

INDEX

Capitol Health Centers, Inc. & Ronald Grusd

Exhibit #	Document
1	United States of America v. Ronald Grusd et al. (Case no. 15CR2821-BAS)
2	CA Secretary of State: Statement of Information, 11/02/2016

ORIGINAL

FILED

17 JUL 11 PM 2:56

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BY: *AJS*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
September 2016 Grand Jury

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

RONALD GRUSD (1),
GONZALO PAREDES (2)
CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK
MEDICAL GROUP (5),
WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY (6),

Defendants.

Case No. 15CR2821-BAS

I N D I C T M E N T
(Superseding)

Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 1349 - Conspiracy to Commit Honest Services Mail Fraud, Mail Fraud, Honest Services Wire Fraud, Wire Fraud, and Health Care Fraud; Title 18, U.S.C., Secs. 1341 and 1346 - Honest Services Mail Fraud; Title 18, U.S.C., Secs. 1343 and 1346 - Honest Services Wire Fraud; Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 1347 - Health Care Fraud; Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 1952(a)(1) and (a)(2) - Travel Act; Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 1956(a)(1) - Money Laundering; Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 2 - Aiding and Abetting; Title 18, U.S.C., Sec. 981(a)(1)(C), and Title 28, U.S.C., Sec. 2461(c) - Criminal Forfeiture

The grand jury charges, at all times relevant:

INTRODUCTORY ALLEGATIONS

THE DEFENDANTS AND OTHER PARTICIPANTS

1. Defendant RONALD GRUSD ("GRUSD") was a physician who has been licensed by the State of California since 1987. Defendant GRUSD's primary area of practice was radiology, and he was certified by the American Board of Radiology in Diagnostic and Nuclear Radiology.

1 Defendant GRUSD was an officer of several entities, including defendants
2 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY,
3 as well as Oaks Diagnostics and Advanced Radiology, all of which shared
4 the same principal business address: 8641 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 105,
5 Beverly Hills, California.

6 2. Defendant GONZALO PAREDES ("PAREDES") was an administrator for
7 several of defendant GRUSD's entities, including defendants CALIFORNIA
8 IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY, and
9 Advanced Radiology.

10 3. Defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP
11 ("CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK") was a California Corporation formed in
12 August 2007, which listed locations on its website in Los Angeles,
13 Beverly Hills, San Diego, Fresno, Rialto, Santa Ana, Studio City,
14 Bakersfield, Calexico, East Los Angeles, Lancaster, Victorville and
15 Visalia. According to its website, defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
16 NETWORK's principal business address was located at 8641 Wilshire Blvd.,
17 Ste. 105, Beverly Hills, California. Among the various services
18 defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK offered were diagnostic imaging
19 services and "Extracorporeal Shockwave Therapy," known as "shockwave."
20 Defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK listed defendant GRUSD as its chief
21 executive officer, chief financial officer, secretary and only director.
22 Defendant GRUSD was also the signatory on defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
23 NETWORK's bank accounts.

24 4. Defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY ("WILLOWS CONSULTING")
25 was a California corporation, formed in June 2011, which listed 8641
26 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 105, Beverly Hills, California as its principal
27
28

1 business address. Defendant GRUSD was listed as its president and the
2 only signatory on defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING's bank accounts.

3 5. The Oaks Diagnostics, a California corporation formed in 1989
4 and doing business as Advanced Radiology, listed 8641 Wilshire Blvd.,
5 Ste. 105, Beverly Hills, California as its principal business address.
6 Advanced Radiology provided Shockwave, nerve conduction velocity ("NCV")
7 and electromyography ("EKG") testing and diagnostic imaging services.
8 Advanced Radiology listed defendant GRUSD as its president, and he was
9 the only signatory on Advanced Radiology's bank accounts.

10 6. Dr. Steven Rigler (charged elsewhere) was a chiropractor
11 licensed to practice in California, who operated three clinics in the
12 Southern District of California specializing in chiropractic medicine.

13 7. Alexander Martinez (charged elsewhere) worked as a marketer
14 and administrator on behalf of Dr. Steven Rigler. Alexander Martinez
15 owned and operated Line of Sight, a professional corporation
16 incorporated in Nevada whose principal place of business was in Calexico,
17 California. Ruben Martinez (charged elsewhere) worked as a marketer for
18 Dr. Rigler, soliciting patients for treatment at Dr. Rigler's clinic in
19 Calexico, California. Ruben Martinez owned and operated Desert Blue
20 Moon, a professional corporation in Nevada.

21 8. Fermin Iglesias and Carlos Arguello (both charged elsewhere)
22 recruited injured workers to seek Workers' Compensation benefits in the
23 state of California. Iglesias and Arguello controlled and operated
24 multiple entities, including Providence Scheduling, INC., MedEx
25 Solutions, Inc., Meridian Medical Resources, Inc. d.b.a. Meridian Rehab
26 Care, and Prime Holdings, Int., Inc.
27
28

1 9. Julian Garcia (charged elsewhere) was a provider of durable
2 medical equipment ("DME") licensed by the State of California to sell
3 or rent such equipment to medical practitioners, including
4 chiropractors, who paid physicians \$50 per Workers' Compensation patient
5 referred to him for DME.

6 10. Jonathan Peña (charged elsewhere) worked as a medical
7 marketer, who recruited doctors to refer medical goods and services,
8 including DME, compound creams, and MRIs, to particular providers in
9 exchange for per-patient referral fees.

10 11. Physicians, including medical doctors and chiropractors, owed
11 a fiduciary duty to their patients, requiring physicians to act in their
12 patients' best interests, and not for their own professional, pecuniary,
13 or personal gain. Physicians owed a duty of honest services to their
14 patients for decisions made relating to the care of those patients,
15 including the informed choice as to whether to undergo ancillary medical
16 procedures and, if so, an informed choice as to the providers of such
17 ancillary medical procedures.

18
19 **CALIFORNIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION SYSTEM**

20 12. The California Workers' Compensation System ("CWCS") required
21 that employers in California provide Workers' Compensation benefits to
22 their employees for qualifying injuries sustained in the course of their
23 employment. Under the CWCS, all claims for payments for services or
24 benefits provided to the injured employee, including medical and legal
25 fees, were billed directly to, and were paid by, the insurer. Most
26 unpaid claims for payment were permitted to be filed as liens against
27 the employee's Workers' Compensation claim, which accrued interest until
28 paid in an amount ordered by the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board or

1 an amount negotiated between the insurer and the service or benefits
2 provider. The CWCS was regulated by the California Labor Code, the
3 California Insurance Code, and the California Code of Regulations, and
4 was administered by the California Department of Industrial Relations.

5 13. CWCS benefits were administered by the employer, an insurer,
6 or a third party administrator. The CWCS required claims administrators
7 to authorize and pay for medical care that was "reasonably required to
8 cure or relieve the injured worker from the effects of his or her
9 injury," and included medical, surgical, chiropractic, acupuncture, and
10 hospital treatment.

11 14. The CWCS and private and public CWCS insurers were "health
12 care benefit programs," that is, a public or private plan or contract,
13 affecting commerce, under which any medical benefit, item, or service
14 was provided to any individual, and any individual or entity who was
15 providing a medical benefit, item or service for which payment may be
16 made under the plan or contract.

17 15. California law, including but not limited to the California
18 Business and Professions Code, the California Insurance Code, and the
19 California Labor Code, prohibited the offering, delivering, soliciting,
20 or receiving of anything of value in return for referring a patient for
21 ancillary medical procedures.

22 16. Effective January 1, 2012, California Labor Code Section 139.3
23 made it a crime for a physician to refer Workers' Compensation patients
24 for a variety of medical goods and services, including diagnostic imaging
25 goods and services and pharmacy goods, to an entity in which that
26 physician had a financial interest, including any remuneration, rebate,
27 subsidy, or other form of direct or indirect payment.
28

1 17. According to California Labor Code Section 3209.3, the term
2 "physician" in the Labor Code included physicians and surgeons holding
3 an M.D. or D.O. degree, psychologists, acupuncturists, optometrists,
4 dentists, podiatrists, and chiropractic practitioners licensed by
5 California state law and within the scope of their practice as defined
6 by California state law.

7 Count 1

8 CONSPIRACY TO COMMIT HONEST SERVICES MAIL FRAUD, MAIL FRAUD, HONEST
9 SERVICES WIRE FRAUD, WIRE FRAUD,
AND HEALTH CARE FRAUD, 18 USC § 1349

10 18. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are
11 realleged and incorporated by reference.

12 19. Beginning on a date no later than December 2012, and continuing
13 through at least September 2015, within the Southern District of
14 California and elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES,
15 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING
16 COMPANY, conspired with Dr. Steven Rigler, Alexander Martinez, Line of
17 Sight, Ruben Martinez, Desert Blue Moon, Fermin Iglesias, Providence
18 Scheduling, MexEx, Meridian, Carlos Arguello, Jonathan Peña, and others
19 to:

20 a. commit Honest Services Mail Fraud, that is, to knowingly
21 and with the intent to defraud, devise and participate in a material
22 scheme to defraud and to deprive patients of the intangible right to
23 their physician's honest services, and for the purpose of executing such
24 scheme, mail and cause to be mailed via the U.S. Postal Service any
25 matter and thing, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,
26 Sections 1341 and 1346;
27
28

1 b. commit Mail Fraud, that is, to knowingly and with the
2 intent to defraud, devise and participate in a material scheme to defraud
3 and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and
4 fraudulent pretenses, representations, promises, and omissions and
5 concealments of material facts, and for the purpose of executing such
6 scheme, mail and cause to be mailed via the U.S. Postal Service any
7 matter and thing, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,
8 Section 1341;

9 c. commit Honest Services Wire Fraud, that is, to knowingly
10 and with the intent to defraud, devise and participate in a material
11 scheme to defraud and to deprive patients of the intangible right to
12 Dr. Rigler's honest services, and for the purpose of executing such
13 scheme, transmit and cause to be transmitted by interstate wire any
14 writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds, in violation of
15 Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 1346;

16 d. commit Wire Fraud, that is, to knowingly and with the
17 intent to defraud, devise and participate in a material scheme to defraud
18 and to obtain money and property by means of materially false and
19 fraudulent pretenses, representations, promises, and omissions and
20 concealments of material facts, and for the purpose of executing such
21 scheme, transmit and cause to be transmitted by interstate wire any
22 writings, signs, signals, pictures, and sounds, in violation of
23 Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343; and

24 e. commit Health Care Fraud, that is, to knowingly and with
25 the intent to defraud, devise and participate in a material scheme to
26 defraud a health care benefit program, and to obtain money and property
27 owned by, and under the custody and control of, a health-care benefit
28

1 program, by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations,
2 and promises, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1347.

3 **FRAUDULENT PURPOSE**

4 20. It was the goal of the conspiracy to fraudulently obtain money
5 from health care benefit programs by seeking payment for medical goods
6 and services that were secured through a pattern of bribes and kickbacks
7 to physicians and to those acting on their behalf, in exchange for the
8 referral of patients to certain health care providers owned or operated
9 by co-conspirators.

10 **MANNER AND MEANS**

11 21. The conspirators used the following manner and means, among
12 others, in pursuit of their fraudulent purpose:

13 a. Using business cards, advertisements, flyers, and call
14 centers in the United States, Mexico, and Central America, co-
15 conspirators Fermin Iglesias and Carlos Arguello and companies they
16 controlled recruited people who had been injured at work to seek Workers'
17 Compensation benefits pursuant to the CWCS.

18 b. Once they had recruited new Workers' Compensation
19 patients, Iglesias and Arguello and companies they controlled, including
20 Providence Scheduling, referred these injured workers to certain
21 chiropractors, including Dr. Rigler (primarily for his San Diego and
22 Escondido clinics), in exchange for Dr. Rigler's agreement to refer
23 those patients for ancillary procedures and DME to certain providers
24 designated by Iglesias or Arguello.

25 c. To extract the maximum value from each Workers'
26 Compensation patient, Iglesias and Arguello assigned a "value" to
27 certain ancillary procedures and DME, such as \$30-\$50 per MRI referral,
28

1 and informed Dr. Rigler of those values. They also established a quota
2 for the "value" of ancillary services and DME that Dr. Rigler was
3 expected to prescribe for each patient sent to him by Providence
4 Scheduling.

5 d. When Dr. Rigler fell behind in meeting the quota for
6 ancillary procedures and DME, Iglesias, Arguello, and Providence
7 Scheduling ceased to refer patients to Dr. Rigler until he agreed to
8 make up for the shortfall in some manner.

9 e. Alexander Martinez and Ruben Martinez also recruited
10 people who had been injured at work to seek Workers' Compensation
11 benefits pursuant to the CWCS, and referred these injured workers to Dr.
12 Rigler (primarily to his clinic in Calexico), in exchange for Dr.
13 Rigler's agreement to refer those patients for ancillary procedures and
14 DME to certain providers designated by Alexander Martinez or Ruben
15 Martinez.

16 f. Defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and Company A were
17 diagnostic imaging companies designated by the co-conspirators as the
18 providers to which physicians were expected to refer patients who needed
19 certain types of ancillary services, including Magnetic Resonance
20 Imagery ("MRI") scans, Electromyography ("EMG") tests, Nerve Conduction
21 Velocity ("NCV") tests, and Extracorporeal Shockwave Therapy
22 ("shockwave") treatments.

23 g. In exchange, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA
24 IMAGING NETWORK, WILLOWS CONSULTING, and Company A, knowing that the
25 payment of per-patient referral fees was unlawful, paid bribes to Dr.
26 Rigler, directly and indirectly, and to Iglesias, Arguello, Alexander
27
28

1 Martinez, Ruben Martinez, and Jonathan Peña for the referral of Workers'
2 Compensation patients for those services.

3 h. It was a further part of the conspiracy that proceeds
4 from insurance claims paid to defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK were
5 funneled through bank accounts by defendants GRUSD to a bank account in
6 the name of defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING, including at least \$6 million,
7 out of which GRUSD and PAREDES paid kickback payments to Dr. Rigler,
8 Iglesias, Arguello, Alexander Martinez, Ruben Martinez, Jonathan Peña,
9 and others.

10 i. It was a further part of the conspiracy that defendants
11 GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK, and WILLOWS CONSULTING used
12 the mails to send bribes to Dr. Rigler, Iglesias, Arguello, Alexander
13 Martinez, Ruben Martinez, Jonathan Peña, and others in exchange for the
14 referral of patients for ancillary medical procedures, and to send claims
15 for payment to insurers, attorneys, and employers.

16 j. It was a further part of the conspiracy that the co-
17 conspirators obscured the true nature of their financial relationships
18 in order to conceal their corrupt cross-referral scheme designed to
19 compensate the referral of applicants to specific providers of ancillary
20 procedures and DME.

21 k. For example, it was a part of the conspiracy that
22 defendants GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK, and WILLOWS
23 CONSULTING characterized the bribes to Dr. Rigler and to Iglesias,
24 Arguello, Alexander Martinez, and Ruben Martinez, as payments for
25 "professional services," when in fact the corrupt payments were made
26 exclusively for the referral of patients for ancillary medical
27 procedures.
28

1 l. It was a part of the conspiracy that the co-conspirators
2 inserted intermediaries, including individuals and their companies,
3 between GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK, and WILLOWS
4 CONSULTING and the physicians who referred patients to GRUSD's
5 companies.

6 m. It was a further part of the conspiracy that Alexander
7 Martinez and Ruben Martinez falsely labeled correspondence concerning
8 lists of Workers' Compensation patients who had been corruptly referred
9 for ancillary medical procedures as pertaining to "marketing hours" and
10 similarly misleading phrases.

11 n. It was a part of the conspiracy that the co-conspirators
12 utilized interstate facilities, including cellular telephones and email,
13 in order to coordinate and promote their corrupt kickback and cross-
14 referral scheme.

15 o. It was a part of the conspiracy that the co-conspirators
16 caused claims to be submitted to health care benefit program insurers
17 containing the following fraudulent and misleading declaration: "I have
18 not violated [California] Labor Code section 139.3 and the contents of
19 the report and bill are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
20 This statement is made under penalty of perjury."

21 p. It was a part of the conspiracy that the co-conspirators
22 concealed from patients, and intended to cause the physicians to conceal
23 from patients, the bribe payments the physicians and those working on
24 their behalf received directly and indirectly from defendants GRUSD,
25 PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and WILLOWS CONSULTING and others
26 in exchange for referring patients, in violation of those physicians'
27 fiduciary duties to their patients and in violation of California law.
28

1 q. It was a part of the conspiracy that the co-conspirators
2 concealed from insurers, and intended to cause the physicians to conceal
3 from insurers, the bribe payments the physicians and those working on
4 their behalf received directly and indirectly from defendants GRUSD,
5 PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and WILLOWS CONSULTING and others
6 in exchange for referring patients, which would have rendered their
7 claims for reimbursement unpayable under California law.

8 r. Using the manners and means described above, defendants
9 GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK, and WILLOWS CONSULTING
10 submitted and caused to be submitted claims in excess of \$20.3 million
11 for ancillary medical services procured through the payment of bribes.

12 **OVERT ACTS**

13 22. In furtherance of the conspiracy and in order to effect the
14 objects thereof, the defendants and others committed or caused the
15 commission of the following overt acts within the Southern District of
16 California and elsewhere:

17 a. In or about 2010 or 2011, Ruben Martinez met with PAREDES
18 and GRUSD to discuss an arrangement to refer and schedule patients from
19 Dr. Rigler's Calexico clinic, at which GRUSD and PAREDES agreed to pay
20 a per-patient referral fee for MRI services.

21 b. In or about 2012, PAREDES and GRUSD agreed to pay \$180
22 per MRI per body part, \$350 per EMG or NCV procedure, and \$50 per
23 shockwave treatment, for each patient referred to GRUSD's company from
24 Dr. Rigler's Calexico clinic.

25 c. In or about 2013, PAREDES and GRUSD agreed to pay \$150
26 per MRI per body part, \$280 per EMG or NCV procedure, and \$50 per
27

1 shockwave treatment, for each patient referred to GRUSD's company from
2 Dr. Rigler's Calexico clinic.

3 d. In or about September 2013, Iglesias, Arguello, and
4 Julian Garcia (charged elsewhere) agreed to send Workers' Compensation
5 patients to Dr. Rigler's San Diego and Escondido clinics if Dr. Rigler,
6 in turn, referred those applicants for a certain amount of ancillary
7 procedures and DME from providers designated by Iglesias and Arguello.

8 e. In or about September 2013, Iglesias, Arguello,
9 Providence Scheduling and Julian Garcia (charged elsewhere) told Dr.
10 Rigler that a company operated by Dr. Grusd and Company A, were the two
11 entities that would provide MRI services for Dr. Rigler's applicants,
12 and explained that Dr. Rigler would have to schedule MRIs through MedEx.

13 f. In or about 2014, PAREDES and GRUSD agreed to pay \$50
14 per MRI for the first body part and \$25 for each additional body part,
15 \$75 per EMG or NCV procedure, and \$50 per shockwave treatment, for each
16 patient referred to GRUSD's company from Dr. Rigler's Calexico clinic.

17 g. In or about the Spring of 2014, Iglesias and Arguello
18 informed Dr. Rigler that MRIs would only be completed by Company A and
19 that MRI referrals from MedEx to defendants GRUSD, PAREDES, and
20 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK had been cut off. This was because GRUSD had
21 fallen behind in paying bribes and kickbacks for MRIs referred to his
22 companies.

23 h. On November 7, 2014, Alexander Martinez emailed defendant
24 PAREDES a list of patients that had been referred to GRUSD, PAREDES,
25 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and Advanced Radiology for ancillary medical
26 procedures.
27
28

1 i. On or about November 7, 2014, following receipt of the
2 email above and in consideration of patients referred for ancillary
3 medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and WILLOWS CONSULTING
4 caused a bribe to be paid to defendants Alexander Martinez and Line of
5 Sight acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler

6 j. On November 25, 2014, Alexander Martinez emailed
7 defendant PAREDES a list of patients that had been referred to defendants
8 GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and Advanced Radiology for
9 ancillary medical procedures.

10 k. On or about December 3, 2014, in consideration of
11 patients referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD,
12 PAREDES and WILLOWS CONSULTING caused a bribe to be paid to Ruben
13 Martinez and Desert Blue Moon acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler.

14 l. On December 15, 2014, in consideration of patients
15 referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and
16 WILLOWS CONSULTING caused a bribe to be paid to Ruben Martinez and Desert
17 Blue Moon acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler.

18 m. On or about December 17, 2014, in consideration of
19 patients referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD,
20 PAREDES and WILLOWS CONSULTING caused a bribe to be paid to Alexander
21 Martinez and Line of Sight acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler.

22 n. On December 17, 2014, Alexander Martinez and Ruben
23 Martinez exchanged emails in an effort to reconcile Dr. Rigler's patients
24 referred for ancillary medical procedures and the bribes that had been
25 paid and were due and owing from various providers, including defendants
26 GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and WILLOWS CONSULTING.
27
28

1 o. On or about January 12, 2015, Ruben Martinez and Desert
2 Blue Moon caused payments to be made, directly and indirectly, to Dr.
3 Rigler and Alexander Martinez, which represented a portion of bribe
4 payments from various providers, including defendants GRUSD, PAREDES,
5 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and WILLOWS CONSULTING, that had been
6 received by Ruben Martinez and Desert Blue Moon while acting on behalf
7 of Dr. Rigler and his patients.

8 p. On January 14, 2015, Alexander Martinez emailed defendant
9 PAREDES a list of the patients who had been recruited and referred to
10 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK or another entity designated by GRUSD for MRI
11 and Shockwave treatments in November 2014.

12 q. On January 14, 2015, Alexander Martinez emailed defendant
13 PAREDES an invoice labeled "EMG/NCV," listing 35 patient names with \$75
14 next to each patient name, for a total of \$2,625 for the 35 patients.

15 r. In or about March 2015, in a meeting at GRUSD's Beverly
16 Hills office, GRUSD offered to pay Jonathan Peña \$50 per MRI that Peña
17 referred to GRUSD's company.

18 s. In or about March 2015, in a meeting at GRUSD's Beverly
19 Hills office, GRUSD suggested that it would be "cleaner," or words to
20 that effect, to pay Jonathan Peña a flat monthly fee instead of per item
21 referred.

22 t. On March 1, 2015, Alexander Martinez emailed defendant
23 PAREDES an invoice labeled "EMG/NCV," listing 36 patient names with \$75
24 next to each patient name, for a total of \$2,700 for the 36 patients,
25 and wrote in the email, "I have attached the Marketing hours for February
26 2015 for your review."
27
28

1 u. On March 2, 2015, defendant GRUSD sent a text message to
2 Dr. Rigler in order to facilitate a meeting to discuss the referral of
3 patients for ancillary medical procedures and the payment of bribes.

4 v. On March 4, 2015, defendants GRUSD and PAREDES met with
5 Dr. Rigler in order to discuss the referral of patients for ancillary
6 medical procedures and the payment of bribes.

7 w. On March 4, 2015, in consideration of patients referred
8 for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and WILLOWS
9 CONSULTING caused bribes to be paid to Dr. Rigler and to Alexander
10 Martinez and Line of Sight acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler.

11 x. On March 6, 2015, Alexander Martinez and Line of Sight
12 caused a payment to be made to Dr. Rigler, which represented a portion
13 of bribe payments from various providers, including defendants GRUSD,
14 PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK and WILLOWS CONSULTING, that had
15 been received by Alexander Martinez, Ruben Martinez, Line of Sight and
16 Desert Blue Moon while acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler and his patients.

17 y. On March 26, 2015, defendant PAREDES emailed Alexander
18 Martinez, explaining that Dr. Rigler had already been paid for his
19 January 2015 NCV referrals.

20 z. On April 2, 2015, Alexander Martinez and Ruben Martinez
21 caused an email to be sent to defendant PAREDES with a list of patients
22 that had been referred to defendants GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING
23 NETWORK and Advanced Radiology for ancillary medical procedures.

24 aa. On April 6, 2015, in consideration of patients referred
25 for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and WILLOWS
26 CONSULTING caused a bribe to be paid to Alexander Martinez and Line of
27 Sight acting on behalf of Dr. Rigler.
28

1 bb. On May 7, 2015, defendant PAREDES emailed Alexander
2 Martinez stating that the invoice for MRI referrals from January 2015
3 had already been paid.

4 cc. On June 5, 2015, defendant GRUSD spoke with Dr. Rigler
5 via cellular phone and confirmed the amount of bribes to be paid for the
6 referral of patients to defendants GRUSD, PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING
7 NETWORK and Advanced Radiology for ancillary medical procedures.

8 dd. On June 5, 2015, defendant PAREDES emailed Ruben Martinez
9 claiming that Alexander Martinez had already been paid \$7050 of the
10 \$7150 owed for referrals for shockwave treatments from February 2015,
11 and \$925 of the \$975 owed for MRIs for January 2015, and that additional
12 pending payments of \$7500 for April 2015 shockwave referrals and \$1125
13 for March NCV referrals would be made around the 15th of the month.

14 ee. On June 17, 2015, Ruben Martinez emailed defendant
15 PAREDES invoices for April and May 2015, for shockwave treatments,
16 listing patient names with \$50 next to each patient name.

17 ff. In or about July 2015, Jonathan Peña met with GRUSD at
18 GRUSD's office in Beverly Hills, to reconcile the payments owed to Peña
19 for referring patients for MRIs and EKG. GRUSD also offered to pay Peña
20 \$100 per compound cream prescription Peña could get a physician to
21 prescribe.
22

23 gg. On or about July 1, 2015, in consideration of patients
24 referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and
25 WILLOWS CONSULTING paid Jonathan Peña \$2,700.

26 hh. On July 16, 2015, in consideration of patients referred
27 for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and WILLOWS
28 CONSULTING caused a bribe to be paid to Alexander Martinez, Ruben

1 Martinez, Line of Sight and Desert Blue Moon acting on behalf of Dr.
2 Rigler.

3 ii. On or about August 20, 2015, in consideration of patients
4 referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and
5 WILLOWS CONSULTING paid Jonathan Peña \$2,000.

6 jj. On or about August 25, 2015, in consideration of patients
7 referred for ancillary medical procedures, defendants GRUSD, PAREDES and
8 WILLOWS CONSULTING paid Jonathan Peña \$2,000.

9 All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1349.

10 Counts 2-16

11 HONEST SERVICES MAIL FRAUD, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1346 AND 2

12 23. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are
13 realleged and incorporated by reference.

14 24. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing through at least
15 September 2015, within the Southern District of California and
16 elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING
17 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY knowingly and with the
18 intent to defraud, devised and participated in a material scheme to
19 defraud, that is, to deprive patients of their intangible right to their
20 physician's honest services.

21 25. Paragraphs 20 through 22 of this Superseding Indictment are
22 realleged and incorporated by reference as more fully describing the
23 scheme to defraud, that is, to deprive patients of their intangible
24 right to their physician's honest services.

26 EXECUTIONS OF THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

27 26. On or about the following dates, within the Southern District
28 of California and elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES,

1 CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING, for
 2 the purpose of executing the scheme and attempting to do so, knowingly
 3 caused the following mail matter to be placed in a post office and
 4 authorized depository for mail matters to be delivered by the United
 5 States Postal Service and private and commercial interstate carrier:

Count	Date	Item Mailed
2	Nov. 10, 2014	\$4,725 check from Willows Consulting Company to Line of Sight for "Professional Services"
3	Jan. 30, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Karla B. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
4	Feb. 27, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Richard D. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
5	Mar. 9, 2015	Request for payment of \$2830 for MRI scan for Luz S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
6	Mar. 9, 2015	Request for payment of \$5660 for two MRI scans for Maria V. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
7	Mar. 10, 2015	Request for payment of \$5660 for two MRI scans for Maria V. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"

Count	Date	Item Mailed
8	Mar. 10, 2015	Request for payment of \$2830 for MRI scan for Javier F. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
9	Mar. 12, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for shockwave treatment for Socorro C. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
10	April 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Sergio S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
11	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Alan B. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
12	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Ariel J. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
13	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Marco S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
14	June 1, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for shockwave treatment for Jose R. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"

Count	Date	Item Mailed
15	June 11, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Hortencia R. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
16	July 8, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Karina S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1341, 1346 and 2.

Counts 17-22

HONEST SERVICES WIRE FRAUD, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1346 AND 2

27. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference.

28. Beginning on a date unknown and continuing through at least September 2015, within the Southern District of California and elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY knowingly and with the intent to defraud, devised and participated in a material scheme to defraud, that is, to deprive patients of their intangible right to their physician's honest services.

29. Paragraphs 20 through 22 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference as more fully describing the scheme to defraud, that is, to deprive patients of their intangible right to their physician's honest services.

//

EXECUTIONS OF THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

30. On or about the following dates, within the Southern District of California and elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING, for the purpose of executing the scheme and attempting to do so, knowingly transmitted and caused to be transmitted the following writings, signs, signals, and sounds via interstate wire transmission:

Count	Date	Interstate Wire Transmission
17	Jan. 14, 2015	Email from Alexander Martinez to defendant GONZALO PAREDES attaching invoice for December 2014
18	March 1, 2015	Email from Alexander Martinez to defendant GONZALO PAREDES attaching invoice for February 2015, described in email as "Marketing hours"
19	March 26, 2015	Email from defendant GONZALO PAREDES to Alexander Martinez, explaining that Dr. Rigler had already been paid for his January 2015 NCV referrals
20	May 7, 2015	Email from defendant GONZALO PAREDES to Alexander Martinez, explaining that Martinez had already been paid for January 2015 MRIs
21	June 5, 2015	Email from defendant GONZALO PAREDES to Ruben Martinez, explaining that invoices for Shockwave and MRI referrals had already been paid
22	June 17, 2015	Email from Ruben Martinez to defendant GONZALO PAREDES attaching the April and May 2015 invoices of patient referrals for shockwave treatments, at \$50 apiece

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1343 and 2.

Counts 23-36**HEALTH CARE FRAUD, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1347 AND 2**

31. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference.

Count	Date	Claims
24	Feb. 27, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Richard D. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
25	Mar. 9, 2015	Request for payment of \$2830 for MRI scan for Luz S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
26	Mar. 9, 2015	Request for payment of \$5660 for two MRI scans for Maria V. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
27	Mar. 10, 2015	Request for payment of \$5660 for two MRI scans for Maria V. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
28	Mar. 10, 2015	Request for payment of \$2830 for MRI scan for Javier F. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
29	Mar. 12, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for shockwave treatment for Socorro C. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
30	April 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Sergio S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"

Count	Date	Claims
31	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Alan B. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
32	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Ariel J. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
33	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Marco S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
34	June 1, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for shockwave treatment for Jose R. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
35	June 10, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Hortencia R. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"
36	July 8, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for NCV procedure for Karina S. secured through the payment of bribes to Dr. Rigler and those acting on his behalf, containing the fraudulent and misleading statement, "I have not violated Labor Code section 139.3"

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1347 and 2.

//

//

Counts 37 - 42

TRAVEL ACT, 18 USC §§ 1952(a)(1), (a)(2) AND 2

35. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference.

36. Beginning on date unknown and continuing through at least August 2015, within the Southern District of California and elsewhere, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY, knowingly used and cause to be used facilities in interstate commerce with the intent to promote, manage, establish, carry on, distribute the proceeds of; and facilitate the promotion, management, establishment, carrying on, and distribution of the proceeds of an unlawful activity, that is, bribery in violation of California Penal Code Sections 139.3-32 and California Labor Code Section 3215, and, thereafter, to promote and attempt to perform acts to promote, manage, establish, carry on, distribute the proceeds of, and facilitate the promotion, management, establishment, carrying on, and distribution of the proceeds of such unlawful activity as follows:

Count	Date	Use of Facility in Interstate Commerce	Acts Performed Thereafter
37	Nov. 7, 2014	Email, as set forth in Paragraph 22(h)	Act as set forth in Paragraph 22(i)
38	Nov. 25, 2014	Email, as set forth in Paragraph 22(j)	Acts as set forth in Paragraph 22(k), (l), and (m)
39	Dec. 17, 2014	Emails, as set forth in Paragraph 22(n)	Acts as set forth in Paragraph 22(o)
40	March 2, 2015	Text Message, as set forth in Paragraph 22(u)	Acts as set forth in Paragraph 22(v), (w), and (x)
41	April 2, 2015	Email, as set forth in Paragraph 22(z)	Act as set forth in Paragraph 22(aa)

Count	Date	Use of Facility in Interstate Commerce	Acts Performed Thereafter
42	June 5, 2015	Cellular Telephone Call, as set forth in Paragraph 22(cc)	Acts as set forth in Paragraph 22(hh)

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1952(a)(1), (a)(2) and 2.

Counts 43-45

MONEY LAUNDERING, 18 USC §§ 1956(a)(1) AND 2

37. Paragraphs 1 through 17 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference.

38. On or about the dates set forth below, within the Southern District of California, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY, knowing that the property involved in the designated financial transactions represented the proceeds of some form of unlawful activity, did conduct financial transactions, as set forth below, which in fact involved proceeds of specified unlawful activities, to wit, Conspiracy, Honest Services Mail Fraud, Mail Fraud, Honest Services Wire Fraud, Wire Fraud, and Health Care Fraud in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1341, 1346, 1347, and 1349, with the intent to promote the carrying on of the specified unlawful activities, and knowing that the transactions were designed in whole and in part to conceal and disguise the nature, the location, the source, the ownership and the control of the proceeds of the specified unlawful activities:

Count	Date	Financial Transaction
43	July 16, 2015	Deposit of check issued by GRUSD and PAREDES out of an account in the name of WILLOWS CONSULTING, for \$2,500.00, payable to Line Of Sight, Inc., with "professional services" in the memo line, to pay per-patient referral fees for referrals by Dr. Rigler for services provided by CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK

Count	Date	Financial Transaction
44	July 31, 2015	Deposit of check issued by GRUSD and PAREDES out of an account in the name of WILLOWS CONSULTING, for \$5,000.00, payable to Line Of Sight, Inc., with "professional services" in the memo line, to pay per-patient referral fees for referrals by Dr. Rigler for services provided by CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK
45	Sept. 1, 2015	Defendant GRUSD's transfer of \$15,000 from an account in the name of Oaks Diagnostic into an account in the name of defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1956(a)(1) and 2.

CRIMINAL FORFEITURE

39. Paragraphs 1 through 38 of this Indictment are realleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein for the purpose of alleging forfeiture pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C) and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c).

40. Upon conviction of the offenses of Conspiracy, Honest Services Mail Fraud, Mail Fraud, Honest Services Wire Fraud, Wire Fraud, Travel Act, and Money Laundering as alleged in Counts 1 - 45, defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY shall forfeit to the United States all right, title, and interest in any property, real or personal, that constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to a violation of such offenses, including:

- (1) An amount not less than \$206,330.56 in the real property located at 14655 Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, California, legally described as:

Assessor's Parcel No. 2275-024-001
 LOT NUMBER: 6; TRACT: 14524; CITY/MUNI/TWNSP:
 REGION/CLUSTER: 03/03172, BOOK 390, PAGE 14, CITY OF
 LOS ANGELES, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES;

Owner of Record: Goslings, L.P., Ronald S. Grusd,
General Partner

(2) A money judgment equal to the amount of proceeds obtained directly or indirectly from the commission of the offenses.

