2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

1.8 19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

28

MLC:mlc

2012 JUN 28 AM 11: 37

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GR 12 00616

INFORMATION

[18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B): Bribery Concerning Programs Receiving Federal Funds]

The United States Attorney charges:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

JOSEPH SERRANO, SR.,

Plaintiff,

Defendant.

[18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B)]

- At all times relevant to this Information: 1.
- The City of Santa Fe Springs was a local a. government that received federal assistance in excess of \$10,000 during the one-year period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending September 30, 2011.
- Defendant JOSEPH SERRANO, SR. ("SERRANO") was an agent of the City of Santa Fe Springs. Specifically, defendant SERRANO was a member of the City Council of Santa Fe Springs from at least in or about January 2010 until in or about October 2011.

From in or about December 2010 to in or about October 2011, defendant SERRANO was also Mayor of the City of Santa Fe Springs.

2. Beginning on or about October 23, 2010, and continuing until on or about September 30, 2011, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendant SERRANO corruptly solicited, demanded, accepted, and agreed to accept things of value from a person, namely, cash payments, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with the business, a transaction, and a series of transactions of the City of Santa Fe Springs involving a thing of value of \$5,000 or more.

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR. United States Attorney

(S. Norder

ROBERT E. DUGDALE Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division

LAWRENCE S. MIDDLETON
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Public Corruption & Civil Rights
Section

MARGARET L. CARTER
Assistant United States Attorney
Public Corruption & Civil Rights Section

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR. United States Attorney ROBERT E. DUGDALE Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Criminal Division MARGARET L. CARTER (CA Bar No. 220637) Assistant United States Attorney Public Corruption & Civil Rights Section 5 1300 United States Courthouse 312 North Spring Street Los Angeles, California 90012 6 Telephone: (213) 894-7413 7 Facsimile: (213) 894-6436 E-mail: maggie.carter@usdoj.gov Attorneys for Plaintiff 8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA . 9 10 11 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 13 Plaintiff, 14 15 JOSEPH SERRANO, SR., 16 Defendant. 17 18 19

2012 JUN 28 AM II: 38 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. LOS ANGELES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CR NG. PL2-12 00616 PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT JOSEPH SERRANO, SR.

This constitutes the plea agreement between JOSEPH SERRANO, SR. ("defendant") and the United States Attorney's Office for the Central District of California ("the USAO") in the investigation of defendant's solicitation and accepting of bribes from a marijuana dispensary operator in the City of Santa Fe Springs. This agreement is limited to the USAO and cannot bind any other federal, state or local prosecuting, administrative or regulatory authorities.

27

26

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 2. Defendant agrees to:
- a) Give up the right to indictment by a grand jury and, at the earliest opportunity requested by the USAO and provided by the Court, appear and plead guilty to a single-count information in the form attached to this plea agreement as Exhibit A or a substantially similar form, and charges defendant with soliciting, demanding, accepting, or agreeing to accept bribes in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B).
 - b) Not contest facts agreed to in this agreement.
- c) Abide by all agreements regarding sentencing factors contained in this agreement.
- d) Appear for all court appearances, surrender as ordered for the service of sentence, obey all conditions of any bond, and obey any other ongoing court order in this matter.
- e) Not commit any crime; however, offenses that would be excluded for sentencing purposes under United States

 Sentencing Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Sentencing Guidelines")

 § 4A1.2(c) are not within the scope of this agreement.
- f) Be truthful at all times with Pretrial Services, the United States Probation Office, and the Court.
- g) Pay the applicable special assessment at or before the time of sentencing, unless defendant lacks the ability to pay and, prior to sentencing, submits a completed financial statement on a form to be provided by the USAO.
- h) Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3663A(a)(3), make restitution to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in the amount

13.

of \$10,000, representing the amount in undercover funds paid to defendant during the investigation of this matter.

THE USAO'S OBLIGATIONS

- 3. The USAO agrees to:
 - a) Not contest facts agreed to in this agreement.
- b) Abide by all agreements regarding sentencing factors contained in this agreement.
- c) At the time of sentencing, provided that defendant demonstrates an acceptance of responsibility for the offense up to and including the time of sentencing, recommend a two-level reduction in the applicable Sentencing Guidelines offense level, pursuant to U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1, and recommend and, if necessary, move for an additional one-level reduction if available under that section.
- d) Except for criminal tax violations (including conspiracy to commit such violations chargeable under 18 U.S.C. § 371), not to prosecute defendant further for any other violations of federal criminal laws arising out of defendant's conduct described in the agreed-to factual basis set forth in paragraph 9 below or for communications that defendant had with dispensary operator M.E. on April 29, 2011; May 2, 2011; and May 3, 2011. Defendant understands that the USAO is free to prosecute defendant criminally for any other unlawful past conduct or any unlawful conduct that occurs after the date of this agreement. Defendant agrees that at the time of sentencing the Court may consider the uncharged conduct in determining the applicable Sentencing Guidelines range, the propriety and extent of any departure from that range, and the sentence to be imposed

after consideration of the Sentencing Guidelines and all other relevant factors under 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

e) Recommend that defendant be sentenced to a term of imprisonment no higher than the low end of the applicable Sentencing Guidelines range, provided that the offense level used by the Court to determine that range is 21 or higher and provided that the Court does not depart downward in offense level or criminal history category. For purposes of this agreement, the low end of the Sentencing Guidelines range is that defined by the Sentencing Table in U.S.S.G. Chapter 5, Part A.

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

NATURE OF THE OFFENSE

In order for defendant to be quilty of the single-count 4. information, that is, soliciting, demanding, accepting, or agreeing to accept bribes in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B), the following must be true: (1) defendant was an agent of a state or local government, or any agency of that government; (2) defendant solicited, demanded, accepted or agreed to accept anything of value from another person; (3) defendant did so corruptly with the intent to be influenced or rewarded in connection with some business, transaction, or series of transactions of the state or local government, or agency of that government; (4) this business, transaction, or series of transactions involved any thing of a value of \$5,000 or more; and (5) the state or local government, or agency of that government, in a one year period, received benefits of more than \$10,000 under any federal program involving a grant or other assistance.

PENALTIES AND RESTITUTION

- 5. The statutory maximum sentence that the Court can impose for a violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 666(a)(1)(B), is: 10 years imprisonment; a three-year period of supervised release; a fine of \$250,000 or twice the gross gain or gross loss resulting from the offense, whichever is greatest; a mandatory special assessment of \$100; and restitution as described in paragraph 2(h), above.
- 6. Defendant understands that supervised release is a period of time following imprisonment during which defendant will be subject to various restrictions and requirements. Defendant understands that if defendant violates one or more of the conditions of any supervised release imposed, defendant may be returned to prison for all or part of the term of supervised release authorized by statute for the offense that resulted in the term of supervised release, which could result in defendant serving a total term of imprisonment greater than the statutory maximum stated above.
- 7. Defendant understands that, by pleading guilty, defendant may be giving up valuable government benefits and valuable civic rights, such as the right to vote, the right to possess a firearm, the right to hold office, and the right to serve on a jury. Defendant understands that once the court accepts defendant's guilty plea, it will be a federal felony for defendant to possess a firearm or ammunition. Defendant understands that the conviction in this case may also subject defendant to various other collateral consequences, including but not limited to revocation of probation, parole, or supervised

release in another case and suspension or revocation of a professional license. Defendant understands that unanticipated collateral consequences will not serve as grounds to withdraw defendant's guilty plea.

8. Defendant understands that, if defendant is not a United States citizen, the felony conviction in this case may subject defendant to the following: removal, also known as deportation, which may, under some circumstances, be mandatory; denial of citizenship; and denial of admission to the United States in the future. The court cannot, and defendant's attorney also may not be able to, advise defendant fully regarding the immigration consequences of the felony conviction in this case. Defendant understands that by entering a guilty plea defendant waives any claim that unexpected immigration consequences may render defendant's guilty plea invalid.

FACTUAL BASIS

9. Defendant admits that defendant is, in fact, guilty of this offense to which defendant is agreeing to plead guilty.

Defendant and the USAO agree to the statement of facts provided below and agree that this statement of facts is sufficient to support a plea of guilty to the charge described in this agreement and to establish the Sentencing Guidelines factors set forth in paragraph 11 below but is not meant to be a complete recitation of all facts relevant to the underlying criminal conduct or all facts known to either party that relate to that conduct.

The City of Santa Fe Springs ("the City") is a local governmental agency within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)

and (d)(2), (3). The Mayor and City Council members of the City are officers of the City authorized to act on behalf of the City, and are agents of the City. At all relevant times, defendant was an elected City Council Member of the City. From approximately December 2010 to October 2011, defendant was also the Mayor of the City.

In all relevant "one year period[s]," as that term is used in 18 U.S.C. § 666(b), the City of Santa Fe Springs received over \$10,000 in "Federal assistance," as that term is used in 18 U.S.C. § 666(b).

In 2010 and 2011, the Santa Fe Springs City Council was discussing options for regulating marijuana dispensaries within the City. Defendant was one of two City Council Members who comprised a subcommittee charged by the City Council with studying the issue. Among the proposals under consideration at various times were restrictions on the number of dispensaries operating in the City, a lottery to determine which dispensaries would receive a license to operate in the City, and an outright ban on dispensaries within the City limits.

Between September 2010 and September 29, 2011, defendant made several telephone calls to and had several in-person meetings with a marijuana dispensary operator (the "dispensary operator") who was already operating a marijuana dispensary within the City. During several of the telephone calls and in-person meetings, defendant asked the dispensary operator to pay defendant money. In exchange, defendant represented that he would provide the dispensary operator with information about the City's plans to regulate marijuana dispensaries and would do what

he could with regard to the City Council's consideration of the marijuana dispensary issue to help the dispensary operator's dispensary stay in business. On several occasions, defendant did in fact provide the dispensary operator with inside information regarding the City's regulation of marijuana dispensaries.

In late October 2010 or early November 2010, defendant met with the dispensary operator at Rachada Thai restaurant in Santa Fe Springs. At the meeting, defendant and the dispensary operator discussed various City Council Members and their positions on marijuana dispensaries. Defendant told the dispensary operator that defendant could control the vote of one of the other City Council members. In the same meeting, defendant discussed a sick relative with high medical bills and asked the dispensary operator whether he could help pay at least \$1,500 towards defendant's relative's medical bills. subsequent telephone call between defendant and the dispensary operator, the dispensary operator agreed to pay defendant \$1,500. In that same telephone call, defendant told the dispensary operator to write up an agreement to make the \$1,500 payment look like a loan. On November 10, 2010, defendant met with the dispensary operator at a McDonald's restaurant in Santa Fe Springs. During the meeting, the dispensary operator gave defendant a personal check for \$1,500, and defendant signed the loan agreement.

On December 8, 2010, the dispensary operator became an informant for the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI"). The dispensary operator agreed to record conversations with defendant

1

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

and to provide the FBI with reports of conversations with defendant.

On December 14, 2010, defendant met with the dispensary operator at a Subway restaurant in La Mirada, California. During the meeting, the dispensary operator asked defendant, "If something happens, I know I can count on you, right?" and defendant responded, "Of course." The dispensary operator then paid defendant \$1,500 cash in FBI undercover funds. After making the payment, the dispensary operator asked defendant, "What's in it for me?" and defendant responded, among other things, "I think you're gonna be fine. I think you're gonna hang in there" and that defendant and another City Council member were "behind your cause" and "have your back" with regard to the City's regulation of dispensaries. Defendant also told the dispensary operator, "And I have to say, I can't say to you directly. . . . Because if I say it directly then that's you, know, . . . that's bribe money, Um, we, you have, we have your back."

