



## REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY



OFFICE OF INVESTIGATION



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

## REPORT OF INVESTIGATION



### INVESTIGATIVE RECORD REVIEW

This Report contains information involving an official investigation by the Office of Inspector General and is subject to provisions of the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S.C. 522a). It is the property of the Inspector General and is loaned to you for official purposes only.

The material must be safeguarded from unauthorized disclosure. It should not be left unattended or discussed with unauthorized persons and must be retained in an approved security container when not in use. Those individuals who review this material are required to complete the Review Log below.

Reproduction of this report, or any portions thereof, must be accounted for on the Copy Log below.

#### REVIEW LOG

DATE	OFFICE/DIVISION	TITLE	SIGNATURE

#### COPY LOG

COPY #	RECIPIENT	DATE	RETURN DATE	DESTROYED



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

# REPORT OF INVESTIGATION



CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

(b) (7)(C)

TITLE: (b) (7)(b) (7)(C)

## NARRATIVE:

### SUBJECT IDENTIFICATION:

(b) (7)(C)

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Office of Inspector General (OIG), (b) (7)(C)

### BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION:

This investigation was initiated based upon notification from (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) HUD, OIG, HOD, Washington, DC, that the "RETIRED" HUD-OIG law enforcement credentials, (b)(7)(C) shipped to retired (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) (C) HUD, OIG, (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) were stolen post-delivery (Exhibit 1).

### POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS:

#### Potential Criminal Violations –

- Title 18 U.S. Code § 641 – Theft of public money, property or records

REPORT BY:

(b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(C)

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

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

Special Investigations Division

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

Special Investigations Division

DATE:

4/27/2015

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 & 552a.



**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

**Potential Administrative Violations –****(b) (7)(C)**

- Failure to safeguard the security and confidentiality of records, including personally identifiable information.

**SYNOPSIS:**

This investigation failed to determine whether or not the package, containing the law enforcement credentials, delivered to **(b) (7)(C)**, was stolen after it was delivered on February 19, 2015, or if it was lost as a result of inclement weather conditions. Therefore, no subject(s) of theft were identified during the course of this investigation.

During the Course of this investigation, **(b) (7)(C)** **(b) (7)(C)** to request a delivery signature receipt when he shipped the law enforcement credentials via United Parcel Service (UPS), which proved to be a contributing factor in the loss of the credentials.

**DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION:**

On March 20, 2015, **(b) (7)(C)** reported, to the Special Investigations Division (SID), that **(b) (7)(C)** claimed **(b) (7)(C)** never received the “RETIRED” HUD-OIG law enforcement credentials reportedly delivered to **(b) (7)(C)** residence by UPS on February 19, 2015. **(b) (7)(C)** provided approved **(b) (7)(C), (b) (5)**  
**(b) (7)(C), (b) (5)** **(b) (7)(C)**

On March 24, 2015, **(b) (7)(C)** was interviewed by SID (**Exhibit 3**). **(b) (7)(C)** stated **(b) (7)(C)** only recently obtained access to the UPS shipping system, and in fact, was granted access approximately one week prior to shipping the credentials in question. **(b) (7)(C)** stated the package containing the credentials may have only been the sixth (6<sup>th</sup>) shipment **(b) (7)(C)** had made using the UPS system. Additionally, **(b) (7)(C)** stated **(b) (7)(C)** was not provided with any training or special instructions regarding the shipment of credentials, nor was **(b) (7)(C)** aware of any HUD policy that dictated the shipment of credentials. Nonetheless, **(b) (7)(C)** stated it was **(b) (7)(C)** intent to, and belief that **(b) (7)(C)** had, shipped the package containing the credentials in such a manner that a signature would be required upon delivery. **(b) (7)(C)** stated a subsequent review of the UPS website revealed that **(b) (7)(C)** did not elect for a signature delivery confirmation, but rather just an email notification.

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 & 552a.

**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

(b)(7)(C) described the packaging as a standard UPS flat document envelope, within which another envelope containing (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C), a HUD Form 26 (Property Receipt), and a note requesting (b)(7)(C) sign the HUD Form 26, and return it to HOD, were contained.

On March 30, 2015, SID coordinated with (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) U.S. Postal (b)(7)(C) (USPIS), (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) stated a query of (b)(7)(C) files revealed no reports of mail theft on the entire route (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)

On March 31, 2015, SID coordinated with (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) UPS, (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) and (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) UPS, (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) identified the UPS (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) UPS, (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) and also provided the UPS (b)(7)(C) scan printout. (b)(7)(C) confirmed that the package was delivered to the "Front Door" of (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C), (b)(7)(C) at 11:24 AM. (b)(7)(C) further stated that at some point, subsequent to the delivery, (b)(7)(C) was sent back out to (b)(7)(C) residence to follow up with (b)(7)(C) however, (b)(7)(C) was unable to provide the exact date or time of the follow up conducted by (b)(7)(C)

On April 2, 2015, (b)(7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 6). (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) had no information pertaining to the missing credentials, and that (b)(7)(C) was never notified by HOD that the credentials were shipped until (b)(7)(C) inquired about their status.

(b)(7)(C) stated, following the report, by HOD, that the credentials were missing, UPS sent the original delivery driver to (b)(7)(C) house to follow up with (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) stated the delivery driver informed (b)(7)(C) that it was snowing when (b)(7)(C) delivered the flat envelope to the front porch. (b)(7)(C) further stated that the driver indicated that (b)(7)(C) either did not usually drive that particular route, or that (b)(7)(C) did not usually make deliveries. (b)(7)(C) stated every other UPS package (b)(7)(C) received was left near (b)(7)(C) garage door, and that (b)(7)(C) rarely ever used (b)(7)(C) front door. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) always entered and exited (b)(7)(C) home through the side load garage, and especially would have during inclement weather. (b)(7)(C) stated because (b)(7)(C) never used (b)(7)(C) front door, the package containing the credentials could have sat at the front door for an extended period of time. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) did not recall what (b)(7)(C) did the day the credentials were reportedly delivered, but stated (b)(7)(C) was in town and may have been home at the time of the delivery.

(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) conducted a search of his property, following the notification from HOD that the credentials

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 & 552a.

## REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

were reportedly delivered, in the event that the wind had blown the envelope off of the front porch. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) searched (b)(7)(C) entire front yard, approximately 150-200 feet to the north of his northernmost property line, and approximately 60 feet to the south of his southernmost property line.

A survey of (b)(7)(C) property, conducted by SID, revealed (b)(7)(C) elevated front porch was not covered, nor was there any type of screen/storm door present. There was a thick rubber mat present on the front porch. The north facing, side load garage extended west from the front of house, just north (left) of the front door. While conducting the survey, significant wind gusts were noted, likely in excess of 20 MPH.

On April 2, 2015, SID conducted canvas interviews of residents in close proximity to (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) which revealed no significant information (Exhibit 7). During the canvas interviews; however, it was noted that several of the surrounding homes had "For Sale" signs posted in the yards, and at least one home was vacant.

On April 3, 2015, (b)(7)(C) was interviewed by SID (Exhibit 8). (b)(7)(C) stated that because the package was sent via two day air, (b)(7)(C) was tasked with making the delivery as opposed to the regular route driver. (b)(7)(C) stated it snowed the date (b)(7)(C) delivered the package, and when (b)(7)(C) arrived to make the delivery, (b)(7)(C) noted every other driveway and sidewalk in the neighborhood had been shoveled, with the exception of (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) parked her vehicle across the street and wrapped the package in a plastic bag to protect it from the elements. As (b)(7)(C) approached the front door, (b)(7)(C) did not notice any tire tracks in the drive or foot prints on the walkway. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) rang the doorbell, and placed the envelope partially under the door mat so that the wind would not cause it to be blown away.

(b)(7)(C) stated several weeks later, (b)(7)(C) was notified that the package (b)(7)(C) delivered to (b)(7)(C) residence was not received. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) returned to the residence and coordinated with (b)(7)(C) who reported not receiving the package. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) informed (b)(7)(C) that (b)(7)(C) was home when the package was delivered, but that (b)(7)(C) never looked out front." (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) told (b)(7)(C) never used (b)(7)(C) front door, and hoped the package was not stolen. (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(7)(C) also informed (b)(7)(C) that TruGreen lawn service had serviced (b)(7)(C) lawn a "couple" of days following the delivery.

On April 3, 2015, SID conducted an area search of the property located at and surrounding (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) A search of the front, side, and back yards of the residences adjacent (b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C)(b)(7)(C) was conducted. Additionally, the wooded area behind, as well as across

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 & 552a.



**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION**

CASE NUMBER: 2015SI000474I

the street from (b)(7)(C) was searched. While paper articles that appeared to have blown from other residences were observed, the missing UPS package was not located.

On April 17, 2015, SID coordinated with (b)(7)(C) Exhibit 10), who stated the last time lawn was serviced by TruGreen was January 31, 2015, and provided a copy of the work order pertaining to the service conducted that day. Additionally, (b)(7)(C) provided a copy of TruGreen web account, documenting all services performed by TruGreen since October 28, 2014. A review of the services performed revealed that as of 10:09 AM, April 17, 2015 (time stamp on the web account), the previous TruGreen service was January 31, 2015.

**DISPOSITION:**

(b)(7)(C) Therefore, no prosecutorial coordination was conducted.

**EXHIBITS:**

1. Advice of Investigation, dated March 20, 2015.
2. Memorandum of Activity, Document Receipt and Review, dated March 20-24, 2015.
3. Memorandum of Interview, (b)(7)(C) dated March 24, 2015.
4. Memorandum of Activity, USPIS Coordination, dated March 30, 2015.
5. Memorandum of Activity, UPS Coordination, dated March 31, 2015.
6. Memorandum of Interview, (b)(7)(C) dated April 2, 2015.
7. Memorandum of Activity, Canvas Interviews, dated April 2, 2015.
8. Memorandum of Interview, (b)(7)(C) dated April 3, 2015.
9. Memorandum of Activity, Area Search, dated April 3, 2015.
10. Memorandum of Activity, Document Receipt and Review, dated April 17, 2015.

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 & 552a.