

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/15/2013	<p>A Hotline complaint was received, alleging corruption by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Old Bridge Housing Authority (OBHA) and the South Amboy Housing Authority (SAHA). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) South Amboy, NJ, alleged in his written communication to HUD OIG that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was misusing HUD funds and was in violation of the Hatch Act. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested a \$10,000 payment from an employee and private contractor of South Amboy in order for him to keep receiving work in the town. In furtherance, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested the funds be directed to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bank account, who is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has a financial interest in numerous insurance companies in the area with his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and might be hiding funds from the IRS as well as from their (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) questioned the cell phone tower on top of a housing development associated with the SAHA and wondered whether the proceeds from that tower was going back to the SAHA or into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bank account. (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5); (b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(E)</p>	An remaining actions will be input under complaint or reopened case

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/9/2013	<p>Detective (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Linden Police Department, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), contacted this agent and advised that their office received an anonymous phone call advising that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a former Section 8 landlord for a property that he owned at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Plainfield, NJ, 07060. The anonymous caller further stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sold the property in 2006, but he was still collecting the Section 8 checks from the Plainfield Housing Authority. This reporting agent met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on May 1, 2009, and listened to the taped call made by the anonymous caller. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has had some money issues in the past where their department had to get involved. A check of (b)(7)(E) revealed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had at least 2 civil actions filed against him, including one for \$8,000. (b)(7)(E) also indicated (b)(7)(C) bought the property on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and sold it on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Further investigation revealed that from January 2008 until March of 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) collect approximately \$1,862 in Section 8 checks when he was not the rightful owner of the property. On May 7, 2009, this reporting agent and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) visited the Plainfield Housing Authority and ordered the file for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A visit to the Plainfield Police Department revealed they had made 19 visits to the property since 2006. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is in the process of finding out where (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does his banking.</p>	Investigation complete, R&D's approved, no further action needed
8/19/2013	<p>A thorough review of Neighborhood Watch and other HUD systems pertaining to U.S. Mortgage during investigation (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed loan officers (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were associated with at least 10 FHA loans that HUD had paid out on and/or were late in the foreclosure stage. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were not associated with the prior mentioned investigation. HUD has paid out approximately \$2.15 million on a total of 18 loans that were conveyed back to them, which includes the 10 from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Interviews conducted on one of the FHA loans already has determined that the verifications of employment, gift letters, and W-2's were all fraudulent. The number of FHA loans in default associated with the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is expected to grow. WHO: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) WHEN: from 1999-2002 WHAT: were loan officers for at least 10 FHA loans that HUD had conveyed back to them WHERE: U.S. Mortgage WHY: HOW: Fraudulent W-2's, fake W-2's and false verification of employments were found in the files associated with the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	All actions have been completed

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/15/2013	<p>Information was originally received (b)(5) through an informant who stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been using money to support a lavish lifestyle. Allegedly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were involved in multiple HUD and City of Paterson sponsored programs in order to disguise the amount of funds they claimed as salary. This referral was originally investigated under (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Investigation revealed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and its subsidiaries (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are nonprofit corporations that previously received HOME, CDBG and HOPWA funding from HUD's Community Development Division. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for these three entities and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also involved in these entities. Currently (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) receives funding to assist the Homeless under Shelter Care Plus and Supportive Housing Program. Due to the aging of case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and the direction this investigation has taken a management decision was made to close (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and open a new investigation to investigate the current direction of the investigation from information received through subpoenaed documents, current working relationship with HUD CPD Program and information they have supplied as well HUD/LEO database checks.</p>	Criminal prosecution declined. No evidence of diversion or misuse of funds.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/20/2013	<p>Information received by the USAO indicates the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the North Bergen Housing Authority is providing support for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), by forcing Housing Authority employees to solicit the votes of tenants. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed the tenants they would get pushed out of their homes if they did not vote. In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forced his employees to make campaign contribution to the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Document received indicating issue with voting democratically by tenants. Case assigned from beginning to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) Further investigation required to address this issue. In addition, investigation expanding into misappropriation of the capital acct in relationship to renovations at the NBHA. Subjects include the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In addition complaint (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) - North Bergen Housing Authority was opened when on September 14, 2009, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Special Agent, Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Newark Field Office, One Newark Center, 1085 Raymond Boulevard, 12 Floor, Newark, New Jersey 07102, received an anonymous letter alleging fraudulent activity at the North Bergen Housing Authority. The alleged fraud that is mentioned in the letter indicates that personnel at the PHA are placing people not on the waiting list into subsidized units. Other allegations indicate that employees are being forced to work/pay for tickets to political events as well as pay money to get vacation time. This complaint will be closed and any further investigation will occur under ongoing investigation (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) - North Bergen Housing Authority.</p>	All judicial actions completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/9/2013	This investigation is being initiated pursuant to HUD OIG Newark field office's continued agency participation with the New Jersey Mortgage Fraud Task Force. This investigation will consist of a multi-agency approach to investigating high level officials in the Mortgage and Banking Industry as well as Investors, Brokers, Real Estate Agents, Title Company officials, public officials, document makers, closing attorneys and employees and/or owners of these subject entities. The New Jersey Mortgage Fraud Task Force will continue to focus investigative efforts on loan origination fraud and illegal property flipping in fiscal year 2010. In addition this case will be used to investigate and document PA HOC QAD referrals and DEC referrals which result in judicial, civil and administrative actions.	Umbrella case is administratively closed. Remaining or new work will be addressed in individual cases.
3/11/2013	Newark HUD OIG will identify a troubled PIH or FHA-insured Multi-family Project that is in mortgage possession status and reduce erroneous payments in the rental assistance program of that project. In addition, any administrative actions taken by the Department in FY10 will be documented under this Initiative	Prosecutions adjudicated and outstanding charges worked under other cases.
9/10/2013	On February 13, 2009, HUD-OIG received Hotline Complaint (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Montgomery Gateway East I (MGE), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Jersey City, NJ, 07302, is accepting \$5,000 kickback payments in exchange for subsidized housing. In addition, it has been alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will only rent to people of Dominican Republic decent. The complainant who wishes to remain anonymous stated HUD has provided MGE with new refrigerators, however, the appliances were never provided to the tenants.	Case was declined for prosecution based on statute of limitations, unsubstantiated allegations, etc. Hotline was notified via e-mail that this office will be closing the matter.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/15/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), One Newark Center, 12th Floor, Newark, New Jersey 07102 received a referral dated July 8, 2010 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Philadelphia Homeownership Center, 3AHHQ, via email regarding a recent monitoring review of First Residential Mortgage Services Corporation (FRM), it was discovered that there were instances where documents used to originate the loans and obtain HUD/FHA mortgage insurance were falsified, contained conflicting information and/or were verified by authorized individuals to be false. Investigation to date indicates potential for fraud regarding FRM to include high default ratio, loans with 6 payments or less, and one subject identified through review of loans was arrested in another mortgage fraud investigation being worked in the Newark Office.</p>	Case transferred to other agent, no actions
3/12/2013	<p>There are allegations of the use of CDBG funds for a project that utilized workers who were paid wages below minimum wage levels. The construction company then falsified payroll records to reflect workers were being paid union scale wages. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) is alleged to have submitted false certified payrolls for a HUD funded project through the City of Orange, NJ known as the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) project. This project was conducted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) operating under (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who applied to receive HUD funding for this project. NJS, a general contractor assisted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with this project. Investigation has determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) created false certified payrolls on behalf of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	Criminal actions fully adjudicated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/29/2013	<p>On July 19, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a referral from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the United States Attorney's Office. The complaint was submitted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on behalf of his clients (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reside at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Saddlebrook NJ. The complaint states that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) withdrew funds in the amount of \$18,630 and \$27,589 for rehabilitation work, under the 203k program, that was never performed. The complaint also states that the HUD consultant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), New Providence, NJ, copied the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) signature and inserted it on the form required to approve the withdrawals. Actions Taken (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reviewed the documentation provided by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) attorney and set up a call to discuss the matter further. After reviewing the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) documentation (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) discovered three other 203k loans in which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the rehabilitation contractor. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was successful in contacting one of the three other 203k loan recipients. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Rahway, NJ, contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stating she wished to file a complaint against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) cited allegations similar to the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) claiming (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) demanded funds up front but never completed the work set forth in the scope of work. After (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) made her complaint (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been indicted in 2009 by the Monmouth County Prosecutor's Office for embezzling \$2.1-million dollars from a joint venture development project in Monmouth County. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been involved in at least 15 additional 203K rehabilitation projects originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Shrewsbury, NJ. Based upon this information, an IG subpoena was issued to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for 203k loan files for which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were involved in the rehabilitation project. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) continues to investigate the scope of these allegations.</p>	<p>Allegations not substantiated and loss deemed to be below USAO threshold</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/29/2013	<p>On December 19, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were indicted on seven counts. At the time of the indictment it was determined that there was no HUD nexus. HUD OIG was requested by (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), to assist in the investigation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Trial is scheduled currently for October 2010. (b)(5) will be utilizing HUD funding as federal funding in the trial of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). OIG will assist in providing witness and documentation for this investigation. Only judicial actions from this point forward will be documented in (b)(7)(E)</p>	No further HUD-OIG investigation required

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/16/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Attorney, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised of an attorney who was allegedly committing bank fraud/mortgage fraud. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated his client, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was in business with a person by the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Manalapan, NJ 07726. These two individuals had a company called (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Hoboken, NJ. This company was formed and operated for only 18 months before they had a falling out. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bought a property together at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Jersey City, NJ, 07036. This property is a 6 unit complex. The attorney advised this property is currently in foreclosure and could be going through a short sale. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received an offer on the home for \$425,000. Agent research indicated this property was purchased for \$480,000 and had 2 mortgages, \$384,000 and \$48,000. Before accepting the offer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) visited (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)'s attorney to discuss the offer. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)'s attorney, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Montclair, NJ, told (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that he'll call the bank and tell them he has an offer for \$300,000. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated if the bank takes the \$300,000, we'll accept the offer for \$425,000 and he would give a finder's fee of \$10,000-\$15,000 upon the sale. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owned a branch of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) but the branch was taken away from him. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not a nice guy and has liens, judgements, and civil suits filed against him. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated his client is willing to assist investigators in any capacity. This reporting agent contacted (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and advised him of the allegations. (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised he had interest and would contact shortly. A source in the mortgage industry contacted this reporting agent to advise of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)'s alleged criminal activity. The source advised he would be able to make consensually monitored phone calls to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as well as make recordings with a body wire. This source is currently working off a charge lodged against him in Essex County. This complaint should be converted to an investigation.</p>	Case has not moved in a timely manner nor is there a clear HUD-Nexus

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/1/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) _____, JP MORGAN CHASE, filled a Qui Tam complaint, number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) _____, in US District Court, District of Massachusetts, alleging JP MORGAN CHASE has defrauded the federal government, including the Department of Treasury and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) through fraudulent mortgage practices. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) _____ relates JP MORGAN CHASE has defrauded the FHA Home Affordable Modification Plan (FHA-HAMP) a double billing scheme.	Qui Tam case settled through civil settlement. Investigation completed.
3/1/2013	HUD Field Office in Hartford received an Anonymous complaint that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) _____ of the West Hartford Housing Authority was misusing HUD funds.	Alleged fraud was de minimus and resolved administratively. No presentation was made to prosecutors. (b)(6);

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/16/2013	<p>On December 7 2006, HUD OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephonically interviewed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the State of Maine Board of Pharmacy (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised he is a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the State of Maine Board of Pharmacy. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated his office has regulatory oversight of the distribution of prescription medications within the State of Maine. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated his office conducted a regulatory investigation on a pharmacy called PINRx. PINRx is operated by members of Maine's Penobscot Indian Nation Tribe (PINT). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated the mission of PinRx was to import less expensive prescription drugs from Canada into the State of Maine for repackaging and redistribution, at a low cost, to low and moderate incomes Maine residence. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regulatory investigation revealed PINRx representatives imported less expensive prescription drugs from Canada into the State of Maine for repackaging. However, a large volume of these prescription drugs were re-sold over Internet web sites. Additionally, alleged 'doctors' from other countries, such as Panama, were the individuals who prescribed the prescription drugs to the individuals who purchased the drugs through the Internet web sites. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated such activity is against federal stature. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated PINT members utilized funds from two federal grants to initiate the PINRx operation. One grant was a \$400,000.00 HUD Community Development Block Grant, and the other was a \$500,000.00 grant from the US Department of Agriculture. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated his office turned this case over to the (b)(5) and the United States Attorney for the District of Maine when he realized criminal violations might have occurred.</p>	Investigation complete. Fully adjudicated in US District Court, District of Maine.
3/29/2013	<p>This investigation was opened by HUD/OIG to address Housing Choice Voucher Program Tenant/Landlord fraud in the Eastern Massachusetts communities. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will be working with the Local Public Housing Authorities, the Local Police Departments and other Federal Agencies, such as SSA/OIG, USPIS, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, State Auditors office to identify and develop cases involving Tenant/Landlord fraud. As subjects are identified they will be added to the profiles. To date, four subjects have been identified. As subjects continue to be identified, they will be added to this investigation.</p>	<p>Investigation complete. Case is administratively closed (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/14/2013	<p>An anonymous complaint is alleging misuse of CDBG funding by the Parks & Recreation Department of the City of Bridgeport, CT. The Parks and Recreation (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has expended funds for a casino bus trip one week prior to local primary elections. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was involved in ticket distribution of tickets for the trip. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a member of the Economic and Community Development and Environment Committee Board that approves CDBG funding.</p>	<p>No evidence of criminality on the part of the subject was uncovered. This case was administratively closed prior to the scheduled 90 Day Case Review of 1/15/2013.</p>
2/4/2013	<p>On March 4, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received an e-mail from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Methuen, Massachusetts Police Department in reference to a Methuen resident that was potentially a victim of a Mortgage Refinance Scam. The victim alleged that he responded via telephone to a mailing from AMERICAN MORTGAGE COMPANY for a potentially lower mortgage rate. The victim was advised via telephone that his current rate was good but if the rates dropped he would contact him. Approximately six (6) months later, the victim received a telephone call from a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) claiming to be from AMERICAN MORTGAGE COMPANY and BEST LOAN SERVICES (BLS). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that victim that the mortgage rates had dropped and he could get him a lower mortgage rate. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) set up a meeting at the victim's residence where the victim provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with copies of his W-2 Tax forms, driver's license, bank statements, and filled out paperwork. The victim wrote out two (2) personal checks to BLS; one (1) for \$100. for office fees and two (2) for \$395. for an appraisal of his home. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) left the residence with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) later identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), driving in a silver BMW. The victim heard from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the next day via telephone but has not heard from him in months and an appraisal has never been completed. Both checks were deposited via ATM into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)'s account by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Review of a HUD database revealed that the victim, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Methuen, MA has a HUD Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loan on his residence. There are victims of similar Mortgage Refinance Scams in Everett and Salem, Massachusetts. This is a joint investigation with HUD-OIG and the Methuen, Massachusetts Police Department.</p>	<p>Case is administratively closed. No potential for loss to HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/14/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Stratford Housing Authority (SHA), was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding a complaint that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had reported to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Public Housing, Hartford, CT field office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) opted to have (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) speak with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pertaining to the complaint. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) offered the following information: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) where (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) receives Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) from the SHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has repeatedly signed SHA landlord certifications reflecting that he not renting to relatives or spouses. The SHA discovered that a former member of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) household, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was terminated from the HCV program as of 04/14/2009 and it was determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owes \$13,709.00 back to the SHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is terminated as of 06/20/2009 per order of the SHA.</p>	<p>State law enforcement declined to prosecute due to questions of jurisdiction. The (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) This case was administratively closed prior to the scheduled case review of 1/15/2013.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/30/2013	<p>HUD-OIG has been asked to investigate a matter by the (b)(5) involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Bridgeport, CT, following several SAR's, complaints made to State and Federal agencies, and review completed by the CT State Banking Department. The majority of the files reviewed by the CT State Banking Department were brokered through (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has an (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in and is listed as a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A total of 575 closed mortgage files were obtained and reviewed from (b)(6);(C). Of the 575, 114 FHA and 231 conventional loans (345 total) were thoroughly examined. It was determined that all FHA's contained evidence of fraud to include violations of four (4) HUD regulations related to duplicative consulting fees (RESPA). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the lender on each FHA mortgage and their (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Several attorneys have been implicated to have participated as the closing attorney on several foreclosed and defaulted properties, specifically (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) misrepresented the applicants' assets, liabilities, occupancy, and income in order to qualify the individual on paper and bring the loan to close. Borrowers were also asked to sign blank applications, HUD-1's, and other various mortgage documents prior to closing. In addition, it is presumed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had provided the borrower with a different HUD-1 than what was originally filed. The original HUD-1 reflected different sales prices, fees, etc.</p>	Criminal prosecution was declined due to the lack of evidence that any Federal crimes were committed (b)(6);(C).
3/29/2013	Information received from HUD program staff of possible improprieties with the former management company (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/19/2012	SSA-OIG received information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is receiving social security benefits and section 8 housing in Cambridge, Ma under this identity and is receiving social security benefits and Section 8 housing under the identity of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Dorchester, Ma.	Investigation completed. Subject successfully prosecuted in U.S. District Court. All judicial and administrative action completed.
2/1/2013	Montpelier Police Department advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had closed its doors and had not paid any vendors, landlords and has not returned security deposits of a number of tenants.	Investigation completed. All judicial action completed. Administrative referral made to DEC.
3/25/2013	Information was received which indicates the TOWN OF BARRE, MA may have acquired a property using HUD CDBG funds in which a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have a financial interest.	No violations of HUD regulations were substantiated.
3/29/2013	Information provided by HUD CPD in Hartford, Connecticut alleged the possible illegal administration and disbursement of HUD funds by employees and contractors of the Town of Manchester in Connecticut. Preliminary information revealed that the Town of Manchester lacked the required documents to support the disbursement of HUD CPD funds. More specifically, HUD reviewed approximately 11 properties that received HUD rehabilitation assistance and 5 of them were issued to one same contractor identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A review of these 5 properties by HUD CPD revealed unsupported change orders paid without the essential and required documents in accordance with HUD's regulations.	Both the U.S. Attorney's Office and the DEC declined to accept this matter.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/12/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Stamford, Connecticut is a licensed mortgage brokerage business in the State of Connecticut. It is alleged that starting around April 2002 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) began operating (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) upstairs from his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) company in Stamford. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) began directing prospective buyers to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for mortgage brokering services. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), along with others, allegedly colluded to mislead consumers and mortgage lenders by falsifying loan applications and luring borrowers into unaffordable loans. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted false accountant's letters to qualify consumers for mortgages, and in addition (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) agents and employees falsified information on consumers' mortgage loan applications including income details. A review by the State of Connecticut Department of Banking revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Mortgage Company was engaged in FHA loan origination services but was not FHA-approved to assist borrowers in obtaining mortgage financing. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Mortgage Company was receiving payments as an unapproved broker for duplicated services, which amounts to unearned fees being paid in FHA insured mortgage transactions.</p>	<p>All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. No further investigative steps are warranted. - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>
3/28/2013	(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C);(b)(7)(E)	Case declined by USAO NH. Case is administratively closed.
2/27/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), which is the largest mortgage broker in the New Hampshire area, has allegedly been altering documents in order to qualify borrowers for mortgages. The allegations concerning the company and its (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) include the altering of applicants' employment verification forms, documents being changed with the use of white out, signatures being forged, etc. A source from within the company came forward to reveal the alleged fraud and to date, many of the allegations have been substantiated by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and other law enforcement agencies.</p>	Case administratively closed in accordance with OIGM 3002 Section 2-11(1).

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/7/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a loan originator with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) located in Cranston, RI. An anonymous source contacted the (b)(5) and advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was falsifying employer and tax return records in order to qualify borrowers for mortgage loans. To date there are 19 loans originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that have gone into foreclosure. This includes two FHA loans. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Rhode Island has been assigned to the case.	Case is fully adjudicated and all administrative action is complete.
3/28/2013	Information was received via HUD program staff, that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Manchester (NH) Housing Authority, who is also a HCVP tenant failed to report her true household composition and income. Additionally, the landlord for the HCVP property is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Case declined by USAO. Type (b)(5)
2/4/2013	The City of Worcester, Massachusetts was recently awarded \$2,390,858 in HUD Neighborhood Stabilization funds. HUD/OIG will monitor this grant to ensure that the monies are awarded and used according to HUD regulations and guidelines.	Case administratively closed. Allegations to be addressed in spin-off case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/8/2013	<p>The operating entity, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy protection in February 2007. Any excess cash generated from the operation of the home should have been used to pay creditors. Instead, the operating entity is two months behind on the rent payment, which is used to pay the HUD-insured mortgage, and it owes the IRS and the State of Connecticut \$639,460 in post-petition payroll taxes. The operating entity also owes \$400,000 for professional fees that have accrued during the bankruptcy. Additionally, the operating entity owes the IRS and the State of Connecticut approximately \$600,000 in pre-petition payroll taxes. The landlord/real estate entity is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During yesterday's meeting, the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the operating entity, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted that over the past eighteen months, he made a total of \$329,000 in over payments to the landlord entity. When asked where the money went and what it was used for, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) simply stated that the money went to himself and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and that it is now gone. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has a 98% ownership interest in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (name unknown) is the sole shareholder for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which controls the IT for the nursing home. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Nursing Services at the home. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the home. Finally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also on the payroll for the nursing home, but it unclear at this time what her role is.</p>	Case fully adjudicated and administratively closed.
6/19/2013	<p>Information was uncovered while reviewing a complaint related to a HUD REO property, that possibly the prior FHA mortgagor may have committed loan fraud when he obtained the FHA mortgage. The subject had just been foreclosed upon by the USDA FSA for mortgages related to Single Family Farm in Western MA, subject had been in bankruptcy at the time. It appears the subject may have failed to accurately disclose his prior foreclosure, bankruptcy filings and loss to the USDA when he obtained the FHA mortgage. The USAO has twice attempted to recover civilly the funds lost by FSA, subject appears to have avoided service in both the USDC in MA and CT. Subject caused a loss of approx. \$95K to FSA and a claim of \$231K to FHA. Other cases of potential FHA related mortgage fraud within Western MA may also be worked under this case as additional information is developed.</p>	Investigation complete. Judicial action completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/25/2013	PHOC QAD received reports from Bank of America (BOA) that borrower's had misrepresented their income when obtaining BOA home mortgages. BOA obtained IRS tax transcript listing income amounts which varied greatly from income reported by the borrower's to qualify for the mortgages.	Fraud for housing not resulting in a loss to HUD.
9/19/2013	Allegations indicate that North Providence RI (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) awarded her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and herself a \$43,000 home rehab loan for low income individuals using CDBG money. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to earn over \$70,000 with the Town of North Providence, RI and should have not qualified. It is alleged that there may be other Town Public Officials that received loans as well.	Investigation completed with civil action taken.
2/1/2013	A referral from the Philadelphia HOC indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Sudbury, Massachusetts, obtained an FHA refinance mortgage (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) by allegedly providing false or inflated income information. The mortgage is currently delinquent.	Case is fraud for housing with no loss to HUD. Does not meet prosecution guidelines. Case is administratively closed.
9/5/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Farmington Police Department, Telephone Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to discuss a fraud allegation which was made to the Farmington Police Department. Section 8 Tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been a Section 8 tenant since September 1, 1996. The Farmington Housing Authority recently discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been falsifying her income since 1997. A loss calculation performed by the Farmington Housing Authority resulted in an estimated monetary loss of approximately \$92,046.00.	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. The file is administratively closed - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/4/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Section 8 vouchers, Bridgeport Housing Authority (BHA), contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephonically to report what she believes to be fraud. (b)(6);(b)(7) stated that the current (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the BHA, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns three homes that house BHA Section 8 tenants. (b)(6);(b)(7) stated that BHA employees are strictly prohibited from being Section 8 landlords. (b)(6);(b)(7) said that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has relatives in the three Section 8 units where she is a landlord, but has not filled out any reasonable accommodation forms. (b)(7)(C) stated that she had been in charge of administering the reasonable accommodation forms, however, the duty has recently been delegated to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) per order of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that there is a rumor that (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are having an affair. (b)(6);(b)(7) stated that (b)(6);(b)(7) approached her recently to ask that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) three Section 8 units be authorized rent increases per request of the landlord when all other BHA Section 8 units have been denied rent increases due to budget concerns.</p>	<p>All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. HUD OIG is administratively closing its file after an administrative resolution.</p>
3/28/2013	<p>Referral from Audit indicated possible Landlord-Tenant Fraud within the Section 8 program from 08/2004 to 09/2007. See referral for details.</p>	<p>Case declined by USAO. Case is administratively closed.</p>
2/26/2013	<p>Hotline received allegations from an employee of East Hartford Housing Authority (EHHA) advising of possible contracting fraud by a program manager at EHHA.</p>	<p>Allegation not substantiated.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/10/2013	<p>On May 21, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with updated information on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) thereafter, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The information was retrieved from Neighborhood Watch – Early Warnings All Lenders/Area by branch office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) ranked third out of nineteen FHA insured Lenders with the highest defaulted FHA loans in the New York State. Based on the analysis of the default and claim information obtained from the Neighborhood Watch report for the period between April 1, 2006 and March 31, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) originated 261 FHA loans and had 49 defaulted FHA loans, total of 1 claim paid in the amount of \$565,109.81, and a default/claim rate of 18.77 percent which is well above the State default/claim rate of 2.82 percent.</p>	<p>No further investigative activity warranted. Remaining admin action will be captured in (b)(7)(E) by temporary reopening case. Evidence chain of custody will be uploaded upon determination of disposition of evidence.</p>
6/17/2013	<p>Our office has met with the Manhattan District Attorney's Office with regard to an investigation that their office has opened pertaining to the death of two firemen during the demolition of the Deutsche Bank building (DB). The DB received over \$260 million dollars in Disaster Recovery funds to purchase and demolish the building. There have been allegations of possible bribery and intimidation of contractors. Our office will be working closely with the Manhattan DA investigators to determine whether or not HUD funds were compromised.</p>	<p>All criminal and civil actions were considered. Case is administratively closed and will be reopened to record the appropriate R&D upon DEC's decision to debar (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/5/2013	<p>This office received a telephone call requesting assistance with a list of names that were found at a search warrant executed in Westchester County by their detectives. SSA-OIG had reviewed the list and informed HUD-OIG that all names were of children and appeared to be from the Bronx, NY area. The list of names were run through the (b)(7)(E) and all the children were from the same zip code 19457 and they had the administering agency, NYCHA. NYCHA-OIG was contacted and it was confirmed that all children were on Section 8 and the case worker was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is related to the subjects that were arrested during the search warrant in Westchester County for identity theft and credit card fraud. The Westchester County detectives then went to the local H&R Block office and requested copies of the tax returns for (b)(6);(b)(7) and the subjects arrested in their case. The names of several of the children appeared on their returns. SSA-OIG and HUD-OIG then conducted several interviews and learned from the parents that their children's identity were used for the earned income credit. These parents had placed a complaint with the IRS.</p>	<p>All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been considered. This file is administratively closed - (b)</p>
4/12/2013	<p>Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track, report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple non-related rental assistance cases currently being investigated and future investigations. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals, and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Westchester County housing authorities and or multi-family rental assistance cases investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2009 will be reported herein.</p>	<p>All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. No further investigative steps are warranted. - (b)</p>
3/4/2013	<p>On May 29, 2009, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was advised of a potential HUD-OIG employee case from the HUD-Office of Counsel in Manhattan. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (above captioned subject) may be committing section 8 fraud. The original allegation came from the HUD Multifamily Housing HUB in Manhattan.</p>	<p>Case was declined by USAO and the allegations were not substantiated.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/29/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7) the former (b)(6);(b)(7) of the St. Johnsville Housing Authority, used the HA credit card for her own personal use. (b)(6);(b)(7) charged approximately \$15,000 of personal and unallowable expenses. (b)(6);(b)(7) also misused the bank account and wrote numerous checks for her personal expenses.	Due to the May 2013, promotion and transfer of the reporting agent, and the shortage of resources, this case will be administratively closed. However, the case will be monitored and reopen to report the judicial and administrative actions
5/24/2013	As a result of the monitoring report issued by the Office of Community Development and Planning, and the findings addressed therein, the City of Buffalo has substantial unsupported costs for their use of Community Block Grant Funds. Specifically, for the five year period of the report, the City removed \$200,000 bi-weekly from CDBG funds to pay for salaries of people not known to be approved for payment from HUD funds. This case has been accepted by the ACE (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) for prosecutorial consideration.	All criminal actions are complete. Case to reopen should the DEC seek debarment of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) USAO closed civil case inasmuch as HUD did not support any civil action
4/11/2013	As a proactive approach HUD/OIG will work with the NYPD Internal Affairs Bureau to identify subjects committing fraud against HUD programs.	Case was not pusued by LE partners or HUD-OIG under this proactive case

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that the (b)(5) initiated an investigation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) after receiving information from HUD-OIG regarding possible corruption at this non-profit organization. There are allegations of bid-rigging and theft by employees.	No additional HUD OIG assistance warranted
6/12/2013	On April 27, 2010, HUD-OIG received a referral from (b)(5) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had underpaid their workers on maintenance and repair contracts held with NYCHA. These contracts were for different housing developments around the New York City. The Department of Equal Opportunity interviewed over 100 employees at several different NYCHA sites and determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had underpaid their workers by \$1,108,698.11. This case was originally under case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered and/or were completed - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
4/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), One Newark Center, 12th Floor, Newark, New Jersey 07102 received a referral on October 25, 2010 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Community Development and Planning Division from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who discussed the circumstances surrounding the indictment of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and Former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in March of 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), were indicted for conspiracy and official misconduct. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) arranged for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) name to be pulled during a public lottery that included 40 other entries. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that she was looking for assistance in this investigation. HUD OIG Investigation established that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$90,000 in HOME funds on 1/31/2006. These HOME funds were committed in 10/16/2002, and allowed for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to purchase a two-family duplex house. Per HUD regulations, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was to live in this property and provide income eligible housing for twenty years. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a landlord for the Perth Amboy Housing Authority and has a tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presently living there. All information will be provided to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for plea negotiations. Court is currently scheduled for November 4, 2010 for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will be also culpable for any restitution owed to HUD. HUD OIG will continue to assist in this investigation. Only judicial actions from this point forward will be taken by the reporting office.	No active participation from HUD-OIG. Pending referral for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will be uploaded via reopened case or new complaint

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/16/2013	<p>On October 29, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Newark Office of Investigations, Office of the Inspector General, received a referral from the Philadelphia Quality Assurance Division (QAD). The referral contained a report by the loan servicer, Chase, which stated the FHA case file, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contained altered bank statements for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Paterson NJ. The loan was originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lender ID (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the borrower was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The QAD verified with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Fraud Security Division at TD Bank (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the statements submitted by the borrower had been altered to increase the account balance. Neighborhood Watch contains the following data as of October 18, 2010. The mortgage status was delinquent within 30 days after the first payment was due. The unpaid principal balance is \$260,988. The current loan servicer is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The first action to commence foreclosure was initiated in September 2010. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is being investigated through the Mortgage Fraud Taskforce. In addition, information was received by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicating a closing attorney maybe involved in short sales and fraudulent activity. Further investigation is warranted. Further investigation indicated approximately 18-22 fraudulent loans at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that involved the same loan officer, appraiser, closing attorney, and other members of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Counsel for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated they conducted their own investigation and the employees involved in the mortgage fraud scheme were terminated. The FHA binders have been ordered for further review.</p>	No loss to HUD-Not presented for prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/30/2013	<p>On October 25, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Newark Office of Investigations, Office of the Inspector General, received a referral from the Philadelphia Quality Assurance Division (QAD). The referral contained a report by the lender, Bank of America, which stated the FHA case file, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contained altered bank statements for borrower purchasing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Elizabeth NJ. The loan was originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lender ID (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the borrower was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The QAD verified with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Wells Fargo's Fraud Risk Management Division at Wachovia (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the statements submitted by the borrower had been altered to increase the account balance. Actions Taken (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reviewed loan data within the file forwarded by the QAD and Neighborhood Watch. Neighborhood Watch contains the following data as of October 5, 2010. The mortgage status is active. The unpaid principal balance is \$351, 526.70. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the (b)(5) (b)(5). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss potential fraudulent activity by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested HUD OIG assistance with investigating fraudulent activity within (b)(6);(C). A member of the (b)(5) presented this case to the US Attorneys Office, New Jersey District. The Assistant United States Attorney currently assigned to this case is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>HUD-OIG participation no longer required. Stats for two subjects will be tracked under (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>
5/6/2013	<p>On November 17, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were indicted on three counts. At the time of the indictment it was determined that there was no HUD nexus. HUD OIG was requested by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to assist in the Investigation of (b)(6);(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Trial is scheduled for February 2011. The AUSA will be utilizing HUD funding as federal funding in the trial of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(C). OIG will assist in providing a witness and documentation for this investigation. Only judicial actions from this point forward will be documented in (b)(7)(E).</p>	<p>No additional HUD-OIG involvement. Admin. referral for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to be posted under reopened investigation or complaint</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/17/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Quincy Housing Authority (QHA), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Quincy, MA 02170 and telephone (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to report an instance of Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Fraud. (b)(6) stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HCV tenant, has been on the HCV program through the QHA since 2001. (b)(6) said that at that time, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been reporting income she was earning as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to the QHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that in September of 2002, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that she had stopped working as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and was receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) income through the state of Massachusetts. (b)(6) stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) continued to claim only AFDC income to the QHA through August of 2006. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said at that time (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported income she was earning through working at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to the QHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that she became aware that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been employed by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) since February of 2002. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that the non-reporting of this income will result in a substantial loss to the QHA, which she will provide (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) when it becomes available. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsified income information and the hire date from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and forged signatures to submit to the QHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been terminated from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that an Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) check on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed that she gained additional income from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as well as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Inc. from 2007 through the present. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said this income was a supplement to the income she received through the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been considered. This case is administratively closed.
1/8/2013	<p>St. Johnsbury and Lyndonville, Vermont received HUD funds to create a revolving loan fund called, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Alleged several of the loan recipients have not made payments for years. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) left his position in July 2010 and took files with him associated with the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	Investigation complete. Case declined prosecution by the USAO.
6/12/2013	Investigation into Single Family FHA fraud in the greater Metropolitan Boston area.	All criminal, civil, and administrative sanctions have been considered - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/23/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Portland Housing Authority (PHA) advised they had terminated an employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for stealing approximately \$10,000 in tenant rent payments. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to HUD-OIG as well as the Portland Police Department.	Investigation completed. Case fully adjudicated and administrative action taken by DEC.
9/19/2013	This investigation was opened as a complaint by former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on 8/20/10 and closed on 12/15/10 due to insufficient information to proceed. Allegations indicate that former NHA employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted fraudulent invoices while employed with the NBHA, totaling \$20,000 in 2009 for reimbursement of education and training. It has been determined by Mass IG that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never attended or received such education trainings and that the invoices were fraudulent. On August 11, 2010 Mass IG and New Bedford PD seized 6 NBHA computers pursuant to a search warrant. New information received by the HUD-OIG from the New Bedford Police Department via the Mass IG require further investigation.	Investigation complete. Judicial and administrative action completed.
6/25/2013	HUD/OIG received a telephone complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that she wanted to report fraud involving a Section 8 recipient that was not reporting her marriage and the income that the husband earned. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes that, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Onset Massachusetts, receives \$1,750 a month in Section 8 benefits from the Hanover Housing Authority (HHA), is not reporting her marriage to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and is not reporting the income that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) earns.	Case is administratively closed as tenant fraud is no longer an OIG investigative priority.
2/20/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have assisted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in obtaining a fraudulent FHA Mortgage, for a property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Agawam, Massachusetts.	Investigation completed. Subject prosecuted in U. S. District Court and sentenced. Referral for administrative sanctions submitted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/28/2013	Anonymous woman called to complain about the Portsmouth NH Housing Authority. She stated that money is being diverted to a special project of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) This money is supposed to be used to house people and instead is going to a special project for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) He is then charging the money as building repairs when there is no building and the voucher program should not have buildings.	Allegation not substantiated. Case is administratively closed.
3/28/2013	Referrals received advising of possible income misrepresentation by FHA borrowers.	Investigation complete, Judicial Actions taken, case is administratively closed.
3/22/2013	Information referred to the HUD-OIG by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Tulsa, OK 74137, Telephone: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) GNND Participant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Waterbury, CT 06710, may not be residing in the GNND property as required by program rules.	All criminal, civil, and admin actions were considered. Criminal declined. SF will attempt to recoup loss from borrower.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/14/2013	<p>MEMORANDUM FOR: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Inspector General for Investigation, 1AGI FROM: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Quality Assurance Division, Philadelphia Homeownership Center, 3AHHQ SUBJECT: Referral for Possible Investigation - QAD File No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA Case Number: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Borrowers: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Property Address: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) East Haven, CT 06512 Sponsor: MetLife Bank, N.A. Lender ID: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>Our office received a self-report from MetLife Bank, N.A. (MB) via HUD's Neighborhood Watch Early Warning System indicating fraudulent actions in connection with the subject loan. Specifically, the closing agent for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) embezzled the funds to payoff the two mortgages being refinanced, which had a combined balance of \$224,223.68. MB stated the closing agent was arrested for embezzlement. Title insurance cannot be issued until lawsuits are resolved. During our monitoring review of MB, we discovered that the pay stubs, W-2s and verbal Verification of Employment (VOE) for the borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), were faxed from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A search of public records revealed this same fax number belongs to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Copies of the relevant documents are attached for your review. We request that you advise this office of any action taken in this matter. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), referring to File No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>The mortgage in question has never been in default since the closing date of September 2008. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>We are closing this file with no further investigative action warranted.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/1/2013	<p>MEMORANDUM FOR: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Inspector General for Investigation, 1AGI FROM: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Quality Assurance Division, Philadelphia Homeownership Center, 3AHHQ SUBJECT: Referral for Possible Investigation - QAD File No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA Case Number: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Borrower: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Property Address: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Stratford, CT 06615 Sponsor: MetLife Bank, N.A. Lender ID: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) During a monitoring review of MetLife Bank, N.A. (MB), we discovered an instance of falsified, conflicting, and/or unverifiable documentation that was used to originate the subject loan. Specifically, the gift funds the borrower received were derived indirectly from the seller of the property. The HUD-1 Settlement Statement (HUD-1), dated September 18, 2009, indicated the borrower needed \$7,808.15 to close the loan. MB obtained a gift letter from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stating that she was giving her friend, the borrower, a gift of \$10,800. A search of public records revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also known as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a person who possibly had an interest in the sale of the property. During the re-verification process, the borrower declared to the HUD monitor that the gift donor was not his friend, and that the funds came from the seller, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The borrower further declared that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) acted as the Loan Officer, handled the loan application, and delivered all the documentation - including the gift letter and pay stubs - to the lender. Copies of the relevant documents are attached for your review. We request that you advise this office of any action taken in this matter. Should you have any questions or wish to discuss this matter further, please contact me at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referring to File No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	Despite the circumstances surrounding the gift, the Department did not suffer financial harm and this appears to be a one-time incident. We are administratively closing the file with no further action contemplated.
3/28/2013	Case referral from the FDA-OCI, regarding a section 8 voucher holder named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Boston, Massachusetts who is allegedly performing unauthorized medical treatments for individuals at their homes with products/medicines unsanctioned by the FDA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may not be claiming any of the income received from these treatments and may also be a business owner without claiming any income to the Boston Housing Authority.	Case declined by USAO. (b)(5) (b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/28/2013	The United States Attorney's Office, Worcester, Massachusetts received a complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Fitchburg, Massachusetts concerning rehabilitation work done on her home using HUD monies. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained a Home Rehabilitation Loan from the City of Fitchburg, Department of Community Development, Division of Housing. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges the rehabilitation work was billed but not completed and the work was substandard. Further, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges there are two other home owners who have been defrauded.	Allegation not substantiated. Case is administratively closed.
6/12/2013	A referral from the HUD-OIG Hotline indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have fraudulently obtained an FHA insured HECM loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly transferred a property to her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and then closed on a HECM loan on the property. The property may have had outstanding tax and sewer liens at the time of closing. Further, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have stolen the proceeds of the mortgage.	No evidence was gathered to indicate the Department will suffer a financial loss due to the alleged crime. We are administratively closing this file with no further investigative action contemplated.
12/17/2012	Referral from (b)(5) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding closing attorney (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Woburn, Massachusetts. An attorney for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been conducting real estate closings and has not been extinguishing existing liens. Final disposition of the payoff funds is unknown. An audit by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed multiple closings with no payoff record, including at least one closing involving an FHA-insured mortgage. Joint investigation initiated with the (b)(5) to identify fraud or transactions that may adversely affect the security of FHA-insured mortgages.	Case completed. All judicial and administrative action completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/31/2013	Department of Labor, OIG referral. Contractor conducting extensive rehabilitation of public housing complexes possibly falsifying records pertaining to disposal of asbestos and hazardous materials, and submitting false claims for payment under ARRA funds.	No evidence was gathered that indicated a Federal crime had been committed against HUD. (b)(5) (b)(5)
7/11/2013	DETAILS OF ALLEGATIONS OR COMPLAINT: The anonymous complainant alleges that landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is committing landlord/tenant fraud. It is alleged that he is residing in the same Section 8 property as tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Complainant also states that the subject continues to receive Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) from HUD.	Evidence reviewed did not corroborate the allegations. No further investigative action is warranted. - (b)(6)
1/8/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had employment income he did not report to the Vermont State Housing Authority.	Investigation complete. Case fully adjudicated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/3/2013	(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)	
2/1/2013	PHOC-QAD forwarded a lender self-report from Metlife Bank, indicating a potential case of property flipping and loan origination fraud.	Subject mortgage has been paid in full. No potential for HUD loss. Case is administratively closed.
7/11/2013	(b)(5) this office is assisting these agencies with their Section 8 fraud investigations. The types of investigations include, but are not limited to, tenant, landlord, public housing employees and homeownership fraud. This will involve multiple tenant fraud investigations that cover various Housing Authorities within NYC. HUD-OIG will investigate these targets together with the above mentioned agencies.	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been resolved and/or considered. - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
9/18/2013	The case is a continuation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for FY11. (b)(5) provided HUD OIG with a spreadsheet containing approximately 12,000 Social Security Numbers of employees of the DOI. The DOI OIG is requesting that HUD OIG run the Social Security Numbers through HUD databases, including (b)(7)(F) to determine whether any of the employees failed to report their incomes to HUD and/or its agent.	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been considered. We are administratively closing this file - (b)(7)(F)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/24/2013	This investigation is being initiated to proactively target officials in the mortgage and banking industry as well as investors, brokers, real estate agents, title company officials, appraisers, closing attorneys and employees and/or owners of these entities. The Mortgage Fraud Task Force, of the Western District of New York, consists of a multi-agency approach to investigating these cases and will continue to focus investigative efforts on loan origination fraud and illegal property flipping in fiscal year 2011. In addition this case will be used to investigate and document HOC QAD referrals and DEC referrals which result in judicial, civil and administrative actions.	All active investigation is complete and actions recorded.
4/9/2013	This case is being opened to track, report, investigative and bring to fruition, multiple non-related Section 8 cases. Arrests, indictments, convictions and letters requesting administrative actions relating to Section 8 fraud by tenants and landlords will be investigated by the reporting agent and reported herein. Those cases that fall below the local judicial threshold will be referred to appropriate agency for administrative action and documented herein.	No pending actions, case was declined
8/27/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track,report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple rental assistance investigations in Rockland County, NY. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals, and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Rockland County housing authorities and/or multi-family rental assistance cases will be investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 and reported herein. The case agent has developed contacts within Rockland County DA's Office to obtain intelligence on subsidy recipients who maybe committing fraud.	This case was reopened to update the judicial disposition of one of the subjects. The case was originally closed in September 2012 - (b)
4/17/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track,report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple non-related rental assistance cases currently being investigated and future investigations. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals,and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Suffolk County housing authorities and or multi-family rental assistance cases investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 will reported herein.	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions have been considered. No further investigative steps are contemplated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/11/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track,report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple non-related rental assistance cases. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals,and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various NYC housing authorities and or multi-family rental assistance cases investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 will be reported herein	See Closed case Checklist and ROI. Pending items to be filed under different Inv. or complaint
5/30/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track,report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple non-related rental assistance cases. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals,and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Suffolk County housing authorities and or multi-family rental assistance cases investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 will be reported herein.	No further investigative activity required. Remaining actions will be tracked under (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) I.
4/11/2013	During a recent QAD review of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) they discovered evidence of false documentation that was used to obtain FHA financing on a number of loans.	Case was declined for prosecution-see ROI
8/27/2013	Received call from (b)(5) requesting assistance regarding HECM loans whose proceeds were being utilized in a fraudulent investment scheme.	No further investigation/involve ment warranted. Subject was sentenced and referrals made to DEC (Declined).

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/12/2013	On February 15, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the NYPD Document Fraud Squad regarding a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Section 8 tenant located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bronx, NY who he believed may be falsely certifying her rental assistance paperwork.	Case is low priority and is stalled in judicial pipeline. Complaint can be opened at a later date to provide additional support to ADA and record R&Ds.
6/3/2013	While visiting the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), we were informed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reside at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bronx, New York 10459, were not claiming their full income. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not claiming her social security benefits and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not claiming his employment income.	Both subjects received Deferred Prosecution, no further actions required
6/20/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track, report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple rental assistance investigations in the Bronx, Queens, Brooklyn and Manhattan, NY. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals, and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Bronx, Queens and Manhattan housing authorities and/or multi-family rental assistance cases will be investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 and reported herein. The case agent has developed contacts within NYPD to obtain intelligence on subsidy recipients who maybe committing fraud.	No additional investigation warranted. All actions against subjects have been added with the exception of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sentencing scheduled for April 2018.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/12/2013	In February, March and April of 2011, several rental checks and money orders were stolen out of a lock box inside the Yonkers Municipal Housing Authority (YMHA). HUD-OIG traced several of these money orders from Western Union, USPS and Ria to see where they were cashed. All the money orders had a signature on the back which read (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and were deposited into JP Morgan Chase Bank. YMHA housing records revealed that there was an applicant for section 8 housing for a woman named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A check with JP Morgan Chase bank showed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had an account there and the money ordres were deposited into her checking account. A GJ subpoena was issued from the Yonkers Criminal Court for all Chase records relating to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	All criminal, civil, and administrative actions were considered. No further investigative steps are warranted. - 4-12-13 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
4/11/2013	Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track,report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple non-related rental assistance cases. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals,and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various New York State housing authorities and or multi-family rental assistance cases investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2011 will be reported herein.	Any remaining stats/admin will be recorded under different case or complaint as needed
4/25/2013	New York State (NYS) Office of the Welfare Inspector General (OWIG) was conducting an investigation on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During the course of their investigation, it was noted that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be committing Section 8 Fraud by not reporting her full income.	Investigation is complete with all actions addressed

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/17/2012	The USAO - SDNY began a proactive civil investigation into alleged underwriting deficiencies of this mortgagee's loan modification practices. They have requested the HUD-OIG's assistance in developing this case.	USAO SDNY has not requested the assistance of the HUD OIG in over 16 months. The HUD OIG will administratively close this matter and will reassess this decision when and if the USAO SDNY contacts the HUD OIG.
3/22/2013	The USAO - SDNY began a proactive civil investigation into alleged underwriting deficiencies of this mortgagee's loan modification practices. They have requested the HUD-OIG's assistance in developing this case.	USAO Civil Division declined due to previously filed Consent Judgment which released Bank of America from further litigation concerning all FHA-insured loans originated after April 2011.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/11/2013	The United States Attorney's Office (USAO) - Southern District of New York (SDNY) began a proactive civil investigation into alleged underwriting deficiencies of this mortgagee's loan modification practices. USAO/SDNY have requested HUD/OIG's assistance in developing this case.	Bankruptcy has stalled settlement negotiations indefinitely. Case can be re-opened if civil settlement becomes a viable option in the future.
10/2/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that SDNY requested assistance on a mortgage fraud initiative that involved Direct Endorsement Lenders. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that the case is based upon looking for potential underwriting problems.	Due primarily to venue issues, the USAO SDNY has agreed to transfer the criminal and civil investigation to the Southern District of Texas. All relevant investigative materials were transferred to Region VI HUD OIG.
6/13/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that SDNY , Civil Division has started a mortgage fraud initiative which includes the subject bank. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that this case was started as a proactive inquiry into potential problems with the underwriting of certain loans.	Case has been dormant with no investigative or prosecutorial action due to other priorities of AUSA.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/15/2013	The USAO-SDNY began a proactive civil investigation into alleged underwriting deficiencies of this mortgagee's loan modification practices. They have requested the HUD-OIG's assistance in developing this case.	This office's assistance no longer requested or needed by prosecution
4/17/2013	On 5/26/2011 Kings County District Attorney's Office referred a complaint to this investigator that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be the victim of identity theft and mortgage fraud.	This case is not being investigated further. Any remaining admin. actions will be input under a new complaint or reopened case.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/22/2013	Case initiated to identify and locate fugitive sex offenders residing in HUD-subsidized housing with the United States Marshals Service (USMS).	Investigation completed. Subject charged and fully adjudicated. Case being administratively closed.
6/19/2013	The Boston HUD Office of Public Housing received a letter from a Medford Housing Authority (MHA) employee, alleging there was misappropriation of MHA funds and alleged procurement fraud regarding contracts, supplies, insurance, and other services utilized by the MHA. These allegations were originally referred to HUD/OIG Audit; however, new information has been developed and HUD/OIG Investigations will be also investigating the allegations.	Investigation completed. Criminal prosecution declined by USAO. State civil action completed. Subject referred for administrative action by DEC.
5/8/2013	HUD HOC QAD referred the following: Webster Bank (WB) reported the 74 loans listed in Exhibit 1 through the Neighborhood Watch Lender Reporting System due to its Financial Intelligence Unit's discovery of falsified certifications on the loan applications.	In light of the criminal declination and administrative settlement with the MRB, no further investigative action is warranted (b)(1)
6/25/2013	A Qui Tam was filed in the USDC for MA in which allegations of contact fraud within the HUD REO program were set forth, USAO forwarded a copy of the Qui Tam to SAC 1AGI for investigation.	USAO declined to intervene in matter.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/25/2013	Colchester Police Department, Colchester, Vermont alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) embezzled over \$500,000 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) over the last three years. Included in these funds were Housing Choice Voucher Program Funds from the Burlington Housing Authority (BHA). Numerous individuals are identified who have involvement in the conspiracy to include (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who may have fraudulently received Section 8 assistance.	Investigation completed with judicial action.
6/20/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the former Somersworth NH Housing Authority (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly stole over \$200,000. from the Somersworth NH Housing Authority. At this time, it is not sure if the stolen money has a federal identity. However, there are indications that others within the Housing Authority may have been involved, and there are indications that other funds, possibly federal, were stolen. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was confronted about the theft on December 6th, 2011. She subsequently overdosed on medications and passed away. However, Somersworth Police Department has requested HUD OIG assistance to determine if others were involved and to determine if the theft was more wide spread.	Investigation complete. Administrative action taken. Matter referred to program for review.
9/17/2013	On February 6, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with PHA Section 8 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and PHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Allegations indicate that Section 8 Landlords (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) defrauded the PHA by renting their section 8 unit to their (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the last ten years when Section 8 units could not be rented to immediate family members. Throughout the years both landlord and tenant have signed forms stating they were not immediate family members. The loss to the PHA is \$89,854.	Case declined by USAO.
6/19/2013	The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Providence Housing Authority has filed a complaint with state and federal authorities against the agency's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging "serious misconduct, fraud and perhaps criminal activity" at the agency. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has engaged in favoritism in hiring and promotions, and that he and favored staffers frequently take long lunches on government time. She also accuses (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of sexual harassment.	Investigation completed. Criminal prosecution declined. Administrative action taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/24/2013	<p>HUD's Office of Regional Counsel, Boston, Massachusetts referred a potential Section 8 program fraud in Hartford, CT. The complaint was initially sent to the U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Connecticut who is considering the matter as a potential Qui Tam case. Counsel representing the Connecticut Fair Housing Center are alleging at least two Section 8 landlords in the Hartford, CT area are overcharging section 8 tenant rent. The complaint also alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the Section 8 contract administrator may be complicit in the fraud.</p>	<p>The Office of Audit, CFD, no longer requires the assistance of OI in this Qui Tam matter. Therefore, we are administratively closing our file with no further investigative action contemplated. (b)</p>
5/31/2013	<p>A referral from the Office of Audit, Boston, Massachusetts indicates members of the Stamford Housing Authority and its' instrumentality may have had a collusive arrangement to limit competition and to award financial accounting services and financial services contracts to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Further, the housing authority may have had similar arrangements with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Finally, housing authority staff may have received improper payments for appointments to boards on non-profit entities organized under the housing authority.</p>	<p>All logical leads have been followed and no evidence of criminal activity can be found. No further investigative steps are warranted (b)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/27/2013	<p>On May 16, 2012, Police Officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Worcester Police Department assigned to the Drug Enforcement Administration, High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Task Force (HIDTA), Worcester, Massachusetts called (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to inquire about several persons believed to be recipients of HUD housing subsidies. Officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained he is conducting a drug trafficking and money laundering investigation in which he has identified several persons involved as possible HUD assisted tenants. He further explained these persons are involved in the money laundering scheme and that they may not be accurately reporting their income to HUD. Officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) identified the persons as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided additional identifying information on each of the persons. Officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested HUD OIG assistance in identify each of the person's reported income by source, application information from tenant files, and any reported financial accounts.</p>	<p>Investigation is being administratively closed (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>
3/21/2013	<p>A referral from the HUD-OIG Hotline indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Lynn Housing Authority Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant, may be renting form a family member without having obtained the required approval from the housing authority/HUD. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) rents a unit located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Lynn, MA from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Further, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be working for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and not reporting the income. A principal of the trust is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is reportedly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A check of public records revealed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in the City of Lynn, MA.</p>	<p>Allegations are unsubstantiated. Case is administratively closed.</p>
7/2/2013	<p>HUD Office of Community Planning and Development (CPD) advised HUD-OIG of possible fraud involving the CDBG loan program in the City of Gloucester. Specifically, CPD Program staff questioned the bid procedures and costs associated with CDBG housing rehabilitation projects within the City of Gloucester.</p>	<p>Case declined by USAO.</p>
9/9/2013	<p>Referral from (b)(5) Complaints received regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) charged large fees for loan modification and foreclosure prevention and did not provide any service. Complaint opened to conduct a preliminary investigation and identify any impact to FHA insurance.</p>	<p>Closed based on declination by USAO due to statute problems.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/29/2013	HUD MF staff reported that Section 236 project in Springfield, Massachusetts entered into contracts for rehab with consultant and Architect without approval from HUD. The Architecture and Engineering (A&E) contract was awarded to an unknown party whose bid was substantially higher than the competing bidder.	Entity being closely supervised by HUD Program Staff. No indication of criminal activity.
9/17/2013	<p>The Chelmsford Housing Authority reported the following allegation of Section 8 tenant fraud against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is allegedly married to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and they reside together at the same Section 8 apartment even though (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not on the lease (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) hit the Mass lottery three years ago and won \$250,000. With this money, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) opened a solon in downtown Lowell. The business is an ongoing operation, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) works there on a regular basis. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has several unreported bank accounts, and one of them shows consistent large deposits. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reports her monthly income as approximately \$800 worth of SSDI. However, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) credit report shows that she regularly spends approximately \$1,500 a month on her credit cards, and she pays off this balance on a regular basis. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly gave (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a 2001 Landrover SUV that she never reported.</p>	Case does not meet prosecution threshold. Subject removed from housing program.
4/8/2013	This investigation serves to target Section 8 and Public Housing tenant and landlord fraud in the Western NY area to include, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, etc...	Case was reopened only to input stats.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/12/2012	<p>Numerous rental assistance cases are developed and worked throughout the year by the reporting agent. To be more efficient, this case is being opened to track, report, investigate and bring to fruition, multiple rental assistance investigations in the Metro New York City Area. Arrests, indictments, convictions, evictions/removals, and letters requesting administrative actions relating to the various Metro New York City Area housing authorities and/or multi-family rental assistance cases will be investigated by the reporting agent for FY 2012 and reported herein. The case agent has developed contacts within (b)(5) to obtain intelligence on subsidy recipients who maybe committing fraud.</p>	<p>With the departure of the case agent from the HUD OIG, we are administratively closing this matter, in favor of the continued investigation of credit card fraud and drug trafficking that is being conducted by the (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/12/2013	Bank of America self reported that after conducting a review of their loans, it appears that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), never paid off the existing mortgages on the loan, falsified the closing documents and that other suspects were identified in connection with the alleged fraud (please see QAD referral).	Main subject was already under investigation/indictment with local prosecutor for suspected fraud concerning the FHA property addressed in the QAD referral. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is no longer doing business with HUD. Other suspect and others are working at different mtg company (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and are being investigated by another S/A.
3/25/2013	Referral received from Office of Audit regarding possible bid rigging by an identity of interest company to the Management Agent.	Allegations in this matter were not substantiated, no other findings merited.
3/11/2013	The reporting agent received information during an interview on case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), that the Bethel CDC used first time proceed funds for two homeowners who were over the income limits.	No criminal or PFCRA case. Determination for administrative action to be bade by local CPD.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/24/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted the reporting agent and advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received CPD ARRA funds for a water park that was never built. Further, a source contacted him and claimed the owners of the property were providing food and beverages to the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in exchange for the \$100,000 in HUD funding.	This case is being merged into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Dunkirk CDBG.
8/1/2013	8-7-2012, Emailed Hotline to SAC 08-06-2012, Emailed 2AGI SAC for interest. SAC replied that Complaint will be opened. In addition to various maintenance issues, the Anon complainant alleges that the subject (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is selling HUD apartments at \$6,000 to \$8,000 each; that he is charging HUD for empty apartments; that management is aware of all this activity but does nothing; and that tenants are afraid to speak out of fear of being kicked out. HUD Assisted Housing name: New Hope Baptist II, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Allegations could not be substantiated
3/5/2013	The office received an anonymous complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (Region 3) alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is a HUD employee, may have used his position to circumvent rules and regulations to purchase an REO property. The complainant had placed a bid for a house he/she wanted to purchase in Ashville, New York. The complainant was informed by a real estate agent that no one else had placed a bid on the house. However, on the last day, 2 other bids were put in for the same house. The property was eventually purchased by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The property is located on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Ashville, New York.	Investigation did not uncover any evidence of wrongdoing by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/19/2013	<p>On 8/21/2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) or Hoboken Housing Authority, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in regards to public corruption allegations. The meeting was held at the Port Authority, Inspector General's Office, 5 Marine View Plaza, Hoboken, NJ. During the meeting (b)(6);(b) alleged he is experiencing political pressure from members of the housing commissioning board as well as from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Superficially he alleges, he is feeling pressured to hire specific Attorneys to counsel the Housing Authority, even though (b)(6);(b) feels the specific attorney he is being told to hire is not as qualified as the other candidates. (b)(6);(b) feels like the chairman of the Board of Commissioners, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has political agendas that are getting in the way of following the proper protocols. (b)(6);(b) feels as though if he does not go along with (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wishes he may be retaliated against. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>	The allegations could not be substantiated. Should additional information be developed, the case will be reopened
5/8/2013	This case is being opened to address PRCRA complaint. It replaces (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that was initially closed due to USAO declination.	PFCRA action completed. Case is administratively closed.
6/12/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD PIH, Boston hub, reported to OIG/OI that PIH managers suspected that a HUD PIH employee was leaking information about a pending housing authority investigation to the media, in violation of HUD policy and possibly in an attempt to undermine an ongoing criminal investigation.	No evidence of wrongdoing was discovered (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
3/28/2013	This case is being opened to capture results of the civil case against Coventry Health Center, et al resulting from two previously closed criminal cases, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	All civil actions entered. Investigation complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/14/2013	Former vendor for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) filed mechanics liens against property owned by the City of New Haven, Connecticut. The former vendor reported non-payment of vendors and fraud by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in the award of Section 3 contracts.	No evidence was gathered to indicate that a Federal crime had been committed.
6/19/2013	<p>The complaint names as defendants the following entities: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>alleges misconduct by a group of purportedly affiliated defendants involved in the servicing of residential mortgage loans—such as failing to follow industry practices, charging excessive fees, and intentionally delaying the sale of distressed properties to increase those fees—which results in decreased returns to investors of residential mortgaged-backed securitizations (“RMBS”) that contain loans serviced by the defendants. According to the relators, the defendants act in various capacities of the servicing process for RMBS purchased by the government—including the Federal Housing Finance Agency (through Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac), the Department of Treasury (through the Troubled Asset Relief Program and the Home Affordable Modification Program), and the Federal Reserve Bank (through the Maiden Lane investment portfolios used by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York)—and, as a result of defendants’ misconduct, the government has (and continues to be) financially harmed by receiving diminished returns on its investments.</p>	Case converted from a complaint. There is no HUD nexus. Case was not intended to be opened.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/20/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Atlantic City, NJ, 08401, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Atlantic City, NJ, 08401, met with this reporting agent to advise that the management company of their building, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Great Neck, NY 11023, were using the SSN's of deceased people to generate Section 8 checks. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was also using the SSN's of people who moved out of the building to still generate checks. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided the names of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as deceased tenants who (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were still generating Section 8 checks for. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided the names of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who had moved out but (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were still generating Section 8 checks for. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated he had a tenant roster that included more names and would locate for investigative agents. Further investigation revealed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was deceased and that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were currently residing elsewhere. Records indicated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a former tenant of the building but no death records could be found.</p> <p>(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	Allegations could not be substantiated.
8/21/2013	This proactive complaint is being opened to document work in identifying suspicious activity within six specific PHA's. These New York PHA's include Tuckahoe, Mount Kisco, Ramapo, New Rochelle, and Poughkeepsie housing authorities. This proactive search is at the request of HUD OIG New York.	Case was not intended to be opened as an investigation.
9/23/2013	<p>On October 17, 2012, HUD-OIG met with the (b)(5) to discuss alleged fraud against the Greater Englewood Housing Corporation. Forensic accountants have found approximately \$500,000- 1 million dollars of HUD multifamily funds have allegedly been misused and taken illegally via payments to fake vendors and principals. Subjects, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have allegedly been misusing and stealing governments funds as employees of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	Allegations not substantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/20/2013	<p>On September 14, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Community and Economic Development Division, City of Atlantic City, NJ, provided information to (b)(5) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that there may be a possible bid-rigging and related fraud occurring between several individuals associated with CDBG and several contractors seeking contracts to perform home rehabilitation services on behalf of CDBG. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and general contracting companies (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be structuring bids in a way that suggests collusion. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated while there are numerous contractors on the approved bidder list, the aforementioned contractors receive nearly all of the awarded contracts. The contractors are further abusing the system by submitting excessive change orders once contracts are awarded. Another contractor who was recently awarded contracts by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the subject of a joint investigation with the (b)(5). This information was received by this office on or about September 15, 2011, during an investigation of the Atlantic City Housing Authority (ACHA) under case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Due to the lack of evidence involving criminal activity in the ACHA and that there was not going to be a parallel investigation of CDBG, it was determined our office would close out the investigation of the ACHA and open up a complaint on the CDBG in Atlantic City on 2/2/2012. Recent information indicated there is approximately \$617,000 that can't be accounted for from the CDBG program. There is indication that the money was taken from CDBG to fund another program within Atlantic City and then to be returned at a later time. The CFO of Atlantic City isn't able to track and locate the money.</p>	Allegations not substantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/31/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Carbondale Housing Authority, Carbondale, PA, contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding several landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher Program who are alleged to be soliciting side payments from tenants.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All allegations unable to be substantiated due to lack of victims/witnesses.</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) Matter referred back to local HA for administrative action against landlord. HUD program officials notified.</p>
12/26/2012	<p>A complaint generated by the Hotline suggests that Luzerne County Housing Choice Voucher participant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently residing in her subsidized residence although (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not on the lease. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently employed as a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It is further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Luzerne County Housing Authority employee, knows that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is residing with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete, and allegations could not be substantiated. However, subject voluntarily removed herself from the Section 8 program, which will preclude further harm to HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/2/2013	<p>On Thursday, March 15, 2012, Chester County Housing Authority (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) e-mailed a complaint to HUD OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complaint alleges that Section 8 HCVP landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forged Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) name on a Chester County Housing Authority utility check after (b)(6); moved out of her Section 8 residence.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegation substantiated. Subject pled guilty to lesser charge, made restitution and paid fine. HUD program personnel notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/22/2012	<p>On November 176h, 2011 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During the course of the meeting a discussion was held regarding interthinx's ranking of zip code 19149 in Philadelphia as the #2 ranked zip code for Mortgage Fraud Risk per (b)(7)(F).</p>	<p>Mortgage fraud risk identified in (b)(7)(E) report unsubstantiated after review of FHA-insured loans in this zip code area. Of 130 FHA loans identified, 13 in claim status plus a sample of 25 in default were reviewed, and no common denominators or fraud indicators were found. Most borrowers were young or elderly, or first-time homebuyers. Probability that #2 fraud risk rating was based on conventional mortgage loan products and not FHA-insured loans.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/21/2012	<p>Numerous leads provided by state/local law enforcement officials, prosecutors, and housing authorities suggest the need for investigation of fraud against PIH programs by tenants/applicants and participating landlords.</p>	<p>HUD OIG assistance and investigation complete. Prosecution declined in lieu of cooperation by subject in murder/kidnapping prosecution. No notification to program personnel.</p>
8/7/2013	<p>On December 15, 2011, the reporting agent received documentation, via U.S. mail, from the United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Pennsylvania, relevant to a qui tam civil action filed under seal in United States District Court, Western District of Pennsylvania by plaintiff (b)(6);(b)(7) against defendant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7) as a Housing Choice Voucher holder through the Allegheny County Housing Authority (ACHA) was required to pay (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an amount in excess of what the HACP HAP contract specified. According to the civil complaint, (b)(6);(b)(7) was required to pay amounts in excess of what the HAP contract specified would be (b)(6);(b)(7) portion of the rent each month. Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that a complaint matter be initiated and that a case number be assigned in (b)(7)(E).</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. USAO will not intervene in this matter on behalf of the relator. No notifications due to grand jury seal.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/5/2013	<p>Citimortgage reported finding from a quality control review. The mortgage was originated by Capital Financial Mortgage and sponsored by Real Esta Mortgage Network. The review found that the real estate transaction documentation may be fraudulent as it does not disclose identity of interests between the parties to this transaction. Per the representative of the buyers: It has been alleged that the sellers fraudulently sold the property to the borrowers under the pretense that they were going to get an \$8,000 dollar tax credit. The sellers, who are the buyer's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never delivered any of the mortgage docs to the borrowers. Additionally, it has been alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the broker who aided and abetted the transaction. Currently the mortgage is in foreclosure.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Identity of interests violation substantiated. Occupancy issue unresolved. Program personnel notified. Prosecution not sought, due to guidelines.</p>
9/3/2013	<p>On January 25th, 2012, Philadelphia Housing Authority (PHA) Office of Inspector General employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) phoned (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During the course of the phone call, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has alleged to him that a PHA Inspector, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who works out of the PHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6) has solicited cash bribes from him on two occasions and a gift card on another occasion. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has indicated that (b)(6);(C) told him that (b)(6);(C) is now soliciting another bribe. The alleged purpose for the bribes is for (b)(6);(C) to pass (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for an HQS inspection.</p>	<p>All criminal and administrative actions investigated. Criminal prosecution was declined and no DEC referral warranted.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/20/2012	This matter is being re-opened to record the results of a 2008 investigation which was closed due to inactivity by the United States Attorney's Office. In 2011 the matter was reassigned to the current prosecutor with Grand Jury proceedings and indictment following. Predicated on a referral from USDA-OIG and VA-OIG, the matter concerns fraud by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) across numerous Federal benefits programs, including theft of VA and OPM annuity payments, fraud against the SSA Title II benefits program, and fraud against the HUD HCVP (by means of failing to report the receipt of stolen or converted VA and OPM annuity payments.) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) converted the annuity payments by failing to report the death of her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the intended recipient, in the late 1980s and using the payment for her own purposes.	HUD OIG investigation complete. Subject adjudicated. HUD program personnel notified. DEC declined due to end-user of services status (did not meet their criteria).
8/5/2013	Unites States Attorney's Office for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted the reporting agent and requested HUD-OIG look into a former Chester County Housing Authority (CCHA) tenant named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for alleged fraud involving the non-reporting of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in her subsidized household and their household income.	Case declined by SAUSA at USAO
7/22/2013	QAD Denver reports that borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) apparently misrepresented her employment when closing on FHA Loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A QC review revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had left her employment voluntarily on 2/28/2011, when the loan closed on 3/16/2011. However, someone at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (employer), possibly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), verified (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employment at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on 3/9/2011. Loan is in default, and QAD is moving to indemnify loan with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Property is also possibly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and is a detached dwelling on the land: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Wexford, PA	HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegations substantiated. Prosecution declined. Program personnel notified.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/29/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] Wilmington, Delaware (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] reported the following to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] agreed to purchase (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted], New Castle, Delaware (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] as an owner occupant. However, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] resides at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] Hockessin, Delaware (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] resides at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] New Castle, Delaware. In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] is listed as a co-owner with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] on five other properties located in Hockessin, Delaware.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegations substantiated, but no prosecutorial merit. Program personnel notified for administrative action.</p>
7/5/2013	<p>A self report by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] during loan audit review, the loan was originated by All Homes Financial. A Review of the loan by QAD process & underwriting discovered the borrower's home business had closed prior to the acquiring the loan. In addition the lender failed to obtain the most recent tax returns qualifying income.</p>	<p>Single loan with no loss to HUD and no evidence of a larger mortgage fraud scheme.</p>
9/12/2013	<p>HUD-OIG received a referral from HUD Single Family that an FHA insured property (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] Richmond, Virginia) that was in foreclosure was listed on HOTPADS.com as being available for rent. HUD-OIG obtained an email from the individual purporting to be renting the property out. The email is from "(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted]" and contains the following quote: "We wanted to Sell but with the Advice of my (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] we decided to Rent and we are looking for a God fearing family that could take our home as their own." Also included in this email is that the monthly rent is \$1,100 with an \$800 security deposit. HUD-OIG determined that the previous owner of this property was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] and that the property is vacant. HUD-OIG will attempt to determine who was offering this property for rent, whether they are doing this with other properties and whether any victims paid a security deposit \ first month's rent as part of this scam.</p>	<p>No further investigative action will be conducted. NO evidence was found that of a dollar loss and the perpetrator was not able to be identified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/28/2013	<p>HUD Hotline received a anonymous complaint regarding possible wrongdoing on the part of a high ranking official of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City. It appears that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), had thousands of dollars, or perhaps tens of thousands dollars' worth of work performed at her personal residence by employees of the Housing Authority of Baltimore City construction division, which is called HABCO. There appears also to have been favoritism given the (b)(6); regarding the price of the work, as well as the use of at least one outside contractor who has an on-going contractual relationship with the Housing Authority, to do additional work on her property.</p>	<p>This matter was addressed as a complaint. Administrative sanctions have been taken and no action was taken after this matter was converted to an investigation.</p>
9/12/2013	<p>HUD program staff received a referral that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) resident of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Richmond, Virginia, has been subletting her HUD subsidized unit out for \$500 per month for the past several years.</p>	<p>Referred for removal from program. No further action will be taken.</p>
9/4/2013	<p>The subject case was self-reported through Neighborhood Watch's Lender Reporting System by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) due to its discovery through online research that the borrower was the owner, rather than an employee, of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), the current employer reflected on the Verifications of Employment (VOE). The file contained 2011 and 2010 IRS Transcripts that indicated the borrower reported wages in 2011 and Schedule C income in 2010 when he was an independent contractor. The loan closed on July 25, 2012, and the most recent pay stubs indicated he earned an hourly wage.</p>	<p>No investigative action needed, single loan that is still active. No loss to HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/11/2012	Information provided by Bucks County Housing Authority (BCHA) officials suggested that HCVP tenants (b)(6);(b) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had unlawfully permitted a registered sex offender to reside in their assisted unit, and had fraudulently concealed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) under the table income from HCVP officials.	Sex offender resided in property May to September 2010. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) removed from program, and ordered to pay restitution of \$5200. Both under supervision for 12 months as part of Pre-Trial Diversion. Prosecuted by Bucks County D.A. Program Director notified.
11/2/2012	It is alleged that a loan officer with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) intentionally falsified information on the Uniform Residential Loan Application (URLA) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in order to qualify them for an FHA mortgage. According to the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), their assets and income were inflated. Also, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) mortgage said that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were paying off certain debt in order to lower their debt-to-income (DTI) ratio to qualify for the loan. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never had any intentions of paying off any other debt.	The loan was never approved.
12/31/2012	It is alleged by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that the purported lender on the mortgage note was not the actual lender, but was only the mortgage broker. The FHA loan originator was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the FHA Lender was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). According to (b)(6); she made her payment to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) but the note filed says the lender is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). FHA loan # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	No current loss to HUD and lack of prosecutorial merit.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/6/2012	<p>Information supplied from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Civil Division, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have obtained Project Rental Assistance Contract (PRAC) payments to which they were not entitled. After (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) took over Elders I and Elders II in August 2011, the payments were to switch from PRAC to vouchers. PRAC payments continued to be made to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while someone at either the management company or (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had access to HUD's (b)(7)(E) system. The AUSA wants certain leads followed to see what happened and to determine if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) returned the PRAC payments tp HUD.</p>	Case has been brought to a logical conclusion
12/26/2012	<p>On May 11, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Elmer, New Jersey, reported that he had conducted a home inspection on January 15, 2012, for FHA insured borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) home inspection found numerous deficiencies related to electrical and heating systems had not been addressed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) original home inspector nor by the FHA appraiser prior to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) going to settlement in November 2010. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) January 15, 2012 home inspection report noted standing water and wires and duct work in the crawl space; outlets not grounded; no attic access; no heat on the 2nd floor; corroded supply and drain lines; improperly installed chimney flashing; rear gutter tucked into the kitchen; front door not installed properly and exposed wires in the attic. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) identified (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as the home inspector and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as the FHA appraiser responsible for inspecting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) prior to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) settlement on the home in November 2010.</p>	<p>Allegations unsubstantiated. Home inspections and appraisals are not the same, and don't have the same requirements. FHA has no jurisdiction over home inspections or inspectors, only FHA-approved appraisers. HUD's review found no evidence of wrongdoing or negligence on the part of the appraiser or the lender. Program staff notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Camden Housing Authority, regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a public housing tenant, admitted to Camden Police that she sublet her public housing unit to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subsequent to a search warrant executed on her unit by the Violent Crime Task Force. During the search warrant five handguns and four ounces of crack cocaine were confiscated. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted to police that she was residing in another subsidized unit with the father of her children located on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Camden. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) statement was tape-recorded by the Camden Police.	HUD OIG investigation complete. Subject adjudicated and program personnel notified of outcome. All administrative forms completed.
8/20/2013	On May 30, 2012, the reporting agent was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh (HACP), wherein (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested that the reporting agent attend a meeting at the HACP offices on May 31, 2012 regarding an allegation of fraud. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), has publicly alleged to the media that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to the HACP, has engaged in the submission of fraudulent activity reports to the HACP. On May 31, 2012, the reporting agent attended the aforementioned meeting at the HACP. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged during the meeting that he was aware of circumstances in which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) appear to have been manipulated by other employees of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that he electronically copied the suspect reports prior to his termination and will make them available. Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that a complaint matter be initiated and assigned to the reporting agent.	HUD OIG investigation suspended, due to declination by USAO in the Western District of PA, based (b)(6);(b)(7)(C);(b)(7)(E) others. HUD program personnel notified.
12/31/2012	An anonymous complaint received by HUD-OIG's Hotline alleges (b)(7)(C) and (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) Diplomats from the Bolivian Consulate, have falsified documentation to obtain a FHA insured mortgage.	No loss to HUD.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/22/2013	Headquarters advised that (b)(1) had sent an ASI concerning an investigation they opened into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Inc. related to allegations of ARRA grant fraud perpetrated by the board members of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The Philadelphia IG's office conducted a preliminary investigation and referred their findings to (b)(5) Philadelphia. There was some media coverage about the fraud, including allegations of credit card use of grant funds for travel and leisure. HUD OIG will work case jointly with (b)(5)	HUD OIG investigation administratively closed, due to unwillingness on (b)(5) agent's part to allow participation of HUD OIG agent in ongoing (b)(1) and city IG investigation.
6/5/2013	QAD reports that lender Wells Fargo, during a quality control review, discovered that the underwriter of this FHA-insured mortgage failed to adequately verify borrower's income and employment, and/or identity and Social Security number. The preliminary review appears to confirm the fraud indicators, two subjects share the same Social Security number, and the employer is listed as two different names, one of which is the same as the borrower. The loan went into default in 3 months. Borrower also failed to complete the HUD/FHA certification in loan documents. FHA # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for property address of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), South Williamsport, PA 17702	HUD OIG investigation complete. Loan officer declined to be interviewed. Does not meet prosecution guidelines, so referred back to program officials. Loan delinquent.
7/31/2013	CitiMortgage Inc. reported findings from a review of the subject loan originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and sponsored by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) review identified the borrower misrepresented occupancy of the property to obtain a loan modification of her defaulted mortgage. The subject loan was underwritten and closed as an owner-occupied transaction.	No further investigative action warranted. Single borrower with minimal loss to government (less than \$1,000)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	<p>QAD reports that a loan review showed income and IRS statement discrepancies involving borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7) purchased a property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Ventnor City, NJ, with a gift down payment from his father of the same name. The lender, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), is a broker for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the Appraiser. The sellers are identified as (b)(6);(b) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It appears (b)(6);(b)(7) defaulted immediately and has made no payments on the loan since origination, allegedly due to unemployment. (b)(6);(b)(7) was self-employed at the time of the loan origination. QAD is pursuing a lifetime indemnification against the lender. The broker is inactive with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and is on extended watch.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. (b)(6);(b)(7) never occupied the property, which is a rental. Unable to locate and interview (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Loan indemnified. QAD notified.</p>
7/23/2013	<p>Information received from the United States Attorney's Office, Camden, NJ suggests that Atlantic City Housing Authority (ACHA) HCVP participant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fraudulently concealed her receipt of FEMA disaster assistance and her extensive criminal history from the ACHA in her initial application for HCVP assistance.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Program personnel notified. First Sandy funding disaster assistance fraud case prosecution and conviction in region.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/7/2013	<p>HUD Regional Administrator referred a letter to HUD OIG which alleged that Wilmington, Delaware councilmember (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has engaged in conflicts of interest related to her serving as the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Housing and License and Inspection Committee while simultaneously working full-time with CDBG and NSP grant funds recipients (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p> <p>Complainant alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has also violated the Federal Campaign Act. (b)(5) is aware of the allegations.</p>	<p>Allegations not proven.</p> <p>Determination ruling made by local legal counsel. No Hatch Act violation. Program officials notified.</p> <p>HUD OIG investigation complete.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/24/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of SF referred an alleged non-occupancy by FHA borrower fraud to HUD OIG involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Newark, DE. Apparently, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bought the property from his (b)(6); lender to preclude foreclosure, and stated he intended to occupy the residence with his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bought the property for a significant amount more than the foreclosure price. The review revealed that (b)(6); did not move in to the residence, but maintained his own residence of 30-plus years. The loan is again in default.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegations substantiated, and prosecution accepted. However, HUD indemnified the loan with the servicing lender without notifying HUD OIG, even though several meetings and notifications were made about the investigation and pending prosecutorial action. Since there will ultimately be no loss to HUD or the government, the AUSA reversed their decision, and has declined prosecution.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/7/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Williamson, WV reported that during an ongoing investigation his office is conducting of Mingo County (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), he was made aware of allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a Section 8 landlord, was receiving HAP payments when the tenant was not occupying the residence. The tenant was allegedly signing false certification documents (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wife brought to her place of employment at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is affiliated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as of January 2012.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Unable to substantiate allegations.</p>
7/26/2013	<p>QAD reports that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) conducted a quality control review and determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owned another property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Phila PA, which he failed to disclose when he applied for FHA Loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Phila PA. QAD also reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to obtain documentation of a gift transfer from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for \$7500 in connection with the purchase of the home. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) works at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in their Credit and Collection Department.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegation substantiated, but does not meet prosecutorial guidelines/thresholds. Referred to program officials for follow-up.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/27/2013	QAD reports that lender (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), reported that FHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) borrowers (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Toms River, NJ 08757, appeared to have submitted false pay stubs in connection with an application for hardship assistance under the Making Home Affordable Program.	HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegations substantiated, but no loss to HUD or the USG, so prosecution declined. Borrowers "attempted" to obtain HAMP, but were denied, based on suspicious documents. HUD program officials notified.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/7/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been involved in multi-family loan equity skimming, misappropriation or misapplication of funds, and/or other fraudulent activities involving a FHA flexible mortgage subsidy loan for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). There may also be IRS issues with the various entities created and operated by (b)(6);(C) and a shell game/Ponzi scheme.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation unnecessary, as prosecution is not viable, as subject has no assets and is in his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Subject also has large civil judgment against him. Subject previously investigated and HUD elected to pursue administrative remedies in lieu of criminal prosecution for same acts alleged in this complaint.</p>
3/26/2013	<p>QAD reports that a lender quality control review conducted by JP Morgan Chase NA found what appeared to be false employment documents submitted by borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in connection with FHA loan # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Phila, PA 19151. These findings came up during loss mitigation efforts, when the lender requested IRS transcripts. The VOE was verbal at the time of loan origination.</p>	<p>Subject is already being investigated and charged under an open, ongoing investigation, so should have been closed prior to conversion. QAD notified. No (b)(5) (b)(5) required.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/27/2013	This initiative case is a joint effort with the, HUD-OIG, Allegheny County Housing Authority Police and other law enforcement agencies. These investigations will primarily focus on subjects that defraud the Housing Authority and HUD.	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All subjects adjudicated who had been charged and were pending plea or trial</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) Program personnel notified.</p>
6/28/2013	<p>This initiative will investigate allegations of rental assistance fraud reported to HUD-OIG by the Baltimore County Housing Office (BCHO), in Baltimore County, Maryland. All substantiated allegations will be referred to the BCHO for tenant removal from the Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP). Substantiated allegations will also be referred to state and federal prosecutors for criminal prosecution. This initiative will</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) in the Baltimore County area.</p>	<p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/12/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that a property was purchased in the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A review of FHA records revealed that the property in question was purchased on October 2, 2008 and is located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Colonial Heights, Virginia 23834. The original mortgage amount was \$337,386. This property was foreclosed upon in March 2011. The confidential source alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had previously purchased a home for his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) "while she cleaned up her credit." It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sign a Power of Attorney to sell this previous property. It is further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used this Power of Attorney to purchase the property located at (b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It was reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) denied having any knowledge of (b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purchasing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was purchased through a loan obtained from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Employees of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have been and continue to be targets in several HUD-OIG investigations. The loan officer involved in this matter is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A check of records related to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed that she has an extensive criminal history, including a Federal conviction for Conspiracy to Commit Tax Fraud, in which she was sentenced to 38 months in prison. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently associated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a property consulting company located in Petersburg, Virginia.</p>	Key witness not able to be located and statue almost. No further investigative action will be take.
7/31/2013	<p>This case was initiated based on a data match conducted by HUD-OIG's Criminal Investigation Division (CID) that in part identified two non-compliant Sex Offenders (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that were listed as Head of Households in the HUD (b)(7)(E) system. Both individuals resided in Washington, DC and CID identified (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as having an active warrant. This information was provided to the (b)(5) in Washington, D.C.. (b)(5) were already aware that (b)(7)(C) was an unregistered sex offender that was residing in a HUD subsidized unit in Washington, DC and not in compliance with the Adam Walsh Act. In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) nor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) disclosed their sex offender status to the District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA) when they applied for and received housing vouchers.</p>	All judicial action taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/31/2013	<p>On March 29, 2012, (b)(6);(b) was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Rockville Housing Authority (RHA). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a low-income housing applicant who is currently on the waiting list for housing assistance, attempted to bribe RHE employees by dropping off an envelope containing \$300.00 in US Currency at the RHE office in Rockville, MD. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly gave the envelope and money to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), who was working at the receptionist desk at the time of the incident.</p>	All judicial action taken.
10/11/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Carbon County Housing Authority, informed that section 8 tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), failed to disclose that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), is also her section 8 landlord.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All judicial and administrative actions complete. Program Director notified of outcome. Restitution paid in full.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/15/2012	<p>On November 29, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Mid Atlantic Region, 100 Penn Square East, Room 10205, Philadelphia, PA 19107 received a memorandum dated November 26, 2010 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Quality Assurance Division (QAD), Philadelphia Homeownership Center (HOC), HUD. This memorandum indicated that the QAD had received a lender self-report from Bank of America through the HUD's Neighborhood Watch Lender Reporting System that alleged the possibility of a occupancy misrepresentation. The information provided indicated that the borrower had indicated his intention to occupy the subject property as his principal place of residency on his original loan application resulting on the loan being closed as an owner-occupied property. The review of documents by bank personnel noted that the subject never occupied the property and that prior to the loan actually closing the subject changed the mailing address of record to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The employment information for the subject employer indicated that the employer is located in Brooklyn, New York.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Insufficient evidence to prove crime occurred. Program and QAD personnel notified.</p>
8/22/2013	<p>Investigation of this matter is predicated upon (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(5) to address the income discrepancies indicated by the EIV system. Numerous discrepancy reports continue to issue associated with probable unreported wages and income for MHA subsidized tenants. OIG, working in tandem with the aforementioned agencies above, will request comprehensive wage and unemployment compensation histories from the Pennsylvania Department of Labor & Industry to further ascertain if the initial discrepancy reports are bona fide. (b)(5) as it is an ongoing participant in the investigation of unreported income by MHA residents. Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that an investigation be initiated and a case number be assigned.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Program personnel notified. All subjects adjudicated and administrative actions taken.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/6/2013	<p>The York County District Attorney's Office's Detective Bureau received information that Landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who allegedly operates and/or owns several real estate investment companies is soliciting tenants and/or persons to submit fictitious documents that they are employed and delinquent his their rent and/or homelss to the York County Community Progress Council to obtain funding through the Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All referrals and judicial actions have been taken. HUD program personnel notified. Subject and subject entities convicted and debarred.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/18/2013	<p>Information provided by the Bucks County Housing Authority (BCHA) suggests that BCHA HCVP participant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsely reported or fraudulently concealed material information in BCHA applications over a span of nine years, including concealing assets (specifically, a residence in Camden, NJ), her marital status, her household composition (omitting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and income (including rental income from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) rental and property management business, operated from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subsidized unit.) Additionally, preliminary inquiry suggests that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fraudulently obtained an FHA-insured mortgage with respect to a property in Doylestown, Pennsylvania, by falsely reporting assets, liabilities, and expenses in his application for the mortgage.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete and state warrant issued for fugitive. Case is being closed administratively (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) (b)(7)(E)</p> <p>Agent will continue to look for fugitive and if located, will endorse warrant to local police for arrest.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/21/2012	<p>On January 7, 2011 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Program Integrity Division (OIG Hemline) advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Office of Investigation (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Mid Atlantic Region, 100 Penn Square East, Room 10205, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107, through the OIG e:Mail system that the OIG Hotline had received an anonymous complaint regarding the subjects. The complainant indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a Housing Authority employee, had assisted her friend, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to obtain a Section 8 housing choice voucher enabling her to participate in the Section 8 program. The complainant advised that the information contained in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) initial application and subsequent recertifications is fraudulent. The complainant related in the e:Mail message to the OIG Hotline that the subject Section 8 tenant had not provided accurate annual household income and that she was not disclosing the actual number of individuals that were residing in the HUD subsidized dwelling.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. HCVP participant entered into repayment agreement with BHA. BHA HCVP (b)(6);(b)(7) denied allegations made by tenant. Program personnel notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/26/2012	<p>The Eastern District of Pennsylvania FHA Datamatch Project will investigate four loans tied to a datamatch spreadsheet provided to the Field by the HQ Criminal Investigation Division. According to the spreadsheet the loss to the FHA for the claims pertaining to the spreadsheet approximate \$800,000.</p>	<p>No case was developed. Two of the FHA loans had no binders or documentation that could be located by HUD or the lenders; one was outside the statutes of limitation criminally and civilly; the other was a single borrower who declared bankruptcy. A spin-off investigation on one of the appraisers in one of the loans in this datamatch will be conducted under (b)(7)(E) Program personnel notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/4/2013	Information developed through preliminary inquiries suggests that Burlington County HCVP tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided false information concerning her household composition-- omitting the presence of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in the household-- and income in written certifications to Burlington County HA officials for HCVP recertification, and to property managers recertifying (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) under the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program. Additionally, preliminary inquiry suggested bankruptcy fraud issues and the involvement of a complicit income tax preparer in Burlington City.	HUD OIG investigation complete. All subjects adjudicated, program personnel notified, actions completed.
10/11/2012	The Delaware County Housing Authority has identified numerous tenants it suspects are committing fraud pertaining to the Housing Choice Voucher Program. OIG will investigate these allegations.	(b)(5) (b)(5), this case will be administratively closed, as it involves single Section 8 tenant fraud allegations of (b)(5) (b)(5) that do not meet federal guidelines, and is not part of a larger, organized scheme, conspiracy or pattern of fraud.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	<p>This matter is being opened to record and capture investigative leads in anticipation of a proactive (b)(5) investigation within the District of New Jersey and elsewhere. The case is titled in the name of a fictitious business services company which forms part of the backstopping for an approved (b)(5) (b)(5)</p>	<p>No UC activities pursued under the storefront operation, due to non-approval of several submitted plans to HQ. UC identity utilized in UC meet in 2013 under case (b)(7)(E)</p> <p>Case will be administratively closed as no investigations arose out of storefront UC operation due to non-approval for execution by HQ.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/11/2012	<p>Information provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Banking, derived from their investigation, suggests that BANKERS FIRST MORTGAGE (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) engaged in a fraudulent scheme to originate FHA-insured mortgage loans by concealing the involvement of non-FHA mortgage brokers, engaging in improper fee splitting, and intentionally or negligently permitting the use of false or forged Verifications in the origination/underwriting process.</p>	<p>AUSA declination, based on changing regulations that would have allowed the practices the subject engaged in. Administrative sanctions administered by the State of PA. Program personnel notified. HUD OIG investigation complete.</p>
10/11/2012	<p>Information provided by the Pennsylvania Department of Banking, derived through their investigation, suggests that mortgage broker (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) doing business as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), fraudulently caused the origination of FHA-insured loans by concealing the existence of side financing to defeat the FHA minimum down payment requirement. The questioned loans primarily relate to the Eagles Landing development near Easton, Pennsylvania.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) originated two FHA-insured loans in Eagles Landing, neither of which are in default, resulting in no loss to the govt. MMI is no longer an FHA-approved lender. Program personnel notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/11/2012	The reporting agent discerned that OIG HQ had performed an SSN identifier match, wherein (b)(7)(E) was cross-referenced against the SSNs of individuals who have obtained HECM loans insured by FHA.	Two identified borrowers had changing financial circumstances which affected their ability to remain in their homes under the FHA-insured HECM mortgages; therefore, they subsequently applied for Section 8 benefits. Both borrowers felt the Financial Freedom HECM counseling was inadequate and failed to properly explain the HECM loan program to them. Program staff notified. No crime occurred. Does not meet new OIG OI guidelines.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/19/2013	According to Neighborhood Watch, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has originated 83 loans in the last 2 years. Of those 83 loans 24 are seriously delinquent. In several cases foreclosure sales have been held. Furthermore, it has been determined that one of the homes was vacant subsequent to the sale and the other became a rental property for at least 14 tenants.	No loss to HUD and (b)(6) no longer FHA approval.
2/5/2013	The HUD Homeownership Center in Philadelphia, PA referred (b)(6);(b) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), FHA (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7) borrowers, for misrepresentation of income and falsified W-2 and earnings and leave statements used to secure a mortgage loan for their purchase of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Clinton, MD. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a US Department of State employee.	All judicial action has been taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/28/2013	<p>This case is being initiated based on information obtained during the investigation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subject of said case, utilized (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to facilitate fraudulent FHA insured loans. Additionally, two HUD hotline complaints, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that were originally assigned to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) case number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), are being incorporated into this case. The Hotline complaints also allege that (b)(6);(b) may have been involved in falsifying income and asset documentation to obtain FHA insured mortgages for individuals that may not have otherwise qualified for loans.</p>	Loans out of SOL.
3/21/2013	<p>By way of a HUD-OIG Audit referral dated August 18, 2009 and sent electronically on August 19, 2009, an audit of the HOME Purchase Assistance Program (HPAP) revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained loans from the District of Columbia Housing Authority (DCHA) to purchase a house at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), NW, Washington, DC 20010. The settlement statement for this transaction stated that (b)(6);(b) made a downpayment of only \$500 for the property which had a sales price of \$560K. The settlement statement indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a DC non-profit was the seller and received \$113,797.23 from the sale of the property. (b)(6);(b) executed two notes from DCHA in the amounts of \$209K and \$188K used to fund most of the purchase of the property. The HPAP file from DC's Department of Housing and Community Development (DCHD) contained documents used to verify (b)(6);(b) income. The Request for Verification of Employment indicated that (b)(6);(b) was a Housing Program Specialist at DCHA and has been employed by DCHA since 1998. This transaction to purchase a house assisted with HOME funds provided by DC DHCD appears to be a conflict of interest.</p>	No conflict of interest and no loss to HUD.
6/5/2013	<p>This case was referred to the Washington Field Office after discovering that the borrowers submitted false HSBC and BB&T bank statements to National City Bank (NCB) to obtain a FHA insured mortgage loan, and that there were discrepancies between 2006 and 2007 tax returns and IRS Transcripts with respect to their self-employment income. In addition, QAD verified that a letter submitted to NCB by the borrowers from the loan servicer, HomeEq Servicing, stating that a payment had been resolved and a letter from PNC to confirm that the borrowers check was not returned for insufficient funds were false.</p>	Single loan with no current loss to HUD.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/24/2013	This office received information from the Housing Authority of Baltimore City - Office of Inspector General that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a software and support system for all tenant/landlord information, including payments and vouchers, has allegedly been illicitly accessing the MST system and using the information of inactive tenants/landlords to re-route payments into personal accounts.	All judicial and debarment actions have occurred.
6/7/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), locates section 8 tenant, maintains properties and collect rents from Baltimore City Housing Authority on behalf of homeowners. Allegedly, the money that is wired to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is withheld from the homeowners and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) uses it for his own profit. Furthermore, it alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsified HAP agreement and submitted them to Baltimore City Housing Authority,	Declined for prosecution.
6/28/2013	Review of Neighborhood Watch revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Maryland have at least 15 mortgages that are in serious delinquency. Many of these mortgages have gone into delinquency within three months which is a red flag of possible fraudulent activity. Additional information was received from an anonymous source alleging that the above mentioned company as well as other affiliated mortgage companies are involved in a scheme to create false documents to obtain FHA mortgages.	Out of SOL.
5/24/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received approximately \$214,000 in HUD grant funds and it alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used this money for personal gain.	Matter was declined.
5/24/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development, was informed by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that they are currently reviewing 109 residents out of 180 for potential fraud. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that a check of EIV revealed discrepancies in income.	All judicial action has been taken.
5/24/2013	Initiative to develop leads for possible unauthorized tenants residing in Public and Assisted Housing. Information will be referred for termination to the appropriate PHA. Leads will be developed for possible criminal prosecution for violations of Public and Assisted Housing programs.	All judicial action taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/1/2013	<p>The Norfolk, Virginia office of the Social Security Administration (SSA)-OIG advised the Richmond HUD-OIG office of information that they developed indicating that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have failed to report the presence of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in her household for as long as the past ten years, resulting in her receipt of SSA benefits to which she was not entitled. Preliminary inquiries by HUD-OIG has found that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been receiving housing assistance for over ten years and has never reported the presence of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in her household or any income (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on her periodic applications for housing assistance. Investigation will be conducted in conjunction with the SSA-OIG to determine if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained housing assistance to which she is not entitled.</p>	<p>This matter has been declined for prosecution due to (b)(5) No further action will be taken.</p>
6/27/2013	<p>HUD-OIG's Inspection and Evaluations Division referred findings of an evaluation of Home Equity Conversion Mortgage payments to Region 13's office of Investigation based on its findings of a February 8, 2008 letter in HECM borrower's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) name requesting an unscheduled loan advance of \$25,000 that was made to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an entity associated with the loan servicer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The payment was made by the servicer on February 12, 2008, which was four days prior to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) February 16, 2008 death. Subsequently, in a letter dated March 3, 2008, a \$15,000 unscheduled line of credit payment was requested by a Power of Attorney for the deceased borrower informing the servicer that the borrower's old checking account was closed and requesting that the payment be deposited into a new account identified on the letter. A line of Credit Draw Request Form dated March 17, 2008 for the \$15,000 was also submitted to the lender containing indications that a different individual may have signed this form. The servicer did not pay the \$15,000 because it had learned of the borrower's death on March 7, 2008.</p>	<p>No loss to HUD, Last pay out was not made.</p>
6/28/2013	<p>Bank of America reported that the borrower misrepresented his occupancy of the subject property. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also purchased properties in Bladensburg and Lanham, MD using conventional financing. He listed both properties as his primary residence on those loan applications. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also has a mailing address at a property in Riverdale, MD.</p>	<p>No loss to HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/20/2013	Information was recieved from Howard County Police Department that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 Tenant, subleased the sub sized unit loctated at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Columbia, Maryland while receiving assistance.	All judicial action has been taken.
6/28/2013	Per a Bank of America review, discrepancies with the borrower's signature on letters of explanation were determined to be forged by the loan officer.	No loss to HUD.
10/11/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Public Housing, Philadelphia Regional Office referred via e-mail to the HUD-OIG Philadelphia Office information provided by the Lackawanna County Housing Authority (LCHA) regarding alleged landlord fraud. The specific allegations made by the LCHA are one of their Housing Choice Voucher recipients, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that her landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is requiring monthly side payments from her in addition to the tenant portion rent she pays each month. These additional side payments have been paid by (b)(6);(b) for years due to the fact (b)(6);(b) feared she would be evicted from her residence by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). After (b)(6);(b) finally reported this matter to the LCHA and the housing authority contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b) reported she was threatened by the owners of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). She also reported she began receiving threatening phone calls from the owners of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegation not substantiated. Lackawanna County Housing Authority (LCHA) moved the complainant, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is no longer authorized to do business as a Section 8 landlord with the LCHA. No prosecution sought. Program director notified of outcome.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/15/2013	<p>The US Department of Justice, Office of the United States Trustee referred this matter. They allege that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), an individual who was incarcerated for nine years on a drug conviction, is engaged in a foreclosure rescue scam. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) The assigned agent will review a list of properties to determine if any of the properties were purchased using FHA Insured Mortgages.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All program actions taken and personnel notified, and all subjects adjudicated.</p>
12/3/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Lender Report from BOA that indicates that based on an audit of the subject loan, they discovered several issues that includes falsified IRS and financial documents, income and marital misrepresentations, and conflict of interest purchase of the property. Provided in the BOA lenders report is an additional allegation concerning the borrowers involvement in an arson and credit card fraud matter that is being investigated by NY State Police (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was contacted and stated that the borrowers fled the country in July 2009.</p>	<p>U.S. Attorney's Office declined prosecution</p>
12/26/2012	<p>An anonymous GAO complaint alleges the subject (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) by the Clarion County Housing Authority for maintenance. The subject has filed false claims for reimbursement and is selling appliances recently replaced. NOTE: An internet search indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and is also the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>Allegations substantiated, but prosecution declined. DEC referral made and declined. Program and Hotline personnel notified. HUD OIG investigation complete. Subject still working with CCHA.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/6/2013	This matter was initiated pursuant to notification by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania – Office of Inspector General, that it believes Shenango Township, Pennsylvania may be engaging in impropriety associated with it's administration of CDBG funds to facilitate the township's housing rehabilitation program.	HUD OIG investigation complete. Subject adjudicated and debarred. HUD program personnel notified.
10/15/2012	The reporting agent was contacted by (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who requested OIG participation in the investigation of captioned subject GFCCDC. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), with close ties to the GFCCDC, has alleged that the GFCCDC is the recipient of a wide array of funds from various federal and state agencies, including HUD, and that the GFCCDC has engaged in squandering funds from the various sources. (b)(6); has further alleged that the GFCCDC obtained at least \$240,000 in funds from HUD to facilitate the purchase of ten acres of property on the former PPG Industries site in the Borough of Ford City, Pennsylvania, and has misspent the HUD funds on activities other than acquisition of the aforesaid property. The reporting agent has verified through consultation with HUD CPD officials that the GFCCDC is a recipient of departmental funds.	Prosecution declined due to insufficient evidence to prove that a crime had occurred, and statute of limitations considerations. HUD OIG investigation complete. Program personnel notified.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/15/2012	Investigation will proactively identify tenants who have failed to truthfully report income and household composition, and other program violations, through contact with Section 8 program directors located within the Middle District of Pennsylvania (ie Susquehanna County, Wayne County, and others).	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All subjects in adjudication process complete. Those subjects not yet charged will not be pursued due to</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/26/2012	<p>This matter was referred to OIG from Audit. During their review of the City of Altoona's CDBG Program, essentially due to a lack of documentation concerning costs of board up and securing vacant buildings provided by the subgrantee Altoona Blair County Development Corporation (ABCD) Corporation, \$914,335 in expenditures were deemed unsupported costs. Subsequent to the Audit, the City of Altoona provided a breakdown of costs per blighted site. The City of Altoona in their reponse to Audit indicated that they have supporting documentation for all of the bighted sites, however the documentation was too voluminous to attach to the documentation reviewed by Audit. The City of Altoona also provided a spreadsheet that displayed a breakdown by address of costs incurred by subgrantee. ABCD corporation was not listed as a subgrantee on any of the addresses. In addition to the unsupported costs, Audit has determined that a conflict of interest may exist.</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>Conflict of interest allegation was unsubstantiated. Audit findings were reduced, and Altoona entered into repayment agreement with HUD on the remaining questioned costs resulting from an audit conducted by OIG. Program personnel notified. Evidence destroyed per request of providers. HUD OIG investigation complete.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/15/2012	A data match of the (b)(7)(E) which contains Multifamily rental assistant recipients, with HECM recipients was conducted. The data match uncovered approximately 7 individuals who are currently receiving Section 8 are originated a HECM loan within the last 4 years.	Of original seven identified matches, only two were prosecutable, and one was outside of statute. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) prosecuted and entered into pre-trial diversion program, restitution ordered. All HUD OIG actions complete. Program personnel notified.
6/21/2013	Information received from a known source alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Bristol (PA) office of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), has routinely solicited and received kickbacks from title companies in exchange for the referral of (b)(6);(b)(7) closing business to those companies.	HUD OIG investigation complete. (b)(6);(b)(7) adjudicated, and all documentation submitted. HUD Program officials notified. Debarment final.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/6/2013	<p>Information received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) PHA OIG indicating Section 8 HCVP recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) since 1998 and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been receiving the HAP for Long since 1999 at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Philadelphia, Pa 19151. In addition, information received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) working at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Philadelphia, Pa 19137. The investigation will be worked by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) assisting.</p>	All judicial and administrative actions pursued.
8/5/2013	<p>Open fraud initiative to record cooperative investigative activities of the HUD OIG, Monroe County Detectives, Monroe County DA's Office, and Monroe County Housing Authority (MCHA) regarding non-reporting or under-reporting of tenants income, unreported live-in tenants, and ineligible tenants with criminal records. Initiative will record tenants criminal prosecutions, civil actions, evictions, program terminations, and repayment agreements.</p>	All matters have been completely investigated and adjudicated
9/3/2013	<p>(b)(5) referred to HUD-OIG. An accountant for the non-profit, Delaware Center for Justice (DCFJ). provided evidence to (b)(5) that the former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsified documentation from 2003 to 2008 that ultimately led to the loss of approximately \$34,000. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the offender registry program that assisted inmates with HIV reenter society. The DCFJ would assist the former inmates by providing monetary assistance for the first three months of his/ her departure form prison. The CPD program that reimbursed the DCFJ was the HUD-CPD Emergency Shelter Program.</p>	DEC declined administrative action. All other matters have been investigated and no further investigative activity is warranted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/5/2013	(b)(5)	HUD OIG investigation complete. All subjects adjudicated or opened under new case numbers (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Program personnel notified. All documents submitted.
	<p>(b)(5)</p> <p>Included as a profile in this matter is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) this referral was forwarded by the Hotline (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Narratives: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is receiving rental assistance for herself and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is receiving assistance from the Luzerne County Housing Authority where (b)(7)(C) is employed. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also resides in the assisted home and is not on the lease. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has lived in the home for over two years. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The housing authority is aware of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presence in the home. Please see the attached correspondence and (b)(7)(E) printouts.</p>	

