

Visit our [new website SF.gov](https://www.sfgov.org)

District Attorney

Former City Commissioner, City Employee & Political Consultant Facing Corruption Charges

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JANUARY 22, 2016

@GeorgeGascon

CONTACT: ALEX BASTIAN (415) 553-1931, MAX SZABO (415) 553-9089

FORMER CITY COMMISSIONER, CITY EMPLOYEE AND POLITICAL CONSULTANT FACING CORRUPTION CHARGES

SAN FRANCISCO – Today, District Attorney George Gascón announced the filing of felony bribery and money laundering charges against former Human Rights Commission (HRC) Commissioner Nazly Mohajer, former HRC employee Zula Jones, and political consultant Keith Jackson. Jackson faces additional charges of grand theft and campaign finance fraud.

"Any perversion of the public trust will be met with severe consequences," said District Attorney George Gascón. "Corruption casts a long shadow on our institutions and the public's notions of fairness. This is a sad day for San Francisco, and we have a lot of work to do to repair the people's confidence in city government."

"For public law offices like the ones George and I lead, we have no more important duty than to punish betrayals of the public trust aggressively and to the law's fullest extent," said City Attorney Dennis Herrera. "To do anything less would diminish San Franciscans' faith in the integrity of their local government, and send a terrible message to would-be scofflaws in similar positions of trust. I am grateful to District Attorney Gascón for his leadership on this case, and for the opportunity my office has had to work closely with the excellent lawyers and investigators of his office. I'm also grateful to be working with FBI investigators who are similarly outstanding. Apart from our investigative collaboration, my office stands ready to assist the San Francisco Employees' Retirement System on the possible forfeiture of benefits, should an eligible defendant be convicted of a crime of moral turpitude."

"Combating public corruption at all levels is one of the FBI's top priorities," said FBI Special Agent In Charge David J. Johnson. "The charges announced by the district attorney today illustrate the unity and commitment of the FBI and San Francisco District Attorney's Office to bring corrupt officials to justice."

According to court documents, Jackson, Jones, and Mohajer are charged with soliciting and accepting \$20,000 in bribes

from an undercover FBI agent in exchange for promised political access and preferential treatment in connection with city contracts. The three defendants are also charged with money laundering. Jackson is additionally charged with six misdemeanor counts of campaign finance fraud for using straw donors to unlawfully funnel bribe money to political campaigns.

In a separate scheme, defendant Jackson – who was a board member of the San Francisco Board of Education between 1995 and 1998 – is charged with grand theft for falsely promising a woman in 2012 that he could place a child in a preferred San Francisco public school in exchange for money.

This ongoing investigation is being conducted by the San Francisco District Attorney Bureau of Investigations, the San Francisco City Attorney's Office, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The following charges have been brought against the following defendants:

Keith W Jackson

- **Felony Counts:** Bribery, PC 68 (4 counts); Money Laundering, PC 186.10(a) (1 count); Grand Theft of Public Money, PC 487(a) (1 count) **[six felony counts in total]**
- **Misdemeanor Counts:** 91000/84301 Govt Code (5 counts); 1.170(a)/1.114(a) SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code (1 count) **[six misdemeanor counts in total]**
- **Exposure:** 11 years and 4 months in state prison.
- **Bail:** \$208,000

Zula Mae Jones

- **Felony Counts:** Bribery, PC 68 (4 counts); Money Laundering, PC 186.10(a) (1 count) **[five felony counts in total]**
- **Exposure:** 7 years and 8 months in state prison.
- **Bail:** \$175,000

Nazly Mohajer

- **Felony Counts:** Bribery, PC 68 (4 counts); Money Laundering, PC 186.10(a) (1 count) **[five felony counts in total]**
- **Exposure:** 7 years and 8 months in state prison.
- **Bail:** \$175,000

###



San Francisco Results

Q1 Do you approve or disapprove of President Barack Obama's job performance?

Approve 69%
Disapprove..... 21%
Not sure 10%

Q2 Do you approve or disapprove of the job Congress is doing?

Approve 11%
Disapprove..... 83%
Not sure 6%

Q3 Do you approve or disapprove of Mayor Ed Lee's job performance?

Approve 38%
Disapprove..... 46%
Not sure 16%

Q4 San Francisco voters established an Ethics Commission 20 years ago to ensure that campaigns, lobbyists and those involved in influencing City Hall decisions have to publicly disclose their efforts and to hold them accountable for violations. Do you think the San Francisco Ethics Commission has succeeded in limiting the power of money in politics or do you think private special interests have too much influence over San Francisco politics?

The San Francisco Ethics Commission has succeeded in limiting the power of money in politics..... 16%
Special interests have too much influence over San Francisco politics 65%
Not sure 19%

Q5 Now I am going to ask you about some measures that are proposed for this November's San Francisco ballot and ask your opinion about them. Here's the first one: A measure proposed for the ballot would prohibit lobbyists, lobbying firms, or lobbyist employers from giving gifts or giving or arranging campaign contributions to the mayor, supervisors, and other city elected officials. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to prohibit lobbyists from giving gifts to elected officials 79%
Oppose the measure to prohibit lobbyists from giving gifts to elected officials 12%
Not sure 9%

Q6 Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would state that it is official public misconduct requiring removal from office for any member of the City Planning Commission, Port Commission, or Building Inspection Commission to violate the laws they are responsible for enforcing or other city or state laws. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to remove from office a City Commissioner who violates the laws they are responsible for enforcing or other city or state laws 80%
Oppose the measure to remove from office a City Commissioner who violates the laws they are responsible for enforcing or other city or state laws 10%
Not sure 10%





- Q7** Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would maintain the \$500 campaign contribution limit on donations to candidates for city office and it would close the loophole that has allowed some city officials to establish a separate committee to raise unlimited campaign contributions for other candidates and ballot measures. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to limit all campaign contributions to candidates for city office to \$500 and close campaign finance loopholes .. 75%
Oppose the measure to limit all campaign contributions to candidates for city office to \$500 and close campaign finance loopholes .. 15%
Not sure .. 10%

- Q8** Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would prohibit lobbyists, contractors, developers and others with a financial interest in city decisions from paying for the official travel expenses of city officials who decide on the donor's interests. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to prohibit those with a financial interest from paying for travel expenses of city officials .. 82%
Oppose the measure to prohibit those with a financial interest from paying for travel expenses of city officials .. 11%
Not sure .. 8%

- Q9** Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would prohibit campaign contributions from real estate developers to city officials who have the power to approve their projects. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to prohibit campaign contributions from real estate developers to city officials who have the power to approve their projects .. 77%
Oppose the measure to prohibit campaign contributions from real estate developers to city officials who have the power to approve their projects .. 16%
Not sure .. 7%

- Q10** Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would prohibit city officials from participating in decisions that may affect donors who have made financial gifts or donations at the city official's request. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to prohibit city officials from participating in decisions that may affect donors who have made financial gifts or donations at the city official's request .. 69%
Oppose the measure to prohibit city officials from participating in decisions that may affect donors who have made financial gifts or donations at the city official's request .. 15%
Not sure .. 16%

- Q11** Here's the next one: A measure proposed for the ballot would prohibit corporations or individuals who are facing criminal charges or being sued by the city from making campaign contributions to the city officials who are in charge of enforcing the law against them. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to prohibit corporations or individuals who are facing criminal charges or being sued by the city from making campaign contributions to the city officials who are in charge of enforcing the law against them .. 77%
Oppose the measure to prohibit corporations or individuals who are facing criminal charges or being sued by the city from making campaign contributions to the city officials who are in charge of enforcing the law against them .. 14%
Not sure .. 9%





Q12 Here's the last one: A measure proposed for the ballot would restrict the ability of citizens to qualify initiative measures for the ballot by increasing the number of petition signatures required and blocking citizens from collecting petition signatures until the Board of Supervisors has first held a hearing on the proposal. If the election were held today, would you vote to support or oppose this measure?

Support the measure to restrict the ability of citizens to qualify initiatives for the ballot 28%
Oppose the measure to restrict the ability of citizens to qualify initiatives for the ballot 54%
Not sure 18%

Q13 If you are a woman, press 1. If a man, press 2.

Woman 53%
Man 47%

Q14 If you are a Democrat, press 1. If a Republican, press 2. If an independent, press 3.

Democrat 65%
Republican 12%
Independent 23%

Q15 If you are Hispanic, press 1. If white, press 2. If African-American, press 3. If Asian, press 4. If other, press 5.

Hispanic 10%
White 58%
African American 6%
Asian 17%
Other 9%

Q16 If you are 18 to 45 years old, press 1. If 46 to 65, press 2. If you are older than 65, press 3.

18 to 45 28%
46 to 65 49%
Older than 65 23%

Q17 Supervisor District

1 9%
2 9%
3 10%
4 8%
5 11%
6 5%
7 14%
8 17%
9 5%
10 8%
11 4%

