

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/17/2020	In 2019, the City of Bridgeport had unspent CDBG funds that they reallocated towards a loan payoff and fire department equipment. It is alleged that the City of Bridgeport did not give a 30 day public comment period in order for the Citizen's Union to vote on the reallocation of the funds. It is also alleged, that there was a Special Committee on the CDBG funds consisting of seven city council members, that had no conflict, who voted on the reallocation.	Allegations from the complainant were administrative in nature and the complaint was referred to the Director of HUD CPD, Hartford, Office.
9/10/2020	This investigation is initiated with the Massachusetts State Police and other local police departments as a local fugitive felon initiative targeting fugitives in the New England States using both (b)(7)(E)	Administratively Close
8/13/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Of the 179, HUD OIG determined the following: 56 no longer had an active warrant. 48 still had active warrants; however, the warrant-holding agency would not extradite to New York. 32 still had active extraditable warrants; however, the original charge did not fit the criteria to be pursued by the USMS or local law enforcement. 21 no longer had a HUD nexus (fugitive was no longer residing in HUD-subsidized housing or no longer listed as HUD-subsidized housing participants). 14 still had active extraditable warrants; however, due to a policy change within HUD OIG, no further action was taken. 4 were arrested prior to HUD OIG's policy change. 3 warrants were for non-felony charges. 1 was referred to the New York State Police (warranting agency) for possible arrest. The original charge did not fit the criteria to be pursued by the USMS.
12/30/2019	In April, 2019 the hotline received a complaint via email alleging that a recently hired HUD PIH employee in New York falsified employment history and education .	Investigation complete, allegations unsubstantiated.
4/6/2020	The New York City Department of Investigations requested assistance in investigating a complaint that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) New York City Housing Authority, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are allegedly engaged in procurement fraud and used NYCHA's operational funds bank cards for personal use.	Allegation not substantiated.
6/17/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2019 from (b)(7)(E) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's (b)(7)(E) removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Administratively closed.
6/17/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2019 from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's (b)(7)(E) removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region	Administratively closed.

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
11/25/2019	Complainant alleges that unknown subject is misrepresenting himself/herself as a HUD employee through the use of the HUD Seal.	Refer to Office of Public Housing and to the Boston Housing Authority
9/23/2020	This investigation will be used to track fugitive felons living in Multifamily or Public Housing units that are referred to HUD OIG by various law enforcement agencies.	HUD OIG assisted our law enforcement partners in apprehending approximately seven fugitives living in public or subsidized housing and the heads of household for the respective units were referred for eviction consideration.
8/18/2020	(b)(6); [redacted] Lakeville, MA (b)(6); [redacted] contacted (b)(6); [redacted] with fraud allegations concerning (b)(6); [redacted] who among other business interests, is the owner of (b)(6); [redacted]. The allegations concern creating fraudulent HUD 1 forms and other related documents which were used to purchase FHA insured loans.	Administratively Closed
1/16/2020	A section 8 tenant/resident of the Lakeview apartments wrote a complaint alleging that several employees of the Lakeview apartment complex's management office, Metropolitan Realty, and some tenants have verbally abused, making noise, discriminated, and harassed the family. Two employees of the management office have allegedly attempted to extort money from the family.	Allegation unsubstantiated and is being referred to PIH for review.
1/15/2020	The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Connecticut contacted HUD-OIGI to request assistance in relocating a cooperating witness. The request was approved and the family number (b)(6); [redacted] was issued. The family number was forwarded to the Assistant US Attorney responsible for coordination of relocating the witness.	Complaint was a Witness Relocation complaint (Complaint # (b)(6); [redacted], (b)(7)(C); [redacted]) which usually does not convert to Investigation status. (b)(7)(E); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(E); [redacted] this complaint automatically converted into an Investigation on (b)(7)(E); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); [redacted] will convert this complaint into an investigation and immediately close it since all activity is complete on this Witness Relocation issue. No further investigation or action is necessary. SPT 01/15/2020.
4/14/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); [redacted] received fugitive felon data on April 1, 2018 from (b)(7)(E); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); [redacted] subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7); [redacted] numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been considered. (b)(6); [redacted]
10/22/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); [redacted] received fugitive felon data on April 1, 2018, from (b)(7)(E); [redacted] Database (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); [redacted] subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7); [redacted] numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Closed by Referral to PHA

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/19/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 1, 2018, from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Tenant Rental Assistance Certification system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Administratively close
11/25/2019	HUD OIG received an allegation that (b)(6); was on Section 8 assistance for a property which she owned.	Successful prosecution.
7/22/2020	(b)(6);, Section 8 Multi Family tenant, is alleged to be residing as a tenant under a false identity. The US Marshals Service believes tenant (b)(6); may actually be a fugitive wanted out of Canada, on thirty year old charges of Parental Kidnapping.	close investigation - successful prosecution
5/8/2020	Homeland Security Investigation requested HUD OIG participation in the Benefits Fraud Task Force. The task force is made up of federal law enforcement agencies. HUD OIG will focus on subjects having a HUD program nexus.	Administratively Closed
5/8/2020	The CT DEEP discovered two uncovered and unlabeled roll off containers containing asbestos waste that was improperly packaged in a common area of an industrial condominium. The containers were missing from a City of Bridgeport asbestos abatement site. The asbestos abatement company, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had not been paid nor did they remove the containers from the site. It is alleged that an employee of the City of Bridgeport and (b)(6); (b)(6); had the containers improperly moved.	Administratively closed
10/4/2019	On August 8, 2018, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Vermont State Housing Authority (VSHA), alleged that Section 8 tenants (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) failed to report to the VSHA that they were convicted sex offenders.	Allegations unsubstantiated
3/9/2020	HUD OIG HQ provided the third list of fugitive felons potentially residing in HUD Public Housing nationwide. The list was generated after (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) cross referenced (b)(7)(E) Database and HUD's Public and Indian Housing systems. This case will document all investigative activities done on the list that fall within the jurisdiction of the New York office.	Case closed, all leads have been exhausted. Of the 20 matches referred to the New York office: - 3 of them did not match personal identifiers of those living in a PIH unit - 2 were not current participants of any HUD rental-assisted program - 3 did not have active warrants - 4 were non-extraditable - 3 were declined by the USMS for arrest, and - 5 were arrested
1/30/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region	Administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/30/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(C) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Administratively closed.
12/13/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 1, 2018, from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(C) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Administratively closed.
11/26/2019	The (b)(6); of HUD FHEO, Boston, alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may be sending HUD FHEO documents to his personal email. Further, (b)(6); may be requesting another individual who does not work for HUD to complete his FHEO work. The (b)(6); of HUD FHEO alleged (b)(6); may be paying this individual to complete work for (b)(6);	Prosecution declined.
10/29/2019	On March 20, 2018, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), Vermont State Housing Authority, alleged (b)(6); owner and landlord of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), is the live-in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), Section 8 tenant of (b)(6); and has been living with (b)(6); for 19 years. Total loss reported by VSHA \$189,200.	Administratively close
7/1/2020	Anonymous company reported HUD REAC Quality Assurance (QA) Inspectors (including (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)), have requested kickbacks from the company's HUD REAC contractors in order to receive favorable inspection reports or for them to influence the contractors' REAC Inspection reports. Further, the new HUD REAC QA inspectors (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are allegedly requesting various woman who work for the company to meet at the hotel after work for drinks and their demands and statements are adult in nature.	Allegation unsubstantiated, administratively closed.
1/30/2020	HUD OIG, Newark Office received information that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Weehawken, NJ, resident receives Sec. 8 assistance without the landlord's acceptance of the program. It is further alleged that (b)(6); received Super Storm Sandy aid at the above residence without the landlord's knowledge.	Administratively closed.
12/13/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon in late 2018, from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(C) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Administratively closed

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/29/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) applied for and received Sandy Storm Recovery funds in the amount of approximately \$59,647.34. GOSR alleges that (b)(6); falsified documents to receive the aforementioned funds.	On March 12, 2019, (b)(6); was arrested based on a criminal complaint, in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York (EDNY), and charged with one count of fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency benefits, one count of false statements, and one count of false transactions with HUD. On February 5, 2020, (b)(6); and the United States Attorney's Office, EDNY, entered into a Deferred Prosecution Agreement where (b)(6); (1) admitted and accepted responsibility of the charges against him and (2) agreed to pay \$59,254.26 to HUD within sixty days of the agreement date. All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. This case file is administratively closed.
4/20/2020	The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of Inspector General requested the assistance of HUD/OIG in their investigation of a Section 8 tenant that is possibly a City of New York employee who is not reporting her true income and/or is using multiple social security numbers to defraud various government programs.	The U.S. Attorney's Office, Eastern District of New York, declined to prosecute (b)(6); for alleged benefits fraud (b)(5) (b)(6); (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(5) This case file is administratively closed.
1/30/2020	On April 28, 2017, The Eastern District of New York received a complaint from the Freeport Housing Authority alleging that a landlord has been accepting Housing Assistance Payments for a Section 8 tenant who is allegedly his relative, violating Section (D)(8) of the HUD Housing Choice Voucher Rules. Landlord and tenant provided sworn documentation, to the Freeport Housing Authority, that they were not related along with copies of tenant's birth certificate. Since April 2017, \$35,667.44 has been paid in HAP to the landlord. The Eastern District of New York forwarded the complaint to HUD OIG on June 20, 2017 and declined prosecution on July 13, 2017.	On February 25, 2019, HUD OIG and NCDA arrested (b)(6); and charged him with three felony counts of offering a false instrument, grand larceny, and two misdemeanor counts of petit larceny and offering a false instrument. On April 15, 2019, (b)(6); pleaded guilty to petit larceny, a misdemeanor. (b)(6); was sentenced to one year of conditional discharge and paid \$35,697.44 in restitution to HUD. On July 31, 2019, HUD OIG referred (b)(6); to HUD's Departmental Enforcement Center for debarment consideration. In April 2019, NCDA issued an arrest warrant for (b)(6); On September 17, 2019, NCDA charged (b)(6); with grand larceny in the 3rd degree, a class D felony, as well as offering a false instrument for filing in the 1st degree, a class E felony. (b)(6); was arraigned and released to probation. (b)(6); is currently awaiting sentencing. All criminal, civil and administrative actions have been pursued.
10/8/2019	On June 29, 2017, HUD OIG received a request for assistance from DSS in trying to locate former Sec. 8 tenant, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who was alleged to be a naturalized citizen through the use of an alias and another's SSN.	Successful Prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/22/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) doing business at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) owned by (b)(6); (b)(6); and (b)(6); is a company located in Maine. Allegations received by the United States Attorney's Office revealed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have misused loans they received from the Department of Commerce and from HUD.	Prosecution Declined
10/28/2019	The HUD Boston Office of Regional Counsel (ORC) made a referral to the OIG concerning the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) located in East Haven, Connecticut. The ORC are concerned (b)(6); of the nursing homes may be diverting funds from the property while the properties are in a delinquent status on their mortgage payments.	Administratively Closed
6/12/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E)	Successful Prosecution
10/28/2019	Information received that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was using project funds for personal use.	Successful Prosecution
10/10/2019	HUD OIG conducted searches within the (b)(7)(F) in a proactive attempt to identify mortgage modification schemes within Vermont.	Administratively closed
12/17/2019	Case was referred by DOL/OIG based on a call from the Cranston PD. The Cranston PD had a witness that wanted to speak to someone relative to unemployment fraud, mortgage fraud, and Section 8 fraud. Allegations indicate that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) would burn his properties for insurance money. In addition, he stole a deceased person's property and collected Section 8 checks. Subjects owns over 50 properties.	Administratively closed

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/8/2019	This matter is a spin-off of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) investigation (b)(6); (b)(6); Shortly after HUD terminated Lend America's FHA license, information received from a (b)(5) warrants a full-scale criminal investigation of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) et. al.	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a mortgage lender and the CEO of a savings bank were sentenced in U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York to a total of 4 years imprisonment followed by 17 years of supervised release. The conspirators were also ordered to pay \$60.3 million in restitution to Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA), \$1 million in restitution to the Internal Revenue Service, and \$120,000 in forfeiture. The lender was a participant in the HUD-administered Direct Endorsement program and originated FHA-insured mortgages that were packaged and sold as GNMA-guaranteed mortgage-backed securities. The conspirators took part in a scheme whereby they misappropriated funds from the lender's warehouse line of credit to pay the lender's operating expenses rather than use the funds for their intended purpose, which was to pay off the first mortgages of FHA-insured refinanced loans. Furthermore, the conspirators caused the bank, a troubled savings bank which acted as a warehouse lender to the mortgage lender, to engage in transactions that gave the appearance that the bank had improved its financial position when it had not. The scheme resulted in a loss to the savings bank in the amount of \$1.84 million.
3/23/2020	This case is being opened for proactive case work associated with Hurricane Sandy.	Prosecution Successful.
3/9/2020	Information received from complainant, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), applicant for housing at (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Mt Vernon, NY 10552. (b)(6); alleged persons who were lower on the waiting list than she were given apartments, because they paid upwards of \$5,000.00 to the (b)(6); (b)(6); did not provide the name of (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	Based on statements obtained from interviews conducted and records reviewed, HUD OIG could not substantiate allegations that individuals were given inappropriate priority preference on the waiting list and/or granted subsidized apartments in exchange for paying a \$5,000 bribe to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E) Based on the above information, no further investigation is warranted and this case is administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/8/2019	<p>NYC-DOI, NYCHA-OIG, contacted HUD-OIG and requested assistance in their investigation against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Section 8 participant, and his family have allegedly received approximately \$275,000 in rental subsidy, Medicaid and Food Stamp benefits that they were not entitled.</p>	<p>The findings of this investigation were referred to the U.S. Attorney's Office (USAO), Eastern District of New York (EDNY), for prosecutorial consideration (USAO) and was accepted. On March 28, 2018, (b)(6) was indicted by a federal grand jury at the U.S. District Court, EDNY, charging him with Theft of Government Funds and Health Care Fraud. The USAO declined to charge the HUD fraud due to statute of limitation issues surrounding the Section 8 benefits. On October 10, 2018, (b)(6) pleaded guilty to Theft of Government Funds. (b)(6) was ordered to pay forfeiture in the amount of \$84,119 before or on the date of his sentencing. On July 29, 2019, (b)(6) was sentenced to 14 months of imprisonment, followed by 36 months of supervised release. He was also order to pay restitution in the amount of \$39,270, payable to the HRA. On the day of the sentencing, (b)(6) paid the \$84,119 in forfeiture. Based on the above information, no further investigation is warranted and this case is closed.</p>
6/12/2020	<p>HomeStart, Incorporated is a non-profit organization that provides homelessness prevention, housing search, housing stabilization, money management and rental assistance services to individuals and families who are, or were formerly, homeless or who are at risk of becoming homeless. Allegations were received that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), may have misappropriated HomeStart client funds. In March 2015, a HomeStart client told a HomeStart employee that he had received an eviction notice from his landlord for nonpayment of rent. The HomeStart client stated he gave his monthly tenant portion of rent directly to his Case Manager, (b)(6); who told him to give it to her directly and she would forward it to his landlord. (b)(6); was approached and she denied the allegations. HomeStart Inc. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and following (b)(6); a review was conducted of (b)(6); clients and HomeStart found discrepancies involving nine HomeStart clients totaling \$13,483. The nine discrepancies included HomeStart clients paying rent directly to (b)(6); per her instructions and these clients were in arrears in rent and other HomeStart Clients housing assistance payment checks from the City of Boston or from HUD were endorsed by (b)(6); and deposited into her own personal bank account.</p>	Successful Prosecution
12/11/2019	<p>This investigation is initiated as a local fugitive felon initiative targeting fugitives in the New England States using both (b)(7)(E)</p>	Administratively Closed
1/13/2020	<p>HUD OIG reviewed Audit Report Number 2017-NY-1013 and learned the New Brunswick Housing Authority (NBHA) did not follow procurement guidelines which caused misappropriation of funds.</p>	Prosecution declined.

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
3/5/2020	This investigation will be used to track fugitive felons living in Multifamily or Public Housing units that are referred to HUD OIG by other law enforcement agencies.	HUD OIG assisted our law enforcement partners in apprehending approximately 62 fugitives living in public or subsidized housing and the heads of household for the respective units were referred for eviction consideration. Furthermore, HUD OIG referred two other individuals for eviction who were interviewed during the course of fugitive felon investigations and determined to be unauthorized tenants living in public or assisted housing.
8/18/2020	Email from HUD (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleging a signed Transfer and Assignment of HUD's Partial Claims Deed of Trust was signed by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) when in fact (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is an employee of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Alleged false documents are part of a FHA Partial Claim Deed of Trust and release documents.	Administratively closed
10/24/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) applied and received Super-Storm Sandy disaster relief funds from the NJ Department of Community Affairs for the reconstruction of damaged property. It is alleged that the applicant did not use the property as a primary residence at the time of the storm which is one of the requirements in order to be eligible for the program.	Administratively closed.
10/8/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleges that his employee, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has fraudulently received excessive sick leave over the last five years by submitting false doctor notes.	Successful Prosecution.
11/22/2019	Initiative opened to identify and review/investigate the impetus behind high risk New England Nursing Homes that are in default and/or delinquent status.	Administratively closed
9/28/2020	NHHFA called (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and referred a potential subsidy fraud case relative to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). According to NHHFA, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has been working for several years and not reporting this income on annual certifications. The potential loss is approximately \$25,000.00.	Administratively Close
9/22/2020	HUD OIG received a complaint from REAC alleging that the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) located in Brunswick, NJ made misleading statements to alter the outcome of the inspection.	Allegation Unsubstantiated
4/22/2020	HUD OIG received information that the Urban Renewal Agency may have misappropriated CDBG grant funds.	Due to the lack of evidence to corroborate the initial allegation, HUD OIG administratively closed this file.
4/15/2020	During an interview of a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) regarding case (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) information was received regarding the firm (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). This firm was hired to conduct all the Hurricane Sandy Monitoring. The employee advised she was aware that 40 draft audit reports prepared by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) were not being finalized and published, at the request of the Department of Community Affairs. This information was initially received from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on or about July 2, 2014, and was then independently substantiated by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).	Successful Prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/12/2019	Complaint received from HOC re: an individual who may have falsified income. Also, records indicate the appraiser may have overstated the value of the property and failed to report negative influences surrounding the property.	This case can now be closed as the investigation is substantially completed. Any future judicial and administrative action can be captured with the case in closed status.
10/4/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) advised this office that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) stated to her in an interview that the CRT submitted falsified reports to the DEDC. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) stated that he brought this matter to the attention of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) but (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did not report the findings to the DEDC. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also stated that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) were pulled from their positions to work on the Home Solutions Program but their salaries were still being paid by a separate HHS grant because Home Solutions did not have any remaining funds.	Prosecuted Successfully, Civil Settlement Agreement
5/11/2020	The US DOL and the Suffolk County District Attorney's Office requested the assistance of the HUD OIG in their investigation of whether United Veterans Beacon House might have misused HUD, VA, and DOL homeless grant funds for personal benefit or other unauthorized purposes.	On January 23, 2018, the USAO declined to charge any of the subjects criminally based on three factors: (b)(5); (b)(7)(E) (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E)
10/22/2019	The Philadelphia QAD received a lender self-report from Mortgage Unlimited for the subject loan. The self-report alleged that the subject borrower applied for a loan to purchase the subject property while residing at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in East Orange, NJ. On the URLA the borrower indicated the proposed sale of this property and provided a sales contract. During a post closing review of the loan a HUD-1 was filed in the loan file. A subsequent credit check revealed that the HUD-1 was fraudulent as the property was never sold. The HUD-1 was faxed from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was contacted the loan officer (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the subject loan answered the phone. The purported closing attorney (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was contacted but had no knowledge of the alleged fraudulent HUD-1.	Successful Prosecution.
5/8/2020	Subject from case (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) provided information relative to mortgage fraud scam by various parties using Loan Officer (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to originate fraudulent FHA mortgage loans for profit. The subject provided seven properties in the last two years that were originated by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and all were FHA-insured loans.	Administratively closed

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/8/2020	(b)(6); [redacted] was identified in case (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] had two properties he could not sell because the value of the properties were far less than his mortgage note. Allegations indicate that (b)(6); [redacted] found straw buyers for his properties through (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] and paid the straw buyers over \$30,000. The straw buyers used FHA insured mortgages to buy the properties. Both properties went immediately delinquent and a FHA claim has been paid in at least one of them. On November 17, 2015, (b)(6); [redacted] present case to (b)(6); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] opened the case and assigned it to (b)(6); [redacted]	Case Administratively closed
10/18/2019	Information received that alleged employees of the State of Connecticut-Department of Housing-Superstorm Sandy Program submitted false statutory checklists for environmental assessments in order to receive reimbursement funds through Superstorm Sandy Program.	Administratively Closed
10/18/2019	Information was received that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] of the (b)(6); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] embezzled HUD funds for her own personal use.	Prosecution declined.
1/10/2020	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG) received a complaint that the subject allegedly obtained Hurricane Sandy Community Development Block Grant (CDBG-DR) funds that she was not entitled too. According to the complainant, the subject's home on Staten Island, NY 10306 has been vacant for seven years but is now under renovation.	Successful Prosecution.
11/12/2019	HUD/OIG received a complaint from New York City Department of Investigation alleging the property owner received a duplication of benefits from New York City's Build It Back program. The property owner failed to disclose an insurance check received for the property.	On August 7, 2019, NYC's HRO submitted a default determination letter to (b)(6); [redacted] through his attorney, stating that he received an over payment of \$272,575.05 which is owed back to the program. (b)(6); [redacted] attorney has appealed this decision and was granted an extension until November 5, 2019, to submit additional documents. Being that this matter is being handled administratively, this case will be closed.
4/20/2020	USAO, SDNY Civil Division notified HUD/OIG of an allegation that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] acting on behalf of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] received bribes, falsified tenant income statements, credit reports, criminal records, and other documents in order to provide Section 8 Housing to individuals who otherwise do not qualify for the program.	Prosecution declined.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/22/2020	<p>HUD OIG received information from the Baltimore Field Office, alleging that a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Baltimore Field Office, misappropriated union funds in their capacity as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) retired prior HUD OIG determining if he committed any potential criminal or administrative violations. The funds in question were union funds, and not HUD's funds and HUD OIG referred this matter to the U.S. Department of Labor, OIG for any action they deemed necessary.</p>	Closed By Referral
7/1/2020	<p>On December 16, 2019, HUD OIG received a hotline complaint alleging that a registered sex offender and was residing in a HUD-supported unit before being arrested. The allegation was substantiated and the individual was removed from the program.</p>	Closed By Referral
2/7/2020	<p>Hotline complaint alleging mortgage loans, originated by (b)(6); with fraudulent documents, including W-2s, paystubs, bank statements and VOEs for homes built by (b)(6);</p>	Allegation Not Substantiated
8/27/2020	<p>HUD OIG received information from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Fairfax Co. Department of Housing and Community Development, who advised that he had developed information regarding Housing Choice Voucher Head of Household (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) advised that (b)(6); is married to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Lifetime Registered Sex Offender and has not disclosed him as a household occupant, as well as not reporting his and her true income.</p>	Prosecution Declined

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/18/2020	<p>On 10/17/2019, the Pennsylvania Office of State Inspector General (OSIG) referred a complaint to HUD-OIG. The OSIG received a complaint from a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) City Mission (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6). The complainant addressed concerns regarding the use of Continuum of Care (CoC) grant funds at City Mission. The complainant addressed three topics, as listed below. The complainant stated that City Mission's grant contract was to operate 12 Transitional Housing (TH) units. However, 11 units are operated. The 12th unit is being used as an emergency apartment. CoC funds are used for the unit's utilities and maintenance. Emergency Solutions Grants (ESG) and Housing Assistance Payment (HAP) dollars are used to fund the unit. Clients seeking shelter and diverted to this unit would not be eligible for the CoC program. City Mission receives ESG funding through the Lawrence County program and may be using those funds for the emergency apartment. Also, CoC funds cannot be matched with ESG or vice versa. Clients must complete a background check and credit check, have a deposit, and have the electric turned on in their name before they can move into a CoC TH unit. In addition, the complainant was concerned about the former Home Again facility. The complainant was not sure if CoC funds were used for building construction, but if so they were likely out of compliance with the 20-year use agreement. When the CoC funding was re-allocated they began operating as a day treatment residential youth facility. The building is currently closed but it is being renovated and seeking to be licensed to operate a youth detention facility. This population is not considered to be homeless. Further, the complainant noted that the agency is falsifying numbers, reporting duplicated numbers as non duplicated, and making up people served that never existed. The complainant raised this issue to staff within City Mission but was told by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) that we don't want to rock the boat and I don't want them looking into it, it's what we have always done and it works this way, so I'm not going to give anyone a reason to look into it and then have to scramble to find other funding . -----</p> <p>----- In October 2019, the Pennsylvania Office of State Inspector General referred an allegation against City Mission (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) that it received from a complaint. The complainant alleged that City Mission may have materially breached its grant agreement for its Continuum of Care (CoC) grant funds. OIG investigation disclosed that (1) City Mission operated one of its transitional housing units as an emergency apartment that may not have complied with HUD requirements, and (2) City Mission's (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) facility may be out of compliance with the 20-year use agreement. This matter was referred to the Pittsburgh HUD CPD office for administrative action.</p>	Closed by referral
9/1/2020	<p>This matter was generated to capture HUD OIG, Region 3 participation on the United States Marshal Service (USMS) Capital Area Regional Fugitive Task Force (CARFTF) based out of Springfield, VA or Northern Virginia (NOVA).</p>	Closed By Referral

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/23/2020	<p>As a result of discussions and review of pertinent information with the NJ Attorney General Office (NJAGO), OIG developed the following: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are identified as living at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsidized unit on (b)(6); Camden, NJ. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) have been at (b)(6); residence since March 2018. It is alleged that they paid \$700 a month to (b)(6); for rent. (b)(6); resides in another property located on Constitution Avenue, Camden, NJ. In October 2019, NJ Attorney General Office (NJAGO) referred the following allegations: a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant rented out their unit while continuing participate in the HCVP program. OIG investigation disclosed that the HCVP resided in another unit that was not their HCVP designated unit. However, the HCVP participant denied renting out their HCVP unit. The HCVP participant received approximately \$7,200 in HCVP benefits per annum. The NJAGO reviewed the results of this OIG investigation and declined prosecution based the lack of evidence and low dollar loss.</p>	Closed by referral
4/20/2020	<p>Woodbury Heights Police Officer (b)(6); reported the following to HUD OIG (b)(6); (b)(6); is a housing subsidy recipient. (b)(6); is allowing (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); to live in her subsidized unit. (b)(6); charges (b)(6); rent to live in the unit. Neither (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are on supposed to be in the unit with her. In October 2019, a NJ Police Department (PD) referred following allegations: a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant had unauthorized persons live with them and charged them rent. OIG investigation could not substantiate these allegations. HCVP participant received approximately \$9,500 in HCVP benefits per annum. The NJAGO reviewed the results of this OIG investigation and declined prosecution based the lack of evidence and low dollar loss.</p>	Prosecution declined
4/8/2020	<p>The investigation did not substantiate the allegations. This investigation determined that the PHA has an unwritten practice that gives PHA Resident Councils authorization to request rent for the use of PHA facilities. In addition, there was no evidence discovered during the course of this investigation that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) caused HUD to terminate the ROSS grant and ban the ROSS grant recipient from the PHA properties. There was no financial loss to HUD.</p>	Referral to Program Staff / HUD
12/2/2019	<p>A HUD (b)(6); was observed checking in as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Field Office. (b)(6); was the subject of a previous OIG investigation and had resigned in lieu of termination. A review of records provided by HUD OGC failed to disclose a term within the settlement agreement barring future reemployment with HUD. HUD OGC reported that HUD missed that (b)(6); was previously removed from federal service due to misconduct.</p>	Allegation Not Substantiated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/3/2019	<p>An anonymous (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) reported to the OIG's Hotline that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) inappropriately directed (b)(6); to prepare Grant Agreements prior to (1) an Action Plan being approved, and (2) Prior to an Action plan being submitted for review. An (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) reported to the OIG's Hotline that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) inappropriately directed (b)(6); to prepare Grant Agreements prior to (1) an Action Plan being approved, and (2) Prior to an Action plan being submitted for review. The investigation did not uncover any evidence of wrongdoing or any negative impact on HUD.</p>	Administrative Closure
9/28/2020	<p>(b)(6); purchased a property located (b)(6); Harrisburg, PA as an owner occupant. REO alleges that (b)(6); did not occupy the property as her primary residence as required. _____ OIG investigation was initiated based on a referral from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Homeownership Center (HOC), Real Estate Owned (REO) Division, Philadelphia, PA; regarding suspected owner-occupant violations by an REO property purchaser. The subject signed an Individual Owner-Occupant Certification agreeing to occupy the property as primary residence for at least 12 months and was suspected of failing to fulfill the owner-occupancy requirement. The subject purchased a REO property located Pennsylvania; on (b)(6); Investigation determined that the subject never lived in the property as required as an owner-occupant buyer. The subject property was transferred on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to an LLC through a "Special Warranty Deed," and was subsequently sold by the LLC on (b)(6); for the sum of \$150,000.00. In a letter in response to HUD-REO's inquiry, the subject's spouse and realtor, falsely reported that the property was held for the requisite 12-month period, failing to disclose to HUD that the property was transferred to the LLC approximately five months after the property was purchased through the REO owner-occupant program. The case was declined for prosecution by the U.S. Attorney's Office due to a lack of criminal intent evidence and since there was no loss.</p>	Prosecution declined
4/29/2020	<p>HUD OIG initiated an investigation based on a news article reported that an audit of a Virginia nonprofit allegedly had been mismanaged by its former CEO. The audit revealed that the CEO had inadequate supporting documentation for their business credit card and travel vouchers. Investigation found no criminal activity and current nonprofit employees were unaware of any fraudulent activity or embezzlement scheme being committed by the former CEO.</p>	Allegation Not Substantiated
10/31/2019	<p>This complaint was generated to capture HUD OIG, Region 3 - Baltimore, Maryland, participation on the CARFTF based out of Washington, D.C.</p>	Referral to Program Staff / HUD

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/20/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(E) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Closed by Referral
3/18/2020	Registered sex offender (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) allegedly resides in Section 8 subsidized housing with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) IN Carlisle, PA. ----- The OIG initiated an investigation after receiving an allegation that a registered sex offender was residing in a Housing Choice Voucher Program subsidized apartment as an unreported household member. The investigation did not support the allegation. The OIG determined there was no program violation or loss to HUD.	Closed by referral.
1/7/2020	HUD OIG initiated this investigation after receiving a referral from the another law enforcement agency alleging that Section 8 program recipient abused HUD's Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP). when they neglected to report their true household income, which resulted in them receiving benefits they was not entitled.	Allegation Not Substantiated
2/21/2020	The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Region 3 – Baltimore Field Office received an allegation from a Housing Authority, based on an anonymous complaint, that a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant allowed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to reside with her in her subsidized unit, as an unreported/unauthorized resident, in violation of HCVP reporting requirements, and that the two (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) The investigation did not substantiate the allegations. The investigation determined that the subjects are involved in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) The investigation further determined that, although he spends time at her subsidized unit, he maintains a legal residence elsewhere. There was no loss to HUD.	Referral to Program Staff / HUD
7/14/2020	HUD OIG received information from a Housing Authority (HA) that a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant abused the program when they neglected to report to HA that they owned their subsidized address with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was their landlord. The facts were presented, accepted and prosecuted by the Baltimore County States Attorney's Office (BCSAO). The subject was charged and sentenced to probation before judgement, and ordered to pay \$173,122 in restitution to the HA.	Successful Prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/24/2019	<p>On or about November 2018, HUD OIG Region 3 (R3) received a recent Fugitive Felon Wanted list from HQ (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's databases, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region. The OIG initiated an investigation in December 2018, after it compared data obtained from (b)(7)(E) to HUD's Public and Indian Housing Center (PIC) removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers, and separated the data by region. As a result of this data-matching effort, the OIG identified twenty-five fugitive felons residing in HUD-subsidized properties in the region, with extraditable felony arrest warrants. The OIG subsequently forwarded relevant information to law enforcement agencies within the geographical jurisdiction. Ten of the twenty-five fugitive were subsequently apprehended by law enforcement agencies in the geographic area where each fugitive resided. Eleven fugitives were referred to the respective housing authorities where each fugitive resided and requested that each take action to terminate subsidy to the associated fugitives. One person was a victim of identity theft and ultimately seven were no longer wanted fugitives.</p>	Administrative closure
10/9/2019	<p>HUD OIG received information alleging embezzlement by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at the Berkley Township Housing Authority. ----- The OIG initiated an investigation after receiving an allegation that the Berkeley Township Housing Authority (BHA) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had created a company that provided services and received payments from the housing authority. A Housing Authority Commissioner also allegedly received unauthorized payments from the BHA. The investigation determined that an independent entity approved by HUD had been compensated to perform program services as authorized by the Project Based Voucher Program. The Housing Authority Commissioner was compensated by another public entity unrelated to HUD and they did not receive any compensation from the BHA.</p>	Allegations unsubstantiated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/25/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is allegedly living with (b)(6); after being twice deemed ineligible to be added to her lease. (b)(6); provided questionable documentation regarding his immigration status and driver's license. Property management continues to see (b)(6); on the property and (b)(6); is currently driving a vehicle registered to (b)(7)(C). HUD OIG initiated an investigation after receiving a referral from management at a HUD multifamily property in Lansdale, PA. Management reported to the OIG that a tenant and HUD Project-Based Section 8 Rental Assistance Program (Section 8) program participant, had failed to truthfully report his/her household composition. Specifically, that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was living in the subsidized unit. OIG investigation did not substantiated that (b)(6); lived at the subsidized unit. The head of household (HOH) twice attempted to add (b)(6); to the household composition. The first time, the HOH withdrew (b)(6); application, because his/her immigration status at that time would have made them ineligible and required them to pay a substantial tenant rent portion which they could not afford. The second time, (b)(6); withdrew the application because he/she did not have a valid driver's license and would not be allowed to have a car on the property. When interviewed, the HOH denied that (b)(6); lived at the subsidized unit.</p>	Closed by Referral
10/11/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is alleged to have misrepresented his residency to the NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in order to receive \$130,229.06 in Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation and Mitigation (RREM) funds. (b)(6); during the time of Hurricane Sandy, was residing in Camden County, NJ. However, (b)(7)(C) represented to DCA that his primary residence was (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Egg Harbor Township, NJ. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was alleged to have misrepresented his residency to the NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA) in order to receive approximately \$130,000 in Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation and Mitigation (RREM) funds. The official was alleged to live in another NJ county, thus ineligible to receive RREM funds. An OIG investigation could not determine if this NJ official failed to reside in his/her primary residence and misrepresented residency. The results of this investigation were submitted to the NJ Attorney General's Office (NJAGO). The NJAGO declined to pursue prosecution of this matter.</p>	Prosecution declined

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/28/2020	(b)(6); [REDACTED] possibly used a fraudulent ID/SSN to receive HCVP subsidies through the Montgomery County Housing Authority. [REDACTED] The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), initiated an investigation based on a referral of information from a Pennsylvania housing authority. The referral pertained to Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant who received HCVP benefits while receiving public housing benefits through another Pennsylvania housing authority. Investigation determined that the HCVP participant received dual subsidies from July 2016 to May 2017, resulting in at least \$20,512 in HCVP benefits that she/he was not entitled to receive, based on program requirements. The housing authority terminated the subject's assistance.	Administrative Closure
7/9/2020	This basis for this investigation was predicated upon a referral to the OIG by the Delaware County Housing Authority (DCHA) regarding the subjects of this investigation. The DCHA advised that it became suspicious in July 2018 that a prohibited familial relationship may exist between the subject HCVP landlord and their tenant while the tenant was at the DCHA to do an annual recertification, and introduced the HCV landlord as (b)(6); [REDACTED]. This matter was jointly investigated with the Delaware County District Attorney's Office, which agreed to permit the subject HCV landlord make restitution to the DCHA in lieu of criminal prosecution. The DCHA terminated the HCV landlord and tenant from participation in the HCV program. The HCV landlord agreed to repay \$46,858 to the DCHA.	Repayment in Lieu of Prosecution
9/11/2020	Country Home Settlement Services is allegedly accepting duplicate fees for items contained on settlement statements and concealing the funds in a separate escrow account.	Successful prosecution
9/3/2020	During a neighbor interview on a separate Sandy Grant Fraud Investigation, it was disclosed that (b)(6); [REDACTED] may have committed grant fraud in order to qualify for Sandy Disaster Relief Funds. The witness disclosed that (b)(6); [REDACTED] lives in Pennsylvania and that the DPA is a seasonal/weekend residence. Initial review on (b)(6); [REDACTED] disclosed that he did receive RREM and RSP funds and appears to live in Pennsylvania.	All investigative activity, prosecution and administrative actions completed for this case.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/4/2019	<p>On April 21, 2017, HUD OIG (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) met with Atlantic County Prosecutors Office (ACPO) Detective Lynne Dougherty. Dougherty related the following: Homeowner (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Brigantine, NJ , gave a \$75,000 check to contractor (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); which was to be distributed to the contractor (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); was supposed to provide a modular home for (b)(6) but never did. (b)(6); unsuccessfully attempted to contact (b)(6);. Several months past and (b)(6); never installed (b)(6); modular home. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) provided (b)(6); a copy of the attached police report detailing this incident. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) advised that (b)(6); is a RREM participant. On May 5, 2017, (b)(6); contacted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) confirmed that (b)(6); received a \$150,000 award from RREM. (b)(6); RREM number is (b)(6); RREM project is in the DCA RREM contractor fraud file. In April 2017, the OIG and a NJ county prosecutor determined that a RREM recipient paid a contractor \$75,000 from RREM proceeds for Hurricane Sandy repair work. The RREM recipient expected the contractor to purchase a modular home from a modular home supplier and then install the modular home on their property. However, the aforementioned never took place. In June 2017, a NJ prosecutor charged the contractor with Theft by Deception, Failure to Make Lawful Disposition and Tampering with Records. On November 2018, the contractor pled guilty to Theft by Unlawful Taking. In April 2019, the contractor was to three years of incarceration and subsequently ordered to pay restitution.</p>	Successful prosecution
12/4/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) misrepresented their primary residence to the NJDCA. The (b)(6); received \$10K RSP, \$143K RREM, \$2820 FEMA, \$31K SBA following Hurricane Sandy.----- The OIG initiated this investigation after receiving a referral from the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice (NJDCJ). A CDBG-DR recipient misrepresented their primary residence to the State of New Jersey Division of Community Affairs and was awarded funds they were not entitled to receive. The grantee pled guilty to Theft by Unlawful Taking and was ordered to pay \$142,414.57 in restitution and complete 60 months' probation.</p>	Successful prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/23/2020	<p>A referral from a state investigative agency alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) applied for and obtained a Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation, and Mitigation (RREM) Program grant in the amount of \$150,000 for which they were not entitled to receive. Both subjects pled guilty to state Theft by Deception and were sentenced to probation and ordered to pay restitution totaling \$130,279.00.</p> <p>----- A referral from the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice (NJDCJ) alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) applied for and obtained a Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation, and Mitigation (RREM) Program grant in the amount of \$150,000 for which they were not entitled to receive. The investigation disclosed the property they filed a Hurricane Sandy disaster claim for was not their primary residence as required by the RREM Program. Both subjects pled guilty in Ocean County, New Jersey Superior Court to Theft by Deception upon the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and the NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA), in violation of New Jersey statute N.J.S.A. 2C:20-4, which is a third degree state felony. (b)(6); was sentenced to 12 months probation and ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$130,279.38. (b)(6); was sentenced under NJ Pretrial Intervention (PTI) to 24 months probation.</p>	Criminal proceedings have been concluded and all appropriate administrative referrals have been made.
12/19/2019	<p>HUD OIG received a complaint regarding, a Section 8 tenant, which alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was not reported as a resident of their household. The complaint further alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was employed and earned a substantial income.</p>	Successful Prosecution
10/30/2019	<p>HUD OIG received a referral from a law enforcement agency who alleged that there were misappropriation of HUD funds. The investigation was substantiated. However, prosecution was declined on all HUD violations, and no referrals were made to HUD program office. .</p>	Prosecution Declined

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/4/2019	<p>This investigation is being opened based on a request from The New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice Hurricane Sandy Taskforce. The taskforce has requested assistance with target interviews being conducted by their (b)(7)(E) Detectives. (b)(7)(E)</p> <p>(b)(7)(E) The (b)(7)(E) will work all other aspects of the case. This investigation will cover all interviews that Region 3 HUD Agents assist with and MOI'S will be submitted under this case number. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), initiated this investigation on February 3, 2016 based on a request from The New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice (NJDCJ) Hurricane Sandy taskforce. The taskforce requested assistance with target interviews being conducted by their civil detectives, referred to as (b)(7)(E) related to potential fraud associated with the Resettlement (RSP) and Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation and Mitigation (RREM) program funds following Hurricane Sandy. (b)(7)(E)</p> <p>(b)(7)(E) These (b)(7)(E) worked all other aspects of the cases. This investigation covered all interviews that Region 3 OIG Agents assisted with and the service of all complaint/summonses issued to targets. In total, OIG provided assistance on 11 subjects. This assistance varied from email correspondences with NJDCJ to conducting interviews and serving criminal complaint/summons on behalf of the NJDCJ. Of the 11 subjects that assistance was provided on, 5 were charged by the State of NJ with theft by deception. The total loss to HUD was \$430,623.13.</p>	Administrative closure
1/17/2020	<p>(b)(6); received \$150,000 in Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Elevation and Mitigation (RREM) Program funds after Hurricane Sandy for a damaged property address that is allegedly not her primary residence.</p>	Criminal prosecution and administrative referrals are complete; no further action is forthcoming or needed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/28/2020	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) HCVP tenant, is alleged to be subletting the basement of the unit of the home for which he is receiving assistance. (b)(6); is also alleged to have unreported income from work as (b)(6); The OIG initiated an investigation based on an anonymous complaint received by a Pennsylvania housing authority (HA) which alleged that a participant in the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP), was subletting the basement of the subsidized unit and had unreported income from work as (b)(6); OIG investigation confirmed that the HCVP participant was working as (b)(6); and had not reported the income on certifications submitted to the HA to determine eligibility for the HCVP. OIG was unable substantiate the allegation that the HCVP participant sublet the basement. The HA paid a total of \$56,936.00 in rental and utility assistance on behalf of the HCVP participant from March 2016, until May 2019. The HCVP participant's assistance was terminated effective May 31, 2019. The HCVP participant was criminally charged by the District Attorney, but charges were dismissed after restitution was made to the HA in the amount of \$5,865.00.</p>	Restitution in lieu of prosecution
7/9/2020	<p>This basis for this investigation was predicated upon a referral to the OIG by the Housing Authority of the County of Erie (HACE) regarding the subjects of this investigation. The HACE advised that it became suspicious in December 2017 that a prohibited familial relationship may exist between the HCVP landlords and their tenant after a HACE HQS inspector overheard a telephonic conversation between both and the HCV tenant referred to the landlord as (b)(6); In October 2018, investigation resulted in the indictment of the HCVP landlords, who are (b)(6); (b)(6); as well as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to whom they were renting their HCV-subsidized residence, for theft from the U.S. government. All 3 defendants were subsequently admitted into a pre-trial diversion program, which required the defendants to repay the HACE \$32,198 and serve 12 months of probation.</p>	Successful Prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/7/2020	<p>HUD OIG received a referral from a law enforcement agency regarding an individual who obtained funds from a homeowner intended for home improvements. However, the home improvements were never completed. The funds came from a HUD-insured home improvement loan, which the individual helped the homeowner to obtain. Investigation revealed a total of 24 homeowners obtained HUD-insured home improvement loans from the individual, who allegedly submitted false documents in order to support the loans. Additionally, the individual required the homeowners to pay him a referral fee in order to obtain the loans, which was prohibited by HUD regulations. The investigation substantiated the allegations. The target went to trial and was convicted on all counts, which included False Statements to a Financial Institution, Promotional Money Laundering, Aggravated Identity Theft, and Failure to File a Tax Return. The target was sentenced to serve 132 months incarceration, five years of supervised release and ordered to pay \$325,522 in restitution.</p>	Successful Prosecution
4/24/2020	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) allegedly embezzled borrower funds through 1,058 ACH transactions totaling \$1,875,110.27. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) diverted unclaimed escrow payments belonging to homeowners by accessing (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) computer system and having the payments sent via wire transfer and ACH transfer to various bank accounts and prepaid debit cards. The employee exceeded their authorization by using a co-worker's computer login and password to approve the funds transfer and by making false entries to appear as though customers had requested their unclaimed funds to be wire transferred into their bank accounts. The OIG determined a total of 1,543 mortgage loans were impacted, 211 of which were FHA mortgage loans. The total loss to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was \$2,087,697. The employee pled guilty to 18 USC 1030, Unauthorized Access of a Computer with Intent to Defraud and 18 USC 1956, Money Laundering. They were sentenced to serve 46 months incarceration, followed by 3 years of supervised release, and was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$2,087,697.</p>	Successful prosecution
9/28/2020	Allegations of occupancy violations involving properties purchased through the REO program	Prosecution declined

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
4/9/2020	A complainant alleged that a HUD listing broker fraudulently purchased at least 13 HUD Real Estate Owned (REO) located in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia. The broker allegedly used limited liability companies to purchase the properties in order to conceal their interest in them, in violation federal laws. The investigation substantiated the allegations and found that the broker purchased a total of 19 HUD REO properties. To execute the scheme, the broker enlisted the assistance of a real estate settlement attorney. The attorney pled guilty to once count False Statements to HUD and was sentenced to two years of probation and ordered to pay a \$9,000 fine. The broker pled guilty to one count of Conspiracy to Defraud the U.S. and was sentenced to 13 months of incarceration, three years of supervised release and ordered to pay a \$36,000 fine.	Successful Prosecution
1/14/2020	HUD OIG received information from a Housing Authority that a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant abused the program when they failed to report their true household income. The facts were presented, accepted and prosecuted by the USAO for violation of Title 18 USC 1001. The subject was arrested and sentenced to three years of probation, and ordered to pay \$150,752 in restitution.	Successful Prosecution
8/19/2020	A proactive search lead to possibility that (b)(6); maybe manipulating disclosures by borrowers. This case is administratively closed due to the case agent's departure.	Administratively closing case due to the case being a proactive case and Case Agent leaving Agency
8/18/2020	PHA advises that an unknown individual changed wiring instructions, via email intrusion, so that an unintended person or entity received \$135,000. Matter has been logged with the Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) and referred to the local FBI.	Administratively Closed
4/9/2020	On April 1, 2018 HUD OIG received fugitive felon data from the (b)(7)(E) HUD OIG subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(E) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region. This match for the South East region contained 62 matches. The subjects identified during this inquiry was crossed referenced with (b)(7) inquiries to insure accuracy and confirmation that warrants for these tenant were currently active. The tenants, totaling 23, that were identified as having an active warrant and participating in HUD's Section 8/Public Housing program violates Public Law 104-193 Sec. 903. A notification was made to the warrant holder, and a referral for eviction was sent to the Housing Authority.	Administratively closed due to case being a FFI initiative

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/23/2020	A referral from the Cobb County Police Department alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) requested cash payments from tenants to avoid eviction. The investigation was unable to determine any criminal violation committed. The investigation was presented to the United States Attorney's Office and was declined due to lack of prosecutorial merit. Based on the above information, no further investigation was warranted and the case was closed.	Administratively closed due to allegations being unsubstantiated.
11/6/2019	HUD OIG received an anonymous complaint alleging a company used the Section 3 Program fraudulently by falsifying the number of workers who qualify as Section 3 Residents. An investigation into their Section 3 Program did not determine any information that warranted further review of the company's records.	Administrative Closed. Allegations unsubstantiated.
10/22/2019	Whistleblower alleged that she was terminated after she advised (b)(6) of a local housing authority that grant funds were being used inappropriately. Per HUD/OIG/OGC, the Whistleblower released her whistleblower rights for valid consideration in the settlement with her employer, being the local housing authority. It qualifies as a prior adjudication under Section 4712.	Administratively closed. WB released her WB rights for valid consideration in the settlement with her employer under Section 4712
3/4/2020	This complaint alleged that a HCVP tenant was allowing a registered sex offender to reside in their HUD-Supported Unit. The complainant also reported that criminal activity is taking place in the residence , such as an unregistered business and the sale of narcotics. This investigation revealed that the sex offender does not reside in HUD subsidized residence. Furthermore, it could not be substantiated that HCVP tenant was operating an unregistered business from the residence nor that the tenant or the spouse was selling narcotics from the property. This case was presented to the United States Attorney's Office where it was declined for lack of prosecutable merit	Allegations not founded.
9/28/2020	It is alleged that a HUD subsidized multi-family tenant in Alabama receives rent in a unit to which she does not reside. It is further alleged the tenant has knowledge of or engaged in defrauding a senior citizen at an assisted living facility. During the investigation, it was determined that further investigation was not merited due to a declination by the USAO - Northern District of Alabama.	Allegations not supported

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/17/2019	<p>The Virgin Island Public Finance Authority (VIPFA) has been designated as a sub-grantee to procure consultants, advisors and program delivery services for Disaster Relief to the VI using CDBG-DR and FEMA funding. VIPFA will also use bond funds to offset CDBG-DR and FEMA funding of project cost. Its alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for VIPFA is also (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at Capital Markets Advisors, LLC. (CMA), who was involved in obtaining a contract with CMA to advise on municipal bonds and securities. The investigation revealed that CMA was contracted using non-federal funds to fill the (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) position, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for VIPFA. (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was never employed by both entities, and CMA did not submit bids for disaster-funded contracts which would have been evaluated by (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). No conflict of interest was identified.</p>	<p>Allegations not substantiated. No evidence of criminal conduct identified.</p>
8/31/2020	<p>Information was received alleging that issues were discovered by MDPHCD surrounding (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Florida Profit Corporation, that requires FLS/Davis-Bacon and Section 3 Compliance Monitoring, Reporting, and Enforcement. A set of documents were provided to HUD-OIG as part of the complaint.</p>	<p>Case was declined and discrepancies were referred to HUD Program Partivipate</p>
4/9/2020	<p>Information received by HUD-OIG indicates that principals of three affiliated companies (a construction company, an asset management company, and a consulting company) obtained loans for construction and rehab of properties throughout South Carolina to be used for low income housing. The companies allegedly obtained Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and HOME fund grants through the State by paying kickbacks to an employee of the State's housing finance agency. Information received also alleged that the affiliated companies kept two sets of financial records, falsified rental records, falsified tenant information, and falsified staff experience to show compliance with program criteria. Information received suggests the affiliated companies received approximately \$14,329,495.22 in fraudulently obtained tax credits, with approximately \$5,888,000 in HUD-funded HOME loans as well. The investigation found that subject received cash from developer, but did not reveal that cash payments resulted in preferential treatment. The case was presented and declined for prosecution for both subjects.</p>	<p>Administratively closed due to allegations unsubstantiated.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/31/2020	<p>HUD-OIG Office of Audit (OA) provided information indicating possible misuse of Community Development Block Grant funds by officials at the Municipality of Yauco. The investigation revealed that from October 2014 through December 2016, Yauco transferred a total of \$1,757,587.50 of all HUD programs they got awarded, to the municipality's operational account. From that amount, \$430,637.50 were ordered, and \$761,637.50 possibly order by (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as it appears instructed on the memos of the bank statements reviewed. On November 4th, 2019, a review of Yauco's bank records and documents, received on same date, revealed that the municipality reinstitute and paid off all financial obligations they had pending with the programs funds. USAO District of Puerto Rico decline for lack of prosecutable merit.</p>	Declined by AUSA
3/17/2020	<p>Allegations of landlord sexual harassment have been reported by a tenant residing in properties managed/owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). This case was opened based the USAO EDKY-Civil-ACE Division request for assistance from Region 4, to obtain documents and records. The request for assistance has been fulfilled and the records were turned over to the USAO as requested for review. The USAO later advised that upon further consultation with Main Justice, due to concerns over attorney-client privilege, and a OIG agent's discovery requirements, the USAO prefers OIG suspend any further investigation into FCA violations during the ongoing Main Justice-USAO investigation into a suspected civil rights violation. No further investigation is warranted at this time and this case is closed.</p>	Administratively closed - Case opened to assist AUSA in receiving documentation. All documentation provided to AUSA. AUSA will advise if they need any additional information.
3/16/2020	<p>Allegations of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the FHA abusing Time and Attendance and using funds of the FHA for personal gain. The investigation concluded that the allegations were unfounded. (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did not use funds for personal gain or use employees for personal use. No further activity required.</p>	Administratively closed due to allegations unsubstantiated
3/23/2020	<p>On October 2, 2019, HUD-OIG received information that a HUD employee from a headquarters component, assigned to the local field office, may not be working in compliance with a telework or flexible work schedule agreement. Information received included observation that the employee has not had a new laptop assigned, even though the rest of the field office received new equipment in February 2019. Investigation revealed that the employee teleworked or took leave rather than working the hours reported on time and attendance and leave and earnings statements. Employee's supervisor was satisfied with job performance. Case was presented and declined for prosecution by US Attorney's Office. Matter was referred to employee's supervisor for possible administrative action.</p>	Employee case referred to HUD supervisor for administrative actions

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/25/2020	Referral from HUD OIG Office of Audit after a data match was conducted revealing matches between Public Housing tenant records and the Do Not Pay list. The data match contained a column which indicates which Do Not Pay source O-American Info Source Obituary, P= American Info Source Probate, and D= SSA Death Master File. The investigation revealed the "O" sources did not accurately report the proper identifiers. The "O" sources (the most common matches) were often processed move-outs by the housing authority, or the obituary source presumed the same social security number as an individual with the same name living in public housing. The "D" sources appeared to be typo's in the social security number, which led to a match. One individual who was later determined to be deceased, matched social security numbers with an individual living in public housing. After an interview of the deceased's brother it was determined the individual was deceased and not living under a different name.	Administratively closing proactive case due to no fraudulent activity.
10/17/2019	Whistleblower alleges he was forced to resign his position after witnessing and reporting unethical and fraudulent behavior by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	Administrative case closed due to the complaint no longer wanted to continue the process.
7/14/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region. OIG conducted (b)(7)(C) and active warrant checks of fugitive felons. Compiled data and cross referenced with local Law Enforcement Agencies to verify active warrants. OIG accessed database to confirm tenants were actively residing in public housing. For the felons with active warrants, OIG sent letters addressed to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) the respective Housing Authorities informing them of the tenants who had active warrants.	Case Closed
6/30/2020	Information received from a CDBG-DR Sub-grantee alleged that a CDBG-DR State Grantee canceled a Request for Proposal (RFP) based primarily on extracurricular input during on the scoring process of the RFP, however, the CDBG-DR State Grantee was unable to support its claim of the irregularities that prompted the unilateral decision to cancel the RFP. After a review of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Puerto Rico Department of Housing and the Puerto Rico Department of Economic Development and Commerce, signed on November 16, 2018, which establishes on VIII. Amendment and Termination [B. Suspension or Termination (2.Termination for Convenience of the PRDOH)] that PRDOH may terminate this MOU any time by notice in writing from PRDOH to the Sub-recipient, the allegations were unsubstantiated. The USAO-PR decline to open or file any judicial action for unsubstantiated allegations.	Allegations not supported.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/18/2020	On July 8, 2019 the Comptroller's Office from Puerto Rico (OCPR) published an audit report based on findings of mishandled funds from a Municipality from January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2015. The report was referred by the US Attorney's Office to HUD-OIG for review. The audit identified a contract that was awarded in August 2011 for the amount of \$142,065 with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from HUD. The investigation confirmed that the contract was awarded in violation of the Methods of procurement to be followed by small purchase procedures in 24 CFR 85.36 (d)(1) which directs the grantee to make an open bid for the service requested for anything over the amount of \$100,000. The findings were presented to the US Attorney's Office Civil Division, triggering substantial settlement conversations with (b)(6); after which the parties reached an instant Agreement of restituting \$142,065.00 to HUD by July 6, 2020.	Allegations Founded Case Settled \$142,065.
3/31/2020	A HUD Multifamily(MF) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was seeking a bribe in return for a HUD Multifamily subsidized apartment. Subsequently, the HUD MF (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was dismissed from her duties as the HUD MF (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The HUD MF (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was found guilty and sentenced to 24 months probation and restitution of \$1000.00 for accepting bribes for \$1000.00	All judicial actions completed and subjected referred to the DEC for administrative actions
3/27/2020	Several Nursing Homes were proactively selected for investigation based on their overall risk to HUD, including that both properties had repeatedly failed REAC inspections which included Exigent Health and Safety (EH&S) violations. The findings within the scope period of this proactive investigation did not reveal evidence of criminal activity indicative of a potential loan default which would cause a loss to HUD. The findings have been discussed with the United States Attorney's Office (USAO), Southern District of Florida. The case will be closed.	Administratively closing due to proactive case that did not find any criminal violations.
9/29/2020	HSI advised that their during their investigation of a HUD Project-Based Voucher participant for suspected selling of gun parts to certain foreign countries posing a risk to national security. Investigation revealed subject withheld his true and complete household income from the housing authority. Subject was convicted of smuggling gun parts to foreign countries and theft of housing subsidy due to unreported income. Subject sentenced to pay restitution to the PHA and to serve 33 months in federal prison.	Successful Prosecution
3/5/2020	HUD-OIG spoke with USPIS, via telephone, regarding a company in Durham, NC. The subject company, allegedly, received an FHA loan for a HUD project. The company and its partners may have used money from the project for personal use. A 2012 audit by HUD-OIG found misuse of rent payments. A new investor for the company repaid the misused funds in 2012, after a settlement with HUD was reached. The US Attorney's Office declined to pursue prosecution due to limited resources.	Administratively closing due to the allegations being addressed by a audit in 2012, and USAO declining the case.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/27/2020	Investigation opened at the requested of the VI-USAO in the aftermath of Hurricanes Irma and Maria to determine if a there was a HUD nexus to reports that a property insurance company intentionally failed pay reasonable and timely property insurance claims. No HUD nexus was found. Matter closed 03/2020.	Allegations not substantiated
10/16/2019	An anonymous complaint was received by HUD-OIG alleging that someone named (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); had illegally applied for Section 8 assistance and charged \$1,500 to another party for an Id card and assistance to obtain the same benefits. The investigation did not reveal any information which could substantiate the allegations and prosecution was declined.	Allegations not substantiated and prosecution declined.
12/4/2019	HUD OIG received a Hotline Complaint alleging (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) from a local Housing Authority may be misappropriating/misusing Housing Authority funds. The investigation determined (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is not an operator of a Housing Authority that receives HUD funding. Moreover, this investigation revealed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is an operator of a City Government Authority that assists privately owned businesses to receive private loans from local banks and does not receive funding from HUD. Finally, this case was presented to the Southern District of Georgia and declined because this case determined no HUD funding was present.	Allegations Not Founded
3/27/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7)(C) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region. OIG conducted (b)(7)(C) and active warrant checks of fugitive felons. Compiled data and cross referenced with local Law Enforcement Agencies to verify active warrants. OIG accessed database to confirm tenants were actively residing in public housing. For the felons with active warrants, OIG sent letters addressed to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) the respective Housing Authorities informing them of the tenants who had active warrants.	Case Closed Administratively
12/12/2019	HUD OIG received a referral from HUD alleging a Public Housing Authority (PHA) (b)(6); in Alabama, deposited several PHA checks into a personal bank account. The investigation confirmed the PHA (b)(6); did in fact deposit several checks in her personal account for personal use. As a result, the PHA (b)(6); entered into a plea agreement and was convicted of violating Alabama Criminal Code 13A-008-005, Theft of Property in the 4th Degree. The (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was sentenced to 6 months incarceration, suspended to one year probation. The (b)(7)(C) was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$2,021.19.	Allegations substantiated

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
3/31/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleges their signature was forged on city reports by other city employees. The investigation did not produce evidence that would merit a successful prosecution. There was no HUD financial loss or negative HUD exposure. As a result, prosecution was declined. No further investigation required.	Allegations not founded.
3/31/2020	HUD OIG received an anonymous complaint alleging that a participant in the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) allowed a registered sex offender to reside in the subsidized property. The investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations. HUD OIG referred the matter to HUD for further investigation. Further investigation determined that the sex offender was a visitor to the property, but not an occupant. The HCVP participant was issued a written notice relative to unauthorized occupants and the case was closed.	Allegations not substantiated case referred to HA
6/29/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a HUD Certified Housing Counseling Agency alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); routinely instructed staff to submit false client information to the HUD intermediary in order to obtain payments for which the agency would otherwise not be eligible to receive. However, HUD reimbursement was NOT found to be contingent upon client information. Allegations unsubstantiated.	Allegations unsubstantiated
3/18/2020	Allegations received by Hotline that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Winter Haven Housing Authority (WHHA) may be engaged in improper hiring practices, allowing improper contracting for maintenance, and allowing family members of WHHA staff to travel on WHHA-funded trips. The case was declined for criminal prosecution by the U.S. Attorney's Office, Middle District of Florida.	Administratively closed due to allegations being unsubstantiated (b)(6); having repaid the cost of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) trip and Board Approving it.
11/1/2019	HUD-OIG received a Hotline Complaint alleging Housing Authority employees may be misappropriating Housing Authority funds. The investigation did not reveal any misappropriation of funds or violations in the Family Self Sufficiency Program, but did reveal a Housing Authority-funded trip for employees to visit New Orleans which may be a violation of federal regulations. This matter was referred to the Office of Audit.	Matter referred for Audit determination.
12/20/2019	On Thursday April, 6th 2017 HUD-OIG received a referral from law enforcement alleging a Non-Profit receiving CDBG funds allegedly is committing fraud. An investigative memorandum was sent from the law enforcement agency outlining the allegation. The memorandum noted tipster stated that CDBG funds in the amount of \$250,000 plus another \$120,000 to the Non-Profit were provided to assist it in the purchase and rehabilitation of a commercial building for social services program center to be run out of that location. Allegedly the owners have not remodeled or moved into the commercial building and are not providing social services that it had agreed to provide.	No evidence of criminal conduct was uncovered

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/23/2020	<p>HUD-OIG received an anonymous complaint On May 24th 2017. The individual stated that a HUD Section 8 tenant is currently making \$48,000 to \$81,000 per year with a tax business. The subject referred to HA and copy to PIH was interviewed and it was determined that the subject owned a Tax Business. The investigation uncovered the subject was making ~\$9,000 per year from tax year 2018 and 2019 as a tax preparer. The subject neither included income from the self-owned business nor did the subject indicate employment on the HUD-50058 for 2018 and 2019. (b)(5) referred to Housing Authority for administrative action.</p>	(b)(5) case was
3/13/2020	<p>A referral from the HUD, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity alleged that the employees of city government misappropriated Community Development Block Grant funds. Upon further investigation, it was revealed the complaint involved some Plantersville residents paying for sewer services. Moreover, some residents were required to pay a sewer fee that was affixed to their property taxes based on their race in violation of the Fair Housing Act. The investigation did not find sufficient evidence to support that Georgetown, South Carolina offered unfavorable terms and conditions based on race.</p>	Administratively closed - The HUD-OIG and the FHEO offices did not find sufficient evidence to support the allegations.
11/25/2019	<p>The Complainant alleges mismanagement and misuse of funds at Lake City Housing Authority, including potential use of government vehicles and government credit cards for personal use. The complainant stated, the agency has been designed as troubled following an audit and the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is not adhering to proper hiring procedures. The Housing Authority made corrective actions after a management review had been conducted. Many of the questionable expenses were allowable, the unallowable expenses were reimbursed per the management review. Based on the corrective actions from the Housing Authority, there was no prosecutorial evidence and this case was declined.</p>	Allegations Unfounded
3/31/2020	<p>Proactive investigation opened based on the following: Allegedly, the loan originator targets low-income individuals with below average credit to purchase new construction homes built by companies for which he also maintains ownership interest. The homes are appraised by the same appraiser, processed by the same loan processor and settled by the same law firm. Relevant files were subpoenaed from the subject, title company and mortgage originator. The review of the files and the interview of the subject did not result in sufficient cause to continue investigation. Matter closed 3/2020.</p>	Allegations not substantiated
9/29/2020	<p>An anonymous complaint alleges the property manager is stealing.</p>	Allegation Not Substantiated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/9/2020	<p>HUD OIG received a referral in August 2017 from a Law Enforcement Partner. The referral alleged that the town received a HUD grant and may be misusing the HUD funds and other funds. This joint investigation disclosed false statements, theft and corruption among the town's Public Officials. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) plead guilty to the Informations filed in the U.S. District Court. Both were sentenced and ordered to pay restitution.</p>	All judicial actions completed and subjects referred for administrative actions.
12/17/2019	<p>HUD OIG received a referral from a housing authority indicating the owner of a property management company had fraudulently assumed ownership of several homes going into foreclosure and registered the properties as section 8 properties to receive housing assistance payments. From 2012 to 2016, the subject perpetrated a scheme of breaking into unoccupied homes, claimed ownership of these homes, registered them with the housing authority and acted as a landlord receiving Section 8 payments for renting them out. A total of 7 properties were identified as containing fraudulent lease agreements with the subject alleging to be the owner. The total dollar loss is approximately \$98,938.80. The subject was indicted on one count of violating Title 18 U.S.C. 1343 (Wire Fraud). The federal indictment against the subject was later dropped by the United States Attorney's Office. Separate but related charges were brought against the subject by the Office of the Commonwealth's Attorney. The subject was found guilty of Criminal Trespass. The subject and management companies owned and operated by the subject have been referred for debarment.</p>	All judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions
3/31/2020	<p>A complainant alleged that a HUD (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) conspired to inflate claim amounts submitted to FHA/HUD by knowingly including false charges for the preservation of HUD REO properties. However, these allegations have not been substantiated. Based on the dates of the alleged criminal conduct (prior to 2016), the absence of more specific leads and the fact that company is no longer a HUD (b)(6) (contract expired and awarded to a different entity) – the investigation is being closed.</p>	Allegations not substantiated.
8/10/2020	<p>A referral from the OIG Hotline alleged that a section 8 tenant allowed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); to reside with her in an apartment complex receiving HUD subsidy. The investigation determined that the registered sex offender resided with a section 8 tenant in an apartment complex near a school without authorization. Additionally, the investigation disclosed the sex offender would visit the apartment complex, disappear, and reappear approximately one week later. The sex offender was sentenced in U.S. District Court to 18 months incarceration and five (5) years supervised release following release from prison.</p>	Judicial Actions are completed for the sex offender and the tenant was referred for eviction.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/5/2020	<p>A referral from the HUD-OIG, Office of Audit alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a Housing Authority (HA) misappropriated property from HA, including three HA-owned vehicles, and a desktop computer. It is also alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have misappropriated public housing funds, to be used in the conversion to the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program. The investigation determined that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) borrowed approximately \$1 million from the Public Housing Capital Fund as part of the RAD conversion. The investigation revealed that approximately \$500,000 of this borrowed money was repaid to the housing authority. Additionally, the housing authority has filed an independent civil suit against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to recoup additional funds. The case was declined for prosecution.</p>	<p>Case declined for prosecution, administrative action already taken by HUD, and OA completed an audit with findings.</p>
2/5/2020	<p>A proactive investigation was initiated based on local news reports citing potential conflict of interest with (b)(6); who also serves as the (b)(6); The investigation of 2012 CDBG Grant awarded to Clayton County, subsequently awarded to the county's subrecipient, The City of Jonesboro, was reviewed, county staff were interviewed and HUD program office was consulted during the review. The investigation did not discover evidence of conflict of interest or criminal activity.</p>	<p>Administratively closed. Allegations unsubstantiated.</p>
3/9/2020	<p>A referral from HUD, Office of Public Housing, alleged that a housing authority may not have procured contracts correctly. Additionally, the report alleged the housing authority may have misused the housing authority credit card for unapproved charges. An investigation into the matter was conducted by the HUD OIG. The findings were presented to the United States Attorney's Office, who declined to pursue the case. A referral was made to HUD Program Staff requesting they take whatever actions they deemed appropriate.</p>	<p>Referred to HUD</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/6/2020	<p>A referral from the IRS was submitted to the HUD program office concerning a bounced check for payroll tax withholdings from a nonprofit organization. According to the referral (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has resigned in lieu of the local government filing a police report. HUD CPD program office contacted the OIG Region 4 Office of Audit to refer a potential fraud case regarding a subrecipient of HOPWA grants. The Office of Audit referred the information to the Office of Investigation for action. The Office of Investigation found testimonial and documentary evidence that substantiated the allegations. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was sentenced on One Count of Wire Fraud (18 USC 1343) before the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky (USDC WDKY). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of (b)(6) a non-profit organization that received its financial support from HUD's HOPWA Grant, depleted the organization's bank accounts and abused his fiduciary responsibility to the organization, and the organization's mission. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) exceeded his authority by using his access to the nonprofit's bank accounts to pay for his personal expenses and to obtain cash to pay for his personal expenses. As part of this scheme and artifice to defraud, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also intentionally wrote checks to the non-profit from his personal account for a value greater than his personal account balance, both to artificially inflate the apparent balance of the non-profit's accounts, and to take advantage of the float time to access funds from the non-profit's accounts. As part of this scheme and artifice to defraud, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) concealed his theft by providing (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) inaccurate information regarding the state of the non-profit's bank accounts. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was ordered to pay \$111,828 restitution, and sentenced to 5 month imprisonment, and 3 years supervised release.</p>	All, judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions.
4/2/2020	<p>Information received from at least two FHA insured mortgage companies during the course of this investigation, indicated that the subject, who was a realtor and an attorney, assisted borrowers in (b)(5) provided false documentation regarding employment and assets in order to get FHA insured mortgages. The majority of subject loans known to HUD/OIG were disclosed by the two FHA insured mortgage companies and were subsequently reported to HUD, via the Self-Report function on Neighborhood Watch. Ultimately, HUD entered into Indemnification Agreements with the associated lenders as appropriate for the affected FHA loans. There were approximately 7 FHA insured loans indemnified with one mortgage company and approximately 26 FHA insured loans indemnified with the other mortgage company. On March 19, 2020, this matter was declined by the US Attorney's Office due to insufficient evidence and the assigned Assistant US (b)(5)</p>	Administratively closed due to insufficient evidence and (b)(5) after loans were indemnified.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/17/2019	<p>A September 2009 query of HUD's Neighborhood Watch system revealed that 22 of 68 FHA loans originated by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) between February 2008 and January 2009 were in default status. A review of 62 of the 68 loans revealed that, as of August 2010, 40 of the 68 were in default. As a result of this finding, a proactive investigation was initiated by HUD-OIG-Miami Field Office. The investigation discovered that at least 29 FHA-insured loans were fraudulently originated by 3 loan officers. Losses to HUD due to these loans were estimated to be approximately between \$3.2 million and \$4 million. This case was presented to U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of Florida (USAO-SDFL) and transferred to the U.S. Department of Justice's Fraud Division in Washington, D.C (USDOJ). DOJ decided to pursue 18-month Pre-Trial Diversion Agreements (PTD) for two loan officers involved in fraudulent loan origination. DOJ was unable to prosecute the biggest offender in this case since the statute of limitations had expired for all offenses committed by him. The said PTDs included restitution payments to FHA in the amount of \$203,056.33.</p>	All judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions.
12/13/2019	<p>In a letter to HUD, the complainant alleges that revitalization efforts at public housing in the area of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are not being completed according to regulations. He alleges that work is subcontracted to unlicensed workers and that wages do not conform to HUD standards. He further alleges that some of the materials are not being replaced as contracts state. All fraudulent activity involved public housing units renovation contracts with a local public housing administration. After an investigation conducted by HUDOIG, DOLOIG and the Miami Dade County OIG, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) the target company were indicted by a Federal Grand Jury in the Southern District of Florida. The defendants were found guilty of Wire Fraud, Conspiracy, and False Statements after a jury trial. They were sentenced to serve prison terms between 41-51 months. A forfeiture order was issued in the amount of \$1,767,076 and a restitution order in the amount of \$32,112. Both individuals were suspended by HUD and currently await debarment. They were also debarred by Miami Dade County.</p>	All judicial actions are complete and subjects have been referred for administrative actions.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/18/2019	<p>HUD-OIG received a complaint from the HUD-OIG Hotline that alleged the housing authority (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and two other housing authority employees were taking money from the Family Self-Sufficiency program. It was reported, they took the money when tenants would lose their voucher. Interviews were conducted of all FSS participants and there were no complaints of participants not receiving their FSS voucher amount; however, there were participants who violated the FSS contract and did not receive the FSS escrow amount. On November 22, 2019, HUD-OIG, contacted United States Attorney's Office (USAO), Northern District of Georgia (NDG), The USAO explained because there is no evidence of the Housing Authority terminating their FSS participants without cause and because the FSS financial statements were reconciled and shows no evidence of theft, the USAO respectfully declined this case due to no evidence of criminal activity.</p>	Allegations not founded.
8/11/2020	<p>According to information received in an online news article, an employee of a title company allegedly fraudulently charged and received fees for title insurance for mortgage loans funding the purchases of single family homes in and around the Asheville, NC area. The title agent allegedly created false title insurance documents in order to give the appearance of a bona fide insurance policy in place, which is commonly required by lenders in order to approve the origination of a mortgage loan. It is estimated this occurred on approximately 1,000 loans. The title agent was charged by bill of information, arrested, and pled guilty to creating fraudulent policies for at least 973 loans, including at least 53 FHA insured loans. The subject was ordered to forfeit \$412,344. No losses to HUD were caused in this case. The subject was sentenced to 14 months incarceration and ordered to repay the forfeited amount \$412,344 in restitution.</p>	All judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions
3/27/2020	<p>A HUD funded Public Housing Authority reported to HUD that (b)(6); allegedly embezzled approximately \$25K from the Housing Authority for personal use. The investigation revealed an actual loss amount of \$95,689.44. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was indicted and subsequently sentenced in the Southern District of Alabama, on count two (2) of the previous Indictment, Title 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1) (Aggravated Identity Theft). (b)(6); was sentenced to twenty – four (24) months federal imprisonment, twelve (12) months supervised release, restitution of \$150,189.44, which included the cost of the forensic audit, and a \$100.00 Special Assessment. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was previously indicted via Grand Jury on one (1) count of violating Title 18 U.S.C. § 641 (Theft of Government Funds) and one (1) count of violating Title 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1).</p>	Successfully prosecuted

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
11/27/2019	HUD OIG received a telephone call from HUD alleging one of their employees was performing outside employment activities during their telework time. The allegations were unsupported; however, the investigation revealed the employee did not receive approval from HUD to operate the business which is a violation of policy.	HUD Employee, case declined for prosecution. Referred to HUD for administrative actions
2/5/2020	Referral received from another OIG alleging that management of Indiantown Non-Profit Housing, Inc, a HUD-grantee, may be misusing federal grant monies as well as receiving illegal payments, services, or gifts for contract awards. As a result of the investigation, the Subject was charged with 18 USC 666 (a) (1) (a) and ultimately plead guilty to said charges. The Subject plead guilty to converting federal funds to her own personal use by way of misusing a government issued credit card and paying for home renovations with government funds. The Subject was Sentenced to 360 days home confinement, five years of supervised release, \$50,000.00 in restitution to US Treasury and a \$10,000 fine paid to the court. Subject also agreed to a 15 year self debarment.	All judicial actions have been completed and subject has been referred for administrative actions.
4/2/2020	HUDOIG received a referral from the Broward County, Florida Inspector General in the form of an audit report in which the Town of Pembroke Park used Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to purchase professional engineering services on 66 different procurements over 16 years from a single vendor without competitive solicitation or negotiation as required by federal procurement regulations. Over \$3.3 million was paid to that vendor. Due to the expiration of the statute of limitation, the vendor was referred to HUD's Department Enforcement Center for administrative action.	Statute of limitation expired and case referred for administrative action
1/8/2020	Information received through the Money Laundering Task Force of the US Attorney's Office for the Western District of North Carolina alleged that a group of individuals, acting as real estate brokers, buyers, sellers, and closing attorneys were allegedly participating in a scheme to flop properties in fraudulent short sale transactions. The investigation revealed that the group allegedly used multiple shell companies, false proof of funds statements, and false repair invoices in order to negotiate short sales for distressed homeowners with their mortgagees. At the same time, the group would find purchasers for the properties and arrange same-day closings for the short sales and purchases, resulting in profit for the group in a non-arms-length situation. Approximately 19 FHA insured mortgage loans were involved in this scheme. The subjects were charged and arrested pursuant to a bill of information and pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to make a false statement. The subjects were sentenced to probation with home confinement and ordered to pay \$90,146.36 in restitution to a lender.	All judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions.

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
10/24/2019	An anonymous complainant alleged that an individual had purchased a HUD REO property as an owner occupant and then immediately rented the property out. A thorough analysis of the property led to additional properties and borrowers, all of whom appeared have a relationship, either as associates or family. Each purchased a home (or several over time) as an owner occupant but information suggests that they rented the properties out. The investigation revealed little evidence to show that the purchasers resided in the properties, and in some cases, the investigation confirmed that the purchasers, some of whom were family members of Real Estate Broker (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) rented the properties. Prosecution was declined by the U.S. Attorneys Office and the matter was referred to the State of Florida, Department of Business and Professional Regulation.	Prosecution declined. Referred to State licensing authorities. Case closed.
10/18/2019	A referral from a Public Housing Authority (PHA) alleged that a PHA employee may have manipulated the PHA's waiting list by assigning units to applicants with a preference when no preference was identified in the file for the applicants. The investigation did not reveal sufficient information to confirm or refute the allegations, and prosecution was declined by the U.S. Attorney's Office.	Unable to substantiate allegations. Prosecution declined.

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
6/4/2020	<p>This investigation was initiated based on information that Carlisle Development fraudulently obtained federal tax credits and grant monies intended for the construction of low-income housing and converted the proceeds of those fraudulently obtained tax credits and grant monies to their personal use and benefit. Investigation disclosed revealed that the defendants submitted the low-income housing developer's applications to the Florida Housing Finance Corporation (FHFC) for the construction of several low-income housing developments. FHFC selected some of these developments, including the Subject Developments, as eligible for federal tax credits and/or grant monies. Once selected by FHFC, the defendants solicited a final construction bid from the Contractors reflecting the total compensation the Contractors would receive to build each Subject Development. The Contractors provided a final construction bid to the defendants for each Subject Development. The defendants then provided the Contractors with inflated prices to use in the construction contract for each Subject Development, which would be submitted to FHFC'S representatives. The defendants and the contractors signed construction contracts with these fraudulently inflated prices for each Subject Development and submitted these contracts to FHFC'S representatives. These construction contracts falsely represented the actual amount of compensation that the Contractors would receive to build the Subject Developments. FHFC'S representatives relied on these fraudulent contracts in determining the amount of federal tax credits and grant monies to issue. At defendant's instruction, the Contractors kicked back these excess funds by writing millions of dollars' worth of checks payable to a fake construction company. From this fake construction company, the kickback payments were distributed for the benefit of the Developers and the Co- Conspirator Developers. In total, as part of this scheme, the Contractors kicked back approximately \$7.2 million in payments for the benefit of the defendants, and the Coconspirator Developers. These kickback payments were separate and in addition to millions of dollars of developers' fees that BHG was already receiving as compensation for the Subject Developments.</p>	<p>All judicial actions completed and all subjects were referred for administrative actions</p>
12/12/2019	<p>A proactive investigation was initiated based on news reports that multifamily properties owned by a nonprofit had been cited for public health risks. The properties were the recipients of HAP contracts, so an investigation was opened to determine whether HUD funds were being misused. The findings were presented to the USAO and the case was declined, so the investigation was closed.</p>	<p>Allegation unsubstantiated.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/4/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) through his attorney (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(A)</p> <p>(b)(7)(A) The complaint alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) promoted the inflation of appraisal values and lied to HUD, Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae as to the seller concessions made and actual value of properties. The investigation revealed that from 2008, through 2019, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) originated and/or underwrote mortgage loans for properties in twenty housing developments, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) held construction loans in many of those developments. Throughout the origination and underwriting process, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was aware that seller concessions, which would have been material to the property valuation, were considered part of the property value, resulting in the inflation of appraisals and over-insurance by FHA. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) agreed to settle the allegations for \$2.8 million. The US Attorney's Office for the District of Puerto Rico declined to pursue the allegations against First Bank.</p>	Investigation complete. Successful prosecution.
4/6/2020	<p>Information was received from the Broward County Housing Authority indicating HCV Landlord (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was charging HCV program participants beyond the amounts agreed upon in the Housing Assistance Payment Contract.</p>	All judicial actions completed and referred for administrative actions.
12/13/2019	<p>As a result of meeting with US Trustee Attorney, Orlando FL HUD OIG was advised that an organization located in the Jacksonville, FL area was engaged in Single Family Equity Skimming. More specifically, the Subjects have acquired several hundred properties throughout the Jacksonville, FL area through Home Owner Association foreclosure sales. Once they obtain Certificates of Title , they make any and all necessary repairs, and then start collecting rent without paying any debt service to the original lending institutions causing the properties to go into further default. The Subjects then placed a substantial amount of properties under a newly created trust then filed bankruptcy on behalf of the trust which immediately ceased any and all foreclosure attempts by the mortgage companies. A significant amount of the properties under the Subject's control are FHA insured properties that are in default, have gone to claim, or are in the foreclosure process. The case was declined based on the United States Attorney's Office assertion that certain elements for Bankruptcy Fraud and Single Family Equity Skimming were not satisfied. The assigned AUSA did not feel the facts of the case satisfied the element of intent to defraud on both statutes that were being considered. The primary justification for this decision was based on the fact that the Subjects conducted their business model with the guidance and advice of bankruptcy attorneys and foreclosure defense attorneys.</p>	Allegations unsubstantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/18/2020	<p>A referral from a Housing Authority (HA) alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is misappropriating funds. The allegation further alleges that capital funding is being utilized on non dwelling projects, HA funds are being utilized to pay (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) personal credit card bill, (b)(6); (b)(6); salary was increased without proper board approval, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was reimbursed for questionable expenses. HUD, OIG initiated an investigation to investigate this allegation. The investigation revealed questionable purchases that did not have the proper documentation to substantiate the transactions. As a result of the investigation, the U.S. Attorney's Office, Western District of Kentucky declined to prosecute (b)(5). Subsequently, the case was referred to the Departmental Enforcement Center for an administrative action.</p>	<p>Case was declined for prosecution (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p>
7/9/2020	<p>HUD/OIG/Tampa received a copy of referral from the U.S. Trustee to the USAO/Orlando. The U.S. Trustee provided the following information: A licensed Florida real estate broker is the managing member of a Florida LLC business. The real estate broker and employees of the Florida LLC are operating a foreclosure rescue scheme in the Orlando and Jacksonville area. They reach out to distressed homeowners through fliers and their website and offer to stop pending foreclosure sales for a fee. After collecting the fee, they prepare and file "bare-bones" bankruptcies for their clients that they know will be dismissed as incomplete filings. As part of the bankruptcy filing, they file an Application to Pay Filing in Installments, in which they falsely represent that the homeowner client will pay the bankruptcy filing fee in installments. No portion of the filing of the fee was ever paid. The filing of the incomplete bankruptcy petition has the effect of postponing a scheduled foreclosure sale. This matter affects several FHA-insured properties. HUD/OIG and FHFA/OIG jointly worked this matter. Investigation corroborated information provided by US Trustee's office. In all, 4 individuals were prosecuted; 3 individuals pled guilty and have been sentenced; and, 1 person went to trial, was found guilty on all counts and has been sentenced. HUD/OIG made referrals to the HUD/DEC; State of Florida, Office of Financial Regulation (for financial services licenses); and the State of Florida, Dept. of Business and Professional Regulation (for real estate licenses).</p>	<p>All judicial actions are complete and all subjects have been referred for administrative actions</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/12/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of information from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) complainant, that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) located (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); Chicago, IL 60620, alleged that (b)(6); has taken her social security funds and used those funds for her own personal use. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has kept possession of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) direct express card and her Link card. It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has tampered with (b)(6); mail by going into her mailbox and opened her mail without (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) consent. It is also alleged that (b)(6); was assisting (b)(6); with paying her bills (which (b)(6); should not have done), but instead would take money off her direct express card and not pay any of her bills. (b)(6); believed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was paying all of her bills in full on a monthly basis and it has been discovered that she has not been. The family has made a complaint to the Department of Aging for senior abuse and a police report has been filed. In addition, another (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) named (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has been mishandling her rent payments to her resident account with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was communicating with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) during the time of (b)(6); (b)(6); transition from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to a nursing home. (b)(6); was instructed by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to leave (b)(6); rent payments in the unit for (b)(6); and (b)(6); would get the rent payments from the apartment. It is alleged that (b)(6); used the rent payments for her own personal use, and did not apply the rent payments to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) rent ledger. It was discovered that the rent payments from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for September and November were applied to (b)(6); rent, instead of being applied to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) rent.</p>	<p>This investigation did not rise to the level of pursuing a criminal prosecution and presenting to a prosecutor. (b)(6); has filed complaints for elder abuse on (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) behalf against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with the City of Chicago, Department of Aging, and with the Chicago Police Department.</p> <p>(b)(7)(A)</p>
4/21/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of allegations that (b)(6); allegedly embezzled funds received to treat Homeless HIV residents. Specifically it is alleged, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) embezzled funds using fraudulent invoices and false services. It is alleged the activity occurred in approximately January of 2016 until (b)(6); closed in 2019.</p>	<p>Although (b)(6); appeared to have some knowledge of how money was being allocated by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) much of his understanding was based on unsubstantiated information. (b)(6); did not have direct knowledge of misuse of funds nor did he have a role in the handling of contracts. This case was not presented to a prosecutor because it did not have sufficient credible information at this time. This case will be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/1/2019	<p>HUD OIG audited HUD to determine if Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) have access to the Do Not Pay system. The audit found HUD did not provide PHAs with access to the Do Not Pay system resulting in HUD potentially paying rental subsidies to 2,278 tenants who were reported as excluded from Federal Programs or deceased. Of the 2,278 cases, 663 cases are located in HUD OIG Region 5. HUD OIG Audit's Region 5 results were sorted by OH PHAs (Participant Code); Head of Household (Relationship); Single Households (Count 1); and Voucher Holders (Program). The sort produced 68 results. The social security number, date of birth, and date of death in the 68 cases were compared with PIC, Lexis Nexis and in some cases OHLEG (Ohio Law Enforcement Gateway). Of the 68 reported cases, • In 22 cases there was a discrepancy in the social security number reported in the Audit database • In 20 cases the social security number was not reported in Lexis Nexis as belonging to a deceased person • In 18 cases an end of participation date was reported in PIC in less than 60 days of the tenant's date of death • In 7 cases the tenant was no longer residing in housing at the time of death. Of the 68 cases, one instance was found in which the tenant residing in subsidized housing has the same social security number as an individual who was reported deceased.</p>	Allegation Not Substantiated. Administratively Closed.
3/26/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)
2/3/2020		Administratively Closed
	<p>A referral from the HUD OIG Hotline alleged misuse of grant money by a development corporation to repair houses. Specifically, it is alleged the repairs are not being made and are shoddy work. Further, mortgages on the houses are in excess of the work being completed. In addition, the development corporation is not following the wait list and some people are getting bumped up the list. Finally, subcontractors are overbilling for work completed or billing for work not completed.</p>	

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/28/2020	Received Hotline referral detailing complainant, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) allegations against (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Specifically, (b)(6); alleges members of (b)(6); are bribing bank employees with all expense paid vacations for insider bid data.	Investigation is being closed administratively with SAC approval. No evidence of of criminal, civil, or administrative fraud. Allegations were unsubstantiated.
10/31/2019	HUD grant funds have allegedly been misused by City of Dayton officials; there is little to no accounting or records of how the funds have been spent.	Prosecution Declined
11/6/2019	HUD-OIG conducted a data match to identify individuals from (b)(5); (b)(7)(E) that may be receiving housing subsidies and provided investigative leads.	All judicial and administrative actions complete.
2/13/2020	HUD OIG compared subsidized housing recipient data against (b)(5); (b)(7)(E) to establish investigative leads.	Administrative Actions completed.
12/23/2019	A referral from a federal law enforcement agency alleged an Ohio based pest control company is billing HUD or management companies receiving HUD subsidies for unnecessary services. Specifically, certain employees will create bed bug/termite fecal during inspections to demonstrate the need for extermination services.	Allegations Unfounded. Administratively Closed.
3/2/2020	(b)(6); allegedly represented Habitat for Humanity of Northwest Indiana as the (b)(6); (b)(6); allegedly told the complainant that she falsified a government grant that (b)(6); submitted to (b)(6);. The grant was allegedly funded by HUD. (b)(6); submitted documents for this grant in August 2018. Specifically, (b)(6); indicated Habitat for Humanity of Northwest Indiana was not renting homes as stated in the agreement. However, (b)(6); allegedly knew (b)(6); (b)(6); Gary, IN, to be rented out.	After further investigation, the case was declined for prosecution by the USAO. No further investigation is warranted at this time.
10/4/2019	An attorney for Lake View East Cooperative (LVE) is requesting that the HUD-OIG office investigate (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Specifically, it is alleged that she used Cooperative funds for her own purposes. It is alleged that the misuse of funds was discovered both in the most recent HUD audit and when the new management company took over and reviewed accounts. Loss is unknown at this time	Case declined by IL AG's Office. No further action is warranted. Close investigation.
10/4/2019	It has been alleged that (b)(6) used false W2s, inflated wages, false VOs, and possibly fraudulent tax returns to be approved for an FHA insured loan in the amount of \$289,656.00 for (b)(6) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Crystal Lake, IL on 02/28/18, FHA # (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	Case declined by IL AG's Office. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation
3/30/2020	Complainant reports that a tenant is allowing a registered sex offender to reside in her HUD subsidized unit.	Investigation declined for prosecution.
3/30/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(6); numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	All actions completed. No additional work needed. ROI completed. Close Investigation.
11/18/2019	HUD OIG compared subsidized housing recipient data against the (b)(5); (b)(7)(E) (b)(5); (b)(7)(E) to establish investigative leads.	Dismissed due to death of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/7/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region	All judicial and administrative action complete.
3/27/2020	This matter involves the Madison County Housing Authority (MCHA) in Madison County, Illinois. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of this HUD funded Public Housing Authority, is allegedly giving illegally preferential treatment to friends and relatives. Specifically, it is alleged that he allows friends and relatives to complete applications while the MCHA waiting list is closed for the section 8 voucher program. Additionally, he is giving vouchers in values which exceed the qualifications of applicants who are related to him. The complainant has direct knowledge of this misconduct because she is an employee of MCHA. The complainant stated that she has personally witnessed this conduct and is in possession of documentary evidence of this misconduct. This misconduct was discovered by the employee during the normal scope of her employment with the MCHA and can be corroborated by fellow employees at MCHA. The complainant alleges that this matter involves several thousands of dollars, but does not know the full monetary extent of the misconduct. This misconduct has been ongoing and continuous since January 2016. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has informed MCHA employees that HUD has specifically authorized him to deviate from HUD's rules and regulations.	After further investigation, this case is being closed (b)(5) (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
2/25/2020	This office was contacted by (b)(5) to assist in the investigation of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Section 8 tenant in the St. Paul PHA. (b)(6); is suspected of illegally purchasing and distributing firearms, some of which have been utilized in criminal acts. (b)(6); financial wherewithal and related disclosures to the PHAs are an integral part of the investigation. (b)(5);(b)(7)(A) (b)(5);(b)(7)(A)	All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
10/31/2019	This case was predicated upon assistance from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Assistant Cuyahoga County Prosecutor, Cleveland OH and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with the Parma Heights Police Department, Parma Heights, OH regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) It is alleged that (b)(6); a home health aide has been defrauding her clients while receiving cash payments. In addition, it is alleged that (b)(6); is a HUD subsidized tenant and is failing to disclose her health care income to the housing authority.	Successful Prosecution
1/28/2020	The complainant alleges to have testimony and social media proof of the subject allowing (b)(6); (b)(6); to reside in the subsidized home as an unauthorized live-in. The Sheriff's department has become involved and the program office has requested assistance in handling the situation.	Case was declined by the local prosecutor. No further action is warranted. Close investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/18/2019	<p>HUD CPD referred the City of Dayton, OH (the City) to the DEC to conduct a review of the City's HOME program. The purpose of the DEC review was to track voucher revisions; follow draws; and determine if the draws were properly supported. The review found the City did not have documentation to support the assignment of funds from one activity to another. The review found five instances in which two activities were assigned the same address. Furthermore, the review found the City is reconciling amounts reported under (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Home program with amounts the City reported in IDIS. The DEC recommended the City repay \$166,144.92 in un-allowed costs and CPD examine \$502,072.07 in unsupported expenses. Finally, the DEC recommended CPD consider referring the matter to HUD OIG for further investigation.</p>	PFCRA Declined
1/6/2020	<p>This case was predicated upon a request for assistance from the Social Security Administration (SSA) Office of Inspector General (OIG) which alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has concealed and continues to conceal marital co-habitation with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Further, it is alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was a tenant of the Mansfield Metropolitan Housing Authority (MMHA) living at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Shelby, Ohio and failure to disclose accurate household composition to include (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The initial review of HUD records identified (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was a HUD recipient of the MMHA Housing Choice Voucher Program until March 1, 2015. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was listed as the only member of the household residing at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).</p>	Successful Prosecution
10/16/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C), Dakota County Community Development Authority, contacted our office in regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) an employee who was in charge of their computer system, may have used his position to take over \$267,000 in which he was not entitled too. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) believes (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) created fictitious landlords and tenants in order to obtain Section 8 rental payments.</p>	All judicial actions complete. DEC referrals sent. No further action is warranted. Close investigation.
2/14/2020	<p>The following referral was submitted by QAD. The subject case was reported through the Neighborhood Watch Lender Reporting System by Bank of America NA Charlotte (BOA) for possible tax falsification. The case file contained numerous copies of the borrowers 2014 and 2015 tax returns for the borrower's personal (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Taxes were filed under both 1120 and 1120S Corporations, by two different tax preparers and the borrower. Documentation evidences that as of June 27, 2016, the IRS had no record of any returns being filed under Bless and Save for 2014 or 2015. The borrower certified that all tax returns were filed as of May 9, 2016.</p>	Prosecution Declined

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/27/2020	This case was predicated upon a request for assistance from the Lake Metropolitan Housing Authority (LMHA), Painesville, OH to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Inspector General (OIG). LMHA reported that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a tenant of the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) residing at (b)(6); Painesville, OH allegedly failed to report employment income. LMHA alleged (b)(6); working as (b)(6); through the Ohio Medicaid Program failed to disclose her employment and income while being a participant in the program causing an overpayment of Housing Assistance Payments of approximately \$20,000.	Successful Prosecution
2/3/2020	(b)(6); is the (b)(6); of the Cleveland Office of Capitol Projects. Reporting has indicated (b)(6); has accepted cash from at least one local vendor to provide a bump out for on-street parking. Information also suggests (b)(6); used city funds to repave an unauthorized street in the City of Cleveland to personally benefit his business, which happens to be next door to the street in question.	Successful Prosecution
10/8/2019	Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) provided a written referral of tenant/landlord fraud. MSHDA alleges that landlord (b)(6); collected HAP payments for several years for an unoccupied house and is (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	All judicial action complete.
3/2/2020	A referral from HUD program alleged a multifamily project owner is misappropriating HUD rental subsidy. Specifically, it is alleged the owner of the non-insured project has not had an approved management agent and has most likely been collecting a management fee without HUDs permission. Further, the property has been without hot water for 2-weeks, the owner is asking residents for personal loans, and the owner is residing in one of the subsidized units and may not be eligible to do so.	Prosecution Declined.
12/20/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) from the Minnesota Department of Human Services, contacted our office regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) stated he was informed we had conducted an investigation of misuse of funds by (b)(6); at (b)(6); He was given our contact information from the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); described how he believes (b)(6); while employed at (b)(6); consequently conducted the same scheme to misuse funds from the State of Minnesota. As a result, a joint investigation is warranted.	All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close investigation.
2/29/2020	A referral from the HUD Philadelphia Quality Assurance Division via a lender self-report alleged an appraiser's signature was used without actually completing the appraisal. Specifically, the appraiser was involved in a car accident in May 2013 and subsequently passed away in October 2013. However, between May 2013 and October 2013, 51 appraisals were completed and certified using the appraiser's signature. HUD/OIG queried SFDW and discovered a total of 88 appraisals were actually completed during this time period.	Prosecution Declined

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/26/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	
5/5/2020	<p>While conducting an audit of the Hammond Housing Authority (HHA) a housing specialist informed the onsite auditor about a possible \$14,000 overpayment for a Housing Choice Voucher tenant. It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) did not report earned income from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Billing (b)(6); allegedly started receiving income from (b)(6) in 2014. (b)(6); did not inform HHA of this income in her 2015 and 2016 annual recertification.</p>	<p>This case was declined for prosecution by the U.S. Attorney's office in the northern District of Indiana. No further action is warranted at this</p>
8/24/2020	<p>(b)(6); purportedly provided false information in order to qualify for and obtain food stamps, education loans, and a FHA insured loan for the purchase of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Pickerington, OH.</p>	Successful Prosecution.
1/24/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of information relative to (b)(6);, an illiterate senior citizen, who had to be relocated from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Chicago, Illinois because of its extremely poor condition. It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had put her name on the mortgage and deed of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Chicago, IL (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) without her knowing what she was signing. The (b)(6); property has received numerous violations resulting in multiple fines. The alleged mortgage is from (b)(6);, which is a dissolved corporation previously owned by (b)(6);. (b)(6); purchased the property from Fannie in 2011 for \$14,000. Numerous attempts were made to obtain loans in (b)(6); name including the (b)(6); property (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>This case was declined for prosecution. No further investigative action is required at this point.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/31/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	(b)(7)(A)
2/25/2020	<p>On September 29, 2016, the Hennepin County Fraud Unit initiated a Fraud Investigation regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has been a recipient of public assistance in Hennepin County since prior to June 1991 and it has been reported to the Fraud Unit that he has been falsely submitting his applications with the assistance of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) receiving Section 8 Housing Assistance from the Met Council. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) while also receiving Section 8 Housing Assistance from the Met Council. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with a FHA-insured loan. During these same, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) applied for public assistance benefits for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>Assistance office helped (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) by taking his applications and conducting his interviews, assisting in keeping (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) scheme from being disclosed. In (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>
10/18/2019	<p>The Mt. Pleasant (MI) Housing Commission filed a complaint with the Detroit Field Office alleging that tenant (b)(6) was suspected of working as a private contractor but not disclosing income to the housing commission. The housing commission hired a private investigator and their preliminary findings appear to support the allegations.</p>	Investigation declined for prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/18/2020	<p>This case was predicated upon a request for assistance from the Social Security Administration Office of Inspector General (SSA/OIG), U.S. Department of Education (ED) OIG and the U.S. Postal Service Inspectors (USPSI) concerning an allegation of identity fraud, associated financial fraud, subsidized housing/Federal Housing Administration (FHA) fraud to include anticipated losses to SSA, EED and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) previously known as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) using Social Security Number (SSN) (b)(6); is operating in a second identity. This second identity is alleged to be in the name (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with SSN (b)(6);. In addition, it is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) assisted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to purchase a residence located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) South Euclid, Ohio 44121 through an FHA loan. It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) orchestrated the house purchase through fraudulent means. Furthermore, SSA/OIG and ED/OIG provided additional allegations that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may also be involved with the allegations of education and housing fraud. The initial review of HUD records identified (b)(6); as a HUD recipient of the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority (CMHA) Public Housing Program, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Cleveland, OH 44113.</p>	Successful Prosecution
10/8/2019	<p>This is a (b)(5) (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and others are involved in a property flipping and mortgage fraud scheme in Joliet, IL. (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is orchestrating the purchase of numerous properties by using Asian strawbuyers to purchase the property on the front end. An appraiser then inflates the sales price by approximately \$100,000 and then the property is sold to another buyer. (b)(5); (b)(6); alleges that the loan files for the front end purchasers contain false and fraudulent documents and information.</p>	The subjects in this case have been charged and convicted. No further investigative action is required at this time.
12/18/2019	<p>This office received information that (b)(6); was recruiting investors for properties located on the south side of Chicago. He would get (b)(6); at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to get the mortgages for investors. (b)(6); told the investors that they would purchase converted condos and he would give them money for the use of their credit, collect all rents which were mostly Section 8, then give the investor a percentage of the profits upon sale. (b)(6); stated he would pay the mortgages for the properties. Shortly after purchase, the investors started to find out (b)(6); was not paying the mortgages but collecting the rents. In most cases, the properties went into foreclosure. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) profitted from the fraudulent mortgages on the properties. (b)(6); of the Illinois Attorney Generals Office accepted this case for prosecution.</p> <p>xxx</p>	All judicial actions complete. The remaining charges have been dismissed due to a plea agreement in another case. No further actions are warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/14/2020	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have acted as a straw-buyer. The seller 1st Liberty Management netted \$188,026 from the sale of the subject property. The loan was originated by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The borrower (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The seller 1st Liberty management is owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).</p> <p>xx</p>	The subject in this case was convicted and sentenced. No further actions are required at this time.
5/12/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of information from the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Internal Revenue Service that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Inc is owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has been involved with property flipping in Chicago, Illinois. More specifically, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) acquired approximately 65 properties from 2005 to the present, and (b)(6) subsequently sold those properties shortly thereafter for more than double the initial sales price. 45 of the properties sold are in foreclosure. Additionally, approximately 7 of the borrowers have FHA insured loans and many of the properties are occupied by Section 8 tenants.</p> <p>0000</p>	The subjects in this case have been convicted and sentenced. No further investigative action is warranted at this time.
2/24/2020	<p>It is alleged the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) FHA mortgagor, provided false information in the origination of her loan. Specifically, a Quality Assurance review revealed what appeared to be inflated and falsified income tax returns as well as a false verification of rent. Further, the mortgage company used for the origination of this loan is a potential subject in another investigation within the office. xxx</p>	The defendant in this case was convicted and sentenced. No further investigative activity is warranted at this time.
11/1/2019	<p>On 2/2/15, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) contacted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Cleveland FBI to report a loan origination fraud where (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was involved in the short sale loan closing (see (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E)). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) will be self reporting the FHA loan for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Akron, OH 44313 involving buyer (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). According to the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) the file contents include false W2's, false income statements and false tax returns. FHA binder requested by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on 2/3/15.</p>	Successful Prosecution
6/3/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of information from HUD-PIH that alleges Alexander County Housing Authority (ACHA) has improperly utilized PHA Operating and Capital funds. More specifically, by awarding contracts outside of HUD procurement/bidding requirements and in one instance to the benefit of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Additionally, information provided by HUD-OLSE alleges ACHA engaged wage violations with both ACHA employees and contractors.</p>	No further investigative or administrative action is warranted on this case at this time. The case will be closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/30/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the White Earth Indian Reservation contacted our office to discuss some irregularities on the White Earth Indian Reservation (WEIR). (b)(6); stated the WEIR was awarded tax credits in order to build 50 new houses on the reservation. (b)(6); alleges the houses were not built to specs and the contractor cut corners in order to avoid building these houses within the housing code. (b)(6); also alleges the WEIR may also receive a new tax credit to rehabilitate an additional 50 homes within the Reservation and is worried the same problems will occur with the new tax credit.	Investigation was not presented for prosecution. Allegations were unsubstantiated. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
3/27/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for the Mansfield Metropolitan Housing Authority (MMHA) contacted HUD OIG alleging that an unauthorized individual had written numerous checks to retailers using MMHA's HAP account number. The remitter on the checks is (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with an address in Canal Winchester, Ohio. A similar incident occurred in December 2014, with the remitter being (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	Administratively Closed
4/29/2020	During the course of the current investigation of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) agents learned that alleged HECM (b)(6); victims were actually victims of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) through his company Windy City. AUSA (b)(6); requested a separate case/investigation be opened on (b)(6);	The findings of this investigation were referred to Assistant United States Attorney (AUSA) (b)(6); U.S. Attorney's Office, Northern District of Illinois, for prosecutorial consideration. Although the investigation revealed that (b)(6); had filed false liens prior to his clients obtaining HECMs, there was no evidence that (b)(6); victimized the elderly homeowners by converting their HECM proceeds to his personal use. Additionally, the covert operations did not reveal additional attempts by (b)(6); to commit HECM fraud or any other type of loan fraud, and AUSA (b)(6); declined to prosecute the case. Based on the above information, no further investigation is warranted and this case is closed.
3/5/2020	An investigation into (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) revealed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may be involved in the origination of fraudulent FHA insured mortgages. Through the use of an (b)(5); (b)(5); HUD-OIG has identified several property transactions in which false documents may have been provided to Wells Fargo Bank and various other mortgage lenders.	The defendants in this case have been convicted and sentenced. No further investigative action is warranted at this time.
2/19/2020	The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported on Cleveland City Councilman (b)(6); refusing to detail his use of HUD CDBG money for the Hough Development Corp.	(b)(6); successful prosecution. (b)(6) prosecution declined.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/6/2020	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is alleged to have stolen over \$20,000 from the Lucas Metro Housing Authority, LMHA, for continuing to collect his HAP payment from LMHA after selling an LMHA HCVP house located at (b)(6); Toledo, OH. (b)(6); is alleged to have collected this HAP money from 3/2011 - 3 /2014. Agents believe (b)(6); concealed selling this house to LMHA to receive the benefit of the HAP payment every month. (b)(6); is currently under a federal indictment on money laundering charges in Toledo, OH.</p>	Successful prosecution.
8/27/2020	<p>A referral was made to HUD-OIG Investigations alleging that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is defrauding prospective buyers by claiming he will renovate the properties after the properties are purchased. There are approximately 176 properties that were purchased through (b)(6); and 11 victims have come forward with complaints. There is a possibility that (b)(6); is collecting Section 8 payments for the properties and fails to forwarding the funds to the buyers. The current loss is around \$5,000,000.</p>	Successful prosecution.
10/8/2019	<p>Complainant alleges that a public official provided CDBG funds to a not for profit at which she worked and inappropriately benefitted from the funds. HUD OIG is in receipt of a referral from the Hotline alleging that an Evanston Official was profiting from misappropriating Evanston CDBG funds to fundamentalist religious group that she is also employed with. Specifically, it is alleged that between 2016-2017, the Evanston has paid \$215,000 of its HUD CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) funding, which is intended to provide affordable housing and economic opportunities for low and moderate income residents, to Evanston City Official (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) employer, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), which has operated illegally as (b)(6); (b)(6); It is further alleged that of that \$215,000, almost 40 percent (\$83,737) was paid to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for administering Sunshine's three 12-week programs in Evanston. In addition to her employer-paid wages, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) earns \$435 per classroom hour, 773% the rate for Illinois teachers. In 2015, (b)(6); who was then an appointed City official, helped to seek out (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to become a CDBG recipient. During the five month period (July to December 2015) that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) helped to secure Sunshine's CDBG grant, she was also hired by the organization to administer the City's Sunshine pilot program, which was improperly facilitated out of the Civic Center.</p>	Case was declined by the Illinois Attorney General's Office. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
2/11/2020	<p>Received referral fro HUD Philadelphia HOC alleging owner occupant fraud. Specifically, it is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) HUD REO owner occupant, purchased (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Niles, MI and failed to occupy the property in violation of HUD guidelines.</p>	Case will be closed pending HUD OLC PFCRA decision.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/29/2020	<p>HUD-OIG, Detroit field office, received a verbal complaint from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at the Inkster Housing Commission (the Commission), located in Inkster, MI. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) made the following allegations: 1) For two separate units, the names of the tenants were cut and paste into a previously-existing Writ of Eviction. The forged Writs were then provided to the REAC inspector as proof that the units were vacant so that the inspector would not inspect the units. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) asked (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to provide her with the previously-issued Writ that was used to make the forged document. The units that were to be inspected were in disrepair and the court had made a judgment for eviction but had not completed the Writ at the time of the REAC inspection. 2) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a current public housing tenant and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had an outstanding balance of unpaid rent. Instead of being evicted, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) removed the balance of unpaid rent and reduced (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) tenant rent from \$469/month to (\$4)/month. 3) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), an unreported occupant in the household of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was allowed to keep his housing and was moved to another housing complex after (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) died. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) knew that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was an unreported occupant prior to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) death. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are also being giving housing even though they are not at the top of the waiting list. 4) Maycock Construction does a lot of Capital Funds projects for the Commission. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) said that Maycock keeps getting contract work because they have (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in their pocket. 5) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) heard that 100 appliances were missing, since the appliances were purchased but tenants are not reporting them installed. There is suspicion of possible scrapping, since the Commission's (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) learned the maintenance men have taken items to the scrap yard but (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has not received any checks from the scrap yard.</p>	Case declined for prosecution.
4/9/2020	<p>Former Stark Metropolitan Housing Authority employee (SMHA) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) contacted HUD-OIG Investigations indicating that SMHA paid over \$150,000 in unbid work to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Service which is a violation of SMHA's procurement policy and HUD regulations. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and SMHA (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as the individuals who are involved in the alleged misconduct. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also reported that SMHA entered into HAP and AHAP contracts without ensuring that environmental reviews or exemptions were completed. Further, SMHA failed to ensure that prevailing wages were paid for the projects under AHAP. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) listed SMHA HCVF (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and SMHA (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as the individuals involved in the alleged misconduct.</p>	Referred to Audit and accepted by audit on 11/26/2018. Audit report completed but not published as of this closing.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/30/2020	JCFD conducted a system-wide investigation into nursing homes across the country where HUD has a financial interest and/or regulator authority. The initial focus will be on matters relating to REAC and matters related to financing. In March 2018, facilities listed on the SFF Monthly Survey Report, and did not show improvement were suggested to the field for further investigation.	Administratively Closed
5/28/2020	This office is in receipt of information from the ACHA's HUD, (b)(6); [redacted] alleging that eight fraudulent checks totaling \$12,193.60 were cashed from the ACHA's Tenant Relocation Bank account at First American State Bank.	This case was declined for prosecution. No further investigative action is required at this time.
12/31/2019	It has been alleged that offender has been falsely reporting family composition and income for her required Section 8 recertifications. It has been alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(6); [redacted] has been living in (b)(6); [redacted] unit for several years. She has not claimed (b)(6); [redacted] or his income on her recertifications. He is allegedly a convicted felon. The complainant further stated that (b)(6); [redacted] has "sold" (b)(6); [redacted] to another family but still claims him for Section 8. The caller stated that drugs, specifically heroin, cocaine, and prescription drugs, are sold from (b)(6); [redacted] unit.	Case was declined for prosecution. Subject was terminated from Section 8. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
3/31/2020	In September of 2017, HUD OIG received a complaint from Fraser Department of Public Safety reporting possible embezzlement and misuse of funds by members and employees of (b)(6); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] is a (b)(6); [redacted] unit housing cooperative located in Fraser, MI. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] is a participant with HUD's Project-based Section 8 Housing Assistance Program. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] has a multi-year term Basic Renewal Contract with HUD Multifamily and the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) is the contract administrator for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] contract units. In 2013, the FHA insured mortgage on the property was paid off, and the Cooperative was no longer obligated to follow the FHA Regulatory Agreement / HUD regulations with any terms of the HUD-held or insured mortgage. (b)(6); [redacted] (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] complainant for this complaint reported that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] is self-managed and has been since they paid off their mortgage in 2013. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) [redacted] was not acting in the best interest of the shareholders he represents at the cooperative. The receptionist alleged (b)(6); [redacted] was taking money out of the corporation accounts for personal use and gain. In addition, the (b)(6); [redacted] voluntarily submitted to HUD OIG copies of ledgers reporting checks were issued to (b)(6); [redacted] for vehicle repairs, and various salary expenses when (b)(6); [redacted] is not an employee of the Cooperative and is not supposed to receive a salary.	Investigation declined for prosecution.
2/13/2020	A referral from another federal law enforcement agency alleged fraud of homelessness programs and Medicaid programs by EDEN and FrontLine Services.	Allegation Not Substantiated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/9/2019	This office is in receipt of allegations from the Springfield Housing Authority, that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Public Housing Tenant, failed to disclose all sources of income to SHA. Specifically, it is alleged that (b)(6); was employed by the State of Illinois Department of Rehabilitation Services since approximately 2008. SHA has estimated a retro-charge of \$19,262.00 because of this alleged act.	The subject in this case was convicted and sentenced. No further investigative action is warranted at this time.
3/26/2020	This office is in receipt of information in relation to (b)(6);. Specifically, (b)(6); is alleged to have been involved in fraudulent mortgage transactions and make false statements on his bankruptcy petition.	This case was declined for prosecution by the USAO in the Northern District of Illinois. However, although the allegations surrounding the handling of foreclosures was declined and forwarded to the Cook County Recorder of Deeds office for further review, other financial discrepancies discovered in (b)(6); bankruptcy were also investigated. Ultimately, those findings also did not meet prosecutorial guidelines as well.
1/14/2020	(b)(6); of Public Housing in Chicago, (b)(6); assumed the position of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at the Gary Housing Authority through the process of receivership. At the time that HUD assumed control over the GHA, the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for the GHA, who is/was a (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) quit his post. (b)(6); spoke to the OIG and stated that he was told from (b)(6); (b)(6); at GHA and several other current GHA employees that the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and other hired (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) were allegedly not performing their (b)(6); duties that they were hired to do. Allegations have also been made that they were double-dipping between the GHA and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	This case was declined for prosecution. See ROI for more details. No further investigative action is required at this time.
6/30/2020	This office received information from the Minnesota Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) regarding embezzlement allegations against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). It was alleged that fake invoices and other means have been used to generate checks for reimbursements. Little Earth is an Indian housing project that receives HUD assistance and is overseen by MHFA. Loss amounts are sufficient to present to the USAO.	Investigation was not presented for prosecution. Allegations were unsubstantiated. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
10/4/2019	It has been alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) forcibly took ownership of two HUD owned properties, located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Chicago, IL and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Calumet City, IL, without HUD's knowledge or authorization and subsequently rented out the properties. Specifically, for the (b)(6); residence, on May 13, 2013, which was the day the property was deeded to HUD (b)(6); filed its Affidavit of Adverse Possession.	Case was declined by the IL Ag's Office. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/4/2019	<p>Bank of America reported that FHA borrower (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was suspected of misrepresenting occupancy of a property owned by him located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Ingalls, Indiana during a Making Homes Affordable FHA refinance application process. Bank of America reported that the Utility Bills used as proof of occupancy appear to have been altered by someone other than the Utility Company. Further investigation reveals that the subject lists on many documents, an address in Anderson, Indiana as his primary residence which is owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) occupation was listed as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on some of the loan documents. Further investigation by the reporting Agent revealed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is or was in fact a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The reporting Agent also learned that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) also has an extensive criminal history, including convictions out of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The reporting Agent also discovered that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is or was also an employee at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Further investigation also revealed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) sued the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and/or his supervisors for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Based on all of the aforementioned information, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the opening of an investigation.</p>	All judicial action complete.
9/18/2020	<p>Reporting agent received a copy of a complaint letter sent to HUD regarding The Funding Source. The Complainant, a former employee, alleges the company is falsifying loan origination documents by fabricating credit scores.</p>	Successful Prosecution
4/29/2020	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) have been conducting illicit real estate transactions at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a title company they co-own located on the south side of Chicago. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) have overseen several alleged fraudulent real estate transactions that involve questionable short sales and double closings. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have had knowledge that the down payment monies in several transactions were provided by someone other than the borrower. Additionally in several transactions, money is funneled to various shell companies and individuals which may have not been disclosed to the respective lenders.</p>	<p>On or about March 3, 2020, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) declined the case for prosecution (b)(5). Based on the above information, no further investigation is warranted and this case is closed.</p>
5/12/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of a referral from the Atlanta HOC, which alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) FHA mortgagor, obtained two owner occupant loans within 12 days of each other. Moreover, he purportedly failed to report the first conventional loan when he obtained the second loan, which was FHA insured.</p>	<p>The Illinois Attorney General's office has declined to charge the remaining transactions within the state forgery statute (720 ILCS 5/17-3). (b)(5). (b)(5). (b)(5). No further investigative action is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/17/2019	<p>This office is in receipt of information alleging that the City of Chicago through its sub grantee (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) failed to comply with Davis-Bacon requirements with respect to paying employees prevailing wages. The City of Chicago receives federal funds from HUD through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) to rebuild and develop foreclosed and bank-owned properties in Chicago. As a condition of payment, the City of Chicago must administer and enforce David-Bacon requirements. The David-Bacon requirements demand that all projects that receive NSP funding would pay prevailing wage rates to individuals working on those projects. xx</p>	<p>(b)(5);(b)(7)(A)</p> <p>No further action is warranted. Close investigation.</p>
10/18/2019	<p>It has been alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Section 8 voucher holder, lived with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in a property allegedly owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) collected Section 8 payments, through a shell landlord, on behalf of his tenant (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) This is a joint HUD-OIG and HSI Chicago investigation. HSI is investigating (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on immigration charges stemming from marriage fraud. The AUSA has been briefed and is willing to indict the Theft of Government Funds charge stemming from the Section 8 Fraud. The HUD loss is approximately \$12,000.00.</p>	<p>All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>
3/31/2020	<p>A HUD contracted Broker (b)(6); alleged that a real estate agent (b)(6); has a scheme involving REO Properties. Allegedly (b)(6); is monitoring the HUD website for properties. Once the properties are listed (b)(6); submits a bid. If (b)(6); bid is accepted, he immediately goes to the property and replaces the Four Seasons signage with his own signage. The signage usually states that the home is a foreclosure for sale and has a number to call for information. (b)(6); stated that (b)(6); is attempting to secure a secondary buyer for the home before they he owns the property. If (b)(6); is unable to secure a buyer they may not close on the property, or they might pay \$150 dollars for a two week extension. (b)(6); may sell the property the same day or shortly after they close on the property. (b)(6); believes that (b)(6); is selling the properties for more than the original purchase price.</p>	<p>The subjects in this case have been convicted and sentenced. No further investigative action is required at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/26/2019	<p>On June 14, 2012, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG), Chicago Region 5, conducted a proactive search of (b)(7)(E)</p> <p>(b)(7)(E)</p> <p>Through this search R/A was able to locate 4 properties located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Chicago, IL, all of which show a real estate transaction history indicative of potential equity skimming based on the location of these properties compared to the sale price. These 4 FHA insured properties have a common seller identified as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) owned by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and utilize a common lender/mortgage company identified as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). This office is also in receipt of information from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Corporate Office. (b)(6); provided 4 loans originated through (b)(6); Chicago office which all have a common gift donor named (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). These FHA insured properties are located at (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Chicago, IL. (b)(6); identified the loan processor for these transactions as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Additionally this office is in receipt of information from the HUD, Atlanta HOC which alleges that another FHA insured property originated by Primary Residential Mortgage's Chicago office utilized what appears to be fraudulent pay stubs, and W-2s provided by the borrower. Additionally this property is located in a declining area which has a larger than typical pool of foreclosures and high number of fraudulent real estate transactions. Atlanta HOC has identified this borrower as (b)(6);. It should be noted that 4 of the 9 properties were originated by Loan Originator (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and 2 of the 9 were originated by Loan Originator (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>The subjects in this case have been convicted and sentenced. No further investigative work is warranted at this time.</p>
1/17/2020	<p>This office is in receipt of information from a title company employee that (b)(6); d/b/a (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), is purchasing properties on Chicago's South side from bank sales and subsequently flipping those properties for a sales price in upwards of \$300,000. Further, the borrowers who purchased these properties obtained FHA insured mortgages and are alleged straw buyers. Numerous borrowers have defaulted on their first mortgage payments.</p>	<p>This case was declined for prosecution. No more further investigative action is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/7/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for Milwaukee County Community Development, through the protection of a proffer letter; admitted to providing insider bid information for contracts awarded through a Milwaukee County Home Repair Program. This program receives Home Funds through HUD's Home Program. (b)(6); provided the bid information to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a contractor and friend of (b)(6);. This bid information provided (b)(6); with the lowest bid on the contract, and allowed (b)(6); the ability to be unfairly awarded the contract.	This case was declined for prosecution. No further investigative action is warranted at this time.
2/21/2020	Hotline complaint forwarded from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who alleges wrongful termination after refusal to alter/forged HCVP documents while employed by Norstar, Buffalo, NY.	Administratively closed/prosecution declined.
3/6/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Mansfield Metropolitan Housing Authority, contacted HUD OIG (b)(6); alleging that HCVP tenant (b)(6); is not residing in her HUD subsidized unit in Marion, Ohio. (b)(6); stated she suspects (b)(6); is residing in Columbus while her subsidized unit remains vacant.	Administratively Closed
8/4/2020	Complaint referred by Ohio AG about possible theft by (b)(6); CMHA. Complaint alleges the (b)(6); used CMHA funds to buy back time towards retirement and runs another business while on CMHA time	Successful Prosecution
6/30/2020	HUD OIG is in receipt of a referral from the IDFPR who alleges that Elite Invest LLC has purchased hundreds of properties in Chicago and have secured hard money lenders to invest in the rehab of these properties which ultimately are re-sold. There are numerous properties which have been allegedly re-sold where neither the deeds nor the mortgages have been recorded. It is also alleged that the appraisals for these re-sold properties appear to be inflated.	Investigation was declined for prosecution. Allegations were unsubstantiated. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
9/29/2020	The HUD-OIG Indianapolis Field Office, (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E) (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E)	AUSA Declined investigation for prosecution (b)(5) (b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/6/2020	<p>The HUD-OIG Indianapolis Field Office, (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E)</p> <p>(b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E)</p>	Case declined for prosecution
9/30/2020	<p>The FBI McAllen Resident Agency received information that an ambulance company would receive COVID - 19 relief funds in exchange for kickbacks to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) A confidential source has informed that these discussions have been held during city executive session meetings. Hidalgo County received approximately \$4,559,466 in Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) for the COVID - 19 pandemic.</p>	No HUD nexus. Close case.
2/18/2020	<p>On April 16, 2019, HUD-OIG received information from the FBI San Antonio, TX, which alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Laredo, TX, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); were involved in a Section 8 tenant extortion scheme. Specifically, the (b)(6); owned and managed three properties under the Section 8 program with the Laredo Housing Authority (LHA), Laredo, TX, and have demanded additional cash monies from tenants above and beyond the LHA contract amount. (b)(6); allegedly threatened to evict tenants if the additional payments were not made. In addition, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6);, owned and managed several Section 8 properties, and were involved in the said scheme.</p>	<p>USAO SDTX declined prosecution. Webb County DAO did not respond to agent. HACL terminated (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as HCVP landlords. No further investigation is warranted. Case is closed.</p>
12/26/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.</p>	Investigation is complete and no further action is required.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/31/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Donna Housing Authority (DHA), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) informed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Mercedes Housing Authority (MHA) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was concerned with the procurement process at the MHA. (b)(6); concern is that (b)(6); received the last four high dollar contracts for a total of approximately \$400,000 which included air conditioning, high-rise plumbing and roofing. (b)(6); explained that (b)(6); Architects LLP receive all the bids and they prepare the bid tabulation sheets. The MHA board does not get to see the original bids and only receives the bid tabulation sheets. (b)(6); explained that (b)(6); has expressed his concern of not being able to see the bids to the rest of the MHA board and believes there could be impropriety taking place.</p>	Allegation could not be corroborated. Case administratively closed.
1/28/2020	<p>HUD Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) informed that during a review of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), HUD uncovered sixteen findings. (b)(6); expressed concerns with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) not completing rehab work they were paid for. City of Pharr CDBG manager confirmed that the City of Pharr never verified if (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) completed work they had been paid for. The City of Pharr also received numerous calls from residents informing that (b)(6); (b)(6); had in fact not completed work in their homes. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a former (b)(6); employee has alleged that bidding and the procurement process was altered by (b)(6); (b)(6); to allow one subcontractor to win all the jobs. (b)(6); has also alleged conflicts of interest and that some of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have received kick backs in exchange for awarding subcontractors work.</p>	Administratively closed. Referred to the Office of Audit, which declined to pursue action. No further investigation warranted as there was no loss to the government and the Office of Audit declined to pursue audit of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)
1/31/2020	<p>Information was received from an individual who wants to remain anonymous indicating that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Fort Worth, Texas, gave employees an improper promotion. Allegedly, (b)(6); changed the promotion level on the SF-50 from a GS 12 to GS 13 for HUD employees (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) HUD Headquarters employee (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and HUD FHEO Fort Worth (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) supposedly did not check to see that these two employees were constantly being promoted and that their full promotion potential was a GS 12.</p>	The allegations were unsubstantiated; therefore, the case will be administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/30/2020	<p>On August 4, 2019, the FBI in Brownsville, TX, provided information from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) The Bishop E. San Pedro Ozanam Center, Inc (Ozanam Center), who alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Ozanam Center; and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Ozanam Center, may be involved in a quid pro quo scheme in relation to court-ordered volunteers at the Ozanam Center. Specifically, (b)(6); relayed that under Ozanam Center's Community Service Program, both (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) certified the completion of court-ordered community service volunteer hours for local parolees and defendants when little or no volunteer work was conducted from certain defendants. (b)(6); believed that certain defendants were providing something to (b)(6); and (b)(6); in exchange for the certification of hours. Through the City of Brownsville, TX, the Ozanam Center received multiple HUD Community Planning and Development Grants, such as Emergency Shelter Grants, from HUD, for the operation of a local homeless shelter.</p>	No HUD nexus. Close case.
9/30/2020	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) are currently working at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Brownsville, TX 78520. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); along with the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); have conspired and accepted bribes from their family members and others in the amounts of \$1000 per application in order to gain acceptance into housing programs. Once the bribe is paid, they provide a portion of the bribe to (b)(6); of the apartment complex. Both (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) like to also accept bribes from individuals that are wanting to move up the waiting list at several housing projects. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has also worked at (b)(6); Apartments located at (b)(6); (b)(6); Brownsville, TX 78520. List of known family members that they requested and accepted bribes from: (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (unknown address)</p>	Case declined. Close.
2/18/2020	<p>On June 12, 2019, the FBI in Corpus Christi, TX, informed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Alice, TX, alleged fraud by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Specifically, (b)(6); alleged that the (b)(6); kept tenants on the books after move-out, and utilized project funds and equipment for personal use. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is a subsidized multi-family property in Alice, TX (MF No. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C))</p>	<p>USAO SDTX and 79th DAO declined prosecution. Agent referred case to HUD's Multifamily Asset Management Division for administrative action. No further investigation is warranted. Case is closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/11/2020	This is a whistleblower case that has been opened based on the direction from OLC. Complainant alleges that after providing information about the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and circumstances around his hiring. The complainant was almost fired, given a 1 week suspension and put on a 90 day review status.	Whistleblower case complete. No further action necessary.
12/2/2019	Tulsa Housing Authority employee is claiming that the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) hired (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6) into a position for which he believes he is unqualified. The complainant is claiming that nepotism has harmed his job and future employment opportunities with the Housing Authority.	Allegations unfounded. Case will be administratively closed
6/25/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)
7/14/2020	On 9/17/18, a complainant, who wished to remain anonymous, contacted the HUD OIG Hotline to report that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) purchased two homes within an approximate five year period utilizing FHA home loans. (b)(6); allegedly purchased the properties for (b)(6); and did not occupy either, as required.	Investigation is complete. Criminal and Civil prosecutions were decline. No further action is warranted.
9/29/2020	The Louisiana Office of Community Development – Disaster Recovery Unit (OCD) reported that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) grant recipient, may have defrauded the Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) Small Rental Property Program (SRPP). (b)(6); received a grant in the form of a forgivable loan to repair a four-plex located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) New Orleans Louisiana 70127. (b)(6); received \$188,000 to repair the property, in exchange (b)(6); agreed to rent the property at affordable rates to low income families. Allegedly (b)(6); provided falsified documents to the SRPP misrepresenting that low income tenants have been residing in the rental units.	Close case
6/8/2020	The Harris County Housing Authority alleges that (b)(6); a HCV participant committed fraud by under reporting her income from 2010 to 2018, causing an over payment of benefits of approximately \$108,000.	Case declined by USAO-SDTX. No further investigative activity warranted. ROI approved. Closing Case File Checklist uploaded. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/19/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from (b)(5) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	All subjects have been referred to local law enforcement and the respective housing authority. No further action needed.
5/13/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from (b)(5) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's Public and Indian Housing system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	All confirmed hits have been referred to both local law enforcement and the respective landlord. No further action needed.
4/2/2020	Complaint alleges improprieties by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in doing construction jobs through the New Orleans Housing Authority (HANO).	Allegations were unsubstantiated, prosecution declined.
12/4/2019	This is a joint whistleblower case opened up based on direction from OLC. Complainant states the Special Advisor to the Board of the Metropolitan Housing Authority in Little Rock, AR, (b)(6); (b)(6) does not come to work and is never in the office. The complainant, (b)(6); (b)(6) believes (b)(6) may have another job. The loss is unknown.	Declined for prosecution by USAO.
11/14/2019	It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is a participant in a HUD rental subsidized program in Lumberton, Texas, but owns a Beaumont construction company named (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The company has an annual gross revenue in excess of \$4 million dollars a year but she pays herself \$9.50 an hour so she can qualify for HUD reduced rent housing. The complex is named (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) which is managed by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).	Case declined by USAO
12/4/2019	Evidence exists that Dallas Police Officer (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as purchased a Good Neighbor Next Door home located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Lancaster, TX 75134 without ever having the intent of residing in the home.	Subject has been charged, convicted, sentenced and referred for administrative action. If and when administrative action is taken the case file will be updated.
9/17/2020	Information was received from the media reporting the New Orleans African American Museum (NOAAM) may have misused CDBG funds. The article states the NOAAM received 3 million from HUD but remains closed. The article further states the CDBG funds were used to receive state and federal tax credits. The City of New Orleans awarded the CDBG funds with the intent of the funds going to purchase and renovate a building. The board governing NOAAM expanded the project to purchase a new building. According to interviews done by the author of the article, the expansion project increased due to unplanned damage caused by termites and water. The potential loss is 3 million.	Close Case

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/14/2020	<p>The Louisiana Office of Community Development – Disaster Recovery Unit (OCD) reported that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) grant recipient, may have defrauded the Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) Small Rental Property Program (SRPP). (b)(6); received a grant in the form of a forgivable loan to repair a duplex located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) New Orleans Louisiana. (b)(6); received \$84,000 to repair the property, in exchange (b)(6); agreed to rent the property at affordable rates to low income families. Allegedly (b)(6); lived in the (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) but provided falsified documents to the SRPP misrepresenting that a low income tenant lived in the unit.</p>	<p>The charges against the defendant were dismissed after the defendant's death.</p>
10/25/2019	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Section 8 tenant, is running unlicensed care facilities. Attorney General Ken Paxton stated in a press release that the conditions the people were living in were dire, heartbreaking and inexcusable. The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services has relocated 29 residents to Austin area licensed facilities. The Attorney General's Office is seeking action against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) n. HUD OIG is trying to determine if (b)(6); (b)(6); qualified for or defrauded the Section 8 program.</p>	<p>Travis County DA's Office (TCDAO) has not moved beyond indictment since March 2018. Case agent informed that TCDAO was pursuing a new civil litigation that would push back the (b)(6); case indefinitely.</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>
6/9/2020	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for the Houston Housing Authority (HHA) contacted HUD OIG to report an allegation against HHA employee (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) The HHA received a hotline complaint alleging that (b)(6); was selling housing vouchers. (b)(6); could not provide specific details but referred HUD OIG to HHA investigator, (b)(6); who has been investigating the allegation against (b)(6);</p>	<p>(b)(6); pled guilty and sentenced. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) pled guilty and sentenced. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was indicted and awaiting trial. No further investigative work warranted. Case closed.</p>
2/12/2020	<p>(b)(6); a Section 8 recipient has been accused of owning Rock Construction Company and not reporting her business in order to receive Section 8 housing Assistance Payments (HAP).</p>	<p>The case was declined for prosecution by the U.S. Attorney's Office. No further action needed.</p>
10/29/2019	<p>Complainant states (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) St. Bernard Parish HCVP, may be abusing her position by personally obtaining property for sale by the parish and selling it to known HCVP landlords. The complainant believes there may be kickbacks or bribes between the potential land owners and (b)(6);</p>	<p>Declination Received</p>
7/14/2020	<p>HUD Fort Worth Multi Family (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and HUD (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and its owner submitted fake rental registers and tenant leases to HUD to show that the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) located in Shreveport Louisiana were at least 85% occupied during an attempt to refinance the 223(f) property. (b)(6); also stated that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) wanted to obtain 2 million cash out as part of the refinance.</p>	<p>The findings of this investigation were referred to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Louisiana for prosecutorial consideration. The case was declined as there was no loss to the government, and minimal evidence to show anyone other than (b)(6); knew the inflated invoices or falsified documents were used in an attempt to defraud HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/31/2019	<p>(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is currently investigating a matter in which (b)(6); a HUD PIH Houston Field Office (b)(6); is the complainant. (b)(6) complained that her supervisor, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) sprayed her in the face with bleach. (b)(6) requested assistance in obtaining certain pieces of information from HUD. The case agent will work to gather the records and turn them over. (b)(6); also reported anomalies revealed to him during his investigation. Specifically, he reported that it (b)(6) has changed and/or recanted her statements over the course of his investigation. The issue of whether (b)(6) filed a false statement will be investigated by HUD-OIG.</p>	<p>HUD OGC advised it will not be taking any administrative action against (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); has been advised to return to work effective 10/29/19. Case closed.</p>
6/8/2020	<p>The Houston HUD OIG office received a package from (b)(6); alleging that Section 8 tenant and USPS employee, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is receiving housing assistance and not disclosing her marriage to USPS employee, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) allegedly has failed to report to the PHA that (b)(6); a member of her household and has also failed to report (b)(6); income.</p>	<p>Case declined by USAO-SDTX. No further investigative work warranted. Case closed.</p>
2/21/2020	<p>On December 12, 2017, the case agent received an email from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) detailing a case of potential FEMA fraud as well as duplicate subsidy fraud. The email originated from the Galveston Housing Authority (GHA). The email will be uploaded in the case opening materials. The email alleges that (b)(6); was receiving multiple subsidies from various housing authorities and possibly renting those units to other families. In the course of the GHA investigation, a Go Fund Me site was discovered for (b)(6) in which she stated that she had been rescued from her home during Hurricane Harvey. This prompted the GHA representative to email FEMA to determine whether (b)(6); had applied for FEMA benefits. The email was forwarded to the case agent. Several attempts to contact the GHA went unanswered. It was later ascertained that the GHA representative, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), was no longer employed by the GHA. The case agent communicated and confirmed the allegations with the GHA (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) on February 5, 2018. That email is included in the case opening documents.</p>	<p>USAO-SDTX declined prosecution on HUD fraud portion of the case. No further investigation warranted. Case closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/11/2019	<p>The complainant states the St. John The Baptist Housing Authority administration is allegedly violating several policies and potentially misusing HUD funds. Specifically, the complaint references: 1. Requiring applicants to obtain criminal background checks. Applicants were allegedly reimbursed but there was no evidence of reimbursement; 2. Not resolving income discrepancies from EIV resulting in over-payment of rental subsidies; 3. Requiring applicants to acquire water permits and pay fees when it's an agency provided service; 4. Charging tenants fines for trash instead of service charges; 5. Charging tenants for normal wear and tear maintenance repairs; 6.) Not properly verifying income and assets. Giving tenants employment verification forms to complete and return. Tenants were completing their own verification forms; 7.) No internal controls; 8.) Overcharging tenant rents by not properly updating utility allowances for families paying income based rent; 9.) Using wrong inspection protocol on public housing units; 10.) Not offering tenants full due process; 11.) Offering unsafe housing; and 12.) Leasing substandard housing.</p>	<p>The investigation did not identify any evidence to support any criminal, administrative, or other misconduct by any employees of the SJBHA. The administrative concerns presented by the complainant or identified during the course of this investigation were referred to HUD Management for action deemed appropriate.</p>
1/2/2020	<p>The subjects of the investigation operated a foreclosure rescue scheme with homeowner referrals from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and others. When (b)(6); could not longer help the homeowner, her would make a referral to the subjects. The subjects would then initiate a new scheme through new contact with the lenders and the submission of false information during the loan modification process. The subject would then file Plaintiff's Original Petitions, Temporary Restraining Orders, and Bankruptcies in order to stay the evictions and force the lender to negotiate.</p>	<p>Main subject has been convicted, sentenced, and referred for administrative action. If and when administrative action is taken, the case file will be updated. Evidence will be stored until all appeals are exhausted and the AUSA approves return or destruction.</p>
3/4/2020	<p>On March 16, 2018 (b)(6); telephonically contacted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a former Louisiana Housing Corporation (LHC) (b)(6); who stated that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has voted to approve funding initiatives for the non-profit Macon Ridge Community Development Corporation while also having an ownership interest in Macon Ridge Community Development Corporation. Macon Ridge Community Development Corporation received HUD HOME funds through LHC. In addition, (b)(6); alleged that the LHC is falsifying HQS inspections for the Tenant Based Rental Assistance Program administered by LHC.</p>	<p>No further investigation warranted (b)(5) (b)(5) and the declination by the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Middle District of Louisiana.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/30/2020	Office of Audit, Region 6, referred information regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). It alleges that Dallas City Official (b)(6); assisted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) owner of (b)(6); (b)(6); in receiving city contracts for HOME Investment Partnerships funds. The city normally required contractors to successfully complete 1 or 2 projects before allowing to operate at full financial capacity. In this case, (b)(6); was allowed to begin 8 projects despite having no previous experience with the city and questions regarding financial capacity. In addition, (b)(6); received a Certificate of Training from a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) during the same time period that the contracts were being awarded. The complaint also alleges that the (b)(6); homes resulted in incomplete and shoddy work.	The case was declined by the U.S. Attorney's Office. No further action necessary.
6/8/2020	The GHA alleges (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) committed HCV fraud by not disclosing income from self employment, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) from 2012 to 2017. The GHA estimates a loss of approximately \$32,000.	Case declined by USAO-SDTX. No further investigative work warranted. Case closed.
7/23/2020	HUD-OIG received information from the Ascension Parish Section 8 Program Administrator that Housing Choice Voucher recipient (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and her listed landlord (b)(6); may possibly be residing together in the residence for which (b)(6); is receiving assistance. It is also alleged that (b)(6); and (b)(6); have a child together, who is also included on the (b)(6); voucher. Both of these allegations if true are against HUD Program rules.	On June 1, 2020, Assistant District Attorney (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Ascension Parish District Attorney's Office accepted the defendant's restitution payment of \$10,207.00 in exchange for a Nolle Prossed of the criminal charges in this investigation. ADA (b)(6); advised she had received a restitution check in the previously listed amount from the defendant on April 30, 2020 and her office is closing the prosecution of this investigation. This case is closed.
12/9/2019	(b)(6); allegedly has a relationship with NOVAD employee (b)(6); and has used her position as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to provide favorable decisions and support to NOVAD.	No information was uncovered to substantiate the allegations. Because of this, the case will be administratively closed.
12/13/2019	The complaint alleges possible unauthorized withdrawals totaling \$35,610.50 from the Reserve for Replacement account by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). This issue was discovered by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). Further, (b)(6); issued a demand for repayment to (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) via email on Friday, June 27, 2014. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Multifamily Housing in Little Rock, AR, is concerned that the company's accounting practices be investigated because (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has management agent authority over approximately five other properties in Arkansas.	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) U.S. Attorney's Office Little Rock, Arkansas, declined prosecution of this investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/28/2020	HUD OIG Hotline received a complaint from a former Regional IT Manager, who had worked for a HUD contractor, alleging that he was terminated after notifying a HUD IT Director that his supervisor had been charged with Theft By Deception-False Impression. Complainant alleged that neither the HUD IT Director nor his supervisor were debarred. The investigation revealed that HUD was aware of conviction and had already taken administrative action; therefore this case was closed administratively.	The investigation revealed that HUD was aware of the allegation, that the subject had been arrested and convicted of a crime. HUD had previously taken administrative action related to the incident; therefore this case is being administratively close.
3/31/2020	(b)(7)(E)	(b)(7)(E)
7/16/2020	HUD OIG received an anonymous complaint, via the Hotline, alleging that an on-site property manager forces disabled tenants to pay higher rent and also exchanges rental payments for sex and drugs. No victims or witnesses could be located to substantiate the allegation nor could any documentary or other evidence be developed to support the allegation. Due to the above, the case was administratively closed.	Investigation uncovered no evidence to support allegation. Case is administratively closed.
9/15/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Pueblo Housing Authority for more than 5 years unexpectedly submitted his resignation to the housing authority's Board of Commissioners. There have been suggestions that the resignation was a result of a discovery of housing authority money being diverted to an unauthorized account.	No criminal violations were substantiated, (b)(5)
11/7/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on April 01, 2018 from the (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's (b)(7)(E) system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	All enforcement and administrative actions required have been complete. No further action is warranted so this case is being administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/26/2019	<p>On April 23, 2019, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Ogden Housing Authority (OHA). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) advised the OHA had received a hotline complaint that alleged housing participant (b)(6); had been renting a unit that was owned by her father and had been operating businesses and not reporting the income. The OHA reviewed the file and determined the landlord's name is the same as the name of (b)(6); on her birth certificate. (b)(6); advised that both (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had signed several documents stating there was no relation and agreeing to not rent from a family member. (b)(6); advised the purpose of collecting the birth certificates are to verify citizenship and the details of the birth certificate are not reviewed at the time of the application other than to verify citizenship. The birth certificate has (b)(6); date of birth but not his Social Security Number. Landlords are identified by their Social Security Numbers. (b)(6); looked (b)(6); up and confirmed (b)(6); the landlord's Social Security Number is a match for (b)(6); the fathers date of birth. (b)(6); has been receiving housing assistance since 2014 in a unit owned by (b)(6); and the overpayment is \$28,038. OHA employees reviewed (b)(6); Facebook account and found that (b)(6) sells art and hosts art classes and appears to have a lot of unreported income as well. After looking (b)(6); up, it has also been confirmed he is a convicted sex offender and was convicted of sex assault of a child.</p>	Case was declined.
5/20/2020	<p>HUD OIG staff opened a proactive investigation to review a list of troubled nursing homes, (b)(7)(E)</p>	<p>This case is being administratively closed. HUD OIG staff opened a proactive investigation to review a list of troubled nursing homes, (b)(7)(E)</p>
10/9/2019	<p>On April 2, 2019 Denver District Attorney's Office Investigator (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) HUD OIG Denver Field Office to discuss potential fraud involving a Home Equity Conversion Mortgage (HECM). On April 4, 2019 (b)(6); contacted (b)(6); to obtain additional details. (b)(6); explained that (b)(6); had obtained a HECM in approximately 2009, however (b)(6); (b)(6) had moved (b)(6); into an Independent Living Facility approximately 5 or 6 years ago. (b)(6); explained the original complaint originated from an anonymous letter sent to the Denver Police Department in regards to the level of care (b)(6); was receiving at the Independent Living Facility. (b)(6); explained that while looking into the matter it was discovered that (b)(6); had obtained a HECM in approximately 2009, however he had not been living at the property, instead, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had been living at the property.</p>	Case was declined for prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/15/2020	On November 27, 2018, HHS-OIG contacted HUD-OIG relating to Medicaid recipient who was allegedly involved in fraudulent billing for Medicaid services. The subject had been residing in subsidized housing since 2010 and was alleged to have undisclosed income and assets. The subject was indicted for multiple counts of healthcare fraud, unrelated to HUD programs. The charges were eventually dismissed. The subject was referred to HUD for potential administrative action, but HUD declined.	The subject was indicted for multiple counts of healthcare fraud, unrelated to HUD programs. The AUSA declined to include HUD charges. The charges were eventually dismissed. The subject was referred to HUD for potential administrative action, but HUD also declined. No further actions (b)(5)
11/7/2019	A former City of Omaha (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleged that contractors doing work under CDBG and HOME funding were being paid by the city for work not done or done outside the specified scope of work.	This case is being administratively closed. The allegations were previously investigated by HUD staff and found to be without merit, therefore no prosecutorial or civil referrals, nor any further referrals to HUD, are warranted.
5/12/2020	A Hotline complainant reported incidents of fraud and bribery by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a community housing agency. The subject had allegedly taken \$600 to \$1000 from some families in order to move them to the top of a wait list at a subsidized housing complex. The results of the investigation were presented to the United States Attorney's Office, which declined to prosecute.	The investigation was presented to an AUSA who declined to prosecute. No further investigation appears warranted at this time.
2/27/2020	On October 18, 2018, the agent received information from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) with the Roosevelt City Housing Authority. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was reporting alleged housing assistance program rule violations involving (b)(6); (b)(7)(C).	All anticipated judicial and administrative actions have been completed.
6/26/2020	HUD OIG was contacted by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) after it received a complaint alleging that a local developer and entrepreneur was misusing the grant funds of a non-profit economic development agency to pay for personal endeavors. The investigation revealed the non-profit had apparently not received HUD grant funds since 2012; therefore the USAO declined to prosecute. The case was referred to the local police department for further investigation relating to potential criminal activity which did not have a HUD nexus.	The investigation revealed no HUD funds appeared to have been disbursed to the subject entity since 2012. The USAO declined further investigation. A referral was made to KCPD for investigation into potential illegal activity where no HUD nexus appears to exist. Due to the lack of HUD nexus, the case is being administratively closed.
3/10/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has managed 3 properties, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Fargo, ND, and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in Wahpeton, ND since 1991. It has been brought to our attention that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may not be operating the 3 projects pursuant to HUD rules, and that money may have inappropriately been misuse and dispersed to the Agent.	HUD forgave the loss and the case was declined for criminal prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/10/2020	<p>On August 9, 2017, a meeting was held between (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and HUD-OIG (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) regarding a walk in complaint received by the FBI Office in Charlotte, S.C., which was subsequently forwarded to the St. Louis, MO FBI office. The complaint was in regards to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Lancaster, S.C. An internal investigation conducted by (b)(6) confirmed 24 loans contained false bank statements, which was confirmed by the issuing financial institution. Monitoring of (b)(6); email and computer information revealed cut and paste information including images, fonts, account numbers, borrower names and financial institution logos. There was no indication that the actual borrowers were involved in a fraud scheme. (b)(6); was questioned but did not confirm or deny any allegations. (b)(6); resigned on 5/8/2017. (b)(6); advised there is already an AUSA who has accepted prosecution of this case. (b)(7)(A);(b)(7) (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E)</p>	<p>Successful prosecution. On June 5, 2019, the subject was indicted for five counts of false statements to FHA/HUD, 18 USC 1010, related to forged and counterfeited loan origination documents. The subject subsequently entered into a Pre-Trial Diversion Agreement in lieu of prosecution, which included 18 months of supervision. The subject was (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E) This case is being closed because no further criminal or administrative sanctions (b)(5) warranted.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/8/2020	<p>On April 25, 2017, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) an elderly female, made a written complaint and statement to the Dundy County Sheriff's Office that she was being harassed and treated with disdain by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and Benkelman Housing Authority (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) complained about being charged additional fees of \$18.00 for requesting that maintenance workers on the property assist her in changing her light bulbs or for any other routine maintenance requests. (b)(6) further reported (b)(6); was charging her \$355.00 per month for rent over a five year period, when she should have been paying between \$186.00 to \$196 monthly for rent under the H.U.D. subsidy. On June 19, 2017, (b)(6); sent a cease and desist letter to (b)(6) for talking with other residents about the ongoing problems at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); reported she did not feel safe on the property due to the ongoing violations and (b)(6); attitude towards (b)(6) for attempting to demand compliance under the regulations and guidelines governing residents of the property. (b)(6) expressed she became so concerned for her safety after receiving threats of eviction from (b)(6); that she moved out of the property and into a residential senior center. On June 6, 2017, the Dundy County Sheriff's Office was given evidence that (b)(6); was offering window air conditioning units for sale on Facebook for between \$25 and \$100 each. It is upon your Affiants information and belief those air conditioning units were purchased with public funds. (b)(6) reported when her window unit was replaced, one of the contractors replacing the units told her that the old units were going to be placed on a trailer, taken out of town and sold. Your Affiant contacted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for Nebraska on August 8, 2017, who stated he had no knowledge that the air conditioning units were being sold or offered for sale and had not approved such a transaction of any property belonging to H.U.D. or acquired with public funds. The Dundy County Sheriff's Office also received a written complaint from a previous tenant, who reported to the Mayor of Benkelman, that she witnessed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) taking money from the laundry machines on the property to wash his personal vehicles. The informant stated the conduct of stealing money from the laundry machines for personal use by employees is ongoing. The informant further reported thorough written statement that (b)(6); and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) commits other violations of disturbing the peace of elderly residence by allowing her pit-bull dogs to roam the property unleashed or retrained and also allows them in the office area. The informant reports that the elderly tenants are afraid of the dogs.</p>	<p>While case was initially accepted for prosecution (b)(5) case is being administratively closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/3/2020	<p>In February 2015, the City of Kansas City received an anonymous complaint detailing allegations that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was paying kickbacks to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) involving a city project in a historic district in KCMO. The city referred the complaint to the USAO, FBI, and HUD OIG. At the time, the allegations could not be substantiated, but new information increased the suspicion that the complaint was valid and warranted further investigation. The USAO declined to prosecute for conduct related to this investigation; however, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) plead to tax fraud in a parallel investigation. The subject was referred for administrative action.</p>	<p>The USAO declined to prosecute. The case was referred for administrative action. No further investigation is warranted.</p>
5/8/2020	<p>HUD OIG was contacted by another OIG requesting assistance with a subject who allegedly committed fraud related to several government programs. The subject was an FHA borrower and was suspected of making false statements on her loan application. Following an investigation, the subject was indicted for alleged violations of 18 USC 1014, False Statements on Loan Applications, 18 USC 641, Theft, 18 USC 1001 (a), and False Statements. The subject eventually pleaded guilty to 18 USC 641, theft of government funds and was sentenced to five years of probation and a combined restitution of \$144,731.49 to be paid to FHA, social Security Administration and the Division of Finance and Administrative Services.</p>	<p>Successful Prosecution. Following an investigation, the subject was indicted for alleged violations of 18 USC 1014, False Statements on Loan Applications, 18 USC 641, Theft, 18 USC 1001 (a), and False Statements. The subject eventually pleaded guilty to 18 USC 641, theft of government funds and was sentenced to five years of probation and a combined restitution of \$144,731.49 to be paid to FHA, social Security Administration and the Division of Finance and Administrative Services. No further criminal, civil, or administrative sanctions appear warranted at this time; therefore the case is being closed.</p>
3/27/2020	<p>The Quality Assurance Division, Denver Homeownership Center received a Lender Self-Report from All Western Mortgage, Inc., stating that its loan originator (LO), (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) NMLS (b)(6); had instructed a borrower's gift donor to wire \$6,500 of gift funds into an account that was his personally. The mortgagee further stated that it terminated (b)(6); employment on February 16, 2016, and has been unable to contact him since. Upon learning of the improper wire, the mortgagee replaced the funds and the purchaser settled on the transaction.</p>	<p>No additional work is required as the subject is a fugitive and has been for a number of years. Case is being administratively closed until such time as subject is located.</p>
3/4/2020	<p>Office of Public Housing, Region 8, referred a complaint it received from a Housing Authority concerning unreported income received by a Public Housing tenant. The loss was determined to be approximately \$24,500. The investigation was declined by the USAO and also for Program Fraud Civil Remedies Act.</p>	<p>No further investigative activity is anticipated. Investigation declined.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/1/2020	<p>The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Office of Audit (OA) conducted an audit of Majestic Management, LLC, located in St. Louis, MO. The audit was in response to a request from the HUD Kansas City, KS, Office of Multifamily Housing Programs. The Audit objective was to determine whether (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) charged only the appropriate fees in managing the projects, properly procured goods and services, and disbursed project funds only for eligible and supported expenses. Upon completion of the audit, the HUD-OIG Office of Audit issued a referral to the HUD-OIG Office of Investigation for further investigation into potential criminal activity. The specific issues noted were: improperly charged fees to projects, improper procurement of goods and services, improper use of project funds for ineligible and unsupported expenditures. The referral further noted findings of (b)(6) having deprived its projects of at least \$242,275 in funds needed to pay for essential items, and HUD and property owners had no assurance that the projects benefited from the \$975,931 paid without adequate support.</p>	<p>USAO declined to prosecute. This referral originally came from HUD OIG Audit (b)(5) therefore no further criminal or administrative actions are warranted and the case is being closed.</p>
2/14/2020	<p>In November 2016, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General, received information concerning fraud related to the HUD Housing Choice Voucher Program. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Lincoln Housing Authority (LHA), Lincoln, NE, revealed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a HUD Housing Choice Voucher recipient, received money from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) confirmed (b)(6); received income from (b)(6); during the time she received Section 8 Housing Assistance in Lincoln, NE, and did not report the money she received from (b)(6); as a source of income to the LHA on an Application for Tenant Eligibility and Recertification form. It was determined by the LHA that the aggregate amount of monthly income (b)(6); received would have exceeded the established LHA income guidelines, thus disqualifying (b)(6); for Section 8 Housing Assistance with the LHA. (b)(6); false reporting resulted in an overpayment in rental assistance, on (b)(6); behalf, in the amount of \$11,470.</p>	<p>The investigation resulted in the subject entering into a Pretrial Diversion Program Agreement with the USAO. No further criminal, civil, and/or administrative referrals are required.</p>
10/9/2019	<p>HUD OIG received a complaint from a Housing Authority representative who alleged that the PHA had approximately \$49,092.00 embezzled out of a HUD ensured, multi-family complex.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed. (b)(5)</p>
2/14/2020	<p>This was a referral from HUD OIG Audit. The complaint alleged that the Wellston Housing Authority (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) certified documents which apparently contained altered signatures and dates, recycling of the same documents year after year, performed annual and interim reexaminations of her relatives who were potentially not reporting all income, and potentially altered the applications for admission/continued occupancy of her relatives to make it look as if they were on the waiting list before they were admitted.</p>	<p>All criminal actions have been resolved - the subject was indicted, pled guilty, and was sentenced. (b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/25/2020	<p>HUD Program staff contacted HUD OIG indicating that during the course of transitioning the management of a public housing authority (PHA) from a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to an interim property management company, HUD discovered discrepancies in expenditures, including the possible misuse of funds allegedly by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) as well as missing records, receipts, and board documents. Among the allegations included the PHA's alleged purchase of a piece of undeveloped land without approval; the PHA paying for (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Master's Degree; gas reimbursements paid to (b)(6); and spending by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) in the position of maintenance supervisor in violation of policy. The case was declined by the USAO.</p>	This case was presented to the USAO and declined for prosecution.
4/1/2020	<p>HHS OIG notified HUD OIG that they were initiating an effort jointly with the FBI and Education OIG to investigate several daycare operations owned and operated by a group of Somali immigrants. The investigators discovered information suggesting that the daycare operators may be fraudulently obtaining housing benefits from HUD via the a Housing Authority and may also be involved in an illegal property flipping scheme. The investigation revealed the subjects, a husband and wife who were residing in public housing during the time in question, overreported attendance at their daycare and underreported their income to HUD. Both subjects pleaded guilty to Theft of Government Property, 18 USC 641, in relation to the daycare scheme. Charges relating to overpayment of housing subsidies were not included in the indictment. One subject was sentenced to eight months incarceration followed by three years of supervision and ordered to pay restitution to HHS. The other subject was sentenced to five years probation and ordered to pay restitution to HHS.</p>	<p>The subjects were convicted of Theft of Government Property related to overpayment of daycare subsidies that were based on overstated attendance at subjects' daycares. The investigation revealed the subjects were public housing tenants during the time in question and allegedly underreported their income to the PHA. The HUD related allegations were not included in charging documents and although it was anticipated that the HUD losses would be included in relevant conduct at sentencing, it was not. The subjects are no longer public housing tenants and the alleged conduct is no longer in statute; therefore, the case is being administratively closed.</p>
12/17/2019	<p>An (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a tribal housing authority contacted (b)(6); indicating that familial relatives of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who are employed by the housing authority often inflate timesheets and have threatened to use (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to remove the him if he protests their practices. Investigation was unable to substantiate the allegations.</p>	The investigation is being administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/11/2020	A real estate developer in the St. Louis area received an FHA-insured mortgage in excess of \$11 million to redevelop a manufacturing plant and several scattered sites. The project defaulted and failed immediately. A subsequent HUD OIG audit's preliminary findings suggested there may have been misrepresentations in the loan application and information provided in support of the appraisal, as well as possible improper underwriting. The matter was referred to the Office of Investigation to determine if there was any criminal wrongdoing involved. The USAO declined criminal prosecution. The case was reviewed for civil litigation, including potential false claims and FIRREA violations. The Civil AUSA also declined; however, HUD entered into settlement agreements with two of the subjects for an amount totaling \$81,000.	HUD entered into a settlement agreement with two of the subjects. The USAO declined to prosecute criminally and declined to file a civil claim or FIRREA. (b)(5) therefore the case is being closed.
8/20/2020	This case was initiated subsequent to a referral from the FBI wherein it was alleged that a company, a mortgage risk assessment service owned and was preying on individuals who were at risk of losing their homes. The company claimed homeowners could use results of forensic loan audit to start legal litigation with their lender. The company charged a \$10,000 up front fee to complete the loan audit, and then collect monthly payments to total \$40,000 over a three-year period of time. In exchange, the homeowner received the title for their home indicating the house had been paid for free and clear. The business preyed on individuals who did not understand the mortgage/foreclosure process.	All investigative activity is complete no further action is warranted.
5/6/2020	HUD OIG personnel became aware, via proactive case development, that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was depositing cash and checks into a bank account that she controlled. The money was later drawn out via ATM locations in Jamaica. Around the same time HUD OIG received a request for assistance by another federal law enforcement agency as well as a county sheriff's department requesting assistance with their investigation surrounding similar activity. The subject was charged locally and eventually pleaded guilty to one count of Theft by Deception. She was sentenced to 24 days incarceration and three years of probation. She was also ordered to pay \$20,000 in restitution to one particular victim.	This case is being closed. The subject was charged locally and eventually pleaded guilty to one count of Theft by Deception. She was sentenced to 24 days incarceration and three years of probation. She was also ordered to pay \$20,000 in restitution to one particular victim. The subject was removed from her position as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) housing authority due to her involvement in this activity. Following her conviction, a referral was made to the DEC. No further criminal, civil, or administrative sanctions appear warranted at this time.
8/5/2020	On January 12, 2018, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General for Investigation (OIGI), Denver, CO met with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) regarding potential fraud that may have occurred between (b)(6); (Landlord) and possibly one of his tenants in the course of their participation in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. According to (b)(6); it is alleged that the property may have had undisclosed occupants as well as unreported income. It was also mentioned that (b)(6); may have been related to one of the tenants. The housing authority stated that they have been terminated from the program.	Allegations could not be substantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/20/2020	<p>This case was originated subsequent to a referral by the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation (AHFC) wherein it was alleged that a subject had obtained over \$17,000 in housing benefits under the identity of her sister who in actuality, resides in Huntsville, Alabama. According to AHFC, had she applied using her true identity, she would be ineligible for housing due to her criminal history. This case will be worked jointly by HUD-OIG, (b)(7)(E) and an investigator associated with (b)(7)(E). We determined the subject has defrauded multiple state and federal agencies by means of aggravated identity theft.</p>	No further activity warranted.
12/17/2019	<p>This investigation was initiated pursuant to information received from FHFA-OIG, and documentation obtained from WA Department of Licensing related to a purported short sale scheme involving multiple companies. In the Spring of 2013, Freddie Mac received a tip from a bank about a short sale they were processing where the borrower was no longer on title to the property. The bank had denied a short sale transaction involving multiple companies because of possible undisclosed relationships and title activity. The bank deemed the attempted transaction suspicious and reported it to Freddie Mac. Freddie Mac conducted an investigation and found five short sales, either in progress or already closed, which contained fraudulent activity on the part of these companies. The investigation identified 20 real estate transactions with fraudulent characteristics. The total loss to banks from the transactions identified is over \$950,000. Several of these transactions were either attempted, closed, or active FHA loans. The investigation was declined for prosecution.</p>	This investigation was declined for prosecution and civil action.
12/17/2019	<p>On February 4, 2016, the St. Louis, MO HUD-OIG office was forwarded information from the Kansas City HUD staff regarding a complaint being lodged by (b)(6); owner of (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has a portfolio of FHA ensured Multi-Family homes, among other business with HUD funded housing assistance. (b)(7)(C) alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has embezzled thousands of dollars from the company. (b)(6) advised the HUD staff that along with one of the property owners, (b)(6); she has filed a formal complaint with the St. Louis City Police Department. (b)(6) also advised a CPA review of their accounts revealed (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was writing herself, and her own company (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), checks from business accounts held by (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The assigned agent contacted (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(A);(b)(7)(E)</p>	<p>The case was presented to a prosecutor who declined to file charges. (b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/13/2020	On 2/11/16, at 1148 and 1150, a HUD Customer Service Representative received phone calls from an anonymous individual who wanted to report that (b)(6); uses cocaine. HUD counsel confirmed that (b)(6); has had past "issues" with being drunk and/or high at work, in addition to concerns about time and attendance.	This case is being administratively closed. The investigation did not result any criminal charges. HUD was kept apprised of findings during the course of the investigation so no referral is necessary.
10/23/2019	On February 26, 2016, (b)(6); (b)(7)(C);, South Dakota Housing Development Authority, informed (b)(6); that her agency provided NSP1 funds to purchase and renovate a mobile home located on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation despite a long-standing dispute between the homeowner and the Crow Creek Housing Authority. Approximately a year prior to the granting of the NSP1 funds, the homeowner, who is occupying the unit through a lease/purchase agreement, alleged that the CCHA used scrap material or did not actually use materials for her unit for which they would seek reimbursement with the NSP1 funds.	All investigative activity has been reviewed, this investigation is being administratively closed due to the allegations being unsubstantiated.
5/14/2020	Referral from Seattle Housing Authority Investigator who identified that a tenant has been in the Housing Choice Voucher Program since 2010 and has claimed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); have lived with him, which allowed him more of a subsidy and also allowed him access to a larger unit. According to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); has lived with the tenant. The approximate loss is \$60,000 to which the tenant was not entitled. The United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Washington requested HUD-OIG assistance with the investigation but did not take any action. The investigation was referred for PFCRA and subsequently declined.	NO further investigative, judicial, or administrative action is warranted.
5/14/2020	Referral from Seattle Housing Authority Investigator who identified that a voucher holder since August 2005, failed to claim the income of (b)(6); who was working as a (b)(6);. The approximate loss is \$42,806.00, but that is dependent on the amount of income (b)(6); brought in. (b)(7)(E); is also asking for HUD-OIG assistance in working this investigation along with three other investigations from the Seattle Housing Authority. The USAO did not pursue the investigation and it was subsequently referred for PFCRA, which was declined.	No further investigative, judicial, or administrative action is warranted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/16/2020	<p>On June 10, 2016, (b)(6); received a forwarded email from HUD Denver staff. On June 22, 2016, (b)(6); met with (b)(6); HUD Multi Family Specialist, Salt Lake City, and called (b)(6);, HUD Financial Analyst to discuss the allegations. A HUD PHARS review was conducted of the Emery County Housing Authority. The review disclosed Emery County had been a troubled housing authority and they brought in (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) from the Carbon County Housing Authority to act as (b)(6); for Emery County Housing Authority as well. It has been alleged (b)(6); hired (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); to perform work on the Emery County Housing Authority without following proper procurement policies. It has also been alleged (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) double billed the Emery County Housing Authority for work on the same units, specifically cleaning units multiple times that were vacant at the time. It also has been alleged (b)(6); moved money in LOCCS without properly obligating it, and moved line items from the budget to categories it did not fall under.</p>	Case was declined.
1/24/2020	<p>The complainant alleges a contractor on two HUD funded multi-family rehabilitation projects creates reasons to put a stop payment on monthly draws for subcontractors.</p>	Referred to Audit.
2/7/2020	<p>HUD OIG received a complaint from a county administrator of HUD community grants alleging that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may have created and promoted a consulting business that, for a fee, would assist nonprofits to obtain Federal, state, and local funding for transitional housing and supportive services for the homeless. (b)(6); purportedly serves as the chairperson of a council that presides over the grant-awarding process.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete, no evidence of conflict of interest or criminal wrongdoing found. (b)(5) no further investigation warranted at this time.</p>
1/28/2020	<p>Hiring announcement for (b)(6); current position described three different university degrees; however, witnesses advise she stated she never attended college. Preliminary contact with purported school shows no record of attendance. Co-worker (competing for same promotion) contacted HQ hotline as whistleblower.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete, no evidence found to conclude criminal wrongdoing or ethical misconduct. As a result, this case will be closed with no further investigation warranted at this time.</p>
4/22/2020	<p>On April 22, 2019, HUD OIG received information from the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) regarding former Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) tenant (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). It was alleged that (b)(6); violated program rules by failing to disclose her (b)(6); true household income. It was further alleged that she (b)(6); did not disclose her (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); and that her (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) lived with her (b)(6);.</p>	<p>All actions have been reported and case requires no further investigative action.</p>
11/25/2019	<p>HUD-OIG received a referral from HUD-OIG, HQ Operations Division, to apprehend Fugitive Felons receiving Public & Indian Housing (Section 8) benefits.</p>	<p>Case initiated pursuant to nationwide Fugitive Felon data match. FFI leads were reviewed and administrative notices made to respective housing authorities. No further investigation warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/9/2020	HUD-OIG received a referral from HUD-OIG, HQ Operations Division, to apprehend Fugitive Felons receiving Multifamily Housing benefits.	Subjects of this investigation have been merged into Region 9 "master" Fugitive Felon Initiative case. As a result, this investigation is administratively closed with no further investigation warranted.
5/19/2020	HUD-OIG received a referral from the HUD-OIG Hotline Complaint Center, alleging that a Section 8 tenant is housing a lifetime registered sex offender. The allegations are unsubstantiated, and referrals were sent to the local PHA and (b)(7)(E). This matter is considered closed, and no further action is warranted.	The allegations of this matter are unsubstantiated; however, this office identified potential violation(s) of a protection order and notified the (b)(7)(E) & Richmond Housing Authority (RHA) to mitigate future violation(s), further preserving the peace and safety of the public.
10/22/2019	On May 3, 2019, HUD-OIG participated in a conference call with Glendale Community Housing Division (GCHD) personnel and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Mesa County Department of Human Services (DHS) concerning GCHD Section 8 HCV tenant (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). (b)(6); advised that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had been collecting an adoption subsidy from the State of Colorado and SSA benefits for a minor, (b)(6); who has resided with several family members, not (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), in the Denver and the Grand Junction, Colorado metro areas. GCHD personnel advised that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) had ported-in to GCHD in July 2016 and had been living in a two bedroom apartment based upon the fact that she reported to GCHD that (b)(6); (b)(6); was living with her. On May 14, 2019, HUD-OIG contacted SSA-OIG (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Denver, Colorado who confirmed that he had had received the referral from Mesa County DHS and that both DHS and SSA were calculating the losses to their respective agencies. (b)(6); advised that he intended to discuss the case with Special Assistant U.S. Attorney (SAUSA) (b)(6); U.S. Attorney's Office, Denver, CO in the near future and requested that HUD-OIG participate in the telephone call. Later on May 14, 2019, GCHD personnel advised that the loss to GCHD due to (b)(6); fraudulent activity was \$5,924 covering the time period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2019. On this same date, HUD-OIG obtained copies of the annual recertifications and other tenant certifications (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) submitted to GCHD during that time period. On June 25, 2019, (b)(6); and HUD-OIG telephonically discussed the case with SAUSA (b)(6);. SAUSA (b)(6); stated that he would be willing to pursue criminal prosecution of the case, to include the fraudulent activity involving GCHD.	Investigation of initial allegation complete, while indicators of fraudulent activity are present, prosecution was declined (b)(5) (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.
4/9/2020	Loan Officer (b)(6); is suspected of loan origination fraud. (b)(6); is responsible for alterations on asset statements linked to Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA) OIG loans. A preliminary review revealed (b)(6); is associated with 8 active HUD FHA loans. 3 of the 8 loans are currently delinquent with suspect income information.	Investigation of initial allegation completed. No evidence of criminal wrongdoing or administrative violations found, as a result (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/12/2020	On July 3, 2019, HUD-OIG received Hotline Complaint (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleging that HOH (b)(6); (b)(6); was allowing (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to reside in her subsidized housing, without reporting that (b)(6); was gainfully employed. It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) works at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	This case was opened to address an allegation of possible rental assistance fraud. After case opening, the assigned case agent was transferred to another OIG division. (b)(5) no further investigation (b)(5) warranted and this case is closed administratively.
4/6/2020	HUD-OIG received a complaint from (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) alleging that (b)(6); was a victim of elderly exploitation, in particular, she was defrauded by her trust conservator who improperly accessed and took unjustified withdrawals from her reverse mortgage. Complainant also alleged that the conservator is a part of an attorney group who purportedly engaged in similar reverse mortgage fraud against four other families. Complainant believes that (b)(6); reverse mortgage was HUD-insured.	Investigation of initial allegation complete. No evidence of criminal wrongdoing or fraud against HUD found. Case is closed with no further investigation warranted at this time.
4/21/2020	HUD-OIG received a request from the United States Attorney, Northern District of California, to participate in a local federal initiative, known as the (b)(7)(E) to combat drug trafficking and other criminal activity within the neighborhood. By way of longstanding interagency collaboration, the HUD-OIG and (b)(7)(E) San Francisco Field Offices, executed arrest warrants of fugitives who actively receive housing benefits within the tenderloin. The operation was a success and this matter is considered closed.	Case requires no further investigation and all action have been reported.
6/9/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E) is a (b)(7)(E) led operation which will be executing approx. 200 felony sex offense-related arrest warrants and compliance checks on approx. 60 sex offenders currently subject to formal probation, all residing in Imperial County, CA.	No prosecution, but referrals made to HA. For further action (b)(5) warranted. Case closed.
5/5/2020	Information compiled by Region 9 investigative analyst disclosed that there have been three FHA QAD referrals relating to (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) currently has 23 loans in defaults, resulting in 4 partial claims (\$210,966) to HUD. FHA QAD referrals alleged possible misrepresentation of assets by (b)(6); and/or borrower(s) during loan origination.	No further action (b)(5) warranted. Administratively closed.
8/12/2020	The respondent alleges a lender is tying loan officer compensation to high loan interest rates thus encouraging loan officers to unlawfully steer borrowers to more expensive mortgages. This results in higher profits for the lender and increased loan officer compensation at the expense of the government due to the government either purchasing, insuring or subsidizing loans that are more likely to default. After further review by HUD, OGC a determination not to pursue an FCA investigation was made and the USAO will decline to intervene based off of HUD, OGC's decision. The DOJ and HUD, OIG will continue to investigate the lender to determine if there is the possibility of a recovery under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act (FIRREA).	Closed administratively.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/18/2020	HUDOIG received a complaint from FHFAOIG whereby 60 loans have been identified as having income misrepresentations to qualify an otherwise unqualified borrower for a loan. The total dollar volume of the loans exceeds \$20,000,000. There are 31 conventional loans for \$10,805,650 and 28 FHA loans for \$10,079,481.	Successful State prosecution. Case closed.
1/29/2020	On October 31, 2018, the Los Angeles HUD-OIG OI received a referral from the Santa Ana HOC wherein it was alleged that HOC employee (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was using HUD travel subsidy funds for expenditures other than those related to his travel to work.	Investigation of allegation complete, no evidence of unethical conduct found. Investigative findings forwarded to HUD ELR for any actions deemed appropriate. No further investigation (b)(5) warranted at this time.
3/16/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) received fugitive felon data on November 01, 2018 from (b)(7)(E) Database. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subsequently cross referenced the data with HUD's (b)(7)(E) system, removed duplicate (b)(7) numbers and separated the data by OIG investigative region.	Investigation completed. Subjects have been charged and sentenced. No additional investigation warranted at this time.
10/16/2019	HUD OIG received information from a proactive case development alleging that a HUD-approved lender may have originated nine FHA loans, six of which containing gift monies, that went into delinquency within a year of closing.	Review of several sampled loans did not reveal any indicators of fraudulent loan origination activity. (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time (b)(5)
11/1/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of HUD-OIG contracting received what he alleged was a possible fraudulent invoice requesting payment for \$50,000 in items shipped to a storage unit in the name of HUD in Las Vegas, NV. Preliminary investigation shows HUD Las Vegas did not order the items and does not own a storage unit.	(b)(5) No prosecution, no loss to HUD. Administratively closed.
3/16/2020	On January 6, 2017, HUD-OIG received information from SSA-OIG regarding Section 8 recipient (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who is believed to have stolen her deceased family member's identity and utilized the identity to obtain governmental aid. It is believed that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)'s real name is (b)(6); (b)(7)(C)	Investigation of initial allegation completed. While indicators of fraudulent activity were present, prosecution declined by USAO. As a result, no additional investigation (b)(5) warranted.
12/30/2019	In March 2017, information was received from HUD OIG Audit regarding a Section 232/223(f) insured multifamily project. It was alleged that the project's owner was possibly violating several rules in its regulatory agreement. The owner eventually sold the property, and its HUD-insured loan obligations were fulfilled resulting in no financial loss. A Civil Money Penalty was also agreed upon between the former owner of the project and HUD. The case was declined for prosecution by the United States Attorney's Office and is now being closed.	Investigation of initial allegation completed, no criminal wrongdoing found and criminal prosecution declined. HUD entered into settlement agreement for civil remedy, no further investigation warranted.
2/13/2020	On January 26, 2017, HUD OIG received information via the Hotline Report Form regarding Section 8 tenant and current (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) It was alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) failed to disclose that she (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) at her Section 8 unit. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who reportedly was distributing drugs in the neighborhood.	Investigation of allegation completed. (b)(5) (b)(5) Investigative findings forwarded to the housing authority for possible administrative action. (b)(5) no further investigation warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/25/2020	Information was received from (b)(7)(E) regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who a involved in a mortgage modification scam under the name of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). It is alleged that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); are soliciting individuals, via mail advertisements, who are seeking lower mortgage payments by promising a loan modification. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); collect upfront fees and mortgage payments before any attempt of services.	Investigation of initial allegation complete. Three subjects charged, convicted and sentenced. (b)(5) no further investigation warranted at this time. (b)(7)(E)
1/15/2020	In June 2017, HUD OIG received information from United Shore Financial (United Shore) regarding an investigation of Global Group Funding (Global) (b)(6);. Thirteen files submitted to United Shore by Global involving (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) were reviewed. Investigation showed that 11 of the 13 files contained misrepresentations regarding employment, income, and/or assets. Five of the 13 files were FHA-insured.	Investigation of initial allegation complete. Even though indicators of fraudulent loan origination were found, none of the subject FHA insured loans were in claim status and there is no financial loss to HUD at this point. (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.
11/22/2019	Complaint indicating that (b)(6); is a section 8 participant and receiving subsidy as a Section 8 landlord as well.	Successful prosecution. Case closed.
11/25/2019	HUD-OIG proactively initiated this investigation alleging a landlord (Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing participant) converted 15 dwelling units in 12 Residential homes into 49 dwelling units without proper building permits.	Investigation of initial suspected fraud complete. Criminal prosecution declined by USAO office. Potential issue ultimately settled administratively by HUD, as a result no further investigation is warranted at this time.
12/10/2019	Allegation from Pico Rivera Housing Authority indicating that a particular individual is the (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and is residing in the subsidized unit with another tenant.	Successful Prosecution. Case closed.
3/16/2020	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) USAO decided not to join (b)(6); and proceed with action. No evidence of criminal activity found, as a result no additional investigation (b)(5) warranted at this time.
1/17/2020	Region 9, Los Angeles Office, received information from (b)(6); that HUD Community Development Block Grant funds received by the City of El Monte (CA) associated with the El Monte Promise Foundation (Foundation) are possibly being misused by the Foundation and being diverted for other purposes related to political campaigns.	No further investigation warranted. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/13/2020	<p>For pro-active measures to identify potential fraud in the home mortgage industry, on December 29, 2009, (b)(6); requested that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) conduct a data base query on FHA loans written for properties in Ventura County, a list of lenders authorized to write/fund FHA loans that are located in Ventura County, and a list of all lenders who have written/funded FHA loans in Ventura County. Based upon (b)(6); response, (b)(6); identified (b)(6); doing business as (b)(6); (b)(7)(C), an FHA approved broker, as having a rate of default higher than the national average. (b)(6); then contacted (b)(7)(E) (b)(7)(E) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to inquire about (b)(6); (b)(6); informed (b)(6); the owner of (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); a realtor/broker currently under investigation by (b)(6); Based upon the research by (b)(6); and (b)(6) and previous investigations of (b)(6); by (b)(6); it's alleged (b)(6); may be using false or altered documents to obtain funding for FHA loans.</p>	Successful Prosecution. No further action warranted.
11/19/2019	<p>Pursuant to a QAD referral letter dated October 28, 2008, pertaining to fraudulent FHA insured loan activities, Pacific Horizon Bancorp (PHB) identified two FHA loans wherein the borrowers involved provided falsified Verifications of Employment (VOE) and/or are delinquent and are non-occupants of the FHA insured property. In FHA Case No. (b)(6); two borrowers allegedly provided false VOE information to PHB in order to fraudulently qualify for an FHA insured loan for the subject property in Corona, CA. In one FHA loan, the borrower allegedly violated HUD regulations by failing to reside at his FHA insured property in San Bernardino, CA.</p>	Successful civil action. No further action (b)(5) warranted. Case closed.
2/21/2020	<p>The Housing Authority City of Los Angeles (HACLA) reported that Section 8 recipient (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) and failed to report the marriage to the HACLA. In addition, (b)(6); failed to report assets and over \$300,000 located in various bank accounts. (b)(6); reports SSI as his only source of income. (b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) subleasing his Section 8 unit and residing with (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) may also be defrauding the IHSS and SSI programs. (b)(6); will request the tenant file and bank accounts for further review. Target interview pending.</p>	Investigation of initial allegation complete. Subject has been charged, convicted and sentenced. No further investigation warranted at this time.
11/25/2019	<p>This complaint is being opened pursuant to information received from (b)(6); (b)(7)(E) (b)(6); (b)(7)(E) alleging that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) a Housing Choice Voucher recipient, has committed both Welfare fraud and Section 8 fraud by failing to report her income.</p>	Investigation of initial allegation completed. Investigative findings presented to Los Angeles District Attorney's Office resulting in charging and conviction of subject (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) has been sentenced and no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/22/2019	This project is being initiated based upon the receipt of referrals from the HAMC HCV (b)(6); (b)(6); pertaining to eight (8) former Section 8 tenants who failed to report all their household income to HAMC as required by the Section 8 program regulations. The loss to HAMC due to these tenant's actions is \$62,331.	Investigation of subjects suspected of underreporting their incomes is complete. While indicators of fraudulent activity are present, prosecution of presented subjects was declined. Appropriate referrals for administrative action made. (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.
11/7/2019	HUD OIG SA proactively searched for HUD-subsidized Section 8 residential addresses among a list of registered sex offenders. HUD OIG SA identified five (5) address matches with individuals subject to lifetime registration as a sex offender within the zip codes featured in this case.	Administratively closed.
11/5/2019	(b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of the Winslow Housing Authority (HA), allegedly embezzled the cash rental payments she received from Winslow Public Housing tenants and attempted to cover up her theft of these funds by using the accounting software password of (b)(6); HA (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) to change the payment amounts HA (b)(6); had originally entered into the Winslow HA internal accounting system to lower payment amounts. (b)(6); actions have resulted in (b)(5) loss of possibly \$69,632 to the housing authority. There is also evidence that (b)(6); (b)(5) the Winslow HA credit card assigned to her for unauthorized personal expenses. (b)(6); has admitted to the Winslow (b)(6); and to the Winslow Police Department that she has stolen funds from the housing authority.	This case was initiated based on information received from the HUD Office of PIH alleging that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) of a housing authority was embezzled funds. Investigation gathered evidence of criminal wrongdoing and investigative findings were presented to the United States Attorney's Office. The subject was subsequently charged with Theft and plead guilty. The (b)(6); was sentenced to 24 months probation and ordered to pay restitution of approximately \$ 52,000 to the housing authority. (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.
6/29/2020	HUD OIG Office of Legal Counsel Hotline received a complaint from licensed contractor, (b)(6); (b)(6); regarding (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) who is a HUD approved loan consultant. (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) is allegedly demanding referrals fees be paid in cash to him for every 203k loan job (b)(6); received.	Investigation of initial allegation completed. Referral for suspension forward to HUD DEC, decision pending. (b)(5) no further investigation is warranted at this time.
4/28/2020	Fugitive felons were identified living in HUD subsidized housing in the counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, CA. A joint effort to arrest the fugitives is ongoing with (b)(7)(E) (b)(7)(E). Administrative referrals for termination will be made as needed.	No further action warranted. Closed administratively.
3/16/2020	Allegations that properties being developed on the Norther Marianas Islands are using Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) but not following the income guidelines for income eligibility.	This case is being closed (b)(5) (b)(5)
2/5/2020	On April 13, 2016, the case agent received information from FHFA-OIG regarding a loan origination scheme involving a company based in Ontario, CA which, according to FHFA-OIG, submitted income and employment documentation on behalf of borrowers that Freddie Mac confirmed were fabricated. A preliminary check of victims of the scheme by HUD-OIG found that it included FHA insured properties.	Close administratively.
4/21/2020	The Riverside District Attorney's office requested assistance from HUD-OIG regarding investigating fraud within federally subsidized housing programs in the County of Riverside, CA.	Prosecution successful.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/27/2020	The Riverside District Attorney's office requested assistance from HUD OIG OI investigating fraud within federal funded housing programs in the County of Riverside, CA.	Prosecution successfully. Case closed.
8/26/2020	<p>City of Phoenix Law Department personnel and City of Phoenix Housing Department Section 8 Division personnel reported that the Section 8 Division had received a letter, reportedly from City of Phoenix Section 8 tenant (b)(6); which stated that (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) was the actual owner of her Section 8 residence located at (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) Phoenix, AZ. The letter further stated that (b)(6) had been receiving the Section 8 housing assistance payments since August 27, 2011 and that (b)(6); had instructed (b)(6); to tell anyone who asked that her landlord was (b)(6); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C). The letter further stated that (b)(6) was trying to evict (b)(6); and requested assistance from the City of Phoenix. City of Phoenix Housing Department personnel confirmed that (b)(6); had been evicted but was now housed in another Section 8 residence. City of Phoenix Housing personnel confirmed that (b)(6); was listed as the owner of (b)(6); residence on the initial Section 8 documents executed in August 2011. City of Phoenix Housing personnel also provided a copy of a quit-claim deed which showed that (b)(6); had quit-claimed the (b)(6); property to (b)(6); on (b)(6);</p>	Investigation of initial allegation complete. Case declined by prosecutor, (b)(5) no further investigation warranted at this time.