IN THE CIRCUIT COURT
OF THE EIGHTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

STATE OF FLORIDA

Court Case No.

VS.

JEFFREY ROBERT FORDLEY

AFFIDAVIT FOR ARREST WARRANT

State of Florida
County of Brevard

BEFORE ME, Sergeant Michael Perez #762, personally came Detective Donovan Brickhouse and Badge #121, of the West Melbourne Police Department, who being duly sworn deposes and says: that Affiant has reason to believe and does believe that probable cause exists for the arrest of **Jeffrey Robert Fordley, 1/30/1981, [redacted] 1551 Whitman Drive West Melbourne, FL 32904, 5'10", 220, White, Male** for a violation of the laws of the State of Florida, to wit: **Organized Fraud Obtain Property Less than 20,000**, contrary to section **817.034 (4)(a)(3)**, Florida Statutes, **Criminal Use of Personal Identification Information**, contrary to section **817.568(2)(a)**, Florida Statutes, which occurred at **1551 Whitman Drive West Melbourne, FL 32904.**

THE FACTS tending to establish the grounds for this application and the probable cause of Affiant believing that such facts exist are as follows:

On 02/19/26, Sgt Perez was notified about a fraud complaint that was being reported involving an 18-year-old female Victim being scammed by an adult male that she was staying with the family of. The mother of the Victim had initially reported this as she was learning more details from her daughter. It was ultimately learned that 3 specific incidents had occurred, with elements occurring in various jurisdictions.

It was initially reported that the Victim had a disagreement with her mother over the last few weeks, regarding her wanting to stay out late and hang out with her friends. When the Victim's mother told her this was unacceptable the Victim began staying with a female friend. The Victim would stay with this friend and her family "off and on" over the course of a couple weeks.

On or about 02/16/26 the Victim notified her mother that she wanted to move out of the house and stay with this family until she could get an apartment of her own. The family lives at 1551 Whitman Dr (West Melbourne), with the friend's brother and father (Jeffrey Fordley). Since the Victim is 18, her mother was willing to allow her or was unable to prevent her from moving out and told her that she would have to take steps to have the vehicle in her mother's name transferred into her name.

On 02/18/26 the Victim contacted her mother and asked for the AT&T account information and PIN to access the account. At that time, the Victim's cell phone was owned by her mother and was on her mother's AT&T plan. The Victim advised she was at Verizon and was trying to transfer the phone into a Verizon account in her own name. The mother learned that the adult male (Jeffrey) was with her at the Verizon store and was suspicious. The Victim also referred to Jeffrey as her "daddy," which also caused the mother to be suspicious and have concerns. The mother told the Victim she would not give her access to alter the AT&T account, but she was willing to help her transfer the phone into her own name or get her an account in her own name. Later that day the mother would research Jeffrey Fordley on the internet and was led to believe that he had criminal history or fraud accusations. This led to the mother having a series of conversations with the Victim, which ultimately led the Victim to learn that she was being taken advantage of, and her returning home (to her mother's residence). Sgt Perez would conduct a brief search of Jeffrey Fordley in Florida criminal court databases but did not locate anything other than animal violations. Sgt Perez did observe that he appears only to have lived in Florida, or has had a Florida Driver's License only since 2021, so he may have criminal history in other states. He appears to have been born in New York.

The first incident that was reported involved the Victim going to or being taken to Verizon for a new phone. The WMPD would later interview the Victim on 02/19/26 and learn the following.

The Victim had gone to Verizon with the Suspect (Jeffrey Fordley). Initially the Victim stated that she went to Verizon with the intention of getting put onto the Suspect's Verizon plan. The Suspect had suggested they go to this specific Verizon store (Malabar Rd) due to him having past dealings with an employee there. This was unusual as there are multiple Verizon stores in West Melbourne and closer to the 1551 Whitman Dr address than this store. Whatever the initial plan was, once at the store the Victim was convinced to obtain multiple phones in 2 different accounts in her name. The Victim was led to believe that Jeffrey would be paying the bill for this account, however it was all done in her name. Ultimately, she was convinced to get 7 new iPhones of varying models. The Verizon representative even convinced her to get extra phones, that she didn't need, explaining to her that she would save money. The Victim opened 2 separate Verizon accounts in her name. The first account # [redacted] was a consumer account, with cellphones using phone numbers 321-210-6568, 321-451-3873, and 321-451-6250. The second account was a business account # [redacted], with cellphones using phone numbers 321-479-0562, 321-479-2595, 321-479-3113, and 321-479-7161. Despite the Victim being convinced to get this business account, no business information was provided (by the Victim) for this account.

The Victim stated that the arrangement was that she would get one of the new phones, with 2 of the new phones going to the Suspect (one personal, one business), and a new phone going to both his daughter and his son. Of the remaining unused phones, she was told they would sell those and use the money to put towards the bill. The Victim believed the Suspect would be paying the Verizon bill, which made sense to her since he and both his children were getting new phones for personal and/or business use. The Victim works at Target and would have no need for a Verizon business account.

A short time after the phones were obtained the Victim, her friend and Jeffrey went to the Walmart in West Melbourne (845 Palm Bay Rd). They were going to sell some of the new

phones into an ecoATM machine to get money for the phones. The machine at Walmart was not operational. Jeffrey then instructed the Victim and his daughter to go to a Dollar General store near or on University Blvd in Melbourne to use that ecoATM machine. Jeffrey remained at Walmart shopping.

The Victim and the friend would go to the ecoATM machine at least 2 times during this day. On one trip they would sell the old phones previously used by the Suspect's daughter and son, which were no longer needed because they now had new iPhones on the account opened in the Victim's name. On the other trip they would sell 3 of the new phones obtained on this day. These phones would represent the 3 phones purchased on the consumer account. The Victim reported that she obtained $209 dollars and $170 dollars for the 2 old phones, and $660, $600, and $263 dollars for the brand-new phones. It was estimated that the new phones were likely $1,000 dollars each, if purchased new, so the money obtained for these transactions would not be sufficient to pay the bill to Verizon. Sgt Perez would later be provided with emailed receipts from the ecoATM transactions which confirmed that the Victim only received $403 dollars for the iPhone 17 Pro Max sold, and $263 dollars (each) for two iPhone 17 phones sold. The money obtained from the ecoATM machine transactions was turned over to the friend, because the Victim was driving and then turned over to Jeffrey. The Victim believed that Jeffrey had not paid anything towards the new Verizon accounts except approximately $300 dollars during the activation of the new accounts to cover taxes.

The three phones sold to the ecoATM machine were determined to be the 3 phones obtained on the consumer account [redacted] per the Victim. The documents provided for these 3 phones do not list the account number. The documents identify these phones as follows:

- Apple iPhone 17 256GB with a device ID# 353502585741307, wireless number 321-210-6568
- Apple iPhone 17 256GB with a device ID# 350661236713918, wireless number 321-451-6250
- Apple iPhone 17 Pro Max 256GB with a device ID# 356605228365363, wireless number 321-451-3873.

The receipts indicate that ecoATM paid out $263 dollars for the 2 iPhone 17 devices and $403 dollars for the iPhone 17 Pro Max device for a total of $929.00 dollars. It would later be determined these phones were a white iPhone 17 Pro Max, a white iPhone 17 and a blue iPhone 17.

Documents provided from Verizon for only the 3 phones sold on the consumer account indicate that the Victim would be responsible for $75.00 monthly line access for each device, with no listed contract length. This would mean that the Victim would be billed from Verizon a minimum of $225.00 dollars, including other fees monthly for the devices that were sold to the ecoATM, which would no longer be available to the Victim.

The Victim and her mother would later contact the friend and/or the Suspect to request getting the other phones back to be returned to Verizon. Later that day (02/23/26) they would recover

the 3 phones that were in the possession of the Suspect and his children. Sgt Perez took photos of these phones and documented that they were as follows:

- iPhone 17 256GB with a device ID# 357417536879860 (purple in color)
- iPhone 17 256GB with a device ID# 350661237254649 (green in color)
- iPhone 17 256GB with a device ID# 356305881462488 (mist blue)

The mist blue phone appeared to still be in the unopened and sealed box, so the phone may not have been turned on or activated yet. This may have been the phone intended to be kept by the Suspect, as the old phones belonging to his children had been sold to the ecoATM and they would have likely activated and been using the new iPhones given to them.

The Victim still had the iPhone obtained for her and had been using it to communicate until she was ready to turn the devices all back over to Verizon. During the transaction for these devices the phone she had previously, which was a cell phone on her mother's AT&T account had been kept by the store as a trade in, despite the phone not being paid for and her mother not having agreed to this. They had not been able to get the phone back as the store claimed it was no longer there. Because they felt the representative was knowingly involved in the scheme with the Suspect, they did not return to speak with him. They had attempted to speak to a manager of the store calling from a different Verizon store, but they claimed there was no manager available.

The phone that was still in the possession of the Victim and intending to be returned to Verizon is as follows:

- iPhone 17 Pro Max with a device ID# 356392240391004, wireless number 321-479-0562, and is Orange in color.

Also, during this interview (02/19/26) we learned that the Suspect assisted the Victim in filing her tax return. At that time the Victim believed that the return, which was expected to be approximately $369 dollars, was set to be electronically deposited into her bank account. Sgt Perez suggested that she look into the filing, if she could, because it was more likely the Suspect set it up to go to him. The Victim also realized that she was not able to access the Verizon account online to give us information during the interview. When she tried it prompted her to enter the phone number associated with the account, and despite the fact that she was the account holder, the number that appeared to be needed was the phone the Suspect kept for himself. It also prompted her for a PIN which she did not know. This further suggested that even though she was going to be financially responsible for the accounts, the Suspect had it sent up to give him control of them. This would also lead us to believe that this was intentionally fraudulent on his behalf.

It was determined that since the transactions of purchasing the phones had been done in Palm Bay, the West Melbourne Police Department may not have jurisdiction for that fraud. The Victim was instructed to report this to the Palm Bay Police Department (PBPD). Sgt Perez was later notified that the Victim and her mother had reported the incident regarding the phones to the PBPD and were given a case report #2026-051210. They were led to believe that the PBPD did not think this was criminal and was not actually making a formal report. They were also told

by PBPD that this should have been reported to our agency (WMPD) because they had already discussed the matter with us.

Sgt Perez would later be contacted by the Victim and her mother (who Sgt Perez communicated most with) and would learn that they could not get much information on the tax return filed. They learned that the return was scheduled to be deposited into a Regions Bank account, which the Victim does not have. The IRS advised them that they would have to know what tax service provider was used in order to get documentation about the return filed. The Victim does not know what system was used to file her return. The IRS advised her that if the account scheduled to receive the funds does not have the Victim's name associated with it the bank should reject the transfer. Sgt Perez suggested they go to Regions Bank and make sure there was not an account the Victim was associated with, that she was unaware of. Sgt Perez suspected that the Suspect may have either added her to his account or opened a new account in both of their names to receive the funds. Regions Bank confirmed that there was no account in which the Victim was associated with but obviously would not be able to identify the account holder of any known accounts without legal process. The bank also confirmed that if the deposit was sent to an account without the name of the subject of the tax return on it, that it would be rejected. The Victim would have to contact the IRS to get the refund re-filed properly.

The Victim stated that to the best of her knowledge the tax return was filed by the Suspect on 02/17/26. On that date the Victim was still considered to be living at the 1551 Whitman Dr address, and the tax return would have been filed from that location. Those circumstances would lead us to believe we had jurisdiction for a crime involving this tax return.

On 02/23/26 Sgt Perez was notified that the Victim had received a credit card notice that an application was made in her name with Discover Card. They had taken steps to protect her credit since the Suspect is known to have her personal information to include at least her name, date of birth and social security number. The Victim was going to contact Discover Card and see if they could get information on the account that was opened or attempted to have been opened. They advised the Victim does not have a Discover Card, did not know anything about getting a Discover Card account and did not authorize any account.

