lodged proposed ade JENNIFER SHASKY CALVERY Chief, Asset Forfeiture and 2 Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) LINDA M. SAMUEL 3 Deputy Chief, AFMLS DANIEL H. CLAMAN 4 Assistant Chief, AFMLS JANET C. HUDSON (Cal. Bar No. 113996) 5 | Senior Trial Attorney, AFMLS Criminal Division United States Department of Justice 1400 New York Avenue, N.W., 10th Floor Washington, D.C. 20530 Telephone: (202) 514-1263 8 Janet. Hudson 2@usdoj. qov ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR. United States Attorney STEVEN R. WELK (Cal. Bar No. 149883) Assistant United States Attorney 312 North Spring Street, 14th Floor Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-6166 Steven. Welk@usdoj.gov 13 Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CV 11-03582-GW 18 Plaintiff, EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR ) POST-COMPLAINT ORDER TO SEIZE, 19 vs. ) SECURE, AND MAINTAIN DEFENDANT ASSETS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE 2.0 ONE WHITE CRYSTAL-COVERED "BAD UNITED STATES TOUR" GLOVE AND OTHER MICHAEL JACKSON MEMORABILIA; ONE 21 [UNDER SEAL] GULFSTREAM G-V JET AIRPLANE DISPLAYING TAIL NUMBER VPCES; REAL PROPERTY LOCATED ON SWEETWATER MESA ROAD IN MALIBU, 23 CALIFORNIA; ONE 2007 BENTLEY 24 AZURE; ONE 2008 BUGATTI VEYRON; ONE 2008 LAMBORGHINI 25 MURCIELAGO; ONE 2008 ROLLS ROYCE DROPHEAD COUPE; ONE 2009 26 ROLLS ROYCE DROPHEAD COUPE; ONE ) 2009 ROLLS ROYCE PHANTOM COUPE; ) 27 ONE 2011 FERRARI 599 GTO; 28 Defendants.

	1	
1	JENNIFER SHASKY CALVERY Chief, Asset Forfeiture and	lodged proposed od
2	Money Laundering Section (AFMLS) LINDA M. SAMUEL	
3	Deputy Chief, AFMLS DANIEL H. CLAMAN	
4	Assistant Chief, AFMLS	13.
5	Criminal Division United States Department of Justice	
6		
7	Washington, D.C. 20530	
8	Telephone: (202) 514-1263  Janet Hudson2@usdoj.gov	£56 ₹37
9	ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR.	
10	'= ' = ' :	3)
11	Assistant United States Attorney 312 North Spring Street, 14 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, California 90012 Telephone: (213) 894-6166 Steven.Welk@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	
12		
13		
14		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. CV 11-03582-GW
18	Plaintiff,	POST-COMPLAINT ORDER TO SEIZE,
19	vs.	SECURE, AND MAINTAIN DEFENDANT ASSETS LOCATED OUTSIDE THE
20	ONE WHITE CRYSTAL-COVERED "BAD TOUR" GLOVE AND OTHER MICHAEL	
21	JACKSON MEMORABILIA; ONE GULFSTREAM G-V JET AIRPLANE	(UNDER SEAL)
22	DISPLAYING TAIL NUMBER VPCES; REAL PROPERTY LOCATED ON	
23	SWEETWATER MESA ROAD IN MALIBU, CALIFORNIA; ONE 2007 BENTLEY	
24	AZURE; ONE 2007 BENTHET AZURE; ONE 2008 BUGATTI VEYRON; ONE 2008 LAMBORGHINI	
25	MURCIELAGO; ONE 2008 ROLLS ROYCE DROPHEAD COUPE; ONE 2009	
26	ROLLS ROYCE DROPHEAD COUPE; ONE 2009 ROLLS ROYCE PHANTOM COUPE;	
27	ONE 2011 FERRARI 599 GTO;	
28	Defendants.	) )
l	II	,

1 The United States of America, by its undersigned attorneys, 2 applies, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 983(j)(1)(A), for a postcomplaint order to seize, secure, and maintain six defendant 3 4 vehicles and the defendant Gulfstream jet, all currently located 5 outside the United States. A memorandum of points and authorities in support of this ex parte application and a 6 7 proposed order are also submitted herewith. 8 Respectfully submitted, DATED: May 18, 2011 9 JENNIFER SHASKY CALVERY, CHIEF ASSET FORFEITURE AND MONEY 10 LAUNDERING SECTION LINDA M. SAMUEL 11 Deputy Chief, AFMLS DANIEL H. CLAMAN 12 Assistant Chief, AFMLS 13 14 ANET C. ∕Senior Trial Attorney, AFMLS 15 Criminal Division United States Department of Justice 16 ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR. 17 United States Attorney STEVEN WELK 18 Assistant United States Attorney 19 Attorneys for Plaintiff UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28

## MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. BACKGROUND

On April 26, 2011, the United States filed a Verified Complaint for Forfeiture in Rem in this case, alleging that various assets are subject to seizure and forfeiture to the United States pursuant to 18 U.S.C. §§ 981(a)(1)(A) and 981(a)(1)(C), for violations of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956 and 1957 and conduct constituting an offense against a foreign nation enumerated in 18 U.S.C. §§ 1956(c)(7)(B)(ii) and (iv).

As indicated in the complaint, several of the defendant assets are at present outside the United States. Complaint,  $\P\P$  10, 84-85, 91-94. Therefore, it will be necessary for the United States to obtain the assistance of the foreign country where the defendants are located in order to execute the Warrant of Arrest *In Rem* as to these defendant assets, and to ensure the availability of the defendant assets for forfeiture.

The defendant assets located outside the United States consist of the defendant Gulfstream jet and six of the defendant luxury vehicles. The last known location of the six defendant vehicles was Paris, France. According to its filed flight plans, the defendant Gulfstream jet recently flew from Brazil to Argentina, then to Equatorial Guinea, from there to Paris, France, and from there back to Equatorial Guinea.

Both the Gulfstream jet and the six defendant vehicles are potentially highly mobile. The vehicles could be driven from France to any number of countries, such as England, Belgium, the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, or Spain, within a few hours. The vehicles could also be shipped to anywhere in the world,

including countries with which the United States does not have a Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty or other cooperation agreement. The jet is even more mobile, and could leave its current location for another country at any time without notice.

If these assets are not restrained in some way, the government's effort to forfeit them could be easily thwarted by simply moving them from one country to another, forcing the government to go through repeated time-consuming processes of requesting assistance from one foreign government after another. Alternatively, these assets could be shielded from forfeiture by simply moving them to a country that does not have a cooperative bilateral relationship with the United States.

In order to ensure that the assets located abroad will be available for forfeiture, it will be necessary for foreign authorities to restrain the assets and either return them to the United States, or maintain control of them during the pendency of the forfeiture action. Proper maintenance of these assets is particularly important; the defendant luxury vehicles and jet are high value assets that can significantly depreciate if they are not properly maintained and secured. Therefore, the government respectfully requests that this court order that the defendant assets located abroad be seized, secured, and maintained, or delivered into the custody of the United States to be secured and maintained by U.S. authorities, and direct that the Attorney General or his designee request that foreign authorities take such measures as may be appropriate to enforce such order.

1 THIS COURT HAS AUTHORITY TO ISSUE THE ORDER UNDER 18 U.S.C. § 983(J)(1)(A) BASED ON A FINDING OF PROBABLE 2 CAUSE 3 Title 18, United States Code, Section 983(j)(1)(A) (enacted 4 as part of the Civil Asset Forfeiture Reform Act of 2000 5 ("CAFRA")), gives the district court broad authority to issue 6 orders to preserve the availability of property subject to civil 7 forfeiture, following the filing of a forfeiture complaint. 8 provides: 9 Upon application of the United States, the court may enter a restraining order or injunction, require 10 the execution of satisfactory performance bonds, create receiverships, appoint conservators, custodians, 11 appraisers, accountants, or trustees, or take any other action to seize, secure, maintain, or preserve the 12 availability of property subject to civil forfeiture-13 upon the filing of a civil forfeiture complaint alleging that the 14 property with respect to which the order is sought is subject to civil forfeiture . . 15 18 U.S.C. § 983(j)(1)(A). 16 This provision is nearly identical to a similar statute that 17 allows the issuance of orders in the context of a criminal 18 forfeiture, after an indictment is returned. See 21 U.S.C. § 19 853(e)(1)(A): 20 (1) Upon application of the United States, the court 21 may enter a restraining order or injunction, require the execution of a satisfactory performance bond, or 22 take any other action to preserve the availability of property described in subsection (a) of this section 23 for forfeiture under this section -24 (A) upon the filing of an indictment or information charging a violation of this subchapter 25 . . . for which criminal forfeiture may be ordered . . . 26 This similarity was intentional. Congress intended the 27

restraining order provision for civil forfeiture to function in

the same way as the restraining order provision for criminal forfeiture. As the legislative history concerning a prior version of CAFRA noted, the objective of the provision that became 983(j) was to allow the court to "enter any restraining order or injunction in the manner set forth in . . . 21 U.S.C. § 853(e)." H. Rep. 105-358(1).

The proper standard for issuance of an order pursuant to § 983(j)(1)(A) is probable cause, just as it is under § 853(e) in a criminal forfeiture case. United States v. Melrose East Subdivision, 357 F. 3d 493, 505 (5th Cir. 2004); United States v. Monsanto, 491 U.S. 600, 615 (1989). In a criminal case, this probable cause showing is met by the issuance of an indictment. "[U]nder § 853(e)(1)(A), the indictment itself establishes the merits of the government's case" and "[f]or the purposes of issuing a restraining order, the probable cause established in the indictment . . . is to be determinative of any issue regarding the merits of the government's case on which the forfeiture is to be based." United States v. Real Property in Waterboro, 64 F.3d 752, 756 (quoting 1984 U.S.C.C.A.N. at 3386).

Based upon the near identity of the language of the provisions and the clear Congressional intent to mirror § 853(e)(1)(A), the same rule should apply for the issuance of restraining orders for civil forfeiture cases pursuant to § 983(j)(1)(A). Thus, this court has authority to make a finding of probable cause based upon its review of the Verified Complaint for Forfeiture and to issue an ex parte order based upon that finding.

11|

III. THE ORDER SOUGHT BY THE UNITED STATES SERVES THE INTERESTS UNDERLYING § 983(J)(1)(A)

As set forth in the language of the statute itself, the objective of § 983(j)(1)(A) is to "preserve the availability of property subject to civil forfeiture." Even before CAFRA, the Supreme Court has recognized that in civil forfeiture cases the Government has "legitimate interests at the inception of forfeiture proceedings . . . to ensure that the property not be sold, destroyed, or used for further illegal activity prior to the forfeiture judgment." United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property, 510 U.S. 43, 58 (1993); see also Monsanto, 491 U.S. at 612-613 (protective order in criminal forfeiture case ensures property available and that forfeiture provisions can be carried out). The order sought by the United States in this case serves these interests directly.

The proposed order directs that any persons with actual notice of this Order by personal service or otherwise, and any other legal or natural persons acting on their behalf, be prohibited, enjoined, and restrained from taking any action that could impair the value or availability of the defendant Gulfstream jet and six defendant vehicles without prior approval of this Court and upon notice to the United States and an opportunity for the United States to be heard. The proposed order also provides that the Attorney General or his designee shall request that the appropriate foreign authorities "take such measures as may be necessary to seize, secure, maintain, and preserve the availability" of the six vehicles and Gulfstream jet, including delivering said assets into the custody of the

United States to be secured and maintained by U.S. authorities.

These restrictions are intended to ensure that the Defendants in Rem will remain available for forfeiture. As high-value assets, they will require appropriate measures to preserve their value. Also, the risk that these assets may disappear is a particular concern given that they are located abroad and are highly mobile.

In addition, because the assets are outside the United States, issuance of the proposed order is also sought in order to provide foreign authorities with a basis for initiation of independent domestic restraint proceedings. Accordingly, the proposed order includes a specific finding of probable cause and directs the Attorney General or his representative to make requests to the appropriate foreign authorities for execution of the order.

16 //

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 |

12 |

13

14

15

17 | //

18 | //

19 //

20 //

21 //

| | ' '

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

## 1 IV. CONCLUSION 2 For all of the foregoing reasons, the United States 3 respectfully requests that this Court enter the requested order. The United States also requests that this application and 4 5 the order be sealed pursuant to the Court's sealing order filed 6 on April 28, 2011, except that the government may disclose this Order to appropriate foreign authorities for purposes of 7 requesting mutual legal assistance and for execution of this 8 9 order. 10 Respectfully submitted, 11 JENNIFER SHASKY CALVERY, CHIEF ASSET FORFEITURE AND MONEY 12 LAUNDERING SECTION LINDA M. SAMUEL 13 Deputy Chief, AFMLS DANIEL H. CLAMAN 14 Assistant Chief, AFMLS 15 16 Senior Trial Attorney, AFMLS 17 Criminal Division United States Department of Justice 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28