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/7/2013	<p>Captioned subject MHA, was the focus of intense OIG scrutiny during the period 2004 through the present, that resulted in the numerous arrests, convictions and referrals for eviction. During the course of continued investigative efforts, additional MHA residents have been identified, through discrepancy reports and through consultation with MHA staff, for whom discrepancies exist associated with income, which could not be resolved through administrative procedures. OIG and the McKeesport Police intend to review the discrepancies, verify employment and interview subjects to ascertain if false statements have been made to MHA. OIG and McKeesport Police intend to charge subjects with a state charge of theft by deception. OIG also intends to continue reviewing McKeesport Police Department reports to identify those MHA residents who have engaged in criminal conduct that is a violation of the MHA "one strike" policy and take appropriate measures to refer violators for termination/eviction. Based upon the foregoing, it is recommended that an investigation be formally initiated and a case number assigned.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. All subjects adjudicated. HUD program personnel notified.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/28/2013	HUD-OIG Baltimore Field Office recieved information from the Prince George's County's Assistant State's Attorney's Office that the aboved named subject stole money from a line of credit granted to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Reverse Mortgage loan from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The subject allegedly told (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that he would be making payments on the loan on her behalf if she wrote personal checks to him. In addition, the subject allegedly persuaded (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to pay him money from her insurance annuities and give him cash advances from a Discover Card to pay back her Reverse Mortgage.	All judicial action taken.
12/31/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are involved in the fraudulent flipping of properties. As part of the scheme, fraudulent appraisals are being provided for properties being flipped, and some of the sub-standard properties are being used to generate income for the targets through the DCHA Section 8 program.	All judicial action has been taken.
3/19/2013	Information was received from the IRS that the subject allegedly is using HOME grant funds in order to support his other business. Furthermore, he alledgey using the HOME grant money to purchase real estate.	Declined for prosection.
6/27/2013	Information was obtained from the (b)(5) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is orchestrating FHA property flipping by providing false documentation to obtain FHA insured loans. Additionally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly is committing identity theft of various FHA approved appraisers in order to inflate appraisals. The counties affected are Baltimore City and Prince George County, Maryland.	All judicial action taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/7/2013	<p>In September 2009, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Program Integrity Division (Hotline), GI advised the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Baltimore Regional Office, 103 South Gay St, 6th Floor, Baltimore, MD that the Hotline had received a Complaint. A homebuyer submitted a complaint regarding a recent refinance processed with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The homebuyer felt that she was treated unfairly and was a victim of abuse. The loan process was handled very unfairly and less than professional resulting in the possibility of loan origination fraud. In addition, the Office of Investigation received an internal mail package from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Quality Assurance Division, (b)(6);(b)(7) Philadelphia Homeownership Center reported findings from a quality control review of another loan that disclosed employment misrepresentation (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Our office has also determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) specifically the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) branch has a significantly high default and claim percentage compared to the statewide average. We will take a sample review of several loans that have recently defaulted or gone into claim.</p>	Allegations were not substantiated.
3/19/2013	<p>During the course of working the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) jointly with the U.S. Postal Inspection Service; the Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service; and the Department of the Treasury, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; it was brought to our attention that another (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Washington, D.C., may be involved in a similar Single Family Equity Skimming scheme involving numerous properties. The above agencies have agreed to work the above case as a joint effort.</p>	This case was declined for prosecution and there is no loss to HUD.
6/19/2013	<p>The basis for our investigation is (b)(5) into allegations that a mortgage broker, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is targeting people whose homes are in the process of being foreclosed and advising them that he can stop the foreclosure. (b)(6) allegedly dupes the victims into signing the title of their home over to him. (b)(6) then sells the property to a straw buyer and strips any equity from the property, without giving the entire proceeds of the sale to the victim.</p>	All judicial action has occurred.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/31/2013	May 27, 2008, the Office of Investigation received an internal mail package from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) Quality Assurance Division, (b)(6);(b)(7) Philadelphia Homeownership Center, Wanamaker Building, 100 Penn Square East, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107-3389. This mailing contained information relating to the subject's purchase of an FHA insured home located at different Maryland addresses. The subject cases were referred to our office due to the lenders use of documents to support approval of the loans that they verified to be false.	Company is no longer in business, no further investigative action warranted.
3/13/2013	The administrator of the Housing Choice voucher program in Chesterfield County, VA received information from a former tenant of subject (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reported that she was living in (b)(6);(b)(7) rental property and paying rent to (b)(6);(b)(7) at a time when (b)(6);(b)(7) was receiving housing assistance payments from HUD for another tenant who was supposedly living in the rental unit.	Rental assistance terminated and this matter does not have
		(b)(5)
7/31/2013	The basis for opening this investigation is information received from HUD Multifamily alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) staff employees were accepting bribes from perspective tenants to obtain subsidized housing that they otherwise may not have qualified for.	No further action needed, HUD subsidized apartment complex closed. County law enforcement will pursue remaining individual with outstanding warrant that has been a fugitive for over a year.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/28/2013	<p>This investigation will investigate violations of HUD rental assistance programs in the Montgomery County area in the State of Maryland. All allegations will be investigated and referred to the appropriate Public Housing Authority or Multi-family management for removal if substantiated. All substantiated violations will also be referred to state and federal prosecutors for criminal prosecution. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) in the Montgomery County area.</p>	All judicial action taken.
7/31/2013	<p>Investigation was predicated upon information received from the Baltimore Office of Multifamily Housing (OMFH), which indicated they had received multiple complaints from residents at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Housing Cooperative in Prince George's County, Maryland, with regard to the financial management of the project. Specifically, the OMFH advised that a former board member at the cooperative had allegedly embezzled \$9,000 from the operating account by way of ATM transactions. Further, HUD recently listed the cooperative as a "troubled property" due to noncompliance with the regulatory agreement by onsite management officials.</p>	No fraud was uncovered.
6/28/2013	<p>HUD-OIG was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former tenant at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Baltimore, MD. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has accepted money in return for assuring that applicants would be approved for public housing. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also informed HUD-OIG that he was stabbed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in November 2007. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) told HUD-OIG that he was stabbed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) after confronting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) about spreading rumors about himself to other residents. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes that his stabbing is a direct consequence of filing a grievance against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has moved to a different multi-family project in Baltimore, MD since his physical assault.</p>	No proof of allegations.
12/31/2012	<p>Investigation involves allegations of fraud committed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and a company associated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It appears the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have committed Section 8 tenant and landlord fraud, and it is believed they have also participated in conventional loan fraud.</p>	This matter is being investigated under case number (b)(7)(E)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/21/2013	<p>Investigation concerns allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) through her company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is involved in a mortgage rescue scheme involving at least 12 properties. It's alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7) promised homeowners she would stop the foreclosure process of their property, and property ownership would be transferred for six months during which the homeowner could improve their credit situation. Homeowners were led to believe that at the end of the six months they could re-purchase their properties. Homeowners continued to make mortgage payments to (b)(6);(b)(7) and were under the impression (b)(6);(b)(7) was making the mortgage payments to the lender. In actuality, (b)(6);(b)(7) arranged for straw buyers to purchase the properties at prices substantially greater than the amount than the existing mortgages. A check of FHA and public records revealed that of the 12 properties identified as part of the mortgage rescue scheme, 9 of the properties were financed through conventional loans, and 3 were financed through FHA loans.</p>	All judicial action has been taken.
12/31/2012	<p>This case was initiated in order to capture and document actions and oversight of various HUD OIG single family white collar criminal investigations while working jointly with other federal, state, and local law enforcement entities. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>	Taskforce has been shut down.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/21/2013	A complaint, then investigation, was initiated after information was received through the HUD OIG Hotline from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (a property management company). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided information which suggested that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 elderly complex receiving Section 8 project based subsidy assistance), may have diverted/embezzled/stolen tenant rental payments.	SOL approaching.
6/28/2013	The basis of this investigation is to identify subsidized housing fraud in Prince George's County area in the State of Maryland. All allegations of fraud will be investigated, then referred for prosecution or removal from program.	All judicial action taken.
3/25/2013	Miami Dade Housing Authority (MDHA) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contact this office for assistance in an alleged MDHA landlord fraud scheme. MDHA tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that her landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was demanding extra rent from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on top of the Housing Assistance Payment contract. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) demanded \$200.00 additional rent from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) each month. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who was recently indicted on federal narcotics conspiracy charges through the Southern District of Florida.	Investigation complete. All judicial and administrative actions complete. No further activity anticipated for this case.
11/5/2012	Received information (b)(5) alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had knowingly processed the FHA loan of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with fraudulent documents.	Does not meet prosecutorial threshold for the USAO in Puerto Rico
12/13/2012	The Government Housing Operations Special Taskforce (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) developed information indicating (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was providing Palm Beach County Housing Authority Public Housing program participants with false certifications of community service hours in exchange for payment.	All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. No further activity is anticipated in this case.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/1/2013	Received information from the San Juan Municipality indicating that various landlords knowingly continued to receive Section 8 payments after the Section 8 tenants had moved from the units.	All judicial actions complete.
3/25/2013	A Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from the Housing Authority of the City of Miami Beach (HACMB) contacted the U.S. HUD-OIG Miami Office to advise of allegations of Excessive Rent being required by HACMB landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7) by multiple tenants.	Investigation complete. All judicial and appropriate administrative actions accounted for. No further activity anticipated.
10/12/2012	P.R.D.H Section 8 Program, referred to HUD-OIG a situation involving an individual who allegedly managed to obtain the processing and mailing of improper landlord property rental payments for a property in which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a Section 8 tenenant. The individual is alleged to have received the payments and deposited them in her bank account.	All actions complete.
9/13/2013	(b)(7)(E) Data Match	Subject entered into an agreement with the State Attorney's office prior to charges being filed. No charges are expected therefore this case is being closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/25/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that FHA Loan No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was originated with fraudulent bank statements and possible false tax returns.	Lead agency has not made this case a priority. HUD's nexus is only one FHA loan.
6/14/2013	Officers of Genworth Financial contacted the United States Attorney's Office in Broward County about possible HECM fraud at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) one of their correspondent lenders. They allege that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a loan officer for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Fort Lauderdale, FL, solicited elderly homeowners for HECM loans and diverted some of the proceeds due the borrowers to his own company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). An initial investigation conducted by private investigators determined that appraisals for some properties had been altered to reflect higher values than originally given by the appraiser.	Investigation complete. All criminal and administrative actions complete and documented.
2/11/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had defrauded the Bayamon City Section 8 Program. He alleged that during divorce proceedings in early 2000s he transferred the title over the property in question to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). However, she filed forged documents required to rent the property under Section 8 to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In addition, he alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lied to the program by alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not living with her, thus, omitting his income. There is another allegation indication that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had abandoned the property and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) collected Section 8 rent payments even though (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was no longer occupying the property.	elements of crime insufficient
1/2/2013	On 07/02/2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted HUD-OIG to discuss a referral his office had received from the USAO-Puerto Rico. In this referral, a citizen complained that former PR PHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and a public housing management company named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had devised a scheme to omit certain HUD mandated deductions in the rent payment calculations for elderly and handicap tenants with the objective of retaining certain amounts.	Allegation unsubstantiated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/10/2013	<p>HUD OIG conducted an audit of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and found deficiencies in the underwriting process. During the audit, it was discovered false employment information had been submitted in several loans and HUD OIG referred this findings to HUD OIG investigations</p>	<p>After numerous interviews and records reviews it was determined that no clear pattern emerged pointing to a single person or group of persons responsible for the alleged fraudulent activity at this time. Statute of limitations is approaching for many of these loans. The lender is no longer in business. Due to these reasons as well as the need to prioritize investigative resources this case is being closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/22/2013	On 8/12/2010, HUD-OIG, San Juan Field Office received information indicating that the PRPHA (b)(6) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had members of their staff in the Proposal selection committee for the new Public Housing Projects/Tax Credits management contracts. It is alleged that numerous irregularities took place in terms of the confidentiality of the process; involvement of the aforementioned individuals by using their staff who were committee members to manipulate the selection process results to favor non-selected M.A.s who are related to them and to cause the cancellation of this process. On 8/13/2010, approx. 8 boxes containing the proposals, as well as several CDs containing documents and e-mails were voluntarily provided by PRPHA's counsel and security director with the knowledge of the new Sec. of Housing/PRPHA Acting Administrator.	Allegations could not be corroborated.
12/6/2012	Tampa Housing Authority (THA) reported the possible misuse of a Social Security Card to obtain benefits to which she was not entitled to. Specifically, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used Social Security Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to enter the Housing Choice Voucher Program operated by the THA. Social Security Administration (SSA) Office of Inspector General (OIG) was contacted and stated that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not belong to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also used (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to obtain a Florida Driver's License. SSA OIG stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is an invalid SSN.	All judicial actions completed
11/16/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly created false loan documents and placed them into loan files, in order to make the borrower qualify for a FHA mortgage loan. Allegedly, the verification of employment (VOEs) came from a company named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	Case completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/16/2012	<p>Due to the devastating impact of mortgage fraud on the economy and consumers of the State of North Carolina, HUD-OIG has initiated a Mortgage Fraud Work Group (MFWG), a collaborative effort with State regulatory agencies, Federal, State, and local prosecutors and law enforcement partners, in order to combat this epidemic. HUD-OIG has formed this work group with the (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5). This work group will develop and harvest criminal, civil, and administrative cases for the Eastern half of North Carolina.</p>	No investigative nexus.
12/21/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is alleged to have falsified HUD-1 Settlement Statements to conceal the value of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) estate in furtherance of an ongoing Medicaid fraud. A potential co-conspirator, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Both the North Carolina Board of Realtors and Commissioner of Banks have received complaints about the business practices of one or the other individuals or related companies.</p>	USAO declined case.
1/15/2013	<p>According to a QAD review, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);, originated three FHA insured mortgages which contain fraudulent documents from (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in all three loan files.</p>	Investigation complete.
1/31/2013	<p>On July 28, 2009, a local television news station ran a story in which (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) of the Rowan County Housing Authority (RCHA), was alleged to have rigged bids on landscaping contracts. An initial review of supporting documentation for landscaping bids at RCHA found discrepancies indicative of bid rigging and requiring further investigation.</p>	All investigative activity is complete.
1/10/2013	<p>The Beaufort Police Department provided information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the current (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of BEAUFORT HOUSING AUTHORITY, may have embezzled HUD funds from the BHA. Preliminary investigation has indicated that ARRA funds may be involved.</p>	Investigation is complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/21/2012	<p>In July 2009, the OIG Hotline received a complaint from the attorney for the Board of Commissioners of the North Wilkesboro Housing Authority (NWA), alleging that NWA's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and other employees had questionable gas expenses using BP service station credit cards in 2008 and 2009. The OIG hotline provided this information to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in March 2010. Subsequent discussions between HUD program staff and Reporting Agent (RA) indicate (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be involved with 1) improperly qualifying (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for public housing, 2) possible discrepancies in NWA's contracting procedures, including ARRA and non-ARRA stimulus grant funds, including the procurement of contracted services without the Board's approval or without HUD's review of ARRA-related contracts, and 3) deposit of NWA public housing rent payments into NWA employees' accounts.</p>	<p>ADMN action declined. ASAC administratively closing case.</p>
1/30/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a participant of the Section 8 Housing Assistance Program from August 2005 thru July 2009. During this period (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to disclose her income she was receiving while employed with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Greenville, Mississippi. This resulted in South Delta Regional Housing Authority to overpay (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) rental assistance during this period. The total amount of overpayment's totaled \$28,546.00.</p>	<p>Case declined by US Attorney's office due to prosecution of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the HA that brought the allegation against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>
1/28/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for disaster assistance with the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) Homeowner Assistance Program (HAP) claiming an address as their primary residence, a requirement of the program, but a review of additional data sources revealed a separate pre-storm address. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$74,640.79 as a result of the MDA/HAP application.</p>	<p>Statute of limitations ran out due to inactivity of the assigned AUSA despite agents continued warnings to assigned AUSA.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/18/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for disaster assistance with the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) Homeowner Assistance Program (HAP) claiming the damaged address as his primary residence, a requirement of the program, but a review of additional data sources revealed a separate pre-storm address. (b)(6);(b)(7) received \$100,000.00 as a result of the MDA/HAP application	US Attorney's Office failed to act. Statute of limitation ran out.
3/18/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for disaster assistance with the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) Homeowner Assistance Program (HAP) claiming the damaged address as their primary residence, a requirement of the program, but a review of additional data sources revealed a separate pre-storm address. (b)(6);(b)(7) received \$114,382.86 as a result of the MDA/HAP application	Case declined no further action taken
5/22/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that an individual filed a complaint that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) Homeowners grant under application number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and received \$107,730 for a property which was not damaged as a result of Hurricane Katrina and that the neighborhood suffered no flooding.	No additional leads or subjects. Case declined by US Attorney's Office.
5/22/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) CDBG homeowner grant under application # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and received a grant of \$23,727. Further review determined that (b)(6);(b)(7) most likely resided in Florida at the time of Hurricane Katrina and the property in Ocean Springs, Mississippi was rental. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further reported that there appears not to have been any flood damage to the property as alleged by (b)(6);(b)(7)	No additional leads or subjects. Case declined by US Attorney's Office.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/29/2012	<p>Preliminary information provided to HUD OIG alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) South Delta Regional Housing Authority (SDRHA) with an address of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Leland, MS, 38756, is misusing HUD Federal funds administered by SDRHA for her personal benefit and gain. Initial information disclosed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is illegally using SDRHA labor, SDRHA construction materials, SDRHA vehicles with State of Mississippi tags and SDRHA resources subsidized by HUD for the renovation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Leland, MS. This address was identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) personal residence as of October of 2008. Also, additional newspaper information alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) committed the same unauthorized use of SDRHA resources at her previous residence identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Leland, MS. This newspaper report revealed multiple neighbors who reported seeing for extended periods of time, SDRHA vehicles and maintenance workers do yard work, poured concrete, put in air conditioners, painted inside and other chores at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) house in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Leland, MS. Information gathered from the U.S. Federal Audit Clearinghouse revealed SDRHA's last Single Audit reported was for Year 2006. This Single Audit disclosed SDRHA expended \$7,540,808 in federal awards granted from HUD'S Federal Programs during the Fiscal Year ending on September 30, 2006 and signed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	All judicial and administrative actions are complete
2/4/2013	<p>The Office of the Commissioner for Financial Institutions (OCIF) referred to HUD OIG a case involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an FHA approved lender, where the company failed to pay off several loans, including an FHA loan, in spite of the fact that they had already received the funds to pay off such loans. The amounts were kept by the mortgage bank, and to conceal this fact. OCIF has already suspended their license to do business as a mortgage bank.</p>	Low loss to HUD, company out of business

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/10/2013	<p>Hotline complaint alleged the security contractor hired by the West Palm Beach Housing Authority utilized false qualifications to obtain the contract and was not the lowest bidder. Complainant indicated the WPBHA was aware of the false qualifications and failed to pursue the matter. Additional unrelated information was identified indicating (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the WPBHA may be operating a private for-profit business out of the WPBHA office and funding from the WPBHA Capital fund may have been issued to a business which utilizes the same address as businesses connected with WPBHA officials.</p>	<p>All investigate efforts have been exhausted. The original complaint was handled administratively and subsequent criminal allegations could not be substantiated sufficiently to continue efforts. Prosecution was declined after further review.</p>
3/5/2013	<p>Complaint from the Homestead Housing Authority about section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7) possibly subleasing their unit after an inspection revealed another person possibly living there for the past year.</p>	<p>Investigation complete. Relevant administrative actions complete.</p>
5/1/2013	<p>HUD-EIV Debt owed report indicated that 26 families had outstanding balances with the Volusia County Department of Community Affairs, Section 8 program. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that all were unreported income and were terminated from the program leaving with an outstanding balance of \$48,764.72.</p>	<p>All Judicial actions complete</p>
1/8/2013	<p>Tampa Housing Authority Section 8 Landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are reported to have been residing together since 2009. Information obtained by HUD OIG indicates that both (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been residing together since 2005.</p>	<p>All actions completed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/4/2013	An anonymous Hotline complaint was received alleging among other things that: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in regards to HECMs they originated, has been withholding and diverting mortgage insurance premiums; failed to pay off pre-existing mortgages and liens; not reported under HDMA since 2006; and have allowed fraudulent certifications by appraisers, among other allegations.	Administrative actions taken by HUD.
4/12/2013	A representative from Lucha Contra El SIDA (CHDO), met with HUD-OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to present allegations and supporting documentation against the organization's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) about apparent fraudulent activities such as the embezzlement and diversion of HUD funds (SHP, HOPWA etc...). It was also alleged that HUD San Juan Field Office should have noticed the irregularities, but that this is overlooked because (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is charged with monitoring these funds, is a childhood friend of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	Subject/issue can more appropriately be handled by audit.
10/5/2012	Seminole County PHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referred former Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) case to HUDOIG because (b)(6); suspiciously terminated her participation in the program after refusing to allow the PHA to inspect her subsidized unit. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also a former employee of the PHA. At the time of withdrawing from the program, (b)(6); was reporting zero earned income and receiving maximum subsidy from the program.	case completely adjudicated; last 90 day report unable to be approved in (b)(7)(E) designating case closed
2/4/2013	On 1/31/2011, HUD San Juan Field Office Counsel and PIH Director reported to HUDOIG that VIHA was requesting approval to file a collection lawsuit against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former VIHA Section participant who failed to declare her employment income from 2000-2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received in excess of \$44,000 in benefits during this period. The case was preliminarily discussed with the US Attorneys' Office of the V.I. and they showed interest in a parallel proceedings (criminal and civil). HUD will not authorize the lawsuit by VIHA and will pass the matter over to HUDOIG. VIHA is currently under receivership by HUD.	Does not meet IG initiative. Aged case.
10/24/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have submitted a false property deed during the process of applying for (and receiving) a HECM Mortgage. (b)(6);(C) received the proceeds from the HECM in a lump sum payment. Shortly thereafter, the property in question was deeded out of the subject's name, thereby further violating the terms of the HECM contract.	Declined by USAO

[illegible]

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/13/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have accepted Housing Assistance Payments under false pretenses during the period of July 2009 through April 2011 while having knowledge that he was no longer the legal owner of the residence in question. According to the complainant, a final judgment of foreclosure on the subject property was obtained by the lender in June 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) transferred his interest in said property the same month. Yet, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) continued to represent himself as the property owner, both to the PHA and the tenant, on documents dated 11/2009 and 12/2010.	All state judicial actions completed
12/6/2012	From June 2009 until present, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has unlawfully obtained public housing assistance by fraudulently reporting her family composition to the Tampa Housing Authority. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lived at a unit in Robles Park. In July 2009, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained an additional residence in a HUD income based multi family property (Columbus Court Apartments). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) resided at her Columbus Court apartment while (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (unauthorized tenant) resided at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residence.	All judicial actions completed
9/30/2013	The Monroe County Sheriff's Office (MCSO) contacted HUD-OIG to advise that there appeared to be numerous instances of tenant fraud at the Stock Island Apartments, a HUD Multifamily property (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The MCSO alleged that several tenants concealed income, assets, or undisclosed tenants from HUD in order to continue to qualify for housing assistance.	Case is being pursued by local law enforcement. Due to a reallocation of manpower and shift in agency priorities this case is being closed.
12/10/2012	Former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have diverted HUD funds to independent, non-HUD related projects using independent corporations to conceal his actions. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also alleged to have invested personal funds in the various real estate development projects.	Allegation could not be corroborated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/9/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) title attorney for the settlement transaction, stole funds to be used for the payoff of mortgage owed (lien) at time of the FHA loan, contrary to the instructions in the HUD-1.	Case opened to capture administrative actions only. This is complete. Timeline for Indemnifications can not be determined and thus case is being closed.
6/13/2013	Collier County Clerk of Court's (CCCC) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presented HUD-OIG an interim audit report that alleged fraud in Collier County's NSP and DRI program. During the course of their audit the CCCC discovered that NPS and DRI contractor billed the county through the Collier County's Housing, Human and Veteran Services (HHVS) for 100% complete work, whereas, in truth and in fact the contractor(s) did not complete the work that they requested full payments for. Further, review revealed that HHVS' inspector(s) approved the release of full payment for work not yet completed.	Investigation complete. Allegations were found to be of an administrative rather than criminal nature and were handled by the County. No further activity is anticipated.
6/27/2013	The Puerto Rico Office of the Comptroller (PROC) referred to HUD-OIG an audit finding where they indicate that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had illegally retained PRPHA funds in the approximate amount of \$77,000 and converted them into a Certificate of Deposit, after PRPHA had demanded the return of all HUD funds in their custody pursuant to the expiration of their management agent contract in 2008. PROC will provide all of the documentary evidence they possess and offered to provide support if needed.	Case could not be corroborated

