

Communication from Public

Name: RIDLEY-THOMAS FEDERAL TRIAL and INDICTMENT
Date Submitted: 10/25/2021 09:58 AM
Council File No: 21-1203
Comments for Public Posting: Charges DO NOT RELATE TO THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES,
IT'S DEPARTMENTS, OR COMMISSIONS!

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CRIMINAL MINUTES - ARRAIGNMENT

Case Number: 2:21-CR-00485

Recorder: CS 10/20/2021

Date: 10/20/2021

Present: The Honorable Rozella A. Oliver, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Court Clerk: Donnamarie Luengo

Assistant U.S. Attorney: Ruth Pinkel and Lindsey Greer
Dotson

United States of America v.	Attorney Present for Defendant(s)	Language	Interpreter
1) MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS BOND-PRESENT BY VTC	1) MICHAEL J. PROCTOR RETAINED		

PROCEEDINGS: ARRAIGNMENT OF DEFENDANT(S) AND ASSIGNMENT OF CASE .

Defendant is arraigned and the Court does not question defendant as to true name.
Defendant is given a copy of the Indictment and acknowledges having been read or having received a copy of the Indictment and waives the reading thereof.

Defendant pleads not guilty to all counts in the Indictment.

This case is assigned to the calendar of District Judge Dale S. Fischer.

It is ordered that the following date(s) and time(s) are set:

Jury Trial 12/14/2021 at 8:30 AM

Status Conference 11/1/2021 at 8:30 AM

Defendant and counsel are ordered to appear before said judge at the time and date indicated.

Counsel are referred to the assigned judge's trial/discovery order located on the court's website, Judges' Procedures and Schedules.

First Appearance/Appointment of Counsel: 00 : 00

PIA: 00 : 02

Initials of Deputy Clerk: DL by TRB

10/13/2021

CASE SUMMARY

DM

Case Number 2:21-cr-00485-PA

Defendant Number 1

U.S.A. v. MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

Year of Birth 1954

☒ Indictment☐ Information

Investigative agency (FBI, DEA, etc.) FBI

NOTE: All items MUST be completed. If you do not know the answer or a question is not applicable to your case, enter "N/A."**OFFENSE/VENUE**

a. Offense charged as a:

☐ Class A Misdemeanor ☐ Minor Offense ☐ Petty Offense☐ Class B Misdemeanor ☐ Class C Misdemeanor ☒ Felony

b. Date of Offense Date unknown to August 2018

c. County in which first offense occurred

Los Angeles County

d. The crimes charged are alleged to have been committed in
(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):☒ Los Angeles☐ Ventura☐ Orange☐ Santa Barbara☐ Riverside☐ San Luis Obispo☐ San Bernardino☐ Other

Citation of Offense 18 U.S.C. 371, 666, 1341, 1343, 1346

e. Division in which the MAJORITY of events, acts, or omissions
giving rise to the crime or crimes charged occurred:☒ Western (Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura)☐ Eastern (Riverside and San Bernardino) ☐ Southern (Orange)**RELATED CASE**Has an indictment or information involving this defendant and
the same transaction or series of transactions been previously
filed and dismissed before trial?☒ No ☐ Yes

If "Yes," Case Number: N/A

Pursuant to General Order 21-01, criminal cases may be related
if a previously filed indictment or information and the present
case:a. arise out of the same conspiracy, common scheme,
transaction, series of transactions or events; orb. involve one or more defendants in common, and would
entail substantial duplication of labor in pretrial, trial or
sentencing proceedings if heard by different judges.Related case(s), if any (**MUST MATCH NOTICE OF RELATED
CASE**): N/A**PREVIOUSLY FILED COMPLAINT/CVB CITATION**

A complaint/CVB citation was previously filed on: N/A

Case Number: N/A

Assigned Judge: N/A

Charging: N/A

The complaint/CVB citation:

☐ is still pending☐ was dismissed on: N/A**PREVIOUS COUNSEL**Was defendant previously represented? ☐ No ☐ Yes

IF YES, provide Name: N/A

Phone Number: N/A

COMPLEX CASE

Are there 8 or more defendants in the Indictment/Information?

☐ Yes*☒ NoWill more than 12 days be required to present government's
evidence in the case-in-chief?☐ Yes*☒ No*AN ORIGINAL AND 1 COPY (UNLESS ELECTRONICALLY FILED)
OF THE NOTICE OF COMPLEX CASE MUST BE FILED AT THE
TIME THE INDICTMENT IS FILED IF EITHER "YES" BOX IS
CHECKED.**SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT/INFORMATION****IS THIS A NEW DEFENDANT?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

This is the _____ superseding charge (i.e., 1st, 2nd).

The superseding case was previously filed on:

N/A

Case Number N/A

The superseded case:

☐ is still pending before Judge/Magistrate Judge

N/A

☐ was previously dismissed on N/A

Are there 8 or more defendants in the superseding case?

☐ Yes*☐ NoWill more than 12 days be required to present government's
evidence in the case-in-chief?☐ Yes*☐ NoWas a Notice of Complex Case filed on the Indictment or
Information?☐ Yes☐ No*AN ORIGINAL AND 1 COPY OF THE NOTICE OF COMPLEX CASE
MUST BE FILED AT THE TIME THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IS
FILED IF EITHER "YES" BOX IS CHECKED.

CASE SUMMARY

INTERPRETER

Is an interpreter required? ☐ YES ☒ NO

IF YES, list language and/or dialect:

N/A

OTHER

☒ Male ☐ Female

☒ U.S. Citizen ☐ Alien

Alias Name(s)

This defendant is charged in:

☐ All counts

☒ Only counts: One, Two, and Four through Twenty

☐ This defendant is designated as "High Risk" per 18 USC § 3146(a)(2) by the U.S. Attorney.

☐ This defendant is designated as "Special Case" per 18 USC § 3166(b)(7).

Is defendant a juvenile? ☐ Yes ☒ No

IF YES, should matter be sealed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

The area(s) of substantive law that will be involved in this case include(s):

☐ financial institution fraud ☒ public corruption

☐ government fraud ☐ tax offenses

☐ environmental issues ☒ mail/wire fraud

☐ narcotics offenses ☐ immigration offenses

☐ violent crimes/firearms ☐ corporate fraud

☐ Other N/A

CUSTODY STATUS

Defendant is **not in custody**:

a. Date and time of arrest on complaint: N/A

b. Posted bond at complaint level on: N/A

in the amount of \$ N/A

c. PSA supervision? ☐ Yes ☐ No

d. Is on bail or release from another district:

N/A

Defendant is **in custody**:

a. Place of incarceration: ☐ State ☐ Federal

b. Name of Institution: N/A

c. If Federal, U.S. Marshals Service Registration Number: N/A

d. ☐ Solely on this charge. Date and time of arrest:

N/A

e. On another conviction: ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF YES: ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Writ of Issue

f. Awaiting trial on other charges: ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF YES: ☐ State ☐ Federal AND

Name of Court: N/A

Date transferred to federal custody: N/A

This person/proceeding is transferred from another district pursuant to F.R.Cr.P. _____ 20 _____ 21 _____ 40

EXCLUDABLE TIME

Determinations as to excludable time prior to filing indictment/information. EXPLAIN:

Date 10/13/2021

Lindsey Greer Dotson

Signature of Assistant U.S. Attorney

Lindsey Greer Dotson

Print Name

10/13/2021

CASE SUMMARY

Case Number 2:21-cr-00485-PA

Defendant Number 2 DM

U.S.A. v. MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN

Year of Birth 1938

☒ Indictment☐ Information

Investigative agency (FBI, DEA, etc.) FBI

NOTE: All items MUST be completed. If you do not know the answer or a question is not applicable to your case, enter "N/A."**OFFENSE/VENUE**

a. Offense charged as a:

