



Report of Investigation

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Inspector General
Office of Investigation

File Number: 2014SI001699I	District/Office: Special Investigations Division (SID), Washington, DC
--------------------------------------	--

Title:

(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)
 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)
 Office of Inspector General (OIG)
 (b) (7)(C)

Narrative:

BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION:

On September 29, 2014, SID initiated an investigation into information that (b) (7)(C) used and provided several different names ((b) (7)(C) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C)) and several different dates of birth (DOB) ((b) (7)(C)) on state government forms and to law enforcement authorities after being arrested on separate criminal violations between 1992 and 2005. This information was discovered during a SID Pre-Employment Suitable Inquiry (PSI) (**Exhibit 1**).

POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS:

Potential Criminal Violations –

- Title 18 U.S. Code §1001 – False Statements

(b) (7)(C)

Date:

January 30, 2015

Special Investigations Division

Special Investigations Division

This report is the property of the Office of Investigation. It contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the Office of Inspector General. It and its contents may not be reproduced without written permission. The report is FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY and its disclosure to unauthorized persons is prohibited. Public availability to be determined under 5 U.S.C. § 552.

Previous Editions Obsolete

HUD-1408(12-95)

OIGM 3000 Appendix 14a

Potential Administrative Violations –

HUD OIGM 1752 (Disciplinary and Adverse Actions) Appendix 2 Table of Penalties

- Page 27 – Failure to cooperate during an OIG inquiry
- Page 27 – Falsification of official documents
- Page 28 – Fraud against the Government
- Page 28 – Lying under Oath
- Page 30 – Unprofessional conduct on duty
- Page 30 – Unprofessional conduct off duty (that impacts or discredits OIG)

RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION:

The investigation revealed that (b) (7)(C) had a history of providing false statements to law enforcement authorities during official investigations, and that (b) (7)(C) exhibited lack of candor as a witness in official investigations.

(b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (7)(C) intentionally used different names and DOBs, during encounters with law enforcement authorities between 1992 and 2005. (b) (7)(C) also advised that his birth name was (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) original DOB is (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) advised that (b) (7)(C) legally changed (b) (7)(C) name from (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) in 2010, through the Fairfax County Circuit Court for the State of Virginia.

Additionally, during an interview with SID, (b) (7)(C) exhibited lack of candor when questioned about a document, (b) (7)(C). While reviewing the document in question, (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that the handwriting on the document appeared to be (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) filed the document with the court in an attempt to get (b) (7)(C) arrest record, relating to one of (b) (7)(C) 1992 theft charges, expunged in the (b) (7)(C). When (b) (7)(C) was asked why (b) (7)(C) wrote an incorrect DOB on the form, (b) (7)(C) originally stated that (b) (7)(C) did not write the DOB on the second page of the document. However, SID identified specific patterns in (b) (7)(C) handwriting, at which point (b) (7)(C) recanted (b) (7)(C) statement and admitted that (b) (7)(C) wrote the wrong DOB on the form. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) could not recall why (b) (7)(C) wrote the wrong DOB, but admitted that it was a mistake.

(b) (7)(C) declined prosecution, due to the fact that HUD has administrative remedies that could be imposed against (b) (7)(C) concerning (b) (7)(C) violations.

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION:

On October 29, 2014, a review of personnel and security records pertaining to (b) (7)(C) was conducted by SID (Exhibit 2). This review did not reveal any evidence that (b) (7)(C) provided false statements on (b) (7)(C) Declaration for Federal Employment form (Form 306), or any other documents (b) (7)(C) submitted in order to gain employment with HUD.

On October 31, 2014, (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 3). (b) (7)(C) had legal representation present during the course of this interview. (b) (7)(C) was represented (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that (b) (7)(C) was arrested on two separate occasions in 1992 for misdemeanor theft, and in 2002 for assault. (b) (7)(C) admitted that (b) (7)(C) intentionally provided law enforcement authorities with the wrong name after being arrested for misdemeanor theft in or around February 1992. (b) (7)(C) stated that during the February 1992 arrest (b) (7)(C) used the name (b) (7)(C) because (b) (7)(C) was afraid. (b) (7)(C) continued that (b) (7)(C) second arrest occurred in March/April 1992, again for a misdemeanor theft. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) used (b) (7)(C) birth name during this incident, but could not confirm or deny providing law enforcement authorities with an incorrect DOB. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) could not remember using the wrong DOB, when (b) (7)(C) was arrested in March/April 1992.

In regard to (b) (7)(C) arrest in 2002 for assault, (b) (7)(C) stated that the incident occurred at (b) (7)(C) residence, and involved a "house guest" named (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) advised that on the date of the incident, (b) (7)(C) discovered that (b) (7)(C) brought drugs in the residence. (b) (7)(C) stated there was an argument between (b) (7)(C) regarding the drugs, which eventually escalated into a physical altercation. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) initiated the altercation, and placed (b) (7)(C) on the defense. (b) (7)(C) acknowledged that at some point a frying pan was utilized during the altercation, but (b) (7)(C) could not recall if (b) (7)(C) was responsible for utilizing the frying pan.

(b) (7)(C) continued that (b) (7)(C) was called (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) to investigate the incident. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) were separated and interviewed by the police officers who responded to the scene. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) was interviewed in the back of a police cruiser, before being arrested and transported to a local jail for processing. (b) (7)(C) said the following morning (b) (7)(C) was scheduled to appear in (b) (7)(C) for (b) (7)(C) initial appearance, but after reaching the court, (b) (7)(C) was released by a court officer and told that the charges against (b) (7)(C) were dropped. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) without any further actions by (b) (7)(C).

At the request of SID, (b) (7)(C) was asked to review three (3) documents relating to (b) (7)(C) 1992 and 2002 arrests. (b) (7)(C) was asked to circle and initial any discrepancies (b) (7)(C) noticed within the documents.

The first document was a copy of the (b) (7)(C) which lists (b) (7)(C) as the individual providing the statement. (b) (7)(C) confirmed that it was a copy of the statement (b) (7)(C) provided to (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated that the handwriting on the document did not belong (b) (7)(C). In addition (b) (7)(C) identified two inconsistencies in the document. (b) (7)(C) stated that the address and the DOB sections were both incorrect. (b) (7)(C) said (b) (7)(C) correct address at the time (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) continued that the report had a DOB (b) (7)(C) and that (b) (7)(C) correct DOB is (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) believed the inaccurate information was reported by the officer who completed the report. (b) (7)(C) denied providing the reporting officer with the wrong DOB, and stated (b) (7)(C) had no idea why the reporting officer noted (b) (7)(C) address incorrectly.

The second document reviewed by (b) (7)(C) was a copy of a document filed with the Superior Court of California, (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) acknowledged the handwriting on the document appeared to be (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) filed the

(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)

document with the court in an attempt to get [redacted] arrest record, relating to one of [redacted] (b) (7)(C) [redacted] (b) (7)(C) [redacted]. (b) (7)(C) originally stated that [redacted] did not write the wrong DOB on the second page of the document. However, SID identified specific patterns in [redacted] handwriting, and (b) (7)(C) admitted that [redacted] wrote the wrong DOB on the form. (b) (7)(C) stated that [redacted] did not know why [redacted] wrote the wrong DOB.

The third document (b) (7)(C) reviewed was [redacted] [redacted] (b) (7)(C) reviewed the document and acknowledged [redacted] signature was on the document. (b) (7)(C) also acknowledged that the handwriting on the document was [redacted] and that there were some inconsistencies within the document. (b) (7)(C) circled and initialed the DOB of [redacted] (b) (7)(C) typed on the document. In addition, (b) (7)(C) circled and initialed an address at the bottom of the document and stated that the address appeared to have been written [redacted] (b) (7)(C). After identifying the DOB and address as inaccurate, (b) (7)(C) stated that [redacted] was not completely sure whether the handwriting and signature on the document (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) said it appeared to be [redacted] handwriting, but [redacted] could not be certain.

On November 5, 2014, (b) (7)(C) was re-interviewed by SID (Exhibit 4). [redacted] (b) (7)(C) was conferenced into the interview, via telephone. (b) (7)(C) was advised that SID wanted to clarify additional allegations made against [redacted] (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) was informed that during the time of [redacted] (b) (7)(C) it was reported [redacted] (b) (7)(C) was involved in prostitution. Specifically, [redacted] (b) (7)(C) [redacted] (b) (7)(C) "does pimp work for (b) (7)(C) over the internet." (b) (7)(C) was given a copy of [redacted] (b) (7)(C) [redacted] to review. (b) (7)(C) was asked to read, aloud, two highlighted sections of the report so that [redacted] (b) (7)(C) would be aware of what [redacted] (b) (7)(C) was being asked to review. (b) (7)(C) read the below listed sections of [redacted] (b) (7)(C)

"(b) (7)(C) directed me to the dresser and pointed out the third drawer which contains only (b) (7)(C) belongings. I observed an approx. 4" (clear plastic) with small black rock looking substance based on my training and experience appeared to be Tar Heroin inside, a syringe, (2) prescription bottles, + court papers with [redacted] name on them.

The black tar substance valtox tested positive for Heroin and was TOTD Narcotics locker."

(b) (7)(C) said the drugs and paraphernalia are not (b) (7)(C) said that [redacted] has been in a methadone program for 3 weeks. (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) does not use drugs and that they must belong to one of [redacted] (b) (7)(C) boyfriends.

[redacted] added that [redacted] does "Pimp" work for (b) (7)(C) over the internet. [redacted] said just dating and no sex. [redacted] (b) (7)(C) is not forced to do so, only doing it for the money."

After reading the highlighted sections of the report, (b) (7)(C) was asked if [redacted] was involved with any type of prostitution, at any point in time. At which point (b) (7)(C) immediately requested time to deliberate with [redacted] (b) (7)(C). After deliberating with [redacted] (b) (7)(C), (b) (7)(C) said, "...I cannot answer that question, based on the way it was presented." (b) (7)(C) asked the RAs to clarify the question. (b) (7)(C) was then

(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)

asked if (b) (7)(C) was a "Pimp", or ever been "Pimped" in his life. (b) (7)(C) originally denied being a "Pimp" and/or being "Pimped", but then asked for clarification on the term "Pimp". (b) (7)(C) was asked if (b) (7)(C) understood the meaning of the terms "Pimp" and/or "Pimped". (b) (7)(C) responded by requesting the RAs definition of the two terms. As a result, the term "Pimp" was defined as an individual who "Procures or facilitates a prostitute in the arrangement of a sex act with a paying customer". After being provided with a definition of the term "Pimp", (b) (7)(C) again asked for time to deliberate with (b) (7)(C). After their ((b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)) deliberation, (b) (7)(C) terminated the interview.

LAW ENFORCEMENT COORDINATION:

During the course of this investigation SID coordinated with (b) (7)(C) on several occasions. (b) (7)(C) reported that their records indicated that (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) for a felony Assault with a Deadly Weapon (other than a gun), (b) (7)(C). A review of (b) (7)(C) revealed that the listed victim of the assault alleged that (b) (7)(C) was involved in prostitution at the time. In addition, it was mentioned in (b) (7)(C) reported that their department was going to gather additional information on the allegation of prostitution. As a result, this office requested additional information relating to the allegation that (b) (7)(C) was involved in prostitution.

On November 6, 2014, (b) (7)(C) that a complete check of any and all records relating to (b) (7)(C) in (b) (7)(C) did not uncover any additional information pertaining to (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C).

PROSECUTORIAL COORDINATION:

(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) regarding Title 18 U.S. Code § 1001 – False Statements. (b) (7)(C) declined prosecution citing a lack of resources and the fact that HUD-OIG has administrative remedies that can be imposed (Exhibit 6).