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/18/2013	A state audit review of the metcalfe County Enrichment Center, it was noted that the Fiscal Court failed to advertise for bids. Auditors identified at least three and possible five vendors hired were either owned by the same individuals or run by related individuals, numerous estimates were signed by individuals with the same last name, vendor invoices were identical except for the names of vendors, descriptions, and amounts, numerous canceled checks were signed by the same individuals and deposited into the same accounts, and some invoices for different companies were in consecutive invoice number order	Declined.
10/5/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7) allegedly continued to receive Housing Assistance Payments in his role as landlord after evicting a Section 8 tenant.	All actions completed.
11/27/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have used false earnings information for 116 FHA insured loans within the past two years. See QAD referral	Final Disposition
11/13/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided documents to the Atlanta Housing Authority misrepresenting ownership of properties and collected over \$70,000.00 in federal funds they were not entitled.	Final disposition
3/28/2013	The HHA advised that several tenants may have failed to report household income. Investigation transferred from AI system. All pertinent documents, such as the acknowledgment letter and IP, is included in the official blue file.	Case declined both federally and by the state for prosecution.
7/15/2013	It is alleged that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Ripley Housing Authority (RHA), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wrote three checks from the RHA checking account, in excess of \$80,000, and deposited those checks in his personal banking account.	All actions are complete
2/27/2013	This case is (b)(5) investigation conducted within the Western District of Tennessee. Subjects used inflated residential appraisals and a HUD approved lender, Capital Mortgage Inc, to flip multiple properties.	Lack of substantive HUD nexus.
4/3/2013	Johnson City Police Department and Tennessee Bureau of Investigation requested the assistance of HUD-OIG in an ongoing investigation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who allegedly falsified invoices and created a shell company that he used to award residential rehabilitation contracts. These residential rehabilitation contracts are funded by HUD CDBG.	Civil declined. Case is completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/10/2012	OPH referred the case to OIG after conducting a limited review of the Housing Authority of the City of Canton (HACC) which revealed the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was misusing the HACC credit card	Allegations unfounded
11/27/2012	Complainant alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is negotiating short sales and subsequently reselling the properties at an inflated value. The closings are reportedly simultaneous. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) offer's the buyer's realtor a \$500 incentive to close at his title company.	Lack of investigative priority.
4/5/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided fraudulent information on loan documents to obtain an FHA loan for property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) TN 38333.	All actions have been completed.
6/21/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is concealing income.	All judicial and administrative actions are complete.
11/1/2012	This investigation is to combat allegations of fraud resulting from the dual receipt of rental assistance benefits from both the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) under the Disaster Housing Assistance Program (DHAP) as well as HUD under the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program	All actions have been captured.
6/20/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is creating fictitious releases on real property.	Declined.
3/28/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is mismanaging HUD funds and using his position and authority for personal gain.	Case allegations were unfounded
10/17/2012	The MHA advised several former tenants failed to fully report their household incomes which resulted in MHA benefit overpayments.	All actions are complete
12/21/2012	The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referred this case to for consideration of a violation of the GNND Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Corporation mailed out a 3rd year anniversary certification to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who failed to respond.	USAO declined.
6/21/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) made up false identities for clients and used money appropriated for the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program to pay their personal bills.	All court and administrative actions have taken place.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/25/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Housing Authority of Whitesburg failed to deposit all monies received for public housing tenant rents into the Authorities bank account. The investigation thus far has revealed that (b)(6);(C) endorsed and cashed HA checks made payable to friends, relatives, and tenants, causing a loss of approximately \$29,000. The investigation was accepted for prosecution bt the Attorney General's Office.	Declined.
11/27/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have obtained a reverse mortgage without the permission or knowledge of the owner, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) woman.	Final Disposition
10/5/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the current Owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a contracted management company for Watts Bar Utility District (WBUD) and also the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6); a vendor receiving Community Development and Block Grant (CDBG) funds for WBUD projects, is engaged in deceptive and fraudulent practices whereby his company is provided preferential treatment in the awarding of WBUD contracts.	Declination.
3/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Northport Housing Authority (NHA), reported to HUD that Section 8 resident, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to NHA that her purse was stolen. (b)(6);(b)(7) stated her purse contained her utility check. The subject check has been duplicated and used produce multiple counterfeit checks to fraudulently withdraw over \$9k from the NHA's Housing Choice Voucher Program's checking account. (b)(6);(b) reported the thefts to the Nortport and Tuscaloosa Police Departments.	All subjects have been adjudicated. No further investigation required.
10/12/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was rehabilitated using HUD HOME funds to obtain a private loan by the non profit property owner. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is now condemned and tenants have been relocated, although the afford ability period and LIHTC contract have not been met. The property may have FHA insurance as well as the funds necessary to maintain the property used for other purposes.	No Loss to HUD
2/22/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former Tuskegee Housing Authority, employee advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(C) may have misused the housing authority credit card.	Case declined by U.S. Attorney's Office. Allegation appear unfounded.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/15/2012	The Subject presented a Quit Claim to the Dekalb Housing Authority representing himself as owner of a property that was approved to receive Section 8 Rental Assistance. The true owner of the property said that she never signed the Quit Claim Deed giving property ownership to the subject.	Loss does not meet the threshold for prosecution.
11/29/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7) provided false tax returns as verification of income for FHA insured loans on two separate occasions, one of which was to re-finance under the energy efficient program.	All actions completed
5/13/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is suspected of fraud involving the transfer of physical assets of three Multifamily projects.	Declined by Criminal and Civil.
6/6/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on behalf of the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA), submitted to the Office of the State Auditor - Katrina Fraud Prevention and Detection Unit, a complaint alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had submitted a fraudulent Elevation Certificate as a part of her MDA Elevation Grant application, application number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Based on the documentation provided in the complaint, the elevation certificate was altered to increase the height from ten(10) feet to 20.2 feet in order to satisfy the elevation height. The unaltered elevation certificate was completed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and, according to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at that office, the elevation certificate at issue was not generated by their company. The grant funds have not been disbursed.	Case adjudicated. No other targets in case.
3/28/2013	The hotline received a complaint alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained a reverse mortgage on a property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Columbia, Mississippi and allegedly the property in question was a rental property.	Case declined by US Attorney's Office. No loss to government.
1/18/2013	The Greenville, South Carolina Housing Authority provided information alleging that the proprietors of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have been charging HCVP/Section 8 tenants rent in excess of what was agreed upon by the Authority. In addition, there are allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owner, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has solicited the food stamps of tenants as payment for excess rent. The Authority learned of the alleged practices from a former employee of the property management company. The Authority plans to remove the landlord from it's program.	

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stole her identity in an attempt obtain an FHA loan.	File originated with all fraudulent identification. We are unable to determine the true identity of the borrower.
12/11/2012	Subjects provided false information on loan applications in an attempt to obtain FHA funding.	No significant loss to HUD
2/22/2013	False statements were provided in an attempt to receive FHA funding.	Declined by the NDGA
10/12/2012	HUD-OIG Audit received an anonymous complaint regarding Fulton County. During a review of the complaint, they identified that it involved alleged fraud of more than \$180,000.00 in County funds that occurred from 2004 through 2010. The funds received by the county appear to be HUD Continuum of Care (CoC) funds used to address the problems of homelessness.	Investigation completed by local law enforcement
6/20/2013	Veteran Services Center of America (VSCOA) entered into a contract with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to provide temporary housing to homeless veterans. It is alleged that VSCOA provided false information in the contracts indicating that the organization had entered into a MOU with HUD as a veteran's services organization. As a result, due to the fraudulent contracts submitted to (b)(6); VSOA received in excess of \$23,000 in HUD, Supportive Housing Program funding. VSCOA also fraudulently used another organizations 501c3 status.	Charges dismissed.
5/14/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with the National Women's Political Caucus of Alabama has received several complaints regarding the HPRP program administered by the Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs (ADECA) via sub grantee Jefferson County Commission for Economic Opportunity (JCCEO). The complainants allege that JCCEO fraudulently operate the HPRP program by providing false award letters to participants. Complainants also allege JCCEO has paid third party non - profit organizations for case work / intake that did not result in the participants receiving benefits.	investigative finding did not warrant prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/1/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly embezzled funds while employed in the Accounts Payable Department at the Bessemer Housing Authority	Final Disposition
12/17/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Birmingham, advised via email she had received a complaint regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complainant stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was assisting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in conducting business for her non-profit during official duty hours. According to the complainant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also the recipient of a homeless grant, she refers her clients directly to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and he contacts the Housing Authority of Birmingham District (HABD) to assist in housing the clients. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also the public housing specialist for HABD.	Investigation did not substantiate allegation.
2/7/2013	During a recent review of Renasant Bank, evidence of fraudulent activities involving an FHA-insured loan was discovered.	Case was declined for prosecution based on lack of evidence.
6/10/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and former Section 8 landlord, was found to have a conflict of interest with his Housing Assistance Payment Contract on account of Sumter County Council having the authority to appoint Sumter Housing Authority Board Members. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) property is located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Sumter, SC, and the Sumter HA self reported this to HUD. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used a property management company, which may or may not have intentionally disguised the conflict of interest. The HAP contract was effective March 16, 2006, and was terminated April 29, 2011.	Final Disposition
10/10/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used their positions and influence as proprietors of A-1 Title and Escrow to embezzle settlement funds from the escrow account of the corporation.	Declination.
3/11/2013	A letter written by a anonymous source indicted that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) often leaves the office for long periods of time. The complainant further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), while serving in an acting role, left the office at noon and did not return until 3:00 p.m.	All actions have been completed. Allegations unsubstantiated and HUD Disposition report indicates no action warranted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/30/2013	Former tenants not reporting all income.	AUSA decline to prosecute subjects and office is closing remaining case due to a lack of resources.
9/26/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) engaged in a short sale transaction with the intention to flip the property to a third party for a monetary gain. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) negotiated the short sale of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) home with Wells Fargo on January 14, 2011. On May 17, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purchased (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) home for \$147,840. Also on May 17, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sold the home to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for \$193,000. The complainant title company informed HUD-OIG that the company was instructed not to contact Wells Fargo about the short sale. The company alleges that full disclosure of the short sale flip did not occur.	
7/1/2013	Loan officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Atlanta, GA originated several FHA insured mortgages. FHA mortgages originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly contained fraudulent documentation.	Proactive investigation original agent transferred to another agency and AUSA has not expressed an interest in the case.
7/1/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) originated several FHA loans which contained false information. HUD has paid a claim on the properties. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), NDGA, asked investigative agent to investigate the loans originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that were endorsed by FHA.	Proactive initiative with minimum results.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/3/2012	Complainant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that a vacant property adjacent to her own was purchased by investor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), who fraudulently claimed to be an owner/occupier of the property. The property has since been rented. This hotline complaint included a letter from a congressman representing Clay county.	case was declined by USAO and HUD did not express interest in matter. Case was referred to OIG Legal for any action they deem appropriate.
11/21/2012	St. Petersburg Housing Authority identified possible fraud being committed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a property management company. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has reportedly been assigned as the property management company for three properties for which they were collecting HAP. It is reported that the owner's of the property did not authorize (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to act their manager - management and that the information on the St. Petersburg Housing Authority Owner-Agent form has been forged (to include signatures and Social Security numbers). Identified potential loss is currently \$14,756.00	Case declined by USAO.
12/28/2012	A referral was received from the USAO regarding suspected loan modification fraud by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will review the information and determine if FHA loans were involved in the fraud scheme.	AUSA review of evidence obtained by Federal Trade Commission revealed problems with evidence handling. AUSA subsequently decided not to pursue criminal prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/2/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) coercively solicited church donations and free labor for personal and church projects from NSP contractors. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) NSP contractor and owner of Customs Homes by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) told him that all NSP contractors donate \$2,000.00 to his church. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) told (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that he donated \$2,000.00 to Grace and Truth under pressure from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had to pay money to a company of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wrote a promissory note to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his General Contractor, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for \$5,973.83.</p>	Declined by AUSA
3/25/2013	<p>During a Quality Control review performed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (lender), it was discovered that three loans all contained false statements and documents relied upon to insure the three properties. Specifically, real estate agent (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and loan officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were involved in three loans containing false documents and statements. Special Note: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was issued a Limited Denial of Participation on August 5, 2002 and was also debarred from participating in all federal programs for two years on May 14, 2003.</p>	Case was handled administratively by the HUD DEC.
1/3/2013	<p>On 01/10/2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to HUD-OIG that two individuals who were repairing an apparent REO property in his bldg., identified themselves as HUD Federal Agents. The U.S. Attorney's Office indicated that they would like to open an investigative matter and for HUDOIG to follow up.</p>	Case completely adjudicated
9/18/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for and received an MDA HAP grant (Phase 2) in the amount of \$100,000 on a residence that was not his primary residence at the time of Hurricane Katrina (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Waveland, MS). Evidence suggests that the property was being rented to someone else prior to the storm. Furthermore, an elevation grant in the amount of \$30,000 was also paid to the subject as well as a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the damaged address. convicted</p>	Final Disposition

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/20/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Public Housing, New Orleans, Louisiana notified HUD OIG that she received a call from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Homer Housing Authority (HHA). (b)(6); advised that he was calling to report (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the HHA, for fraudulent activities. (b)(6);(b)(7) told (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted to forging signatures on checks written to herself. (b)(7)(C) stated he became aware of the fraudulent activity after being contacted by the bank which noticed an unusual amount of checks coming through that were written to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) stated he requested copies of checks through January and the estimated amount of unauthorized checks through that period is in excess of \$10,000.	Case has been fully adjudicated.
9/18/2013	Subjects may have submitted SRAP applications containing fraudulent documents. Declined	Declined by AUSA
5/17/2013	The Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) made a complaint on Small Rental Assistance Program (SRAP) applicant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advising that (b)(6);(b)(7) submitted a fraudulent deed in support of his SRAP application (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in order beat the cutoff deadline to qualify for the program.	Case charged , indicted then dismissed. no further investigation.
6/27/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a Section 8 recipient with the Mississippi Regional Housing Authority No. VIII. Beginning in May 2010 to December 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7) failed to disclose his Workman's Compensation income resulting in MRHA VIII to submit overpayments on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) behalf in the amount of \$10,996.00.	Money repaid by subject to HA. US Attorney's office declines any further action.
9/3/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has refused to surrender or permit the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) to review documentation of the progress and expenditures for her Small Rental Assistance Program (SRAP) applications. MDA believes the subject has either misspent, misappropriated or otherwise utilized the \$1.1 million in SRAP funds that she has received in an unauthorized manner.	Case Declined by USAO.
1/9/2013	The complainants alleged that a manager at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is coercing residents to pay undisclosed side payments in order to keep their Section 8 housing.	Administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/19/2013	Complainant alleges that his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has fraudulently applied for and received Section 8 Assistance from the Brunswick Housing Authority. Complaint alleged that (b)(6) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Brunswick Police Department and should not have qualified for Section 8 assistance. Complainant also alleged that subject's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is illegally living in the Section 8 unit, running an unauthorized Day Care.	Allegations unfounded.
1/2/2013	US Attorney's Office for the Southern District of GA contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advising that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a HUD-funded contractor hired to do construction work on Savannah Gardens, may have illegal aliens working on the project. It is also alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is submitting false information to HUD to conceal that they are employing illegal aliens on the project	Lack of HUD Nexus. Case primary focus are immigration violations
10/5/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forged his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) signature on documents in order to obtain an FHA-insured loan. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed the lender that she had no knowledge of the transaction/mortgage loan, and that she felt (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained the mortgage without her knowledge.	Declination.
3/14/2013	Roswell Housing Authority was approved for an emergency roof repair at the housing authority. The RHA obtained the services of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and paid the contractor \$61,000.00, however the sub-contractor's have complained they were not paid for their labor. Further review of the contract has revealed the information provided to the RHA appears to be false and the costs were inflated.	Lack of prosecutive merit
10/16/2012	The complainant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Rental Management Program, Douglas-Cherokee Economic Authority, alleges serious mismanagement of HUD funding, including tenant fraud, employee theft, and equipment theft.	

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/1/2012	<p>HUD OIG was contacted Cobb County Police Department with a complaint they received from home owner, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) found unknown individuals living at his residence located at (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Mableton GA 30126. Once Cobb County Police interviewed the unauthorized tenants, the tenants stated they signed a lease with a company named "(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)", previously "(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)" and was paying approximately \$1200 a month. The unauthorized tenant stated the owner of the company is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Once (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was arrested, a search warrant for the business and residence of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed multiple addresses that were acquire by deceitful means. One of the address was an FHA insured property. A Section 8 tenant viewed the arrest of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on the local news and contacted Cobb County Police stating he was her landlord.</p>	Final Disposition
9/26/2013	<p>A pro-active review of SFDW data revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had 26 properties that were in claim status, in the amount of \$3,064,784.49. The combined loss to HUD to date is \$999,477, with nine properties pending a loss figure. All loans were originated at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and involved two Underwriters; (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (11 properties) and (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (15 properties). Additionally, a query of both (b)(6);(b)(6) and (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) revealed that (b)(6);(b)(6) was identified as participating in appraisal fraud and (b)(6);(b)(6) in loan origination fraud.</p>	case is being
2/27/2013	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), City of Knoxville, embezzled HUD Community Planning and Development Funds from KPD by forging invoices from charity organizations from which KPD contributed.</p>	All actions have been completed.
10/16/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Westgate Apartments located in Garden City, GA. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(6) is extorted money from tenants potential tenants to move them ahead on the waiting list for housing. (b)(6);(b)(6) has allegedly charged \$200-\$500. (b)(6);(b)(6) has also allegedly falsified tenant information to hide the fact that the applicant is a convicted felon. In addition, it is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(6) caused utility checks to be issued in tenants names and then cashed the checks for her own use.</p>	Declined by AUSA
11/30/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly orginated multiple loans using (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) license number. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) loan file orginated by (b)(6);(b)(6) appears to contain multiple false statements.</p>	Allegations unfounded

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/28/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), all claiming to be sovereign citizens have taken illegal possession of a HUD insured property and provided fraudulent documents to the utility companies in order to obtain services.	Final Disposition
12/20/2012	An anonymous letter was mailed to the Nashville HUD Field Office regarding alleged fraudulent activity involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The allegations include, but are not limited to mismanagement of government funds, theft and salary discrepancies.	Administratively closed by ASAC. Lack of criminal and or civil violations.
3/15/2013	Brunswick, GA Community Development CDBG Manager allegedly receiving fulltime pay via the CDBG Entitlement grant program, but is working another job during required CDBG Entitlement work hours, thus fraudulently drawing payment for hours not worked.	Allegations unfounded
9/26/2013	At the request of Main Justice, HUD-OIG is investigating allegations that a member of the South Pittsburg Housing Authority is involved in public corruption, as well as conducting gambling and the illegal distribution of Xanax on public housing property, at the bequest of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Specifically, Main Justice is concerned that HUD funds may have been diverted for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) personal use.	Allegations could not be substantiated
2/7/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the landlord for his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) whose last names are on the lease. The Section 8 payments are being mailed to a post office box. A request for information inquiry to the Post Office showed that owner of the post office box's address is the same as the address that the Section 8 subsidy is being paid for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It is noted that the owner's address when the lease was first executed in 1998 was listed as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The address was changed to the PO Box address somewhere around 2003 based on archived information. And, finally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). If substantiated, the loss to HUD is estimated to be substantial due to the time frame this fraud has been ongoing.	Case is being ADMN closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/1/2013	Information was received through a source that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Monroe Housing Authority (MHA) was transferring large sums of money via multiple transactions in a small timeframe to the Philippines. The transactions occurred during his tenure and after his retirement from the Monroe Housing Authority. It is suspected that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have embezzled housing authority funds and was trying to transfer them out of the Country.	Allegations unfounded
11/28/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly received kickbacks from doing work with the Housing Authority in Paris, Kentucky.	Lack of investigative merit.
3/4/2013	The Miami-Dade Public Housing Agency forwarded information regarding allegations that Compliance Reviewer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had utilized her position to obtain or receive in higher amounts than authorized, Housing Choice Voucher program benefits for herself and family members.	Investigation did not reveal activity warranting criminal prosecution. Subject resigned and no further administrative actions are possible.
11/7/2012	Written communications from the Miami Dade County Commission on Ethics and Public Trust alleged that Multifamily project landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) continued to collect section 8 rent payments for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Miami, FL after the tenant vacated the property.	No longer meets agency investigative priorities. Administrative actions complete.
7/2/2013	This office has receive information indicating \$35 million in HECM mortgages may have been originated fraudulently.	Declination by AUSA