41. If any of the above described forfeitable property, as a result of any act or omission of defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, and WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY (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 intent of the United States, pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(b), to seek forfeiture of any other property of defendants RONALD GRUSD, GONZALO PAREDES, CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY, up to the value of the forfeitable property described above. All pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C), and Title 28, United States Code, Section 2461(c).

DATED: July 11, 2017.

A TRUE BILL:


Foreperson

ALANA W. ROBINSON
Acting United States Attorney

By: 
VALERIE H. CHU
CAROLINE P. HAN
FRED SHEPPARD
Assistant U.S. Attorneys

FILED

DEC 12 2017

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY *SM* DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 15CR2821-BAS

v.

VERDICT

RONALD GRUSD,
GONZALO PAREDES,
CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK
MEDICAL GROUP,
WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY,

Defendants.

COUNT ONE (conspiracy)

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

Not Guilty

Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

Not Guilty

Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty

Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

Not Guilty

Guilty

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **COUNT TWO** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the November 10, 2014 check from Willows
2 Consulting to Line of Sight)

3 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

4 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

6 Guilty

7 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
8 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

9 Guilty

10 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
11 COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

12 Guilty

13
14 **COUNT THREE** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the January 30, 2015 request for payment for
15 NCV procedure on Karla B.)

16 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

17 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

19 Guilty

20 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
21 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

22 Guilty

23 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
24 COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

25 Guilty

1 **COUNT FOUR** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the February 27, 2015 request for payment for
2 NCV procedure on Richard D.)

3 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

4 Not Guilty
5 Guilty

6 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

7 Not Guilty
8 Guilty

9 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
10 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
14 COMPANY:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 **COUNT FIVE** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the March 9, 2015 request for payment for MRI
18 procedure on Luz S.)

19 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

20 Not Guilty
21 Guilty

22 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

23 Not Guilty
24 Guilty

25 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
26 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

27 Not Guilty
28 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT SIX** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the March 9, 2015 request for payment for MRI
procedures on Maria V.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty
10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty
13 Guilty

14 **COUNT SEVEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the March 10, 2015 request for payment for MRI
procedures on Maria V.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty
17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty
20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

1 **COUNT EIGHT** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the March 10, 2015 request for payment for MRI
2 procedure on Javier F.)

3 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

4 Not Guilty
5 Guilty

6 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

7 Not Guilty
8 Guilty

9 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
10 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
14 COMPANY:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 **COUNT NINE** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the March 12, 2015 request for payment for
18 shockwave procedure on Socorro C.)

19 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

20 Not Guilty
21 Guilty

22 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

23 Not Guilty
24 Guilty

25 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
26 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

27 Not Guilty
28 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT TEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the April 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV
procedure on Sergio S.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty
10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty
13 Guilty

14 **COUNT ELEVEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV
procedure on Alan B.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty
17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty
20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

1 **COUNT TWELVE** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV
procedure on Ariel J.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

13 Guilty

14 **COUNT THIRTEEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for
NCV procedure on Marco S.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

26 Guilty

1 **COUNT FOURTEEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the June 1, 2015 request for payment for
shockwave procedure on Jose R.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty
10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty
13 Guilty

14 **COUNT FIFTEEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the June 11, 2015 request for payment for
NCV procedure on Hortencia R.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty
17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty
20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

1 **COUNT SIXTEEN** (Honest Services Mail Fraud regarding the July 8, 2015 request for payment for NCV
2 procedure on Karina S.)

3 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

4 Not Guilty
5 Guilty

6 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

7 Not Guilty
8 Guilty

9 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
10 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
14 COMPANY:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 **COUNT EIGHTEEN** (Honest Services Wire Fraud regarding the March 1, 2015 email from A. Martinez
18 to Defendant GONZALO PAREDES)

19 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

20 Not Guilty
21 Guilty

22 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

23 Not Guilty
24 Guilty

25 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
26 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

27 Not Guilty
28 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT NINETEEN** (Honest Services Wire Fraud regarding the March 26, 2015 email from Defendant
GONZALO PAREDES to A. Martinez)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

13 Guilty

14 **COUNT TWENTY** (Honest Services Wire Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 email from Defendant
GONZALO PAREDES to A. Martinez)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

26 Guilty

1 **COUNT TWENTY-THREE** (Health Care Fraud regarding the January 30, 2015 request for payment for
NCV procedure on Karla B.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

13 Guilty

14 **COUNT TWENTY-FOUR** (Health Care Fraud regarding the February 27, 2015 request for payment for
NCV procedure on Richard D.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

26 Guilty

1 **COUNT TWENTY-FIVE** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 9, 2015 request for payment for MRI procedure on Luz S.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
 Guilty

7 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

8 Not Guilty
9 Guilty

10 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 **COUNT TWENTY-SIX** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 9, 2015 request for payment for MRI procedures on Maria V.)

14 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

18 Not Guilty
 Guilty

19 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

20 Not Guilty
21 Guilty

22 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

23 Not Guilty
24 Guilty

1 **COUNT TWENTY-SEVEN** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 10, 2015 request for payment for MRI procedures on Maria V.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

13 Guilty

14 **COUNT TWENTY-EIGHT** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 10, 2015 request for payment for MRI procedure on Javier F.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

26 Guilty

1 **COUNT TWENTY-NINE** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 12, 2015 request for payment for
shockwave procedure on Socorro C.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
 Guilty

7 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

8 Not Guilty
9 Guilty

10 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 **COUNT THIRTY** (Health Care Fraud regarding the April 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV procedure
on Sergio S.)

14 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

18 Not Guilty
 Guilty

19 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

20 Not Guilty
21 Guilty

22 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

23 Not Guilty
24 Guilty

COUNT THIRTY-ONE (Health Care Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV procedure on Alan B.)

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

COUNT THIRTY-TWO (Health Care Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV procedure on Ariel J.)

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT THIRTY-THREE** (Health Care Fraud regarding the May 7, 2015 request for payment for NCV
procedure on Marco S.)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty

4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty

7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty

10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty

13 Guilty

14 **COUNT THIRTY-FOUR** (Health Care Fraud regarding the June 1, 2015 request for payment for
shockwave procedure on José R.)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty

17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty

20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty

23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty

26 Guilty

COUNT THIRTY-FIVE (Health Care Fraud regarding the request for payment for NCV procedure on Hortencia R. on or about June 11, 2015)

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

Not Guilty
 Guilty *No VOTE*
Juras 10

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

COUNT THIRTY-SIX (Health Care Fraud regarding the July 8, 2015 request for payment for NCV procedure on Karina S.)

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT THIRTY-SEVEN** (violating the Travel Act regarding the November 7, 2014 email from A.
Martinez to GONZALO PAREDES and a payment for services made the same day)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty
10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty
13 Guilty

14 **COUNT THIRTY-EIGHT** (violating the Travel Act regarding the November 25, 2014 email from A.
Martinez to GONZALO PAREDES and a payment for services made on December 3, 2014, December 15,
2014, and December 17, 2014)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty
17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty
20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

1 **COUNT THIRTY-NINE** (violating the Travel Act regarding the December 17, 2014 exchange of emails
2 between A. Martinez and R. Martinez and payments from their entities to S. Rigler on January 12, 2015)

3 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

4 Not Guilty
5 Guilty

6 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

7 Not Guilty
8 Guilty

9 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
10 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

11 Not Guilty
12 Guilty

13 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
14 COMPANY:

15 Not Guilty
16 Guilty

17 **COUNT FORTY** (violating the Travel Act regarding the March 2, 2015 text message from RONALD
18 GRUSD to S. RIGLER and a meeting that took place between the GRUSD, PAREDES and S. Rigler on
19 March 4, 2015, a payment was made on March 4, 2015, and payments from entities belonging to A.
20 Martinez and R. Martinez to Dr. S. Rigler on March 6, 2015)

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

27 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING
28 NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING
COMPANY:

Not Guilty
 Guilty

1 **COUNT FORTY-ONE** (violating the Travel Act regarding the April 2, 2015 email caued to be sent by A. Martinez and R. Martinez to defendant GONZALO PAREDES and a payment made on April 6, 2015)

2 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

3 Not Guilty
4 Guilty

5 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

6 Not Guilty
7 Guilty

8 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

9 Not Guilty
10 Guilty

11 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

12 Not Guilty
13 Guilty

14 **COUNT FORTY-TWO** (violating the Travel Act regarding the June 5, 2015 cellular phone call between RONALD GRUSD and S. Rigler and a payment made on July 16, 2015)

15 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant RONALD GRUSD:

16 Not Guilty
17 Guilty

18 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant GONZALO PAREDES:

19 Not Guilty
20 Guilty

21 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP:

22 Not Guilty
23 Guilty

24 We, the jury in the above-captioned case, unanimously find defendant WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY:

25 Not Guilty
26 Guilty

27 **SO SAY WE ALL.**

28 DATED: 12/12/17

 Juror 10
FOREPERSON OF THE JURY



State of California Secretary of State

S

Statement of Information

(Domestic Stock and Agricultural Cooperative Corporations)

FEES (Filing and Disclosure): \$25.00.

If this is an amendment, see instructions.

IMPORTANT – READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM

FG85313

FILED

In the office of the Secretary of State
of the State of California

NOV-02 2016

1. CORPORATE NAME

CAPITOL HEALTH CENTERS, INC.

2. CALIFORNIA CORPORATE NUMBER

C3637282

This Space for Filing Use Only

No Change Statement (Not applicable if agent address of record is a P.O. Box address. See instructions.)

3. If there have been any changes to the information contained in the last Statement of Information filed with the California Secretary of State, or no statement of information has been previously filed, this form must be completed in its entirety.

If there has been no change in any of the information contained in the last Statement of Information filed with the California Secretary of State, check the box and proceed to **Item 17**.

Complete Addresses for the Following (Do not abbreviate the name of the city. Items 4 and 5 cannot be P.O. Boxes.)

4. STREET ADDRESS OF PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICE	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			
5. STREET ADDRESS OF PRINCIPAL BUSINESS OFFICE IN CALIFORNIA, IF ANY	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			
6. MAILING ADDRESS OF CORPORATION, IF DIFFERENT THAN ITEM 4	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
6310 SAN VICENTE BLVD., SUITE 101 SUITE 105, LOS ANGELES, CA 90048			

Names and Complete Addresses of the Following Officers (The corporation must list these three officers. A comparable title for the specific officer may be added; however, the preprinted titles on this form must not be altered.)

7. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER/	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
RONALD S. GRUSD	8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			
8. SECRETARY	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
RONALD S. GRUSD	8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			
9. CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER/	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
RONALD S. GRUSD	8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			

Names and Complete Addresses of All Directors, Including Directors Who are Also Officers (The corporation must have at least one director. Attach additional pages, if necessary.)

10. NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
RONALD S. GRUSD	8641 WILSHIRE BLVD. SUITE 105, BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211			
11. NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE
12. NAME	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE

13. NUMBER OF VACANCIES ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, IF ANY:

Agent for Service of Process If the agent is an individual, the agent must reside in California and Item 15 must be completed with a California street address, a P.O. Box address is not acceptable. If the agent is another corporation, the agent must have on file with the California Secretary of State a certificate pursuant to California Corporations Code section 1505 and Item 15 must be left blank.

14. NAME OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS
KEITH R. KAPLAN

15. STREET ADDRESS OF AGENT FOR SERVICE OF PROCESS IN CALIFORNIA, IF AN INDIVIDUAL CITY STATE ZIP CODE
9200 ALDEA AVENUE, NORTHRIDGE, CA 91325

Type of Business

16. DESCRIBE THE TYPE OF BUSINESS OF THE CORPORATION
DIAGNOSTIC RADIOLOGY

17. BY SUBMITTING THIS STATEMENT OF INFORMATION TO THE CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE, THE CORPORATION CERTIFIES THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN, INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS, IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

11/02/2016 KEITH R. KAPLAN CPA
DATE TYPE/PRINT NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING FORM TITLE SIGNATURE