On February 9, 2011, defendant met with the dispensary operator at an IHOP restaurant in La Mirada (the "La Mirada IHOP"). The dispensary operator paid defendant \$3,000 cash. During the meeting, the dispensary operator asked defendant, among other things, "I'm gonna be straight up with you; would you take care of me? I mean when it comes to -" and defendant responded, among other things, "I'm gonna do everything I can," and "I will fight for you 'till the end. I'm one vote. But I have to be able to - you have to be able to trust me . . . to work those other people." The dispensary operator also told defendant "I'm really counting on you - cause I really want to

make sure that the business expands . . . And that if something happens you got my back," to which defendant responded, among other things, "Yeah," and "But the way it's going right now," the City was "not looking until the end of 2012" to implement any new regulation regarding dispensaries.

On March 17, 2011, defendant met with the dispensary operator again at the La Mirada IHOP. The dispensary operator paid defendant \$2,000 cash. During the meeting, defendant told the dispensary operator that defendant "had to maneuver" to prevent the City Council from passing a ban on marijuana dispensaries. Defendant also told the dispensary operator, "[B]elieve me, I'm going to do everything I can to keep you where you're at," (which was operating a marijuana dispensary in the City) and "I'm going to put the pressure on the rest of the Council." Defendant also asked the marijuana dispensary operator, "what are the chances of, of, I don't want to say being put on the payroll, but on a monthly basis getting something from you . . ." Defendant stated that he was asking for "a minimum of the house payment. My house payment is \$1,600," and asked the dispensary operator to pay in cash to avoid "a paper trail."

On April 8, 2011, defendant met with the dispensary operator at a Subway restaurant in La Mirada. The dispensary operator paid defendant \$1,800 cash. During the meeting, the dispensary operator asked, "You will shake my hand and you will say, you will put a good thing with the City Council . . ." and defendant replied, "Whatever I have to do."

On April 27, 2011, defendant was interviewed by FBI Special Agents. Defendant told the agents that he had met with one

dispensary operator "once and that was it." Two days later, on April 29, 2011, defendant met with the dispensary operator in a car outside of a Cabo Taco Baja Grill restaurant in La Mirada. Defendant told the dispensary operator that he had met with FBI agents. The dispensary operator asked defendant, "[A]re we still meeting?" and defendant responded, "Well yeah definitely," but stated that defendant and the dispensary operator had to be "more discreet," such as by meeting or exchanging money in a car.

FBI Special Agents interviewed defendant again on May 2, 2011. At that meeting, defendant told the agents that he had met the dispensary operator twice, not once, as defendant had stated in his first interview with the FBI. Defendant also stated that he never received any gifts, payments, gratuities, loans, or any kind of cash disbursements from any dispensary operators, except for gift cards from the dispensary operator's landlord, which defendant stated that defendant had donated to charity. That evening, defendant called the dispensary operator and told him that defendant had again been interviewed by the FBI. The dispensary operator also asked defendant, "[Y]ou still wanted, uh, to meet tomorrow, I think?" and defendant responded, "Yeah, yeah. . . . Yeah, yeah, we still need to meet, yeah."

The next day, on May 3, 2011, defendant met with the dispensary operator in a car outside of a Sizzler restaurant in La Mirada. The dispensary operator paid defendant \$1,700 cash. Defendant told the dispensary operator that the City had to "do something" because the City had "so many" marijuana dispensaries. Defendant told the dispensary operator that defendant would do "[w]hatever I can do" to take care of the dispensary operator.

On June 2, 2011, the dispensary operator called defendant and dispensary operator and defendant agreed not to meet or talk for awhile. Thereafter, the dispensary operator received a letter from the City asking him to cease and desist his dispensary operations by September 26, 2011. Such letters were sent by the City to all marijuana dispensaries known to the City.

On September 8, 2011, defendant approached the dispensary operator after a Santa Fe Springs City Council Meeting and told the dispensary operator that he wanted to meet the following Defendant and the dispensary operator thereafter arranged week. to meet and did meet on September 14, 2011, at the La Mirada IHOP. During the meeting, defendant told the dispensary operator that defendant needed one more payment from the dispensary operator by Friday, September 16, 2011, so that defendant could pay his mortgage. The dispensary operator asked defendant whether the dispensary operator could count on defendant when the time came for him to apply for a dispensary license from the City, and defendant replied that he was "only one" but he would try to get other City Council members to approve the license. The dispensary operator also asked defendant whether defendant would "take care of" the dispensary operator, to which defendant responded, "I've always told you that I would do everything I can and I always have." Defendant and the dispensary operator met again on September 15, 2011, in a car outside of the La Mirada IHOP. During the meeting, defendant stated that defendant would do "anything and everything he can" to make sure that the dispensary operator obtained a dispensary license from the City.

1

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2.5

26

Defendant and the dispensary operator also met on September 26, 2011, in a car outside a Home Depot store in La Mirada. At that meeting, the dispensary operator told defendant that he had closed his dispensary as of that day. Defendant told the dispensary operator that the City planned to shut down only five dispensaries initially, and that the dispensary operator's dispensary was not among the five, stating, "You are safe for at least two to three weeks at least." Defendant also told the dispensary operator that defendant would find out more information for the dispensary operator at a closed session City Council meeting that Thursday. Defendant repeated several times that he needed \$1600 to pay his mortgage, and told the dispensary operator "I told you I would help you" and "I told you I would be loyal to you." Defendant and the dispensary operator also discussed whether "the feds" were investigating in the City and what would happen if "they know that I am talking to you right now."

Defendant and the dispensary operator spoke a final time on September 29, 2011, via telephone. During that call, the dispensary operator asked defendant whether it was okay for his dispensary to be open and whether defendant had his back on that. Defendant responded, "Yeah, yeah."

Defendant accepted each of the above-described payments and solicited payment from the dispensary operator in September 2011 corruptly and with the intent to be influenced or rewarded in connection with the business of the City, namely the regulation of marijuana dispensaries within the City. The parties agree

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

4

that \$10,000 of the funds that defendant accepted from the dispensary operator were undercover funds provided by the FBI.

SENTENCING FACTORS

- 10. Defendant understands that in determining defendant's sentence the Court is required to calculate the applicable

 Sentencing Guidelines range and to consider the range, possible departures under the Sentencing Guidelines, and the other sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). Defendant understands that the Sentencing Guidelines are advisory only, that defendant cannot have any expectation of receiving a sentence within the calculated Sentencing Guidelines range, and that after considering the Sentencing Guidelines and the other § 3553(a) factors, the Court will be free to exercise its discretion to impose any sentence it finds appropriate up to the maximum set by statute for the crime of conviction.
- 11. Defendant and the USAO agree and stipulate to the following applicable sentencing guideline factors:

```
Base Offense Level
                                        14
                                              [U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(a)]
         Specific Offense
         Characteristics
         Offense involving more
         than one bribe/extortion :
                                        +2
                                              [U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(b)(1)]
         More than $10,000
         obtained by defendant
                                        +4
                                              [U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(b)(2),
                                               2B1.1(b)(1)(C)]
         Offense involving an
         elected official
                                              [U.S.S.G. § 2C1.1(b)(3)]
24
                                        +4
25
         Adjustments
26
         Acceptance of
                                        -3
                                              [U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1]
         Responsibility
27
28
         Total Offense Level
                                        21
```

The USAO will agree to a two-level downward adjustment for acceptance of responsibility (and, if applicable, move for an 2 additional one-level downward adjustment under U.S.S.G. § 3E1.1(b)) only if the conditions set forth in paragraph 3(c) are met. Subject to paragraph 25 below, defendant and the USAO agree not to seek, arque, or suggest in any way, either orally or in writing, that any other specific offense characteristics, adjustments, or departures relating to the offense level be imposed. Defendant agrees, however, that if, after signing this agreement but prior to sentencing, defendant were to commit an 10 act, or the USAO were to discover a previously undiscovered act committed by defendant prior to signing this agreement, which 12 act, in the judgment of the USAO, constituted obstruction of 13 justice within the meaning of U.S.S.G. § 3C1.1, the USAO would be free to seek the enhancement set forth in that section.

