18 MAG 2826

Approved:

JESSICA LONERGÁN/NICOLAS ROOS

Assistant United States Attorneys

Before:

HONORABLE HENRY B. PITMAN

United States Magistrate Judge Southern District of New York

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

SEALED COMPLAINT

Violations of

VICTOR CASADO,

18 U.S.C. §§ 371, 201(b)(2)(C), 1791,

1349, 1343, and 1346

Defendant.

COUNTY OF OFFENSE:

NEW YORK

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, ss.:

WILLIAM MATELSKI, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a Special Agent with the Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General ("DOJ-OIG"), and charges as follows:

COUNT ONE (Conspiracy)

- From at least in or about 2016, up to and including at least in or about 2017, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other to commit offenses against the United States, to wit, (1) bribery, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 201(b)(2)(C), and (2) providing contraband in prison, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1791(a)(1).
- It was a part and object of the conspiracy that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, being a public official, directly and indirectly, corruptly demanded, sought, received, accepted and agreed to receive and accept things of value personally and for another person and entity, in return for being induced to do and omit to do an act in violation of his official duties, to wit, CASADO, a correctional officer at the Metropolitan Correctional Center (the "MCC"), a federal jail, solicited and accepted

payments in return for smuggling contraband, including, but not limited to, cellular telephones and alcohol, into the MCC, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 201(b)(2).

3. It was further a part and an object of the conspiracy that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and others known and unknown, in violation of a statute and a rule and order issued under a statute, would and did provide to inmates of the MCC contraband, including, but not limited to, cellular telephones and alcohol, and did attempt to do so, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1791(a)(1).

OVERT ACTS

- 4. In furtherance of said conspiracy and to effect the illegal objects thereof, the following overt acts, among others, were committed in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere:
- a. In or about late 2016, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, received \$5,000 from an inmate at the MCC.
- b. In or about late 2016, CASADO smuggled alcohol into the MCC for the same inmate in exchange for money.
- c. In or about spring 2017, CASADO gave the same inmate a written note containing a name and contact information for an individual in the Dominican Republic. CASADO asked the inmate to have \$5,000 wired to the individual in the Dominican Republic.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.)

(Bribery)

5. From at least in or about 2016, up to and including at least in or about 2017, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, being a public official, directly and indirectly, corruptly demanded, sought, received, accepted and agreed to receive and accept a thing of value, personally and for another person and entity, in return for being induced to do and omit to do an act in violation of his official duty, to wit, CASADO, a correctional officer at the MCC, solicited and accepted payments in return for smuggling

contraband, including, but not limited to, cellphones and alcohol, into the MCC.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 201(b)(2)(C).)

(Providing Contraband in Prison)

6. From at least in or about 2016, up to and including at least in or about 2017, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, in violation of a statute and a rule and order issued under a statute, provided to an inmate of a prison a prohibited object, and attempted to do so, to wit, CASADO provided to inmates of the MCC contraband, including, but not limited to, cellular telephones and alcohol.

(Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1791(a)(1) and (b)(4).)

COUNT FOUR (Conspiracy to Commit Honest Services Fraud)

- 7. From in or about 2016, up to and including in or about 2017, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate, and agree together and with each other to violate Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 1346.
- 8. It was a part and an object of the conspiracy that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly, having devised and intending to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and to deprive the Federal Bureau of Prisons of its intangible right to the honest services of CASADO, a correctional officer at the MCC, would and did transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communication in interstate and foreign commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 1346, to wit, CASADO, including through the use of interstate wire communications, agreed to smuggle contraband, including, but not limited to, cellular telephones and alcohol, into the MCC in exchange for bribe payments from an inmate.

(Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349.)

COUNT FIVE (Honest Services Fraud)

9. From at least in or about 2016, up to and including in or about 2017, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, having devised and intending to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and to deprive the Federal Bureau of Prisons of its intangible right to the honest services of CASADO, a correctional officer at the MCC, willfully and knowingly transmitted and caused to be transmitted by means of wire communication in interstate and foreign commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme and artifice, to wit, CASADO, including through the use of interstate wire communications, solicited and accepted bribe payments from an inmate in exchange for CASADO smuggling contraband, including, but not limited to, cellular telephones and alcohol, into the MCC.

(Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 1346.)

The bases for my knowledge and for the foregoing charges are, in part, as follows:

10. I am a Special Agent with DOJ-OIG and I have been personally involved in the investigation of this matter. This affidavit is based upon my personal participation in the investigation of this matter, my conversations with law enforcement agents, witnesses, and others, as well as my examination of reports, records, and audio recordings. Because this affidavit is being submitted for the limited purpose of establishing probable cause, it does not include all the facts that I have learned during the course of my investigation. Where the contents of documents and the actions, statements, and conversations of others are reported herein, they are reported in substance and in part, except where otherwise indicated.

The Metropolitan Correctional Center

- 11. Based on my conversations with other law enforcement officers and my review of reports and records, I know the following:
- a. The United States Marshals Service ("USMS") is a federal law enforcement agency within the United States Department of Justice. Among other things, the USMS is responsible for the care and custody of federal inmates from the time of their arrest by a federal agency or remand by a judge

until they either are acquitted, committed to their designated Federal Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") institution following a conviction, or otherwise ordered released from USMS custody.

- b. The USMS does not own or operate detention facilities; rather, the USMS houses its inmates at either state or local government facilities, BOP facilities, or private detention facilities.
- c. In New York City, the USMS houses pretrial detainees at several locations, including the MCC, which is a BOP-run federal jail located in Manhattan.
- d. The MCC employs more than 110 correctional staff, which includes Correctional Officers, Senior Officers, and Senior Officer Specialists. Senior Officers and Senior Officer Specialists are both correctional officers of higher rank.
- e. The primary duty of Correctional Officers, Senior Officers, and Senior Officer Specialists is to ensure the care, custody, and control of the inmate population of the MCC. In connection with this duty, such officers participate in inspections and searches of inmates and MCC facilities, and are tasked with, among other things, ensuring that contraband is not brought into the MCC.
- According to the BOP's Standards of Employee f. Conduct (the "Standards of Employee Conduct"), employees of the MCC are expressly forbidden from "offer[ing] or giv[ing] to an inmate or a former inmate or any member of his/her family, or to any person known to be associated with an inmate or former inmate, any article, favor, or service that is not authorized in the performance of the employee's duties" and from "accept[ing] any gift, personal service, or favor from an inmate or former inmate, or from anyone known to be associated with or related to an inmate or former inmate." In addition, "[i]ntroducing or attempting to introduce contraband into or upon the grounds of any Federal correctional institution . . . without the CEO's [Chief Executive Officer's] knowledge and consent, is prohibited." Contraband is defined as "material prohibited by law, or by regulation, or material which can reasonably be expected to cause physical injury or adversely affect the security, safety, or good order of the institution."

The Defendant

- 12. Based on my conversations with other law enforcement officers and my review of records from the MCC, I know the following:
- a. VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, is currently employed as a Senior Officer Specialist at the MCC. CASADO has been employed as a correctional officer at the MCC since in or about 2012.
- b. On or about June 4, 2012, CASADO signed a BOP form acknowledging that he had received the Standards of Employee Conduct.
- c. On or about January 13, 2014, CASADO signed a form acknowledging that he had received the Standards of Employee Conduct and that his "conduct [was] governed by this policy and it [was his] responsibility to familiarize [him]self with the provisions of this document."
- d. CASADO provided a telephone number ending in 2853 (the "2853 Cellphone") to the BOP as his cellphone number.
- e. CASADO has been on leave since in or about late September 2017 due to an injury.