☐ Class A Misdemeanor ☐ Minor Offense ☐ Petty Offense☐ Class B Misdemeanor ☐ Class C Misdemeanor ☒ Felony

b. Date of Offense Date unknown to August 2018

c. County in which first offense occurred

Los Angeles County

d. The crimes charged are alleged to have been committed in
(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):☒ Los Angeles☐ Ventura☐ Orange☐ Santa Barbara☐ Riverside☐ San Luis Obispo☐ San Bernardino☐ Other

Citation of Offense 18 U.S.C. 371, 666, 1341, 1343, 1346

e. Division in which the MAJORITY of events, acts, or omissions
giving rise to the crime or crimes charged occurred:☒ Western (Los Angeles, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura)☐ Eastern (Riverside and San Bernardino) ☐ Southern (Orange)**RELATED CASE**Has an indictment or information involving this defendant and
the same transaction or series of transactions been previously
filed and dismissed before trial?☒ No ☐ Yes

If "Yes," Case Number: N/A

Pursuant to General Order 21-01, criminal cases may be related
if a previously filed indictment or information and the present
case:a. arise out of the same conspiracy, common scheme,
transaction, series of transactions or events; orb. involve one or more defendants in common, and would
entail substantial duplication of labor in pretrial, trial or
sentencing proceedings if heard by different judges.Related case(s), if any (**MUST MATCH NOTICE OF RELATED
CASE**): N/A**PREVIOUSLY FILED COMPLAINT/CVB CITATION**

A complaint/CVB citation was previously filed on: N/A

Case Number: N/A

Assigned Judge: N/A

Charging: N/A

The complaint/CVB citation:

☐ is still pending☐ was dismissed on: N/A**PREVIOUS COUNSEL**Was defendant previously represented? ☐ No ☐ Yes

IF YES, provide Name: N/A

Phone Number: N/A

COMPLEX CASE

Are there 8 or more defendants in the Indictment/Information?

☐ Yes*☒ NoWill more than 12 days be required to present government's
evidence in the case-in-chief?☐ Yes*☒ No*AN ORIGINAL AND 1 COPY (UNLESS ELECTRONICALLY FILED)
OF THE NOTICE OF COMPLEX CASE MUST BE FILED AT THE
TIME THE INDICTMENT IS FILED IF EITHER "YES" BOX IS
CHECKED.**SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT/INFORMATION****IS THIS A NEW DEFENDANT?** ☐ Yes ☐ No

This is the _____ superseding charge (i.e., 1st, 2nd).

The superseding case was previously filed on:

N/A

Case Number N/A

The superseded case:

☐ is still pending before Judge/Magistrate Judge

N/A

☐ was previously dismissed on N/A

Are there 8 or more defendants in the superseding case?

☐ Yes*☐ NoWill more than 12 days be required to present government's
evidence in the case-in-chief?☐ Yes*☐ NoWas a Notice of Complex Case filed on the Indictment or
Information?☐ Yes☐ No*AN ORIGINAL AND 1 COPY OF THE NOTICE OF COMPLEX CASE
MUST BE FILED AT THE TIME THE SUPERSEDING INDICTMENT IS
FILED IF EITHER "YES" BOX IS CHECKED.

CASE SUMMARY

INTERPRETER

Is an interpreter required? ☐ YES ☒ NO

IF YES, list language and/or dialect:

N/A

OTHER

☐ Male ☒ Female

☒ U.S. Citizen ☐ Alien

Alias Name(s)

This defendant is charged in:

☐ All counts

☒ Only counts: One and Three through Twenty

☐ This defendant is designated as "High Risk" per 18 USC § 3146(a)(2) by the U.S. Attorney.

☐ This defendant is designated as "Special Case" per 18 USC § 3166(b)(7).

Is defendant a juvenile? ☐ Yes ☒ No

IF YES, should matter be sealed? ☐ Yes ☐ No

The area(s) of substantive law that will be involved in this case include(s):

☐ financial institution fraud ☒ public corruption

☐ government fraud ☐ tax offenses

☐ environmental issues ☒ mail/wire fraud

☐ narcotics offenses ☐ immigration offenses

☐ violent crimes/firearms ☐ corporate fraud

☐ Other N/A

CUSTODY STATUS

Defendant is **not in custody**:

a. Date and time of arrest on complaint: N/A

b. Posted bond at complaint level on: N/A

in the amount of \$ N/A

c. PSA supervision? ☐ Yes ☐ No

d. Is on bail or release from another district:

N/A

Defendant is **in custody**:

a. Place of incarceration: ☐ State ☐ Federal

b. Name of Institution: N/A

c. If Federal, U.S. Marshals Service Registration Number: N/A

d. ☐ Solely on this charge. Date and time of arrest:

N/A

e. On another conviction: ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF YES: ☐ State ☐ Federal ☐ Writ of Issue

f. Awaiting trial on other charges: ☐ Yes ☐ No

IF YES: ☐ State ☐ Federal AND

Name of Court: N/A

Date transferred to federal custody: N/A

This person/proceeding is transferred from another district pursuant to F.R.Cr.P. ____ 20 ____ 21 ____ 40

EXCLUDABLE TIME

Determinations as to excludable time prior to filing indictment/information. EXPLAIN:

Date 10/13/2021

Lindsey Greer Dotson

Signature of Assistant U.S. Attorney

Lindsey Greer Dotson

Print Name

10/13/2021

DM

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 April 2021 Grand Jury

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS and
15 MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN,

16 Defendants.
17

CR 2:21-cr-00485-PA

I N D I C T M E N T

[18 U.S.C. § 371: Conspiracy;
18 U.S.C. §§ 666(a)(1)(B), (a)(2):
Bribery Concerning Programs
Receiving Federal Funds; 18 U.S.C.
§§ 1341, 1343, 1346: Honest
Services Mail and Wire Fraud]

18 The Grand Jury charges:

19 INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS

20 At times relevant to this Indictment:

21 A. DEFENDANT MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS

22 1. Defendant MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS was a public official employed
23 by the County of Los Angeles ("County"), within the Central District
24 of California. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS was a member of the Los
25 Angeles County Board of Supervisors ("Board of Supervisors") for the
26 Second District from approximately 2008 to 2020 and served as the
27 Chairman of the Board of Supervisors in or around 2017. The five-
28 member Board of Supervisors was the governing body of the County and

1 had executive, legislative, and quasi-judicial roles. Members were
2 elected by voters in their respective districts and could serve up to
3 three four-year terms.

4 2. As a public official employed by the County, defendant
5 RIDLEY-THOMAS owed a fiduciary duty to the citizens of the County to
6 perform the duties and responsibilities of his office free from bias,
7 conflicts of interest, self-enrichment, self-dealing, concealment,
8 deceit, fraud, kickbacks, and bribery.

9 3. The County was a local government that received benefits in
10 excess of \$10,000 under a Federal program involving a grant,
11 contract, subsidy, loan, guarantee, insurance, and other forms of
12 Federal assistance in each of the calendar years 2017 and 2018.

13 B. MRT RELATIVE 1

14 4. MRT Relative 1 was a close relative of defendant RIDLEY-
15 THOMAS and a member of the California State Assembly ("State
16 Assembly") from approximately 2013 to on or about December 31, 2017.

