

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :
 :
 v. :
 :
 WILLIESTEINA JACOBS, :
 :
 Defendant. :
-----X

MEMORANDUM & ORDER
14-CR-0160 (WFK)

WILLIAM F. KUNTZ, II, United States District Judge:

On July 26, 2016, a jury found Williesteina Atlanta Jacobs (“Defendant”) guilty on 21 of 27 counts of Aiding and Assisting in the Preparation of False Tax Returns, in violation of 26 U.S.C. § 7206(2). The Court now sentences her and provides a complete statement of reasons pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c)(2) of those factors set forth by Congress and the President and contained in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a). For the reasons discussed below, Defendant is hereby sentenced to 24 months of incarceration, one year of supervised release with special conditions that include payment restitution in the amount of \$31,188.00, and payment of a \$2,100.00 special assessment.

BACKGROUND

On March 21, 2014, the United States indicted Defendant on 27 counts of Aiding and Assisting in the Preparation of False Tax Returns. *See* Indictment at 3, ECF No. 1. On July 26, 2016, a jury entered a verdict finding Defendant guilty of Counts 1 through 8, 12 through 21, and 25 through 27; the jury found Defendant not guilty of Counts 9 through 11 and 22 through 24. *See* Jury Verdict at 1, ECF No. 60. The Court hereby sentences Defendant and sets forth its reasons for Defendant’s sentence using the rubric of the 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) factors pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c)(2).

DISCUSSION

I. Legal Standard

18 U.S.C. § 3553 outlines the procedures for imposing sentence in a criminal case. If and when a district court chooses to impose a sentence outside of the Sentencing Guidelines range, the court “shall state in open court the reasons for its imposition of the particular sentence, and . .

. the specific reason for the imposition of a sentence different from that described” in the Guidelines. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(c)(2). The court must also “state[] with specificity” its reasons for so departing “in a statement of reasons form.” *Id.*

“The sentencing court’s written statement of reasons shall be a simple, fact-specific statement explaining why the guidelines range did not account for a specific factor or factors under § 3553(a).” *United States v. Davis*, 08-CR-0332, 2010 WL 1221709, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2010) (Weinstein, J.). Section 3553(a) provides a set of seven factors for the Court to consider in determining what sentence to impose on a criminal defendant. The Court addresses each in turn.

II. Analysis

A. The Nature and Circumstances of the Offense and the History and Characteristics of the Defendant

The first § 3553(a) factor requires the Court to evaluate “the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant.” 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(1).

Defendant was born on April 26, 1961, in Harlem in New York, New York. Presentence Investigation Report (“PSR”) ¶ 46, ECF No. 63. Although Defendant does not know whether her parents were married, her father “was an active parent and supported the family” during his lifetime, but he passed away when Defendant was two years old. *Id.* Thereafter, Defendant, her three siblings, and her two half siblings were raised by their mother, who relied on public assistance, in a low-income household in Brooklyn, New York, and later in Bronx, New York. *Id.* ¶¶ 46, 49. While Defendant “reported [having] a good relationship and frequent contact with all of her siblings,” she also explained that, when she was young, they “always” told her “she was not loved” because she did not physically resemble them. *Id.* ¶ 49. Defendant’s sole

reported father figure was her mother's friend, William Hopkins, who resided in Defendant's home until she was twelve years old and who she described as "very supportive and someone who helped make [her and her family's] lives better." *Id.* ¶ 47. Mr. Hopkins passed away "from blunt head trauma" sustained in 1979. *Id.* Although she had several other romantic relationships, Defendant's mother currently lives alone in the Bronx. *Id.* ¶ 48. She is retired and suffers from diabetes as well as "other unspecified issues," and Defendant reported that she knows of Defendant's conviction, but "doesn't understand it." *Id.*

When she was 16 years old, Defendant entered into a relationship with Steven Strong. *Id.* ¶ 51. Although the two never married because Defendant "did not agree with Mr. Strong's lifestyle," which involved "hanging out in the streets," the two were in an on-and-off relationship for 12 to 14 years. *Id.* Defendant and Mr. Strong have three children: Princess Jacobs, a New York City Police Department officer; Precious Jacobs, a partner at a Chicago law firm; and Steven Strong, Jr., who is currently incarcerated for possessing a weapon. *Id.* While Defendant raised Princess and Precious and Steven resided with his father, Defendant was an active parent and provided financial support. *Id.*

At the age of 20, Defendant began a romantic relationship with Winston Moxey. *Id.* ¶ 52. Defendant and Mr. Moxey also have three children: Passionete Jacobs, who is employed by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, is a member of the United States Army Reserves, and is a plumber; Princeton Jacobs, who is a clerical worker for Defendant's tax preparation business; and Prince Jacobs, Princeton's twin brother, who works as a baggage handler at John F. Kennedy International Airport in Queens, New York. *Id.* Defendant and Mr. Moxey remained in a romantic relationship for 12 years, after which time he moved to Florida, but Mr. Moxey provided no financial support to Defendant, even when their children were young. *Id.*

Defendant has a disjointed educational history: She attended the High School of Fashion Industries in Manhattan, New York, but she dropped out during tenth grade because the other students' behavior—"cutting class[] and destroying property including windows"—made her feel unsafe. *Id.* ¶ 72. She reported that she got her GED, but this could not be confirmed in the New York State Education Department's database. *Id.* She enrolled in an accounting program at New York City College of Technology in Brooklyn, *id.* ¶ 70, and transferred to a similar program at York College in Queens, which provided her a more convenient commute, but left school after three years to raise her children, *id.* ¶¶ 69–70. In light of these limitations and in an effort to support her large family financially, Defendant began to perform tax preparation services in 1989. *Id.* ¶ 73. In 1992, she registered International Professional Business Services as a domestic business corporation and was its sole owner and operator. *Id.* She also performed tax preparation services through the entity Daughters of Jacobs Business Enterprise, Inc. *Id.* Both businesses are technically dissolved, but Defendant still actively performs tax preparation services. *Id.*

Beginning in or around 2010, the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") launched an investigation into Defendant's tax preparation activities. *Id.* ¶ 8. The investigation included identifying certain of Defendant's clients and interviewing them about their tax returns and experiences with Defendant. *Id.* ¶ 13. It also included an undercover operation in which an IRS agent, posing as a taxpayer, asked Defendant to prepare his 2009 tax return. *Id.* ¶ 18. The agent's tax return would have generated a tax liability if prepared correctly, but the tax return Defendant prepared indicated the agent was entitled to a tax refund. *Id.* This was because Defendant "falsified nearly \$12,000 in deductions that were not based on any information

provided to the defendant by the undercover agent,” and “fabricated a business loss of approximately \$580.” *Id.*

Based upon the information obtained from the investigation, the government indicted Defendant. Indictment ¶¶ 1–7. Because Defendant pleaded not guilty on all counts, the case proceeded to trial, where it was determined that the tax loss caused by the falsified returns charged in the Indictment was \$31,188.00. *See* PSR ¶¶ 1, 16. Trial testimony from several of Defendant’s clients whose returns were not charged in the Indictment established an additional tax loss of \$28,008.00. *Id.* ¶ 17. Furthermore, the IRS’s investigation established a tax loss from related conduct of \$148,670.00. *Id.* ¶ 18. In total, Defendant is responsible for \$207,866.00 in tax loss—an amount estimated to be “highly conservative,” as it is based on an analysis of about 120 of the at least 3,650 returns Defendant prepared in the relevant time period—that is, the 2007, 2008, and 2009 tax years. *Id.* ¶ 20. Defendant also owes the IRS approximately \$13,000.00 in unpaid personal income taxes. Addendum to PSR ¶ 78, ECF No. 69.

Defendant has been at liberty since her arrest and subsequent release on \$150,000.00 bond on March 25, 2014. PSR at 1. She has continued to prepare and file tax returns using her daughter Passionete’s Electronic Filing Identification Number (Defendant’s was revoked due to the 2010 investigation), conduct that is legal and is not precluded by the conditions of her supervised release. *Id.* ¶ 23. Indeed, the supervising Pretrial Services officer has advised that Defendant has complied with all Court-ordered conditions of release. *Id.* ¶ 2. Defendant experiences pain from knee surgery for a torn meniscus sustained in 2013, which she treats with various painkillers, including Ibuprofen. *Id.* ¶ 58. A psychiatric evaluation concluded Defendant has agoraphobia, Adjustment Disorder with depressed mood, and Personality Disorder with obsessive-compulsive features. *Id.* ¶ 64. Nevertheless, prior to and during her release,

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.