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 12. Defendant understands that there is no agreement as to defendant's criminal history or criminal history category.
- 13. Defendant and the USAO reserve the right to argue for a sentence outside the sentencing range established by the Sentencing Guidelines based on the factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. \$3553(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(6), and (a)(7).

WAIVER OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

- Defendant understands that by pleading guilty, defendant gives up the following rights:
 - The right to persist in a plea of not guilty. a)
 - The right to a speedy and public trial by jury. b)
- The right to be represented by counsel and, if C) necessary, have the court appoint counsel - at trial. Defendant

. 18

- d) The right to be presumed innocent and to have the burden of proof placed on the government to prove defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
- e) The right to confront and cross-examine witnesses against defendant.
- f) The right to testify and to present evidence in opposition to the charges, including the right to compel the attendance of witnesses to testify.
- g) The right not to be compelled to testify, and, if defendant chose not to testify or present evidence, to have that choice not be used against defendant.
- h) Any and all rights to pursue any affirmative defenses, Fourth Amendment or Fifth Amendment claims, and other pretrial motions that have been filed or could be filed.

WAIVER OF APPEAL OF CONVICTION

15. Defendant understands that, with the exception of an appeal based on a claim that defendant's guilty plea was involuntary, by pleading guilty defendant is waiving and giving up any right to appeal defendant's conviction on the offense to which defendant is pleading guilty.

LIMITED MUTUAL WAIVER OF APPEAL OF SENTENCE

16. Defendant agrees that, provided that the Court imposes a total term of imprisonment on all counts of conviction of no more than 46 months, defendant waives and gives up the right to

appeal all of the following: (a) the procedures and calculations used to determine and impose any portion of the sentence, and the manner in which any portion of the sentence was calculated;
(b) the term of imprisonment imposed by the Court; (c) the fine imposed by the Court, and the manner in which the fine was determined, provided the fine is within the statutory maximum;
(d) the amount and terms of any restitution order, provided it requires payment of no more than \$10,000; (e) the term of any probation or supervised release imposed by the Court; and (f) any condition of probation or supervised release imposed by the Court.

1.5

- 17. Defendant also gives up any right to bring a post-conviction collateral attack on the conviction or sentence, including any order of restitution, except a post-conviction collateral attack based on a claim of ineffective assistance of counsel, a claim of newly discovered evidence, or an explicitly retroactive change in the applicable Sentencing Guidelines, sentencing statutes, or statutes of conviction.
- 18. The USAO agrees that, provided (a) all portions of the sentence are at or below the statutory maximum specified above and (b) the Court imposes a term of imprisonment of no less than 37 months, the USAO gives up its right to appeal any portion of the sentence.

RESULT OF WITHDRAWAL OF GUILTY PLEA

19. Defendant agrees that if, after entering a guilty plea pursuant to this agreement, defendant seeks to withdraw and succeeds in withdrawing defendant's guilty plea on any basis other than a claim and finding that entry into this plea

agreement was involuntary, then (a) the USAO will be relieved of 1 all of its obligations under this agreement; and (b) should the USAO choose to pursue any charge or any civil, administrative, or regulatory action that was either dismissed or not filed as a result of this agreement, then (i) any applicable statute of limitations will be tolled between the date of defendant's 6 signing of this agreement and the filing commencing any such 7 action; and (ii) defendant waives and gives up all defenses based 8 on the statute of limitations, any claim of pre-indictment delay, or any speedy trial claim with respect to any such action, except 10 to the extent that such defenses existed as of the date of 11 defendant's signing this agreement. 12

RESULT OF VACATUR, REVERSAL, OR SET-ASIDE

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

20. Defendant agrees that if the count of conviction is vacated, reversed, or set aside, both the USAO and defendant will be released from all their obligations under this agreement.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AGREEMENT

21. This agreement is effective upon signature and execution of all required certifications by defendant, defendant's counsel, and an Assistant United States Attorney.

BREACH OF AGREEMENT

22. Defendant agrees that if defendant, at any time after the signature of this agreement and execution of all required certifications by defendant, defendant's counsel, and an Assistant United States Attorney, knowingly violates or fails to perform any of defendant's obligations under this agreement ("a breach"), the USAO may declare this agreement breached. All of defendant's obligations are material, a single breach of this

agreement is sufficient for the USAO to declare a breach, and defendant shall not be deemed to have cured a breach without the express agreement of the USAO in writing. If the USAO declares this agreement breached, and the Court finds such a breach to have occurred, then: (a) if defendant has previously entered a guilty plea pursuant to this agreement, defendant will not be able to withdraw the guilty plea, and (b) the USAO will be relieved of all its obligations under this agreement.

2.4

- 23. Following the Court's finding of a knowing breach of this agreement by defendant, should the USAO choose to pursue any charge or any civil, administrative, or regulatory action that was either dismissed or not filed as a result of this agreement, then:
- (a) Defendant agrees that any applicable statute of limitations is tolled between the date of defendant's signing of this agreement and the filing commencing any such action.
- (b) Defendant waives and gives up all defenses based on the statute of limitations, any claim of pre-indictment delay, or any speedy trial claim with respect to any such action, except to the extent that such defenses existed as of the date of defendant's signing this agreement.
- (c) Defendant agrees that: (i) any statements made by defendant, under oath, at the guilty plea hearing (if such a hearing occurred prior to the breach); (ii) the agreed upon factual basis statement in this agreement; and (iii) any evidence derived from such statements, shall be admissible against defendant in any such action against defendant, and defendant waives and gives up any claim under the United States

Constitution, any statute, Rule 410 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 11(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, or any other federal rule, that the statements or any evidence derived from the statements should be suppressed or are inadmissible.

3

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

COURT AND PROBATION OFFICE NOT PARTIES

- 24. Defendant understands that the Court and the United States Probation Office are not parties to this agreement and need not accept any of the USAO's sentencing recommendations or the parties' agreements to facts or sentencing factors.
- Defendant understand's that both defendant and the USAO are free to: (a) supplement the facts by supplying relevant information to the United States Probation Office and the Court, (b) correct any and all factual misstatements relating to the Court's Sentencing Guidelines calculations and determination of sentence, and (c) argue on appeal and collateral review that the Court's Sentencing Guidelines calculations and the sentence it chooses to impose are not error, although each party agrees to maintain its view that the calculations in paragraph 11 are consistent with the facts of this case. While this paragraph permits both the USAO and defendant to submit full and complete factual information to the United States Probation Office and the Court, even if that factual information may be viewed as inconsistent with the facts agreed upon in this agreement, this paragraph does not affect defendant's and the USAO's obligations not to contest the facts agreed upon in this agreement.
- 26. Defendant understands that even if the Court ignores any sentencing recommendation, finds facts or reaches conclusions

different from those agreed upon, and/or imposes any sentence up to the maximum established by statute, defendant cannot, for that reason, withdraw defendant's guilty plea, and defendant will remain bound to fulfill all defendant's obligations under this agreement. Defendant understands that no one -- not the prosecutor, defendant's attorney, or the Court -- can make a binding prediction or promise regarding the sentence defendant will receive, except that it will be within the statutory maximum.

NO ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS

27. Defendant understands that, except as set forth herein, there are no promises, understandings, or agreements between the USAO and defendant or defendant's attorney, and that no additional promise, understanding, or agreement may be entered into unless in a writing signed by all parties or on the record in court.

PLEA AGREEMENT PART OF THE GUILTY PLEA HEARING

28. The parties agree that this agreement will be considered part of the record of defendant's guilty plea hearing

20 //

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

. . || .

26 //

27 1/

28 //

as if the entire agreement had been read into the record of the proceeding.

