RANDY S. GROSSMAN 1 Acting United States Attorney ALEXANDRA F. FOSTER/ JOSEPH S. GREEN D.C. Bar No. 470096/CA Bar No. 251169 Assistant United States Attorneys Office of the U.S. Attorney 880 Front Street, Room 6293 San Diego, CA 92101 4 Telephone: (619) 546-6735/6955 Email: Alexandra.Foster@usdoj.gov/Joseph.Green@usdoj.gov 6 Attorneys for Plaintiff 7 United States of America 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 Case No.: 19CR4488-JLS 11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, MOTION REGARDING RESTITUTION 12 Plaintiff, 13 v. RUBEN ANDRE GARCIA (3), 14 [REDACTED] aka "Jonathan," 15 Defendant. 16 17 18 Plaintiff, United States of America, by and through its counsel, Randy Grossman, Acting United States Attorney, and Alexandra F. Foster and Joseph S. Green, Assistant 19 20 United States Attorneys, hereby moves this Court for an order of restitution. 21 I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE 22 On November 7, 2019, an indictment was filed against Ruben Andre GARCIA and 23 his co-Defendants on charges of sex trafficking women. On December 17, 2020, GARCIA 24 pled guilty to counts one and seven of the indictment charging him with one count of 25 conspiracy to commit sex trafficking, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1594(c), and one 26 substantive sex trafficking count, in violation of 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1591(a)(1) and (2). As part

of the plea agreement, the parties agreed that restitution was mandatory under 18 U.S.C.

Sec. 1593. On June 14, 2021, this Court sentenced GARCIA, and set a restitution hearing

27

currently scheduled for October 8, 2021. At the parties' request, the Court continued the hearing to December 10, 2021.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Beginning in approximately 2013 and continuing up to October 2019, GARCIA participated in a conspiracy with Michael James Pratt, Matthew Isaac Wolfe, Theodore Wilfred Gyi, Valerie Moser, and others, to recruit Victims 1-5, as identified in the Indictment, and others, to engage in commercial sex acts using force, fraud and coercion. Those sex acts were ultimately posted on Girlsdoporn.com (GDP) and girlsdotoys.com (GDT). GDP and GDT charged visitors a subscription fee to access the websites' content. The websites generated millions of dollars in revenue for the owners, Pratt and Wolfe.

Throughout the conspiracy, GDP and GDT received millions of views. To promote the websites, video content from both sites was posted on free porn sites such as pornhub.com, one of the world's most visited porn sites. The videos from GDP and GDT posted on pornhub.com were often viewed millions of times according to its view counters.

From approximately 2013 to October 2019, GARCIA was employed at GDP. GARCIA recruited women to appear in videos for GDP and GDT and appeared as the male actor in the videos for GDP. GARCIA was paid a commission for each woman that he recruited on top of an hourly rate for his employment.

To recruit victims to appear in videos for the websites, GARCIA, and others, including Pratt, Wolfe, Gyi, Moser and Nored, lied to the victims and told them that the videos would never be posted on-line, that the videos would never be released in the United States, and that no one who knew the women would ever find out about the video,

Section 3664(d)(5) provides that the Court shall set a date for a final determination of the victims' losses within 90 days after sentencing. The Supreme Court, however, has held that a sentencing court retains the power to order restitution, even after the expiration of the 90 days, where the court made clear prior to the deadline's expiration that it would be ordering restitution, leaving open only the amount. *Dolan v. United States*, 560 U.S. 605, 608 (2010).

representations that GARCIA and other members of the conspiracy knew were false. Hundreds of women from various cities throughout the United States and Canada were recruited to appear in videos based upon these material misrepresentations.

III. BASIS FOR RESTITUTION ORDER

Title 18, United States Code, Section 1593 provides that the Court shall order restitution for the "full amount of the victim's losses" for any offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18 of United States Code, which includes both counts of conviction for Garcia, Sections 1591 and 1594. Section 1593(b)(3) provides that the term "full amount of the victim's losses" has the same meaning as provided in section 2259(c)(2) "plus the greater of the gross income or value to the defendant of the victim's services or labor or the value of the victim's labor as guaranteed under the Fair Labor Standards Act." 18 U.S.C. Sec. 1593(b)(3). We will focus on the amount of the victims' losses under Section 2259(c)(2) in this section. The Government is seeking three types of restitution in this matter: first, the return of the rights to the victims' images and videos to the victims; second, restitution for the gross income as detailed in the statute; and third, restitution for the victims' specific losses.

A. Return of Rights to Images and Videos

18 U.S.C. Sec. 1593(b)(2) explains that "[a]n order of restitution under this section shall be issued and enforced in accordance with [18 U.S.C.] section 3664 in the same manner as an order under [18 U.S.C.] section 3663A." Section 1593 defines a victim for purposes of this statute broadly as "the individual harmed as a result of a crime under this chapter...." Likewise, "victim" is defined under 18 U.S.C. Section 3663A(a)(2) to include all persons directly and proximately harmed as a result of the commission of an offense. "Under 18 U.S.C. § 3664, a dispute as to the proper amount of restitution must be resolved by the district court by a preponderance of the evidence." *United States v. Waknine*, 543 F.3d 546, 556 (9th Cir.2008) (citing 18 U.S.C. § 3664(e); *United States v. Clayton*, 108 F.3d 1114, 1118 (9th Cir.1997)). "The government bears the burden of proving that a

person or entity is a victim for purposes of restitution, [United States v.] Baker, 25 F.3d [1452,] 1455 [(9th Cir.1994), rev'd on other grounds, United States v. Lawrence, 189 F.3d 838, 846 (9th Cir.1999)], and of proving the amount of the loss, 18 U.S.C. § 3664(e)." United States v. Gamma Tech Indus., Inc., 265 F3d 917, 927 (9th Cir 2001).

Restitution clearly focuses on the victim, not the individual defendant, and seeks to compensate the victim for all the direct and proximate losses resulting from the defendant's conduct, not only for the reasonably foreseeable losses. The purpose of restitution is to put the victim back in the position he or she would have been but for the defendant's criminal conduct. The Ninth Circuit has explained: "[t]he purpose of restitution is twofold: (1) to restore the defrauded party to the position he would have had absent the fraud, Restatement of Restitution [§] 1, Comments a, b, c, and d (1937); (2) and to deny the fraudulent party any benefits, whether or not foreseeable, which derive from his wrongful act." *Nelson v. Serwold*, 687 F.2d 278, 281 (9th Cir. 1982).

18 U.S.C. Sec. 3663A(b)(1)(A) provides: "The order of restitution shall require that such defendant – (a) in the case of an offense resulting in damage or loss ... of a victim of the offense – (A) return the property to the owner of the property." The primary and overarching goal of the Mandatory Victims Restitution Act (codified in 18 U.S.C. Sec. 3663A) is to make victims of crime whole. In achieving this objective, Congress intended district courts to engage in an expedient and reasonable restitution process, with uncertainties resolved with a view toward achieving fairness to the victim. *United States v. Gordon*, 393 F.3d 1044, 1048 (9th Cir. 2004).

In this case that means restitution should include returning the wrongfully and fraudulently appropriated images and videos to the individual victims of the offense. The rightful owner of each image and/or video posted on Girlsdoporn.com and/or Girlsdotoys.com (the property) is the respective woman pictured therein. Attachment A (which is filed under seal) lists all known GDP and GDT videos, and the model identified with that video/image.

The Government proposes that the Court issue an order as part of the restitution in this case. The order would declare that all rights, title and interest in all of the images and videos in Attachment A belong to each respective victim pictured or depicted therein; and include in that order a provision that the Court's Order and a redacted version of Attachment A may be used by each individual victim to enforce their property rights including, but not limited to, the right to seek Digital Medium Copyright Act (DMCA) Notices to remove and destroy all videos and images of each individual victim in the possession of third parties.

B. Payment of GDP's and GDT's Gross Income to Victims

Title 18, United States Code, Section 1593 also provides that the Court shall order restitution for the "full amount of the victim's losses" for any offense under Chapter 77 of Title 18 of United States Code, which includes both counts of conviction for Garcia, Sections 1591 and 1594. Section 1593(b)(3) provides that the term "full amount of the victim's losses" has the same meaning as provided in section 2259(c)(2), plus the greater of the gross income or value to the defendant of the victim's services or labor or the value of the victim's labor as guaranteed under the Fair Labor Standards Act. 18 U.S.C. § 1593(3).

The gross income for GDP and GDT should be \$16,922,798, calculated as follows:²

25

26

27

28

CCBill, Epoch, and ICF are payment processors used by GDP and GDT to collect customer payments from on-line viewers on their websites.

Account Name

BLL Media

EG Publications

EG Publications

BLL Media

BLL Media

Domi Publications

Domi Publications

CCBILL

1,191,723

423,963

7,873,242 \$

482,340

1,110,476

1,583,830

12,665,574 \$

\$

\$

\$

\$

ICF

157,679

20,690

104,679

28,191

83,994

39,324

\$

434,557 \$ 16,922,798

Total

1,191,723

1,264,870

221,738

534,317

11,977

8,562,423

1,110,476

1,583,830

1,299,129

410,832

46,431

645,728

Epoch

1,107,191 \$

89,664 \$

\$

221,738

11,977

584,502

135,197

326,838

46,431

1,299,129

3,822,668

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
	Ш
8	
8 9	
9	
9 10	
9 10 11	

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2/2013 - 6/2019

TimeFrame

2/6/2013 - 1/7/2014

5/31/2017 - 10/31/2018

10/31/2018 - 1/30/2019

11/29/2013 - 5/2017

5/24/2017

11/15/2013 - 1/25/2017

12/29/2016 - 4/11/2017

3/1/2018 -8/31/2018

9/1/2018 - 5/30/2019

2/11/2019 - 6/30/2019

7/2/2019 - 7/17/2019

4/17/2015 - 6/29/2019

7/29/2019

C. Payment of Specified Victim Losses

Summary of Monies Received from On-line Processors

Bank Account

JPMC 6095

Comerica 7867

**Comerica 7867

Union Bank 7613

**Union Bank 7613

BOA 3976

US Bank 9123

JPMC 6590

***JPMC 6590

SDCCU 95

**SDCCU 95

**Citibank

** - From Epoch.com disbursements City National Bank 8795
*** - From Addl JPMC records received see detail on tab

**** - From ICF Tech. July 2019 Statement

Title 18, United States Code, Section 2259(c)(2) provides that the term "full amount of the victim's losses" includes any costs incurred, or that are reasonably projected to be incurred in the future, by the victim, as a proximate result of the offenses involving the victim, including: medical services relating to physical, psychiatric, or psychological care; physical and occupational therapy or rehabilitation; necessary transportation, temporary housing, and child care expenses; lost income; reasonable attorneys' fees, as well as other costs; and any other relevant losses incurred by the victim. 18 U.S.C. § 2259(c)(2).

Section 1593(b)(2) provides that the order of restitution shall be issued and enforced in accordance with Section 3664. Any dispute as to the proper amount or type of restitution shall be resolved by the Court under a preponderance of the evidence standard. The burden

 $\frac{1}{2}$

of demonstrating the amount of the loss sustained by a victim as a result of the offense shall be on the attorney for the Government. 18 U.S.C. § 3664(e).

The Government requests that the Court enter an order directing Defendant to pay restitution to the following victims, as specified below, under Title 18, United States Code, Section 2259(c)(2). The requests are supported by declarations from the victims and other evidence attached as Attachment B to this motion.

Victim	Total Restitution
	\$8,200
	\$37,562
	\$20,000
	\$200
	\$62,434.88
	\$41,644.47
	\$92,529
	\$127,610
	\$600
	\$14,080
	\$15,000
	\$27,840.04
	\$8,229
	\$6,176
	\$43,940.48
	\$15,000
	\$157.400
	\$52,472

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

\$316,640
\$2,523
\$4,975
\$6,582
\$2,938

D. Additional Claims

In addition to the restitution claims set forth above, victims who were plaintiffs in the related civil suit have submitted requests for restitution for amounts that the United States believes are already accounted for, or, in some cases not covered, by the applicable statutes. The claims fall into three categories: economic damages equal to the profits GDP received from the use of victims' videos; damages for emotional distress and punitive damages; and attorney's fees and costs related to the victims' civil lawsuit against the operators of GDP.

First, certain victims have requested \$46,628.70 each in economic damages "equal to the profits GirlsDoPorn received from the use of [the victims'] video[s]." The United States believes that these requests are already taken into consideration by 18 U.S.C. § 1593(b)(1) which provides that victims are entitled to "the greater of the gross income or value to the defendants of the victim's services." 18 U.S.C. § 1593(b)(1). Here, the United States has identified approximately \$17 million in gross income from the scheme, which the United States believes should be allocated to the 402 victims identified in Attachment A. \$16,922,798 divided by 402 victims comes out to \$42,097 per victim.

Second, victims have requested payments for noneconomic damages for emotional distress, ranging from \$250,000 to \$500,000 each, and punitive damages in the amount of

The amount requested was based upon an expert analysis of the profits generated per video that was published on GDP.

\$150,000 each, equal to the amounts awarded to the victims by Judge Enright in the civil suit. Restitution, however, is generally limited to the victim's *actual losses*. *United States v. Bussell*, 504 F.3d 956, 964 (9th Cir. 2007). The purpose of restitution is not to punish the defendant, but to make the victim whole again by restoring to him or her the value of the losses suffered as a result of the defendant's crime. *United States v. Hunter*, 618 F.3d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir. 2010). Restitution, unlike civil damages, cannot include intangible harms like pain and suffering or emotional distress. *United States v. Singh*, No. 1:15-CR-00212-AWI, 2016 WL 3407608, at *2 (E.D. Cal. June 20, 2016). Accordingly, noneconomic damages for emotional distress and punitive damages are not recoverable in the court's restitution order.

Third, victims have requested payments for attorneys' costs and fees associated with the civil lawsuit. The attorneys' costs and fees requested by the victims are contingent costs and fees associated with the civil lawsuit which are payable to the attorneys who represented the victims in the civil lawsuit. The attorneys' fees have not been incurred by the victims, rather the costs and fees are owed to the attorneys out of any funds that are recovered in the civil suit pursuant to an agreement between the victims and their attorneys. The United States recognizes that 18 U.S.C. § 2259(c)(2)(E) authorizes the court to award restitution for "reasonable attorneys' fees, as well as other costs incurred;" however subsection (c)(2) of the statute refers to costs that are "incurred" or "reasonably projected to be incurred in the future, by the victim "18 U.S.C. § 2259(c)(2). Applied here, the victims have not incurred, nor will they, incur any of the attorneys' fees or costs. Instead, the attorneys' fees and costs would be taken out of any funds recovered in the civil suit. As such, the United States does not believe that such attorneys' fees and costs are recoverable as restitution in this criminal matter.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Government request that the Court enter the following restitution orders.

A. Restitution Order as to the Rights to Videos

- Defendant Ruben Andre Garcia, aka "Jonathan," has no right to use, publish, or otherwise exploit GirlsDoPorn (GDP) or GirlsDoToys (GDT) images, likenesses, or videos;
- all purported model releases and other agreements between GirlsDoPorn (GDP) and/or GirlsDoToys (GDT) and its models purporting to give GDP and/or GDT the right to use, publish, or otherwise exploit its models' images, likenesses, or videos are void and unenforceable, having been procured by fraud;
- all transfers, licenses, or leases of the right to use, publish, or otherwise exploit the models' images, likenesses, or videos by GDP and/or GDT to any third parties are void;
- each model listed in Attachment A holds superior right, title, and interest in all images, likenesses, and videos depicting that model produced by GDP and/or GDT;
- each model listed in Attachment A shall have and recover all property that GDP and/or GDT took from them, including images, likenesses, videos, and/or copyrights.

B. Restitution Order for Distribution of Gross Income

Defendant Ruben Andre Garcia, aka "Jonathan," is ordered to pay the gross income, calculated as \$16,922,798, which will be paid to the victims identified in Attachment A.

C. Restitution Order for Specified Victim Losses

Defendant Ruben Andre Garcia, aka "Jonathan," is further ordered to pay financial restitution to the victims of this offense in the amounts set forth below:

Victim	Total Restitution
	\$8,200
	\$37,562
	\$20,000
	\$200
	\$62,434.88
	\$41,644.47
	\$92,529
	\$127,610
	\$600
	\$14,080
	\$15,000
	\$27,840.04
	\$8,229
	\$6,176
	\$43,940.48
	\$15,000
	\$157.400
	\$52,472

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
	7
1	8
	9
2	
2	
$2 \\ 2 \\ 2$	2 3 4

26

27

28

\$316,640
\$2,523
\$4,975
\$6,582
\$2,938

DATED: December 3, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

RANDY S. GROSSMAN Acting United States Attorney

s/ Alexandra Foster/Joseph Green

ALEXANDRA F. FOSTER JOSEPH S. GREEN Assistant United States Attorneys Attorneys for the United States