UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA MIAMI DIVISION

CASE NO.:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,						
Plaintiff,						
vs.						
VESNA BACIC,						
Defendant.						

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S COMPLAINT FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION

Plaintiff, the United States of America ("United States"), through its undersigned counsel, hereby sues Defendant Vesna Bacic ("Defendant") and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Starting as early as April 2017 and continuing to the present, Defendant has assisted and facilitated a predatory wire fraud scheme that primarily victimizes senior citizens of the United States. The scheme operates by having telemarketers pose as purported computer technicians to fraudulently induce U.S. consumers to pay for phony or otherwise misrepresented technical support services related to computers.
- 2. The United States seeks to prevent continuing and substantial injury to consumers victimized by this fraudulent scheme by bringing this action for a permanent injunction and other equitable relief under 18 U.S.C. § 1345 to enjoin the ongoing commission of wire fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 18 U.S.C. § 1345 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1345.
 - 4. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is the United States.
- 6. Defendant is a resident of Columbia, Maryland, and previously was a resident of Broward County in the Southern District of Florida. Defendant Bacic transacts or has transacted business in the Southern District of Florida. Defendant knowingly has used bank accounts, money transmitting services, and stored value cards to facilitate a fraudulent technical support scheme.

DEFENDANT'S ONGOING FRAUDULENT SCHEME

- 7. Since at least as early as April 2017, Defendant has assisted and facilitated a large-scale technical support scheme by accepting consumer payments and forwarding proceeds to perpetrators of the scheme.
- 8. Telemarketers working for the scheme contact consumers either by calling them or by using pop-up computer advertisements disguised as security alerts to direct the consumers to immediately call a telephone number, which the telemarketers answer.
- 9. Regardless of the initial method of contacting a consumer, the scheme proceeds similarly once a telemarketer working for the scheme has the consumer on the phone. Emphasizing the need for immediate action and often claiming to work for or be affiliated with well-known technology companies, the telemarketer falsely claims that the consumer's computer is at risk and that the telemarketer can assist the consumer but first needs remote access to the consumer's computer. Once remotely connected, the telemarketer purports to confirm the

existence of a serious computer virus or other threat to the consumer's computer, sometimes claiming that a hacker will soon be able to access the consumer's personal information, including financial account numbers, social security numbers, and passwords. Imparting a sense of urgency, the telemarketer then claims that he will install expensive and high-quality network security software to resolve the threat in exchange for a substantial sum of money.

- 10. At times during the scheme, the telemarketers tell consumers to provide their bank account information to the telemarketers over the telephone. Using that information, the telemarketers cause unauthorized bank account transfers to be made out of the consumers' accounts. The typical cost to consumers deceived into making payments ranges between several hundred to thousands of dollars.
- 11. Since at least April 2017, numerous consumers have been victimized by the fraudulent technical support scheme facilitated by Defendant. Defendant plays a critical role in accepting unauthorized or fraudulently-induced payments initiated by the telemarketers. Defendant then forwards the funds received from consumers to the scheme perpetrators. These transactions take place through various means, including wire transmission, bank account transfers, and stored value card credit.

DEFENDANT'S KNOWLEDGE OF FRAUD

12. Upon information and belief, the United States alleges that Defendant has knowledge that her conduct facilitates a fraudulent scheme involving the purported offer of technical support services in exchange for consumer payments.

HARM TO CONSUMERS

- 13. Consumers suffer financial losses from the wire fraud scheme facilitated by Defendant. Consumers victimized by the scheme reside throughout the United States.
 - 14. The scheme disproportionately affects elderly consumers.

15. Absent injunctive relief by this Court, Defendant's conduct will continue to cause injury to consumers.

<u>COUNT I</u> (18 U.S.C. § 1345 – Injunctive Relief)

- 16. The United States re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through15 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.
- 17. By reason of the conduct described herein, Defendant violated, is violating, and is about to violate 18 U.S.C. § 1343 by executing a scheme and artifice to defraud for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent representations with the intent to defraud, and, in so doing, use interstate or foreign wire communications.
- 18. Upon a showing that Defendant is committing or about to commit wire fraud, the United States is entitled, under 18 U.S.C. § 1345, to a permanent injunction restraining all future fraudulent conduct and any other action that this Court deems just to prevent a continuing and substantial injury to consumers.
- 19. As a result of the foregoing, the Court should enjoin Defendant's conduct under 18 U.S.C. § 1345.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, United States of America, requests of the Court the following relief:

- A. That the Court issue a permanent injunction, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1345, ordering that Defendant is restrained from engaging, participating, or assisting in any technical support business or money transmitting business, and
- B. That the Court order such other and further relief as the Court shall deem just and proper.

