




Office of the Inspector General U.S. Department of Justice

OVERSIGHT ★ INTEGRITY ★ GUIDANCE



Report to Congress on Implementation of Section 1001 of the USA Patriot Act

(as required by Section 1001(3) of Public Law 107-56)

September 2018

Section 1001 of the USA PATRIOT Act (Patriot Act), Public Law 107-56, directs the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ or Department) to undertake a series of actions related to claims of civil rights or civil liberties violations allegedly committed by DOJ employees. It also requires the OIG to provide semiannual reports to Congress on the implementation of the OIG's responsibilities under Section 1001. This report summarizes the OIG's Section 1001-related activities from January 1, 2018, through June 30, 2018.

I. INTRODUCTION

The OIG is an independent entity within the DOJ that reports to both the Attorney General and Congress. The OIG's mission is to investigate allegations of waste, fraud, and abuse in DOJ programs and personnel, and to promote economy and efficiency in DOJ operations.

The OIG has jurisdiction to review programs and personnel in all DOJ components, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF), the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS), and the U.S. Attorneys' Offices.¹

The OIG consists of the Immediate Office of the Inspector General and the following divisions and offices:

- **Audit Division** conducts independent audits of Department programs, computer systems, financial statements, and DOJ-awarded grants and contracts.
- **Evaluation and Inspections Division** conducts program and management reviews that involve on-site inspection, statistical analysis, and other techniques to review Department programs and activities.
- **Investigations Division** investigates allegations of bribery, fraud, abuse, civil rights violations, and violations of other criminal laws and administrative procedures that govern Department employees, contractors, and grantees.

¹ The OIG has authority to investigate allegations of criminal wrongdoing or administrative misconduct by any Department employee, except for "allegations of misconduct involving Department attorneys, investigators, or law enforcement personnel, where the allegations relate to the exercise of the authority of an attorney to investigate, litigate, or provide legal advice." 5 U.S.C. App. 3 § 8E(b)(2)-(3).

- **Oversight and Review Division** blends the skills of attorneys, investigators, and program analysts to investigate or review high profile or sensitive matters involving Department programs or employees.
- **Management and Planning Division** provides planning, budget, finance, personnel, training, procurement, automated data processing, computer network communications, and general support services for the OIG.
- **Office of General Counsel** provides legal advice to OIG management and staff. In addition, the office drafts memoranda on issues of law; prepares administrative subpoenas; represents the OIG in personnel, contractual, and legal matters; and responds to Freedom of Information Act requests.

The OIG has a staff of more than 475 employees, about half of whom are based in Washington, D.C., while the rest work from 17 Investigations Division field and area offices and 6 Audit Division regional offices located throughout the country.

II. SECTION 1001 OF THE PATRIOT ACT

Section 1001 of the Patriot Act provides the following:

The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall designate one official who shall —

- (1) review information and receive complaints alleging abuses of civil rights and civil liberties by employees and officials of the Department of Justice;
- (2) make public through the Internet, radio, television, and newspaper advertisements information on the responsibilities and functions of, and how to contact, the official; and
- (3) submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate on a semi-annual basis a report on the implementation of this subsection and detailing any abuses described in paragraph (1), including a description of the use of funds appropriations used to carry out this subsection.

III. CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES COMPLAINTS

Section 1001 requires the OIG to “review information and receive complaints alleging abuses of civil rights and civil liberties by employees and officials of the Department of Justice.” While the phrase “civil rights and civil liberties” is not specifically defined in the Patriot Act, the OIG has looked to the “Sense of Congress” provisions in the statute, namely Sections 102 and 1002, for context. Sections 102 and 1002 identify certain ethnic and religious groups who would be vulnerable to abuse due to a possible backlash from the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, including Muslims, Arabs, Sikhs, and South Asians.

The OIG’s Investigations Division manages the OIG’s Section 1001 investigative responsibilities. The two units with primary responsibility for coordinating these activities are Operations Branch I and Operations Branch II, each of which is directed by a Special Agent in Charge and one or two Assistant Special Agents in Charge (ASAC).² In addition, these units are supported by Investigative Specialists and other staff assigned to the Investigative Support Branch, who divide their time between Section 1001 and other responsibilities.