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/16/2013	The above named realtor may have participated in loan origination fraud involving 14 borrowers and over \$2 million worth of mortgages.	Due to the minimum or lack of time left on the criminal statute and the minimum loss amount to HUD. As a result, the AUSA has decided not to move forward with the criminal prosecution of this case.
2/19/2013	The Palm Beach County Department of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the Palm Beach County Attorney's Office reported an allegation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former (b)(6) employee maintained a business and possibly personal relationship with a realtor who engaged in business activities with (b)(6);(b)(7) in her official capacity. (b)(6);(b)(7) also utilized her official position to obtain personal identification information for use in her personal tax preparation business.	Case declined for prosecution. Subject previously terminated from County employment.
11/28/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Barbourville Housing Authority and is allegedly selling Social Security Numbers of Section 8 tenants for cash.	Lack of investigative merit.
3/5/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Pikeville HA is allegedly telling Section 8 tenants that landlords will enforce sidebar contracts where the tenant pays more than what is contained in the HAP agreement.	Allegations unsubstantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/6/2013	Contact was made with the Hillsborough County Sheriffs Department identifying Tampa Housing Authority (THA) Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as maintaining a second and possible third residence while allowing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to reside in the subsidized unit. Additionally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was identified by another THA Section 8 participant as purchasing identities from a THA employee, later identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Contact with the Tampa Police Department (TPD) resulted in two confidential informants for the TPD identifying (b)(6);(C) as working at the THA and selling identities.	Allegation not corroborated/accurate.
11/30/2012	HUD OIG received a referral (b)(5) alleging (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) transferred approximately \$136,000 from nonprofit accounts associated with Intergenerational Resource Center (IRC) to her personal bank account. IRC has received approximately \$1.9 million federal dollars divided between HUD Economic Development Initiative (EDI) Grant and a Fulton County Community Development Block Grant (CDBG).	Allegations unsubstantiated
10/31/2012	On 06/08/2012, a source alleged that she had been told by a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that he had to pay a bribe in the amount of \$20,000 in order to obtain HOME Program funding from the Puerto Rico Housing Finance Authority (PRFHA). The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) offered to take her to the person whom he needed to pay the bribe to in order to have PRFHA disburse the rest of the HOME funds for one of her projects previously approved by this agency. The individual implied PRFHA's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was involved in the scheme.	Not enough information available to conduct investigation. (b)(5) (b)() were placed in file and not sent out
		(b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/30/2012	The Anonymous Douglasville County Housing Authority employee alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been using govt. vehicles and credit cards for personal use. Complainant also alleges that (b)(6) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is selling HUD owned property for personal profit. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is hiring convicted felons for temporary and full time employment.	Allegations unsubstantiated
12/6/2012	Information was forwarded by HUD-CPD regarding allegations of bid rigging/tampering by an employee of the Community Redevelopment Associates of Florida, Inc. (CRAFL).	The investigation revealed administrative problems but no clear criminal violations.
11/2/2012	This investigation was initiated as a result of proactive analysis of HUD's SFDW and NW. In the past two years, FHA loans originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have resulted in 92 claims totaling over \$8.9 million. HUD suffered losses of over \$3.6 million as a result of those claims.	Document review does not support systemic fraud within lender.
4/8/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former Wells Fargo (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) originated an FHA-insured loan and forged the borrower's signature on an explanation of credit letter.	Declined for prosecution by AUSA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
9/3/2013	Subjects received approximately \$552,000 in Small Rental Assistance Program (SRAP 2) disbursements and there has been little or no progress on the development. While there is evidence to suggest that some of the disbursed funds have been spent on the project, there is approximately over \$300,000 in funds that appear to have been transferred to a related company and are no longer under the control of the applicant and thus are not available to the applicant to continue the project or to repay the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA). It appears that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who had divested herself of any ownership and management of the applicant, prior to the final approval and disbursement of funds had actually endorsed the payment checks from the program and transferred the funds out of the applicant's checking account.	Declined for prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/5/2013	Former Lakeland Housing Authority (LHA) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have improperly entered into a contract with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for IT Services at the direction of LHA Board of Commissioner's Chairperson, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Allegedly 2 contracts were drafted for approximately \$49,000 instead of a \$100,000 contract in an effort to avoid bidding. In the last 12 months, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), has received approximately \$197,000 from the LHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have been directly involved in the procurement of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to be an associate/business partner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owner.	Allegations unsubstantiated
9/3/2013	The final Uniform Residential Loan Application dated 4/19/2011 reflects that the borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was employed at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as a Musician for 11 years. The URLA reflects monthly wages of \$2,399.80. This income was used as the qualifying income. The income was based off of a pay stub for the period of 4/11/2011 - 4/17/2011 which reflected salaried wages of \$533.60.	Lack of significant impact to HUD program
4/3/2013	A preliminary investigation conducted by the Special Investigations Division (SID) determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) inappropriately touched two female HUD employees during a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) convention that occurred between (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Atlanta, Georgia.	Collateral investigation completed.
9/26/2013	HUD-OIG Region 8 Office of Investigations requested assistance in conducting interviews of former employees of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as part of the Big Lender Initiative.	opened as part of a collateral for case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) all interviews requested have been completed
4/11/2013	Received email from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with U.S. Attorney's Office reference a complaint he received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) brought a claim against the city of Bartlett for failing to provide him water service even though he was in an area where service was provided. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged he was discriminated against due to his race and stated he filed a complaint with HUD because the city of Bartlett received federal funds from HUD. He alleged that a HUD employee conducted an investigation and when his case went to trial, the HUD employee lied about his findings.	Declined.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/11/2013	It is alleged that fraudulent statements were made on applications to the Louisville Metro Human Relations Commission (HRC) in order to obtain Female Business Enterprise (FBE) status for Overlook Development.	ASAC administratively closing this matter due to funding involving tax credits. Referred to the state.
9/3/2013	Subject applied for the NRRP program when she did not meet the requirements. Subject may have conspired with her tenant to make her rental property appear to be unoccupied prior to securing the forgivable loan.	Case declined by AUSA
7/26/2013	HUD-OIG was notified by the United States' Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of Wisconsin that an individual identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have benefitted financially by defrauding HUD's HOME program as administered by the City of Milwaukee. Specifically, the allegations are that (b)(6);(b) submitted a set of invoices with higher rates in order to bill the city of Milwaukee, and in turn, paid off contractors less than what was actually billed for their services. A follow-up conversation with the city of Milwaukee revealed that the aforementioned fraud may involve a contract worth \$21,000.	Subject repaid the alleged misused funds. Given the repayment by (b)(6);(b) after HUD-OIG's involvement, and the fact that no actual loss was sustained by any entity, the USAO declined further prosecution.
5/1/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a landlord under the Indianapolis Housing Agency's Housing Choice Voucher Program. A review of the payments made to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was conducted by IHA Office of Special Investigations and it was determined that \$346,697 in ineligible Housing Assistance Payments were made. OSI Audit Report (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported deficient housing quality standards, deficient documentation for the property and/or assisted units, and several tenants harboring violent criminals, violating the One Strike Policy, and concealing income and assets.	Settlement was reached with the subject. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/21/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of allegations that the property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been the subject of a fraudulent real estate transaction. Specifically it appears that the closing documents were altered numerous times prior to the actual closing on 6/25/2009. The seller's name was changed aproximatley three times as was the sales price. The appraisal appears to have been inflated or altered due to the appraised value not matching the appraisers comments.</p>	<p>After obtaining employment information and checking last know addresses and contacts, it was determined that the buyer no longer is a resident of the U.S. It appears this was a single transaction that would not merit prosecutorial consideration without the buyer of further witnesses. This investigation will be closed at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/3/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information from the Wisconsin Department of Justice Consumer Protection and Anti-Trust Unit which alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and associates are potentially involved in Mail Fraud stemming from a Mortgage Rescue scheme. More specifically, it is alleged by potential victims (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that they received mail from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), in which they (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were made to believe they were being solicited to enroll in the Making Home Affordable (MHA) program, which is sponsored by the US Departments of Treasury and US Department of Housing and Urban Development. Letters provided by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) show (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) utilizing MHA letterhead and the US Department of Treasury Official Seal. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subsequently provided check payments to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) after being sent letters from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advising them that a successful loan modification had been achieved through the MHA program.</p>	<p>This case is being closed due to Region 9 investigating the subject under a different name and having established a more appropriate venue to investigate case. The ASAC has spoken with the ASAC from Region 9 regarding advisement of case. Region 9 case number is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) No further investigation from Region 5 at this time but will continue to provide support to Region 9.</p>
7/15/2013	<p>HUD Field Office Director (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated he received a phone call from ABC 6 news reporter (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) inquired about burglaries of HUD owned properties. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised he spoke to a Grove City police detective who investigated a burglary of a HUD owned property in which there were not signs of a break in. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated he would forward (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) information to the Philadelphia Home Ownership Center.</p>	<p>Additional investigation not warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/8/2013	Reporting Agent received information from the Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) pertaining to possible tenant/landlord fraud. The allegations claim that Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), is subletting her Section 8 unit to another person, while living in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) home. MSHDA also supplied information to support (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residence at her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residence. The allegations also articulate that the landlord was interviewed regarding this matter, and although knew something was wrong decided to ignore it as she was still receiving her payments from the Ann Arbor Housing Commission.	Allegations do not meet prosecutor guidelines.
7/29/2013	Congressional inquiry forwarded for investigation. Original complainant is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is alleging that HUD employees in Detroit, MI, Grand Rapids, MI, and Washington D.C. have colluded in Sabotage, Extortion, Harassment, Misuse of Discretionary Decision Making, Interference with a Contract, and Retaliation for Reporting Actions to Supervisors.	Case declined for prosecution. Allegations appear to be unfounded.
5/6/2013	Lender self report from Bank of America (BOA) reported allegations of false income tax and W-2's as support for the FHA insured loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Columbus, OH 43207. Specifically, the borrower submitted one 2010 W-2 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reflecting wages of \$41,370.94, along with another 2010 W-2 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reflecting wages of \$41,029.66, for a total 2010 earnings of \$82,400. However, the 2010 Federal Income Tax Return only reflects wages of \$41,421. Neighborhood Watch shows a history of delinquency, with 10 payments before first 90-day default. It is currently 2-months delinquent. NW also shows the property occupied by the borrower.	Complaint inadvertently converted to an investigation. Investigation to be closed as the single borrower instance does not meet agency guidelines.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/20/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former prosecutor, owned 20 condos located on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Centerville, OH. (b)(6);(b) allegedly allowed his friend, realtor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), to live in a condo rent free. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also lived in the condo. (b)(6);(b) sold the condo's to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for approximately \$1.3 million. Most of the condos were occupied by tenants who did not income qualify for public housing. (b)(6);(b) paid tenants a \$925 moving stipend and 42 months rental assistance for the difference between the current rent of \$625 and higher rent somewhere else. (b)(6);(b) allegedly received more than \$11,000 rental subsidy. On the rental subsidy application, (b)(6);(b) allegedly reported three people living in the unit. (b)(6);(b) allegedly failed to report that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also resided in the unit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the real estate agent for (b)(6);(b) sale of the property to (b)(6);(b). For purposes of child support, (b)(6);(b) reported she earned \$31,000 a year. (b)(6);(b) would have qualified for public housing earning \$31,000 a year. On the rental subsidy application (b)(6);(b) allegedly reported earning \$47,000 a year which qualified her for rental subsidy. (b)(6);(b) has a recent foreclosure and bankruptcy. (b)(6);(b) is allegedly buying a home through land contract. Complaint further alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owned a home and did not reside at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) condos. (b)(6);(b) also received approximately \$13,000 to relocate. (b)(6);(b) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly owned (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>All logical leads have been exhausted. Therefore, no additional investigative efforts to be expended and case will be administratively closed.</p>
7/25/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) MSHDA referred allegations to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that HCVP tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is living with her HCVP landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Port Huron, MI. The allegations state that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were recently shown in the Port Huron Times Herald newspaper as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Their names were shown as surviving family in an obituary. (b)(6);(b)(7) said that (b)(6);(b)(7) has been receiving HCVP assistance while living at this address since 2005 and received approximately \$56,000 in assistance to date.</p>	<p>Case declined for prosecution.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/11/2013	<p>Cleveland HUD Multifamily employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephonically contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and reported the following: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as a walk-in complainant. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been a 7-year tenant at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) adn is a \$25 per month tenant. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has knowledge and may have witnessed individuals paying \$ in order to be moved up the wait list. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes this may have occurred on at leave 5 instances. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Identity of Interest company manages (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a 100% section-8 subsidized apartment complex. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested confidentiality of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as she has been threatened both physical harm and death. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) speaks broken english and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recommended having an interpreter available to fully interview (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) North Canton, OH, 44720 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);</p>
8/27/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (last name not given) contacted HUD-OIG Investigations to file a complaint on her neighbor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has sub-leased her residence at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Lorain, Ohio 44055 to known drug dealers in the past and is currently subleasing the residence to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (last name unknown). It is speculated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lives with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and has subleased her property for the past 3 years. The complainant contacted the Lorain Metropolitan Housing Authority's fraud department to file a complaint on many occasions. She belives that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) knows someone within the agency and they are declining to follow-up on her complaints. One person she remembers speaking to was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complainant has video displaying the fraud being committed at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) location. She will email or fax the reporting agent a copy of a detailed report disclosing the fraud being committed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complainant's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will assist her with the complaint and both want to remain anonymous. Complainant's phone number is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>Investigation to be closed. (b)(5) (b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/19/2013	<p>Hotline received the following email: The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is abusing his power in many ways and waiting (sic) tax dollars all while receiving personal benefits. First, He has hired sub par contractors that he has a personal relationship with. The work performed is terrible. The contractors have made hundreds of thousands of dollars. He is paying outrages (sic) amounts of money for work that could easily be preformed (sic) by the maintenance workers employee by the Authority. In return, the contractors performed home improvements to his personal house and a co-worker and well below market value for the work and in some cases (sic) at ZERO cost. Secondly, he is a co-owner of a computer program he helped design. He removed the computer system that was in place at the housing authority and replaced it with his own and made money on the cost as well as the monthly maintenance contract. Third, he is hiring his friends to come in and paint apartments. No FRP process, just a call to his friends at a cost that far exceeds the employees hr rate.</p>	<p>Not enough evidence was furnished to justify the opening of a full-scale investigation - (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>
9/24/2013	<p>This complaint is predicated upon a referral from the Buffalo Metropolitan Housing Authority (BMHA) regarding public housing resident and resident BMHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also serves as a Tenant Representative, receiving a HUD-funded stipend to do chores in and around BMHA property. BMHA received a complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a newly appointed Tenant Representative, asserting that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had driven (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to a nearby gas station to cash (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stipend check of about \$200, at which time (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) demanded \$100 of it as a one-time processing fee for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) appointment as a Tenant Representative. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) later advised BMHA, who conducted a limited investigation and found no other wrongdoing. However, the investigation was limited solely to interviews. Therefore, BMHA referred the matter to HUD OIG for further, more in-depth investigation.</p>	<p>This investigation converted prior to the complaint being closed. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is meeting with Buffalo HUD PIH program staff during the week of September 23, 2013 in order to discuss and refer the allegations as they do not meet prosecution guidelines.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	Columbus, OH Police telephonically contacted HUD/OIG to request assistance with allegations that FHA insured borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), used counterfeit check(s) as a source of downpayment for the residence located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Centerburg, OH 43011.	All judicial actions complete. No further investigation required.
3/12/2013	DTE Energy and the Detroit Police Department organized a task force to address the rampant vandalism and theft and copper and appliances from vacant houses in the city of Detroit. HUD and HUD-OIG have joined the task force to combat such theft occurring in HUD REO homes. The Detroit Housing Commission recently expressed interest in participating in the initiative to combat theft and vandalism occurring in their scattered sites public housing. HUD-OIG will coordinate with DHC, DTE, and DPD (b)(7)(E) in DHC housing, and the subsequent arrest of the perpetrators.	Proactive investigation did not yield results as expected. No further investigative effort will be expended.
4/30/2013	Case referred by CPD management alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an NSP Representative in Detroit, was under suspicion of steering NSP funded contracts to a particular contractor. In addition, CPD management allege (b)(6);(b) may have misstatements on her resume for employment with HUD and that she often arrives late to the office.	Case declined by prosecutor, administrative action completed.
12/7/2012	On 01/10/2012, at approximately 10:44 hours, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Warren, MI, 48092 contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of U.S. Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General (HUD OIG) Detroit Field Office pertaining to possible FHA loan application fraud. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that in November 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), obtained an installment loan for \$10,000.00 using a social security number that did not belong to him. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was scheduled to apply for an FHA mortgage loan application using the same social security number, and possible false employment information on 01/10/2012, at approximately 13:30 hours.	All judicial action complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/11/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employed by the City of Pontiac, Federal Programs Division, as the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) notified HUD staff via email on 1/17/2012, of violations allegedly committed by companies under contract with the City. The violations include failing to file paperwork with State regulatory agencies, poor work performance, and possible falsified paperwork. After notifying State agencies and the City of such violations, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employment was terminated. After HUD-OIG and EPA-CID agents interviewed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) more allegations against City employees were made, including possible bribery and/or extortion by contractors to obtain demolition contracts payable with HUD CDBG monies.</p>	Allegations unfounded.
10/17/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are all companies associated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a landlord under Indianapolis Housing Agency's Housing Choice Voucher Program. Among all of these companies, there were approximately 91 properties that were enrolled in the Voucher Program. The true ownership of the properties was often concealed and/or fraudulently declared. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is an ineligible landlord due to his criminal history that includes Dealing Cocaine and Possession of Cocaine.</p>	All administrative action complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
6/21/2013	<p>It is alleged that CEDA is conspiring with a core group of contractors to subvert the federally funded Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) by accepting bribes in exchange for favorable terms and/or access to the contract to do the work paid for the WAP program. In addition, CEDA and or it's contractors may be submitting false statements/claims with regard to work incomplete work or work not done or in accordance with the contract, using unapproved materials, filing false certifications, to obtain approval to work in the program and using unapproved an unreported subcontractors.</p>	<p>After further investigation, it was determined that HUD funds were not provided to CEDA nor was any HUD program negatively impacted. Subsequently, this case will be closed at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/22/2013	<p>This office recieved information that (b)(6);(b)(7) was entering into Section 8 rental contracts for properties that he did not own. Further, it appears that the properties are at various stages of the forclosure process. Initial loss estimates suggest that this case meets the prosecutorial guidelines of the state court.</p>	<p>Insufficient evidence to present for prosecution and more importantly, one of the subjects who was uncovered in this case is part of an investigation by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>
11/29/2012	<p>On November 23, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with HUD-Chicago provided the OIG with written complaints concerning (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in CPD in the Minneapolis Field Office. CPD Representatives and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subordinates, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7) allege they witnessed (b)(6);(b)(7) viewing pornographic images on his HUD owned computer during work hours. (b)(6);(b)(7) alleges she has seen (b)(6);(b)(7) viewing pornographic images on three different occasions. (b)(6);(b)(7) described the images as photos of unclothed women in provocative poses. (b)(6);(b)(7) also alleges (b)(6);(b)(7) has created a hostile work environment and believes (b)(6);(b)(7) is in violation of HUD's Internet and sexual harassmt policies. (b)(6);(b)(7) alleges she saw (b)(6);(b)(7) viewing a pornographic image on one occasion. (b)(6);(b)(7) described the image as a picture of an almost naked woman posing provocatively.</p>	<p>All actions have been taken in this case and all evidence has been destroyed and documented through the appropriate channels.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/18/2013	<p>The Illinois Attorney General reported to the Atlanta HOC that the borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was the victim of ID theft and had a HECM loan originated in her name without her knowledge. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not own any property, and did not authorize the transaction.////// (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while hospitalized, was approached by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with an offer to find housing. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) agreed. Later, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) realized that a HECM was taken out in her name when she was notified that the proceeds from the HECM was ready for pick-up. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not pick up the money. She reported the matter to the Illinois AG.</p>	<p>There is an active investigation involving the lender in this particular case. Based on that, the loan in question for this case will be merged into the case that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) currently is working.</p>
3/26/2013	<p>On January 26, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received an anonymous call from a male regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Alexandria, MN. (b)(6);(C) is an eight unit facility that provides transitional housing for battered women and children through HUD's Supportive Housing Program in Community Planning and Development (CPD). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not currently have a Program Coordinator (PC) for transitional housing because the previous coordinator walked out a few months ago. The PC was paid \$35,000 annually and the caller wonders where the money may be going now that (b)(6);(C) does not have a PC. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) gets a lot of money from HUD and is always claiming to have no money. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not meeting the needs of its' clients and may be in violation of HUD requirements. The Board of Directors for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been monitoring (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the last two months. The board is documenting what she is doing and how she spends her day. The caller was told by a social worker in Minneapolis to report (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to HUD. The caller is not employed at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) but received this information from a very reliable source. The caller stated that he knows this information to be fact and does not randomly report people to HUD. The caller knows Assistant Attorney Generals in the Office of the Minnesota Attorney General (AG) and advised that (b)(6);(C) is/was under investigation by the AG.</p>	<p>Lack of sufficient evidence to warrant review through a criminal prosecutor. This matter is best suited for administrative review by HUD CPD staff in Minneapolis. See ROI for complete explanation and summary.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/26/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a part owner and investor in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which owns and rents properties. More specifically (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Investments received Milwaukee County, Section-8 Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) for section-8 tenants located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Milwaukee, WI. Additionally it is alleged and inferred that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) authorized the HAP payments that were received by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from the Milwaukee County.</p>	<p>This case was declined by the prosecutor for not meeting their prosecutorial guidelines. No further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
10/25/2012	<p>This office is in receipt of information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Chicago Housing Authority (CHA). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that in 2009, a contractor (not currently known) was given a contract for \$60,000 to conduct a gut rehab of multiple units in the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) scattered site projects. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) this contract was a relative of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Now CHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) instructed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to authorize the \$60,000 payment to the contract, even though work was not completed. Later in 2011, the CHA again authorized funds to rehab the same units. An additional allegation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) made was that himself and the rest of the Quality Control Analysts were pressured by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to forge signatures, and alter tenant files in order to pass the upcoming HUD Annual Review.</p>	<p>This case will be closed due to lack of supporting documentation and material evidence to support allegations. In addition, the allegations appear to be related to HR issues within CHA rather than criminal in nature. This case will be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/10/2012	<p>Reporting Agent was contacted by the US Attorney's Office (USAO) who is representing HUD in a construction lien foreclosure action, originally filed in state court by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), the general contractor on the HUD multi-family housing project, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), located in Burton, Michigan. The project has a FHA/HUD-insured mortgage that closed June 2006, the current mortgage holder is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The principal of the general contractor and the general partner of the partnership that owned the project is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) moved to add HUD as a defendant, asserting that HUD was a necessary party under the Michigan construction line foreclosure act. HUD moved to dismiss on the grounds that a HUD Regulatory Agreement was not a lien interest and, therefore, HUD wasn't properly a defendant. The court recently denied our motion. The USAO is requesting assistance as HUD needs to assert any compulsory counter-claims arising from the matters that are at issue in the foreclosure. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has moved for partial summary judgment, on the grounds that (b)(6) filed liens that contradict sworn statements to HUD regarding the commencement of construction. It is alleged that fraudulent liens may have been filed on the property as well as false statements provided by the borrower and/or contractor.</p>	Case declined for prosecution
8/14/2013	<p>Joint investigation with HUD/OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). This case was predicated upon a request for assistance from the (b)(5) (b)(5) in conducting a sex offender compliance check involving individuals allegedly living in subsidized housing in Cleveland's Fourth Policing District. As a result, approximately 36 sex offenders were identified as living in subsidized housing as unauthorized occupants.</p>	<p>Case to be combined with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Case administratively closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/25/2013	Reporting Agent received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Detroit Police Department (DPD) that he received allegations from a source within the City of Detroit Finance Department that buildings targeted for demolition under the City of Detroit Residential Demolition Program have been reported by the City of Detroit Buildings, Safety Engineering, & Environmental Department (BSE&ED) as being demolished, but are actually still standing. The Residential Demolition Program utilizes HUD Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funding and is administered by the City of Detroit Planning and Development Department. Investigator (b)(6);(b) reported personally visiting over 90 properties reported to have been demolished, but found five buildings still standing.	Allegations appear unsupported. Does not require further investigative effort.
6/7/2013	US Bank reported to the Philadelphia HOC that the borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used false employment information to qualify for an FHA insured loan. The loan was a second payment default in November 2011.//////// The property was located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Blacklick, Ohio 43004.	Investigation declined for prosecution. Therefore, no further investigative efforts to be expended and case to be closed.
2/28/2013	Marion Metropolitan Housing Authority (MMHA) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that fraudulent payroll checks reflecting MMHA's HAP bank account and routing information were being cashed at numerous locations in the surrounding area. Although these checks contained MMHA bank account and routing information, they represented that they were from various private businesses and not MMHA. The total loss amount stolen from MMHA's HAP account is approximately \$34,000 thus far.	All judicial actions completed. Therefore no further investigative efforts to be expended and investigation to be closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/29/2013	Received email from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging HUD CPD employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), emailed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and used sexually and racially explicit language. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided a copy of the email in question that appears to have been sent from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) official HUD email address.	Employee retired in lieu of disciplinary action
7/26/2013	Individuals representing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Calumet City, IL 60409, were going door-to-door in a neighborhood on Chicago's west side when they convinced (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to take out a Home Equity Conversion Mortgage (HECM) in exchange for doing repairs around her house. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that the representatives from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pressured her into a HECM, and when she tried to cancel within the allotted time, allegedly levied threats against her in terms of litigation. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) says that she now has a HECM, and never received any money or repairs on her house. Specifically, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that a man by the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) took the check given to her pursuant to her HECM and she has not heard from him since. In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) says that she was never provided counseling as requirements for a HECM dictate. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the subject of a previous complaint, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in which, much like with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) individuals were going door-to-door targeting seniors and pressuring them into a HECM. In that instance, the complainant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never went through with the HECM, but alleged some of the same pressuring tactics.	Case will be incorporated into case # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Transfer of case evidence. No further action warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/26/2013	We received a complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Public and Indian Housing, Minneapolis HUD Office, Minneapolis, Minnesota. (b)(6);(b) has numerous with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Forest Lake Housing Authority, Forest Lake, Minnesota. (b)(6);(b) states she has received a couple of complaints alleging (b)(6);(b)(7) is using Housing Authority funds for personal use. This includes using a personal credit card, having work completed at her personal house and being paid by the Housing Authority, stealing tenant's personal assets, and not showing up to work. As a result, an investigation is warranted.	Insufficient evidence to warrant further investigation and presentation through the U. S. Attorney's Office. The subject is no longer employed by each authority in question. Based on this, no further activity is warranted in this matter.
10/24/2012	This office was contacted by the Fergus Falls HRA regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly resided with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while retaining her Section 8-assisted apartment in excess of 12 months. Preliminary loss to the HRA is approximately \$8,600. The the Otter Tail County Welfare Fraud Unit is also looking at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for false statements related to her residency. This loss amount is within charging standards for the Otter Tail County Attorney's Office.	All judicial actions have been taken in this case. No further action is warranted.
12/19/2012	On September 17th, 2010 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) spoke to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Lafayette Housing Authority (LHA) regarding a former Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program tenant named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was recently terminated from the program for failing to report income and concealing employment information. LHA discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been working for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) since December 2008. LHA confronted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding this information, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) denied working for the company. LHA provided documentation to the reporting Agent indicating that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was an employee of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) including wage and earning information and signed verifications from her employer.	All judicial actions are complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/26/2013	<p>While working with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Cook County Bureau of Community Development, recipients of grants for HUD programs, such as the Neighborhood Stabilization Program and the HOME program, came under question. The initial allegations resulted from questions asked about the funds leaving Cook County for various HUD programs. The ledger of funds leaving was obtained from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). More specifically, two entities, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which received in excess of \$150,000 for a project in Matteson, Illinois under the HOME program and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which has received money under the NSP, for development in Ford Heights, Illinois, were questioned. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided Agents with documents pertaining to each entity and made himself available to answer any questions. It was determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received money without ever completing a project, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is slated to receive large grants for development in Ford Heights, IL whilst (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is facing a current civil injunction related to past mortgage fraud.</p>	<p>Allegations are unsubstantiated. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>
6/4/2013	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is involved in straw buying, false employment, and property flipping, relative to the purchase of a FHA insured home as well as other properties.</p>	<p>Case declined by for prosecution.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/8/2013	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided fraudulent information while obtaining a FHA insured loan. The alleged false statements were uncovered during the request for a Short Sale application by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During this process, the bank discovered that the information provided by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was different than his original loan application.</p>	<p>The seller of this property is the subject of another multi-loan investigation that is currently being investigated by the HUD OIG and the United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Illinois. Based on this information, this case will be closed and merged into the existing investigation.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/30/2013	<p>An anonymous complainant reported that a former Sokaogon Housing Authority employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) defrauded the housing authority of at least \$40,000. The housing authority received \$1.8 million in a Native American Block Grant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from ARRA funding to build 11 homes. While the homes were completed, a review of the invoices shows that an excessive number of items were purchased beyond what was needed for the construction. The complainant alleges that in one case, 14 refrigerators were purchased with the grant funds, but the refrigerators were delivered to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Other items were purchased with the grant funds but were delivered to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) home or storage facility. The subject, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) left the housing authority and is now a HUD employee in Chicago. Records show that she is a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in the Office of Native American Programs. According to the complainant, the housing authority (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has proof of the fraud in the form of invoices, and delivery information. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is willing to cooperate but is fearful of reprisals. Sokaogon Housing Authority Sokaogon Chippewa Community Mole Lake Band Crandon, Wisconsin 54520</p>	All judicial and administrative actions complete. Subject currently incarcerated in federal prison. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
3/4/2013	<p>On March 1, 2011 the Indianapolis Field Office was in receipt of a letter from an inmate at the Indiana Department Corrections. The letter stated that the inmate was living with another female who was on Section 8 subsidy while being incarcerated at the Rockville Correctional Institution. The agent confirmed that the subject was indeed incarcerated from December 17, 2009 until January 18, 2011. The agent also verified through the Evansville Housing Authority that the tenant was receiving a Section 8 subsidy during the time frame in question.</p>	All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
10/24/2012	<p>This office recieved information from the Willmar HRA regarding possible fraud committed by a tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not report that she had married and that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was living with her and working. His income was not reported to the HRA or to the county welfare office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been charged with the welfare fraud and the county attorney's office is requesting that a case be presented regarding the tenant fraud.</p>	All judicial actions have been taken in this case. No further action is warranted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/1/2012	This office is in receipt of information pertaining to Section 8 tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and Section 8 Landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The information was provided by the Aurora Housing Authority. Allegedly, (b)(6);(C) who is the owner of the Section 8 property is related to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and resides at the Section 8 address located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Aurora, IL 60505.	ASA Declined due to insufficient evidence. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/19/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, Chicago, IL which alleges that City of Gary Housing Authority tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and East Chicago Housing Authority tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were receiving FEMA Assistance income during the time period they were receiving public housing subsidies from thier perspective local housing authorities.</p>	<p>Following multiple attempts by both e-mail and telephone to contact the U. S. Attorney's Office relative to the referral of this matter, our office has received no response. Further, the HUD loss in these cases is minimal compared to the loss to the Department of Homeland Security/FEMA. Moreover, based on the nature of these cases, public housing tenant allegations, our office will close this matter. Particularly, in light of new priorities and initiatives, no further activity is warranted in this matter.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/22/2013	Wells Fargo Bank reported to the Atlanta HOC that the borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), falsified his loan support documents to qualify for his home loan. QAD found that he falsified his bank statements, paystubs, and other documents. /////////////// The property was located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Des Plaines, IL.	No loss to HUD in this matter. Case declined based on aforementioned "Presentation to Prosecutor"
6/11/2013	This Agent received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Bloomington Police Department regarding possible Section 8 tenant fraud at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bloomington Indiana. Through a separate check fraud and forgery investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had two individuals living with her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in exchange for their food stamp money. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and several other individuals are involved in stealing checks, forging signatures and cashing them at various banks. This Agent investigated further and learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are Section 8 recipients. The reporting Agent also checked with parole and probation and learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was on parole and probation for forgery and reported (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Bloomington, Indiana as his address. Further investigation revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have never reported to Bloomington Housing Authority that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have been living with them. Based on this, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the opening of an investigation.	All judicial and administrative actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/2/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referred this case to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) after her investigation revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a Section 8 tenant and a Housing Choice Voucher Program recipient under the Lafayette Housing Authority, had concealed the fact that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was working full-time and living in her residence. After the apartment complex maintenance staff reported seeing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at her residence on numerous occasions, the Management office requested that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provide proof that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not live with her. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsified a lease purportedly showing that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lived elsewhere. During an interview with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted to falsifying the lease and concealing the fact that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been living with her. Lafayette Housing Authority removed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from the Section 8 program for failing to report (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his income, and the case was referred to the HUD Office of Inspector General for further investigation.</p>	All judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.
6/10/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residing in North Riverside, Illinois, attempted to purchase a two-flat at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Chicago, Illinois. This transaction included an alleged \$10,000 gift, was going to be FHA insured, owner occupied, and had a sales price of \$250,000. After three appraisals determined the sales price exceeded the property value, the deal was quashed. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) then purchased a two-flat located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Illinois, FHA # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on 8/1/11. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) realtor and recruited her to purchase the property. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that she would occupy the property as a primary residence on her Loan Application. This transaction included a \$3,000 gift that was allegedly from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) family member. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided a check at closing that was never used thus she received the monies back. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) cash to closing was provided by a friend of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has not moved into the property and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) told (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) he'd obtain Section 8 tenants for both units of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The building is being managed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a company that is located at the same address as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also managing the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) property.</p>	Case declined for prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/25/2012	<p>On November 1, 2010, HUD-OIG Columbus field office received a telephone call from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority's (CMHA) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained that the CMHA had reason to believe that section 8 tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had unreported income and may be involved in large money laundering ring in the Cincinnati area.</p>	<p>All judicial actives have been completed. Therefore, no further investigative efforts to be expended and this investigation will be closed.</p>
2/1/2013	<p>The Perrysburg Police Department contacted Reporting Agent regarding a builder in there area potentially committing mortgage fraud with FHA insured loans. Upon review of the first property in question R/A established that the builder, title agent, and loan processor were conspiring with each other to conceal a second mortgage between the builder/seller and buyer. R/A located a HUD-1 addendum where the parties certified there were no other loans involved in this transaction. R/A obtained e-mail correspondence between the loan processor and the title agent talking about concealing the second mortgage.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative action complete</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/18/2013	<p>HUD/OIG received the following email message from Cincinnati (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C): The "landlord" (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had signed over rent checks to her "tenant" (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) without problem and without us knowing about it. But, apparently they tried to do it again recently and the check cashing place wouldn't honor it. So, the client contacted our staff to try to get a check re-issued because the back of the check had been scribbled over and no one would honor it. The back appears to have been endorsed by the "landlord" and she apparently tried to sign it over to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). You probably can't tell in the PDF but it is pretty obvious in the original. I have attached all of the checks to this e mail. Two of them are cancelled checks the other one is the one that is scribbled on. The unit the client is residing in, that we paid deposit and rent on, is a single family home that according to the auditor's website this (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns with another person (spouse, maybe?) but it doesn't appear that she owns any other property in the community. I believe that the landlord and tenant have created false documents and are splitting the funds. I don't believe that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) woman resides in the property she is "renting" from the landlord. I spoke with the client, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) about the check prior to seeing it. She called 3 or 4 times. Upon seeing the check I tried calling her back to ask more questions and she has not since returned any of my calls. The landlord contacted the case manager a day ago or so and the case manager told her to contact me.</p>	<p>Allegations determined to be unfounded. Investigation to be closed.</p>
2/20/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported he was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) whose company is currently employed to manage properties on behalf of Community Housing Solutions, which is funded by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that he noticed several irregularities when he took over property management contract which appear to have been caused by the previous management company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The irregularities include failure to pay property taxes and failure to pay tenant's water bills.</p>	<p>ASAC spoke with AUSA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and reported HUD/OIG will be closing case file, but will reopen should additional information become available demonstrating a loss to HUD.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/15/2013	<p>United States Department of Justice Drug Enforcement Administration Task Force (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was assigned to a Drug Task Force Investigation involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). On 03/28/2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested assistance from United States Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG) Detroit Field Office. On 10/08/2009, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purchased a HUD REO property as owner occupant located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) MI, 48146. On 08/10/2010, DEA DTIU agents seized \$9,465.00 as suspected drug proceeds from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at the Detroit Metropolitan Airport. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to DEA DTIU agents that funds seized were from when he sold his HUD REO property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for \$22,000.00 however he did not file the proper paperwork with the Wayne County Deeds office. On 12/21/2010 DEA DTIU agents interviewed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reported that she bought (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in July or August of 2010 for \$21,000.00. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also informed DEA DTIU agents that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Woodhaven, MI notified her that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was unable to be sold before 10/09/2010, and any attempt to do so could result in criminal charges for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	Subject was found not guilty by bench trial.
3/7/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with Plymouth Housing Commission (PHC) submitted a referral to the Detroit Field Office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former participant between 09/06/2002 through 11/30/2010 of PHC currently owes \$13,770.00 in overpaid subsidy. The amount over paid was determined to start in 2006 through 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had unreported business income on her 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 Federal Income Taxes which she received directly from the Internal Revenue Service.</p>	All judicial action completed. No further investigation necessary.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/11/2013	<p>The Michigan State Housing Development Authority (MSHDA) received an anonymous complaint from a family member of Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reported that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has resided with the tenant since their children were born over (b) years ago. The complainant stated that (b)(6);(b) is employed as a subcontractor for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) own numerous cars and boats. MSHDA obtained (b)(6);(b) Michigan tax returns, driver's license history, and vehicles registrations, which confirm his employment and occupancy at the Section 8 assisted unit. (b)(6);(b)(7) has continuously certified since entering the program in July 2008 that only herself and her children live in the Section 8 assisted unit and that she receives no income outside of food stamps and \$200 per week in child support, which is not supported by a court order. Based on the unreported occupant and income from (b)(6);(b) (b)(6);(b)(7) has been overpaid \$23,460.00 in housing subsidy.</p>	Case dismissed.
12/7/2012	<p>(b)(5) contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) during March 2011 to inform him that they revealed two (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Properties that were sold by HUD to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as owner occupants. The (b)(5) (b)(5)</p>	Case does not meet HUD-OIG investigative guidelines
9/27/2013	<p>The Lucas Metropolitan Housing Authority (LMHA) contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to inform him of a Landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that is currently participating in the Housing Choice Voucher Program. LMHA alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) parented a baby that was born on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7). The Housing Assistance Payment Contract prohibits the landlord from housing family members and living in the subsidized unit.</p>	All judicial action completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/13/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD Office of Community Planning and Development received an e-mail from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Cory Place on 05/20/11. The e-mail from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Cory Place is writing checks to herself from the Cory Place bank account in excess of \$22,000. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a counseling and crisis intervention agency with services available to youth and their families in Bay, Arenac, and Gladwin counties, MI. Among the many funding sources for Cory Place is HUD. Recent allocations to HUD was \$136,666.00 in 2011.</p>	Case no longer meets HUD-OIG investigative guidelines.
2/21/2013	<p>Cincinnati - Hamilton County Community Action Agency (CCA) received approximately \$18 million dollars for weatherization programs funded by a Department of Energy (DoE) ARRA grant. Per DoE OIG, beginning approximately January 2009, CCA allocated a large portion of the funds to weatherize (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) located in Cincinnati, OH. According to DoE OIG, CCA paid for weatherization at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that was not done correctly; not done at all; or work completed on buildings scheduled for demolition. Furthermore, DoE OIG alleges, not all the work allegedly completed at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) qualified under the weatherization program. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had a HUD insured mortgage for approximately \$1.5 million. On September 24, 2010, the ownership entity for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) signed initial endorsement on a \$31,666,000 HUD 221(d)(4) insured mortgage. The purpose of the loan was to refinance the existing HUD insured debt on the property and provide money for rehab. The property will undergo a 24 month construction period. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also received \$3.2 million in HOME funds. The property will be 100% multi-family section eight units. Is HUD money from the 221(d)(4) loan paying for HVAC, windows, insulation, furnaces, etc that were allegedly already paid for by DoE ARRA funds? Was false information submitted to the lender in order to obtain the HUD 221(d)(4) mortgage? (b)(5)</p>	At this time there is not sufficient evidence of a loss of HUD funds to continue this investigation. Should additional evidence of HUD fraud become available through the course of DOE OIG's investigation, this office can re-open the case. Therefore, this investigation will be administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/7/2012	Case involves several suspect mortgages in the Lansing area in which loan origination fraud is suspected. Mortgage broker, appraisers, title company employees and purchasers are suspects	Case does not meet HUD-OIG investigative guidelines as it does not have a HUD nexus.
8/20/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was contacted by Detroit Police about a landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who owns approximately 80 single-family properties in the city of Detroit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were tampering with utility boxes to reduce the utility usage at her properties. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) checked the Public Housing Database and found that (b)(6);(b)(7) has twenty current housing choice voucher program tenants from four housing commissions in the Detroit Metropolitan Area. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) checked with the housing commissions and found that (b)(6);(b)(7) was responsible for the utilities on the subsidized units.	All judicial action complete.
7/17/2013	The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Quality Assurance, received a lender self report from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging fraud by their loan correspondent, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allowed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) non approved lenders, to originate loans under their lender ID number. Further review revealed possible fraudulent documentation may have also been submitted to (b)(6);(b)(7) by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on the behalf of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In total, (b)(6);(b)(7) reported 4 potentially fraudulent loans	All judicial and administrative action complete with the exception of one outstanding referral for debarment. When decision from the DEC is received the case will be reopened and the proper documentation completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/8/2013	<p>Information was received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD Office of Public Housing, advising that the current fee account for the Luna Pier Housing Commission (LPHC) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), contacted him regarding possible misappropriation of LPHC funds. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that during the course of his accounting he had discovered possible misappropriation of LPHC funds by the former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) relative to payroll and LPHC bank accounts.</p>	All judicial and administrative action complete.
5/1/2013	<p>HUD NSP Coordinator contacted HUD-OIG regarding alleged attempted bribery of a contractor procured with Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) by the Township of Royal Oak, Michigan. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) won a contract with the Township to conduct demolition work on various commercial and residential properties. (b)(6);(C) said that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and other associates of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), who owns (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), one of the losing bidders to the demolition contract, has made attempts to bribe (b)(6);(C) to take over the project. In addition, the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is allegedly involved in the bribery attempts, and had tried to steer the Township to award the bid to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) instead of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) worked as an asbestos contractor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in 2007, and was paid by the Township to conduct asbestos abatement work at the properties now being demolished by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	Received last of DEC decisions

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/16/2012	<p>This case was predicated upon an allegation from the United States Secret Service (USSS) Cleveland Field Office that (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) is involved in multiple mortgage fraud schemes. This case originated on a referral from the USSS Minneapolis Field Office that (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) fraudulently stole a U.S. Treasury check in which he cashed. The USSS Cleveland Field Office further investigated this matter and discovered that (b)(6),(C) was the owner of several homes without any evidence of income. The USSS discovered evidence that indicated (b)(6),(C) formulated fraudulent documents on his computer in order to get mortgages he applied for to be approved by a loan officer.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have occurred. Awaiting DEC response on debarment referral for (b)(6),(b)(7)(C). Email sent to DEC on 10/16/12 checking on status. Investigation will be closed and reopened if necessary to process decision by DEC on debarment.</p>
7/16/2013	<p>(b)(6),(b)(7)(C) is a small meat/poultry store located in Grand Rapids, Michigan. (b)(6),(b) is redeeming approximately \$15,000 in food stamp benefits per month. Comparable stores in the same area redeem approximately \$3,500 in SNAP benefits each month. (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) have purchased EBT benefits in exchange for cash, phone cards and other ineligible items during numerous undercover transactions. United States Department of Agriculture-Office of Inspector General (USDA-OIG) investigation disclosed that (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) has lived in a HUD Multi-family development since 2000. In addition, (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) has withdrawn over \$125,000 in cash from a personal bank account from 2005-2008. USDA-OIG believes that the \$125,000 would have disqualified (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) from receiving HUD assistance.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative action complete.</p>
4/10/2013	<p>Information was telephonically received from (b)(6),(b)(7)(C) regarding the Community Development Program, a HUD sponsored program in Lorain, OH. Specifically, (b)(6),(b)(7) learned that a loan of \$47,000 was granted for a residence of an elderly resident while he was in the hospital. Allegations of bid rigging, appraisals, and kickbacks to contractors were alleged by the COMPLAINANT (b)(5)</p>	<p>No further investigation necessary and case to be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/15/2013	Referral by the Regional Inspector General for Audit regarding an FHA HECM loan. Specifically, it was alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have impersonated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and forged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) signature on loan documents submitted to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in order to obtain the FHA HECM loan, which he would not have otherwise been eligible for. It is also alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained the FHA HECM loan to withdraw cash equity from the property for personal use.	Case does not meet guidelines for referral to DEC. All other judicial proceedings are complete. No further investigative activity necessary.
12/7/2012	SSA OIG contacted HUD/OIG regarding a Section 8 Tenant who is in the HAP. The subject collects a voucher for rent at a home in Holland, MI. The subject is collecting Social Security income as well as working in Illinois.	All Judicial action completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/5/2013	<p>On April 21, 2010, Reporting Agent (R/A) was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Grand Rapids Housing Commission (GRHC), Grand Rapids, MI regarding Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) fraud. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated the GRHC suspected a HCV tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was renting a unit from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Grand Rapids, MI. Due to the GRHC suspicions, an informal hearing was held by the GRHC on April 21, 2010 to give (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an opportunity to discuss it. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and an individual believed to be (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were present. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presented a death certificate which disclosed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) passed away in 2000. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) confirmed she leased the residence from her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The GRHC also was provided birth certificates and proof of residency (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) due to their suspicions of unauthorized tenants living with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested a copy of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) identification for her file and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believed the identification looked like her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further stated she researched HUD's Enterprise Income Verification (EIV) system and it disclosed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received Social Security Income in North Carolina. Furthermore, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided a bank statement which detailed recent bank transactions in North Carolina. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further relayed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) originally received her HCV in California and recently transferred it to Michigan. On April 21, 2010, R/A researched addresses (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was associated with in California and North Carolina and noted they were both near military bases. R/A contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Air Force Office of Special Investigations, Tinker AFB, OK and requested a military records check of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated a review of the Department of Defense Employee Interactive Data System (DEIDS) disclosed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was listed as a US Navy dependent under the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was married to an active duty Navy member, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is stationed in North Carolina.</p>	All judicial and administrative action complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/4/2013	<p>he U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office of Inspector General (OIG) was telephonically contacted by (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>	All judicial and administrative actions complete. Therefore, no further investigative efforts will be expended and investigation will be closed.
4/26/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly collected rents, to include section eight, as property manager and failed to use the rents to pay mortgages. Furthermore, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained a loan from Delaware County Department of Development for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Restaurant. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is 19 months behind on the loan. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used restaurant money to further her investment scheme.</p>	All judicial and administrative actions complete. No further investigation necessary and case to be closed.
8/20/2013	Complainant alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have been fraudulently using Re/Max Executives NAID number and signature to submit HUD.	Case does not meet HUD-OIG investigative guidelines nor guidelines set by the United States Attorneys Office.
2/4/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) review revealed property flipping prior to the closing on the subject loan. Specifically, the property was deeded back and forth between the seller and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) before finally being sold to the current owner. The purpose of transferring the home from the sellers, to their trust (of which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the Trustee), to the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and finally back to the sellers, before being sold to the current owners, was to allegedly appear as one sale (seller to buyer).</p>	Case does not meet HUD-OIG investigative guidelines

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/23/2013	<p>Allegations were brought forth by a source alleging that one of the property managers at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Cleveland, OH 44102) was knowingly accepting bribes to move prospective tenants up the list to acquire living space sooner.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative actions complete. No further investigative steps necessary and investigation to be closed.</p>
10/31/2012	<p>This case was initially reported to USSS Cleveland Field office from Cleveland Browns security as an investment fraud involving some NFL football players. Further investigation revealed that the alleged investment scam is part of a bigger mortgage fraud scheme to defraud including numerous targets and strawbuyers and properties throughout Ohio and Atlanta, GA. Interviews conducted by Agents from USSS and IRS revealed that individual(s) may have been enrolled in the Section 8 HCVP without their knowledge. A detailed narrative has been attached to this electronic case file titled: Summary Narrative (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>All judicial actions have occurred within this investigation. Investigation to be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/29/2013	<p>Philadelphia HOC received a lender self-report from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) their Neighborhood Watch Lender Reporting System that reported asset misrepresentation. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) determined the bank assets were falsified. The review disclosed the following: . The file did not include a Verification of Employment. The file included asset and income/employment documentation that showed conflicting information and/or irregularities that were not resolved by AMSC. . The Borrower's Huntington Bank Statement, for the period September 9, 2008 to October 6, 2008, shows two ATM Withdrawals totaling \$300 in the activity section; however, these two ATM Withdrawals are not shown/included in the summary debit section used to calculate the ending balance shown on the statement. Therefore, the ending balance is incorrect. . The income/employment documentation, the file included three W-2 forms, two (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) W-2 forms for 2006 and 2007 and a 2007 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) W-2. The W-2 forms all showed incorrect Social Security (SS) and Medicare tax withholdings based upon the wages shown. For example, the 2007 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) W-2 forms shows wages of \$98,777.31, SS withholdings of \$2,188.56, and Medicare withholdings of \$1,180.76. Based upon wages of \$98,777.31, the SS withholdings should be \$6,124.19 and the Medicare withholdings should be \$1,432.27. Furthermore, the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pay stubs also showed incorrect Social Security (SS) and Medicare tax withholdings based upon the wages shown. .The credit report shows different employer names. Specifically, the loan application, dated October 24, 2008, showed the borrower's current employer as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the past month and the borrower's previous employer as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C); however, the credit report showed present employer as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and previous employment with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). As a result, it is unclear how the file included a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 2007 W-2 form when the loan application showed the borrower was only employed with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for one month and with his previous employer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from September, 2006 to October 1, 2008. It is also unusual that the Huntington Bank Statement showed the borrower received a \$10,000 bonus from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in October, 2008, the same month he was employed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) per the loan application. .The borrower's income documentation was faxed from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an unknown source.</p>	All judicial actions for subjects under this case number completed and case to be closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/21/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) misused project funds on six multi-family, FHA insured properties. Specifically, (b)(6) alleged that the owners of DDH used an identity of interest company, known as MSI, for routine maintenance and repair work at the DDH properties and charged a significant cost mark-up. According to (b)(6);(C) the mark-up went from 60% to as much as 400%. A second allegation was that DDH hired unrelated sub-contractors to perform work at DDH properties, but instead of having DDH pay the sub-contractors, they funneled the bills through MSI, who paid them and then charged the DDH a mark-up of approximately 66%.</p>	<p>(b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5) This case will be closed at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/8/2013	<p>The seven national mortgage insurance providers are allegedly entering into re-insurance agreements with mortgage companies and ceding 25% to 40% of insurance premium for an amount of risk that is negligible. This captive reinsurance agreement becomes a vehicle for kickbacks to be routed to the re-insurance partners that receive the ceded premium, though assume almost no risk for the premium. Data suggests that claims have not been paid out pursuant to these captive re-insurance agreements. Disclosures pursuant to RESPA regulations may not be made to correctly disclose the agreements to the paying consumers. Approximately \$500 million in MI premiums are paid annually in the U.S.</p>	<p>Region 5 was instructed by HUD OIG Headquarters to forward the investigative jurisdiction to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau pursuant to HUD losing its venue in RESPA cases. Based on this, we were further instructed to close this case pending CFPB's final case findings.</p>
3/26/2013	<p>HUD along with FEMA conducted a computer match based on the Katrina disaster. Based on the computer match (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Based upon initial information, (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(5);(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been taken in this investigation. No further activity is warranted in this matter.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/4/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was receiving Section 8 assistance from 10/7/2005 to 5/31/2006 while also receiving rental assistance from FEMA as part of DHAP Katrina. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$1,844 in Section 8 assistance at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in St. Paul from 9/1/2005 to 11/30/2005. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) resided together at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) prior to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) moving in with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) where \$5,773 was paid in Section 8 assistance. Both (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) listed the same vacant address in New Orleans as their damaged residence. DHS-OIG has contacted this office to assist in the investigation of the above-named individuals for fraud related to Katrina DHAP. Assistance appears to have been paid from both HUD and FEMA.</p>	<p>Final judicial actions have been completed. No further investigative activity is warranted in this matter.</p>
1/22/2013	<p>Reporting Special Agent received the following information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that in September 05, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had purchased 8 new vehicle on the same day by obtaining business loans in the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from different banks in the Chicago land area. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is an assisted housing recipient at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). He certifies that he is a mechanic by trade with an annual income of \$18,000.00. He did not list the vehicles or his corporation on his recertification in October 05. After running a public records search, it was learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also owns 2 properties. The first property is located in Highland Park, IL with a value in excess of \$700,000.00. The second property is located in Mt. Prospect, IL with a value in excess of \$300,000.00. It was also learned through a check of an ICE database that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and preliminary checks suggest that he currently (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>Conduct charged was not HUD related. Three subject have been fugitives and have left the country over 2 1/2 years ago. Based on this lack of nexis and the "fugitive" matter, no further activity is warranted in this matter.</p>
10/19/2012	<p>Received a referral from the Office of Housing Voucher Programs, HUD, regarding suspected duplicate payments to section 8 landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on behalf of Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It was reported that the resident received rental assistance simultaneously from both FEMA and HUD.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been taken in this case. No further action is warranted.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/26/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not living at his property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Cicero, Illinois as indicated on his Uniform Residential Loan Application. A telephone check verified the borrowers' telephone number to be associated with his property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Westchester Illinois.	After multiple interviews and review of records, the evidence needed to proceed with a criminal investigation in this district was insufficient at this time. This appears to be a single-instance transaction with a relatively low loss amount that would not meet prosecutorial guidelines. No further investigation is warranted at this time.
8/22/2013	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been involved in fraudulent loans processing for the property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Indianapolis, In 46201. Alleged Violations: The information on the National credit Systems, Inc. letter was falsified. The loan officer was not an employee of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Conflict of interest between lender and appraiser.	Case declined bu Marion County Prosecutor. No referral to the DEC will be made. No further action is warranted. close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/9/2013	<p>The agent received a referral from the U. S. Department of Justice, Office of the United States Trustee, Northern District of Indiana that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) targeted African immigrants, both unsuspecting buyers and straw-buyers, in a mortgage fraud scheme estimated at more than 12 million dollars in mortgaged properties. The referral notes that the scheme encompasses 250 properties, with 19 subjects/witnesses filing bankruptcy petitions. Of the 250 properties noted in the scheme, more than 90 have had or currently have section 8 tenants. Per the bankruptcy petitions, it is believed that the properties were over inflated causing multiple foreclosures. The loss is undetermined.</p>	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were found guilty by trial on all counts and have been sentenced to incarceration. All administrative actions have been completed. No further investigation is warranted.</p>
10/30/2012	<p>On January 13, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with the (b)(5) regarding alleged complaints that they received regarding various Section 8 tenants who are residing at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Chicago, Illinois. This property, which is also known as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a HUD Multifamily Project Based Section 8 property. Allegations have been made that there are individuals residing at this building who are receiving Section 8 rental assistance in which they are not entitled to. Allegations include misrepresentation of family household composition, unreported employment, unreported income, and unreported assets. Agents from the HUD-OIG will attempt to serve an IG Subpoena for various tenant files and a review will be conducted in order to determine if these individuals are legitimately receiving Section 8 rental assistance.</p>	<p>All judicial and Administrative actions completed. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/17/2012	(b)(6);(b) allegedly while acting as a bankruptcy attorney purchased properties from the debtor then failed to record the property or the proceeds from the sale. Several of these properties were FHA insured properties.	All judicial and administrative actions are complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation. Evidence will be retained per AUSA pending subject appeals.
11/7/2012	It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stating they had received a notice from their previous lender (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding a bounced check. The borrowers wanted to know why the previous mortgage had not been paid off with a Federal Housing Administration loan which closed on July 31, 2008. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Mortgage loan was intended to refinance and pay off the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Mortgage. A review of the statement from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Mortgage revealed the previous mortgage was still active, and the lender had a different phone number on record for the borrower's. The phone number on the record was traced to the loan officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It was discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also owned the title company in the subject transaction. It was determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been paying the monthly mortgage payment on the subjects loan in order to cover-up the fact that the loan had not been paid off at closing. The cover-up continued until a mortgage payment check was returned for insufficient funds. Also, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purportedly kept the funds that had been paid in full by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Underwriting Insurer.	All judicial and administrative actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/4/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) simultaneously received assistance from FEMA and the Chicago Housing Authority while purportedly residing at two separate addresses. Specifically, on March 1, 2009 (b)(6);(b) began a temporary lease at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Chicago, which was being paid by FEMA. On May 9, 2009 (b)(6);(b) began a lease at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Chicago, IL, which was received under the Housing Choice Voucher program. (b)(6);(b) received payments at the HCV address May 2009 through January 2010. (b)(6);(b) received lump sum FEMA assistance in April and June of 2009.</p>	<p>This case will be closed in order to migrate the subject into case number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which is also has the same targets of investigation.</p>
3/4/2013	<p>This office is in receipt of information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Moline Housing Authority (MHA) public housing tenant, failed to report to the MHA that he was employed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from June 25, 2007 until September 14, 2007 & by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from November 14, 2007 until August 17, 2009 (as of MHA employment verification form dated (via fax) August 17, 2009). (b)(6);(b) signed MHA public housing paperwork for the years 2007, 2008, and 2009, failing to disclose to the MHA that he was working at the time.</p>	<p>The defendant in this case was convicted and sentenced to probation and ordered restitution made payable to the housing authority. No further investigation is warranted.</p>
12/19/2012	<p>On June 22nd, 2010 HUD-OIG Chicago received a letter from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Co-Operative Apartments. (b)(6);(b)(7) alleged that a tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was receiving HUD assistance and subleasing her apartment to another individual. (b)(6);(b)(7) charged this individual rent and a security deposit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referred the case to this agent on July 12, 2010.</p>	<p>All judicial actions are complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/18/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Minneapolis Public Housing Authority, contacted our office regarding a previous Section 8 tenant. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report her actual income on her Annual Section 8 Re-certifications. As a result, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received over \$11,739 in Section 8 benefits which she was not entitled to.	This case was declined by the Hennepin County State's Attorney's Office. No further activity is warranted in this matter.
1/10/2013	The Minnesota Department of Commerce, in cooperation with DOE-OIG, contacted this office for assistance in investigating the use of DOE Weatherization funds to provide improvements to Section-8 properties. It is alleged that the improvements were not made to the properties.	Following the State of Minnesota's receipt of payment, no further investigation is warranted in this matter. Based on a review of the final agreement and HUD not being referenced, our office "NO for HUD reference on the R & D. This case will now be closed.
7/18/2013	This office received information from the site Project Management that it had been discovered through the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had failed to report substantial wages since 2008. Overpayment of housing assistance to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is in excess of \$10,000.	All judicial actions have been taken in this matter. No further activity is warranted in this matter.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/31/2013	<p>It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not report family income. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been a resident at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Stillwater, MN since 5/4/2004. He later added (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to his lease. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report Social Security benefits he has been receiving for himself and his children since 1999. In addition (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) earned \$36,162.00 income in 2009, and possibly has a second job. Both (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report additional income to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been taken in this case. No further activity is warranted in this matter.</p>
10/25/2012	<p>This office is in receipt of allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has fraudulently been receiving Housing Choice Voucher assistance from the Springfield Housing Authority. Specifically, it has been alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been employed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and has failed to report all of her income.</p>	<p>This case will be closed due to lack of interest to prosecute from the Illinois State's Attorney's Office. In addition, this case does not meet IG criteria to continue investigation.</p>
10/15/2012	<p>This office is in receipt of information from the Chicago Housing Authority, Office of the Inspector General (CHA-OIG), which alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have been subletting her Section-8 property, while the actual Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been residing in a nursing home. CHA-OIG was contacted by a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who claims he has occupied property since September 1, 2008 and stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not live there. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated he has been paying rent to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) whose members include (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Cook County Recorder of Deeds (CCRD) shows that a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the actual owner of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) property. CHA alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been receiving the Housing Assistants Payment (HAP) checks and is legally married to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Prior to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) receiving HCVP subsidy at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), CHA claims (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also received subsidy for the same address.</p>	<p>After consideration from the State's Attorney's Office, this case has been declined for prosecution due to failure to meet prosecutorial guidelines. This case was referred back to the CHA-OIG for any action, if any, as they see as appropriate.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/20/2013	<p>This Agent received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Bloomington Police Department regarding possible Section 8 tenant fraud at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bloomington Indiana. Through a separate investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had two individuals with histories of Narcotic distribution living with her in her residence. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) learned that one of the individuals, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was on parole. The other individual, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was on probation. This Agent investigated further and learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a Section 8 recipient. The reporting Agent also checked with parole and probation and learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was on parole and reported (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bloomington, Indiana as his address. This Agent also learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been reporting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Bloomington Indiana as his living address. His probation officer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) told this agent that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) eventually kicked (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) out of her residence because "she couldn't keep hiding him from Section 8." (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sent her a signed letter confirming that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lived with her. Further investigation revealed that (b)(6);(C) never reported to Bloomington Housing Authority that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been living with her. Based on this, there is sufficient evidence to warrant the opening of an investigation.</p>	<p>All administrative and judicial actions complete. No further action is warranted. Close Investigation.</p>
8/23/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a subcontractor for the Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) advised that they suspected that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for both the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA) Homeowner grant program and the LRHP grant program. Initial inquiry revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has an approved application pending with MDA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Pass Christian, Mississippi and also a LRHP approved application (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has pulled the application from the closing process as has ICF/Road Home.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative actions are complete.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/24/2013	Information received reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for the Louisiana Road Home Program under application number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and received a grant of \$76,650 for property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana by claiming that as their primary residence on 8/29/2005. There was evidence obtained indicating that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reside at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana prior to and after Hurricane Katrina; and that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also applied for the Louisiana Road Home Program under application number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and received a grant of \$85,292 for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) property.	All judicial and civil actions are complete.
3/5/2013	Information was received from the Federal Bureau of Investigation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and an Orleans Parish Assessor, may have committed fraud in the HUD funded Project Based Section 8 Program.	Waiting on DEC decision for (b)(6);(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).
9/25/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that HANO employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was withholding payments under the contract for work at the Lafitte Housing Development after (b)(6);(C) refused to hire (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as a subcontractor. Additionally (b)(6);(b)(C) claimed to HANO that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was working as or for one of the subcontractors on the Lafitte site during the weekends. (b)(6);(C) further alleged in his complaint to HANO that his (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) payroll data which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has to sign off on was somehow given to another subcontractor on the site that ended up hiring (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	No criminal prosecutorial interest.
1/24/2013	Information was received (b)(5) indicating that an individual(s) within the City of Baton Rouge is attempting to use foreclosed/blighted properties for various real estate schemes. HUD-OIG has been requested (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(5)	All judicial and administrative actions are complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/21/2013	Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) contractor ICF, International reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for the LRHP (application #: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)) and received \$136,100 of which \$50,000 was for the Additional Compensation Grant (ACG). Information was developed which indicates that (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7) did not reside at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana and that she resides at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana and the (b)(6);(b)(7) property was rental.	AUSA Declination.
10/10/2012	On March 30, 2010, an anonymous complainant provided a letter to the HUD-OIG Hotline alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employed by the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) violated the Good Neighbor Next Door Program (GNND). Specifically, the complainant stated that shortly after the purchase of the GNND property, (b)(6);(b) rented the house and began living with a friend elsewhere. A review of SFIS and Neighborhood Watch revealed that (b)(6);(b) is a GNND participant and purchased a residence located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) San Antonio, Texas, FHA Loan No. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	The case resulted in an indictment in State Court, however, there has been no decision by the state as to when and if the case will be prosecuted. In the event the state goes forward with the prosecution, the case will be reopened.
11/20/2012	The Arlington Housing Authority has numerous individuals that owe money for rental assistance overpayments due to fraud committed by the participant. In most cases the participant failed to report that they were employed and therefore received HAP at a higher rate than should have been paid on their behalf.	All subjects have been charged and convicted.
8/29/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Lonoke County Housing Authority has allegedly paid herself 60 hours per week from Housing Authority funds when she was only entitled to 10 hours of pay per week, uses the Housing Authority credit card for personal use, took a Housing Authority computer home and paid \$31,000 to a company affiliated with (b)(6);(b)(7) when no work was done.	Subject has agreed to a PTD and no further action is necessary at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/22/2013	The OIG Houston, Texas has initiated a Rental Housing Income Integrity Program (RHIP) initiative regarding the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) apartment complex, a HUD Multifamily property, located in Houston. HUD OIG will jointly investigate residents of the apartment complex to identify individuals defrauding HUD by failing to accurately report their income and/or household composition. The initiative will also attempt to identify and remove convicted felons, sex offenders, unauthorized tenants to improve the quality of life for law abiding tenants.	Investigation is complete
4/5/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently receiving Section 8 benefits through OHFA. She is reporting zero income, however she has been able to send about \$75,000 in wire transfers to individuals in Turkey.	This investigation has been completed.
1/25/2013	The Oklahoma Housing Finance Agency (OHFA) administers the Family Self-Sufficiency Program, the HOME Tenant-Based Rental Assistance Program, the Multifamily Housing Program, the Homeownership Program, and the Housing Choice Voucher Program throughout the state of Oklahoma. HUD OIG will prosecute landlords who defraud HUD by misrepresenting tenant occupancy or by occupying the assisted units. HUD OIG will also prosecute tenants who defraud HUD by with respect to drug/violent criminal activity or misrepresentation of household income/composition . HUD will cooperate with USDA and Oklahoma DHS OIG where the Food Stamp, Medicaid and Medicare fraud are involved. OHFA will refer cases involving HUD losses over \$20,000 to HUD OIG throughout 2010	All criminal and civil remedies have been completed. No further investigation is required.
12/21/2012	This investigation targets multiple Section 8 tenants who fail to report their income to various housing authorities throughout the state of Arkansas.	All investigative, judicial, and admin action complete.
7/1/2013	Information was received indicating that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was operating a foreclosure rescue scam. Supposedly, (b)(6);(b) finds distressed homeowners and convinces them to deed their property to his company while leaving the mortgage in name of the original homeowner. (b)(6);(C) subsequently collects rent on the home but fails to make the mortgage payments causing the mortgages to go into foreclosure.	Subject has been convicted, sentenced, and debarred.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/2/2013	<p>In September 2007, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pleaded guilty to misprison of equity skimming, false statement and aiding and abetting. (b)(6);(b) had been the CEO of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), which operated several HUD-insured nursing homes in Oklahoma. In April 2008, (b)(6);(b) was sentenced to one year and one day in prison and three years of supervised release. (b)(6);(b) wrongful activities led to a loan causing a loss to HUD in the amount of \$4,489,161.82. In November 2008, the USAO Civil Division expressed interest in civil enforcement against the other officers/owners of (b)(6);(b)(C) including (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). These other parties are suspected of receiving assets from the HUD-insured properties while in a nonsurplus cash position. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) began coordinating with the USAO Civil Division and documented activities under the original criminal investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which is now closed. The current investigation will cover the civil enforcement.</p>	This investigation has been completed.
7/10/2013	<p>HUD OIG received allegations of wrongdoing related to the Muscogee Nation Housing Division, a division of the Muscogee Nation of Oklahoma, an Indian tribe. The allegations came from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a contractor in Muskogee, OK. Six members of the Muscogee Nation, some of whom were tribal employees, allegedly received free homes from the Housing Division for which they were ineligible. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided contact information for potential cooperating witnesses within the Muscogee Nation with personal knowledge of the alleged activity.</p>	This investigation has been completed.
2/7/2013	<p>Region 11 (b)(6);(b)(7) provided the Southwest Region 8 fraud referrals alleging that tenants/landlords were fraudulently receiving HUD housing assistance and DHAP assistance simultaneously.</p>	Investigation is complete

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/18/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Gregory Housing Authority (GHA) noticed on her first day of employment that the PHA office did not have a computer, fax machine or a cell phone. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) spoke to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) maintenance man, who informed her a computer was missing from the office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is concerned because there are missing contracts and because the tenants social security numbers could possibly be in the missing computer. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is not aware of an inventory list that might list all of the equipment that should be at the GHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that she would ask her board chairman to see if such a list exists. As (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) went through some paperwork in the office, she learned that the GHA had three credit cards under the PHA; Sears credit card, American Express, and a Chase credit card. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been unable to locate any of the cards and believes (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) might still be in possession of them. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes that the American Express card and the Chase card might have a zero balance but is unsure of the balance on the Sears card. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is concerned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) might have used the PHA cards for his personal use and benefit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also came across three GHA checks made payable to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C): 8/1/2009 - \$1,789 8/19/2009 - \$5,753 8/19/2009 - \$2,251 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that there was no documentation attached to the checks and does not know why (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received these payments. The checks were signed by a commissioner (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) suspects that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) might have taken advantage of the commissioner.</p>	This investigation has been completed
5/1/2013	The Bexar County Housing Authority has agreed to work jointly with the OIG to achieve the goals of the Rental Housing Integrity Improvement Program.	Investigation is complete
4/11/2013	Information received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Lancaster HA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicates that various individual recipients of Section 8 assistance have knowingly provided false information regarding their income. Section 8 tenants have made false statements on certifications and re-certification forms in order to receive housing authority assistance.	This investigation has been completed.
10/28/2012	Information was received indicating that various individuals with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are conspiring to make false statements on FHA insured mortgage Settlement Statements. Supposedly, the title company is inflating fees charged to borrowers to cover the cost of a kickback paid to a loan officer in return for referring mortgage business.	All administrative action complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/26/2013	GSA-OIG contacted Houston HUD-OIG office and advised of an investigation involving Self Help Housing of East Texas (SHHET). SHHET, a nonprofit, acquired several FEMA mobile homes from a GSA auction administered by the Texas Facilities Commission (TFC). As part of the program, SHHET obtained the mobile homes at a very low cost to donate them to be used by low income/homeless people. After 18 months SHHET could dispose of the mobile homes for profit. Instead of donating the mobile homes for use, SHHET sold the mobile homes for \$12,000 each. SHHET sold one mobile home to the Deep East Texas Foundation (DETF) who purchased the mobile home for a needy family under a Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). DETF is a nonprofit associated with the Deep East Texas Council of Governments (DETCOG). SHHET also rented some mobile homes to DETCOG for Section 8 tenants.	Investigation has been completed
8/12/2013	The Houston HUD-OIG office received a referral from the HUD Hotline. The Hotline received a complaint from the Cleveland Texas Police Department alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Cleveland Housing Authority (CHA) embezzled HUD funds by issuing payroll checks in her name to pay for her childrens health insurance and took out several credit cards in the name of the CHA to buy personal items for herself totaling approximately \$13,000.	This investigation is complete.
4/18/2013	This office has received allegation from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (Immigration and Customs Enforcement-Dallas) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used a false Social Security number in order to obtain a HUD loan. Initially, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) opened an investigation on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in order to determine the validity of certain immigration documents. During the investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had used a fake Social Security number in a loan application for a HUD loan. The loan defaulted on 10/05/2007 and suffered a loss on sale on \$30,739.	All efforts to locate and arrest subject has failed. It is likely the subject fled the country. This case is being administratively closed.
11/6/2012	Borrower has two HECM loans on two different properties. The subject cannot live in both properties. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	All investigative activity related to this case has been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/10/2012	The Housing Authority of the City of Austin and the Austin Police Department have agreed to work jointly with the IG's office to further the goals of the Rental Housing Intergrity Improvement Project.	All judicial and administrative matters have been completed.
4/26/2013	The Housing Authority of the City of Austin and the Austin Police Department have agreed to work jointly with the IG's office to further the goals of the Rental Housing Intergrity Improvement Program.	This investigation is complete.
10/10/2012	(b)(5) [redacted] that alleged 14 police officers received federal money from the Waco Housing Authority for working as part time security guards while they were actually on duty with Waco PD.	Investigation declined for criminal prosecution by the United States Attorney's Office.
3/15/2013	The hotline received an allegation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] listed as living in a Section 8 residence however the complaintant stated the residence has been vacant for several years and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] moved to Marble Falls, TX.	Investigation is complete
3/21/2013	The City of San Antonio alleges the former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] submitted approximatley \$17K in vouchers for a Community Development conference which actually went to pay for a retirement party for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] also submitted vouchers in which she paid herself approximately \$3K in a 1 year period. The City is in the process of conducting an audit which should disclose all the ineligible expenses paid for by CDBG grant	Investigation has been completed
2/26/2013	(b)(5) [redacted] received an allegation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) [redacted] accepted \$1000 cash bribe payments from potential tenants to sever a Section 8 Voucher and place them in housing in exchange for bypassing people on the waiting list. (b)(5) [redacted] (b)(5) [redacted] (b)(5) [redacted]	Declination by both USAO and local DA Office.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/3/2012	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was an employee of the City of Fort Worth. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was engaging in secondary employment with out authorization and conducting business for his own personal gain while on the clock for City of Fort Worth. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) salary was paid out of HUD's CDBG, HOME, NSP and ARRA program funds. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was conducting TREC inspections on properties that were receiving rehab funds through the City of Fort Worth.</p>	Declined for criminal prosecution. No civil and/or admin actions available to pursue.
5/7/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a walk-in from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Ft. Worth TX 76114; Cellular Telephone: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Home Telephone: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Benbrook, TX 76116, Telephone: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) concerning alleged rental assistance fraud conducted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It is alleged that between early 2007 and March 2010 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a head of household residing in a subsidized residence at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Corpus Christi, TX 78412. During this time frame (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was also a resident of this unit. Both (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were employed and did not disclose their income. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not find out about the status of the unit, that it was subsidized unit, until he had been living there for some time. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that the entire time (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was receiving rental assistance she was also employed with the State of Texas Food Stamp Office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has recently relocated to a Food Stamp Office in the Fort Worth, TX area. It was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) understanding that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not pay anything toward rent while residing at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Corpus Christi. Approximate loss is estimated to be 30K.</p>	this investigation is complete
6/13/2013	<p>The complaint alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of New Mexico, is believed to have misused and/or embezzled HUD grant/program funds. Former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employees: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are believed to be associated with the alleged misuse of funds. A subsequent independent audit of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) financial records was utilized to substantiate the allegation of fraud. As a result of the audit findings, CPD imposed an edit in the Line of Credit Control System (LOCCS), restricting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) access to HUD funds. HUD's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forwarded written correspondence to the Region 6 HUD-OIG Office of Investigations in an effort to provide documentation to support the allegations against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	This investigation has been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/18/2012	Region 6 Audit advised that DHAP Rental Assistance recipients (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Houston, Texas, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Orange, Texas, received rental assistance after their deaths. Audit also alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Galveston, TX, social security number was identified as being used prior to his date of birth.	All judicial and administrative actions completed.
9/27/2013	Employees from the City of Houston's Housing & Community Development Department (HCDD) allege instances of fraud and false statements by HCDD employees in the course of conducting HCDD business. HCDD receives CDBG entitlement funding from HUD.	This investigation has been completed.
7/1/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD program participant, is alleged to receive multiple HUD subsidies under the Multi Family (2) and Public Housing (1) programs for different apartments/properties. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) applied for the 3 HUD subsidy programs all during 2009 and is currently receiving housing assistance on each apartment unit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to not live at 2 of the properties and is possibly sub leasing those 2 apartment units.	Subject has been charged and sentenced. No further investigation needed.
10/2/2012	The allegation states that the above subject intentionally altered documentation to reflect falsified assets in an effort to obtain a HUD/FHA mortgage loan. According to Neighborhood Watch, the loan is currently delinquent.	Investigation declined for criminal prosecution by the United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Texas.
2/28/2013	The Housing Authority of the City of Austin (HACA), Austin, TX alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an employee of HACA, may have committed fraud relating to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Section 8 tenant. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have used her position within HACA to bypass rules and regulations and may have sublet (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 residence to other family members. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have moved (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) out of her residence and into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residence.	Insufficient evidence to corroborate allegation and declination by DA's Office.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/18/2012	The Houston CPD Office advised that a HUD Approved Real Estate Broker, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly forged the signature of City of Houston, Housing and Community Development Department Employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on Proof of Funds letters for Guiding Light CDC to purchase HUD REO properties.	Awaiting decision from OGC on whether or not to pursue a PFCRA.
3/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephonically contacted HUD-OIG to report that she was working with a loan officer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to purchase a HUD REO property. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) took approximately \$7,000 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which was to be used towards the purchase of the property. Instead (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) kept the money and stopped contact with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) later learned that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were themselves in the process of purchasing the HUD REO property.	This investigation has been completed
8/19/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forwarded an employee allegation made by HUDOIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Houston, Texas. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained a financial statement for a Vietnamese Community Center (VCC) in the Houston area and written in Vietnamese was the fact that a person by the name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) cashed 12 checks for \$500 each (\$6,000) from VCC. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recognized that name as being the name of a HUD CPD Employee. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also knows that the VCC received a CPD grant for \$400,000.	This investigation has been completed.
12/4/2012	On January 11, 2011, HUD-OIG received information from several former employees and former Board Members for the Aransas Pass Housing Authority (APHA), Aransas Pass, TX. The complainants alleged mismanagement of funds, public corruption, and contract fraud within the APHA. Specifically, the complainants alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), APHA, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) APHA, are violating HUD contracting rules and receiving gratuities from local APHA contractors.	Case had no prosecutorial merit.
4/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Beaumont, Texas. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is receiving a Section 8 voucher at that address. HUD-OIG CRS alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recently applied for a Home Affordable Modification Program (HAMP) loan. The program requires that the applicant be an owner-occupant. Section 8 policies prohibit the landlord from residing at a subsidized unit. Therefore, false information may have been provided to one of the entities.	This investigation is complete