On 02/24/26 Sgt Perez was provided with a copy of the letter received in the mail. It was dated 02/17/26 and was addressed to the Victim at her mother's address. It indicated that they (Discover) had received a "Discover it" card application with the Victim's name and/or social security number. It instructed her to contact Discover if she had not applied for this account or card. This would further indicate a fraudulent use of the Victim's personal identification information by the Suspect. The Victim was advised by Discover that the application was received on 02/16/26 which would also have occurred while the Victim was "living" at the 1551 Whitman Dr address. This would further show an ongoing course of fraudulent conduct by the Suspect using the Victim's personal information and convincing her to take action such as giving him her personal information and signing for the 7 new Verizon phones on 2 different accounts. Due to this ongoing activity the WMPD will attempt to investigate the matter as one ongoing scheme and obtain sufficient evidence for a criminal charge for fraud.

On 02/24/26 Sgt Perez went to 525 E University Blvd, where the Dollar General is located. Sgt Perez made contact with ecoATM and attempted to recover the sold phones, as Sgt Perez believed the Victim had been "scammed" into that transaction. ecoATM accessed the machine and opened it for him, but there were no phones present. Sgt Perez believes the phones may have been picked up already by the company. They advised that using the IMEI numbers, ID#'s previously listed in this report, the company may be able to flag the devices and if they are located send them to the WMPD. Later this afternoon Sgt Perez would receive an email from ecoATM providing claim numbers assigned to each of the three devices that were sold. Those claim numbers are as follows:

- iPhone 17 Pro Max – IMEI 356305228365363, Claim: C03493547
- iPhone 17 – IMEI 353502585741307, Claim: C03493546
- iPhone 17 – IMEI 350661236713918, Claim: C03493548

If ecoATM required to be reimbursed for the money paid for these devices this will either be paid by the Victim who voluntarily sold the phones, and (if possible) passed on to the Suspect as further loss caused by his actions. The money was reportedly given to the Suspect, so he would have been the person to profit from the phones being sold. If the phones can be recovered and are not required to be reimbursed, they will be returned to the Victim who will return them to Verizon when trying to cancel all the accounts and phone lines opened on 02/18/26.

Based on the information obtained Sgt Perez believed the Suspect has committed multiple criminal fraud crimes to include Scheme to Defraud (817.034) as he has apparently been in an ongoing scheme to obtain property (new cell phones and money) from the Victim, by convincing the Victim to obtain phones on a new account in her name. It was also the Suspect's intent to provide his children with new phones that the Victim would be financially responsible for. He also attempted to obtain funds, in the form of the Victim's tax return, which was electronically set to be received to an account the Victim did not know about and had no access to. In addition to those charges the Suspect would have committed a Criminal Use of Another Person's personal information by applying for a Discover Card in the Victim's name, without the Victim's knowledge or consent using either her name and/or social security number. Further proof of the Suspect's actions may require additional documentation not yet obtained by the Victim.

On 02/25/26 Sgt Perez received an email containing an image of a text conversation between the Victim and Suspect. This was the conversation Sgt Perez been told about where the Victim asked the Suspect for the money given to him by selling the phones to the ecoATM. We believed that if ecoATM was able to return the phones sold, that they may want to be compensated for the money paid out. The Suspect advised that he would have to get the money back from "Joe," which is supposed to be the Verizon representative that made the sale for the phones to the Victim. The Suspect indicated that he "paid off" the phones they got from Verizon.

On 02/26/26 Sgt Perez received an email containing bills from Verizon that the Victim had received to help explain the financial loss the Victim would be taking from these transactions. Sgt Perez did not believe the Suspect would not actually pay these bills on the Victim's behalf, as she was led to believe he would.

The first bill was for the consumer account showing her first bill for February was $467.36. This was for the three phones on this account, which were 2 iPhone 17s and 1 iPhone 17 Pro Max. The bill listed 36 months of additional payments through 02/29/29. If all 37 payments were the same as the payment for February ($467.36) the Victim would be expected to pay $17,292.32 on this account. This would have been for 3 phones that the Suspect convinced her to sell to ecoATM, where she obtained $929.00 for the sale of. It is unreasonable to assume and very unlikely that the Suspect would have paid this bill for the Victim for the next 36 months, as she was led to believe, when no one would be benefiting from the use of the phones sold.

The second bill was for the business account and listed the 4 lines previously reported. The first bill showed that the Victim would be expected to pay $228.36 in March. The bill shows Device Promotional Credits (-$829.99 - each) taking $3319.95 from the bill, and a Credit to the monthly bill of (-$23.24 – each) taking $92.96 off the bill. It is unclear if these credits would extend the life of the contract, which also appears to be 36 months, or if the bill would go up significantly with the credits no longer being applied. There are additional credits that appear to be applied, but is unclear what phones are involved as all show one number listed (321-479-0562).
There was a second bill associated with the business account. This bill indicated that there was a $52.49 dollar bill for the main number (321-479-0562) and additional charges of $42.29 for each of the 3 additional lines on the business account (321-479-2595, 321-479-3113, and 321-479-7161). This would suggest that the Victim would have been expected to pay $228.36 in addition to $179.36 each month, $407.72 total, every month also for 36 months. This would total $14,677.92 over the course of the 36-month contract if the charges remained the same every month.

If the charges are accurate and remain the same, the Victim in this case would have been convinced, by the Suspect and possibly by the Verizon representative, to sign up for contracts that would have ultimately cost her $31,970.24 dollars over the course of 36 months. In doing so she would have only received the use of the one phone she kept for her, with 3 others going to the Suspect and his 2 children, and three phones having been sold for less than $1,000 total.

On 03/03/26 Sgt Perez was notified about a text message sent to the Victim's mother received on 03/02/26. The Suspect was contacting the Victim's mother as the Victim is now using a new phone and number, which the Suspect does not know. The text message indicated that the Victim's tax return "came into" his account and that all she has to do is meet him at the bank to sign some paperwork to "release it." He stated that if she does not the bank will send the money back and she won't be able to get it for 6 months, when the IRS sends a paper check. This sounded suspicious as the Victim was told by the bank, that if the money comes in with a name not associated on the account, the tax return would automatically be rejected. It is unknown if the Suspect intends to meet with the Victim to try to convince her to sign the money over to him, sign over something else to him, or just try to talk her out of filing criminal charges against him as he has not talked to her directly since these reports were made.

Later this afternoon Sgt Perez made contact (telephone) with a Regions Bank Investigator who confirmed that if the Suspect had or has a Regions Bank account, and a tax return was electronically deposited or attempted, documents requested by subpoena should show this. Sgt Perez advised he would have a subpoena sent out for that information.

Sgt Perez also received a response email from ecoATM regarding the cellphones recovered. They confirmed that the company wants to be reimbursed for the money paid out, prior to the phones being returned to the Victim, otherwise they would like the phones returned to the company. They advised the current payout would be $526 dollars ($263 each), for the 2 recovered phones that were paid out. Sgt Perez notified the Victim that ecoATM wants to be reimbursed and asked them to let him know if they are willing to do this to get the phones returned. The last phone, if recovered, would be an additional $403 dollars to be released.

On 03/05/26 Sgt Perez forwarded information to me where I intended to send a subpoena to Regions Bank for evidence of the tax return being sent to an account in the Suspect's name.

On 03/09/26 Sgt Perez received emails from ecoATM advising that the third device (iPhone 17 Pro Max) had been located and was being shipped to WMPD.

On 03/12/26 Sgt Perez received the last device in the mail. He verified the IMEI number (356605228365363) matched the paperwork provided to by the Victim and her mother, as the third device sold to ecoATM. The three phones will be held as evidence until the Victim decides if they are going to reimburse ecoATM for the cost paid out, in which case the phones will be turned over to the Victim. If not, the devices will be sent back to ecoATM.

On 03/20/26 Jeff Fordley called into the West Melbourne Police Department to speak to a supervisor about a matter related to this case. A Patrol Sergeant called Fordley in Sgt Perez's presence. Fordley provided the Sergeant with a brief explanation related to the situation. He advised that this young female friend of his daughter's had been kicked out of her house by her mother and he allowed her to stay with them. He then began helping her get her stuff together. While doing this he assisted her in filing her tax return. He advised that the girl had "made up" with her mother and returned home. He indicated that the tax return money had been placed into his bank account, but his bank was now investigating him for fraud and has since frozen his account. He advised that he has been trying to get the young female (Victim) to come to the bank to and sign a piece of paper that will allow her to get this money and allow the bank to unfreeze his account. He stated that he had considered filing a report with us (possibly for a fraud) against the Victim, but he did not specify what action she may have done that would lead him to believe he was a Victim. He stated multiple times that he was trying to resolve the situation without filing a report against her. He stated getting this money released and getting his account unfrozen was the last step in what was going on, but he did not provide details about what other steps had taken place.

Sgt Perez notified Det Brickhouse of this phone call and the statements Fordley made, suggesting he may want to come in and file a report. He had mentioned that Monday (03/23) was the date his bank had given him to get this matter resolved and suggested that as of Monday he may need to take some other action, possibly reporting something to the police department.

On 03/23/26 Sgt Perez attempted to make contact with Fordley (321-515-3894) but received no answer and left a message. A short time later Fordley called back and discussed the issue he was claiming to have. He admitted to helping the Victim file her taxes weeks ago, knowing that the money would be deposited into his account. He advised that he has done this with his children in

the past and that there is a release form that they or she would have to sign to get the money released. He advised that the Victim has refused to meet with him and sign this release, which has led the bank to freeze his account and possibly file fraud charges against him. He confirmed that today was the deadline the bank gave him to get this taken care of, and if he does not have it done by 5pm the bank would file charges on him. He said he saved messages between him and the Victim and the Victim's mother showing he was trying to get this addressed. He mentioned at least twice that this tax return was the last thing he needed to get addressed.

Sgt Perez asked him if there were other issues and he said yes. He talked about having helped the Victim get a new cell phone and talked about her selling his old phones at an ecoATM, but he did not elaborate. Sgt Perez did not ask for more details as he did not want him to think we were investigating that until he was willing to come in and speak to someone. He advised he would be willing to come in and show us the messages between him and the Victim and her mother. He also stated he wanted to have the incident documented in case the bank filed fraud charges on him. He stated that he had a meeting at the bank this afternoon, that he expected to be finished by 4pm and he would come to the police department after. The phone call was recorded and placed into the electronic case file. He was not sworn to his statements, and Sgt Perez did not want him to think he was being interviewed. Fordley failed to respond to the WMPD to speak with anyone on that day.

On 3/2/26, I Detective Brickhouse was assigned this case for further investigation.

On 3/4/26, sent subpoenas for the Internal Revenue Service, Verizon Wireless, and Regions Bank.

On 3/19/26, I received the Regions Bank subpoena results back and it shows that Jeffrey Fordley has 2 accounts in his name[redacted] In reference to the account ending in 0346, on 2/23/26 there was a deposit/credit from the IRS/Treasury Department for a tax refund from the Victim in the amount of $321.00. It should be noted the subpoena was for the dates of 2/13/26 through 2/23/26 in which there was a zero balance in the account prior to the deposit of the $321.00. On the same day, $200.00 was removed (received cash) from the account, leaving a balance of $121.00.

On 3/25/26, the Victim came to the station due to her receiving a letter in the mail about an application for credit with Discover. According to the denial letter, the application was received on 2/17/26 and the address that is listed was 1551 Whitman Drive West Melbourne, FL which belongs to Fordley. The Victim advised she never filled out an application; however, she remembered giving Fordley her social security number and date of birth while completing the process for the cellphones (at Verizon Wireless). It should be noted the phone listed on the application is (321)515-3894, which belongs to Fordley. The Victim wrote a statement advising she didn't fill out an application or ever give anyone permission to apply for credit in her name.

Later in the day, Fordley came to the station to speak with me and provided me the following in summary: He advised his daughter to ask him if the Victim could stay with them due to family issues at home. Fordley said he knew the Victim good enough for her to call him "daddy" and he considered her his daughter. Fordley said she asked him to do her taxes, help her get a cellphone,

and drop off her car. The first thing they took care of was getting her some cellphones (he claims she figured out that she could get multiple phones, so she did).

Fordley had her and his daughter bring two old cellphones that belonged to him to the ecoATM to pawn in which he received $400 for. These would have been the phones his son and daughter had been using. Fordley claimed he paid the taxes on the cellphones at Verizon Wireless that were for the Victim which were also $400. He advised the Victim's mother filed a report against him with Palm Bay Police Department about the phones that were purchased in the name of the Victim. Fordley then said he completed the taxes for the Victim and had the funds sent to his personal account due to an issue with the Victim wanting to use her account. It should be noted that the Victim had previously advised this statement was false.

Fordley said when the funds were deposited into his account, the account was frozen by Regions Bank due to it appearing to be fraudulent. It should be noted; the Victim is not listed or apart of his account so the funds should never have been sent to his account. Fordley said he asked the Victim to come to the bank to sign a form so she could get her money and she advised her mother said not to. Fordley then advised he also had spoken to the Brevard County Sheriff's Office about the incident, and they forwarded him to WMPD. Fordley provided the name of his point of contact at the Regions Bank (located at 1051 W. New Haven Ave).

Fordley presented me with copies of text message from the Victim's phone number and her mother's phone. I explained to him regardless of what the message may say, we can't put whoever behind the phone that may have been texting him unfortunately. When asked about how the Victim was able to get so many phones he advised he didn't know. He then advised that Verizon ran her credit and all he did was bring her to the location. Fordley advised in total, the Victim was able to get 5 phones and one of which went to his daughter.

Fordley explained the conversation about the Victim's taxes came about when she originally was going to get her mother to complete them but changed her mind. He claims she called two tax services, and they were asking for about $200 each, so he offered to do it for her. Fordley said the Victim asked him to put the return into his account, but he couldn't remember which tax service he used, and the tax information was sent to her email address. Fordley was sworn to his verbal statement.

On 6/22/26, the cellphones that were placed into evidence from the EcoATM were sent back via FedEx due to Hernandez not wishing to pay for them to keep them.

On 7/27/26, I received the business certification for the application that was submitted to Discover, which was done outside of the knowledge and without permission of Hernandez.

Based on the above facts, statements and physical evidence provided, your Affiant has probable cause to believe and does believe that the above listed probable cause, all leads to the substantiation that defendant, **Jeffrey Robert Fordley**, has committed a violation of the laws of the State of Florida, to wit: **Organized Fraud Obtain Property Less than 20,000,** contrary to section **817.034 (4)(a)(3),** Florida Statutes, **Criminal Use of Personal Identification Information**, contrary to section **817.568(2)(a)**, Florida Statutes.

Your Affiant, Detective Donovan Brickhouse (hereinafter referred to as Your Affiant) is a sworn Law Enforcement Officer employed by the City of West Melbourne since 2014. This certification was accomplished through the Brevard Community College Police Testing Center, Melbourne, Florida in 2008 and accompanied with the successful completion of a State administered certification test. Since that time, your affiant has served in the West Melbourne Police Department's Patrol Division and held the positions of Patrol Officer and Field Training Officer. Presently, your affiant is assigned to the Criminal Investigations Division of the West Melbourne Police Department as a Detective. Responsibilities in this Division include the investigation of felony crimes. Your affiant has received training in Investigative Interviews and over 700 additional training hours, including prior Law Enforcement experience from 2001-2008 in the state of North Carolina. Your Affiant also has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Criminal Justice

WHEREAS, your Affiant makes this affidavit and prays for the issuance of an Arrest Warrant with authority to effect the arrest of **Jeffrey Robert Fordley** for the violation of the laws of the State of Florida, to wit: **Organized Fraud Obtain Property Less than 20,000,** contrary to section **817.034(4)(a)(3),** Florida Statutes, **Criminal Use of Personal Identification Information,** contrary to section **817.568(2)(a)**, Florida Statutes.

121

Detective Donovan Brickhouse and Badge #121
West Melbourne Police Department
Affiant

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME THIS 29th DAY OF July, A.D. 2026 BY Detective Donovan Brickhouse (Affiant) WHO IS PERSONALLY KNOWN TO ME.

762

SERGEANT MICHAEL PEREZ #762
[SWORN LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER]
BREVARD COUNTY, FLORIDA