

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIALED

SAN JOSE DIVISION

JUN 14 2018 LERK US DISTRICT COUR HERN DISTRICT COUR SAN OF COUR

NORT

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

VS.

ELIZABETH A. HOLMES & RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI

INDICTMENT

against Theranos Investors

18 U.S.C. § 1343 – Wire Fraud

18 U.S.C. § 1343 - Wire Fraud

against Doctors and Theranos Patients

COUNT 1:

COUNT 2:

COUNTS 3-8:

COUNTS 9-11:

A true bill.

Foreperson

une Filed in open court this day of A.D. 201_ United States Magistrate Judge

18 U.S.C. § 1349 – Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud

18 U.S.C. § 1349 – Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud

DUCULAN Bail. \$ No bail and warran 141114

1 L	.:	Case 5:18-cr-00258-LHK Docume	nt 1 Filed 06/14/18 Page 2 of 14		
	1	ALEX G. TSE (CABN 152348) Acting United States Attorney	FIL		
	2	Acting Onited States Attorney	FILED		
	3		JUN 1 4 2018		
	4		NO CLERK USAN Y. SOONO		
	5	THE DUCE	WOHTHERN DISTRICT COURT SAN JOSE		
	6	State DI UI			
	7	U count			
	8				
	9	UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT		
*	10	NORTHERN DIST	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
		SAN JC	SE DIVISION		
	11	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 10	0258-M NC		
	12				
	13	Plaintiff,	$\frac{\text{VIOLATIONS}}{10 \text{ MOLATIONS}}$		
	14		18 U.S.C. § 1349 – Conspiracy; 18 U.S.C. § 1343 – Wire Fraud; 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C.		
	15	ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,	\$ 2461(c) - Forfeiture		
	16	Defendants.	SAN JOSE VENUE		
	17				
	18				
	19	<u>INDI</u>	<u>CTMENT</u>		
	20	The Grand Jury charges that, at all relevant times	:		
	21	Introduct	ory Allegations		
	22	1. The defendant Elizabeth A. Holmes ("HOLMES") resided in Los Altos Hills, California,			
	23	and owned and operated a health care and life sci	ences company called Theranos, Inc. ("Theranos" or		
	24	"Company"). HOLMES founded Theranos in 2003, and served in the role of Chief Executive Officer			
	25	from 2003 through the present.			
	26	2. The defendant Ramesh "Sunny" Balwani ("BALWANI") resided in Atherton, California,			
	27	and was employed by Theranos from September	2009 through 2016. BALWANI served in various roles		
	28	at Theranos: as a member of its Board of Directo	rs, as its President, and as its Chief Operating Officer.		
		INDICTMENT			

3. Theranos was a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its
 principal place of business in Palo Alto, California. Theranos opened and maintained a corporate bank
 account in Palo Alto, California at Comerica Bank. Comerica Bank is headquartered in Dallas, Texas.
 When Theranos solicited and received financial investments from investors, the money was deposited
 into its Comerica Bank account.

The Business of Theranos

7 4. Theranos was a private health care and life sciences company. Its stated mission was to
8 revolutionize medical laboratory testing through allegedly innovative methods for drawing blood, testing
9 blood, and interpreting the resulting patient data—all for the purpose of improving outcomes and
10 lowering health care costs.

During its first ten years, from approximately 2003 to approximately 2013, Theranos 11 5. operated in what HOLMES called "stealth mode," with little public attention. While operating in 12 "stealth mode," Theranos pursued the development of proprietary technology that could run clinical tests 13 using only tiny drops of blood instead of the vials of blood typically drawn from an arm vein for 14 15 traditional analysis. Theranos also worked to develop a method for drawing only a few drops of capillary blood from a patient's finger using a small lancet, and collecting and storing that blood in a 16 proprietary device called the "nanotainer." Theranos's stated goal was to produce a second proprietary 17 device that could quickly and accurately analyze blood samples collected in nanotainers. Theranos 18 referred to these devices using several terms, including "TSPU" (or "Theranos Sample Processing 19 20 Unit"), "Edison," and "miniLab."