17 5. In or around the fall of 2017, MRT Relative 1 was the
18 subject of an internal sexual harassment investigation in the State
19 Assembly. At least in or around November 2017, defendant RIDLEY-
20 THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 were aware of the investigation, which was
21 not public at the time, and knew that MRT Relative 1 would likely
22 resign from the State Assembly. Around this time, defendant RIDLEY-
23 THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 sought to secure paid employment for MRT
24 Relative 1 following his/her abrupt departure from the State
25 Assembly. With this paid employment, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT
26 Relative 1 endeavored to provide a stable income to MRT Relative 1,
27 who was in debt tens of thousands of dollars, and also to minimize
28 any damage to MRT Relative 1's and, in turn, defendant RIDLEY-

1 THOMAS's public images from MRT Relative 1's sudden resignation from
2 elected office.

3 6. In or around December 2017, MRT Relative 1 was planning to
4 become the new director of Nonprofit A. Fiscal Sponsor A was
5 Nonprofit A's fiscal sponsor. A fiscal sponsor was an umbrella
6 organization that provided administrative support to smaller entities
7 and allowed them to operate under the sponsor's tax-exempt, 501(c)(3)
8 status, but it did not provide funding to the entity. Accordingly,
9 for MRT Relative 1 to receive compensation, obtain healthcare
10 benefits, and hire staff, MRT Relative 1 would have needed to raise
11 money for Nonprofit A's operating funds.

12 7. In or around December 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS paid
13 \$100,000 in campaign funds to Fiscal Sponsor A for the benefit of
14 Nonprofit A. At defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's instruction, on or about
15 December 7, 2017, a \$100,000 check made payable to "[Fiscal Sponsor
16 A] fbo [Nonprofit A]" was sent to Fiscal Sponsor A from the Mark
17 Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A. MRT Relative 1 was on
18 email correspondence regarding the funding.

19 8. On or about January 30, 2018, Fiscal Sponsor A refunded the
20 \$100,000 payment because it was concerned with, among other things,
21 the nepotistic optics of a politician donating campaign funds to
22 financially benefit his close relative.

23 9. Following the refund of the \$100,000 payment, MRT Relative
24 1 did not become Nonprofit A's new director. Instead, in or around
25 early 2018, MRT Relative 1 founded Nonprofit B.

26 10. Fiscal Sponsor B became Nonprofit B's fiscal sponsor. As
27 with other fiscal sponsorships, in order for MRT Relative 1 to
28

1 receive compensation, obtain healthcare benefits, and hire staff, MRT
2 Relative 1 needed to raise money for Nonprofit B's operating funds.

3 C. DEFENDANT MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN

4 11. Defendant MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN was a tenured faculty member
5 at a university in Southern California ("University") and dean of the
6 University's School of Social Work ("Social Work School") from
7 approximately 1997 to 2018. On top of her substantial salary for her
8 tenured faculty position, defendant FLYNN earned additional
9 compensation tied to her role as dean, which equaled over sixty
10 percent of her tenured faculty salary.

11 12. The University was a private research university in Los
12 Angeles, California. The Social Work School and the University's
13 School of Public Policy ("Public Policy School") offered postgraduate
14 degrees in the fields of social work and public policy, respectively.
15 The University and the Social Work and Public Policy Schools were
16 located within the Second District when defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS was a
17 member of the Board of Supervisors for the Second District.

18 13. Under defendant FLYNN's leadership, the Social Work School
19 was facing a multimillion-dollar budget deficit in or around 2017 and
20 2018 that threatened the school's viability, as well as defendant
21 FLYNN's deanship and reputation within the field of social work.

22 14. Defendant FLYNN was removed as dean of the Social Work
23 School in or around June 2018 and resigned from the University
24 altogether in or around September 2018.

25 D. RELEVANT UNIVERSITY POLICIES

26 15. University policy prohibited faculty members from being
27 candidates for degrees in the same department or program in which
28

1 they simultaneously had a faculty appointment due to a potential
2 conflict of interest.

3 16. University policy also prohibited donations from the
4 University where the donation recipient intended to use the donation
5 to hire staff and pay salary. Defendant FLYNN was aware of this
6 policy.

7 17. University policy required donation recipients to commit to
8 use all donated funds by the end of the University's fiscal year or
9 else the entirety of the funds could not be released. Defendant
10 FLYNN was aware of this policy.

11 18. These Introductory Allegations are incorporated into each
12 count of this Indictment.

COUNT ONE

[18 U.S.C. § 371]

[ALL DEFENDANTS]

A. OBJECTS OF THE CONSPIRACY

19. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing until in or around August 2018, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, defendants MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS and MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN conspired with each other, and others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, to knowingly and intentionally commit offenses against the United States, namely, bribery concerning programs receiving federal funds, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 666(a)(1)(B), (a)(2), and mail and wire fraud, including through the deprivation of honest services of a County official, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1341, 1343, 1346.

B. MEANS BY WHICH THE OBJECTS OF THE CONSPIRACY WERE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED

20. The objects of the conspiracy were to be accomplished, in substance, as follows:

a. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS would solicit, demand, accept, and agree to accept direct and indirect financial benefits from defendant FLYNN and other University officials for the benefit of defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS, MRT Relative 1, and others, in exchange for official acts to benefit defendant FLYNN and the University.

b. MRT Relative 1 would keep defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS apprised of MRT Relative 1's solicitations and demands in order for defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS to exert pressure on defendant FLYNN and

1 other University officials to comply with MRT Relative 1's
2 solicitations and demands.

3 c. In exchange for direct and indirect financial benefits
4 from defendant FLYNN and other University officials, defendant
5 RIDLEY-THOMAS would agree to perform and perform official acts,
6 including, among others, voting to issue and amend County contracts
7 with the University and Social Work School.

8 d. In exchange for such official acts by defendant
9 RIDLEY-THOMAS, defendant FLYNN would give, offer, and agree to give
10 direct and indirect financial benefits to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS,
11 MRT Relative 1, and others, including, but not limited to: (1)
12 admission to the University for MRT Relative 1 to obtain a master's
13 degree; (2) a full tuition scholarship for MRT Relative 1 to attend
14 the University; (3) a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach
15 at the University while MRT Relative 1 was simultaneously a student;
16 and (4) a \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B
17 for the benefit of Nonprofit B.

18 e. Defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN and MRT Relative 1
19 would take steps to disguise, conceal, and cover up the bribes,
20 kickbacks, and other benefits defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT
21 Relative 1 received from defendant FLYNN and other University
22 officials, including by: (1) concealing the official acts defendant
23 RIDLEY-THOMAS agreed to perform and performed in exchange for direct
24 and indirect financial benefits from defendant FLYNN and other
25 University officials; (2) falsifying in a letter the nature and
26 purpose of the \$100,000 payment from defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS to the
27 Social Work School; (3) providing false information to University
28 officials about the purpose and timing of the University's \$100,000

1 payment to Nonprofit B; and (4) concealing material facts from
2 University officials about the purpose and timing of the University's
3 \$100,000 payment to Nonprofit B.

4 C. OVERT ACTS

5 21. In furtherance of the conspiracy and to accomplish the
6 objects of the conspiracy, on or about the following dates,
7 defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN, and others known and unknown to
8 the Grand Jury, committed and caused to be committed various overt
9 acts within the Central District of California, and elsewhere,
10 including the following:

11 **University Admission and a Full Scholarship for MRT Relative 1**

12 Overt Act No. 1: On May 17, 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
13 told defendant FLYNN that MRT Relative 1 was interested in obtaining
14 a postgraduate degree from the University.

15 Overt Act No. 2: On May 18, 2017, MRT Relative 1 emailed
16 defendant FLYNN to request a meeting.

17 Overt Act No. 3: On May 18, 2017, defendant FLYNN responded
18 via email to MRT Relative 1 and wrote, "I am glad to hear from you --
19 and so quickly!" Defendant FLYNN told MRT Relative 1 to schedule a
20 meeting with her.

