

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
**Office of the Inspector General**  
**Summaries of Investigations Requested by Senators Grassley and Coburn**  
October 1, 2010 – March 31, 2011

1. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted an investigation concerning allegations that an official at the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) improperly used his position to influence a contract award process, had a personal affair with a subordinate DEA employee, and arranged official travel to pursue his affair. The OIG investigation did not substantiate any misconduct relative to the contract issue or the travel allegations. However, the OIG investigation determined that the DEA official engaged in a sexual relationship with a subordinate employee in violation of DEA's Standards of Conduct. Furthermore, the OIG investigation determined that the DEA official violated federal merit system principles when he recommended the subordinate employee for a lateral transfer without disclosing his relationship with her to the selecting official. The official retired from DEA the day after his interview with the OIG.
2. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations involving spousal abuse by an employee at the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS). The USMS employee and the spouse each claimed that he or she was assaulted during a domestic dispute incident and received medical treatment at separate facilities for injuries sustained. The USMS employee was arrested, first and second degree assault charges were filed, but the first degree assault charge was dismissed prior to trial and the USMS employee was found not guilty of the second degree assault charge. A second degree assault charge was also filed against the spouse, and she was found not guilty on that charge. The OIG reported its findings to the USMS, and they cautioned the USMS employee but imposed no further disciplinary action.
3. The OIG conducted an investigation into allegations that an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) misused his position regarding an alleged dispute between the AUSA's daughter and her roommates. The complainant alleged that the AUSA contacted his daughter and the roommates, stated that he was an AUSA, used profane language, and threatened to have the roommates arrested and expelled from college. The AUSA admitted contacting his daughter's roommates, but denied stating he was an AUSA and denied using profanity. During the investigation, the OIG determined that the AUSA had sent e-mails to a parent of one of the roommates containing the AUSA's position and work address from the AUSA's government computer. The e-mails also contained threats of

physical harm directed towards one of the roommates. The OIG investigation substantiated the allegations, and disciplinary action against the AUSA is pending.

4. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations that an AUSA was using his government computer to view inappropriate material on his government computer. The investigation determined that the AUSA routinely viewed adult content during official duty hours, and that there was at least one image of child pornography recovered on the AUSA's government computer. The AUSA acknowledged that he had spent a significant amount of time each day viewing pornography. The U.S. Attorney's Office declined prosecution. Disciplinary action against the AUSA is pending.
5. The OIG conducted an investigation into allegations that a Department attorney made harassing telephone calls to the employee's former supervisor using a DOJ telephone. The OIG substantiated the allegations. The employee resigned from DOJ upon receiving notice of his proposed termination.
6. The OIG conducted an investigation into allegations that officials within the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) retaliated against an FBI Special Agent for making protected disclosures regarding the alleged improper handling of his transfer from an FBI division based on threats to his personal safety arising from his work. The OIG found that there were reasonable grounds to believe that the Special Agent's lowered performance rating was a reprisal for his protected disclosure. The OIG, however, noted that the Special Agent's performance rating was corrected by the FBI's Human Resources Division when the Special Agent filed an appeal concerning his rating. The OIG also found that FBI supervisors made revisions to two threat assessment reports relating to the Special Agent that were highly biased and unfair to the agent. We identified the supervisor who was responsible for the unfair changes in one of the reports, and recommended that she be disciplined. However, because FBI witnesses said they were unable to recall who made the changes to the other report, the OIG was not able to determine with certainty the person or persons responsible for those revisions. With the Special Agent's consent, the OIG provided its report to the Office of Attorney Recruitment and Management for further consideration of the Special Agent's retaliation claim, and to the FBI with a recommendation for disciplinary action relating to the conduct of a supervisor who altered one of the threat assessment reports and unfairly downgraded the agent's performance rating. The OIG also recommended that the unfair threat assessment reports be expunged from FBI records. The FBI has not yet responded to these recommendations.