

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA * **CRIMINAL NO. 13-CR-24**
v. * **SECTION: N(2)**
JOHN P. SENS * **VIOLATION: 18 U.S.C. § 371**
* * *

FACTUAL BASIS

Should this matter have proceeded to trial, the Government would have proven, through the introduction of competent testimony and admissible evidence, the following facts, beyond a reasonable doubt, to support the allegations in the Bill of Information now pending against the defendant, **JOHN P. SENS** (“**SENS**” or the “defendant”).

The defendant, **SENS**, has agreed to plead guilty as charged to the one-count Bill of Information charging him with conspiracy to commit bribery, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

Background Information

Evidence, including admissible documents and testimony, would be introduced to prove that, beginning in at least 2006 through in or about 2012, the defendant, **SENS**, was employed as the Director of Purchasing at the Orleans Parish Sheriff’s Office (“**OPSO**”). In his role as the Director of Purchasing, **SENS** was in charge of, among other things, receiving bids and selecting the winning bidders for particular **OPSO** jobs. **SENS** also had a role in approving invoices from the various contractors who were bidding on **OPSO** jobs and projects. In his role as the Director of Purchasing, **SENS** acted as an agent of the **OPSO**. The **OPSO** is an organization and/or local government/political subdivision of the State of Louisiana that received, in each of the years 2007 through 2012, in excess of \$10,000 annually in federal funds.

Conspiracy to Commit Bribery

Beginning in or around 2007, through in or around 2011, **SENS** corruptly received things of value from several contractors at the OPSO in exchange for the official acts he was undertaking to steer work to these same contractors. For example, **SENS** received cash from Businessman A, a maintenance contractor at the OPSO, totaling approximately \$30,000. Businessman A also provided him with the construction and building of a pool in March and April 2009, worth approximately \$25,000, at a residence owned by **SENS** in Mississippi at no charge. Similarly, Businessman B, an electrical contractor at the OPSO, paid for several paintings (so-called “Blue Dog” prints) and the framing of those paintings, worth over \$5,000, for **SENS** at no cost to him. **SENS** accepted these things of value from Businessman A and Businessman B intending to be influenced or rewarded in connection with his official duties at the OPSO, as set forth below. In total, **SENS** received at least \$40,000, but not more than \$70,000, worth of cash, goods, or services from Businessman A and Businessman B.

In exchange for these things of value, **SENS** undertook official acts to steer OPSO work to Businessman A and Businessman B. More specifically, Businessman A and Businessman B would routinely submit bids for various OPSO projects and jobs that contained bids from their respective companies, as well as bids from other companies which were phony or fraudulent. Businessman A and Businessman B, with the knowledge and assistance of, among others, **SENS**, would submit these fraudulent bids in an effort to give the appearance of competition for OPSO projects when, in reality, the bid process was rigged in favor of Businessman A and Businessman B. An example of this rigged bid process occurred on or about January 13, 2010, when Businessman A submitted a bid in the name of his company for an OPSO project worth approximately \$20,000. With the knowledge of, among others, **SENS**, Businessman A also

submitted a phony or fraudulent bid for this project in the name of a local company that was intentionally higher than the real bid submitted by Businessman A. As a result, **SENS** awarded this OPSO project to Businessman A and his company. Similarly, on or about April 21, 2010, Businessman B submitted a real bid in the name of his company for an OPSO project worth approximately \$20,000. With the knowledge of, among others, **SENS**, Businessman B also submitted a phony or fraudulent bid for this project in the name of a local company that was intentionally higher than the real bid submitted by Businessman B. As a result, **SENS**, among others, awarded this OPSO project to Businessman B. Despite this rigged bid process, **SENS** would repeatedly award millions of dollars of OPSO work to Businessman A and Businessman B.

Limited Nature of a Factual Basis

This proffer of evidence is not intended to constitute a complete statement of all facts known by **SENS** and described by **SENS** to the government, but rather is a minimum statement of facts intended to prove the necessary factual predicate for his guilty plea. The limited purpose of this factual basis is to demonstrate that there exists a sufficient legal basis for **SENS**'s plea of guilty to the charged offense.

Financial records, bank records, contracts, bid paperwork, invoices, and other documents would further be introduced and admitted to prove the facts set forth above. Additionally, testimonial evidence, including testimony from OPSO employees, and testimony from special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, would also be admitted to prove the facts set forth above.

MATTHEW S. CHESTER
Assistant United States Attorney
Texas Bar No. 24045650

Date

JON M. MAESTRI
Assistant United States Attorney
La. Bar Roll No. 25156

Date

RALPH CAPITELLI, ESQ.
Attorney for the Defendant
La. Bar Roll No. 3858

Date

BRIAN CAPITELLI, ESQ.
Attorney for the Defendant
La. Bar Roll No. 27398

Date

JOHN P. SENS
Defendant

Date