelphia

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Criminal cases are deemed related when the answer to the following question is "yes".

Does this case involve a defendant or defendants alleged to have participated in the same action or transaction, or in the same series of acts or transactions, constituting an offense or offenses?

YES/NO: Yes

Case Number: US v. Donna Romsteadt, et al and US v. Albert R. Coccia, Jr., et al (filed same day)

CRIMINAL: (Criminal Category - FOR USE BY U.S. ATTORNEY ONLY)

1. ○ Antitrust
2. ○ Income Tax and other Tax Prosecutions
3. ○ Commercial Mail Fraud
4. ○ Controlled Substances
5. ○ Violations of 18 U.S.C. Chapters 95 and 96 (Sections 1951-55 and 1961-68) and Mail Fraud other than commercial
6. ● General Criminal

(U.S. ATTORNEY WILL PLEASE DESIGNATE PARTICULAR CRIME AND STATUTE CHARGED TO BE VIOLATED AND STATE ANY PREVIOUS CRIMINAL NUMBER FOR SPEEDY TRIAL ACT TRACKING PURPOSES)

(SEE reverse for Violations Charged and Additional Defendants)

DATE: 7/28/2026

*/s Paul J. Koob*
PAUL J. KOOB
CARLA JORDAN-DETAMORE
DOJ Trial Attorneys

File No. 2026R00661
U.S. v. JOSEPH PIZZO, et al

Violations:

18 U.S.C. § 1349 (conspiracy to commit health care fraud – 1 count)
18 U.S.C. § 1347 (health care fraud – 3 counts)
18 U.S.C. § 2 (aiding and abetting)

Additional Defendants:

TIZIANA TAORMINA: Philadelphia, PA