

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : Criminal No. 19-  
v. :  
BARRY MARKMAN : 26 U.S.C. § 7201

**INFORMATION**

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

1. At all times relevant to this Information:

a. Defendant BARRY MARKMAN was a resident of Margate, New Jersey. Defendant MARKMAN was a partial owner of Company 1 located in Northfield, New Jersey. Company 1 sold and installed various shutters, shades and blinds to retail customers and to wholesale customers under the name, Company 2. Defendant MARKMAN maintained a personal bank account at Bank of America.

b. The Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) was a constituent agency of the United States Department of Treasury and part of the Executive Branch of the Government responsible for administering and enforcing the tax laws of the United States and collecting taxes owed to the Treasury of the United States, and providing refunds of taxes overpaid.

c. A U.S. Individual Income Tax Return (“Form 1040”) was the form filed by a taxpayer and used by the IRS to assess liability for personal income tax and eligibility for refunds.

d. Generally, individuals were required by law to prepare and file Form 1040 income tax returns with the IRS by April 15 of the year following the year when the income was earned unless an extension was granted. If those income tax returns showed that income taxes were due and owing, then the tax payer was obligated by law to pay that sum of money to the IRS.

2. Between in or about 2012 and 2016, defendant BARRY MARKMAN skimmed business receipts from Company 1 and Company 2 in order to evade the assessment of federal income tax. He accomplished this by causing customers of Company 1 and Company 2 to provide him with checks, paid to the order of him personally, for products and services provided by Company 1 and Company 2. Those skimmed receipts totaled approximately \$618,002, which defendant MARKMAN deposited into his personal bank account at Bank of America. Defendant MARKMAN used portions of these monies for personal expenses. Defendant MARKMAN failed to report as income on his personal tax returns the monies skimmed from Company 1 and Company 2 that he received from customers of Company 1 and Company 2, thereby causing such returns to understate a substantial amount of income.

3. For tax years 2012 through 2016, defendant BARRY MARKMAN generally reported to the IRS, among other things, Form W-2 wages paid by Company 1, interest and dividend income, prior refunds, property tax information, casino winnings and losses, and other deductions. He omitted, however, all of the money he embezzled from Company 1 and Company 2 which defendant MARKMAN used for his personal benefit. Thus, defendant



MARKMAN failed to disclose and report a significant portion of his income on his tax returns, thereby causing those tax returns to substantially understate the amount of income he received.

4. On or about April 15, 2013, defendant BARRY MARKMAN filed a 2012 Form 1040 on behalf of himself and his wife. That return falsely stated that their taxable income for the calendar year 2012 was \$54,692 and requested a tax refund of \$2,187.

5. The tax return did not include approximately \$40,502 in additional taxable income defendant BARRY MARKMAN received in 2012. Based upon this income, an additional tax of approximately \$8,523 was due and owing to the United States.

6. On or about April 15, 2014, defendant BARRY MARKMAN filed a 2013 Form 1040 on behalf of himself and his wife. That return stated that their taxable income for the calendar year 2013 was \$88,610 and the amount of tax due and owing was \$3,714.

7. The tax return did not include approximately \$72,617 in additional taxable income defendant BARRY MARKMAN received in 2013. Based upon this income, an additional tax of approximately \$19,205 was due and owing to the United States.

8. On or about April 15, 2015, defendant BARRY MARKMAN filed a 2014 Form 1040 on behalf of himself and his wife. That return falsely stated that their taxable income for the calendar year 2014 was \$89,611 and the amount of tax due and owing was \$3,657.

9. The tax return did not include approximately \$67,322 in additional taxable income defendant BARRY MARKMAN received in 2014. Based upon this income, an additional tax of approximately \$17,070 was due and owing to the United States.

10. On or about April 15, 2016, defendant BARRY MARKMAN filed a 2015 Form 1040 on behalf of himself and his wife. That return falsely stated that their taxable income for the calendar year 2015 was \$93,510 and the amount of tax due and owing was \$4,581.

11. The tax return did not include approximately \$179,919 in additional taxable income defendant BARRY MARKMAN received in 2015. Based upon this income, an additional tax of approximately \$50,792 was due and owing to the United States.

12. On or about April 15, 2017, defendant BARRY MARKMAN filed a 2016 Form 1040 on behalf of himself and his wife. That return falsely stated that their taxable income for the calendar year 2016 was \$77,852 and the amount of tax due and owing was \$658.

13. The tax return did not include approximately \$257,639 in additional taxable income defendant BARRY MARKMAN received in 2016. Based upon this income, an additional tax of approximately \$75,114 was due and owing to the United States.

14. The total additional tax due and owing to the United States for tax years 2012 through 2016 was \$170,704.

15. On or about April 15, 2017, in the District of New Jersey and elsewhere, defendant

BARRY MARKMAN

did willfully attempt to evade and defeat a substantial part of the income tax due and owing to the United States, in that he signed and caused to be filed a false and fraudulent 2016 U.S. Individual Income Tax Return, Form 1040, described in paragraph 12 of this Information, knowing it to be false and fraudulent as described in paragraph 13 of this Information, thereby concealing and attempting to conceal from the IRS his true and correct income.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7201.

  
CRAIG CARPENITO  
United States Attorney

CASE NUMBER: 19-

---

---

United States District Court  
District of New Jersey

---

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

BARRY MARKMAN

---

---

INFORMATION FOR

26 U.S.C. § 7201

---

---

CRAIG CARPENITO  
U.S. ATTORNEY, NEWARK, NEW JERSEY

---

---

JASON M. RICHARDSON  
ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY  
CAMDEN, NEW JERSEY  
(856) 757-5026

---

---

USA-48AD8  
(Ed. 1/97)