In or around 2013, Theranos began to publicize its technological advances. According to 6. 21 Theranos, its proprietary methods and technologies carried several advantages over conventional blood 22 testing. For example, Theranos claimed that its laboratory infrastructure yielded test results in less time 23 24 than conventional labs—requiring hours instead of days. Theranos claimed that its proprietary technology and methods would minimize the risk of human error and generate results with the highest 25 accuracy. According to Theranos, the small blood sample size required for Theranos's proprietary tests, 26 and its method of collecting blood by finger stick, would also benefit elderly individuals with collapsed 27 28 veins, individuals who required frequent blood tests due to chronic health conditions, and any individual

INDICTMENT

6

who feared needles. In addition, Theranos claimed that its blood tests provided substantial cost savings,
 advertising that it billed all of the tests on the Medicare Clinical Laboratory Fee Schedule at rates 50%
 or more below the published reimbursement rate.

7. Prior to its commercial launch, HOLMES heavily promoted Theranos's supposed 4 5 technological and operational capabilities. In a September 2013 press release, Theranos claimed that it had "eliminat[ed] the need for larger needles and numerous vials of blood" by relying instead on 6 7 samples "taken from a tiny finger stick or a micro sample taken from traditional methods." In another press release, dated November 13, 2013, Theranos touted its use of "blood sample[s] as small as a few 8 drops—1/1000th the size of a typical blood draw." In that same statement, the Company again declared 9 10 that it had "eliminate[ed] the need for large needles and numerous vials of blood typically required for diagnostic lab testing." 11

8. In addition to directing the actions of the Company, HOLMES also made statements to
 the media advertising the capabilities of Theranos's technology. In an interview for a *Wall Street Journal* article published on September 9, 2013, HOLMES said that Theranos could "run any
 combination of tests, including sets of follow-on tests" at once, very quickly, all from a single small
 blood sample.

9. Theranos also used its website to increase awareness of its technology. On its website,
 Theranos displayed a nanotainer of blood balanced on a fingertip along with the slogan, "one tiny drop
 changes everything." The website also assured visitors that "for the first time," Theranos's laboratory
 could perform tests "quickly and accurately on samples as small as a single drop."

21

Theranos's Partnership with Walgreens

10. As part of its commercial launch, Theranos pursued a partnership with national pharmacy
chain Walgreens. On September 9, 2013, Theranos announced that it would be rolling out Theranos
"Wellness Centers" inside Walgreens retail locations. In a press release on that date, Theranos
promoted its testing services by stating that "consumers can now complete any clinician-directed lab test
with as little as a few drops of blood and results available in a matter of hours." Theranos offered tests
to the public beginning in late 2013 through its Wellness Centers located in Walgreens stores in Palo
Alto, California as well as in Phoenix, Arizona and surrounding areas.

INDICTMENT

The Scheme to Defraud Investors

11. From a time unknown but no later than 2013 through 2015, HOLMES and BALWANI,
 and others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, through their company, Theranos, engaged in a
 scheme, plan, and artifice to defraud investors as to a material matter, and to obtain money and property
 by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, and promises, by making
 materially false and misleading statements, and failing to disclose material facts with a duty to disclose.

Particular 12. Beginning in approximately 2013, HOLMES and BALWANI made materially false and
misleading statements to investors and failed to disclose material facts, using, among other things: (1)
false and misleading written and verbal communications; (2) marketing materials containing false and
misleading statements; (3) false and misleading financial statements, models, and other information; and
(4) false and misleading statements to the media. HOLMES and BALWANI:

(A) represented to investors that, at the time the statement was made, Theranos's proprietary analyzer—the TSPU, Edison, or miniLab—was presently capable of accomplishing certain tasks, such as performing the full range of clinical tests using small blood samples drawn from a finger stick and producing results that were more accurate and reliable than those yielded by conventional methods—all at a faster speed than previously possible; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos's proprietary analyzer had accuracy and reliability problems, performed a limited number of tests, was slower than some competing devices, and could not compete with larger, conventional machines in high-throughput, or the simultaneous testing of blood from many patients, applications;

(B) represented to investors that Theranos was presently a financially strong and stable company, including that Theranos would generate over \$100 million in revenues and break even in 2014, and that Theranos expected to generate approximately \$1 billion in revenues in 2015; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos had and would generate only modest revenues, roughly a few hundred thousand dollars or so, in 2014 and 2015;

(C) deceived investors through misleading technology demonstrations intended to cause potential investors to believe that blood tests were being conducted on Theranos's proprietary analyzer; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos's proprietary analyzer

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

was running a "null protocol" during the demonstration to make the analyzer appear to be operating, but was not testing the potential investor's blood, and yet failed to disclose that fact;

(D) represented to investors that Theranos presently had an expanding partnership with Walgreens, that is, Theranos would soon dramatically increase the number of Wellness Centers within Walgreens stores; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew, by late 2014, that Theranos's retail Walgreens rollout had stalled because of several issues, including that Walgreens's executives had concerns with Theranos's performance;

(E) represented to investors that Theranos presently had a profitable and revenuegenerating business relationship with the United States Department of Defense, and that Theranos's technology had deployed to the battlefield; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos had limited revenue from military contracts and its technology was not deployed in the battlefield;

(F) represented to investors that Theranos did not need the Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") to approve its proprietary analyzer and tests, but instead that Theranos was applying for FDA approval voluntarily because it was the "gold standard"; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that by late 2013 and throughout 2014, the FDA was requiring Theranos to apply for clearance or approval for its analyzer and tests;

(G) represented to investors that Theranos conducted its patients' tests using Theranosmanufactured analyzers; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos purchased and used for patient testing third party, commercially-available analyzers;

(H) represented to investors that Theranos's technology had been examined, used, and validated by several national or multinational pharmaceutical companies and research institutions; when, in truth, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that these pharmaceutical companies and research institutions had not examined, used, or validated Theranos's technology; and

(I) represented to members of the media for publication many of the false and misleading statements described above within paragraph 12(A) - 12(H), and shared the resulting articles

.:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

with potential investors both directly and via the Theranos website, knowing their statements to members of the media were false and misleading.

3 13. After receiving false and misleading statements, misrepresentations, and omissions from HOLMES and BALWANI, persons known to the Grand Jury as Investors 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 initiated 4 electronic wire transfers for the purpose of investing money in Theranos. These wires, specifically 5 alleged in paragraph 24 of this Indictment, used a domestic electronic funds transfer system known as 6 the Fedwire system, which is owned and operated by the United States Federal Reserve System. All 7 8 Fedwire wire transfers alleged in this Indictment were electronically routed through Fedwire centers in 9 East Rutherford, New Jersey and/or Dallas, Texas and into Theranos's bank account in the Northern District of California. All of the wire transfers alleged in this Indictment travelled between one state and 10 another state.

The Scheme to Defraud Doctors and Patients

13 14. Between approximately 2013 and 2016, HOLMES and BALWANI, through advertisements and solicitations, encouraged and induced doctors and patients to use Theranos's blood 14 15 testing laboratory services.

16 15. HOLMES and BALWANI devised a scheme to defraud doctors and patients, through 17 advertisements and marketing materials, through explicit and implicit claims concerning Theranos's ability to provide accurate, fast, reliable, and cheap blood tests and test results, and through omissions 18 concerning the limits of and problems with Theranos's technologies. Based on these representations, 19 20 many hundreds of patients paid, or caused their medical insurance companies to pay, Theranos, or 21 Walgreens acting on behalf of Theranos, for blood tests and test results, sometimes following referrals 22 from their defrauded doctors.

23 16. Despite representing to doctors and patients that Theranos could provide accurate, fast, 24 reliable, and cheap blood tests and test results, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos's 25 technology was, in fact, not capable of consistently producing accurate and reliable results. In particular, HOLMES and BALWANI knew that Theranos was not capable of consistently producing 26 27 accurate and reliable results for certain blood tests, including but not limited to calcium, chloride, 28 potassium, bicarbonate, HIV, Hba1C, hCG, and sodium.

INDICTMENT

• !

1

2

11

12

1 17. Despite their knowledge of Theranos's accuracy and reliability problems, HOLMES and
 2 BALWANI used interstate electronic wires to purchase advertisements intended to induce individuals to
 3 purchase Theranos blood tests at Walgreens stores in California and Arizona. Through these
 4 advertisements, HOLMES and BALWANI explicitly represented to individuals that Theranos's blood
 5 tests were cheaper than blood tests from conventional laboratories to induce individuals to purchase
 6 Theranos's blood tests. HOLMES and BALWANI held Theranos's blood tests out to individuals as
 7 accurate and reliable. HOLMES and BALWANI:

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

(A) transmitted, caused to be transmitted, or otherwise delivered to doctors and patients,
 including in the form of marketing materials and advertisements, materially false and misleading
 information concerning the accuracy and reliability of Theranos's blood testing services;

(B) posted on the Theranos website, or otherwise represented to a broad audience including doctors and patients, materially false and misleading information concerning the accuracy and reliability of Theranos's blood testing services;

(C) transmitted, caused to be transmitted, or otherwise delivered to doctors and patients
 Theranos blood test results where HOLMES and BALWANI knew that the tests performed on
 Theranos technology contained or were likely to contain:

17 18

19

20

(1) inaccurate and unreliable results;

- (2) improperly adjusted reference ranges;
- (3) improperly removed "critical" results; and
- (4) results generated from improperly validated assays.

18. Knowing that the accuracy and reliability of Theranos test results was questionable and
suspect, HOLMES and BALWANI oversaw the electronic wiring of test results to patients, including
persons known to the Grand Jury as Patients 1 and 2 in paragraph 26 of this Indictment. These wires,
specifically, the wires alleged in paragraph 26 of this indictment, travelled between one state and
another.

26 <u>COUNT ONE</u>: 18 U.S.C. § 1349 (Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud against Theranos Investors)
 27 19. Paragraphs 1 through 18 are realleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

20. From a time unknown but no later than approximately 2013 through approximately 2015,
 within the Northern District of California, and elsewhere, the defendants,

ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,

and others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, did knowingly and intentionally conspire and agree
together and with each other to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section
1343, by devising a scheme and artifice to defraud as to a material matter and to obtain money by means
of materially false and fraudulent representations, specifically by soliciting investments through making
the false and fraudulent representations as set forth in this Indictment.

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

11 <u>COUNT TWO</u>: 18 U.S.C. § 1349 (Conspiracy to Commit Wire Fraud against Doctors and Theranos Patients)
 12

21. Paragraphs 1 through 18 are realleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

14 22. From in or about 2013 through 2016, within the Northern District of California, and
15 elsewhere, the defendants,

ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,

and others known and unknown to the Grand Jury, did knowingly and intentionally conspire and agree
together and with each other to commit wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section
1343, by devising a scheme and artifice to defraud as to a material matter and to obtain money by means
of materially false and fraudulent representations, specifically by soliciting, encouraging, or otherwise
inducing doctors to refer and patients to pay for and use its laboratory and blood testing services under
the false and fraudulent pretense that Theranos technology produced reliable and accurate blood test
results.

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

26 COUNTS THREE THROUGH EIGHT: 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Wire Fraud)

23. Paragraphs 1 through 22 are realleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

28

27

25

۰.

3

4

10

13

16

24. On or about the dates set forth below, within the Northern District of California, and
 elsewhere, the defendants,

ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,

for the purpose of executing the material scheme and artifice to defraud investors, and for obtaining
money and property from investors by means of materially false and fraudulent pretenses,
representations, promises, and material omissions with a duty to disclose, did knowingly transmit and
cause to be transmitted by means of wire communication in interstate commerce certain writings, signs,
signals, and pictures, that is, electronic funds transfers and payments from investor bank accounts to
Theranos, as further set forth below:

12	COUNT	DATE	ITEM WIRED	WIRED FROM	WIRED TO
13	3	12/30/2013	\$99,990	Investor #1's	Theranos's
14				Charles	Comerica Bank
15				Schwab/Wells Fargo Bank account	account
16	4	12/31/2013	\$5,349,900	Investor #2's	Theranos's
17				Pacific Western Bank account	Comerica Bank account
18 19	5	12/31/2013	\$4,875,000	Investor #2's Texas Capital Bank account	Theranos's Comerica Bank account
20	6	2/6/2014	\$38,336,632	Investor #3's Citibank account	Theranos's Comerica Bank account
21	7	10/31/2014	\$99,999,984	Investor #4's	Theranos's
22				Northern Chicago Bank account	Comerica Bank account
23	8	10/31/2014	\$5,999,997	Investor #5's JP	Theranos's
24				Morgan Chase account	Comerica Bank account

25

3

4

11

Each in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

COUNTS NINE THROUGH ELEVEN: 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Wire Fraud)

27

26

25. Paragraphs 1 through 24 are realleged and incorporated as if fully set forth herein.

26. On or about the dates set forth below, within the Northern District of California, and
 elsewhere, the defendants,

ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,

for the purpose of executing the material scheme and artifice to defraud doctors and patients, and for
obtaining money and property from patients, doctors, and insurance companies by means of materially
false and fraudulent pretenses, representations, promises, and material omissions with a duty to disclose,
did knowingly transmit and cause to be transmitted by means of wire communication in interstate
commerce certain writings, signs, signals, and pictures, that is, laboratory and blood test results and
payments for the purchase of advertisements soliciting patients and doctors for its laboratory business,
as further set forth below, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343:

12	COUNT	DATE	WIRED FROM	WIRED TO	ITEM WIRED
13	9	09/19/2014	California	Arizona	Patient #1's
14					laboratory blood test results
15	10	11/25/2014	California	Arizona	Patient #2's
16					laboratory blood test results
17	11	8/3/2015	Theranos's Wells Fargo Bank	Horizon Media, Inc.'s J.P. Morgan	Electronic Funds Transfer in the
18			account in California	Chase Bank account in New	amount of \$1,126,661.00 to
19			Cumonina	York	purchase
20					advertisements for Theranos
21					Wellness Centers

Each in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.

23

3

4

24

22

FORFEITURE ALLEGATION: 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) (Forfeiture of Wire Fraud Proceeds)

25 27. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 26 of this Indictment are realleged and by this
26 reference fully incorporated herein for the purposes of alleging forfeiture pursuant to the provisions of
27 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C) and 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c).

28

28.

Upon a conviction for the offense alleged in Counts One through Eleven, the defendants,

.: |

1					
2	ELIZABETH A. HOLMES and RAMESH "SUNNY" BALWANI,				
3	shall forfeit to the United States all property, constituting and derived from proceeds traceable to said				
4	offenses, including but not limited to the following property:				
5	(a) a sum of money equal to the amount of proceeds obtained as a result of the offense.				
6	If any of said property, as a result of any act or omission of the defendant-				
7	(a) cannot be located upon the exercise of due diligence;				
8	(b) has been transferred or sold to or deposited with, a third person;				
9	(c) has been placed beyond the jurisdiction of the Court;				
10	(d) has been substantially diminished in value; or				
11	(e) has been commingled with other property which cannot be subdivided without difficulty;				
12	Any and all interest defendant has in any other property (not to exceed the value of the above forfeitable				
13 14	property), shall be forfeited to the United States pursuant to Title 21, United States Code, Section				
14	853(p), as incorporated by Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(b)(1).				
16	The forfeiture is authorized by Title 18, United States Code, Section 981(a)(1)(C) and Title 28,				
17	United States Code, Section 2461(c); Title 21, United States Code, Section 853(p) as incorporated by				
18	Title 18, United States Code, Section 982(b)(1); and the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 32.2.				
19	DATED: 6-14-18 A TRUE BILL				
20	Ch Oako				
21	FOREPERSON				
22	ALEX G. TSE Acting United States Attorney				
23	Q1 Walling				
24	BARBARA J. VALLIERE				
25	Chief, Criminal Division				
26	(Approved as to form:				
27	AUSA JEFFREY SCHENK AUSA ROBERT LEACH				
28	AUSA JOHN BOSTIC				
	INDICTMENT 11				

AO 257 (Rev. 6/78)

DEFENDANT INFORMATION RELATIVE TO A CRIMINAL ACTION - IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT					
	Name of District Court, and/or Judge/Magistrate Location				
18 U.S.C. § 1349 (Conspiracy);	SANJOSE DIVISION				
18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Wire Fraud); 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) (Forfeiture) Minor					
Misda	e-				
PENALTY: All per count:	DISTRICT COURT NUMBER				
20 years imprisonment \$250,000 fine	DOFOLK				
3 years supervised release \$100 special assessment					
	DEFENDANT				
PROCEEDING	IS NOT IN CUSTODY Has not been arrested, pending outcome this proceeding.				
Name of Complaintant Agency, or Person (& Title, if any)	1) X If not detained give date any prior summons was served on above chárges				
FBI, USPS, FDA	- No. Cu - I				
give name of court	2) Is a Fugitive				
	3) Is on Bail or Release from (show District)				
this person/proceeding is transferred from another district					
☐ per (circle one) FRCrp 20, 21, or 40. Show District					
	4) 🗌 On this charge				
this is a reprosecution of					
charges previously dismissed which were dismissed on motion	5) On another conviction				
Of:	6) Awaiting trial on other charges				
	If answer to (6) is "Yes", show name of institution				
this prosecution relates to a ☐ pending case involving this same	Has detainer Yes } If "Yes"				
defendant MAGISTRATE					
prior proceedings or appearance(s)	DATE OF Month/Day/Year				
before U.S. Magistrate regarding this defendant were recorded under	Or if Arresting Agency & Warrant were not				
Name and Office of Person	DATE TRANSFERRED Month/Day/Year				
Furnishing Information on this form Alex G. Tse	TO U.S. CUSTODY				
🗙 U.S. Attorney 🔲 Other U.S. Agency					
Name of Assistant U.S. SCHENK/BOSTIC/LEACH	This report amends AO 257 previously submitted				
PROCESS: ADDITIONAL INF	ORMATION OR COMMENTS				
SUMMONS NO PROCESS* WARRANT	Bail Amount: No Bail				
If Summons, complete following:	* Where defendant previously apprehended on complaint, no new summons or				
Defendant Address:	warrant needed, since Magistrate has scheduled arraignment				
	Date/Time: Before Judge:				
Comments:	AI				

