



**U.S. Department of Justice**

*United States Attorney  
Eastern District of New York*

RCH:EWS/ADG  
F. #2022R00718

*271 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201*

February 20, 2026

By ECF

The Honorable Diane Gujarati  
United States District Court  
Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Re: United States v. Anthony Carreira  
Criminal Docket No. 24-361 (DG)

Dear Judge Gujarati:

The government respectfully submits this letter in advance of defendant Anthony Carreira's sentencing hearing, which is scheduled for March 6, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., and in response to the defendant's sentencing memorandum filed on November 26, 2025 (ECF No. 86). For the reasons set forth below, the government respectfully submits that a sentence within the United States Sentencing Guidelines ("U.S.S.G." or "Guidelines") range of zero to six months should be imposed in this case.

I. Background

A. The Covid-19 Pandemic and Paycheck Protection Program

On March 13, 2020, the President of the United States issued Proclamation 9994 declaring a national emergency beginning on March 1, 2020, as a result of the spread of COVID-19. On March 27, 2020, the President signed into law the CARES Act, which was designed to provide emergency financial assistance to the millions of Americans who were suffering the economic effects caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. One source of relief provided by the CARES Act was the authorization of up to an initial \$349 billion in forgivable loans to small businesses for job retention and certain other expenses, through a program referred to as the Paycheck Protection Program ("PPP"). (Presentence Investigation Report ("PSR") ¶¶ 12-13).

To obtain a PPP loan, qualifying businesses were required to submit a PPP loan application, which was signed by an authorized representative of the business. The PPP loan application required recipient businesses, through an authorized representative, to acknowledge the program rules and make certain affirmative certifications to establish eligibility for the PPP loan. For example, in the PPP loan application, recipient businesses, through an authorized representative, were required to state, among other things, their average monthly payroll expenses and number of employees. These figures were used to calculate the amount of money the businesses were eligible to receive under the PPP. The recipient businesses were also required to provide documentation supporting the information contained in the PPP loan application. (*Id.* ¶ 14).

PPP loan proceeds were required to be used by the recipient businesses on certain permissible expenses such as payroll costs, interest on mortgages, rent, and utilities. The PPP allowed the interest and principal on a PPP loan to be entirely forgiven if the recipient businesses spent the loan proceeds on these expense items within a designated period of time after receiving the proceeds and used a certain percentage for payroll costs. (*Id.* ¶ 15).

The PPP was overseen by the Small Business Administration (“SBA”), which had authority over all PPP loans. Individual PPP loans, however, were issued and approved by private lenders, who received and processed PPP loan applications and supporting documentation and, following SBA approval, made loans using the lenders’ own funds. (*Id.* ¶ 16).

According to a June 2023 report from the SBA Office of the Inspector General (“SBA OIG”), more than \$64 billion in PPP loans were potentially fraudulently acquired through schemes such as the one participated in by the defendant. *See* SBA OIG, Covid-19 Pandemic EIDL and PPP Loan Fraud Landscape, June 27, 2023, *available at* [https://smallbusiness.house.gov/uploadedfiles/sba\\_oig\\_report\\_23-09.pdf](https://smallbusiness.house.gov/uploadedfiles/sba_oig_report_23-09.pdf).

#### B. Overview of the Fraudulent Schemes

Co-defendant John Bolden was a full-time New York City Police Department (“NYPD”) detective residing in Long Island, who also worked as a tax preparer and operator of at least three franchise locations for a tax preparation business (the “Tax Business”). The defendant Carreira was also an NYPD detective who had an ownership interest along with Bolden in at least one of the franchise locations. (PSR ¶¶ 7, 10).

Between approximately May 2020 and September 2022, Bolden engaged in multiple, wide-spread schemes to defraud the SBA and financial institutions administering the PPP loans by working with his tax preparation clients and co-conspirators to obtain loans to which they were not entitled. As part of the scheme, Bolden prepared fictitious Internal Revenue Service (“IRS”) Form Schedule C documentation concerning the applicants’ employment, gross income, and/or net income. These Schedule C forms, which accompanied the PPP loan applications, included figures that made it possible for Bolden and his clients to apply for loan

forgiveness without having to submit additional documentation to support the fraudulent figures. (*Id.* ¶¶ 17-18).

In total, Bolden helped more than 60 individuals submit online applications that contained false and fraudulent information, resulting in a loss of over \$2 million dollars. In exchange for Bolden's illicit services, co-conspirators and clients would pay Bolden a fee of approximately \$3,000 - \$6,000 for each fraudulent application. (*See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 24, 29).

### C. Carreira's Criminal Conduct

Bolden, Carreira, and another conspirator ("CC-1") worked together to fraudulently acquire PPP loans on Carreira's behalf even though Carreira was not entitled to those loans. On May 17, 2020, CC-1 emailed Bolden a fraudulent Schedule C falsely representing that Carreira operated a business in 2019 that earned \$108,969 in gross receipts and \$97,453 in net income, figures that ensured that Carreira could apply for loan forgiveness without having to provide backup documentation. The Schedule C also listed Carreira's profession as "Armed Security,"<sup>1</sup> and the business address listed was Carreira's personal residence. Later that day, Bolden forwarded the email and fraudulent Schedule C to Carreira. On May 18, 2020, a PPP loan application for \$20,302 was submitted on Carreira's behalf along with the fraudulent Schedule C as support. (*Id.* ¶¶ 27-28). On May 20, 2020, the loan was approved and \$20,302 was credited to Carreira's personal bank account. Carreira then provided \$6,000 to Bolden, including by sending \$3,000 via Zelle. (*Id.* ¶ 29). This loan was later forgiven.

On March 15, 2021, a second draw PPP loan application in the amount of \$20,099 was submitted on Carreira's behalf. The loan application included the same fictitious Schedule C. The application was approved and two days after Carreira received the funds, he again transferred \$6,000 to Bolden. However, this loan was not forgiven. (*See id.* ¶ 31).

### D. Procedural History

On August 5, 2025, Carreira pled guilty before Chief Magistrate Judge Vera M. Scanlon to Count 4 of a six-count Indictment, charging Carreira and Bolden with wire fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1343. (*Id.* ¶ 2). The Court accepted the defendant's guilty plea on November 18, 2025. (ECF No. 80).

## II. Guidelines Calculation

The parties agree that the following Guidelines range should apply:

|                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| Base Offense Level (§ 2B1.1(a)(1))               | 7  |
| Plus: Loss Exceeding \$15,000 (§ 2B1.1(b)(1)(C)) | +4 |

---

<sup>1</sup> Carreira operated an ATM business when this PPP loan was submitted.

|                                                                                         |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Plus: Fraud in Connection with Major Disaster<br>or Emergency Benefits (§ 2B1.1(b)(12)) | +2        |
| Minus: Zero-Point Offender (§ 4C1.1)                                                    | -2        |
| Minus: Acceptance of Responsibility (§ 3E1.1)                                           | -2        |
| Minus: Global Disposition <sup>2</sup>                                                  | <u>-1</u> |
| Total:                                                                                  | <u>8</u>  |

Based on a Criminal History Category of I, the Sentencing Guidelines calculate a range of imprisonment of 0 to 6 months.

### III. A Sentence Within the Guidelines Range is Warranted

The government respectfully submits that a sentence between the Guidelines range of 0 – 6 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary to achieve the goals of sentencing.

To be sure, the defendant's crime was serious. The PPP loan program was part of the government's response to an unprecedented emergency; billions of taxpayer dollars were rushed to American businesses so they could stay afloat and keep workers employed. The defendant took advantage of that emergency and sought to steal approximately \$40,000 from the program.<sup>3</sup> He agreed with Bolden and others that a Schedule C with false information would be submitted on his behalf so that he could acquire money to which he was not otherwise entitled. And as an active-duty NYPD detective, he broke the law he swore to uphold.

General deterrence also supports a Guidelines sentence. As previously stated, numerous individuals defrauded a program meant to help Americans during a time of crisis. These crimes steal money from the American taxpayer, leave less money available to those who it is meant to assist, and weaken Americans' faith in important government programs. A

---

<sup>2</sup> As described in paragraph 14 of the defendant's plea agreement, the parties agreed that the defendant would receive a global disposition one-point reduction if all three defendants pleaded guilty. Though recent amendments to the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines eliminated the departure provision applicable to global dispositions, the government intends to abide by the parties' agreement in advocating for a sentence within the range contemplated by the parties.

<sup>3</sup> Because only one of the loans was forgiven, the actual loss to the program caused by Carreira was approximately \$20,302.00.

Guidelines sentence would send a message that taking advantage of national emergencies is unacceptable.

While there is no excuse for this theft, the government views Carreira as substantially less culpable than co-defendants John Bolden and Christian McKenzie. The government has no reason to believe that Carreira was aware of the broader conspiracy involving Bolden and others to defraud the SBA out of millions of dollars for numerous clients and to then profit from that fraud. Additionally, Carreira quickly accepted responsibility for his conduct and already paid restitution to the government. The government believes that a Guidelines sentence within 0 – 6 months appropriately reflects that Carreira is differently situated than his co-defendants and should be sentenced accordingly.

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the government respectfully requests that the Court impose a sentence within the Guidelines range of 0 – 6 months.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH NOCELLA, JR.  
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Andrew D. Grubin  
Andrew D. Grubin  
Eric W. Silverberg  
Assistant U.S. Attorneys  
718-254-7000

cc: Clerk of the Court (DG) (by ECF)  
All Counsel of Record (by ECF)  
Alexandria Lohwasser, United States Probation Officer (by E-mail)