<u>Overview</u>

13. Based on my conversations with witnesses, my review of wire transfer, BOP, and other records, and my review of recorded telephone calls, I believe that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, has abused the power entrusted to him as a correctional officer by taking bribes in exchange for smuggling contraband to inmates housed at the MCC. CASADO smuggled alcohol and cellular phones, among other contraband, into the MCC. In return, CASADO received bribes from an inmate of thousands of dollars at a time, ultimately totaling in excess of \$45,000. These bribes typically were funneled to CASADO by the inmate's non-incarcerated associates, including one of the inmate's attorneys, usually in cash.

CASADO Takes Bribes From Inmate-1 in Exchange for Smuggling Contraband

- 14. Based on my conversations with a former MCC inmate ("Inmate-1"), my conversations with other law enforcement officers, and my review of debriefing notes, I have learned that Inmate-1 has reported that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, smuggled contraband, including alcohol and cellular telephones, into the MCC in exchange for bribe payments from Inmate-1. In particular, Inmate-1 stated, in substance and in part:
- a. Following Inmate-1's arrest in or about 2016, Inmate-1 was incarcerated and housed at the MCC through at least the middle of 2017.
- b. In the second half of 2016, another inmate told Inmate-1 that CASADO wanted to provide Inmate-1 with CASADO's telephone number. The inmate told Inmate-1 that he should pay CASADO \$10,000 if Inmate-1 could afford to do so, or, otherwise, \$5,000. Inmate-1 agreed, and CASADO provided his telephone number to either Inmate-1 or a member of Inmate-1's legal team ("Attorney-1").
- c. Reasoning that it could be helpful to have a prison guard indebted to him, Inmate-1 directed Attorney-1 to provide approximately \$5,000 to CASADO. Attorney-1 received the money through Western Union wires from contacts of Inmate-1 based overseas.
- d. An individual who was employed by a car service ("Driver-1") worked as a driver for Attorney-1. Both Attorney-1 and Driver-1, at Attorney-1's direction, made payments to CASADO as described herein, including the first \$5,000 payment, which Inmate-1 believes was provided to CASADO in cash by Driver-1.
- e. Around the time of the first payment, CASADO told Inmate-1 that if Inmate-1 needed anything to let CASADO know.

¹ Inmate-1 has pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement to offenses, including, among others, a conspiracy to violate United States sanctions against Iran, money laundering, and, in connection with the conduct described herein, bribery, and is providing information in the hope of obtaining leniency at sentencing. The information provided by Inmate-1 has proven to be reliable and has been corroborated, at least in part, by other evidence.

- f. Within the next few months, Inmate-1 made approximately two or three additional multi-thousand dollar payments to CASADO.
- g. During this time period, Inmate-1 asked another inmate ("Inmate-2") if Inmate-2 had a source for alcohol. Inmate-2, who knew that Inmate-1 had been paying CASADO, suggested that he (Inmate-2) could ask CASADO to provide them with alcohol. A short time after that conversation, CASADO approached Inmate-1 and said, in substance and in part, that what Inmate-1 wanted was "difficult," but that he (CASADO) would do it. Thereafter, CASADO began smuggling alcohol to the MCC and providing it to Inmate-1. CASADO brought the alcohol into the MCC in plastic water bottles, which he passed to Inmate-2, who provided it to Inmate-1. In total, CASADO provided alcohol to Inmate-1 on more than five occasions.
- h. On another occasion, CASADO asked Inmate-1 for \$25,000 to help one of CASADO's family members in the Dominican Republic. Inmate-1 agreed to pay CASADO \$15,000, which Attorney-1 provided to CASADO, in cash. Attorney-1 received the money through Western Union wires from contacts of Inmate-1 based overseas.
- i. In or about April or May 2017, Inmate-1 asked CASADO to bring a cellphone into the MCC for Inmate-1 to use. Inmate-1 told CASADO that Attorney-1 would provide the cellphone. CASADO agreed to do so, and on multiple occasions, CASADO smuggled a cellphone into and out of the MCC for Inmate-1. At the beginning of his shift, CASADO handed the cellphone to Inmate-2, who then provided it to Inmate-1. During the day, another inmate ("Inmate-3") often held the cellphone and charged it. Towards the end of CASADO's shift, Inmate-1 returned the cellphone to Inmate-2, to provide to CASADO. Inmate-1 explained that the first cellphone that CASADO brought into the MCC was too large; subsequently, CASADO brought in a smaller cellphone.
- j. Inmate-1 paid Inmate-2 approximately \$10,000, with the money primarily going from Attorney-1 to Inmate-2's wife.
- k. In addition to holding the cellphone for Inmate-1, Inmate-3 frequently sold his telephone minutes to Inmate-1 and waited in the computer line for Inmate-1. Inmate-1 arranged to have Inmate-3 paid for the telephone minutes and the other services that he provided, usually by having money sent to Inmate-3's commissary account at the MCC by, among others,