AO 257 (Rev. 6/78)

DEFENDANT INFORMATION RELATIVE TO A CRIMINAL ACTION - IN U.S. DISTRICT COURT				
	Name of District Court, and/or Judge/Magistrate Location			
OFFENSE CHARGED				
18 U.S.C. § 1349 (Conspiracy);	SAN JOSE DIVISION			
18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Wire Fraud); 18 U.S.C. § 981(a)(1)(C), 28 U.S.C. § 2461(c) (Forfeiture) Minor	DEFENDANT - U.S			
Misde- meand				
× Felony	DISTRICT COURT NUMBER			
PENALTY: All per count: 20 years imprisonment \$250,000 fine 3 years supervised release \$100 special assessment	00258 LHK			
PROCEEDING	IS NOT IN CUSTODY			
Name of Complaintant Agency, or Person (& Title, if any)	Has not been arrested, pending outcome this proceeding. 1) X If not detained give date any prior			
FBI, USPS, FDA	summons was served on above charges			
person is awaiting trial in another Federal or State Court, give name of court	2) Is a Fugitive			
	3) Is on Bail or Release from (show District)			
this person/proceeding is transferred from another district				
└ per (circle one) FRCrp 20, 21, or 40. Show District	IS IN CUSTODY			
	4) On this charge			
this is a reprosecution of charges previously dismissed which were dismissed on motion of: U.S. ATTORNEY DEFENSE	5) On another conviction 6) Awaiting trial on other charges			
	If answer to (6) is "Yes", show name of institution			
this prosecution relates to a pending case involving this same defendant MAGISTRATE CASE NO.	Has detainer Yes } If "Yes" give date filed?			
prior proceedings or appearance(s) before U.S. Magistrate regarding this	ARREST Month/Day/Year			
defendant were recorded under	Or if Arresting Agency & Warrant were not			
Name and Office of Person Furnishing Information on this form Alex G. Tse	DATE TRANSFERRED Month/Day/Year			
🕱 U.S. Attorney 📋 Other U.S. Agency				
Name of Assistant U.S. SCHENK/BOSTIC/LEACH	This report amends AO 257 previously submitted			
ADDITIONAL INFO	DRMATION OR COMMENTS			
PROCESS:	Bail Amount: No Bail			
If Summons, complete following:				
Arraignment I Initial Appearance	* Where defendant previously apprehended on complaint, no new summons or warrant needed, since Magistrate has scheduled arraignment			
	Date/Time: Before Judge:			
Comments:	-1			

.

Case 5:18-cr-00258-LHK Document 1-1 Filed 06/14/18 Page 1 of 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CRIMINAL COVER SHEET

<u>Instructions</u>: Effective November 1, 2016, this Criminal Cover Sheet must be completed and submitted, along with the Defendant Information Form, for each new criminal case.

CASE NAME:		CASE NUMBER:	
USA V. ELIZABETH A. HOLMES & RAMESH "	SUNNY" BALWAI		
Is This Case Under Seal?	1 100 1	NO 0258LHK	NC
Total Number of Defendants:	1	2-7 ✓ 8 or more	
Does this case involve ONLY charges under 8 U.S.C. § 1325 and/or 1326?	Yes	No 🗸	
Venue (Per Crim. L.R. 18-1):	SF	OAK SJ ✓	
Is this a potential high-cost case?	Yes	No 🗸	
Is any defendant charged with a death-penalty-eligible crime?	Yes	No 🗸	
Is this a RICO Act gang case?	Yes	No 🗸	
Assigned AUSA (Lead Attorney): Jeff Schenk		Date Submitted: June 14, 2018	

Comments:

RESET FORM

JUN 7 A 2018