

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	Hon.
	:	
v.	:	Crim. No. 22-
	:	
GERARD BEAUZILE	:	18 U.S.C. § 1343
	:	18 U.S.C. § 2

INDICTMENT

The Grand Jury in and for the District of New Jersey, sitting at Newark, charges:

COUNTS ONE THROUGH TEN
(Wire Fraud)

Introduction

1. From in or around 2014 through in or around December 2020, the defendant Gerard Beauzile ("BEAUZILE") abused his position as Controller of a New York-based company ("Victim Company") to embezzle funds from the Victim Company by issuing fraudulent Victim Company checks to himself and then depositing those funds into his bank account for his own personal benefit.

Defendant and Other Entities

2. At all times relevant to this Indictment:

a. BEAUZILE was a resident of South Plainfield, New Jersey, and was employed as Controller by the Victim Company from approximately in or around 2001 through in or around February 2021. As Controller, BEAUZILE oversaw the accounting functions within Victim Company and, as such, had

authority to issue Victim Company checks on its behalf from Victim Company's bank account held at Bank 1.

b. Victim Company was located in New York, New York, and was a provider of news, data, analysis and research for the global energy industry.

c. Bank 1 was a financial institution with numerous bank locations in New York, New York.

d. Bank 2 was a financial institution with numerous bank locations in New York and New Jersey. BEAUZILE maintained his bank account at a Bank 2 branch in South Plainfield, New Jersey.

The Scheme to Defraud

3. From in or around 2014 through in or around December 2020, in the District of New Jersey, and elsewhere, defendant

GERARD BEAUZILE

knowingly and intentionally devised and intended to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud Victim Company, and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, as set forth below.

Goal of the Scheme to Defraud

4. The goal of the scheme was for BEAUZILE to enrich himself by fraudulently issuing Victim Company checks to himself and then depositing those checks into his bank account at Bank 2 for his own personal benefit.

Manner and Means of the Scheme to Defraud

5. It was part of the scheme to defraud that:

a. BEAUZILE—without authorization—issued approximately 140 Victim Company checks drawn on Victim Company's bank account at Bank 1. The checks had a total value of approximately \$2,372,738, were made payable to BEAUZILE, and were deposited by BEAUZILE into his bank account at Bank 2 branches located in New York, New York.

b. Once the fraudulent checks were deposited into BEAUZILE's bank account at Bank 2, he used the funds for his own personal benefit and the benefit of his family, including to pay for purchases made at restaurants, retail and department stores, and liquor stores, and the payment of utility bills, transportation costs, furniture, and home maintenance expenses.

c. BEAUZILE concealed the theft and embezzlement of funds from Victim Company by:

i. Intentionally failing to enter fraudulent checks into Victim Company's accounting system, thereby hiding the payments of Victim Company funds to BEAUZILE;

ii. Falsely entering fraudulent checks into the Victim Company's accounting system under various Victim Company vendor names as payees, thereby causing the accounting system to falsely reflect that the checks were made payable to Victim Company vendors instead of to BEAUZILE;

iii. Falsifying Victim Company vendor invoices to correspond to the entries made in the Victim Company's accounting system to falsely reflect that the fraudulent checks were made payable to vendors instead of to BEAUZILE; and

iv. Falsifying Victim Company bank account statements from Bank 1 by removing and altering opening, running, and closing balances, check payment entries, summary check listings, and inter-account transfers.

Execution of the Scheme to Defraud

6. On or about the dates listed below, for the purpose of executing the scheme and artifice to defraud, in the District of New Jersey and elsewhere, defendant

GERARD BEAUZILE

did knowingly transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communications in interstate commerce certain writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds, described below, each constituting a separate count:

Count	Approximate Date	Description
1	January 18, 2019	Interstate wire transfer related to \$10,669.44 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
2	March 15, 2019	Interstate wire transfer related to \$10,761.30 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
3	April 2, 2019	Interstate wire transfer related to \$17,251.26 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
4	July 19, 2019	Interstate wire transfer related to \$17,251.26 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.

5	September 30, 2019	Interstate wire transfer related to \$17,251.26 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
6	January 2, 2020	Interstate wire transfer related to \$17,773.19 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
7	March 4, 2020	Interstate wire transfer related to \$11,130.00 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
8	September 15, 2020	Interstate wire transfer related to \$10,164.50 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
9	October 2, 2020	Interstate wire transfer related to \$18,919.25 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.
10	December 4, 2020	Interstate wire transfer related to \$10,900.27 BEAUZILE misappropriated from Victim Company's Bank 1 account.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 2.

FORFEITURE ALLEGATION

1. Upon conviction of the wire fraud offenses, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343, as charged in this Indictment, defendant GERARD BEAUZILE shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), all property, real and personal, the defendant obtained that constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the commission of the said offenses.

Substitute Assets Provision

2. If any of the above-described forfeitable property, 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 person;
- 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 subdivided without difficulty;

it is the intent of the United States, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), as incorporated by 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendant up to the value of the forfeitable property.

A TRUE BILL

A black rectangular redaction box covering a signature.

FOREPERSON

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Philip R. Sellinger".

Philip R. Sellinger
United States Attorney

CASE NUMBER: _____

**United States District Court
District of New Jersey**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

GERARD BEAUZILE

INDICTMENT FOR

18 U.S.C. § 1343

18 U.S.C. § 2

A True Bill,


Foreperson

PHILIP R. SELLINGER
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

BLAKE COPPOTELLI
ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEY
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY
973-856-9095