Driver-1, which I have corroborated by reviewing information from the BOP.

- 1. Inmate-1 learned from CASADO and Attorney-1 that they primarily communicated through WhatsApp, an encrypted telephone application that allows users to make telephone calls and send text messages.
- m. On one occasion, Inmate-1 observed that CASADO was angry. CASADO directed Inmate-1 to tell Attorney-1 not to call "that number." Based on my training, experience, and familiarity with this investigation, I believe that CASADO was angry because he did not want a call from Attorney-1 on his primary cellphone. Rather, CASADO wanted Attorney-1 to contact him on another cellphone or through WhatsApp, as is discussed *supra* in subparagraph 14(1).
- n. According to Inmate-1, CASADO tried to get his quarterly work assignments at the MCC arranged based on Inmate-1's housing assignments at the MCC. Based on my review of BOP housing and work assignment records, I believe this to be true. For example, Inmate-1 was housed in Unit 11-South of the MCC from approximately December 2016 through early March 2017; from early January 2017 through February 2017, CASADO was also assigned to Unit 11-South on numerous days. From early March 2017 until May 2017—at which point he was transferred to the Special Housing Unit ("SHU")—Inmate-1 was housed in Unit 7-South of the MCC; during that same time period, CASADO was assigned on numerous days to Unit 7-South, and only once to Unit 11-South. In the fourth quarter of 2016, the approximate time when Inmate-1 started paying CASADO, CASADO's assignment was "internal," which I have learned is an elevator post.
- o. In total, between mid-2016 and mid-2017, Inmate-1 paid CASADO approximately between \$45,000 and \$50,000, typically through Attorney-1. In addition to the alcohol and cellphones, CASADO smuggled additional items into the MCC for Inmate-1, including vitamin C, over-the-counter pain medication, DayQuil, and food.
- 15. I have spoken to two additional inmates—the inmate identified above as Inmate-3, who helped store the cellphones that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, brought for Inmate-1, and another inmate ("Inmate-4"). Both inmates corroborated Inmate-1's account of the scheme described above, including CASADO's provision of contraband to Inmate-1. In addition, Inmate-4 was propositioned to engage in a similar scheme with CASADO.

Specifically, based on my conversations with Inmate-3 and Inmate-4,2 I have learned the following, in substance and in part:

- a. Inmate-3 has been incarcerated at the MCC, where he met Inmate-1, since in or about 2012. In approximately April 2017, Inmate-1 told Inmate-3 that Inmate-1's attorney was going to help bring a cellphone into the MCC. Inmate-1 asked Inmate-3 for help concealing the cellphone, and Inmate-3 agreed to help. Inmate-3 hid and charged the cellphone for Inmate-1 on multiple occasions. Inmate-3 saw CASADO with the same cellphone. In addition, because computer access at the MCC is limited and there is often a queue of inmates waiting to use computers, Inmate-3 assisted Inmate-1 at times by waiting in the computer line for Inmate-1.
- b. Inmate-1 paid Inmate-3 for his various forms of assistance, and did so for other inmates we well. In order to facilitate these payments, Inmate-1 had money sent by Western Union from his country of origin to either one of Inmate-1's attorneys (a woman, whom I believe to be Attorney-1) or to Inmate-2's wife ("Wife-1"). Inmate-1's attorney or Wife-1 then had the money sent to Inmate-3's and other inmates' commissary accounts at the MCC, which I have corroborated by reviewing BOP records for Inmate-3.
- c. In addition to being aware that CASADO was smuggling cellphones into the MCC for Inmate-1, on several occasions, Inmate-3 observed CASADO with plastic water bottles in his hands, and then, a short time later, saw Inmate-2 with the same water bottles. Inmate-2 explained to Inmate-3 that CASADO left the water bottles near a garbage can for Inmate-2 to collect.
- d. Inmate-3 was aware that the water bottles contained alcohol, and occasionally drank some of the alcohol with Inmate-1 and Inmate-2. Both Inmate-1 and Inmate-2 explained that Inmate-1 paid CASADO for the bottles of alcohol. Inmate-2 collected and stored the bottles on Inmate-1's behalf.

² Inmate-3 has pleaded guilty pursuant to a cooperation agreement to federal crimes unrelated to the conduct described in this Complaint. Inmate-4 has pleaded guilty to federal crimes unrelated to the conduct described in this Complaint. Both Inmate-3 and Inmate-4 are providing information in the hope of obtaining leniency at sentencing. The information provided by Inmate-3 and Inmate-4 has proven to be reliable and has been corroborated, at least in part, by other evidence.

- e. In or about mid-2017, CASADO told Inmate-3 that another correctional officer had warned CASADO to stop bringing cellphones and alcohol into the MCC, after learning about it from another inmate.
- f. Inmate-4 has been incarcerated at the MCC, where he met Inmate-2 and Inmate-1, since in or about 2016.
- g. In a conversation in or about August or September 2017, Inmate-2 offered to introduce Inmate-4 to CASADO for the purpose of smuggling alcohol or a cellphone into the MCC. Inmate-2 explained that CASADO had previously smuggled alcohol and cellphones into the MCC for Inmate-1 and could do it for Inmate-4. Inmate-2 explained that a woman on Inmate-1's legal team (whom I believe to be Attorney-1) delivered thousands of dollars to CASADO. Inmate-2 and Inmate-4 further discussed that Inmate-4 would help finance the smuggling scheme.
- h. Ultimately, the scheme discussed by Inmate-2 and Inmate-4 never went forward because, according to Inmate-2, CASADO injured himself and did not return to work at the MCC.
- 16. As detailed above, Inmate-2 helped take contraband from VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, to provide to Inmate-1 and others. Further, through his wife (Wife-1), Inmate-2 facilitated certain payments on behalf of Inmate-1. I also know from my conversations with other law enforcement agents, my participation in and review of reports of interviews with inmates, and my review of wire transfer records, that Inmate-1 compensated Inmate-2 for his help by having Attorney-1 pay Wife-1. Inmate-2 discussed the scheme in detail with Wife-1 over recorded telephone calls from the MCC. Specifically, based on my review of a series of draft transcripts of some of those calls³ from in or about April 2017 through in or about July 2017, I have learned of the following conversations, among others:
- a. On April 4, 2017, at approximately 1:26 p.m., Inmate-2 placed a call to Wife-1, in which they discussed that Wife-1 had not yet received money ("four thousand dollars") from "this woman," which Wife-1 was supposed to receive in "cash." Inmate-2 told Wife-1 that he passed along this information to another person who "just got back from court," who said to "call

The recorded telephone calls between Inmate-2 and Wife-1 were in Spanish. The calls were translated into English, and draft English transcripts were created, which I have reviewed. The transcripts are preliminary and subject to revision.

- her." Inmate-2 provided a telephone number and a first name for the woman. Inmate-2 also instructed Wife-1 to send \$500 to Inmate-3.
- b. Based on my training, experience, and participation in this investigation, I believe that in the call referenced in subparagraph (a) above, Inmate-2 and Wife-1 were discussing a payment that was supposed to be made from Attorney-1 to Wife-1 on Inmate-1's behalf. I believe that the individual who "just got back from court" and said to "call her" was Inmate-1, on whose behalf Attorney-1 was making the payment.
- c. On April 5, 2017, at approximately 12:56 p.m., Inmate-2 placed a call to Wife-1, in which they discussed that Wife-1 had received money ("four thousand dollars") from a woman "on the street." Wife-1 reported that the woman told her, "from that to give two to him." Inmate-2 believed that the woman "had to give [Wife-1] more money because ... that money ... it's mine." Wife-1 asked Inmate-2 to speak with someone, telling him, "Look ... she gave her four ... and, supposedly, two are yours. Explain to me how this thing is." Inmate-2 instructed Wife-1 not to "send him money ... because [he] and I didn't agree on any of that.... We spoke about ... about a deal, and him and me.... I'm doing him a service ... and he's paying me for my work." Inmate-2 clarified that "[h]e was supposed to give you ten."
- d. Based on my training, experience, and participation in this investigation, I believe that in the call referenced in subparagraph (c) above, Inmate-2 and Wife-1 were discussing a \$4,000 payment that Wife-1 received from Attorney-1, who told Wife-1 to send \$2,000 to Inmate-1. Wife-1 asked Inmate-2 to speak with Inmate-1 to clarify the situation. Inmate-2 told Wife-1 not to send any money to Inmate-1, explaining that Inmate-1 had agreed to pay Inmate-2 (and Wife-1) a larger amount, specifically \$10,000.
- e. On April 9, 2017, at approximately 4:55 p.m., Inmate-2 placed a call to Wife-1, in which Inmate-2 told her that "this kid ... that the [female] lawyer has to give you some money, I told her to see if she can do it by Wednesday."
- f. Based on my training, experience, and participation in this investigation, I believe that in the call

⁴ The information and participants in the call make me believe that "this woman" is a reference to Attorney-1 despite the fact that the first name provided by Inmate-2 was not the same as Attorney-1's first name.

referenced in subparagraph (e) above, Inmate-2 and Wife-1 were discussing that Attorney-1 had to provide more money to Wife-1.

- g. On April 13, 2017, at approximately 6:16 p.m., Inmate-2 placed a call to Wife-1, in which they discussed that Wife-1 had not been able to meet with "her" because "he was in court." They tried to figure out when to set up the meeting, which Wife-1 explained was difficult because "she [the other woman] lives I think in a hotel ... let's just say that ... on Fridays, right away, she goes ... to her country." Inmate-2 confirmed that "he" was "in court" that day.
- h. Based on my training, experience, and participation in this investigation, I believe that in the call referenced in subparagraph (g) above, Inmate-2 and Wife-1 were discussing that Wife-1 had not been able to meet with Attorney-1 that day because Inmate-1 had been in court, making Attorney-1 unavailable. Wife-1 explained that Attorney-1 lived in a hotel in New York, returning regularly to Attorney-1's country of origin.
- 17. Based on my review of travel and hotel records for Attorney-1, I have learned, that in the time period between mid-2016 and in or about August 2017, Attorney-1 took multiple trips between Attorney-1's (and Inmate-1's) country of origin and New York City, often staying in New York City for several weeks at a time, including times corresponding with payments to VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and Wife-1 discussed supra.
- 18. Based on my review of information obtained by subpoena from Western Union, I have learned that from in or about December 2016 through in or about April 2017, Attorney-1 received over \$200,000 in money transfers through Western Union. All of the transfers were sent from the country of origin of both Inmate-1 and Attorney-1.
- 19. As noted above, in addition to using Attorney-1, Inmate-1 also used Driver-1 to pay VICTOR CASADO, the defendant. I have reviewed subscriber and toll records that show Driver-1 and CASADO in contact. Specifically, as noted above, CASADO provided the 2853 Cellphone to the BOP as his contact number, and I am aware that that phone is subscribed to by "Victor Casado." In or about November 2016, around the time that Inmate-1 stated that he first paid CASADO, the 2853 Cellphone was in contact with a telephone number ending in 3258 (the "3258" Cellphone), which I believe based on BOP commissary records to belong to Driver-1. Specifically, in or about early November 2016, there were

approximately three telephone calls and/or text messages between the 2853 Cellphone and the 3258 Cellphone. In or about late November 2016, there were approximately five telephone calls and/or text messages between the 2853 Cellphone and the 3258 Cellphone.

CASADO Requests Additional Bribe Payments

- 20. Based on my conversations with Inmate-1, I have learned that in or about the spring of 2017, VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, requested additional bribe payments from Inmate-1. In particular, Inmate-1 stated, in substance and in part:
- a. In or about the spring of 2017, Inmate-1 watched CASADO write a note (the "Note") containing the name and contact information for an individual in the Dominican Republic, who CASADO said was a member of his family ("Individual-1"). CASADO gave the Note to Inmate-1 and asked Inmate-1 to have \$5,000 wired to Individual-1.
- b. A short time later, in or about May 2017, Inmate-1 was sent to the Special Housing Unit ("SHU"). At the time of Inmate-1's transfer to the SHU, all of Inmate-1's property, including the Note, was confiscated.
- c. Due, in part, to Inmate-1's transfer to the SHU, Inmate-1 never caused any money to be sent to Individual-1.
- 21. Based on my review of BOP records, I have learned that Inmate-1 was transferred to the SHU in or about May 2017.
- 22. I have spoken with a Correctional Officer at the MCC, who provided me with the property confiscated from Inmate-1 at the time of Inmate-1's transfer to the SHU. I reviewed that property, which contained, among other things, a number of handwritten notes. I showed two of the handwritten notes to Inmate-1, who identified one of the notes as the Note that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, provided to Inmate-1.
- 23. I have reviewed the Note, which contains the name of the individual previously identified as Individual-1, a telephone number ending in 8050 (the "8050 Phone"), and an address in the Dominican Republic.
- 24. I have reviewed a memorandum from the Dominican Republic National Police and have learned, in substance and in part, the following:

- a. The 8050 Phone is subscribed to in the name of Individual-1.
- b. Individual-1 is a cousin of VICTOR CASADO, the defendant.
- 25. Based on my conversations with a lieutenant ("Lieutenant-1") and a technician ("Technician-1") at the MCC about VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and Inmate-1, my conversations with other law enforcement officers, and my review of debriefing notes, I have learned, in substance and in part, the following:
- a. In or about mid-2017, Lieutenant-1 was performing checks in the various housing units. Lieutenant-1 was in Unit 7-South, when CASADO approached Lieutenant-1 and asked if there was a case against him (CASADO). CASADO further stated that another staff member had warned him that he should not be working on Unit 7-South because Inmate-1 was in that unit. CASADO explained that he was working on Unit 7-South regardless for scheduling reasons.
- b. In or about May 2017, when Inmate-1 was placed in the SHU, Inmate-1's property, which included the Note, went to MCC's Special Investigative Services ("SIS") Department. Upon an inmate's transfer to the SHU, the inmate's property is usually collected by a property officer, who reviews the property before sending it to the inmate in the SHU. The SIS Department, however, can request an inmate's property for investigative purposes.
- c. In or about June 2017, CASADO called Lieutenant-1 and asked about Inmate-1's property, explaining that Inmate-1 had requested it. Lieutenant-1 explained that when the SIS Department was finished with Inmate-1's property, it would be forwarded to the property officer.
- d. Following the phone call referenced in subparagraph (c), supra, CASADO went in person to the SIS Department and spoke with Technician-1 about retrieving Inmate-1's property. Technician-1 did not give CASADO the property, and instead told Lieutenant-1 about the conversation with CASADO.
- e. CASADO did not reach out to Lieutenant-1 again about Inmate-1's property.

CASADO Requests Additional Payments from Another Inmate

- 26. Based on my participation in the debriefing of a cooperating witness ("Inmate-5") 5 , I have learned, in substance and in part, the following:
- a. Following Inmate-5's arrest in or about 2012, Inmate-5 was incarcerated and housed at the MCC through in or about July 2017.
- b. In or about 2015 or 2016, Inmate-5 was visited at the MCC by a paralegal ("Paralegal-1"). While Inmate-5 was meeting with Paralegal-1 in the attorney visiting area, Paralegal-1 was approached by VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, who began making flirtatious comments toward Paralegal-1. Shortly thereafter, CASADO began delivering messages to Inmate-5 that he instructed Inmate-5 to pass along to Paralegal-1. Based on my review of emails maintained by the BOP, I have learned that CASADO and Paralegal-1 exchanged emails, which appear to be of a romantic nature. Accordingly, based on the information from Inmate-5 and these emails, I believe that CASADO and Paralegal-1 were engaged in a romantic relationship.
- c. In or about late 2016 or early 2017, CASADO approached Inmate-5 and told Inmate-5, in sum and substance, that CASADO was going to the Dominican Republic for vacation. CASADO then told Inmate-5, in substance and in part, that he needed money and asked Inmate-5 to give him money. Inmate-5 told CASADO, in substance and in part, that he did not have money in the United States. CASADO then asked for \$5,000. Inmate-5 again stated that he did not have the money, but that he would try to procure it for CASADO. Inmate-5 asked CASADO where Inmate-5 should send the money. CASADO told Inmate-5 that he should send the money to Paralegal-1.
- d. Following Inmate-5's conversation with CASADO, Inmate-5's family members sent \$1,000 or \$1,500 to Paralegal-1. Based on Inmate-5's conversations with CASADO, Inmate-5 understood that those funds were given by Paralegal-1 to CASADO.

⁵ Inmate-5 has pled guilty to federal offenses unrelated to the bribery and extortion scheme described in this affidavit. Inmate-5 has been a cooperating witness with the Government and was previously sentenced. Inmate-5 is providing information to the Government in the hope of obtaining a future sentence reduction. The information provided by Inmate-5 has proven credible and has been corroborated, at least in part, by independent evidence.

- e. In or about January 2017, CASADO called Inmate-5 into CASADO's office and opened a computer. CASADO told Inmate-5 that he is a "well recommended" inmate. CASADO then showed Inmate-5 pictures of inmates and stated that inmates who talk about or tell on correctional officers are "not well recommended." Inmate-5 understood CASADO to be implying that if Inmate-5 talked about CASADO or another correctional officer, there could be some form of retribution.
- f. Approximately one week later, CASADO again asked Inmate-5 for money because CASADO was going to the Dominican Republic. CASADO told Inmate-5 to send the money to Paralegal-1, whom Inmate-5 understood would give the money to CASADO. Inmate-5's family members subsequently sent \$1,000 or \$1,500 to Paralegal-1.
- g. On a subsequent occasion, Paralegal-1 told Inmate-5, in sum and substance, that one time she met CASADO in a car and that she gave him the money that Inmate-5's family members had sent to her.
- 27. Based on my review of travel records maintained by U.S. Customs and Border Protection, I have learned that in or about July 2016 and March 2017, around the times, according to Inmate-5 that VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, asked for money, CASADO traveled to the Dominican Republic.

WHEREFORE, I respectfully request that an arrest warrant be issued for VICTOR CASADO, the defendant, and that he be arrested and imprisoned or bailed, as the case may be.

WILLIAM MATELSKI Special Agent

Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General

Sworn to before me this 4th day of April, 2018

THE HONORABLE HENRY B. PITMAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK