

SECOND - Extortion Allegretta

She Lied Under Oath — and the Court Let It Stand

At sentencing, the government had **one witness** to support its extortion theory.

That witness was **Allegretta**.

Out of **7,600 merchants**, this is the only merchant they could produce.

And under oath, her testimony **fell apart**.

-She denied ever taking a merchant cash advance before Par Funding — until cross examination forced her to admit them.

-She denied that Par Funding ever conducted an onsite inspection of the company— until cross examination proved otherwise.

-She claimed fear and coercion — while her own emails praised and thanked **Joe LaForte** and **Par Funding** after the alleged threats.

These were not minor inconsistencies.

They were **material facts**, contradicted by evidence, reversed only when confronted under cross-examination.

By any plain-English understanding, that is **false testimony under oath**.

Yet the Court found her “credible.”

On the strength of **that one witness** — despite sworn contradictions, documentary impeachment, and zero corroboration — extortion remained in the sentencing calculus.

And Joseph LaForte was sentenced to the maximum **15½ years in federal prison**.

One witness.

Three proven falsehoods.

Maximum consequences.

This was not about proof.

It was about permission — permission to accept a story because it was useful.

And that should outrage anyone who believes truth is supposed to matter when the state takes a man’s freedom.

The case against **Joe LaForte** did not begin with a jury.

It began with an affidavit.

And at the center of that affidavit was **one merchant—Allegretta**—whose account became a **major prong** supporting probable cause. Her statements helped unlock search warrants. Those warrants unleashed raids. Those raids ignited the case.

From interview room to raid team, her narrative mattered.

Why This One Merchant’s Story Had to Be *This* Story

Two inescapable incentives emerge from the record.

Incentive #1: “Threat” as a Get-Out-of-Debt Card

If a merchant frames a lender as criminal—especially as “extortionate”—repayment becomes irrelevant if the narrative is bought and created by a corrupt system.

The company is destroyed. Collections stop. The obligation vanishes.

That incentive does not prove intent.

But it **explains direction**—why a narrative would move toward fear and away from obligation.

Incentive #2: Exclusivity Creates a Single Villain

Exclusivity was the linchpin.

If the merchant claimed **Par Funding was the only MCA she ever received**, then:

- Par Funding becomes the sole focus
- **Joe LaForte** becomes the only plausible source of any alleged threat
- Investigators are pointed in one direction—hard

But if the truth included **multiple prior MCAs**, then the story fragments:

- Many brokers
- Many collectors
- Many possible interactions
- Many possible sources of pressure

In that world, **causation collapses**.

Exclusivity simplified the case.

Multiplicity would have complicated it beyond usefulness.

From Affidavit to Fury

Those early statements did not sit idle. They were **operationalized**:

- Cited in support of probable cause
- Used to secure warrants
- Approved by a judge

- Executed by **hundreds of agents**

Homes were raided. Offices seized. Businesses dismantled.

All before a jury ever weighed extortion.

At sentencing, when cross-examination exposed contradictions—when documents impeached testimony—credibility should have ended.

It didn't.

The same merchant whose account helped **start** the case was credited again to **finish** it. Extortion—never pled to, never proven—remained alive in the PSI.

On that basis, **Joe LaForte received the maximum sentence of 15½ years.**

This case is about **how a single narrative, incentivized to simplify blame, can power an entire prosecution**—from affidavit to raid to sentence—**even after it fractures.**

The case started with her.

The case ended with her.

Let's talk about the lies and the proof!

Lie #1: "Joe LaForte threatened me"

That is what she told the FBI.
That is what she told the Court.

See Interview in Search Warrant Snippet:

9. Christina Allegretta of V. Allegretta Electrical Contractors

111. The FBI interviewed CHRISTINA ALLEGRETTA, who is the office manager of V. ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL CONTRACTORS ("ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL"), a small business in New York. ALLEGRETTA stated that she helped arrange a loan for ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL with CBSG. ALLEGRETTA's primary point of contact with CBSG in arranging the loan was JOSEPH LAFORTE's brother, "JIMMY." She knew his telephone number to be 929-244-6073.

112. ALLEGRETTA advised that in 2019 she was threatened over the telephone by JOSEPH LAFORTE on three separate occasions after she began to dispute her loan arrangements with CBSG. The phone number that ALLEGRETTA used to communicate with

JOSEPH LAFORTE was his office number, 215-922-2636, which has been identified through open source records as the main number for CBSG.

113. In February 2019, ALLEGRETТА spoke with JOSEPH LAFORTE, who at the time she knew as “JOE MACK,” via his office phone number regarding ALLEGRETТА ELECTRICAL’s debt. During this conversation, JOSEPH LAFORTE said that one day she would turn on her car and “poof.” ALLEGRETТА understood this statement to mean that he would blow up her car.

114. According to ALLEGRETТА, the threats concerning ALLEGRETТА ELECTRICAL’s debt with CBSG continued. ALLEGRETТА advised that around April 2019, JOSEPH LAFORTE told her that she was going to pick up her children, and they would not be there. Around August 2019, JOSEPH LAFORTE asked ALLEGRETТА if she had ever heard of “cement shoes” and told her she would end up in the Hudson River.

But her own emails to Joe LaForte at Par Funding say the opposite months after the “alleged” threats!!!!

Emails sent **after** the alleged threats on February 2019 and April 2019 show her:

- Thanking Joe LaForte
- Praising Par Funding
- Saying she was “forever grateful”
- Writing: *“I would not have made it without you”*

People do not praise the people they fear.
Fear does not send thank-you emails.

Friends of Joe LaForte, do you realize how crazy this is! These emails prove this never happened! Knowing Joe LaForte, he would never threaten a woman! And this is the proof!

TRUTH - EXHIBIT:

Email 4/29/2019

From: Tina Allegretta <tina@vallegrettaelectric.com>
To: "joe@parfunding.com" <joe@parfunding.com>
Subject: Checking In
Sent: Mon, 29 Apr 2019 15:16:47 +0000

Joe,

Good Morning, hope all is well with you. I first want to say that I am very thankful for CBSG for all of the assistance you have provided to me. I'm forever grateful.

As I'm sure you are aware of my hourly communications with Valerie that I am unable to fulfill my end of our contracts at the level of daily and weekly payments. In review of my current cash flow vs. my fixed expenses, payroll, O and P- I'm upside down shutting the doors at this rate.

You guys are ACH \$995 per day plus I have exhausted every resource over the past 2 weeks to come up with the payments I have sent. Valerie has stated to me verbally that I need to send in \$ 8,000 per day plus this ACH which I have no idea what that is for.

Is it possible to create a new contract combining the total due for both notes and extending the time frame out? I'm sure you really don't want to go to court that wouldn't help either of us. I wouldn't be writing this email if I wasn't literally desperate for a reduction.

No exaggeration in my statements, I met with my lawyer and CPA last Thursday afternoon and this is the guidance I received was to reach out to you direct.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tina

Tina M. Allegretta, Principal

V. Allegretta Electrical Corp.

150 A East Montauk Highway Hampton Bays, NY 11946

631-723-3030 P 631-723-3330 F

www.vallegrettaelectric.com



Email 6/27/2019

Follow up

From: Tina Allegretta <tina@vallegrettaelectric.com>
To: joe@parfunding.com
Date: Thu, 27 Jun 2019 11:02:03 -0400

Joe,

Good Morning,
I first want to say thank you very much for everything you have done for me through the years, I would not have made it through without your help.

I apologize for any inconvenience I have caused you. I'm heading over with money now, my customers are calling me and you bridget in particular. Can you please shut down the email going out.

Tina

Lie #2: "No Prior Merchant Cash Advances before Par Funding"

See sentencing transcripts below of Allegretta's direct testimony where she LIED under oath!

9	Q	Now, I believe your testimony earlier today was that you
10		found Par funding pursuant to an internet search sometime in
11		2018, correct?
12	A	I believe so. I think I'm [indiscernible]
13	Q	And you also, and you also testified that prior to being
14		extended funds from Par, you did not engage in any previous
15		merchant cash advance transaction. Is that fair?
16	A	Yes.

TRUTH - EXHIBIT:

Consolidation Calculator – that proves prior Advances

Consolidation Calculator

Client: ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL CORP

Funding Date: 08/10/18

Terms		Week	Date	Funding	Payment
Existing Balances	\$ 868,345.12	1	08/10/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Daily MCA ACH	\$ 5,650.10	2	08/17/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
New Funding		3	08/24/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Total Funding	\$ 868,345.12	4	08/31/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Factor	1.4	5	09/07/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Discount	20.0%	6	09/14/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Term	269	7	09/21/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
RTR	\$ 1,215,683.17	8	09/28/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Payment	\$ 4,520.08	9	10/05/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
MCA Deal #1 YELLOWSTONE		10	10/12/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Balance	\$ 112,225.00	11	10/19/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Payment	\$ 1,191.00	12	10/26/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Days Left	95	13	11/02/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
MCA Deal #2 1ST GLOBAL		14	11/09/18	\$ 28,250.50	\$ 22,600.40
Balance	\$ 406,793.66	15	11/16/18	\$ 27,550.46	\$ 22,600.40
Payment	\$ 2,367.08	16	11/23/18	\$ 24,752.80	\$ 22,600.40
Days Left	172	17	11/30/18	\$ 24,752.80	\$ 22,600.40
MCA Deal #3 1ST GLOBAL		18	12/07/18	\$ 24,752.80	\$ 22,600.40
Balance	\$ 297,561.00	19	12/14/18	\$ 23,832.80	\$ 22,600.40
Payment	\$ 1,392.48	20	12/21/18	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
Days Left	214	21	12/28/18	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
MCA Deal #4 UFS		22	01/04/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
Balance	\$ 51,765.46	23	01/11/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
Payment	\$ 699.54	24	01/18/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
Days Left	74	25	01/25/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
		26	02/01/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
		27	02/08/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
		28	02/15/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40
		29	02/22/19	\$ 18,797.80	\$ 22,600.40

***Allegretta knew that she had many cash advances yet lied under direct examination by the government that she had none! Only after cross-examination and shown proof did she conveniently remember that she had \$868,345.12 in existing advances before Par Funding! (See existing balances on calculator above) And the reason for this as explained prior is exclusivity!**

Lie #3: "No Onsite Inspection was performed"

Under direct examination by the US Attorney's office after being sworn in under oath and the penalty of perjury below is what Allegretta testified to:

4 | Q Okay. Was there any inspection or underwriting done by
5 | PAR funding before getting funded?
6 | A No.
7 | Q And, and when I'm talking about like onsite inspection,
8 | people coming out, you know, examining, you know, the books
9 | and records from the controller's office, anything like that?
10 | A No.

THIS LIE WAS TOLD TO HELP WITH THE PROSECUTIONS THEORY THAT PAR FUNDING'S UNDERWRITING WAS LACKLUSTER!

21 BY MR. COROZZO:

22 Q Oh, that's it. If I can have a follow up. I believe you
23 testified on direct examination that there was no onsite
24 inspections for Allegretta electrical. Is it not true that
25 Metro Inspections, a third-party inspection company conduct

87

1 an inspection on site for Allegretta Electrical on October
2 16th, 2017?

3 A I don't recall that, sir.

4 Q If I can just show you one document. Number 9, does this
5 refresh your recollection that there was an onsite inspection
6 done at Allegretta Electrical on October 16th, 2017? Does

7 that refresh your recollection that onsite inspection was
8 done and those photographs were taken?

9 A I see pictures of my office, yes, outside and inside.

10 MR. COROZZO: Your Honor, for -- just for the
11 record, I'll, I'll note that the inspection certificate,
12 inspection report should be marked as defendant's D.

13 THE COURT: Exhibit D. No more. Thank you.

Only under cross-examination does she now all the sudden not remember! What is more amazing is that in her original testimony she adamantly said, no regarding the on-site inspection.

**Most importantly –

The US ATTORNEY'S OFFICE KNEW THAT AN ONSITE INSPECTION WAS DONE BECAUSE THEY WERE IN POSSESSION OF THE EXACT SAME DISCOVERY THAT THE DEFENSE HAD! THEY LET THIS WITNESS LIE WHILE KNOWING THE WHOLE TIME THAT AN ONSITE WAS DONE BECAUSE IT BENEFITED THEIR CAUSE!

TRUTH - EXHIBIT:

Onsite Inspection Report

		MERCHANT SITE INSPECTION REPORT PHONE (623) 930-0466 FAX (623) 930-0560 www.metroinspections.com			
Metro Order #:152439			Order Date: OCTOBER 12, 2017		
Business Information: Legal Name of Business: V. ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL CORP Doing Business As: V. ALLEGRETTA ELECTRICAL CORP Address: 150 E MONTAUK HWY City/State/Zip: HAMPTON BAYS, NY 11946			Contact Person: TINA AND VINCENT ALLEGRETTA Work Phone: Mobile Phone: 631-377-0996 OR 631-902-7640 Home Phone: Email Address:		
INSPECTION RESULTS					
DATE OF INSPECTION: OCTOBER 16, 2017		TIME OF INSPECTION: 2:00 PM		INSPECTED BY: SANDRA PETCHONKA INTERVIEWED: TINA ALLEGRETTA	
BACKGROUND: <p style="text-align: center;"> Type of Business: ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING Date Established: 2/6/2004 # Years Under Current Ownership: 13 # Years at current location: 5 </p>					
FACILITIES: <p style="text-align: center;"> Business Location Type: COMMERCIAL LOCATION Neighborhood type: COMMERCIAL Is signage present?: YES If yes, Is signage permanent?: YES If yes, signage matches exact business name provided? YES Condition of building: WELL KEPT Approximate Square Footage: 1,001-1,500 </p>					
STAFFING: <p style="text-align: center;"> Names of Owner/Principal: TINA ALLEGRETTA # of Full-time Employees: 24 # of Part-time Employees: N/A # of Contract Labor: N/A </p>					

Metro Order #:152439

OPERATIONS:

Business Days/Hours of Operation: SATURDAY, SUNDAY, MONDAY - FRIDAY
Hours: 6:00 AM to 5:00 PM

Professional Licenses/Certs Observed?: YES

Business License Observed?: YES

Type of Business?: ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING

Inventory/Facilities Consistent with Business Type?: YES

Condition of Equipment, Supplies and Inventory: GOOD

Were relevant supplies and inventory observed?: YES

If yes, Approx. # of supplies/inventory observed: 101+

BUSINESS:

Indication Merchant is going out of Business: NO, N/A

Indication Business is for Sale? NO, N/A

Plans to relocate? NO

If Yes, When/New Address?: N/A, N/A

Marketing Materials Observed? YES

If Yes, describe: BROCHURE

Website URL: N/A

of Customers Observed on-site during Site Visit: 1-3

Is Business Currently Operating?: YES

Does Business Appear to be Legitimate?: YES

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION











The Allegretta advance was a prudent decision by Par Funding; it was the merchant that was bad and did not want to pay their debts. Allegretta's motive was greed! Allegretta borrowed \$400,000. **She confirmed that the business was doing \$700,000 plus per month in revenue! THAT IS OVER \$8 MILLION PER YEAR!**

This Advance had a holdback of only 8.3%. The average holdback on a cash advance industry wide is 25%! The advance was responsible and designed to help Allegretta prosper. And instead turned into Joe LaForte's worst nightmare.

EXHIBIT – TRANSCRIPTS FROM THE SENTENCING HEARING OF JOE LAFORTE

59

1 Q And, and there came a point in time in 2017, 2018 that
2 the monthly income for Allegretta would be as high as
3 \$700,000 a month, correct?
4 A Yes.
5 Q Okay. So a few million dollars a year of income,
6 correct?
7 A Yes.

The evidence was so overwhelming that The Judge didn't have to believe LaForte or counsel. But Judge Mark A. Kearney (a 2014 Obama appointee) found this witness, "credible" anyway! Instead of clearing LaForte's name of extortionate conduct, LaForte is stuck with this label for life!

How can any American feel safe!? Evidence completely exonerates a man but is completely IGNORED!!!!!!!!!!!!

The question is WHO IS NEXT!