

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED)
STATES VIRGIN ISLANDS)
)
 PLAINTIFF,)
)
 V.)
)
 JPMORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.)
)
 DEFENDANT.)

Case Number: 1:22-cv-10904-UA

ACTION FOR DAMAGES

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff Government of the United States Virgin Islands (“Government”) files this Complaint against JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. (“JP Morgan”) for violations of Trafficking Victims Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1591 to 1595, the Virgin Islands Criminally Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 14 V.I.C. §§ 600 to 614, and the Virgin Islands Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act, 12A V.I.C. §§ 301 to 336, and in support thereof alleges as follows:

PARTIES

1. The Attorney General of the United States Virgin Islands (hereinafter “Virgin Islands”) brings this *parens patriae* action on behalf of the Plaintiff, Government of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1595(d) and 3 V.I.C. § 114 and her statutory authority to enforce the laws of the Virgin Islands and protect public safety.

2. The Attorney General, pursuant to her authority to represent the Government of the United States Virgin Islands, also acts on behalf of, and with the lawfully delegated authority of, the Virgin Islands Department of Licensing and Consumer Affairs under 12 V.I.C. § 327 in regard to Count Four of the Government’s Complaint alleging violations of the Virgin Islands Consumer

Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act.

3. This action stems from an enforcement action the Government filed against the Estate of Jeffrey E. Epstein, the Co-Executors of the Estate, and various entities relating to Jeffrey Epstein (“Epstein”), under the Virgin Islands’ Criminally Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (“CICO Act”), *see Government of the U.S. Virgin Islands v. Indyke et al.*, Case No. ST-20-CV-14 (Super. Ct. V.I. Jan. 15, 2020). The Attorney General brings this action, after presenting her findings to JP Morgan in September 2022, in her ongoing effort to protect public safety and to hold accountable those who facilitated or participated in, directly or indirectly, the trafficking enterprise Epstein helmed. The investigation revealed that JP Morgan knowingly, negligently, and unlawfully provided and pulled the levers through which recruiters and victims were paid and was indispensable to the operation and concealment of the Epstein trafficking enterprise. Financial institutions can connect—or choke—human trafficking networks, and enforcement actions filed and injunctive relief obtained by attorneys general are essential to ensure that enterprises like Epstein’s cannot flourish in the future.

4. Defendant JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A. is an American multinational investment bank and financial services company headquartered in New York City and incorporated in Delaware.

5. At all relevant times, JP Morgan engaged in business in the Virgin Islands, including, but not limited to, the acts and practices described herein.

6. As described below, based on documents reviewed and interviews conducted by the Government, JP Morgan knowingly facilitated, sustained, and concealed the human trafficking network operated by Jeffrey Epstein from his home and base in the Virgin Islands, and financially benefitted from this participation, directly or indirectly, by failing to comply with federal banking

regulations. JP Morgan facilitated and concealed wire and cash transactions that raised suspicion of—and were in fact part of—a criminal enterprise whose currency was the sexual servitude of dozens of women and girls in and beyond the Virgin Islands. Human trafficking was the principal business of the accounts Epstein maintained at JP Morgan.

7. Upon information and belief, JP Morgan turned a blind eye to evidence of human trafficking over more than a decade because of Epstein’s own financial footprint, and because of the deals and clients that Epstein brought and promised to bring to the bank. These decisions were advocated and approved at the senior levels of JP Morgan, including by the former chief executive of its asset management division and investment bank, whose inappropriate relationship with Epstein should have been evident to the bank. Indeed, it was only after Epstein’s death that JP Morgan belatedly complied with federal banking regulations regarding Epstein’s accounts.

JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND RELATED CASE

8. This action is brought pursuant to and based on federal and Virgin Islands statutes, including the federal Trafficking Victims Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1591 to 1595 (“TVPA”), and the federal Bank Secrecy Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 5311 to 5336 (“BSA”).

9. This Court has federal question subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the Government’s TVPA and BSA-based causes of action arise under federal law.

10. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over the Government’s Virgin Islands law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because these claims are so related to those arising under or based on federal law as to form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

11. This Court is an “appropriate district court of the United States” in which for the Government to obtain appropriate relief under 18 U.S.C. § 1595(d) and venue is proper under 28

U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because Defendant maintains its principal place of business within this judicial district, so that this Court may exercise general personal jurisdiction over Defendant, and because many of the alleged acts and omissions of Defendant giving rise to the Government's claims took place within this judicial district, so that this Court may exercise specific personal jurisdiction over Defendant.

12. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 1.6(a), the undersigned believe that this action is related to *Doe I v. JP Morgan Chase & Co.*, No. 1:22-cv-10019 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 24, 2022), because both actions arise from a common nucleus of operative fact involving Defendant JP Morgan's alleged participation, directly or indirectly, in Epstein's sex-trafficking venture by facilitating payments to women and girls, channeling funds to Epstein to fund the operation, and concealing Epstein's criminal conduct by failing to comply with federal banking regulations.

BACKGROUND

I. JP Morgan's Federal and State Legal Requirements

13. JP Morgan is subject to federal laws, including the BSA and the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-56, 115 Stat. 272 ("USA PATRIOT Act").

14. Under both the BSA and USA PATRIOT Act, JP Morgan is required to implement adequate, risk-based anti-money laundering ("AML") policies and systems to detect and prevent money laundering or other use of the institution's services to facilitate criminal activities. This includes, but is not limited to, maintaining a due diligence program, filing suspicious activity reports ("SARs") when the financial institutions detect suspicious behavior and currency transaction reports ("CTRs") for currency transactions or series of currency transactions that exceed \$10,000 in a 24-hour period, preventing structuring or assistance with structuring of

transactions undertaken for the purpose of evading federal reporting requirements, and maintaining systems to prevent money laundering.

15. The FDIC and the other federal banking regulators, including the Federal Reserve Board and Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, formed an interagency organization known as Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (“FFIEC”).

16. To provide further guidance to banks on what BSA compliance requires, FFIEC published a Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination Manual (“BSA Manual”).

The BSA Manual explains that an effective SAR program is essential:

Suspicious activity reporting forms the cornerstone of the BSA reporting system. It is critical to the United States’ ability to utilize financial information to combat terrorism, terrorist financing, money laundering and other financial crimes. Examiners and banks should recognize that the quality of SAR content is critical to the adequacy and effectiveness of the suspicious activity reporting system.¹

17. Pursuant to the BSA Manual, “[p]roper monitoring and reporting processes are essential to ensuring that the bank has an adequate and effective BSA compliance program. Appropriate policies, procedures, and processes should be in place to monitor and identify unusual activity.”² When a bank detects suspicious activity, it is required to report that information within 30 days to the U.S. Department of the Treasury’s Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (“FinCEN”). The reporting requirement ensures that the government is able to monitor and act when alerted to potential illegal conduct.

18. Appendix F of the BSA Manual includes examples of suspicious transactions that may indicate money laundering, terrorist financing, or fraud, including:

¹ FFIEC Bank Secrecy Act/Anti-Money Laundering Examination Manual, Suspicious Activity Reporting at 1 (2014)
https://bsaaml.ffiec.gov/docs/manual/06_AssessingComplianceWithBSARegulatoryRequirements/04.pdf.

² *Id.* at 2.

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.