

JS-6

1 STEPHANIE YONEKURA
 Acting United States Attorney
 2 ROBERT E. DUGDALE
 Assistant United States Attorney
 3 Chief, Criminal Division
 STEVEN R. WELK
 4 Assistant United States Attorney
 Chief, Asset Forfeiture Section
 5 CHRISTEN A. SPROULE (California State Bar Pending)
 Assistant United States Attorney
 6 LUCAS E. ROWE (CBN: 298697)
 Special Assistant United States Attorney
 7 Asset Forfeiture Section
 California Bar No. Pending
 8 Federal Courthouse, 14th Floor
 312 North Spring Street
 9 Los Angeles, California 90012
 Telephone: (213) 894-4493
 10 Facsimile: (213) 894-7177
 E-mail: Christen.A.Sproule@usdoj.gov
 11 Lucas.Rowe@usdoj.gov

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SOUTHERN DIVISION

16 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

NO. SACV 13-907 DOC (JPRx)

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

JUDGMENT OF FORFEITURE

19 ONE 2006 LAMBORGHINI
 20 MURCIELAGO

21 Defendant.

22 _____
 23 NEXTGEAR CAPITAL, INC.,

24 Claimant.
 25

26
 27 //

28 //

1 A Court trial of this matter was held on May 26, 2015. The Court issued its Order
2 re Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Docket No. 75) on June 16, 2015. The
3 Court found that Plaintiff, United States of America, proved by a preponderance of the
4 evidence that the defendant, One 2006 Lamborghini Murcielago, is subject to forfeiture
5 pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 5317(c)(2) because it represents proceeds of, or is traceable to,
6 one or more violations of 31 U.S. C. § 5324. The Court further found that Claimant,
7 NextGear did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it was an innocent
8 owner of the defendant under 18 U.S.C. § 983(d), or establish any other defense to the
9 forfeiture.

10 //

11 //

12 //

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED THAT:

2 1. All right, title and interest in the defendant, One 2006 Lamborghini
3 Murcielago, is hereby forfeited to plaintiff United States of America and no other right,
4 title or interest shall exist therein. The government shall dispose of the defendant vehicle
5 according to law.

6 2. Claimant NextGear did not substantially prevail in this action within the
7 meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2465. This judgment shall constitute a certificate of reasonable
8 cause within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2465(a)(2).

9 3. There being no just reason for delay, the clerk is hereby directed to enter
10 this judgment, which constitutes a final judgment resolving this action as to all of the
11 parties hereto, and all other potential claimants.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 June 23, 2015

15 DATE

David O. Carter

HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

16 PRESENTED BY:

17 STEPHANIE YONEKURA

18 Acting United States Attorney

19 ROBERT E. DUGDALE

20 Assistant United States Attorney

21 Chief, Criminal Division

22 STEVEN R. WELK

23 Assistant United States Attorney

24 Chief, Asset Forfeiture Section

25 /s/ Lucas E. Rowe

26 CHRISTEN A. SPROULE

27 LUCAS E. ROWE

28 Assistant United States Attorneys

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA