1. The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) conducted an investigation concerning allegations that a Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) employee had directed a staffing company to convert temporary contractor positions held by the employee's dependent child and another employee's dependent child to full-time positions. The OIG investigation did not substantiate the allegation that the DEA employee induced or coerced the staffing company to hire employees' dependent children as permanent employees. However, the OIG found that DEA employees had sought and obtained permission from DEA supervisors for their dependent children to apply for temporary contractor positions and that the requesting employees supervised these staffing companies. The OIG determined that the permission should not have been granted, and that the DEA supervisors should have sought legal and ethics guidance prior to granting such permission. On September 29, 2011, the OIG referred the matter to the DEA for action it determines to be appropriate.

2. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations of irregularities in connection with a sole source contract awarded by the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS). The OIG did not find a conflict of interest, ethics violation, or contract procurement irregularity. However, the investigation determined that the USMS official violated a USMS policy directive by making an unauthorized commitment to the contractor for compensation for work performed prior to the contract issuance. On August 29, 2011, the OIG referred the matter to the USMS for action it determines to be appropriate.

3. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations that an Assistant U.S. Attorney (AUSA) misused her position by identifying herself as a U.S. Attorney's Office employee and demanding payment on a debt owed to her boyfriend. The OIG investigation determined that the AUSA sent e-mails on behalf of her boyfriend that contained her official position and title. In addition, the OIG investigation determined that the AUSA made unauthorized disclosures of sensitive information to her boyfriend; used government databases to conduct legal research for her boyfriend; provided her boyfriend access to government computer accounts; and sent a gift to an attorney in order to obtain legal assistance for her boyfriend. The matter was presented to the Criminal
Division, which declined prosecution. The OIG has been advised that on December 9, 2011, the AUSA received a letter of suspension for 14 days.

4. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations that an AUSA was arrested for brandishing a gun at his home to a contractor. The local police department arrested the AUSA. Local officials subsequently decided not to file charges. The OIG investigation determined that the AUSA committed off-duty misconduct, misused his official position by telling the arresting officers of his position, and failed to follow supervisory instructions relating to the police investigation. The AUSA resigned prior to the conclusion of the OIG's investigation. The OIG provided its report to the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys.

5. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning an allegation that a Bureau of Prisons (BOP) official smuggled contraband into a federal prison facility. The OIG investigation determined that the BOP official signed forms authorizing inmates to have items such as shoes and toiletries mailed to the BOP official's attention at the prison facility, in violation of BOP policies and procedures. The OIG investigation further determined that the BOP official did not thoroughly inspect a package he received on behalf of an inmate and used his government computer to track incoming packages for the same inmate. This investigation was presented to the U.S. Attorney's Office, which declined prosecution. The BOP official resigned prior to the conclusion of the OIG's investigation. The OIG provided its report to the BOP.

6. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations that a Department attorney may be associated with the subject of a child pornography investigation. The OIG investigation determined that the DOJ employee was not associated with the child pornography subject. However, in the course of the investigation, the OIG determined that the employee had used his government computer to visit adult pornography websites. There was no evidence that he had accessed child pornography websites. The employee resigned his Department employment prior to the conclusion of the OIG's investigation. The OIG provided its report to the Department.

7. The OIG conducted an investigation into an allegation that Leonard Briskman, the lead career official with the USMS Complex Asset Team, owned a private appraisal business that presented a conflict of interest with his official USMS duties, which involved valuing and selling assets. The investigation did not substantiate the allegation of a conflict of interest, but concerns about potential irregularities in the USMS's management of complex assets prompted the OIG to conduct an audit of the USMS Complex Asset Team. In addition, the OIG investigation determined that Briskman had failed to obtain the required authorization
permitting him to engage in outside employment through his appraisal business. On September 12, 2011, the OIG referred the matter to the USMS for action it determines to be appropriate.

8. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning allegations that a Department attorney identified himself as a federal prosecutor to local police and another person at the scene of a minor automobile accident in which he was involved as a passenger. The attorney was initially arrested for assault, but the charges were eventually dismissed. The OIG investigation determined that the attorney had identified himself as a federal prosecutor to the police in an attempt to influence the police action. The OIG provided its report to the Department, and the OIG was advised that on December 1, 2011, the Department attorney received a letter of counseling.

9. The OIG conducted an investigation concerning an allegation that a Department employee arranged for the relative of a friend to be hired under a government contract. The OIG determined that the employee misused his position. The OIG provided its report to the Department for action it determines to be appropriate.