21 Overt Act No. 4: On May 24, 2017, defendant FLYNN emailed a
22 University employee and told the employee to contact MRT Relative 1
23 "right away" to facilitate MRT Relative 1's postgraduate work at the
24 University. Defendant FLYNN wrote that MRT Relative 1 was "the
25 [close relative] of [defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS]" and that she
26 "intend[ed] to open every door for [MRT Relative 1][.]"

27 Overt Act No. 5: On June 5, 2017, defendant FLYNN emailed
28 University officials to inform them that she was going to dinner with

1 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and that there was the potential for
2 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS to assist the Social Work School with various
3 County initiatives. Defendant FLYNN wrote, "[t]here are significant
4 amounts of [C]ounty funds available[.]"

5 Overt Act No. 6: On June 5, 2017, University Official 1
6 responded to defendant FLYNN's June 5th email about having dinner
7 with defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and wrote, "[defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS]
8 has lots of discretionary money" and "should give us \$1M each year
9 for three years."

10 Overt Act No. 7: On June 5, 2017, defendant FLYNN replied to
11 University Official 1's June 5th email and wrote that she and
12 University Official 2 were going to help MRT Relative 1 obtain a
13 joint master's degree from the Social Work and Public Policy Schools.
14 Defendant FLYNN wrote that she and University Official 2 intended to
15 offer MRT Relative 1 "a full scholarship between [both schools]."
16 Defendant FLYNN characterized the exchange as a "full scholarship for
17 our [Social Work School] funds."

18 Overt Act No. 8: On June 23, 2017, defendant FLYNN met with
19 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and solicited official action from him as a
20 member of the Board of Supervisors.

21 Overt Act No. 9: On July 23, 2017, defendant FLYNN caused a
22 confidential letter to be hand-delivered to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
23 ("hand-delivered letter") in which she memorialized an agreement that
24 she and defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS had made during their June 23rd
25 meeting. Defendant FLYNN wrote, "I am prepared to follow up on our
26 discussion in my office." Defendant FLYNN said, "I look forward to
27 working with [MRT Relative 1]" and will "take steps with [MRT
28 Relative 1] to plan the road ahead." Defendant FLYNN then outlined

1 what she expected from defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS in exchange for her
2 efforts to benefit MRT Relative 1: (1) a new contract between the
3 University/Social Work School and the Los Angeles County Department
4 of Children and Family Services ("DCFS"); (2) a new contract between
5 the University/Social Work School and the Los Angeles County
6 Probation Department ("Probation"); and (3) an amendment to an
7 existing contract between the University/Social Work School and the
8 Los Angeles County Department of Mental Health ("DMH") related to
9 services provided by University Telehealth ("Telehealth"), which was
10 a clinic where Social Work School students provided online mental
11 health and counseling services to patients referred by the County.

12 a. In the hand-delivered letter, defendant FLYNN said
13 that she and defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS had discussed the "[b]locked
14 movement of [the University's] Title IVe contract with DCFS[.]"
15 "Title IVe" referred to Title IV(e) of the Social Security Act, which
16 allowed the County to use federal funds to compensate schools of
17 social work, including the Social Work School, for training and other
18 services. Defendant FLYNN told defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS that she
19 needed "[i]mmediate negotiation and [execution] of a 3-year contract
20 by DCFS and the University Consortium for Children and Families[.]"
21 Defendant FLYNN said that the "new contract...should contain
22 increased resources" and that the Social Work School had "[drawn] up
23 our budgets for the 2017-18 fiscal year" based on the expectation of
24 those increased resources. Defendant FLYNN noted that the
25 "unprecedented lag" in securing a new contract was "particularly
26 problematic" for the University and Social Work School.

27 b. In the hand-delivered letter, defendant FLYNN also
28 told defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS that she wanted a new "[Title] IVe

1 contract" with Probation in which the University would be involved in
2 "parole office refurbishment and services." Defendant FLYNN said
3 that she would be meeting with County Official 1 "to discuss
4 development of a IVE contract with the Department of Probation." She
5 continued: "[The University] will need the help and cooperation of
6 DCFS and perhaps assurance that the Board of Supervisors would favor
7 this initiative."

8 c. In the hand-delivered letter, defendant FLYNN told
9 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS that she needed a "contract amendment" for
10 the Telehealth-DMH contract to expand its scope and capacity, and
11 that "[t]hese two actions are now essential to solidify the
12 functionality of Telehealth."

13 Overt Act No. 10: On July 26, 2017, defendant FLYNN told MRT
14 Relative 1 that he/she would receive a full tuition scholarship to
15 pursue a joint master's degree from the Social Work and Public Policy
16 Schools.

17 Overt Act No. 11: In July 2017, defendant FLYNN began working
18 with University officials to ensure that MRT Relative 1 would receive
19 a joint master's degree from the Social Work and Public Policy
20 Schools with a full tuition scholarship.

21 Overt Act No. 12: On July 26, 2017, defendant FLYNN told a
22 University employee that there was a "specific and very rigid
23 sequence of courses alternating between [the Social Work School] and
24 [the Public Policy School] that [had] to be followed." To
25 accommodate MRT Relative 1's preferences and schedule, defendant
26 FLYNN told the employee to "tackle this enigma" in order to ensure
27 that MRT Relative 1 could receive a joint master's degree without
28 adhering to the standard sequence of coursework.

1 Overt Act No. 13: In July 2017, defendant FLYNN began working
2 with University officials to ensure that MRT Relative 1 could attend
3 University classes online. Defendant FLYNN understood that MRT
4 Relative 1 preferred to attend classes online and endeavored to have
5 an entire online curriculum, which had never existed previously for
6 this program, developed to accommodate MRT Relative 1.

7 Overt Act No. 14: In July 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
8 presented a motion, Item No. 16 on the Board of Supervisors' August
9 1, 2017 agenda, recommending "a memorandum of understanding to
10 establish a partnership with [the Social Work School] to enhance
11 services[.]"

12 Overt Act No. 15: On July 30, 2017, upon receiving an email
13 from a University employee about Item No. 16 on the Board of
14 Supervisors' August 1, 2017 agenda, which would establish a
15 partnership between the County and Social Work School, defendant
16 FLYNN replied: "Yes, I talked with [defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS] about
17 this, and I am very happy to see that [defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS] was
18 as good as his word."

19 Overt Act No. 16: On August 1, 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
20 voted in favor of Item No. 16, which passed.

21 Overt Act No. 17: In October 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
22 presented a motion, Item No. 3 on the Board of Supervisors' October
23 17, 2017 agenda, relating to "Probation University." Probation
24 University was a concept whereby an outside university, such as the
25 Social Work School, would help train Probation employees and, in
26 return, receive compensation for providing those services.

27 Overt Act No. 18: On October 12, 2017, upon receiving an email
28 from a University employee about Item No. 3 on the Board of

Supervisors' October 17, 2017 agenda, which could lead to additional compensation for the Social Work School, defendant FLYNN replied: "I am holding my breath...[defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS] is really trying to deliver here."

Overt Act No. 19: On October 17, 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS voted in favor of Item No. 3, which passed.

Overt Act No. 20: On October 17, 2017, upon learning that Item No. 3 had passed, defendant FLYNN emailed a University employee: "I am THRILLED!"

The Paid Professorship for MRT Relative 1

Overt Act No. 21: In the fall of 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 began soliciting from defendant FLYNN and other University officials a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach at the University.

Overt Act No. 22: While soliciting the paid professorship for MRT Relative 1, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 concealed from University officials that MRT Relative 1 was the subject of a sexual harassment investigation and that MRT Relative 1 might resign from the State Assembly.

Overt Act No. 23: On December 4, 2017, when MRT Relative 1 was a Member of the State Assembly representing a district in Los Angeles and the subject of a sexual harassment investigation, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS received an email from MRT Relative 1 about a press release regarding a sexual harassment investigation of a fellow Member of the State Assembly. MRT Relative 1 said, "rumors are another Los Angeles Legislator is next[.]"

