

## INDEX OF APPENDIX

1) Photocopies of En Banc and Third Circuit Court of Appeals

Judgments..... "A"

2) Copy of the Defense Appellate

Brief..... "B"

3) Copies of All Trial Transcripts....."C"

4) Copies of all jury communications ..... "D"

5) Copy of District Court of New Jersey Local Area Rule

79.1..... "E"

# APPENDIX A

**NOT PRECEDENTIAL**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 16-1422

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

MARIJAN CVJETICANIN,

Appellant

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of New Jersey  
(D.N.J. Crim. No. 3-14-cr-00274-001)  
District Judge: Hon. Michael A. Shipp

---

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
February 6, 2017

---

Before: MCKEE, COWEN, and FUENTES, *Circuit Judges*.

(Opinion filed: July 21, 2017)

---

OPINION\*

---

---

\* This disposition is not an opinion of the full court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

McKEE, *Circuit Judge*.

Marijan Cvjeticanin appeals the District Court's dismissal of his Motion to Dismiss the Superseding Indictment and the District Court's denial of his Motion for New Trial. Cvjeticanin also challenges the District Court's loss calculation and the amount of restitution he was ordered to pay. For the reasons that follow, we will affirm the District Court in its entirety.

I

**A. Denial of Cvjeticanin's Motion to Dismiss the Superseding Indictment and Motion for New Trial**

*1. Motion to Dismiss Superseding Indictment*

We exercise plenary review over legal conclusions in reviewing denial of a motion to dismiss an indictment, and we review factual findings for clear error.<sup>1</sup> A motion to dismiss an indictment is a "challenge to the sufficiency of the indictment," and must therefore "be decided based on the facts alleged within the four corners of the indictment, not the evidence outside of it."<sup>2</sup>

In this case, Cvjeticanin maintains that the conduct the Superseding Indictment described amounted to no more than a breach of contract between Automatic Data Processing and Broadridge, on the one hand, and Flowerson, on the other hand, and that the District Court therefore erred in not dismissing the Superseding Indictment because it criminalized a civil dispute.

---

<sup>1</sup> *United States v. Huet*, 665 F.3d 588, 594 (3d Cir. 2012).

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Vitillo*, 490 F.3d 314, 321 (3d Cir. 2007).

We disagree. The allegations in this Superseding Indictment were sufficient under Rule 7(c)(1) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to allege a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341.<sup>3</sup> The Superseding Indictment charged nine separate instances of mail fraud, each linked to the mailing of a false invoice billing either ADP or Broadridge for thousands of dollars of non-existent services. These allegations, if proven, “constitute a violation of the law that [Cvjeticanin] [was] charged with violating,”<sup>4</sup> and “could result in a guilty verdict.”<sup>5</sup> Indeed, the allegations in this case *did* result in a guilty verdict for Cvjeticanin. The Superseding Indictment never alleges a contract, or a breach thereof, and Cvjeticanin’s contention that the allegations amount to a civil contract dispute is meritless. His criminal conduct arose in the context of a contractual relationship (as is true of many mail frauds), but his attempt to redefine that criminal conduct into a mere breach of contract is a frivolous argument the District Court properly rejected.

## 2. Motion for New Trial

---

<sup>3</sup> Under Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(c)(1), “[t]he indictment . . . must be a plain, concise, and definite written statement of the essential facts constituting the offense charged.” “An indictment is generally deemed sufficient if it: 1) contains the elements of the offense intended to be charged, 2) sufficiently apprises the defendant of what he must be prepared to meet, and 3) allows the defendant to show with accuracy to what extent he may plead a former acquittal or conviction in the event of a subsequent prosecution.” *United States v. Rankin*, 870 F.2d 109, 112 (3d Cir. 1989) (internal quotation marks, citation, and brackets omitted).

<sup>4</sup> *United States v. Small*, 793 F.3d 350, 352 (3d Cir. 2015).

<sup>5</sup> *United States v. Bergrin*, 650 F.3d 257, 268 (3d Cir. 2011). *See also United States v. Panarella*, 277 F.3d 678, 685 (3d Cir. 2002) (explaining that an indictment does not state an offense sufficiently if the specific facts that it alleges “fall beyond the scope of the relevant criminal statute, as a matter of statutory interpretation”).

# 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.