

INFORMATION
JD-CR-71 Rev. 10-10

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT

Disposition date

Police Case number
2014-00103

Agency name
Office of the Chief State's Attorney

Agency number
5700

Title, Allegation and Counts

State of Connecticut vs. (Name of accused)
DeCillis, Dana L.

Residence (Town) of accused
[REDACTED]

Docket number

Address
[REDACTED]

Date of birth
[REDACTED]

The undersigned Prosecuting Authority of the Superior Court of the State of Connecticut charges that:

To be held at (Town)
Hartford

Geographical area number
14

Court date

Count One — Did commit the offense of:
Larceny in the First Degree by Defrauding a Public Community

At (Town)
Hartford, CT

On or about (Date)
5/30/13 - 12/5/13

In violation of General Statute number
53a-122 (a) (4)

Continued to Purpose Reason

Count Two — Did commit the offense of:
Attempted Larceny in the Second Degree by Defrauding a Public Community

At (Town)
Hartford, CT

On or about (Date)
11/10/13 - 12/5/13

In violation of General Statute number
53a-48/53a-123 (a) (4)

Count Three — Did commit the offense of:
Insurance Fraud

At (Town)
Hartford, CT

On or about (Date)
5/30/13 - 12/5/13

In violation of General Statute number
53a-215

See other sheet for additional counts

Date
6/10/2015

Signed (Prosecuting Authority)
Richard Keenan

Court Action

Defendant advised of rights before plea (Judge) (Date)

Bond Surety

10 % Election (Date)
 Cash CT JY

Attorney Public defender Guardian

Bond change

Seized property inventory number

Count	Plea date	Plea	Plea withdrawn		Verdict finding	Fine	Remit	Additional disposition
			Date	New plea				
1						\$	\$	
2						\$	\$	
3						\$	\$	

Date	Other Court Action	Judge

Receipt number Cost IMP NCI Bond information Bond forfeited Forfeiture vacated Forfeiture vacated and bond reinstated

Application fee - receipt number if paid Circle one W I Q Program fee - receipt number if paid Circle one W I Q Probation fee - receipt number if paid Circle one W I Q

Prosecutor on original disposition Reporter/monitor on original disposition Signed (Clerk) Signed (Judge)

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64b Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**
www.jud.ct.gov

For Court Use Only	
Supporting Affidavits sealed	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No

Police Case number 2014-00103	Agency name Office of the Chief State's Attorney	Agency number 5700
Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford
		Geographical Area number 14

Application For Arrest Warrant

To: A Judge of the Superior Court

The undersigned hereby applies for a warrant for the arrest of the above-named accused on the basis of the facts set forth in the: Affidavit Below. Affidavit(s) Attached.

Date 6/10/2015	Signed (Prosecuting authority) <i>Richard Keenan</i>	Type/print name of prosecuting authority Richard Keenan
--------------------------	---	---

Affidavit

The undersigned affiant, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

- That, I Inspector Tracy Enns, have been a sworn police officer for the past 27 years. I am employed by the Division of Criminal Justice, Office of the Chief State's Attorney for the State of Connecticut, and assigned to the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit (MFCU). I have received specialized training in the investigation of fraud type crimes. The facts and circumstances contained in this affidavit are from personal knowledge, investigation, and information supplied by other officers, or other acting in their official capacity.
- That, the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit received a DSS 42 CFR 455.21 (a)(1) Referral dated 5/29/14, from the Department of Social Services-Office of Quality Assurance (DSS-OQA). This referral was based on an anonymous complaint DSS received on 8/14/13, alleging Medicaid provider Dana DeCillis LPC (DeCillis), AVRS# [REDACTED] is double billing for patient sessions, billing for services not rendered, having unprofessional contact with patients, and purchasing unused prescription medication from patients. This matter was also referred to the US Department of Health and Human Services - Office of the Inspector General (HHS-OIG), and HHS-OIG Special Agent Justin Lehnou was assigned to this case.
- That, DSS is a single state agency that operates, administers, and oversees the medical assistance program as Medicaid, pursuant to Connecticut General Statute, 17b-260 et seq., and Title XIX of the Social Security Act as amended. Medicaid is a government insurance program for persons whose income and resources are insufficient to pay for healthcare.
- That, the State of Connecticut Medicaid program is an "insurance company" as defined in C.G.S. 38a-1(11) "insurer" or "insurance company" includes any person or combination of persons doing any kind of form of insurance business other than a fraternal benefit society, and shall include a receiver of any insurer when the context reasonably permits.

(This is page 1 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) <i>Tracy Enns</i>
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 6/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) <i>Inspector</i> 2254

Finding

The foregoing Application for an arrest warrant, and affidavit(s) attached to said Application, having been submitted to and considered by the undersigned, the undersigned finds from said affidavit(s) that there is probable cause to believe that an offense has been committed and that the accused committed it and, therefore, that probable cause exists for the issuance of a warrant for the arrest of the above-named accused.

Date and Signature <i>Hartford</i>	Signed at (City or town) Hartford	On (Date) 6/15/15	Signed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee) <i>[Signature]</i>	Name of Judge/Judge Trial Referee KWAK
---------------------------------------	---	-----------------------------	--	--

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
---	---	--	--------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

5. That, a CPT code is an acronym for Current Procedural Terminology published by the American Medical Association. The purpose of the five digit coding system is to provide uniform language that accurately describes medical, surgical, and diagnostic services.

6. That, during a review of DeCillis for the period of 7/5/13 to 12/20/13, DSS found DeCillis was operating a business out of Blissful Journeys Psychotherapy, LLC, [REDACTED], with Shawna Schnitzke (Schnitzke). During this time, DSS notified DeCillis and Schnitzke of their review and requested client information. DSS indicated since this information was not being submitted to them in a timely manner, they placed a hold on all Medicaid payments to DeCillis on 11/26/13.

7. That, during the DSS review period, DeCillis was licensed in CT under a Professional Counselor License (PCL) # [REDACTED] with an expiration of 10/31/14, and Schnitzke was not a licensed Social Worker. Per CT State Law, Schnitzke could only provide therapy in a clinical environment with a licensed Medical Director, which DeCillis was not. Schnitzke was not enrolled with the CT Medical Assistance Program (CMAP) as a performing provider, therefore DeCillis couldn't submit claims to CMAP for therapy rendered by Schnitzke. In addition, the CT Department of Public Health (DPH) had 2 active investigations against DeCillis' CT license, and 1 against Schnitzke's pending CT Clinical Social Worker (LCSW) license.

8. That, DeCillis submitted an application to CMAP for enrollment as an individual behavioral health clinician on 2/22/13, which was approved on 3/2/13. When a provider is enrolled in CMAP as an individual provider, this provider can only submit Medicaid claims for services they render under the DSS Provider Enrollment Agreement.

9. That, CMAP made \$26,136.34 in Medicaid payments to and held in suspension \$4,286.58 for DeCillis under her NPI# [REDACTED] and AVRS# [REDACTED] for this DSS review period, for 11 clients. In this affidavit, these 11 Medicaid clients, other clients, and their parents, are being identified by their initials in order to comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, Title 11, Section 2.1 (Patient Health Information Privacy Rule). These individuals are: Client 1 "J.L.," Client 2 "M.L.," Parent 1 "S.M.," Client 3 "S.M.," Client 4 "K.E.," Client 5 "B.M.," Client 6 "J.S.," Client 7 "C.A.," Client 8 "L.M.," Client 9 "D.M.," Client 10 "M.M.," Client 11 "E.V.," and Other Client 1 "C.C."

10. That, based on interviews of Client 1 "J.L." and supporting text messages by Client 1 "J.L.," it was determined by Lehnou and I, that DeCillis submitted fraudulent claims to DSS for the treatment of Client 1 "J.L." and her daughter Client 2 "M.L." I verified the phone numbers used

(This is page 2 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) [Signature]		
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 6/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) INSPECTOR # 2254 [Signature]		
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) [Signature]	Date 6/11/2015	Reviewed (Judge/Judge-Trial Referee) [Signature]	Date 6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

in these text messages, [REDACTED] (DeCillis) and [REDACTED] (Schnitzke), did in fact belong to these individuals. On 3/30/15, after examining the text messages between herself and DeCillis, Client 1 "J.L." said she recalls she began therapy with Schnitzke only, a couple of weeks before 5/30/13, while her daughter continued therapy with DeCillis. Client 1 "J.L." said she knows this because DeCillis text messaged her on 5/30/13, asking for her and her daughter's Medicaid information, which she had already given to Schnitzke a couple of weeks earlier during a therapy session with Schnitzke. The Medicaid billing for Client 1 "J.L." after 5/30/13, showed CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 minutes with patient and/or family member) was fraudulently billed for: 6/2/13; 6/6/13; 6/13/13; 6/20/13; 6/26/13; 7/3/13; 7/10/13; 7/18/13; 7/25/13; 7/29/13; 8/1/13; and 8/7/13; at the rate of (\$94.63) per visit, totaled \$1,135.56. In addition, there were other text messages either confirming or implying Client 1 "J.L." was seeing Schnitzke as a therapist.

11. That, Client 1 "J.L.," further stated after examining the text messages on 3/30/15, between her and DeCillis on 7/20/13, that the Medicaid claim billed for her daughter Client 2 "M.L." on 7/20/13, also didn't occur. Client 1 "J.L." said she knows this because her daughter's cousin was visiting this day, and verified it by the text messages on 7/20/13 at 1418 Hrs., where DeCillis asks Client 1 "J.L." what she is up to and Client 1 "J.L." responds on 7/20/13 at 1904 Hrs., that she just saw the text message and her daughter's cousin was over. DeCillis says she had wanted to get together, and Client 1 "J.L." replies, that would have been fun. Based on this, the Medicaid fraud identified on 7/20/13, under CPT code (Family Psychotherapy (Conjoint Psychotherapy) with Patient Present), was \$76.72.

12. That, DeCillis' knowledge of the Medicaid fraud is confirmed in text messages between Client 1 "J.L." and DeCillis on 8/9/13. DeCillis says, "I was a little blind to some of the Shawna/ bill stuff and wanted to make sure you're ok with all that going on, if you're good that's good, if ur blind too then all the better! Just wanted to let you know if its ever weird u can trust me not to blab to Shawna...I don't want u to feel split either so hopefully all is ok?" Client 1 "J.L." responds, "No I don't know and I might have to call the insurance company and get a copy of the visits." On 3/30/15, Client 1 "J.L." stated this made her angry because Husky only gives you so many visits, her daughter needed the therapy, and she wasn't sure how much fraud was done in her and her daughter's name.

13. That, on 8/4/14, a non-Medicaid patient of Schnitzke called me stating he wished to be interviewed. This male's name and address is not being disclosed in order to comply with the requirements of C.G.S.54-86e, where upon information regarding the name and address of victims of sexual assault is to be confidential. For reporting purposes, I will refer to this male as John Doe. John Doe stated he is making a complaint because DeCillis and Schnitzke are

(This is page 3 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) <i>[Signature]</i>
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 6/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) INSPECTOR [Signature] 2254
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) <i>[Signature]</i>	Date 6/10/2015
Reviewed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee) <i>[Signature]</i>	Date 6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
---	---	--	--------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

victimizing vulnerable clients and need to be stopped.

14. That, John Doe told Lehnnow and I, he started seeing Schnitzke as his therapist at BJP, in about 2/13, then this relationship developed into a friendship and voluntary sexual relationship with both DeCillis and Schnitzke. Regarding Medicaid, John Doe said DeCillis and Schnitzke told him they scammed the Medicaid program by obtaining Medicaid authorization, seeing a client once or twice a week, then billing Medicaid for 3 or 4 visits instead. John Doe said he asked DeCillis and Schnitzke what they would do if they got caught, and they laughed stating, "prove we didn't see them."

15. That, John Doe said DeCillis and Schnitzke also sent him a photo attached to a text message of a Medicaid check they received with the caption, "all this for half the work," and a photo of DeCillis and Schnitzke dividing money at DeCillis' residence holding a ledger, which he emailed to DPH on 9/11/13. I verified with DPH Nurse Consultant Adrienne (Anderson), that DPH received from John Doe text messages between John Doe, DeCillis, and Schnitzke, and received a photo of a check #19011671 payable to DeCillis, issued by DSS on 7/9/13 for \$5,271.05. Anderson said she didn't receive documentation with the caption, "all this for half the work," or a photo of DeCillis and Schnitzke dividing money holding a ledger. I then attempted to obtain this information off of John Doe's phone through the CT Forensic Laboratory Computer Crimes Unit. They advised this information was not retrievable.

16. That, John Doe said he saw inside this ledger once depicted in the above mentioned photo and it detailed client billing to include date of service, "D" or "S" when a payment came in, and disbursement. John Doe said it was his impression, DeCillis and Schnitzke didn't want this book discovered because they kept it at DeCillis' residence in MA and told him they had to keep their business records out of CT.

17. That, on 12/4/14, Lehnnow and I interviewed Parent 1 "S.M.," regarding the therapy her daughter Client 3 "S.M." received from DeCillis. When we reviewed the Medicaid billing, Parent 1 "S.M." laughed, shook her head no, and stated the billing didn't match the services received. Parent 1 "S.M.," said DeCillis never did family psychotherapy, and the only time DeCillis spoke to her about her daughter's treatment was on 8/17/13, and her daughter wasn't present. Based on this, the Medicaid fraud identified for Client 3 "S.M.," under CPT code 90847 (Family Psychotherapy with Patient Present) for the billing dates of: 8/17/13; 8/25/13; 9/3/13; 9/16/13; 9/19/13; 9/28/13; 10/5/13; 10/24/13; and 10/31/13 at the rate of (\$76.72) per visit, totaled \$690.48.

18. That, on 12/4/14, Lehnnow and I interviewed Client 4 "K.E.," who identified DeCillis as her therapist. No Medicaid fraud was identified.

(This is page 4 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) [Signature]
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) INSPECTOR 6/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) INSPECTOR #2254 [Signature]
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) [Signature]	Reviewed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee) [Signature]
Date 6/10/2015	Date 6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**
www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

19. That, on 12/10/14, Lehnou and I interviewed Client 5 "B.M.," who identified Schnitzke as her therapist. At BJP, Client 5 "B.M." said she saw Schnitzke for therapy maybe twice. Since DeCillis couldn't bill for services performed by Schnitzke, or bill for services that didn't take place, the following 38 fraudulent Medicaid billings were identified totaling \$3,407.55:

1. CPT code 90791 (Psychiatric Diagnostic Evaluation) 6/12/13 (\$103.25)
2. CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 Minutes with Patient) 6/19/13; 6/24/13; 7/1/13; 7/8/13; 7/15/13; 7/26/13; 7/29/13; 8/5/13; 8/11/13; 8/16/13; 8/21/13; 8/26/13; 9/4/13; 9/9/13; 9/18/13; 9/23/13; 9/30/13; 10/3/13; 10/9/13; 10/16/13; 10/23/13; 10/30/13; 11/6/13; 11/10/13; 11/20/13; 12/5/13 for (\$94.63) each totaling \$2,460.38
3. CPT code 90847 (Family Psychotherapy Conjoint) 8/31/13; 9/14/13; 9/28/13; 10/6/13; 10/13/13; 10/19/13; 10/27/13; 11/3/13; 11/15/13; 11/23/13; 11/30/13 for (\$76.72) each totaling \$843.92

20. That, during Client 5 "B.M.'s" interview, Client 5 "B.M." turned over to me a 2 page poem she had written about the pain Schnitzke's deceit caused her, and 21 pages of text messages between her and Schnitzke from 10/21/13, to 12/29/13. Client 5 "B.M.," identified Schnitzke's number as [REDACTED] and her number as [REDACTED]. Reviewing these text messages, Client 5 "B.M.," pointed out Schnitzke wrote, "Remember if Medicaid calls u YOU need to say you see Dana DeCillis for weekly individual this is for ur insurance otherwise I go to jail sista lol. Thanks." Client 5 "B.M.," said she tried to figure out what Schnitzke was talking about, so she asked more questions, and Schnitzke says she's also been billing Medicaid for couples visits under Client 5 "B.M.," sometimes weekly. Client 5 "B.M.," said she asked why Schnitzke would go to jail, and Schnitzke responds, "shhhhh don't tell anyone and yah medicaid fraud jail time." Angered, Client 5 "B.M.," said she texted back her displeasure because she and her child with special needs, rely on their benefits. Schnitzke's text message reply included, "I apologize with my whole heart and soul I am so sorry I betrayed you like this. I was caught up in trying to make a business work without any money." Schnitzke goes on to say she is shutting down her business because it is the right thing to do, that she may go to jail for this, and maybe this is what she needs. Client 5 "B.M.'s" cellular phone [REDACTED] was forensically examined and downloaded the CT Forensic Laboratory Computer Crimes Unit, verifying these text messages were on her phone.

21. That, on 12/15/14, Lehnou and I interviewed Client 6 "J.S.," who identified DeCillis as her therapist. Client 6 "J.S." said she only saw DeCillis for 12 visits "max," with 1 or 2 visits with her boyfriend. When she was told Medicaid was billed by DeCillis for 54 visits, Client 6 "J.S." replied, "There is no way." Client 6 "J.S.," also sent me a photo attached to a text message

(This is page 5 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) <i>[Signature]</i>
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 06/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) UNRESPECTED #2254
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) <i>[Signature]</i>	Reviewed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee) <i>[Signature]</i>
Date 6/10/2015	Date 6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

from her phone verifying a billed date of service that was not rendered. Client 6 "J.S." initially agreed to cooperate in this case, but didn't follow through, therefore the fraud for Client 6 "J.S." was not calculated.

22. That, on 12/15/14, Lehnaw and I interviewed Client 7 "C.A.," who identified DeCillis as her therapist. No Medicaid fraud was identified.

23. That, on 1/6/15, Lehnaw and I interviewed Client 8 "L.M." Client 8 "L.M.," said while she and her 2 children were seeing DeCillis as a therapist in 2013, she learned DeCillis was having an affair with her husband. Once she learned of this affair, Client 8 "L.M." said she and her children stopped seeing DeCillis as a therapist. To determine when Client 8 "L.M." learned of this affair and when she and her children stopped seeing DeCillis as a therapist, Client 8 "L.M." made available a journal she had written in and her cellphone [REDACTED]. This journal had an entry dated 1/3/14, which stated Client 8 "L.M." learned of her husband's affair with DeCillis in "May of 2013." Unable to forensically examine and download the information off her phone, on 3/16/15, I manually located 3 text messages numbered 28, 30, and 32 dated 5/31/13, in "Sent Items," detailing conversations of this affair. I read Client 8 "L.M." these text messages on 3/27/15, and she verified my findings, stating she knew about this affair a day or 2 before these messages. I asked Client 8 "L.M.," how she knows her children didn't see DeCillis for therapy on or after 5/31/13, and she said she would have known and her husband agreed it wasn't appropriate under the circumstances. Based on this, the following fraudulent Medicaid billing was identified totaling \$452.82:

1. Client 9 "D.M." CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 Minutes with Patient and/or Family Member) 5/31/13 (\$94.63), CPT code 90846 (Family Psychotherapy without Patient Present) 6/4/13 (\$62.28)
2. Client 8 "L.M." CPT code 90847 (Family Psychotherapy Conjoint with Patient Present) 6/3/13 (\$76.72)
3. Client 10 "M.M." CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 Minutes with Patient and/or Family Member) 6/4/13 (\$94.63), CPT code 90846 (Family Psychotherapy without Patient Present) 6/5/13 and 6/11/13 (\$62.28) each.

24. That, Lehnaw and I interviewed Client 11 "E.V.," 3 times. On 12/17/14, Client 11 "E.V.," said she saw DeCillis for individual therapy visits and family visits with her boyfriend Other Client 1 "C.C." Client 11 "E.V.," said she is certain she didn't see DeCillis from 10/27/13 to 11/6/13 because she and Other Client 1 "C.C.," were away on a cruise. Based on this, the following fraudulent Medicaid billing was identified totaling \$342.70:

(This is page 6 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date	6/10/15	Signed (Affiant)	[Signature]
Jurat	Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 06/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public)	INSPECTOR [Signature] 2254
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official)	[Signature]	Reviewed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee)	[Signature]
Date	6/10/2015	Date	6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

SUPERIOR COURT

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
---	---	--	--------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

1. CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 Minutes with Patient) 10/29/13 and 11/4/13 (\$94.63) each
2. CPT code 90847 (Family Psychotherapy Conjoint) 10/28/13 and 11/1/13 (\$76.72) each

25. That on 1/13/15, Client 11 "E.V.," said the more she has thought about it, she knows she didn't go to see DeCillis on 10/26/13 because she celebrated her boyfriend's birthday with friends at the Vineyard for the day and used leaving the next day for the cruise as a reference. In addition, Client 11 "E.V.," also stated she didn't see DeCillis on 11/30/13 because she had to babysit her nephew using Thanksgiving as a reference. Based on this, the following fraudulent Medicaid billing was identified totaling \$171.35:

1. CPT code 90837 (Psychotherapy, 60 Minutes with Patient) 10/26/13 (\$94.63)
2. CPT code 90847 (Family Psychotherapy Conjoint) 11/30/13 (\$76.72)

26. That, on 3/10/15, Other Client 1 "C.C." verified to Lehnaw and I, that the Vineyard date and the date of the cruise Client 11 "E.V." had given us was correct. As verification, Client 11 "E.V.," showed Lehnaw and I, a photograph from the cruise dated within the time period identified.

27. That, Lehnaw and I attempted to interview DeCillis and Schnitzke. DeCillis said her attorney would call regarding an interview, but no call was received. Two voicemails were left for Schnitzke at work, and did not return these calls.

28. That, a criminal history check for DeCillis and Schnitzke were negative in CT and MA. During this investigation, information was obtained to support DeCillis and Schnitzke as having a drug habit during 2013.

29. That on 4/14/15, DSS Forensic Fraud Examiner Janet Bacon identified 3 payment holds under DeCillis after 11/26/13, payment 019023054, 019022207, and 019021404. Of the fraudulent claims verified in this case, these payment holds affected billings for:

1. Client 11 "E.V.," CPT code 90847 for the service date of 11/30/13 for (\$76.72)
2. Client 5 "B.M.," CPT code 98037 for service dates 11/10/13; 11/20/13 and 12/5/13 for (\$94.63) each
3. Client 5 "B.M.," CPT code 90847 for service dates 11/15/13; 11/23/13 and 11/30/13 for (\$76.72) each. Based on this, the attempted larceny total is \$590.77.

30. That based on this investigation, I have probable cause to believe DeCillis committed the following criminal violations, C.G.S. 53a-122 (a) (4) Larceny in the First Degree by Defrauding a

(This is page 7 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) [Signature]
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 06/15/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) [Signature] 2254
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) [Signature]	Reviewed (Judge/Judge-Trial Referee) [Signature]
Date 6/10/2015	Date 6/15/15

ARREST WARRANT APPLICATION

JD-CR-64a Rev. 10-10
C.G.S. § 54-2a
Pr. Bk. Sec. 36-1, 36-2, 36-3

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

Name (Last, First, Middle Initial) DeCillis, Dana L.	Residence (Town) of accused [REDACTED]	Court to be held at (Town) Hartford	Geographical Area number 14
--	---	---	---------------------------------------

Affidavit - Continued

Public Community, C.G.S. 53a-48/53a-123 (a) (4) Attempted Larceny in the Second Degree by Defrauding a Public Community, and C.G.S. 53a-215 Insurance Fraud. The total larceny verified for DeCillis in this case is \$6,277.18. Of that number, DeCillis received Medicaid payments of \$5,686.41 under her provider number, and the remaining \$590.77 were billed Medicaid attempts held by DSS.

(This is page 8 of a 8 page Affidavit.)

Date 6/10/15	Signed (Affiant) <i>[Signature]</i>
Jurat Subscribed and sworn to before me on (Date) 06/10/15	Signed (Judge/Clerk, Commissioner of Superior Court, Notary Public) INSPECTOR <i>[Signature]</i> 2254
Reviewed (Prosecutorial Official) <i>[Signature]</i>	Date 6/10/2015
Reviewed (Judge/Judge Trial Referee) <i>[Signature]</i>	Date 6/15/15