

7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,

v.

D-1 SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS,
Defendant.

Case: 2:08-cr-20353
Judge: Rosen, Gerald E
MJ: Morgan, Virginia M
Filed: 06-20-2008 At 02:40 PM
INFO USA V. SEALED MATTER (TAM)

VIOLATIONS: 18 U.S.C. §§ 224 and 2

INFORMATION

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES:

COUNT ONE.

(18 U.S.C. § 224(a) - Conspiracy to Influence Sporting Contests by Bribery)

D-1 SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS

A. GENERAL ALLEGATIONS.

At all times material to this Information:

1. Individuals or businesses whose business consists of the taking and recording or registering of bets or wagers on sporting contests, such as bookmakers and casinos, use a "point spread" to equalize betting on competing teams, such as college basketball teams, so that bettors may bet on the point spread of the game, rather than simply betting on which team will win. The point spread defines which team is the "underdog," that is, expected to lose by a certain number of points, and which team is the "favorite," that is, expected to win by a certain number of points.

For example, if Team A is an underdog by three (3) points, that is, predicted to lose by three (3) points, then a person who bets on Team A will win the bet if Team A either wins the game or if Team A loses the game by less than three (3) points.

2. A basketball game may be "fixed" by, among other ways, a basketball player's agreement to influence the game's outcome by ensuring that the final score falls at a point either within or outside of the point spread. Such a scheme, sometimes called "point shaving," entails an effort by a basketball player, who is usually a member of the "favorite" team, to ensure by their play during the game, or by some other means, that their team scores a certain number of points during the game. The number of points to be scored depends on what the point spread is on that particular game.

B. THE CONSPIRACY.

3. That from at least in or about December 2004, and continuing through at least in or about March 2006, in the Eastern District of Michigan and elsewhere, SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, did unlawfully, knowingly and intentionally combine, conspire, confederate and agree with persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney, to carry into effect a scheme in commerce to influence by bribery various sporting contests, that is basketball games between the University of Toledo men's basketball team and various opponents, with knowledge that the purpose of such scheme was to influence by bribery those contests.

C. MANNER, MEANS AND METHODS OF THE CONSPIRACY.

4. The manner, means and methods employed by the defendant, SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, and other persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney, to effect the

objects of the conspiracy were as follows:

5. It was a part of the conspiracy that SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, and other persons known and unknown to the United States Attorney, did agree upon and carry into effect a "point shaving" scheme to "fix" University of Toledo men's basketball games during the 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 basketball seasons.

6. It was further part of the conspiracy to carry into effect a "point shaving" scheme to "fix" University of Toledo men's basketball games that SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, did accept the payment of money and other things of value, in exchange for using his ability as a player to control events on the basketball court during games to attempt to ensure that the University of Toledo basketball team would score a certain number of points determined by the point spread.

7. It was further part of the conspiracy that certain other persons known to the United States Attorney who were participants in the conspiracy did place wagers on certain University of Toledo men's basketball games, knowing that these games were "fixed," to generate money and profits for the conspirators in the "point shaving" scheme.

8. It was further a part of the conspiracy that SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, did also facilitate the "point shaving" scheme to "fix" University of Toledo men's basketball games by aiding in attempting to recruit other University of Toledo men's basketball team members to join the conspiracy.

9. It was further a part of the conspiracy that SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, did facilitate carrying into effect the "point shaving" scheme to "fix" University of Toledo men's basketball games by acting as an intermediary in paying money to

another University of Toledo men's basketball team member who was a participant in the conspiracy.

10. It was further a part of the conspiracy that SAMUEL AVILES VILLEGAS, Defendant herein, did travel from Ohio to Michigan to meet with other conspirators known to the United States Attorney, and did use interstate telephone facilities between Ohio and Michigan to contact another conspirator known to the United States Attorney, to carry into effect the "point shaving" scheme to "fix" University of Toledo men's basketball games.

D. OVERT ACTS.

In furtherance of the conspiracy, and to effect the object thereof, the Defendant and his co-conspirators committed and caused to be committed the following overt acts, among others, in the Eastern District of Michigan and elsewhere:

1. On or about November 30, 2005, the Defendant met with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney in Toledo, Ohio.
2. On or about December 12, 2005, the Defendant met with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney in Hamtramck, Michigan.
3. On or about December 16, 2005, the Defendant met with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney in Detroit, Michigan.
4. On or about December 22, 2005, the Defendant met with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney in Hamtramck, Michigan.
5. On or about January 11, 2006, the Defendant met with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney in Detroit, Michigan.
6. On or about January 26, 2006, at approximately 3:57 p.m., the Defendant received a

telephone call and spoke with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney.

7. On or about February 4, 2006, at approximately 12:15 p.m., the Defendant placed a telephone call from Ohio to Michigan and spoke with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney.

8. On or about February 4, 2006, at approximately 12:29 p.m., the Defendant placed a telephone call from Ohio to Michigan and spoke with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney.

9. On or about February 4, 2006, at approximately 3:57 p.m., the Defendant received a telephone call and spoke with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney.

10. On or about February 4, 2006, the Defendant played in the men's basketball game in Toledo, Ohio between teams from the University of Toledo and Central State University, and during the game intentionally missed two free throw attempts.

11. On or about February 4, 2006, at approximately 9:46 p.m., the Defendant placed a telephone call from Ohio to Michigan and spoke with a conspirator known to the United States Attorney.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 224(a) and 2.

STEPHEN J. MURPHY
United States Attorney

LYNN A. HELLAND
Assistant Chief, Criminal Division

DAVID E. MORRIS
Assistant U.S. Attorney

SAIMA S. MOHSIN
Assistant U.S. Attorney

DATED:

United States District Court Eastern District of Michigan	Criminal Case Co	Case: 2:08-cr-20353 Judge: Rosen, Gerald E MJ: Morgan, Virginia M Filed: 06-20-2008 At 02:40 PM INFO USA V. SEALED MATTER (TAM)
NOTE: It is the responsibility of the Assistant U.S. Attorney signing this form to co		Companion Case Number:
Companion Case Information		Judge Assigned:
This may be a companion case based upon LCrR 57.10 (b)(4) ¹ :		AUSA's Initials: SM
Yes	X No	

Case Title: USA v. Samuel Aviles Villegas

County where offense occurred : Wayne County & Ohio

Check One: Felony Misdemeanor Petty

Indictment/ Information --- no prior complaint.
 Indictment/ Information --- based upon prior complaint [Case number: _____]
 Indictment/ Information --- based upon LCrR 57.10 (d) [Complete Superseding section below].

Superseding Case Information:


Superseding to Case No: _____ Judge: _____

- Original case was terminated; no additional charges or defendants.
- Corrects errors; no additional charges or defendants.
- Involves, for plea purposes, different charges or adds counts.
- Embraces same subject matter but adds the additional defendants or charges below:

<u>Defendant name</u>	<u>Charges</u>
-----------------------	----------------

Please take notice that the below listed Assistant United States Attorney is the attorney of record for the above captioned case.

6/20/2008
Date


 SAIMA MOHSIN
 Assistant United States Attorney
 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001
 Detroit, MI 48226-3277
 Phone: (313) 226-9163
 Fax: (313) 226-3265
 E-Mail address: Saima.Mohsin@usdoj.gov
 No Mich. P#

¹ Companion cases are matters in which it appears that (1) substantially similar evidence will be offered at trial, (2) the same or related parties are present, and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence. Cases may be companion cases even though one of them may have already been terminated.