

State of Minnesota
County of Hennepin

District Court
4th Judicial District

Prosecutor File No.
Court File No.

16A14192

State of Minnesota,

Plaintiff,

vs.

ANTHONY JAMES HANSON DOB: 08/13/1971

10633 SHADY OAK CT N
Champlin, MN 55316

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Summons

The Complainant submits this complaint to the Court and states that there is probable cause to believe Defendant committed the following offense(s):

COUNT I

Charge: Aggravated Forgery-Legal Rights Created/Terminated

Minnesota Statute: 609.625.1(1), with reference to: 609.05.1, 609.05.2

Maximum Sentence: 10 YEARS AND/OR \$20,000

Offense Level: Felony

Offense Date (on or about): 05/26/2016

Control #(ICR#): 16000981

Charge Description: That on or about 5/26/2016 to 5/29/2016, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, Defendant ANTHONY JAMES HANSON, acting alone or intentionally aiding, advising, hiring, counseling or conspiring with another, with intent to defraud, falsely made or altered a writing so that it purports to have been made with different provisions, and the writing, when genuine, creates, terminates, or transfers legal rights, privileges, or obligations, or the writing is normally relied upon as evidence of debt or property rights.

COUNT II

Charge: Aggravated Forgery-Utter or Possess Writing/Object

Minnesota Statute: 609.625.3, with reference to: 609.625.1, 609.05.1, 609.05.2

Maximum Sentence: 10 YEARS AND/OR \$20,000

Offense Level: Felony

Offense Date (on or about): 05/26/2016

Control #(ICR#): 16000981

Charge Description: That on or about 5/26/2016 to 5/29/2016, in Hennepin County, Minnesota, ANTHONY JAMES HANSON , acting alone or intentionally aiding, advising, hiring, counseling or conspiring with another, with intent to defraud, issued, uttered or possessed with intent to utter a forged writing or object knowing it to have been forged.

STATEMENT OF PROBABLE CAUSE

Complainant has investigated the facts and circumstances of this offense and believes the following establishes probable cause:

Your Complainant is a sworn peace officer and Special Agent with the Minnesota Department of Commerce Fraud Bureau, tasked with investigating insurance fraud and other related complex financial crimes. Acting in this capacity, your Complainant along with other Agents with the Commerce Fraud Bureau began investigating fraud committed by Defendant herein ANTHONY JAMES HANSON through his bail bonds company, Ability Bail Bonds (hereinafter Ability). The fraud scheme involved the Defendant altering a \$100,000 bond to pass it off as a \$500,000 bond in order to secure the release of an inmate being held at the Hennepin County Jail. The Defendant accepted cash from the inmate's family as partial payment to post her bond, and the inmate was released after Ability posted the fraudulent bond. The Court subsequently issued a warrant for the inmate's arrest and she was returned to custody a few days later. The Defendant did not return any of the funds paid by the inmate's family to secure her release on bond. The investigation further revealed that the Defendant forged his wife's signature on the fraudulent bond under investigation.

Ability Bail Bonds:

Ability Bail Bonds first registered as a business with the Minnesota Secretary of State on June 2, 2009, and listed its principal place of business as 322 South 3rd Street, City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota. The investigation showed that Defendant herein ANTHONY JAMES HANSON was in charge of the daily operations of Ability. The Defendant's wife was the listed owner of the business, but was not involved with any of its daily operations. Ability employed several licensed bail agents. The Defendant was licensed as a recovery agent, but his insurance producer's license was revoked by the Department of Commerce in 2008 based on a finding that he committed fraud in conjunction with the business dealings of a previous bail bond company, Integrity Bonding.

Background:

In June 2016, the Commerce Fraud Bureau was contacted by Financial Casualty & Surety Inc. (hereinafter Victim Insurance Company) to report fraud by their client, Ability. Victim Insurance Company reported that Ability forged bond documents and presented them in Hennepin County District Court on behalf of an inmate (hereinafter Inmate A) who was subsequently released on a \$350,000 bond. Agents later learned that Inmate A's family had paid at least \$18,500 cash to the Defendant to secure her release on the \$350,000 bond set by the Court. Victim Insurance Company reported that they did not issue a large enough Power of Attorney form or "Power" to Ability to allow them to post a \$350,000 bond. The largest "Power" that Victim Insurance Company issued to Ability in the relevant timeframe was \$100,000, and it was believed that Ability forged that "Power" to post the larger bond for Inmate A.

Posting Bail Bonds:

In order to post a bond on behalf of an incarcerated inmate, the bail bonds agent presents a Power of Attorney form, commonly known as a "Power," and a Bail Bond – Appearance Only form, commonly known as a "Form 702," to a designated court clerk. The "Power" is issued by a surety insurance company to the bail bonds company. Each "Power" displays a Value which is the maximum obligation of the surety company in the event that the bail bond is forfeited by the Court. The surety insurance company issues "Powers" to the bail bonds company in advance, and the bail bonds company holds on to the individual

"Powers" to use as needed. Multiple "Powers" are sent to the bail bonds company at a time, along with a "Receipt of Powers" form which lists the unique Power Number of each Power, its Value, and Expiration Date. The corresponding Form 702 is filed under the defendant's court file number and lists the defendant's name, criminal charges, and bond amount. Form 702 is signed by the defendant as principal and the bail bond agent who presents the bond as attorney in fact for the surety insurance company. The 702 form is also signed by the owner of the bail bonds company, acknowledging the surety relationship between the bail bonds company and the surety insurance company who issued the Power.

Forged \$500,000 Bond:

Agents spoke with one of the bail bond agents employed by Ability (hereinafter Witness 1) and learned that on or about May 26, 2016, the Defendant received a Fed Ex delivery from Victim Insurance Company of several Powers. The Defendant was expecting a \$600,000 Power in that delivery which would allow him to post a substantial \$350,000 bond on behalf of Inmate A. By this date, the Defendant had engaged in communications with Inmate A's associates about posting her bond, and had accepted \$18,500 in cash as a partial payment to post Inmate A's bond. As part of this investigation, Agents obtained a copy of a receipt documenting the \$18,500 payment from Inmate A's associates to Ability. When the package from Victim Insurance Company arrived on the above date, the Defendant opened it up and learned that the largest Power that Ability received from Victim Insurance Company was \$100,000. Witness 1 described how the Defendant became extremely upset and shocked upon opening the package and finding that the surety did not authorize a large enough Power to post Inmate A's bond.

As part of the ongoing investigation, Agents obtained a copy of the Receipt of Powers form which was included in the above referenced Fed Ex delivery. The Receipt of Powers form was signed by the Defendant on May 26, 2016, and showed that the largest Power issued that date had a \$100,000 Value. The unique Power Number on the \$100,000 Power received by the Defendant on May 26 matched the Power Number on the forged \$500,000 bond that was later posted for Inmate A on May 29, 2016.

Witness 1 told Agents that once they learned that Ability did not have a sufficient bond to post on Inmate A's behalf, the Defendant told him that they needed to create the bond. The Defendant directed Witness 1 to purchase glue and tweezers so they could create a bond that looked "legit." Witness 1 made these purchases as directed and brought them to the Defendant. The Defendant proceeded to assemble a \$500,000 bond by cutting and pasting smaller bonds together. The Defendant used a "5" from a \$5,000 bond and pasted it over the "1" on the \$100,000 bond. The Defendant placed the doctored bond on a desk and flattened it out with an encyclopedia. Witness 1 stated that they later contacted a second bail bond agent employed by Ability (hereinafter Witness 2) and directed him to post the bond at the jail. The Defendant provided the bond to Witness 2 who delivered it to the Hennepin County jail, located in the City of Minneapolis, Hennepin County, Minnesota, on May 29, 2016.

Text messages between Witness 2 and the Defendant show that the Defendant contacted Witness 2 on the afternoon of May 29 in reference to Inmate A's bond. The Defendant's text messages to Witness 2 state that Inmate A's bail is \$350K and go on to say, "we changed the bond and left it and 702 on table for you... to post." Witness 2 subsequently picked up both forms at Ability, signed the 702 form as the bail bond agent, and delivered those documents to the Hennepin County Jail. Text messages show that Witness 2 communicated with the Defendant after the bond was posted and confirmed that it was done. Records show that a \$350,000 bond for Inmate A was posted on May 29, 2016, and that Inmate A was released from custody on May 30, 2016. The Court later issued a warrant for Inmate A on June 3, 2016, and she returned to custody.

Agents contacted the Hennepin County Criminal Centralized Unit and obtained the original Power and 702 form documents submitted by Ability on behalf of Inmate A. It was clear upon analyzing the Power

document that the bond's Value was altered. Agents touched the areas where alterations occurred and could feel that the paper was raised. Agents turned the document over and could see that the original printing identified the Value of the Power as \$100,000. Furthermore, the Power Number of the bond began with "FCS100" which indicated that the Power was for \$100,000. Agents observed that the corresponding 702 form appeared to have been signed by the Defendant's wife (hereinafter Victim 1) as CEO of the company acknowledging the surety relationship between Ability and Victim Insurance Company. The 702 form was also signed by Witness 2 as the bail bond agent and dated May 29, 2016. The 702 form was signed by Inmate A as principal on May 30, 2016, the date she was released from custody.

Agents made contact with the Defendant at his home in the City of Champlin and took a voluntary statement from him. The Defendant's wife, Victim 1, was also present. The Defendant admitted that he was given \$16,000.00 as a partial payment for Inmate A's bond. The Defendant later admitted that he still had Inmate A's money and that it may have been \$19,000.00. The Defendant described it as "street money." The Defendant acknowledged that Inmate A's bail was set at \$350,000 and that the surety company had only issued him a \$100,000 power around that time. When Agents asked Victim 1 about her signature on the 702 form used to bond out Inmate A, Victim 1 stated that it was not her signature and that it was a forgery. The Defendant then admitted that he forged Victim 1's signature on that document as well as several other 702 forms submitted in Hennepin County District Court.

SIGNATURES AND APPROVALS

Complainant requests that Defendant, subject to bail or conditions of release, be:
(1) arrested or that other lawful steps be taken to obtain Defendant's appearance in court; or
(2) detained, if already in custody, pending further proceedings; and that said Defendant otherwise be dealt with according to law.

Complainant declares under penalty of perjury that everything stated in this document is true and correct. Minn. Stat. § 358.116; Minn. R. Crim. P. 2.01, subds. 1, 2.

Complainant

Markham L Stock
Special Agent
85 7th Place East
Suite 500
St. Paul, MN 55101
Badge: 112

Electronically Signed:
01/12/2017 07:49 AM
Ramsey County, MN

Being authorized to prosecute the offenses charged, I approve this complaint.

Prosecuting Attorney

Sarah Stennes
300 S 6th St
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(612) 348-5550

Electronically Signed:
01/09/2017 02:51 PM

FINDING OF PROBABLE CAUSE

From the above sworn facts, and any supporting affidavits or supplemental sworn testimony, I, the Issuing Officer, have determined that probable cause exists to support, subject to bail or conditions of release where applicable, Defendant's arrest or other lawful steps be taken to obtain Defendant's appearance in court, or Defendant's detention, if already in custody, pending further proceedings. Defendant is therefore charged with the above-stated offense(s).

SUMMONS

THEREFORE YOU, THE DEFENDANT, ARE SUMMONED to appear on _____, _____ at _____ AM/PM before the above-named court at 300 S Sixth Street, Minneapolis, MN 55487 to answer this complaint.

IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR in response to this SUMMONS, a WARRANT FOR YOUR ARREST shall be issued.

WARRANT

To the Sheriff of the above-named county; or other person authorized to execute this warrant: I order, in the name of the State of Minnesota, that the Defendant be apprehended and arrested without delay and brought promptly before the court (if in session), and if not, before a Judge or Judicial Officer of such court without unnecessary delay, and in any event not later than 36 hours after the arrest or as soon as such Judge or Judicial Officer is available to be dealt with according to law.

Execute in MN Only

Execute Nationwide

Execute in Border States

ORDER OF DETENTION

Since the Defendant is already in custody, I order, subject to bail or conditions of release, that the Defendant continue to be detained pending further proceedings.

Bail: \$50,000.00

Conditions of Release:

This complaint, duly subscribed and sworn to or signed under penalty of perjury, is issued by the undersigned Judicial Officer as of the following date: January 12, 2017.

Judicial Officer

Daniel Moreno
District Court Judge

Electronically Signed: 01/12/2017 09:37 AM

Sworn testimony has been given before the Judicial Officer by the following witnesses:

**COUNTY OF HENNEPIN
STATE OF MINNESOTA**

State of Minnesota

Plaintiff

vs.

ANTHONY JAMES HANSON

Defendant

LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER RETURN OF SERVICE
*I hereby Certify and Return that I have served a copy of this
Summons upon the Defendant herein named.*

Signature of Authorized Service Agent: