

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO**

Criminal Case No. 18-432-RBJ

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

3. ROBERT REVIS

Defendant.

The Clerk of the
United States District of Colorado,
Certifies that this is a true
Copy of the original Document

Dated: *Apr 26, 2019*

JEFFREY P. COLWELL

By s/ cthom

SUPERSEDING INFORMATION

The United States Attorney charges:

COUNT 1

On or about and between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2015, in the
District of Colorado, the defendant,

ROBERT REVIS

did knowingly and willfully pay, contribute to, and supplement the salary of Dwane
Nevins, an officer and employee of the executive branch of the United States
Government, from a source other than the United States government, as compensation

....

....

....

....

....

....

for Nevins's services as an officer and employee of the executive branch of the United States.

All in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Sections 209(a) and 216(a)(2).

JASON R. DUNN
United States Attorney

By: /s/ Bryan David Fields
Bryan David Fields
Assistant U.S. Attorney
U.S. Attorney's Office
1801 California St., Ste. 1600
Denver, CO 80202
Telephone: 303-454-0200
Fax: 303-454-0406
E-mail: Bryan.Fields3@usdoj.gov
Attorney for Government

DEFENDANT: ROBERT REVIS

AGE/YOB: 1958

COMPLAINT FILED? _____ Yes ___X___ No

If Yes, MAGISTRATE CASE NUMBER _____

HAS DEFENDANT BEEN ARRESTED ON COMPLAINT? ___ Yes ___X___ No
If No, a new warrant is required

OFFENSE(S): 18 U.S.C. §§ 209 & 216 (Illegal Supplementation of Government Salary)

LOCATION OF OFFENSE: Denver, Colorado

PENALTY: NMT 5 years' imprisonment; fine of \$250,000 or 2x gain/loss, whichever is greater (or both a fine and imprisonment); NMT 3 years' supervised release; and a SA fee of \$100

AGENT: Scott Alexander
Special Agent, FBI

AUTHORIZED BY: Bryan David Fields
Assistant U.S. Attorney

ESTIMATED TIME OF TRIAL:

X five days or less; ___ over five days

THE GOVERNMENT

X will NOT seek detention in this case based on 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f)(2)

The statutory presumption of detention is not applicable to this defendant