

1 CHRISTOPHER CHIOU
Acting United States Attorney
2 Nevada Bar No. 14853
NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON
3 Assistant United States Attorney
501 Las Vegas Blvd. S, Ste. 1100
4 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101
702-388-6336
5 Nicholas.dickinson@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for the United States

6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9 United States of America,
10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Jamal Rashid,
13 Defendant.

2:19-cr-00246-GMN-NJK

Government's Sentencing Memorandum

14
15 Certification: This memorandum is timely.

16 **I. Introduction**

17 From at least 2002 through 2014, defendant Jamal Rashid openly ran several
18 "escort" businesses in Las Vegas that were fronts for high-end prostitution agencies.
19 Defendant pandered hundreds of women over those years under two different business
20 models: "independent contractors" who paid the business a portion of what they earned
21 though prostitution and "priority girls" who essentially worked exclusively for defendant
22 and turned over nearly all of the proceeds from prostitution to defendant.

23

24

1 Defendant persuaded, induced, enticed, and caused numerous victims to engage in
2 prostitution, including approximately 35 Priority Girls. Defendant's criminal enterprise
3 earned him millions of dollars. The only way to provide meaningful deterrence and
4 commensurate punishment for defendant's actions is through a significant prison sentence.
5 Accordingly, the United States requests a sentence of 33 months' imprisonment consistent
6 with the Sentencing Guidelines and Section 3553(a) factors.

7 **II. Procedural Background.**

8 The FBI began investigating defendant in 2014. In September 2014, the FBI
9 executed federal search warrants at the defendant's business and home.

10 On October 29, 2019, the defendant waived indictment and pleaded guilty to a one
11 count information charging 18 U.S.C. 1952(a)(3), Use of an Interstate Facility in Aid of
12 Unlawful Activity, specifically, a prostitution business in violation of Nevada law.
13 Defendant and the government entered into a binding plea agreement. Under the terms of
14 the plea agreement, the parties are permitted to argue for a prison sentence between one
15 month and 33 months. In addition, if the Court sentences defendant to less than 12
16 months imprisonment, the defendant will agree to period of home confinement as a special
17 term of supervised release that combined with the term of imprisonment will total one year.

18 The parties also agreed that with acceptance of responsibility, the defendant's total
19 offence level would be at least 16. The government reserved the right to argue for an
20 upward departure under USSG 2G1.2, comment. (n.6.) based on the number of victims.

21 The Presentence Investigation Report ("PSR") determined that defendant's total
22 offence level with acceptance of responsibility is 16 and determined that defendant is in a
23 criminal history category of III. Thus, defendant's advisory guideline range is 27-33
24

1 months. Defendant's sentencing had been continued by stipulation eight times, primarily
2 because of the COVID pandemic.

3 **III. Factual Background¹**

4 Defendant began his prostitution enterprise in about 2002, and it became an
5 extensive, nationwide business in the mid-2000s. The enterprise's profitability and scope
6 peaked in 2014, after which the businesses were shut down because of the initiation of the
7 FBI's criminal investigation. The FBI interviewed approximately 40 women who worked
8 for defendant's business from 2000 to 2014, and approximately 55 other witnesses who had
9 knowledge of the enterprise. In addition, the FBI seized approximately 50,000 pages of
10 documents and numerous digital devices from defendant's house and businesses. In
11 addition, defendant's financial records, including banking and credit card statements show
12 that defendant ran a high-end prostitution business that transported women across the
13 United States and utilized the internet to post advertisements.

14 Defendant's employed hundreds of women as escorts. These escorts were hired as
15 independent contractors. In most instances, a woman would sign a model release form
16 related to their pictures used in defendants advertising and would sign a two-page
17 independent contractor agreement. The agreement called for the independent contractor to
18 pay the business 50% of their fee for each escort call. The agreement also falsely stated that
19 "The Company dose not participate in or benefit from any illegal sex-for-hire practices, and
20 will not solicit, schedule, or otherwise arrange appointments for the Contractor in which
21 payment has been offered in exchange for sexual favors."

22
23 ¹ The PSR describes many of the relevant facts in detail. The government agrees with those
24 facts.

1 Defendant's business model used what he called "Priority Girls." Defendant
2 personally persuaded, induced, enticed, and caused Priority Girls to engage in prostitution.
3 Unlike the other women, Priority Girls were required to give most of what they earned to
4 defendant. In exchange, defendant provided housing in one of several of his properties and
5 the use of a high-end vehicle. Priority Girls were given the best clients and it was common
6 for them to earn \$1,000 to \$10,000 per date. After a woman became a Priority Girl, she
7 quickly learned that defendant expected her to follow many rules. Most importantly, they
8 only were usually allowed to keep \$100 from each call with the rest going to defendant. But
9 there were other rules. For example, defendant required priority girls to text him when they
10 went anywhere, they were not allowed to date anyone, and defendant encouraged them to
11 get Rashid related tattoos to demonstrate their loyalty to him.

12 In addition, defendant would romance many of the Priority Girls, leading them to
13 believe they were the one who defendant would marry or advance their career in show
14 business. But at the end of the day defendant's promises were unfulfilled and the victims
15 realized defendant only cared about the money they earned him from prostituting
16 themselves.

17 The PSR details the statements of the seven victims who were part of the factual bias
18 of the plea agreement. These victims also discuss defendant's threats of surveillance and
19 violence, verbal abuse, and actual violence. The other approximately 28 other victims who
20 were Priority Girls, all corroborate the defendant's rules and threats and some recount
21 violence. Many of the victims stated that defendant assigned them a "code," designated by
22 an amount of cents that they were to use when they made their money deposits, or "drops"
23 for him. The women say defendant used these codes to determine who was making the
24

1 most money for him, and also as a way to pit the girls against each other in a competition to
2 see who could be the most competitive and please him the most. One reoccurring theme
3 was that the victims knew that if they stopped being a Priority Girl, and stop working for
4 defendant, they would immediately have nowhere to live and little to no savings.

5 In 2010, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police department executed search warrants at
6 defendants' business, residence, and some of his apartments where priority girls lived.
7 Defendant was not deterred and continued his illegal business. No charges were ever
8 brought. It was not until 2014, after the FBI executed search warrants and began to
9 interview victims, that defendant's business was halted.

10 **IV. Sentencing Argument**

11 As the Court is aware, determining an appropriate sentence begins with the
12 Sentencing Guidelines range, which serves as "the starting point and the initial
13 benchmark" for the court to consider. *United States v. Carty*, 520 F.3d 984, 991 (9th Cir.
14 2008 (en banc)). From this starting point, it is then appropriate to consider the factors set
15 forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a) to arrive at an individualized sentence. These factors include
16 the nature and circumstances of the offense, the important need for general deterrence, the
17 need to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide
18 just punishment. 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a).

19 The government recommends a 33-month sentence, in accordance with the plea
20 agreement. The is also within the advisory guideline range as determined by the PSR and
21 the government.

22 The nature and circumstances of this offense reflect the defendant's concerted effort
23
24

1 over at least a twelve-year period to operate an illegal prostitution business. Defendant's
2 criminal conduct could hardly have been more pervasive and systematic. Defendant's
3 conduct was not the result of a single poor decision or regrettable judgment. Rather, his
4 entire livelihood for more than a decade depended on pandering women every day.
5 Defendant's illegal enterprise was enormous and far reaching. Defendant spent millions of
6 dollars on on-line advertising to generate business.

7 The brazen nature of the defendant's criminal conduct is highlighted by the fact that
8 he continued to operate his prostitution business after LVMPD executed searched warrants
9 on his business and residences. Defendant obviously believed he was above the law and
10 continued operate and grow his illegal enterprise.

11 Any sentence below the low-end of the Sentencing Guidelines calculation would
12 not reflect just punishment or necessary deterrence for a defendant who engaged in a
13 extensive criminal scheme to enrich himself.

14 More importantly, once the Court factors in the harm defendant caused his victims,
15 a 33-month sentence become more than reasonable. As defendant admitted in his plea
16 agreement, he persuaded, induced, enticed, and caused numerous victims to engage in
17 prostitution. Defendant manipulated his victims into becoming a Priority Girls and then
18 imposed rules, threats, and violence, all while taking most of the prostitution earnings for
19 himself.

20 The harm to the victims is not adequately reflected in the Guidelines calculation,
21 and a below-Guidelines sentence would not reflect defendant's cavalier attitude toward the
22 harm he caused his victims. Under USSG § 2G1.2, comment (n.6.), "if the offence
23 involved more than ten victims, an upward departure may be warranted." Although a
24

1 departure is not needed for a 33-month sentence, the Court should consider the large
2 number of women that defendant victimized when fashioning an appropriate sentence.

3 Finally, the government respectfully asks the Court the accept the binding plea
4 agreement. The investigation into defendant's illegal conduct was thorough but took
5 significant time. In addition, because of COVID, the sentencing has been continued a
6 significant time. Thus, many of the victims do not feel they have closure on this matter.
7 The government believes the binding plea is a proper resolution of the case and the parties
8 worked diligently in reaching the proposed resolution.

9 **V. Conclusion**

10 Based on the above, this Court should sentence defendant to 33 months in prison
11 and three years' supervised release.

12 Respectfully submitted this 6th day of May, 2021.

13
14 CHRISTOPHER CHIOU
Acting United States Attorney

15 *s/ Nicholas D. Dickinson*
16 NICHOLAS D. DICKINSON
Assistant United States Attorney