

# INDEX

California Imaging Network Medical Group, 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, 05/31/2016

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 15<sup>th</sup> 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 <b>Javier F.</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"
9	Mar. 12, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for <b>shockwave</b> treatment for <b>Socorro C.</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"
10	April 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for <b>NCV</b> procedure for <b>Sergio S.</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"
11	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for <b>NCV</b> procedure for <b>Alan B.</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 <b>NCV</b> procedure for <b>Ariel J.</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"
13	May 7, 2015	Request for payment of \$1100 for <b>NCV</b> procedure for <b>Marco S.</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"
14	June 1, 2015	Request for payment of \$2900 for <b>shockwave</b> treatment for <b>Jose R.</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"

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.

32. 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, WILLOWS CONSULTING COMPANY knowingly and with the intent to defraud, devised and participated in a material scheme to defraud a health care benefit program, and to obtain money and property owned by, and under the custody and control of, a health-care benefit program, by means of false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1347.

33. Paragraphs 20 through 22 of this Superseding Indictment are realleged and incorporated by reference as more fully describing the scheme to defraud

EXECUTIONS OF THE SCHEME TO DEFRAUD

34. 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 submitted and caused to be submitted the following claims to health care insurers seeking payment:

Count	Date	Claims
23	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"

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

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 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

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-SIX** (Health Care Fraud regarding the March 9, 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 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**

FD93730

**FILED**

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

**MAY-31 2016**

**1. CORPORATE NAME**

CALIFORNIA IMAGING NETWORK MEDICAL GROUP, INC.

**2. CALIFORNIA CORPORATE NUMBER**

C2949796

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
14655 MULHOLLAND DRIVE, LOS ANGELES, CA 90077			

**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.

05/31/2016      KEITH R. KAPLAN      CPA      \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE      TYPE/PRINT NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING FORM      TITLE      SIGNATURE