



## Report of Investigation

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

File Number: <b>2014SI000850I</b>	District/Office: <b>Special Investigations Division (SID), Washington, DC</b>
--------------------------------------	--

Title:

(b) (7)(C)

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

(b) (7)(C)

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

HUD, OIG, (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

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

HUD, OIG, (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

Narrative:

### BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION:

On (b) (7)(C), HUD-OIG, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C), regarding an allegation that (b) (7)(C) when (b) (7)(C) failed to return, in its entirety, original documentation that a private citizen, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) provided (b) (7)(C) during an interview at (b) (7)(C) residence. It was also alleged that (b) (7)(C) was rude and spoke (b) (7)(C) in a less than professional manner (**Exhibit 1**).

(b) (7)(C)

Special Investigations Division

(b) (7)(C)

Special Investigations Division

Date:

October 30, 2014

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

OIGM 3000 Appendix 14a

HUD-1408(12-95)

- Title 18 U.S. Code § 641 – Public Money, Property or Records.
- Title 18 U.S. Code §1001 – False Statements

- Page 28 – Improper evidence handling.
- Page 30 – Unprofessional conduct on duty.

[illegible]

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

### DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION:

(b) (7)(C) stated (b) (7)(C) advised (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) was (b) (7)(C) and gave (b) (7)(C) a telephone number. (b) (7)(C) continued that (b) (7)(C) called the telephone number that was provided by (b) (7)(C) but it was not the correct number for (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) believes (b) (7)(C) intentionally gave (b) (7)(C) the wrong telephone number for (b) (7)(C).

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

(b) (7)(C)  
and CARLING. (b) (7)(C)

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

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

CARLING (b) (7)(C)

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

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

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

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

(b) (7)(C)

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

(b) (7)(C)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

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

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

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

CARLING

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

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C), (b) (5)

CARLING (b) (7)(C)

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

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

(b) (7)(C)

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

(b) (7)(C), (b) (5)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) CARLING. (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)

On June 27, 2014, SID interviewed (b) (7)(C) confirmed that she received documents from (b) (7)(C) and that (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) failed to give (b) (7)(C) a property receipt for the documents. (b) (7)(C) advised that they (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) visited (b) (7)(C) residence to follow-up on (b) (7)(C) original complaint involving alleged fraudulent predatory lending practices relating to a home renovation loan (b) (7)(C) received through the DHCD. (b) (7)(C) stated that she took the documents to review them for any potential fraud relating to any HUD programs. (b) (7)(C) was able to confirm (b) (7)(C) loan was a conventional uninsured loan, which did not fall within the investigative purview of HUD-OIG.

(b) (7)(C) also admitted to, "losing cool"; during a March 2014 telephone conversation after (b) (7)(C) accused (b) (7)(C) several times, of stealing (b) (7)(C) documents. (b) (7)(C) spoke to (b) (7)(C) in a manner that could be perceived as unprofessional. (b) (7)(C) adamantly denied stealing (b) (7)(C) documents.

In an attempt to describe (b) (7)(C) demeanor during the interview, (b) (7)(C) that there was an incident, while (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) were at (b) (7)(C) residence. (b) (7)(C) explained that (b) (7)(C) fell down on the floor and started complaining about (b) (7)(C) medical condition. (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) was (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) so (b) (7)(C) helped (b) (7)(C) to the couch, before ultimately calming (b) (7)(C) down. (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) advised them (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) had undergone two open heart surgeries and that (b) (7)(C) health was deteriorating, so (b) (7)(C) was not sure (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) was getting overwhelmed by discussing (b) (7)(C) HUD programmatic complaint.

According to (b) (7)(C) during a conversation with (b) (7)(C) just after the interview of (b) (7)(C) told (b) (7)(C) overheard the entire incident (b) (7)(C) complaining about (b) (7)(C) medical condition, and (b) (7)(C) calming (b) (7)(C) while (b) (7)(C) was in the bathroom. (b) (7)(C) said that (b) (7)(C) that (b) (7)(C) purposely stayed in the bathroom until (b) (7)(C) calmed down.

(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C) CARLING, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
 (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)

[illegible]

(b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] after (b) (7)(C)  
(b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)  
(b) (6)(b) (6)(b) (6)(b) (6). Furthermore, (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C)  
(b) (7)(C) [REDACTED]

[illegible][illegible]



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

On August 12, 2014, the facts of this investigation were presented to (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) [redacted] for the potential prosecution of CARLING for violation of Title 18 U.S. Code § 641 – Public Money, Property or Records. (b) (7)(C) (b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5) (b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)(b) (5)



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

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

<b>Exhibit Number:</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Advice of Investigation, dated April 2, 2014.
2	Memorandum of Interview, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)
3	Memorandum of Interview, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)
4	Memorandum of Interview, (b) (7)(C)
5	Memorandum of Interview, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)
6	Memorandum of Interview, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)
7	Memorandum of Activity, (b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)(b) (7)(C)