AGREED AND ACCEPTED

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR.
United States Attorney

MARGARET L. CARTER

Assistant United States Attorney

Date

JOSEPH SERRAND, SP. Defengant

06.27-2012

DOMINIO CANTALUPO Attorney for Defendant JOSEPH SERRANO

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT

I am fluent in the spoken and written English Language. I have read this agreement in its entirety. I have had enough time to review and consider this agreement, and I have carefully and thoroughly discussed every part of it with my attorney. I understand the terms of this agreement, and I voluntarily agree to those terms. I have discussed the evidence with my attorney, and my attorney has advised me of my rights, of possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or at trial, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of relevant Sentencing

Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this agreement. No promises, inducements, or representations of any kind have been made to me other than those contained in this agreement. No one has threatened or forced me in any way to enter into this agreement. I am satisfied with the representation of my attorney in this matter, and I am pleading guilty because I am guilty of the charges and wish to take advantage of the promises set forth in this agreement, and not for any other reason.

Defendant

CERTIFICATION OF DEFENDANT'S ATTORNEY

I am Joseph Serrano's attorney. I have carefully and thoroughly discussed every part of this agreement with my client. Further, I have fully advised my client of his rights, of possible pretrial motions that might be filed, of possible defenses that might be asserted either prior to or at trial, of the sentencing factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), of relevant Sentencing Guidelines provisions, and of the consequences of entering into this agreement. To my knowledge: no promises, inducements, or representations of any kind have been made to my client other than those contained in this agreement; no one has threatened or forced my client in any way to enter into this agreement; my client's decision to enter into this agreement is an informed and voluntary one; and the factual

basis set forth in this agreement is sufficient to support my client's entry of a guilty plea pursuant to this agreement.

DOMINIC CANTALUPO Attorney for Defendant JOSEPH SERRANO Date

6/27/2012

Exhibit A

2 3 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. 11 Plaintiff, INFORMATION 12 [18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B): v. 13 Bribery Concerning Programs JOSEPH SERRANO, Receiving Federal Funds 14 Defendant. 15 16 The United States Attorney charges: 17 [18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B)] 18 At all times relevant to this Indictment: 19 The City of Santa Fe Springs was a local 20 government that received federal assistance in excess of \$10,000 21 during the one-year period beginning October 1, 2010 and ending 22 September 30, 2011. 23 Defendant JOSEPH SERRANO ("SERRANO") was at all b. 24 times relevant to this information an agent of the City of 25 Santa Fe Springs. Specifically, SERRANO was a member of the City 26 Council of Santa Fe Springs from at least in or about 27

January 2010 until in or about October 2011. From in or about

1

2.8

MLC:mlc

December 2010 to in or about October 2011, SERRANO was also Mayor of the City of Santa Fe Springs.

2. Beginning on or about October 23, 2010 and continuing until on or about September 30, 2011, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendant JOSEPH SERRANO corruptly solicited, demanded, and agreed to accept things of value, namely cash payments, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with the business, a transaction, and a series of transactions of the City of Santa Fe Springs involving a thing of value of \$5,000 or more.

ANDRÉ BIROTTE JR. United States Attorney

ROBERT E. DUGDALE
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Criminal Division

LAWRENCE S. MIDDLETON
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Public Corruption & Civil Rights
Section

MARGARET L. CARTER
Assistant United States Attorney
Public Corruption & Civil Rights Section

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, GEORGINA MORENO, declare:

That I am a citizen of the United States and resident or employed in Los Angeles County, California; that my business address is the Office of the United States Attorney, United States Courthouse, 312 North Spring Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012; that I am over the age of eighteen years, and am not a party to the above-entitled action;

That I am employed by the United States Attorney for the Central District of California who is a member of the Bar of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, at whose direction I served a copy of:

PLEA AGREEMENT FOR DEFENDANT JOSEPH SERRANO, SR.

service was:

[1] Placed in a closed envelope, for collection and interoffice delivery addressed as follows:

[] Electronic Mail

[] By hand delivery

[X] Placed in a sealed envelope for collection and Mailing via United States Mail, addressed as follows:

[] By facsimile as follows:

[] By federal express as follows:

DOMINIC CANTALUPO, ESQ. 100 WILSHIRE BLVD., STE. 950 SANTA MONICA, CA 90401-1145

This Certificate is executed on, June 28, 2012, Los Angeles, California.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

GEORGINA MORENO