UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. YANI STANCIOFF	No. 2:24-

INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges:

General Allegations

At times relevant to this Information:

1. The defendant resided in Portland, Maine, in the District of Maine.

2. The Paycheck Protection Program ("PPP") was a COVID-19 pandemic relief program administered by the Small Business Administration ("SBA") that provided forgivable loans to small businesses for job retention and certain other expenses. The PPP permitted participating third-party lenders to approve and disburse SBA-backed PPP loans to cover payroll, fixed debts, utilities, rent/mortgage, accounts payable and other bills incurred by qualifying businesses during, and resulting from, the COVID-19 pandemic. PPP loans were fully guaranteed by the SBA.

3. To obtain a PPP loan, a qualifying business had to submit a PPP loan application, which was signed by an authorized representative of the business. The PPP loan application required the business (through its authorized representative) to acknowledge the program rules and make certain affirmative certifications to be eligible to obtain the PPP loan, including that the business was in operation and either had employees for whom it paid salaries and payroll taxes

or paid independent contractors. A business applying for a PPP loan was required to provide documentation showing its payroll expenses.

4. The proceeds of a PPP loan could be used for certain specified items, such as payroll costs, costs related to the continuation of group health care benefits, or mortgage interest payments. The proceeds of a PPP loan were not permitted to be used by the borrowers to pay personal expenses unrelated to the specified authorized expenses.

5. The Economic Injury Disaster Loan ("EIDL") program was an SBA program providing low-interest financing to small businesses, renters, and homeowners affected by declared disasters. The Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act ("CARES Act") authorized the SBA to provide EIDLs of up to $2 million to eligible small businesses experiencing substantial financial disruptions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, the CARES Act and subsequent legislation authorized the SBA to issue advances of up to $10,000 to small businesses within three days of applying for an EIDL.

6. In order to obtain an EIDL and advance, a qualifying business was required to submit an application to the SBA and provide information about its operations, such as the number of employees, gross revenue for the 12-month period preceding the disaster, and cost of goods sold in the 12-month period preceding the disaster. In the case of EIDLs for COVID-19 relief, the 12-month period was the period preceding January 31, 2020. For a business to be eligible for an EIDL, the business must have been in operation before February 1, 2020.

The applicant was also required to certify that all of the information in the application was true and correct to the best of the applicant's knowledge.

7. All EIDL applications were submitted online. Upon approval of an application for an EIDL or advance, SBA would disburse the funds.

The Scheme and Artifice

8. Beginning on about June 23, 2020, and continuing to about September 10, 2021, in the District of Maine and elsewhere, the Defendant,

YANI STANCIOFF,

knowingly and willfully devised and intended to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud, and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and fraudulent pretense, representations and promises.

Manner and Means

9. The manner and means by which the defendant sought to accomplish the scheme and artifice included, among others, the following:

a. The defendant caused to be prepared and submitted PPP loan applications and an EIDL advance application that included materially false and fraudulent representations and pretenses, such as:

i. False statements on an EIDL advance application that the defendant owned a business in the agriculture industry and that the supposed business employed 12

people;

ii. False statements on an EIDL advance application about his supposed business's gross revenue;

iii. False statements on the PPP application about the defendant's gross income from a supposed sole proprietorship;

iv. False statements that the PPP loan proceeds were necessary to support payroll and other specified items approved under the PPP;

v. Affirming under penalty of perjury that the statements in the applications were true and correct.

b. The defendant caused to be prepared and submitted false and fraudulent IRS documents in support of the PPP applications;

c. The defendant caused to be prepared and submitted false loan forgiveness applications for his PPP loans.

10. As part of the scheme, the defendant caused to be filed the following EIDL and PPP loan applications:

APPROXIMATE DATE	APPLICATION TYPE	APPROXIMATE APPLICATION AMOUNT
June 23, 2020	EIDL ADVANCE	$10,000
April 18, 2021	PPP	$20,833

May 28, 2021	PPP	$20,833

11. Stancioff received approximately $51,666 as a result of the above referenced applications. The funds were deposited electronically into bank accounts Stancioff controlled.

COUNT ONE
Wire Fraud

12. Paragraphs 1 – 11 and all subparts are incorporated herein.

13. On about the dates specified below, in the District of Maine and elsewhere, the defendant,

YANI STANCIOFF

having devised and intending to devise a scheme to defraud, and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, did transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communications in interstate commerce, writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds for the purpose of executing the scheme to defraud, as set forth below:

DATE	DESCRIPTION
June 29, 2020	Electronic fund transfer of $10,000 from the SBA into a bank account held by Yani Stancioff.
May 5, 2021	Electronic fund transfer of $20,833 of PPP funds into a bank account controlled by Yani Stancioff.
June 25, 2021	Electronic fund transfer of $20,833 of PPP funds into a bank account controlled by Yani Stancioff.

Thus, the Defendant violated Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 2.

FORFEITURE NOTICE

1. Upon conviction of the offense alleged in Count One of this Information, charging a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343, the defendant shall forfeit to the United States, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), any property, real or personal, constituting or derived from proceeds traceable to the offense and, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(2), any property constituting, or derived from, proceeds obtained directly or indirectly as the result of the offense. The property to be forfeited includes, but is not limited to, a money judgment in the amount of those proceeds and property derived from those proceeds.

2. If any of the property described in Paragraph 1, above, as being forfeitable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c), and pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 982(a)(2), as a result of any act or omission of the defendant—

a. cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;

b. has been transferred or sold to, or deposited with, a third party;

c. has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;

d. has been substantially diminished in value; or

e. has been commingled with other property which cannot be divided without difficulty;

it is the intention of the United States, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) and 18

U.S.C. § 982(b)(1), incorporating 21 U.S.C. § 853(p), to seek forfeiture of any other property of the defendant up to the value of the property described in paragraph 1 above.

All pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c), and Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(a)(2).

Dated this 3rd day of December, 2024, in Portland, Maine.

Respectfully submitted

Darcie N. McElwee
United State Attorney



Sean M. Green
Assistant United States Attorney