Overt Act No. 24: On December 5, 2017, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS was blind carbon copied ("bcc'ed") on an email MRT Relative 1 sent to

1 University Official 2. MRT Relative 1 told University Official 2
2 that he/she wanted a "Practioner-in-Residence" title for his/her
3 professorship, "beginning compensation" in the range of \$25,000, and
4 to "launch in January [2018]."

5 Overt Act No. 25: On December 9, 2017, at approximately 11:17
6 a.m., defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS received a forwarded email from MRT
7 Relative 1. The forwarded email was sent at approximately 10:21 a.m.
8 from University Official 2 in response to MRT Relative 1's December
9 5th email. University Official 2 told MRT Relative 1 that a January
10 2018 start date was not feasible and that University Official 2 would
11 have to "create a part-time position with a salary" to accommodate
12 MRT Relative 1, which University Official 2 had not been
13 anticipating.

14 Overt Act No. 26: On December 9, 2017, at approximately 11:58
15 a.m., defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed MRT Relative 1 the link to a
16 blog article suggesting that MRT Relative 1 may be "the Next #MeToo
17 to Go," meaning to be forced out of the State Assembly on account of
18 a sexual harassment scandal.

19 Overt Act No. 27: On December 11, 2017, defendant FLYNN
20 received an email from MRT Relative 1, who bcc'ed defendant RIDLEY-
21 THOMAS. MRT Relative 1 told defendant FLYNN that he/she wanted to
22 "follow up on a couple things" and provided his/her phone number.

23 Overt Act No. 28: On December 14, 2017, defendant RIDLEY-
24 THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN. The subject line had the name of
25 County Official 2, who was a high-level public official in a position
26 to help defendant FLYNN secure a lucrative amendment to the
27 Telehealth-DMH contract from the County. The email said: "[He/She]'s
28 ready to go. 🙄 [winking face emoji][.]"

1 Overt Act No. 29: In or around 2017 and 2018, defendant
2 RIDLEY-THOMAS advocated for and exerted pressure on County Official 2
3 to perform official acts favorable to the Telehealth-DMH contract.

4 Overt Act No. 30: On December 14, 2017, within approximately
5 one hour of receiving defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's email saying that
6 County Official 2 was "ready to go," defendant FLYNN emailed multiple
7 University officials and MRT Relative 1 to expedite MRT Relative 1's
8 enrollment at the University and full tuition scholarship. In the
9 email, defendant FLYNN instructed that MRT Relative 1's admission to
10 the University should be given the "highest priority." In spite of
11 the Social Work School's multimillion-dollar budget deficit,
12 defendant FLYNN agreed to "tap our endowed funds" so that the Social
13 Work School could "pay[] all of [MRT Relative 1's] tuition costs
14 through a scholarship award." Defendant FLYNN urged University
15 officials to move quickly to "wind this up before we all leave for
16 the holidays." Defendant FLYNN further noted that MRT Relative 1
17 "will be the first to attempt a joint degree through the [Virtual
18 Academic Center], combining social work and the Master's in Public
19 Administration from [the Public Policy School]" and that "[the Public
20 Policy School] is still building their online degree and won't have
21 courses available for several months for the MPA."

22 Overt Act No. 31: On December 15, 2017, after receiving
23 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's December 14th email that County Official 2
24 was "ready to go," defendant FLYNN sent an email to University
25 Official 2 to expedite MRT Relative 1's paid professorship. Flagging
26 the email as "URGENT," defendant FLYNN insisted that University
27 Official 2 "get the offer letter out before the holidays" to MRT
28

1 Relative 1 "in the interests of showing MRT [defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS]
2 that we can deliver."

3 Overt Act No. 32: In or around 2017 and 2018, defendant FLYNN
4 sought University admission for MRT Relative 1 to obtain a joint
5 degree from the Social Work and Public Policy Schools and, at the
6 same time, a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach at the
7 Social Work and Public Policy Schools, even though MRT Relative 1's
8 dual student-faculty status would violate University policy.

9 Overt Act No. 33: On January 4, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
10 received an email from MRT Relative 1 that contained an accounting of
11 MRT Relative 1's significant debt.

12 Overt Act No. 34: On January 5, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
13 emailed defendant FLYNN and asked her to call him.

14 Overt Act No. 35: On January 7, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
15 received an email from MRT Relative 1 regarding MRT Relative 1's
16 anticipated University employment and personal finances. With
17 respect to the Social Work and Public Policy Schools, MRT Relative 1
18 stated that he/she was "await[ing] [defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's]
19 conversation with [defendant FLYNN] and [University Official 2]" for
20 a "check-in."

21 Overt Act No. 36: On January 9, 2018, defendant FLYNN caused
22 MRT Relative 1 to be awarded a "full tuition scholarship," totaling
23 over \$26,000 in paid tuition from the Social Work School for the
24 spring and summer of 2018.

25 Overt Act No. 37: On January 9, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
26 received from MRT Relative 1 a forwarded email dated January 9, 2018
27 about the full tuition scholarship award.

1 Overt Act No. 38: On February 13, 2018, defendant FLYNN caused
2 MRT Relative 1 to receive an email informing him/her that the
3 University had agreed to waive the usual hiring process and that
4 he/she would soon receive a contract for the paid professorship.

5 Overt Act No. 39: On February 13, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-
6 THOMAS received from MRT Relative 1 a forwarded email dated February
7 13, 2018 about the paid professorship.

8 Overt Act No. 40: On February 13, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-
9 THOMAS responded via email to MRT Relative 1 about the paid
10 professorship with thumbs up and winking face emojis: "👍🙄 [.]"

11 Overt Act No. 41: On February 13, 2018, after learning that
12 same day that the usual hiring process had been waived and MRT
13 Relative 1 would be offered the paid professorship, defendant RIDLEY-
14 THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN. The subject line was "Probation
15 Reform motion." Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS wrote, "[w]ould like to
16 discuss this with you in the near term."

17 Overt Act No. 42: On February 13, 2018, defendant FLYNN
18 responded to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's "Probation Reform motion"
19 email. Defendant FLYNN wrote that she had "an excellent meeting last
20 night with [County Official 2] and [County Official 3]," who were two
21 high-ranking public officials in a position to help defendant FLYNN
22 obtain a lucrative amendment to the Telehealth-DMH contract and
23 secure the Probation contract with the Social Work School. Defendant
24 FLYNN stated that she was "very encouraged" and thanked defendant
25 RIDLEY-THOMAS "for facilitating all these important relationships and
26 opportunities."

27 Overt Act No. 43: On February 23, 2018, defendant FLYNN
28 emailed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS about "an extremely important request

1 for contract amendment that will be on the [Board of Supervisors']
2 agenda next week" regarding "our TeleHealth contract with DMH."

3 Overt Act No. 44: On February 23, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-
4 THOMAS responded to defendant FLYNN's "extremely important request"
5 email regarding the Telehealth contract amendment and bcc'ed MRT
6 Relative 1. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS told defendant FLYNN: "Your wish
7 is my command."

8 Overt Act No. 45: On March 9, 2018, defendant FLYNN caused a
9 University employee to mail an offer letter, dated February 16, 2018,
10 to MRT Relative 1 for the paid professorship. In the letter, the
11 University formally offered MRT Relative 1 the position of "Professor
12 of the Practice of Policy and Social Work," beginning on March 16,
13 2018 and continuing until May 15, 2019. The offer letter stated that
14 MRT Relative 1 would receive a salary of \$50,000, of which the Social
15 Work School and Public Policy School would each fund half.

16 Overt Act No. 46: On March 10, 2018, defendant FLYNN caused
17 her plan to secure MRT Relative 1 a paid professorship with the
18 University to be achieved, as MRT Relative 1 signed the offer letter
19 for the paid professorship.

20 **The \$100,000 Payment for the Benefit of MRT Relative 1**

21 Overt Act No. 47: In or around early to mid-2018, defendant
22 RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 considered hiring Individual 1 to
23 work for Nonprofit B. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative 1
24 were aware that MRT Relative 1 needed to raise money for Nonprofit B,
25 not just for MRT Relative 1 to receive a salary, but also to allow
26 MRT Relative 1 to formally hire and compensate Individual 1.

27 Overt Act No. 48: In or around early to mid-2018, defendant
28 RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative 1 agreed that Individual 1 would begin

1 full-time employment with Nonprofit B in May 2018 and be paid on the
2 "15th of every month."

3 Overt Act No. 49: On April 20, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
4 emailed defendant FLYNN and asked her to call him.

5 Overt Act No. 50: On April 21, 2018, defendant FLYNN responded
6 to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's April 20th email and said, "[w]ill
7 certainly do so."

8 Overt Act No. 51: On April 26, 2018, defendant FLYNN met with
9 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS, solicited official action from him as a
10 member of the Board of Supervisors, and discussed a "gift agreement"
11 with him.

12 Overt Act No. 52: On April 26, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
13 emailed Individual 1's resume, which he had received from MRT
14 Relative 1, to defendant FLYNN and wrote: "As discussed. Thank you."

15 Overt Act No. 53: In 2018, defendant FLYNN told multiple
16 University officials that the Social Work School needed to obtain the
17 amended Telehealth-DMH contract from the County, which she expected
18 to generate approximately \$9 million per year for the Social Work
19 School.

20 Overt Act No. 54: On April 26, 2018, at defendant RIDLEY-
21 THOMAS's request, defendant FLYNN agreed to funnel a \$100,000 payment
22 from the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A. through the
23 University/Social Work School to Fiscal Sponsor B for the benefit of
24 Nonprofit B and, in turn, MRT Relative 1.

25 Overt Act No. 55: Beginning in late April 2018, defendants
26 RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN and MRT Relative 1 concealed the agreement to
27 funnel \$100,000 from the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better
28 L.A. through the University/Social Work School to Fiscal Sponsor B

1 from University officials, Fiscal Sponsor B officials, and the public
2 in order to ensure the success of the University's payment to Fiscal
3 Sponsor B and avoid any political fallout for defendant RIDLEY-
4 THOMAS.

5 Overt Act No. 56: Around the time of defendant FLYNN's April
6 26th solicitation meeting with defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS, defendant
7 FLYNN told University Official 3 something to the effect that
8 defendant FLYNN had good news, in that the University was going to
9 get the Telehealth contract, but that defendant FLYNN had to do a
10 "favor" to get it. Defendant FLYNN winked at University Official 3
11 when she talked about doing a "favor" in exchange for the Telehealth
12 contract.

13 Overt Act No. 57: On April 27, 2018, MRT Relative 1 falsely
14 told at least one Fiscal Sponsor B employee that the University had
15 awarded Nonprofit B a "grant," thereby furthering efforts by
16 defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN to conceal the true nature of the
17 funneled \$100,000 payment from the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a
18 Better L.A. through the University to Fiscal Sponsor B.

19 Overt Act No. 58: On May 2, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
20 caused a letter and \$100,000 check to be sent to defendant FLYNN.
21 The check was made payable to the Social Work School from the Mark
22 Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A. The letter stated that the
23 \$100,000 was to be used at defendant FLYNN's "discretion in order to
24 best facilitate the impressive policy and practical work of the
25 [Social Work School] and its impact in the community."

26 Overt Act No. 59: On May 3, 2018, at approximately 9:20 p.m.,
27 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS received an email from MRT Relative 1 with
28

1 bank wiring information for Fiscal Sponsor B in order to facilitate
2 the \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B.

3 Overt Act No. 60: On May 3, 2018, at approximately 10:20 p.m.,
4 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN the bank wiring
5 information for Fiscal Sponsor B to facilitate the \$100,000 payment
6 from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
7 bcc'ed MRT Relative 1 and told defendant FLYNN: "At this point it is
8 necessary to act with dispatch so as to facilitate the completion of
9 [Individual 1's] on-boarding with [Fiscal Sponsor B] in a timely
10 manner -- no later than May 15th."

11 Overt Act No. 61: On May 3, 2018, at approximately 10:27 p.m.,
12 defendant FLYNN responded to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's 10:20 p.m.
13 email. Defendant FLYNN wrote: "If that is the case, then we
14 definitely cannot use the option of a university appointment, at
15 least this year. However, I will adopt another course of action
16 tomorrow morning and assume the person we are to contact is [Fiscal
17 Sponsor B Employee 1]. I will let people know that this must be
18 expedited."

19 Overt Act No. 62: On May 3, 2018, at approximately 10:35 p.m.,
20 defendant FLYNN emailed University officials to facilitate the
21 \$100,000 payment from the University/Social Work School to Fiscal
22 Sponsor B. Defendant FLYNN said: "I will explain later, but it is
23 urgent that we issue a sponsorship to [Fiscal Sponsor B] for \$100,000
24 and that it be received by May 15th if at all possible."

25 Overt Act No. 63: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 8:16 a.m.,
26 defendant FLYNN emailed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS with an update
27 regarding the \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor
28 B. Defendant FLYNN wrote: "Part of the issue here is that the

1 sponsorship will have to move through the university payroll office
2 over which we have very little control. I can guarantee that we will
3 fulfill our part of the transaction today, but can only nag and nip
4 at people's heels at the higher administration levels. If May 15th
5 is a drop dead date, then I will need to understand a little more so
6 that I can figure out what to do about bridge funds. (I actually
7 have an idea already.)"

8 Overt Act No. 64: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 11:39 a.m.,
9 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS responded to defendant FLYNN's 8:16 a.m.
10 email and said: "I have spoken with [Fiscal Sponsor B Employee 2],
11 fiscal agent for [Nonprofit B]. Please call [him/her] and assure
12 [him/her] of the School's commitment and that you have begun the
13 funds transfer...Please confirm receipt and keep me in the loop. 🙄
14 [shushing face emoji][.]"

15 Overt Act No. 65: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 12:03 p.m.,
16 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS received an email from MRT Relative 1
17 containing the offer letter previously sent to Individual 1 for
18 Individual 1's employment with Nonprofit B.

19 Overt Act No. 66: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 12:29 p.m.,
20 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed Fiscal Sponsor B Employee 2 the news
21 that Individual 1 had accepted an offer of employment with a salary
22 of \$70,000. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS wrote: "It is my understanding
23 that [University] financial support comes in at \$100k."

24 Overt Act No. 67: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 12:50 p.m.,
25 defendant FLYNN responded to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's 11:39 a.m.
26 email. Defendant FLYNN wrote: "I am happy to say that I think we can
27 expedite this so that the funds are available by May 18th...I think
28 the path looks clear."

1 Overt Act No. 68: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 2:06 p.m.,
2 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS responded to defendant FLYNN's 12:50 p.m.
3 email: "You're the best!"

4 Overt Act No. 69: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 2:57 p.m.,
5 defendant FLYNN sent defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS an email with the
6 subject line "On its way." In the email, defendant FLYNN provided
7 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS an update on the status of the \$100,000
8 payment and said: "I communicated with [Fiscal Sponsor B Employee 1]
9 at [Fiscal Sponsor B] this afternoon, sent [him/her] a template for
10 the invoice we need, [he/she] prepared an invoice to the [Social Work
11 School] on that basis, I confirmed with our business office that the
12 template was proper, and once we confirm vendor information, we will
13 process the [\$100,000] payment...perhaps this afternoon. We will
14 track it through the [U]niversity and as far as I know, payment
15 should be received by May 18th."

16 Overt Act No. 70: On May 4, 2018, at approximately 3:25 p.m.,
17 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS responded to defendant FLYNN's 2:57 p.m.
18 email: "I repeat: You're the best!!!"

19 Overt Act No. 71: During the time defendant FLYNN was ensuring
20 that Nonprofit B received the \$100,000 payment from the University at
21 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's request, defendant FLYNN concealed from
22 University officials that Fiscal Sponsor B, Nonprofit B, and MRT
23 Relative 1 intended to use the \$100,000, at least in part, to hire
24 and compensate Individual 1, which violated University policy.

25 Overt Act No. 72: In early May 2018, in order to ensure the
26 successful transfer of the entire \$100,000 payment to Nonprofit B,
27 defendant FLYNN falsely told University officials that Fiscal Sponsor
28 B intended to expend the entire \$100,000 payment by June 30, 2018

1 (the end of the University's fiscal year), even though defendant
2 FLYNN knew that Fiscal Sponsor B, Nonprofit B, and MRT Relative 1
3 intended to use the \$100,000, at least in part, as salary for
4 Individual 1 and that the \$100,000 would not be expended in its
5 entirety by June 30, 2018.

6 Overt Act No. 73: On May 4, 2018, defendant FLYNN, in order to
7 ensure the successful transfer of the \$100,000 payment to Nonprofit
8 B, falsely told Fiscal Sponsor B Employee 1 to write on the invoice
9 to the University that Fiscal Sponsor B intended to use the \$100,000
10 to fund a survey and that the \$100,000 would be expended prior to
11 June 30, 2018.

12 Overt Act No. 74: On or after May 4, 2018, defendant FLYNN
13 signed and approved the false Fiscal Sponsor B invoice to facilitate
14 the \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B.

15 Overt Act No. 75: On May 8, 2018, defendant FLYNN emailed
16 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and said that the \$100,000 payment to Fiscal
17 Sponsor B would arrive on Monday, May 14, 2018.

18 Overt Act No. 76: On May 9, 2018, defendant FLYNN caused a
19 \$100,000 check to be mailed from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B.

20 Overt Act No. 77: On May 10, 2018, defendant FLYNN met with
21 County Official 2 "to get an update on the timing of renegotiation
22 for our TeleHealth contract."

23 Overt Act No. 78: On May 10, 2018, at approximately 3:49 p.m.,
24 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS received an email from Fiscal Sponsor B
25 Employee 2 confirming that Individual 1 would be offered employment
26 by Fiscal Sponsor B/Nonprofit B.

27 Overt Act No. 79: On May 10, 2018, at approximately 4:05 p.m.,
28 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS forwarded the 3:49 p.m. email from Fiscal

1 Sponsor B Employee 2 to MRT Relative 1. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
2 said: "My piece is done. 🍻 [fist bump emoji][.]"

3 Overt Act No. 80: On May 10, 2018, at approximately 9:56 p.m.,
4 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN, bcc'ed MRT Relative
5 1, and wrote: "Need to debrief and clear up a few things with you
6 confidentially."

7 Overt Act No. 81: On May 11, 2018, at approximately 6:21 a.m.,
8 defendant FLYNN responded to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's May 10th email
9 and wrote: "I'm sorry I missed you" and "[y]ou have my cell phone
10 number."

11 Overt Act No. 82: On May 11, 2018, at approximately 6:58 a.m.,
12 defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS responded to defendant FLYNN's 6:21 a.m.
13 email and wrote: "Want to talk master [County] contract stuff and
14 somehow use yesterday's 'discussion' to advance it. 😏 [winking face
15 emoji][.]"

16 Overt Act No. 83: On May 11, 2018, defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS
17 and FLYNN caused the University to deposit the \$100,000 check from
18 the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A. by means of an
19 interstate wire transmission.

20 Overt Act No. 84: On May 24, 2018, defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS
21 and FLYNN caused Fiscal Sponsor B to deposit the \$100,000 check from
22 the University by means of an interstate wire transmission.

23 Overt Act No. 85: In or around June 2018, in an effort to
24 ensure the continued success of her agreement with defendant RIDLEY-
25 THOMAS in exchange for the \$100,000 payment following her removal as
26 dean, defendant FLYNN told University Official 3 that she had made a
27 "deal" or "arrangement" with defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and MRT Relative
28

1 1 and that, at some point, she would need to tell University Official
2 3 about the deal.

3 Overt Act No. 86: On July 31, 2018, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS
4 voted in favor of Item No. 27 on the Board of Supervisors' July 31,
5 2018 agenda, which was a favorable amendment to the University's
6 Telehealth agreement with the County that would sustain the program
7 for an additional year and was consistent with the terms defendant
8 FLYNN requested in her February 23, 2018 email to defendant RIDLEY-
9 THOMAS. The motion passed.

COUNT TWO

[18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(1)(B)]

[DEFENDANT MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS]

22. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing until in or around August 2018, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendant MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS, an agent of the County of Los Angeles, corruptly solicited, demanded, accepted, and agreed to accept something of value from a person to benefit himself and others, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with a business, transaction, and series of transactions of the County of Los Angeles having a value of \$5,000 or more. Specifically, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS solicited, demanded, accepted, and agreed to accept something of value from Marilyn Louise Flynn and other University officials to benefit himself and MRT Relative 1, including: (1) MRT Relative 1's admission to the University to obtain a master's degree; (2) a full tuition scholarship for MRT Relative 1 to attend the University; (3) a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach at the University; and (4) a \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B for the benefit of Nonprofit B and MRT Relative 1, intending to be influenced and rewarded in connection with, among other things, the issuance of, and amendment to, County contracts with the University and Social Work School.

COUNT THREE

[18 U.S.C. § 666(a)(2)]

[DEFENDANT MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN]

23. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing until in or around August 2018, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendant MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN corruptly gave, offered, and agreed to give something of value to a person, intending to influence and reward Mark Ridley-Thomas in connection with a business, transaction, and series of transactions of the County of Los Angeles having a value of \$5,000 or more. Specifically, defendant FLYNN gave, offered, and agreed to give something of value to Mark Ridley-Thomas and MRT Relative 1, including: (1) MRT Relative 1's admission to the University to obtain a master's degree; (2) a full tuition scholarship for MRT Relative 1 to attend the University; (3) a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach at the University; and (4) a \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B for the benefit of Nonprofit B and MRT Relative 1, intending to influence and reward Mark Ridley-Thomas in connection with, among other things, the issuance of, and amendment to, County contracts with the University and Social Work School.

COUNTS FOUR THROUGH TWENTY

[18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 1346, 2(b)]

[ALL DEFENDANTS]

A. THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

24. Beginning in or around 2017, and continuing until in or around August 2018, in Los Angeles County, within the Central District of California, and elsewhere, defendants MARK RIDLEY-THOMAS and MARILYN LOUISE FLYNN, together with others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, knowingly and with intent to defraud, devised, participated in, and executed a scheme to defraud the citizens of the County of Los Angeles of their right to the honest services of defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS by means of bribery, kickbacks, materially false and fraudulent pretenses, and the concealment of material facts.

B. MEANS AND METHODS OF THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

25. The scheme to defraud operated, in substance, in the following manner and by the following means:

a. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS and his co-schemers would seek and accept bribes and kickbacks from defendant FLYNN and other University officials in the form of direct and indirect financial benefits, including but not limited to: (1) MRT Relative 1's admission to the University to obtain a master's degree; (2) a full tuition scholarship for MRT Relative 1 to attend the University; (3) a paid professorship for MRT Relative 1 to teach at the University; and (4) a \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B for the benefit of Nonprofit B and MRT Relative 1.

1 b. In exchange for the bribes and kickbacks from
2 defendant FLYNN and other co-schemers, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS would
3 agree to perform and perform the following types of official acts,
4 among others: (1) presenting motions and agenda items for the Board
5 of Supervisors; (2) voting on Board of Supervisors' motions and
6 agenda items; (3) exerting pressure on other members of the Board of
7 Supervisors to present, introduce, and vote on motions and agenda
8 items; and (4) exerting pressure on other County officials to perform
9 official acts with respect to the issuance of, and amendment to,
10 County contracts with the University and Social Work School.

11 c. Defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN and their co-
12 schemers would conceal their scheme and operate their scheme through
13 materially false and fraudulent pretenses by: (1) concealing bribes
14 and kickbacks solicited and received by defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS;
15 (2) concealing bribes and kickbacks offered and given by defendant
16 FLYNN and other University officials at defendant FLYNN's direction;
17 (3) concealing material facts, including but not limited to: (a) that
18 defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and FLYNN had agreed to funnel the \$100,000
19 payment from the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A.
20 through the University by way of a nearly simultaneous \$100,000
21 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B; and (b) that Fiscal
22 Sponsor B, Nonprofit B, and MRT Relative 1 intended to use the
23 \$100,000, at least in part, to hire and compensate Individual 1; and
24 (4) making materially false statements, including but not limited to
25 the date by which Fiscal Sponsor B intended to expend the entirety of
26 the \$100,000 payment.

1 C. USE OF MAILS

2 26. On or about the dates set forth below, within the Central
3 District of California, and elsewhere, defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and
4 FLYNN, for the purpose of executing the above-described scheme to
5 defraud, willfully caused the following items to be placed in an
6 authorized depository for mail matter to be sent and delivered by the
7 United States Postal Service, or to be deposited to be sent and
8 delivered by a private or commercial interstate carrier according to
9 the directions thereon:

<u>COUNT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>MAILING</u>
FOUR	March 9, 2018	Letter dated February 16, 2018, addressed to MRT Relative 1 from defendant FLYNN and University Official 2, offering MRT Relative 1 the position of "Professor of the Practice of Policy and Social Work," which was sent via FedEx.
FIVE	May 9, 2018	Check no. 50587154 dated May 9, 2018, in the amount of \$100,000 from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B, which was sent via FedEx.

19 D. USE OF WIRES

20 27. On or about the dates set forth below, within the Central
21 District of California, and elsewhere, defendants RIDLEY-THOMAS and
22 FLYNN, for the purpose of executing the above-described scheme to
23 defraud, transmitted and caused the transmission of the following
24 items by means of a wire communication in interstate commerce:

<u>COUNT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>WIRE TRANSMISSION</u>
SIX	December 5, 2017	MRT Relative 1 emailed University Official 2 and bcc'ed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS. In the email, MRT Relative 1 told University Official 2 that he/she wanted a "Practitioner-in-

COUNT	DATE	WIRE TRANSMISSION
		Residence" title for his/her professorship, "beginning compensation" in the range of \$25,000, and to "launch in January [2018]." Using his/her Google/Gmail account, MRT Relative 1 sent the email to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account.
SEVEN	December 9, 2017	MRT Relative 1 forwarded an email from University Official 2 to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS. In the forwarded email, University Official 2 told MRT Relative 1 that a January 2018 start date was not feasible and that University Official 2 would have to "create a part-time position with a salary" to accommodate MRT Relative 1. Using his/her Google/Gmail account, MRT Relative 1 forwarded the email to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account.
EIGHT	December 14, 2017	Using his Oath/AOL account, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN. The subject line had the name of County Official 2. The email said: "[He/She]'s ready to go. 🙄 [winking face emoji][.]"
NINE	January 9, 2018	MRT Relative 1 forwarded an email regarding the full tuition scholarship award to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account. The forwarded email stated that MRT Relative 1 had been awarded a full tuition scholarship totaling over \$26,000 to attend the University in the spring and summer of 2018.
TEN	February 13, 2018	MRT Relative 1 forwarded an email to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS. The forwarded email indicated that the University had agreed to waive the usual hiring process and that MRT Relative 1 would soon receive a contract for the paid professorship.

COUNT	DATE	WIRE TRANSMISSION
		Using his/her Google/Gmail account, MRT Relative 1 forwarded the email to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account.
ELEVEN	February 13, 2018	In response to the February 13th email from MRT Relative 1 about the paid professorship, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed MRT Relative 1 with thumbs up and winking face emojis: "👍😉 [.]". Using his Oath/AOL account, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed MRT Relative 1 at his/her Google/Gmail account.
TWELVE	February 13, 2018	Using his Oath/AOL account, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN. The subject line was "Probation Reform motion." Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS said, "[w]ould like to discuss this with you in the near term."
THIRTEEN	February 13, 2018	In response to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's February 13th email regarding the "Probation Reform motion," defendant FLYNN emailed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account and said: "I had an excellent meeting last night with [County Official 2] and [County Official 3]." Defendant FLYNN thanked defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS "for facilitating all these important relationships and opportunities."
FOURTEEN	February 23, 2018	Defendant FLYNN emailed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account about "an extremely important request for contract amendment that will be on the [Board of Supervisors'] agenda next week" regarding "our TeleHealth contract with DMH."

COUNT	DATE	WIRE TRANSMISSION
FIFTEEN	February 23, 2018	In response to defendant FLYNN's February 23rd email regarding the Telehealth-DMH contract amendment, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN and bcc'ed MRT Relative 1. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS told defendant FLYNN: "Your wish is my command." Using his Oath/AOL account, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed MRT Relative 1 at his/her Google/Gmail account.
SIXTEEN	May 3, 2018	Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN the bank wiring information for Fiscal Sponsor B to facilitate the \$100,000 payment from the University to Fiscal Sponsor B. Defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS said: "At this point it is necessary to act with dispatch so as to facilitate the completion of [Individual 1's] on-boarding with [Fiscal Sponsor B] in a timely manner -- no later than May 15th." Using his Oath/AOL account to send the email to defendant FLYNN, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS also bcc'ed MRT Relative 1 at his/her Google/Gmail account.
SEVENTEEN	May 3, 2018	In response to defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS's May 3rd email, defendant FLYNN emailed defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS at his Oath/AOL account and said: "I will let people know that this must be expedited."
EIGHTEEN	May 11, 2018	Using his Oath/AOL account, defendant RIDLEY-THOMAS emailed defendant FLYNN and said: "Want to talk master [County] contract stuff and somehow use yesterday's 'discussion' to advance it. 🙄 [winking face emoji][.]"

COUNT	DATE	WIRE TRANSMISSION
NINETEEN	May 11, 2018	Bank wire transfer of \$100,000 from a California Bank & Trust account for the Mark Ridley-Thomas Committee for a Better L.A. into a Bank of America account for the University processed through Bank of America servers located in Virginia and Texas.
TWENTY	May 24, 2018	Bank wire transfer of \$100,000 from a Bank of America account for the University into a JPMorgan Chase Bank account for Fiscal Sponsor B processed through Bank of America servers located in Virginia and Texas.

A TRUE BILL

/S/

Foreperson

TRACY L. WILKISON
Acting United States Attorney

SCOTT M. GARRINGER
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Criminal Division

MACK E. JENKINS
Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Public Corruption
and Civil Rights Section

RUTH C. PINKEL
Assistant United States Attorney
Senior Litigation Counsel
Acting Deputy Chief, Public Corruption
and Civil Rights Section

LINDSEY GREER DOTSON
Assistant United States Attorney
Public Corruption
and Civil Rights Section