



# Report of Investigation

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

File Number: <b>2015SI000166 I</b>	District/Office: <b>Special Investigations Division (SID), Washington, DC</b>
---------------------------------------	--

Title:  
 [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C)  
 [REDACTED]  
**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)**  
**Office of the Inspector General (OIG)**  
 [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C)  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]

### BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION:

On November 20, 2014, HUD-OIG, SID received an [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] HUD, OIG, [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) that [REDACTED] received [REDACTED] [REDACTED] misused [REDACTED] position by inappropriately utilizing [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for personal benefit. [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) further alleged that [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) provided [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) leading to integrity issues.

### POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS:

Potential Administrative violations – [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C)

- Dishonest, infamous, or notoriously disgraceful conduct (Including discreditable involvement with local or Federal Law Enforcement Authorities)
- Criticism by Administrative or Judicial Tribunal/misconduct during trial or hearing.

<b>(b) (7)(C)</b>		Date: <b>March 4, 2015</b>
<b>Special Investigations Division</b>	<b>Special Investigations Division</b>	

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.

(b) (7)(C)

- Improper investigative/Audit technique
- Lying under oath
- Misuse /theft/unauthorized possession of Government property or funds
- Misuse of Government owned/leased vehicle

### RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION:

This investigation found no evidence to support the allegation that [REDACTED] abused [REDACTED] position by using [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) for personal use, as alleged by (b) (7)(C). SID did not identify any abuse or misuse of government property, restricted [REDACTED] or time by [REDACTED]. Additionally, SID found no information to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] provided false testimony in a court proceeding.

### DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION:

On November 21, 2014, SID requested and obtained [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) audit outlining all usage by [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) from 2009 through November 2014 (Exhibit 2). A review of this audit did not reveal any apparent personal or inappropriate usage by [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C).

On November 24, 2014, SID requested an (b) (7)(C) audit outlining all usage by [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) from 2009 through November 2014 (Exhibit 3). According to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] A review of this audit did not reveal any apparent personal or inappropriate usage by [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C).

On December 2, 2014, [REDACTED] was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 4). [REDACTED] alleged that [REDACTED] had been using [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) for personal gain and that [REDACTED] lied under oath in a [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) although [REDACTED] was unable to provide any further details to corroborate [REDACTED] allegations. [REDACTED] provided a list of names [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] ran through [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C). [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) made additional claims that [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) followed a former girlfriend, [REDACTED] to her place of employment, forced their [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) to drive by one of [REDACTED] ex-girlfriend's residences and took photographs of one of [REDACTED] ex-girlfriend's vehicles while parked in [REDACTED] driveway. [REDACTED] (b) (7)(C) did not provide any details to substantiate these claims or that these alleged incidents took place on government time or utilizing government resources. [REDACTED] admitted that most of [REDACTED] allegations were "assumptions" on [REDACTED] part.

On December 2, 2014, SID obtained [REDACTED]

SID reviewed these documents and confirmed that these appeared to be duplicates of the documents provided by [REDACTED] during his initial allegation.

(b) (7)(C)

On December 3, 2014, (b) (7)(C) HUD, OIG, (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 6) (b) (7)(C) had not observed any misuse of government resources, to include, government time, misuse of (b) (7)(C) or property by (b) (7)(C) does not have access to "many" (b) (7)(C) and relies upon (b) (7)(C) HUD, OIG, (b) (7)(C) to (b) (7)(C) inquiries for (b) (7)(C) case work. (b) (7)(C) has kept (b) (7)(C) apprised of (b) (7)(C) ongoing (b) (7)(C) regarding (b) (7)(C)

On December 3, 2014, (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 7). (b) (7)(C) has run requested (b) (7)(C) and the (b) (7)(C) HUD-OIG agents through (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) has not observed any inappropriate usage or requests from (b) (7)(C) or the other agents. (b) (7)(C) provided (b) (7)(C) for SID's review. SID did not observe any inappropriate usage by (b) (7)(C) nor were any of the names provided (b) (7)(C) as potential targets of (b) (7)(C) misuse, located in the log book.

On December 3, 2014, (b) (7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 8). F (b) (7)(C) stated that (b) (7)(C) had not misused (b) (7)(C) position for personal gain or lied under oath, as alleged by (b) (7)(C) informed SID that (b) (7)(C) did not have access to any (b) (7)(C) except for (b) (7)(C) also stated that (b) (7)(C) had never requested other (b) (7)(C) colleagues to run anyone for (b) (7)(C) personal benefit. (b) (7)(C) SID that (b) (7)(C) situation with (b) (7)(C) had been ongoing since (b) (7)(C) and (b) (7)(C) was probably lodging this complaint due (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) that was in (b) (7)(C) favor. (b) (7)(C) also advised SID that the magistrate judge in (b) (7)(C) was in the process of overturning (b) (7)(C) previous decision, to include the comments referenced by (b) (7)(C) in (b) (7)(C) complaint. (b) (7)(C) continued that, ironically, (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) for inappropriate usage (b) (7)(C) filled out a sworn affidavit and affirmed that there had been no inappropriate behavior on (b) (7)(C) part, as alleged (b) (7)(C)

On December 4, 2014, SID obtained additional certified (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) SID reviewed these documents and located additional (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) did not provide previously.

On December 8, 2014, SID requested an additional audit of the (b) (7)(C) to include specific names provided (b) (7)(C) (Exhibit 9). SID reviewed (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C) participant and observed that according to both (b) (7)(C) audit reports pertaining (b) (7)(C) logged (b) (7)(C) 68 times and made 194 inquiries. (b) (7)(C) did not search for any of the names provided by (b) (7)(C). Based upon this review, no evidence was found that would indicate (b) (7)(C) utilized the (b) (7)(C) for personal gain.

On January 7, 2015, (b) (7)(C) contacted SID and alleged that (b) (7)(C) used her government owned vehicle (GOV) for personal use to drive to court appearances, threatened secretaries at their (b) (7)(C)

(b) (7)(C)

and (b) (7)(C) and that (b) (7)(C) may have run names on (b) (7)(C) behalf. When questioned by SID, (b) (7)(C) did not "directly threaten" the secretaries. (b) (7)(C) did not provide any specific dates or further details of the other allegations and stated that these things may have occurred "in general". (Exhibit 10)

On January 11, 2015, (b) (7)(C) provided SID a list of additional names that (b) (7)(C) believed (b) (7)(C) may have run through (b) (7)(C). A subsequent review of (b) (7)(C) usage, which was obtained previously by SID, revealed that none of the names were run by (b) (7)(C). (Exhibit 11).

#### PROSECUTORIAL COORDINATION:

(b) (7)(C)  
(b) (7)(C) In addition, no potential administrative violations regarding (b) (7)(C) were identified during the course of this investigation.