DATED: October 3, 2018

GUSTAV W. EYLER
Acting Director
Consumer Protection Branch

JILL P. FURMAN
Deputy Director
Consumer Protection Branch

By: s/ Richard Goldberg

Richard Goldberg
Senior Counsel for Complex Litigation

Consumer Protection Branch
United States Department of Justice

P.O. Box 386

Washington, DC 20044 Tel.: 202.307-2532

Fax: 202.514.8742

Email: richard.goldberg@usdoj.gov

Counsel for United States of America

Respectfully Submitted,

ARIANA FAJARDO ORSHAN UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

By: s/ James A. Weinkle

James A. Weinkle

Assistant United States Attorney

Florida Bar No. 0710891

United States Attorney's Office Southern District of Florida

99 N.E. 4th Street, Suite 300

Miami, Florida 33132 Tel.: 305.961.9290 Fax: 305.530.7139

Email: James. Weinkle@usdoj.gov

Counsel for United States of America

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17) FLSD Revised 06/01/2017

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.) NOTICE: Attorneys MUST Indicate All Re-filed Cases Below.

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS United States of America			DEFENDANTS Vesna Bacic						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)			County of Resider NOTE: Attorneys (If Know	(IN U.S. I IN LAND C THE TRAC	ce of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.				
Richard Goldberg, U.S Branch, P.O. Box 386,			on						
(d) Check County Where Actio	n Arose: MIAMI-DADE	☐ MONROE Ø BROWARD	□ PALM BEACH □ MARTIN □ S	T. LUCIE 🗖 INDI	AN RIVER	OBEE HIGHLAN	1DS		
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only) II	I. CITIZENSHIP OF		L PARTIES (
U.S. Government Plaintiff	☐ 3 Fed (U.S. Government	eral Question Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Onl	PTF DEF	Incorporated or Pri			<i>DEF</i> □ 4	
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citizen of Another State	2 2 2	2		□ 5		
			Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3 3	Foreign Nation		□ 6	□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		nly) DRTS	Click here for; Nature of Suit Co FORFEITURE/PENALT		NKRUPTCY	OTHER	STATHT	F.S	
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury Med. Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 7385 Property Damage	625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 88 690 Other 690 Other 690 Other 690 Other 690 Other 690 Other 690 Other Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 740 Railway Labor Act 751 Family and Medical Leave Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 620 Naturalization Applica	422 App 423 With 28 U PROP 820 Cop 830 Pate New Dru 840 Trad 862 Blac 863 DIW 864 SSI 865 RSI 870 Taxc 870 Taxc 871 TR USC 760	eal 28 USC 158 Idrawal USC 157 ERTY RIGHTS VIGHTS IN Abbreviated and Application leemark LISECURITY (1395ff) k Lung (923) (7(7DIWW (405(g))) D Title XVI	□ 375 False Cl □ 376 Qui Tar 3729 (a)) □ 400 State Re □ 410 Antitrus □ 430 Banks a □ 450 Comme □ 460 Deporta □ 470 Rackete Corrupt Org □ 480 Consum □ 490 Cable/S □ 850 Securiti Exchange □ 891 Agricul □ 893 Erwiron □ 895 Freedon Act □ 896 Arbitrat □ 896 Arbitrat	laims Act n (31 USC eapportion st und Bankin ree tition ser Influen anizations ser Credit at TV es/Commu- tatutory A tural Acts mental M n of Infor- or Appea	nment ng seed and solutions fatters mation	
1 Original 2 Remove Proceeding from S Court	ved □ 3 Re-filed □ 4		erred from	Dist fron	n Magistrate	Multidistrict9 Litigation9 – Direct File	Remand Appellat		
VI. RELATED/ RE-FILED CASE(S)	(See instructions): a)		✓ NO b) Related		ES ∡ NO CKET NUMBER	:			
VII. CAUSE OF ACTIO		Anti-Fraud Injunctio	filing and Write a Brief State n Statute (for both sides to try entire ca		(Do not cite jurisdict	ional statutes uni	ess divers	ity):	
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS UNDER F.R.C.P	IS A CLASS ACTION . 23	DEMAND \$		CHECK YES only		•	nt:	
ABOVE INFORMATION IS TO DATE October 3, 2018	TRUE & CORRECT TO	THE BEST OF MY KNO SIGNATURE OF	OWLEDGE ATTORNEY OF RECORD	JU	RY DEMAND:	Yes	v No		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT IF	р либбе)	MAG JUDGE					