The Investigations Division receives civil rights and civil liberties complaints via mail, e-mail, telephone, and facsimile. Upon receipt, Division ASACs review the complaints and assign an initial disposition to each matter, and Investigative Specialists enter the complaints alleging a violation within the investigative jurisdiction of the OIG or another federal agency into an OIG database. Serious civil rights and civil liberties allegations relating to actions of DOJ employees or contractors are typically assigned to an OIG Investigations Division field office, where special agents conduct investigations of criminal violations and administrative misconduct.³

Given the number of complaints the OIG receives compared to its limited resources, the OIG does not investigate all allegations of misconduct against DOJ employees. The OIG refers many complaints involving DOJ employees to internal affairs offices in DOJ components such as the FBI Inspection Division, the DEA Office of Professional Responsibility, and the BOP Office of Internal Affairs. In certain referrals, the OIG requires the components to report the

² These units also coordinate the OIG’s review of allegations of misconduct by Department employees: the Operations Branch I has primary responsibility for matters involving the BOP, USMS, and the U.S. Attorneys’ Offices; the Operations Branch II has primary responsibility for matters involving the FBI, DEA, and ATF.

³ The OIG can pursue an allegation either criminally or administratively. Many OIG investigations begin with allegations of criminal activity but, as is the case for any law enforcement agency, do not result in prosecution. When this occurs, the OIG may continue the investigation and treat the matter as a case for potential administrative discipline. The OIG’s ability to handle matters criminally or administratively helps to ensure that a matter can be pursued administratively even if a prosecutor declines to prosecute a matter.

results of their investigations to the OIG. In most cases, the OIG notifies the complainant of the referral.

Many complaints the OIG receives involve matters outside its jurisdiction, and when those matters identify a specific issue for investigation, the OIG forwards them to the appropriate investigative entity. For example, complaints of mistreatment by airport security staff or by the Border Patrol are sent to the Department of Homeland Security OIG. The DOJ OIG also has forwarded complaints to the Offices of Inspectors General at the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Education. Allegations related to the authority of a DOJ attorney to litigate, investigate, or provide legal advice are referred to the DOJ Office of Professional Responsibility. Allegations related solely to state and local law enforcement or government officials that raise a federal civil rights concern are forwarded to the DOJ Civil Rights Division.

When an allegation received from any source involves a potential violation of federal civil rights statutes by a DOJ employee, the OIG discusses the complaint with the DOJ Civil Rights Division for possible prosecution. In some cases, the Civil Rights Division accepts the case and requests additional investigation by either the OIG or the FBI. In other cases, the Civil Rights Division declines prosecution and either the OIG or the appropriate DOJ internal affairs office reviews the case for possible administrative misconduct.

A. Complaints Processed During This Reporting Period

Between January 1, 2018 and June 30, 2018, the period covered by this report, the OIG processed **456** new complaints that were identified by the complainant as civil rights or civil liberties complaints.⁴

Of these complaints, **403** did not fall within the OIG's jurisdiction or did not warrant further investigation. The vast majority (323) of these complaints involved allegations against agencies or entities outside the DOJ, including other federal agencies, local governments, or private businesses. When possible, the OIG referred those complaints to the appropriate entity or advised complainants of the entity with jurisdiction over their allegations. Some complaints (80) raised allegations that were not suitable for investigation by the OIG and could not be referred to another agency for investigation, generally because the complaints failed to identify a subject or agency.

The OIG found that the remaining **53** of the 456 complaints it received involved DOJ employees or DOJ components and included allegations that

⁴ These complaints include all matters in which the complainant made any mention of a civil rights or civil liberties violation, even if the allegation was not within the OIG's jurisdiction.

required further review. The OIG determined that **49** of these complaints raised management issues generally unrelated to the OIG’s Section 1001 duties and, consequently, referred these complaints to DOJ components for appropriate handling. Examples of complaints in this category included allegations by federal prisoners about the general prison conditions, and by others that the FBI did not initiate an investigation into particular allegations. Additionally, **2** of these complaints were assigned to OIG personnel for possible investigation based on allegations unrelated to civil rights or civil liberties.

The OIG identified **2** complaints warranting further investigation to determine whether Section 1001-related abuses occurred. These complaints were referred to the appropriate DOJ component for further investigation. The next section of this report describes the substance of these 2 complaints.

The following is a synopsis of the new complaints processed during this reporting period involving DOJ employees or components, including allegations requiring further review:

Complaints processed	456
Complaints not within OIG’s jurisdiction or not warranting further review	403
Total complaints within OIG’s jurisdiction warranting review	53
Management issues referred to DOJ components for handling	49
Complaints assigned to OIG personnel based on allegations unrelated to civil rights and civil liberties	2
Possible Section 1001 complaints warranting investigation by OIG	0
Possible Section 1001 complaints warranting investigation by DOJ components	2

B. Section 1001 Complaints

1. Investigations Opened During This Reporting Period

During this reporting period, the OIG referred the following 2 Section 1001-related complaints to the BOP for investigation, both of which

remain pending. The OIG has requested that the BOP provide the OIG a copy of its investigative report upon completion of the investigation of each referred complaint.

a. Continuing BOP Investigations

- A BOP inmate alleged that BOP employees tortured him because of his Muslim religion by intentionally leaving his cell light on 24 hours a day, resulting in sleep deprivation, and by telling him his food contained pork. The inmate further alleged that he was retaliated against for filing a grievance.
- A BOP inmate alleged that during a strip search, correctional officers and a case manager made derogatory statements about his Muslim faith, asking him if he was a terrorist and if he had blown up the victims of his crimes. The inmate further alleged that the correctional officers accused him of requesting a transfer to a different correctional unit to join a “terrorism cell” and threatened to put him in the Special Housing Unit (SHU) with “the rest of the Muslim terrorists.”

2. Pending Investigations Opened During Previous Reporting Periods

a. Complaints Referred to BOP

The OIG referred the following 3 complaints to the BOP for investigation during a prior reporting period; the investigations remain open. The OIG has requested that BOP provide a copy of its investigative report upon completion of the investigation of each referred complaint.

- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer yelled, used obscenities, and made insulting comments about the inmate’s hijab during a medical trip.
- A BOP inmate alleged that a correctional officer confiscated a news article containing contact information for the American Jewish Council and asked why a Muslim inmate would want to contact a Jewish group. The inmate further alleged that another correctional officer harassed him for reporting the incident; that the first correctional officer later stated, “this is what you get for being Muslim”; and that another inmate heard that correctional officer saying how the prison staff will “get” the inmate.

- A BOP inmate alleged that he has experienced constant discrimination and humiliation by BOP staff because of his religious beliefs. The inmate specifically alleged that he was prohibited from participating in congregational prayers, and that a correctional officer made several derogatory remarks about Islam and intentionally disrupted the inmate's prayers.

3. Previously Opened Investigations Completed During This Reporting Period

a. BOP Investigations

The BOP completed the investigation of the following 7 Section 1001-related complaints that were referred to it by the OIG in a prior reporting period. The BOP provided the OIG with a copy of its investigative report upon completion of each investigation. Here is a summary of each:

- A BOP inmate alleged that while being transported to an outside hospital, a correctional officer threatened him and called him religiously derogatory names; another correctional officer left him outside in the cold for 10-15 minutes, denied him use of the bathroom, and inappropriately squeezed his handcuffs; and a third correctional officer made reference to killing him. BOP interviewed the correctional officers who were involved in the inmate's transfer and hospital stay, and all specifically denied engaging in the alleged conduct or having knowledge of any other officer engaging in said conduct. Two of the officers also referenced an incident report charging the inmate with "Refusing to Obey an Order" due to his loud and aggressive behavior while being escorted to the hospital bathroom, charges a BOP hearing officer ultimately sustained. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.
- A BOP inmate alleged that after he refused orders to "cuff up" and instead laid down on the floor of his cell, correctional officers entered the cell and began kicking him in the side and stomach while calling him a derogatory racial and religious name. The inmate further alleged that after he was placed in the SHU, he was denied medical care and placed in restraints for an extended period of time. The BOP interviewed the inmate, who refused to provide a sworn statement and did not identify witnesses to corroborate the allegations. BOP interviewed three of four correctional officers present and they all denied physically abusing, making unprofessional

comments, or being unprofessional in any other way toward the inmate. The fourth BOP officer retired before the investigation was completed and was not interviewed. BOP documentation revealed that prior to the incident, the Warden had authorized a Use of Force Team and its use of ambulatory restraints due to the inmate's continuous disruptive behavior, and the BOP concluded after a review of video and audio recordings that staff complied with policy, was justified in placing the inmate in ambulatory restraints, and did not physically assault the inmate. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

- A BOP inmate alleged that a BOP employee made racially disparaging comments about various inmates and called two inmates “terrorists” based on their religious affiliation. BOP interviewed three inmates who worked with the employee. Two of the inmates stated that the employee made racially and religiously disparaging comments in their presence. The third stated that he never heard the employee use any such terms toward inmates. All three inmates refused to provide a sworn statement. A fourth inmate identified as a witness had been released and was not interviewed. The investigation was closed administratively when the employee retired from BOP before the investigation was completed and BOP's attempts to contact the employee for a statement were unsuccessful.⁵
- Several BOP inmates alleged that BOP staff locked rooms containing microwaves so that Muslim inmates would not have access when they broke Ramadan fast. The inmates also alleged that they were not permitted to worship in the chapel and instead had to worship in the gymnasium. BOP interviewed the inmates and most stated that access to the microwaves was remedied by staff after the first night of Ramadan. The BOP Chaplain said the large number of worshipers at most services created safety and security issues, and a decision had been made to have some inmates worship in the gymnasium rather than the chapel. The Chaplain said this decision was made after soliciting feedback from inmates, and that it was the end result of progressively tightening controls on chapel attendance and participation due to a significant increase in gang and contraband activities, as well as the

⁵ The BOP originally closed this investigation in April 2018, and subsequently edited and reissued its investigative report at the request of the OIG in August 2018. Because the investigation was completed during the reporting period for this Section 1001 Patriot Act Report, the OIG has here reflected the status of this investigation as “completed.”

assault of a chaplain. A BOP Captain who supervised the new Ramadan procedures stated that the gymnasium was not unsanitary at the time it was used for prayer and that inmates appeared primarily upset that the entire population was unable to attend services together in the chapel. BOP determined that the allegations that BOP staff were unprofessional and engaged in discrimination against Muslim inmates were not substantiated and closed its investigation.

- A BOP inmate alleged that he and other Muslim prisoners have been harassed and retaliated against by a BOP employee ever since the conclusion of a lawsuit the inmate filed regarding Muslim inmates' right to wear their pants above the ankle. During the course of the lawsuit, BOP amended its policy and the inmate agreed to voluntarily dismiss his lawsuit as the issue had become moot. BOP interviewed the employee, who stated that he was informed that inmates were permitted to wear their pants one inch above the ankle and that he questioned multiple inmates about the length of their pants without harassing them. CCTV audio and video recordings document the employee questioning the inmate about the length of his pants, but BOP investigators determined the recordings did not corroborate the inmate's allegations of discrimination. BOP determined that the allegations were not substantiated and closed its investigation.
- A BOP inmate alleged that all Ramadan participants at the inmate's institution have been subjected to harassment and prejudice by being targeted for full body pat down searches without cause and being subjected to inappropriate remarks about their religion. The inmate further alleged that a BOP Lieutenant refused to investigate his allegations. BOP interviewed the inmate, who refused to answer questions regarding his allegations and did not identify any witnesses. BOP also interviewed an inmate who said he was serving as the "inmate Imam" at the time of the alleged conduct. That inmate stated that while several inmates did not like that staff searched their meals, he does not believe the Muslim community was being targeted and he did not hear any correctional officers make inappropriate comments about the Muslim religion. The Lieutenant denied receiving allegations of discrimination from the complaining inmate BOP determined that the allegation that the Lieutenant failed to report a violation of rules and regulations was not substantiated, and it administratively closed its investigation into the correctional officer when the

officer retired from BOP before the investigation was completed and could not be interviewed concerning the case.

- A BOP inmate alleged that a BOP employee yelled at him when he tried to enter the chapel at his designated worship time and also prevented other inmates from entering the chapel. The inmate also alleged that the same employee humiliated and yelled at Muslims in the cafeteria for wearing their kufis, which, according to the inmate, is permitted by BOP. BOP interviewed the inmate, who alleged that on two separate occasions the employee told him to return to his unit, which he said prevented him from attending religious services. The inmate acknowledged that the employee did not say anything that was unprofessional and that there were no witnesses to the alleged incidents. The Chaplain was also interviewed and stated that while he did not witness the alleged incidents, it is routine for BOP staff to instruct inmates to keep moving when they congregate outside the chapel prior to services, as they are not permitted to be there at that time. The investigation was closed administratively when the employee retired from BOP before the investigation was completed and BOP was unable to question the employee about the incident.⁶

IV. OTHER ACTIVITIES RELATED TO POTENTIAL CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES ISSUES

The OIG conducts other reviews that go beyond the explicit requirements of Section 1001 in order to implement more fully its civil rights and civil liberties oversight responsibilities. The OIG is conducting several such reviews that relate to the OIG's duties under Section 1001. These reviews are discussed in this section of the report.

A. FBI's Involvement in the National Security Agency's Bulk Telephony Metadata Collection Program

The OIG is reviewing the FBI's use of information derived from the National Security Agency's (NSA) collection of telephony metadata obtained from certain telecommunications service providers under Section 215 of the Patriot Act. The review will examine the FBI's procedures for receiving, processing, and disseminating leads the NSA develops from the metadata, and

⁶ The BOP originally closed this investigation in March 2018, and subsequently edited and reissued its investigative report at the request of the OIG in August 2018. Because the investigation was completed during the reporting period for this Section 1001 Patriot Act Report, the OIG has here reflected the status of this investigation as "completed."

any changes that have been made to these procedures over time. The review will also examine how FBI field offices respond to leads, and the scope and type of information field offices collect as a result of any investigative activity that is initiated. In addition, the review will examine the role the leads have had in FBI counterterrorism efforts.

B. DEA's Use of Administrative Subpoenas

The OIG is examining the DEA's use of administrative subpoenas to obtain broad collections of data or information. The review will address the legal authority for the acquisition or use of these data collections; the existence and effectiveness of any policies and procedural safeguards established with respect to the collection, use, and retention of the data; the creation, dissemination, and usefulness of any products generated from the data; and the use of "parallel construction" or other techniques to protect the confidentiality of these programs.

V. EXPENSE OF IMPLEMENTING SECTION 1001

Section 1001 requires the OIG to include in this report "a description of the use of funds appropriations used to carry out this subsection."

During this reporting period, the OIG spent approximately \$149,686 in personnel costs and \$100 in miscellaneous costs, for a total of \$149,786 to implement its responsibilities under Section 1001. The total personnel and miscellaneous costs reflect the time and funds spent by OIG special agents, attorneys, auditors, inspectors, program analysts, and paralegals who have worked directly on investigating Section 1001-related complaints, conducting special reviews, implementing the OIG's responsibilities under Section 1001, and overseeing such activities.



The Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General (DOJ OIG) is a statutorily created independent entity whose mission is to detect and deter waste, fraud, abuse, and misconduct in the Department of Justice, and to promote economy and efficiency in the Department's operations.

To report allegations of waste, fraud, abuse, or misconduct regarding DOJ programs, employees, contractors, grants, or contracts please visit or call the **DOJ OIG Hotline** at oig.justice.gov/hotline or (800) 869-4499.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

950 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest
Suite 4760
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Website
oig.justice.gov

Twitter
[@JusticeOIG](https://twitter.com/JusticeOIG)

YouTube
[JusticeOIG](https://www.youtube.com/JusticeOIG)

Also at Oversight.gov