

1 TRACY L. WILKISON  
Acting United States Attorney  
2 SCOTT M. GARRINGER  
Assistant United States Attorney  
3 Chief, Criminal Division  
SCOTT PAETTY (Cal. Bar No. 274719)  
4 CATHERINE AHN (Cal. Bar No. 248286)  
BRIAN FAERSTEIN (Cal. Bar No. 274850)  
5 Assistant United States Attorneys  
Major Frauds/Environmental and Community Safety Crimes Sections  
6 1100/1300 United States Courthouse  
312 North Spring Street  
7 Los Angeles, California 90012  
Telephone: (213) 894-6527/2424/3819  
8 Facsimile: (213) 894-6269/0141  
E-mail: Scott.Paetty@usdoj.gov  
9 Catherine.S.Ahn@usdoj.gov  
Brian.Faerstein@usdoj.gov

10 DANIEL S. KAHN  
Acting Chief, Fraud Section  
11 Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice  
CHRISTOPHER FENTON  
12 Trial Attorney, Fraud Section  
Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice  
13 1400 New York Avenue NW, 3rd Floor  
Washington, DC 20530  
14 Telephone: (202) 320-0539  
Facsimile: (202) 514-0152  
15 E-mail: Christopher.Fenton@usdoj.gov

16 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

19 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 RICHARD AYVAZIAN,  
aka "Richard Avazian" and  
24 "Iuliia Zhadko,"  
MARIETTA TERABELIAN,  
25 aka "Marietta Abelian" and  
"Viktoria Kauichko,"  
26 ARTUR AYVAZIAN,  
aka "Arthur Ayvazyan," and  
27 TAMARA DADYAN,  
MANUK GRIGORYAN,  
28 aka "Mike Grigoryan," and

No. CR 20-579(A)-SVW

REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THE  
GOVERNMENT'S MOTION IN LIMINE #2  
TO ADMIT EVIDENCE INEXTRICABLY  
INTERTWINED WITH THE CHARGED  
OFFENSES; DECLARATION OF CATHERINE  
AHN; REDACTED EXHIBITS 3 AND 6  
ATTACHED AND EXHIBITS 1-2 AND 4-5  
ATTACHED AND FILED UNDER SEAL

Hearing Date: June 14, 2021  
Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Trial Date: June 14, 2021  
Location: Courtroom of the  
Hon. Stephen V.  
Wilson

1 "Anton Kudiumov,"  
2 ARMAN HAYRAPETYAN,  
3 EDVARD PARONYAN,  
4 aka "Edvard Paronian" and  
5 "Edward Paronyan," and  
6 VAHE DADYAN,  
7  
8 Defendants.

9 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel  
10 of record, the Acting United States Attorney for the Central District  
11 of California, Assistant United States Attorneys Scott Paetty,  
12 Catherine Ahn, and Brian Faerstein, and Department of Justice Trial  
13 Attorney Christopher Fenton, hereby files this reply in support of  
14 the government's motion in limine seeking admission of evidence  
15 inextricably intertwined with the charged bank fraud and wire fraud  
16 and money laundering conspiracies and schemes.

17 This reply is based upon the attached memorandum of points and  
18 authorities, the attached declaration, the files and records in this  
19 case, and such further evidence and argument as the Court may permit.

20 Dated: June 7, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

21 TRACY L. WILKISON  
22 Acting United States Attorney

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

26 /s/  
27 CATHERINE AHN  
28 SCOTT PAETTY  
BRIAN FAERSTEIN  
Assistant United States Attorneys  
CHRISTOPHER FENTON  
Department of Justice Trial Attorney

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| <u>DESCRIPTION</u>                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....                                                                                                                                                                                          | ii          |
| MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.....                                                                                                                                                                          | 1           |
| I. INTRODUCTION.....                                                                                                                                                                                               | 1           |
| II. ARGUMENT.....                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 1           |
| A. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Derived from<br>Federal Search Warrants and Is Inextricably<br>Intertwined with the Charged Fraud and Money<br>Laundering Conspiracy Offenses.....                           | 1           |
| B. Ninth Circuit Precedents are Squarely in Favor of the<br>Reserve Identities' Evidence Admission.....                                                                                                            | 8           |
| C. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Inextricably<br>Intertwined with the Same Scheme and Conspiracy for<br>which Defendants Paronyan and V. Dadyan are Charged<br>and are Therefore Admissible Against Them..... | 10          |
| D. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Admissible under<br>Rule 404(b).....                                                                                                                                         | 12          |
| III. CONCLUSION.....                                                                                                                                                                                               | 12          |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

| <u>DESCRIPTION</u>                                                           | <u>PAGE</u> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b><u>CASES</u></b>                                                          |             |
| <u>United States v. Anderson</u> , 741 F.3d 938 (9th Cir. 2013).....         | 10          |
| <u>United States v. Dorsey</u> , 677 F.3d 944 (9th Cir. 2012).....           | 10          |
| <u>United States v. Loftis</u> , 843 F.3d 1173 (9th Cir. 2016).....          | 4, 8, 9     |
| <u>United States v. Romero</u> , 282 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2002).....           | 12          |
| <u>United States v. Vizcarra-Martinez</u> , 66 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 1995).... | 9           |
| <u>United States v. Vo</u> , 413 F.3d 1010 (9th Cir. 2005).....              | 12          |

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The government moved in limine for the admission of evidence related to identities, and instruments of fraud, that were not directly used in identified PPP or EIDL applications but were collocated with, and whose possession was inextricably intertwined with, evidence of business and individual identities directly used in PPP and EIDL applications and associated financial accounts and transactions (the "reserve identities evidence"). Defendants Richard Ayvazyan, Marietta Terabelian, Artur Ayvazyan, and Tamara Dadyan filed their opposition arguing that such evidence should be excluded under Fed. R. Evid. ("Rule") 404(b) (ECF 419), and defendants Edvard Paronyan and Vahe Dadyan filed an opposition arguing that the evidence was not admissible against them under a Rule 404(b) analysis and, if admitted, a limiting instruction should be provided (ECF 420 and 424). For the reasons described below, this Court should find that the reserve identities evidence is inextricably intertwined with the charged schemes and conspiracies, and that presentation of the evidence is necessary to tell a coherent story of how defendants executed the scheme to defraud and conspiracies.

**II. ARGUMENT**

**A. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Derived from Federal Search Warrants and Is Inextricably Intertwined with the Charged Fraud and Money Laundering Conspiracy Offenses**

Defendants R. Ayvazyan, M. Terabelian, A. Ayvazyan, and T. Dadyan open their opposition with a factual inaccuracy. Defendants appear to argue from the position that the evidence discussed in the government's motion in limine was obtained from a state investigation. As discussed at length in its motion (see e.g., Mot.

1 at 5-6), the evidence was obtained through federal and not state  
2 search warrants, which this Court previously reviewed and upheld.  
3 (ECF 269 and 297.)

4 Defendants' misconception appears to be based on their assertion  
5 that defendants - as alleged by the state - used some of the same  
6 identities and instruments of fraud to perpetrate mortgage fraud.  
7 (ECF 419 at 9-10.) This argument reveals an inconvenient truth for  
8 defendants, which is that defendants have apparently used the same  
9 identities, the same instruments of fraud, for multiple forms of  
10 fraud and conspiracy, including the ones charged in the instant case.  
11 (Id.)

12 For example, defendants point to identification cards and  
13 documents related to Liudmyla K., Egia K., Mykhail D., and others as  
14 examples of "reserve identities" evidence that should be excluded.  
15 Defendants are simply incorrect - the identities of Liudmyla K., Egia  
16 K., Mykhail D., Roza A., and others were directly used in the PPP and  
17 EIDL fraud, as evidenced by defendants R. Ayvazyan and T. Dadyan's  
18 own text messages. (Mot. at 15 and Exh. 3 (previously filed under  
19 seal).) However, the striking similarities between this and the  
20 reserve identities evidence may have fueled that confusion and is  
21 further evidence of their use in a common criminal scheme. The  
22 reserve and used identities evidence were all found in the same  
23 general location because these identities are - as discussed in the  
24 government's motion - interchangeable components of the fraud and  
25 money laundering conspiracies. (Mot. at 2, 15, 24.) Defendants'  
26 actual use of the identities highlighted by the defense provides a  
27 useful lens through which to better understand how and why the  
28

1 reserve identities evidence is inextricably intertwined with the  
2 overall conspiracies and schemes.

3 As further discussed below, to execute their conspiracies to  
4 submit fraudulent EIDL and PPP applications, obtain the proceeds, and  
5 distribute the proceeds to co-conspirators for personal use,  
6 defendants needed the following:

- 7 1) A ready supply of individual and business identities whose  
8 existence and operations could be proved to the government  
in support of a PPP or EIDL application;
- 9 2) Purportedly official-looking documents that supported the  
10 pre-COVID-19 existence and operation of these applying  
businesses and their employees;
- 11 3) Bank accounts whose real, fake, or synthetic owners and  
12 signatories sufficiently matched the PPP and EIDL  
13 applications to ensure the funds would be disbursed after  
approval;
- 14 4) Additional bank accounts through which the PPP and EIDL  
15 proceeds could be distributed to co-conspirators for  
payment and to conceal the source of funds when used for  
personal benefit;
- 16 5) A ready supply of individual and business documents to  
17 prove the existence of these individuals and businesses to  
banks if or when the accounts were flagged for fraud; and
- 18 6) A similar ready supply of individual and business documents  
19 to open new accounts if and when accounts were frozen or  
closed out due to fraud.

20 A common theme in each of the steps above is defendants' access  
21 to personal and business identities and the instruments of fraud to  
22 prove their existence - which is why defendants' possession of the  
23 reserve identities evidence is inextricably intertwined with the  
24 charged fraud and money laundering conspiracies. It shows the jury  
25 how defendants managed to complete each of the above-referenced steps  
26 on the fraud assembly line, proves the fraudulent scheme as a whole,  
27 and enables the government to tell a complete and coherent story of  
28

1 the charged crimes. United States v. Loftis, 843 F.3d 1173, 1175-78  
2 (9th Cir. 2016).

3 At its core, defendants' fraud and money laundering conspiracies  
4 operated as follows: defendants used a combination of real, stolen,  
5 and fake personal and business information to develop synthetic  
6 individual and business identities. Defendants used businesses and  
7 identities that they had already created, such as Secureline Realty  
8 and ABC Realty, as well as quickly created paper companies like  
9 "Green Label Nutrienrs" (sic)<sup>1</sup>. (See Mot. at 9 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt  
10 2) and Gov't. Exh. 1 (filed under seal).) They soon brought their  
11 pre-existing access to online databases to the conspiracy, as well.  
12 As shown through T. Dadyan's text messages, T. Dadyan had a  
13 subscription to information database TLOxp through her apparently  
14 suspended (not legitimately operating) real estate company Secureline  
15 Realty, and defendants further used public websites to steal the  
16 information of real businesses for use on PPP and EIDL applications.  
17 (See Mot. at 9-10 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt 2), 13-14 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt  
18 5), and 18-19 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt 7).) The government does not  
19 intend to try defendants for committing mortgage loan fraud. But it  
20 cannot tell the story of the PPP and EIDL fraud without reference to  
21 defendants' use of their real-estate business and the tools they used  
22 to commit PPP and EIDL fraud and money laundering conspiracy. It was  
23 the defendants, not the government, who brought these lines of fraud  
24 together. The government should not be artificially limited in its  
25 presentation of proof because defendants committed multiple crimes  
26

---

27 <sup>1</sup> File name "GREEN LABEL TAX ID.pdf" sent from "tammy" to "Rich  
28 New" on or about May 28, 2020 with the message, "Look that's mine I  
can apply." The document is an EIN assignment letter from the IRS  
dated May 7, 2020 - well after the COVID-19 pandemic began.

1 using the same instruments of fraud. United States v. Williams, 989  
2 F.2d 1061, 1071 (9th Cir. 1993).

3 Defendants also manufactured false and fraudulent identification  
4 cards to support the lie that the identified people were the actual  
5 owners of businesses legitimately seeking PPP and EIDL funds. Not  
6 only did the government find numerous false and fraudulent CADLs in  
7 the same location in T. Dadyan's and A. Ayvazyan's residence, the  
8 government also discovered notes on how to falsify CADLs, images from  
9 identification making software, and images of many of the same CADLs  
10 on A. Ayvazyan's phone. (See Gov't. Exh. 2 at 1 (showing physical  
11 CADLs found at the T. Dadyan and A. Ayvazyan residence) and 2-3  
12 (showing digital images of identification cards bearing different  
13 photos and notes on how to create doctored identification cards found  
14 on A. Ayvazyan's phone).)

15 One set of images found on A. Ayvazyan's phone is particularly  
16 critical to explaining to the jury how this part of the scheme and  
17 conspiracy operated. The government found on A. Ayvazyan's phone a  
18 photograph of a hand-written note containing instructions on how to  
19 doctor the identification card of Nerses N. ("Please use a (sic) old  
20 Armenian guy and Please match his Description to . . .") (Id. at 3.)  
21 This explicitly shows the jury the role A. Ayvazyan played and the  
22 deliberate and intentional use of synthetic identities as part of the  
23 fraud conspiracy. During the November 2020 residential searches, the  
24 same Nerses N. CADL was found in A. Ayvazyan's and T. Dadyan's  
25 residence, along with CADLs of identities like Roza A., Liudmyla K.,  
26 and Mykhail D., among others, that were used in PPP and EIDL  
27 applications. (Id. at 1; see also Fenton Decl. (ECF 207) Exh. 8 at  
28 1-3.) To confirm A. Ayvazyan's knowledge of and role in the

1 conspiracy, the government found screenshots and photographs of SBA  
2 EIDL websites confirming the submission of applications using emails  
3 associated with Liudmyla K. and Mykhail D., among others, on A.  
4 Ayvazyan's phones. (See Gov't. Exh. 2 at 4-5.)

5 Unlike with Roza A., Mykhail D., Egia K., and Tony G., the  
6 government has not found a PPP or EIDL application using the Nerses  
7 N. identity, but its physical collocation with those that were used,  
8 and its presence on A. Ayvazyan's phone with other doctored  
9 identification cards, shows how it is inextricably intertwined with  
10 the conspiracy and necessary for the government to complete the story  
11 of this criminal enterprise.

12 The text messages between "tammy" and "Rich New" also show R.  
13 Ayvazyan using Gusto, an online payroll service provider, to generate  
14 false payroll reports in support of purported payroll expenses in  
15 EIDL and PPP applications. This includes payroll reports purportedly  
16 for "LK Designs" owned by Liudmyla K. sent between "tammy" and "R.  
17 Ayvazyan" through text messages. As shown below, "tammy" explicitly  
18 references a payroll report "Rich new" did for "22" while also  
19 texting "Rich New" a file named "LK Schedule C Copy.pdf."

20 **T.D. iPhone Excerpt 9 (July 1, 2020):**

| #    | Time (UTC) | From     | Body                                                                                |
|------|------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 3429 | 9:05 PM    | tammy    | Bro look this idiot want detailed payroll report or w2 s<br>[LIUDMYLA KOPYTOVA.png] |
| 3431 | 9:15 PM    | tammy    | 7472324114                                                                          |
| 3432 | 9:16 PM    | tammy    | U have this number                                                                  |
| 3433 | 9:16 PM    | tammy    | Urgent for                                                                          |
| 3434 | 9:16 PM    | tammy    | Fiber one                                                                           |
| 3435 | 9:16 PM    | Rich New | I don't have that number aziz                                                       |
| 3436 | 9:26 PM    | tammy    | 8185939816                                                                          |
| 3437 | 9:26 PM    | tammy    | U have this phone babe                                                              |
| 3438 | 9:27 PM    | Rich New | No that's the number you gave me                                                    |

1 3450 11:51 PM tammy FIBER ONE MEDIA EMAIL OF RICH:  
2 EMAIL.FIBERONEMEDIA.COM  
3 PASSWORD: Shoup@317  
4 Email: INFO@FIBERONEMEDIA.COM  
5 3451 11:59 PM tammy 7472324114 can u please update website Put this a phone  
6 3452 12:00 AM tammy On it  
7 3453 12:00 AM tammy And text me when u so so Steph does yellow pages  
8 3454 12:20 AM tammy Mayor talking now  
9 3455 12:36 AM Rich New Ok I got that email  
10 3456 12:36 AM Rich New You need to send a code?  
11 3457 12:37 AM tammy Yes hold on u have it open  
12 3458 12:37 AM Rich New Ya  
13 3459 1:07 AM Rich New [61534485256\_\_015D99A0-04CD-4F44-9A6E-  
14 A172C089D9C9.jpeg]  
15 3460 1:07 AM Rich New Here is the account for the tax account  
16 3461 1:33 AM tammy Ok 👍  
17 3462 2:18 AM tammy I need a detailed payroll report like the redacted one u gave me  
18 3463 2:25 AM tammy [Gusto Employee report.pdf]  
19 3464 2:25 AM Rich New Ok  
20 3465 2:25 AM tammy U did one like  
21 3466 2:25 AM tammy That for 22  
22 3467 2:25 AM Rich New I have u one  
23 3468 2:26 AM tammy This idiot wants either that or  
24 3469 2:26 AM Rich New I don't know if it's 22  
25 3470 2:26 AM tammy W2  
26 3471 2:26 AM Rich New I think it's 14  
27 3472 2:27 AM tammy This is like8  
28 3473 2:30 AM Rich New Hold on let me find it  
3474 2:53 AM tammy That's the one  
[LK Schedule C Copy.pdf]  
3475 2:53 AM tammy 22 employees  
3476 2:54 AM tammy U want the amounts for each month ? Or no u going to off of  
the schedule cc  
3477 2:54 AM Rich New Ok  
3478 2:54 AM Rich New No all good  
3479 2:56 AM tammy Tom comming over now I told art show him the decline letter  
from the eidl and it's simple it's 35 percent for ppp

A quick glance at the July 2020 LK Designs PPP application submitted to Newtek Small Business Finance shows that it included a 22-employee Gusto-generated payroll report, which uses - down to the

1 penny - the exact same monthly payroll cost, adjusted earnings, and  
2 state taxes numbers over the same time period and same number  
3 employees as at least two other applications. (See Gov't. Exh. 3 at  
4 1-3 (redacted).) These are the Journeyman Construction PPP  
5 application submitted purportedly in the name of Anna M. that was  
6 submitted from co-defendant Manuk Grigoryan's Sun Valley residence,  
7 and the Mykhail D. dba MD Acquisition Services EIDL application.  
8 (Id.) The fake payroll reports sent between the co-conspirators  
9 included purported Fiber One Media paystubs for Egia K. and Tony G.  
10 (See Gov't. Exh. 4 at 1-2 (filed under seal).) These reports were  
11 texted from "tammy" to "Rich New" on or about October 9, 2020, with  
12 the request, "Rich see if you u can print this for me on the check  
13 paper u have at work" and "And this I keep printing doesn't come out  
14 good."

15 The coconspirators also relied on a ready supply of new  
16 identities to open bank accounts when existing ones were frozen or  
17 closed due to fraud concerns. (See Mot. at 14 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt  
18 6).) As before, defendants' possession of the reserve identities  
19 evidence completes the story of, and is inextricably intertwined  
20 with, the charged conspiracies.

21 **B. Ninth Circuit Precedents are Squarely in Favor of the**  
22 **Reserve Identities' Evidence Admission**

23 Defendants' attempts to distinguish Loftis and other case  
24 precedents rely on a misunderstanding of the underlying facts of the  
25 case. The additional wires found to be inextricably intertwined with  
26 the charged fraud in Loftis were not simply additional transfers of  
27 the *same exact* financial transaction (e.g., the completion of a wire  
28 request). Rather, the Ninth Circuit held that the additional wires

1 were admissible and not subject to Rule 404(b) because "it is  
2 evidence of part of the *crime charged* in the indictment - the overall  
3 scheme to defraud." Loftis, 843 F.3d at 1176 (emphasis in  
4 original).) Although the presence of other act evidence within the  
5 same actual transaction (e.g., possession of a firearm during a  
6 shoot-out) does weigh in favor of admissibility, it is not a  
7 requirement to such a finding.

8 The scheme and conspiracy charged in the First Superseding  
9 Indictment includes, within its manner and means, the use and  
10 transfer of fraudulent individual and business identities. It  
11 includes the fraudulent use of financial accounts in names not  
12 defendants' own. As such, the reserve identities evidence falls  
13 squarely within the four corners of Loftis and its holding.

14 Defendants' attempts to distinguish United States v. Vizcarra-  
15 Martinez, 66 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 1995) is similarly unavailing. The  
16 basis for the Ninth Circuit's exclusion of defendant's possession of  
17 a personal-use amount of methamphetamine was because it "was,  
18 unquestionably, not a part of the transaction with which he was  
19 charged . . . The prosecution presented absolutely no evidence that  
20 the methamphetamine in question was obtained from a member of the  
21 conspiracy or that Vizcarra-Martinez had been involved in its  
22 manufacture or distribution." Id. at 1013. The facts of the instant  
23 case are starkly different. In contrast to the facts of Vizcarra-  
24 Martinez, the reason why the government seeks to introduce the  
25 reserve identities evidence is because of how it was used and  
26 exchanged between members of the conspiracy, and its importance in  
27 being able to explain to the jury how the overall conspiracy  
28 operated.

**C. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Inextricably Intertwined with the Same Scheme and Conspiracy for which Defendants Paronyan and V. Dadyan are Charged and are Therefore Admissible Against Them**

Defendant Paronyan and V. Dadyan's argument that Rule 404(b) prohibits the introduction of the reserve identities evidence against him avoids engaging with the threshold inquiry as to whether Rule 404(b) applies. As discussed above, evidence is inextricably intertwined when introduction of that evidence is necessary to tell a clear and comprehensible story and the acts are part of a single, criminal episode. United States v. Anderson, 741 F.3d 938, 949 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting United States v. Dorsey, 677 F.3d 944, 951 (9th Cir. 2012)).

Defendant Paronyan directly benefited from charged fraud conspiracy and scheme through the May 2020 submission of a \$130,187 PPP application on behalf of Redline Auto Collision, which was submitted in Paronyan's name. The PPP application asserted defendant had 12 employees with an average monthly payroll cost of \$52,075.25. (See Gov't. Exh. 5 at 1 (redacted).) As a result of this loan \$130,187 in PPP proceeds were wired to an account controlled by Paronyan. However, only about one month prior, an EIDL application had been submitted, also on behalf of Redline Auto Collision and in Paronyan's name, claiming the company had only 4 employees. (See Gov't. Exh. 5 at 5 (relevant portions magnified and highlighted for ease of review).)

What is striking about Paronyan's PPP application is not just the fact that over a single month Paronyan's business tripled its employees in the midst of a once-in-a-lifetime economic disaster. What is also striking is that the 12-employee Gusto generated payroll

1 report submitted for Redline Auto Collision had - to the penny - the  
2 same average monthly payroll cost, the same adjusted earnings, the  
3 same taxes, benefits, and the same number of employees for the same  
4 exact dates as: (1) the Fiber One Media, Inc. PPP application  
5 submitted in the name of Viktoria Kauikchko (application number  
6 16289241); (2) the Mod Interiors, Inc. PPP application submitted in  
7 the name of A.I. (application number 16173818); and (3) the Hart  
8 Construction PPP application submitted in the name of identity theft  
9 victim M.H. (application number 16031166). (See Gov't. Exh. 5 at 2-  
10 4.) This is because - as discussed above for other PPP and EIDL  
11 applications - members of the conspiracy like R. Ayvazyan and T.  
12 Dadyan repeatedly used the same falsified Gusto payroll reports to  
13 support fraudulent PPP and EIDL applications. (See Mot. at 15 and  
14 Exh. 3 (previously filed under seal).) The Redline Auto Collision  
15 PPP application shows that defendant Paronyan participated in, and  
16 benefitted from, the PPP fraud scheme and conspiracy and therefore,  
17 acts in furtherance of that conspiracy are admissible against him.

18 The same is true for defendant V. Dadyan. Defendants like  
19 T. Dadyan relied on coconspirators like V. Dadyan to receive PPP  
20 proceeds and fraudulently transfer those proceeds to other accounts  
21 for impermissible purposes (e.g., not actual payroll or operational  
22 expenses). For example, PPP and bank records show that co-defendant  
23 Vahe Dadyan received a \$157,500 PPP loan for his company, Voyage  
24 Limo, into a Voyage Limo account for which he was the sole signatory.  
25 (See Gov't. Exh. 6 at 1 (line 2 of table) and 3-6 (filed under  
26 seal).) On or about July 3, 2020, the same day "tammy" texted "Rich  
27 New" that "I'm expecting a wire for Art for \$73,500 / And for me  
28 \$157," approximately \$155,000 was transferred from the Voyage Limo

1 account into the Runyan Tax Bank 2 account controlled by T. Dadyan.  
2 (See Mot. at 18 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt 7) and Gov't. Exh. 6 at 2.) It  
3 was only after these transfers that "tammy" and "Rich New" discussed  
4 ways in which they could wire "Vahe" at least \$25,000 per attempted  
5 transfer. (See Mot. at 18-19 (T.D. iPhone Excerpt 7).)

6  
7 **D. The Reserve Identities Evidence is Admissible under Rule 404(b)**

8 As discussed in its original motion, even if this Court does not  
9 find the reserve identities evidence admissible as inextricably  
10 intertwined, it should still be admissible under the "low threshold"  
11 of Rule 404(b). As discussed in this motion, defendant relied on a  
12 pre-existing reserve of individual and business identities and tools  
13 of fraud to perpetrate the charged offenses. Their possession of  
14 this evidence shows opportunity, knowledge, intent, plan, and absence  
15 of mistake that all lean in favor of inclusion. United States v. Vo,  
16 413 F.3d 1010, 1018 (9th Cir. 2005) and United States v. Romero, 282  
17 F.3d 683, 688 (9th Cir. 2002).

18 **III. CONCLUSION**

19 For the aforementioned reasons, the government respectfully  
20 requests the Court grant the government's motion and find the reserve  
21 identities evidence admissible as inextricably intertwined with the  
22 charged offenses.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28