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/7/2013	The Harris County Sheriffs Office contacted HUD-OIG and advised that real estate agent, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were arrested burglarizing a HUD REO property. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were caught removing appliances from the REO property.	Investigation is complete
6/28/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) confessed to making personal purchases totaling somewhere in the range of \$10,000.00. That included daily meals, home furnishings, clothing, and electronics. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) ate out each day from May 2010 through January of 2011 totaling over 8K.	This investigation has been completed.
4/5/2013	Complaint received through the Southern Plains Office of Native America Programs (SPONAP) regarding a complaint they received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Ponca Tribe Housing Authority, Kaw City, Oklahoma. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that when she took over as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) she uncovered abuses of the housing authority credit cards including the purchases of groceries for personal use at a local Wal-Mart store.	This investigation has been completed
12/13/2012	This is an umbrella case used to investigate leads received or proactively developed regarding disaster fraud in the Upper Texas Coast area.	This investigation is complete all case closing activity has been completed.
10/18/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recieved a telephone call from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is receiving Section 8 although she has a criminal record and that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Perseall Housing Authority knows about (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) criminal record. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also alleged she has gone into the PHA several times to fill out applications and her appclctaion always seems to get lost. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted there is an issue between (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Investigation resulted in an administrative recovery to the Housing Authority. This case is closed.
10/18/2012	The Houston HUD-OIG Office is proactively developing tenant fraud cases from the various housing authorities in South Texas. The allegations involve tenants not providing true and correct information regarding income, family composition, criminal history, sex offender registration, and/or receiving simultaneous housing assistance.	All judicial and administrative items have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/1/2012	The Tarrant County Housing Assistance Office (TCHAO) indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) committed fraud totaling approximately \$79,315. The TCHAO alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) knowing lived with his former tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while he collected Federal subsidy from HUD's Housing Choice Voucher Program.	Based on the foregoing, case closure is recommended. No further action is warranted at this time.
6/28/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Housing Fraud Task Force, advised that he has identified a group of individuals who have participated in a counterfeit check cashing scheme. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the manufacturer of the checks, which bear the Houston Housing Authority logo, Section 8 Utility Assistance Program bank account number, and signatures of former employees. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has gathered information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former public housing tenant, recruited at least four individuals to cash the checks created by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The check cashers are (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	This investigation has been completed
5/7/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a HUD employee in Fort Worth. It appears that she may have ownership interest in hundreds of investment properties in the Fort Worth area. Many of these properties are occupied by tenants who receive Section 8 assistance from Arlington and Fort Worth housing authorities.	This investigation has been completed.
3/21/2013	The complaint alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted Wells Fargo regarding the possible identity theft of his social security number regarding a HUD/FHA mortgage loan. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) states that the loan is not his and someone has possibly used his number to unlawfully obtain the loan. Approximately \$138,997 have been paid in claims.	Investigation has been completed.
2/5/2013	Information was received from a HANO contractor suggesting that a Section 8 landlord and tenant had conspired with a HANO employee to create a duplicate voucher. The result appears to be that the landlord has received two HAP payments per month for the same tenant for approximately three years. The loss to HANO is currently estimated at approximately \$30,000.00	AUSA Declined to prosecute.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/5/2013	The Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG), New Orleans, Louisiana received information regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD-OIG received information from the Jefferson Parish Housing Authority that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report her employment with the Department of Veterans Affairs and subsequent income to the Jefferson Parish Housing Authority. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) caused the Jefferson Parish Housing Authority to suffer an approximate loss of \$11,128.	All judicial and administrative actions completed. Nothing further at this time.
6/25/2013	Neighbors reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have provided false statements to the Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) regarding their primary residence at the time of Hurricane Katrina on August 29, 2005. After an initial review of the LRHP information, it appears as if the subjects indicated that they resided at the address of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, LA. The allegation indicates that the subjects did not live at that address, but were renting it out. The subjects received a grant in the amount of \$84,505.22.	All Judicial, civil and administrative actions have been completed.
6/26/2013	On June 8, 2007, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a \$150,000 grant from the Louisiana Road Home Program (LRHP) for damaged property that they claimed was their primary residence located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana, under LRHP application (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). On October 24, 2008, the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a \$109,954 grant from the LRHP for a damaged property that they claimed was their primary residence located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana, under LRHP application (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In a July 5, 2007, interview with the LRHP Poydras office, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised the LRHP that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) address was rental property. The LRHP office advised him that the rental property did not qualify for a grant. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) then went to a different LRHP office and advised that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) address was their primary residence at the time of Hurricane Katrina.	Subject died before any judicial actions were taken
6/6/2013	On March 15, 2011, the United States Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Louisiana, forwarded an anonymous complaint to HUD OIG alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residing at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Gretna, Louisiana, may have committed fraud in the HUD funded Disaster Housing Assistance Program.	AUSA declined prosecution
7/25/2013	On October 12, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Edcouch Housing Authority (EHA), contacted HUD and alleged that former EHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), misappropriated public housing funds.	This investigation has been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/23/2013	On Tuesday, October 18, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Social Security Administration-Office of Inspector General informed that his office had received an anonymous complaint regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complaint informed that (b)(6);(b) was defrauding Social Security, Section 8 and food stamps. The complaint detailed that (b)(6);(b) was not reporting income from rental units, a business and vehicles she sold. The complaint explained that (b)(6);(b) was transferring her properties under others names in order to qualify for benefits.	This investigation has been completed.
9/26/2013	The Office of Audit conducted a review of the Yale Court Apartments at the request of the Director of HUD Houston Multifamily. The review uncovered documentation was (b)(5). Additional document reviews and interviews conducted by auditors support the allegation that the documents were falsified.	This investigation has been completed
6/5/2013	A Federal Housing Administration borrower, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), stated real estate agent, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), falsified a \$3,000 gift letter during the loan's origination in order to qualify (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to purchase the property.	This investigation will be absorbed into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)
1/8/2013	IRS-CI (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) called to request the HUD file for the FHA-insured loan relating to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Saltillo, Mississippi for purposes of his tax investigation. Upon further questioning, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised the HUD-insured loan relating to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was in a default status off and on from 2006 to present. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated the owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), who resided in the Fayetteville, Arkansas area, used (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) funds to pay for personal expenses, such as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) private school tuition. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said it was likely personal expenses were made by (b)(6);(b) from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) funds during a period the HUD-insured loan was in default or in a non-surplus cash position. Further research determined HUD records reflect (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the FHA Project Number is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). According to HUD records, the FHA-insured loan on this property is delinquent, and this project is in a troubled status.	This case was declined for prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/24/2013	The complaint alleges possible Time and Attendance Fraud or Abuse, along with the possibility of false statements on the subject's employment application with HUD. The complaint infers that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) takes frequent unplanned/unscheduled sick leave on short notice that coincide with his possible dates of working in the capacity as a Deputy Sheriff.	This investigation has been completed.
6/28/2013	The complaint alleges a possible foreclosure scam and unqualified assumption.	This investigation has been completed and was declined for prosecution.
5/7/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to have unreported income and an unauthorized guest at her residence. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly stole the identity and credit cards of an elderly woman who resides at the place of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged employment, and used those items to make purchases. The loss to the San Antonio Housing Authority has not been determined since SAHA did not have a current EIV for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The loss from the ID theft allegation is between 3-9K. Once Texas Workforce Commission is run for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a loss to SAHA will be determined.	This investigation is complete
1/7/2013	This is a case referral from USPS-OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that USPS employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was submitting fraudulent medical travel vouchers pertaining to her OWCP claim when she did not have any medical appointments to travel to and from. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) estimated a total loss to USPS/DOL of more than \$145,000. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) might be a HUD HCVP recipient. HUD records indicated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is, in fact, a HCVP recipient, administered by the Houston HA. Upon analyzing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) USPS medical payments, it appeared (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report approximately \$30,477 of her medical reimbursement income from USPS/DOL to the Houston HA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), USAO, Southern District of TX, has been assigned to the investigation. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested HUD-OIG to join the investigation with USPS-OIG and DOL-OIG so to show that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has a pattern of committing fraud against government programs.	Investigation is complete and was declined prosecution

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/7/2013	<p>On March 28, 2012, the OIG received allegations of irregularities in the procurement of a CDBG Disaster Recovery Grant funded construction contract to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) by the City of San Benito (CSB). The amount of the construction contract awarded to (b)(6) was \$741,635. Allegedly, CSB (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and CSB (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are related to the owner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) by marriage.</p>	Investigation is complete
7/15/2013	<p>Received a memorandum dtd April 25, 2012 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) CPD, stating they received on March 29, 2012, an email from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), alleging misappropriation of HUD funds by the City of Dallas involving CDBG and Home funds.</p>	Allegations did not prove to have merit.
5/14/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Certified Public Accountant, informed that he conducted a independent audit at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) County Housing Authority (JHCHA) in 2010 and found that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had run up about \$12,000 in credit card purchases for personal items. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said the credit cards were taken out in the housing authority's name but the board may not have known (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did this. Most of the purchases were made on the Walmart and Lowes card. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also found that the JHCHA was paying for four AT&T cell phones in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) name. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been collecting unemployment while employed with the JHCHA. The former JHCHA board did not want to prosecute and approached the District Attorney's Office. A meeting was held between the board, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the District Attorney's Office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) agreed to repay the money and the District Attorney's Office was going to draft a repayment agreement. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) moved out of town and never made a payment. A repayment agreement was never drafted. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is unsure if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) could be related or is friends with anyone at the District Attorney's Office.</p>	This investigation has been completed.
9/3/2013	<p>The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the Construction Safety Department is allegedly steering contracts to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his company has been awarded contracts between February 2012 and the present in the amounts of \$75,000, \$25,000, \$6,000 and \$8,000 for the following projects: heating, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) demolition (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Public Facilities Improvement).</p>	Case was declined by USAO.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/26/2013	The reporting agent received an allegation via phone call from Housing Authority City of Orange (HACO) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleging that she was being directed by the HACO Board to use certain contractors and developers for the sale, demolition and re-construction of HACO apartments. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also alleged that her signature was copied and placed on HACO letters that were submitted to HUD by the HACO Board without her knowledge.	This investigation has been completed.
6/4/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the St. Bernard Housing Authority contacted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) relative to potential inappropriate transfers of property. It is alleged that several individuals with political connection to both the parish president and sheriff are seeking to trade worthless properties that were destroyed during Katrina with more valuable properties that were sold to the State of Louisiana via the Louisiana Road Home Program.	No criminal violation.
4/22/2013	An anonymous complainant stated that the current owner/occupant of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), New Orleans, received a LRH grant, but did not own or reside in the property at the time of the storm.	No criminal violation found.
10/2/2012	Information was received from (b)(5) alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fraudulently obtained Disaster Housing Assistance Program (DHAP) funds. Allegedly (b)(7)(C) submitted false invoices to Harris County Housing Authority for reimbursement for case management services that were never actually provided by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received approximately \$2.5 million for DHAP case management.	No HUD nexus.
6/4/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have committed fraud when applying for Louisiana Road Home Program monies for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), New Orleans, Louisiana. According to a deposition given by them they admitted to not owning the property.	No criminal violation.
7/29/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$103,332.20 from the Louisiana Road Home Program for a property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Marrero, Louisiana, but allegedly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not occupy the residence but was living in Houston, Texas at the time of Hurricane Katrina.	Out of statute of limitations.
4/22/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$102,500 from the Louisiana Road Home Program for a property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), New Orleans, Louisiana, but allegedly (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not occupy the residence.	All judicial actions have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/29/2013	Allegedly, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received \$84,491.06 for a property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) New Orleans, Louisiana, from the Louisiana Road Home Program but she did not reside at the property at the time of Hurricane Katrina.	No fraud present.
6/25/2013	On December 6, 2011, information was received which indicated the subject of the investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former closing attorney for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have been involved in a scheme to defraud HUD by flipping an FHA insured property in addition to other properties. The initial information received indicates (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) closed on at least one FHA property that may have been flipped on the same day as well as closing on several other properties that caused suspicion for his employment to be terminated.	No criminal violation. No loss to HUD.
4/4/2013	The allegation states that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have committed possible HECM fraud by acquiring a HUD Single Family property using their (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The complainant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further states that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and is not aware of any transactions occurring relative to the purchase of a house.	This investigation has been completed.
8/23/2013	On Wednesday, October 17, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development-Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG), met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Fraud Investigator, San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is aware of the identity of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) through previous contact. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) voluntarily provided the following information: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a Section 8 participant but SAHA had learned through (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Last Name Unknown (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had purchased a home with an FHA loan and continued to recertify for Section 8 assistance thus allowing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to reside in the subsidized unit while (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lived in her FHA home with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) are not on the lease or the head of household for the subsidized unit. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 tenant file. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephone number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	This investigation is complete.
8/30/2013	Information was received indicating that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) made false statements while applying for a FHA insured mortgage. A re-verification of assets revealed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) bank statements had been altered.	No loss to HUD.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/28/2013	The City of Galveston Grants and Housing Department received CDBG Disaster Recovery funds to repair or replace homes damaged by Hurricane Ike. In the proses, the City of Galveston used several contractors. Three of the contractors, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), filed documents indicating that they had paid their subcontractors and the contractors were paid based on those assertions in the documents. Later, the City of Galveston determined that the contractors had not paid some of their subcontractors causing some of the contractors to place liens on the homes of the CDBG disaster recovery applicants.	was converted from a complaint in error and allegations have no criminality.
3/26/2013	This complaint was referred by the HUD Hotline (b)(6);(b)(7) in reference to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an alleged illegal immigrant receiving public housing assistance with the Housing Authority City of El Paso. (b)(6);(b) is alleged to be using a false identity to receive housing and other governmental assistance and is alleged to be involved in drug trafficking and human smuggling with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(C), and using her public housing unit to facilitate the criminal activity.	This investigation has been completed.
7/18/2013	The complainant alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Shelter Resources made materially false statements in order to receive HOPWA funds.	AUSA declined prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/13/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a telephone call from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Arkansas Department of Human Services (DHS) Fraud Investigations. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) noted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly submitted a forged Saline County Circuit Court family order when applying for State Public Assistance benefits (SNAP and Medicaid). (b)(6);(b) allegedly forged Saline County (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) signature on the above referenced court order. The order reported that (b)(6);(b) had full custody of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) however, it appears that (b)(6);(b) shares custody with the children's father. DHS will investigate to determine if the children actually are under the care of their father and if (b)(6);(b) falsified DHS documents. (b)(6);(b) also reported to the DHS that she receives HUD housing benefits. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further noted that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was very alarmed by the forgery and also requested the Saline County Sheriff's Office to investigate the alleged forgery. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) requested HUD-OIG to investigate as to whether (b)(6);(b) may have falsified HUD housing documents. A search of HUD databases indicated (b)(6);(b) was admitted into the Housing Choice Voucher Program, monitored by the Little Rock Housing Authority, on 07/23/2011. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as part of her family composition.</p>	This investigation has been completed.
4/10/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Assisted Housing Programs informed that the San Antonio Housing Authority (SAHA) has concluded fraud investigations of the following program participants, all have been issued termination notices. • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has admitted on statement form that unauthorized occupant (father of children) has been residing in unit since 2001. (b) has been charged criminally by Food Stamp Office. Total Loss: \$31,994.00 • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Unreported Income. Total Loss: \$14,132.00 • (b)(6);(b) Subleasing. No show for two scheduled interviews. Total Loss: \$7,777.00 Complaints regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were referred back to SAHA for administrative action. SAHA will provide the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) complaint once they terminate her participation from the HCV program: • (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Unreported Income. (b) admitted in interview. Total Loss: \$20,551.00. File/docs forwarded to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) A termination notice will be mailed as soon as the file is returned.</p>	Investigation is being merged with another case and is being administratively closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/23/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) San Antonio housing Authority, informed that SAHA received a letter from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informing of widespread fraud. The letter informed that SAHA employees were taking bribes from SAHA contractors. (b)(6);(b)(7) informed that SAHA was unable to determine who (b)(6);(b)(7) was.	This investigation is complete.
7/25/2013	On March 19, 2013, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Brackettville Housing Authority (BHA), was contacted by HUD-OIG and alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), BHA, misused the BHA credit card for personal purchases, provided herself a bonus from ARRA money, and did not provide support for Capital Fund draw downs.	This investigation has been completed.
7/25/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former management poorly ran the property and failed to adequately verify tenant eligibility. This has led to an excess of crime and issues in and around the property.	This investigation has been completed.
8/23/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that the San Antonio Housing Authority internal auditor and her staff audited the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) books relating to voucher payments, credits, etc. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) informed that although it does not appear like the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owed SAHA money; the findings of the audit are disturbing. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) referred it to HUD-OIG to determine if there is fraud against Section 8 tenants or just malfeasance on the part of the landlord.	No loss to HUD. This investigation has been completed.
2/5/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Cowlitz Tribe, has allegedly had a HUD funded tribal housing unit refurbished for his personal use and has been residing in the unit for a number of years. (b)(6);(b)(7) personal income is \$94,000.00 which is above the 80% median income required to reside in the Cowlitz Tribal Housing Authority's subsidized unit.	No loss to HUD. No further investigative activity warranted.
7/26/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a Seattle Housing Authority Section 8 tenant who failed to report a significant criminal history to the SHA. (b)(6);(b)(7) claimed to have several minor convictions but in reality he served time in a Federal correctional facility for interstate transportation of minors for prostituion. SHA also discovered that (b)(6);(b)(7) owns and runs several businesses which were not reported to the SHA, niether was the income earned resulting in a \$22,000 loss.	All judicial and investigative activity is complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/31/2013	On May 14, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General for Investigation (OIGI), Denver, CO, received a referral from the HUD complaint hotline regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and the Adams County Office of Community and Economic Opportunity from approximately November 2009 and possibly continuing to the present. The anonymous complaint stated the following: "This firm had a close relationship with a county employee, and were given a contract involving HUD funds even though they came in third, over the objections of the project manager who complained in writing that the employee was rigging the bid. They then raised their price significantly and also appear to have billed for work that wasn't done, including two public surveys and other work. The County has had numerous other scandals and is attempting to cover this up."	Allegations could not be substantiated.
12/4/2012	The referral stated that in the course of an on going investigation by the Wyoming Medicare Control Fraud Unit regarding Rehabilitation Enterprises of North Eastern Wyoming (RENEW) there were allegations that RENEW had received HUD funds for homes that are provided to persons with disabilities. However the allegations provided by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated that these homes were being used to house non-qualified persons by RENEW. These properties are allegedly located in Sheridan, Newcastle, and Gillete Wyoming.	Case referred back to HUD programs for administrative action.
7/29/2013	On May 8, 2013, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Colorado sent an electronic message to the Office of Investigation. The electronic message included a waveform audio file (.wav file) attachment of a recorded voice mail message from an individual who identified himself as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In the voice mail message, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that he lived in a HUD subsidized apartment complex in Glenwood Springs, Colorado. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained that there appeared to be a serious fire hazard in the 40-year old apartment complex he resided in due to a potential faulty installation of a new boiler system. In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated that the apartment complex management was refusing to allow (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the Glenwood Springs, Colorado Deputy Fire Marshal, access to the building to inspect this boiler system. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) could be reached at the following telephone number: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Finally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided the following cellular telephone number as his contact number: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).	Allegations were administrative in nature so the case was referred to HUD's Multi-Family Office.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/10/2013	Uniform Residential loan Application	Unable to substantiate loss on FHA loans in Idaho. No further investigative activity.
10/18/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a former HAYC Section 8 tenant and Yamhill County Housing Commission (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who allegedly failed to report her income and that of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) She initially failed to report that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) then refused to report his income. (b)(6);(b) failed also to report (b)(6);(C) owns a residence in Vancouver, Washington. (b)(6);(C) repeatedly refused to report (b)(6);(b) income.	Low dollar loss, limited resources.
9/23/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7) resides in a HUD owned multi family complex and allegedly receives in home medical care. The care giver allegedly does no care and only signs vouchers and gives the tenant cash in return. The Oregon DOJ is currently investigating (b)(6);(C) and the health care worker. The tenant allegedly resides a majority of the time at a different residence.	All judicial and investigative work completed.
7/24/2013	HOC QAD reports Beehive FCU (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted to altering a VOE. Loan not insured, matter opened as complain to document the matter and to review other Beehive FCU loan activity	No loss to HUD. No further leads developed.
2/5/2013	(b)(6);(C) is alleged to be running an unreported business from her home and a market in Portland Oregon while failing to report her income to the Washington County Housing Authority.	No further investigative activity is anticipated in this matter.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/21/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purchased (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Florissant MO, using and FHA insured loan in the amount of \$248,535.00. The qualifying income was \$8,374.00 per month from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The file also contained the 2008 and 2009 tax returns which were self prepared. Bank of America, loan servicer, discovered that the tax returns submitted by the borrower were false at the time of the application. The report also indicated that the borrower failed to disclose additional mortgage debt.</p>	<p>This case was inadvertently allowed to convert from a Complaint to an Investigation after 120 days; however, it is being closed and referred back to HUD's QAD for any action they deem appropriate.</p> <p>Accordingly, (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>
5/23/2013	<p>The loan application dated 4/16/2012, showed the borrower was self employed by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Florissant MO. The address is located in a residential neighborhood. Missouri Secretary of State records shows no registration with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at that address. Real estate records show that the address of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a property owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The borrower received a gift in the amount of \$5,000 from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the purchase of the property. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is listed as the employer of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) according to the loan application. However, a handwritten notation on a bank printout showing the withdraw of the gift funds state the gift was from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The address listed for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on the gift letter was at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Maryland Heights, MO.</p>	<p>Complaint converted to Investigation while agent was TDY. Lack of prosecutive merit and failure to meet current OIG investigative priorities.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/18/2013	Information received that there may be some issues with the owners/landlords /tenants on the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Kansas City, Missouri.	Case inadvertently converted from Complaint to Investigation. Unable to substantiate allegations. Case should be closed.
7/26/2013	On May 20, 2013, a QAD referral for FHA case number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was received by the St Louis, MO HUD-OIG office. The subject property is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) St Peters, MO, borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and lender NewCastle Home Loans. The documents provided show inaccurate reporting of the borrowers income and employment on the borrowers application. The loan was closed on June 22, 2012, and the first unpaid installment was reported April 1, 2013. An initial review of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA loan reveals this is a second refinance of the loan. This matter will be reviewed further for investigative leads, with a focus on lender NewCastle Home Loans.	This case was inadvertently allowed to convert from a Complaint to an Investigation after 60 days; however, it is being closed and referred back to HUD's QAD for any action they deem appropriate. (b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/19/2013	On February 13, 2009, the HUD OIG office in Los Angeles received information from a HOC referral, wherein it is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted fraudulent information while originating an FHA Mortgage. The VODs had been altered to to increase the borrower's checking and savings account balances. Additionally, it is alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recruited acquaintances to purchase properties with the intent of using them as rental property. It is further alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used Section 8 tenants to occupy the properties. It is noted (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was sentenced to 6 months home detention, three years probation and fined \$5,000 subsequent to an ICE investigation which revealed he was structuring cash deposits in the amount of \$453,800 to circumvent financial reporting requirements.	Statute issues, unable to substantiate allegations.
11/23/2012	Denver HOC reports receiving alert from lender US Bank that sole documentation of self-employment income--tax returns--are fictitious. HOC reports loan is seven month delinquent and foreclosure proceedings started. Unpaid principal balance is \$226,235 to \$228,358	Investigaiton failed to establish the validity of the allegations.
9/23/2013	Washington n Department of Health and Human Services allege (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is married to his landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while unlawfully receiving Section 8 voucher from Snohomish County Housing Authority.	All investigative activity completed, no further activity.
11/23/2012	Billings Housing Authority reports that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lived in the basement portion of a home for which he received rental subsidies on behalf of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in turn, did not report (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presence in the unit.	Investigation failed to establish the validity of the allegations. A SIR was drafted and submitted.
12/20/2012	During a HUD-OIG mortgage fraud investigation ((b)(6);(b)(7)(C)), it was revealed that realtor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly provided down payment funds to a borrower during the procurement of a FHA mortgage. The alleged fraudulent transaction involved FHA borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) This investigation is being opened as a proactive measure to identify possible loan origination fraud conducted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Currently, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a realtor for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Declined for prosecution.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/29/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contacted HUD-OIG and requested HUD-OIG to look into facts surrounding the subject of a Washington Post article that referenced a development in Saint Louis County funded by HUD Home funds and the project was never completed. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) wanted to know if there are any criminal issues to be pursued regarding the undeveloped project.	Unable to substantiate allegations.
3/4/2013	Englewood Housing Authority alleges Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program participant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has committed fraud and theft of government services by not accurately reporting her household income. Englewood Housing Authority alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report \$46,922.00 in wages to the Englewood Housing Authority between the time period of February 2010 and October 2011.	All foreseeable judicial and administrative actions have been taken.
4/10/2013	The Kansas City, KS Housing Authority (KCKHA) alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report income. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) filed taxes for the years 2009 and 2010 and did not report that income to the KCKHA. As a result, the KCKHA made approximately \$5,000 in housing payments on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) behalf that she did not deserve. Additionally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who works for HUD, initially confirmed her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) earned income by braiding hair. The hair braiding income information, which was never reported to KCKHA, was used to begin the process to terminate (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 assistance. At the KCKHA termination hearing, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated she never said (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained income by braiding hair. Due to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) changing her story and members of the KCKHA board feeling intimidated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employment with HUD, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was initially able to avoid termination.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete. Closed with concurrence from SID.
11/6/2012	This complaint is being opened as a spinoff from case number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The loan processor, identified as, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), from the above mentioned case, was the subject of an investigation conducted by the Colorado Division of Real Estate regarding her participation as a loan originator while working at Access Equity.	Allegations could not be substantiated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/9/2012	<p>The complaint alleged that according to records, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was first issued a voucher on October 17, 1995. Her original lease with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Trinidad, Colorado, is dated January 1, 1996. It appears that (b)(6);(b)(7) was residing at that address at the time the lease was signed. It had been reported to the Housing Authority that (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6);(b)(7) are husband and wife or have at least represented themselves as such. It has also been reported that (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6);(b)(7) maintain a residence in Arizona and "winter" there annually. The estimated loss amount at this time is not known.</p>	Case is being referred back to the Housing Authority due to other investigative priorities.
12/19/2012	<p>Allegations from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Wichita, KS 67226; (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) I would like to report section 8 fraud in Wichita, Kansas. The address where the fraud is taking place is (b)(6);(b)(7) (b)(6);(b)(7) Wichita Kansas 67208. I assisted the owner of the property with fixing up the property to pass section 8 inspection in January 2011. The tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) moved into the property February 2011. The owner of the property (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has also been living at the resident since February 2011. There was an inspection in the latter part of 2011 due to being informed of the inspection (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) moved his belongings to not raise suspicion. Ike is currently residing at the resident and collecting the Section 8 voucher and using a PO Box to as a mailing address. The local section 8 office was contacted however no action has been taken. The section 8 recipient is also running a home daycare out of the residence. Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.</p>	Declined for prosecution. All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete.
10/16/2012	<p>Information was forwarded to assigned agent indicating that registered sex offender (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently living in a multifamily housing facility known as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Saint Louis, Missouri. According to the Missouri State Highway Patrol website, (b)(6);(b)(7) is a non compliant registered sex offender and was convicted of sexual misconduct in 2006.</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
12/21/2012	<p>On May 3, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7) HUD-OIG met with law enforcement officers of the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department regarding allegations concerning the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Apartments located in Kansas City, Kansas. Specifically, members of the police department reported that they received an anonymous tip that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Apartments received kickbacks from drug dealers allowed to reside on the property. Furthermore, it was alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allowed several females to run a prostitution ring at one of the subsidized units.</p>	Unable to substantiate allegations, administratively close.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/3/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, St Louis, Missouri office of Housing and Urban Development, was arrested on 02/13/12, for failure to return a rental car. It was later determined that (b)(6);(C) utilized her government travel card to rent the vehicle while not on official travel. Also noted was that (b)(6);(C) was reprimanded in 2010 for misuse of her government travel card. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Fair Housing & Equal Opportunity, sent a query asking for assistance in dealing with the offense. This complaint was forwarded to the Office of Inspector General inquiring as to potential criminal violations. The HUD Office of General Counsel is waiting to pursue further administrative action pending the OIG investigation.</p>	All foreseeable actions complete. SID concurred with closing.
7/23/2013	<p>On August 27, 2012, SSA-OIG referred a matter to HUD-OIG regarding Section 8 recipient, (b)(6);(b)(C) (b)(6);(C) Specifically, SSA-OIG has been investigating (b)(6);(C) for allegations of unreported income. It has been alleged that (b)(6);(C) has done work as a Personal Trainer and failed to report his employment and income to the SSA, which resulted in an overpayment that is expected to be in excess of \$100,000. Furthermore, SSA-OIG's investigation has revealed that (b)(6);(C) enters body building competitions, which conflicts with his disability allegations. SSA-OIG discovered that (b)(6);(C) has been a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher recipient for several years and alleged that he may have failed to disclose his income to the Housing Authority. Furthermore, SSA-OIG suspects that there could be landlord fraud involved because (b)(6);(C) has been renting a trailer home from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	Lack of prosecutive merit regarding HUD portion of case.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/29/2013	<p>On September 20, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) participated in a conference call with Iowa Department of Inspection and Appeals (DIA) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Southern Iowa Regional Housing Authority (SIRHA) employees (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also participated in the call. The purpose of the call was to discuss possible Section 8 Landlord fraud on behalf of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The allegations are that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) arranged to transfer the property of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) into her name in order to receive Section 8 benefits as a landlord and to assist (b)(6);(C) in qualifying for Medicaid. Additionally, there was a life estate filed in March 1998 transferring the property from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C); however, (b)(6);(C) was entitled to live in the property until her death. Immediately following the life estate, (b)(6);(C) arranged for (b)(6);(C) to receive Section 8 assistance and (b)(6);(C) collected HAP payments from SIRHA from approximately 1998 to 2010. SIRHA officials stated that because (b)(6);(C) was still the owner of the home while receiving assistance, she should have never qualified for Section 8 benefits, which were arranged by (b)(6);(b)(C).</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete.
7/26/2013	<p>On April 8, 2009, this office received information from a Hotline referral, wherein complainant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained a HECM mortgage on a property at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Seattle, WA, belonging to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently residing in a nursing home. (b)(6);(C) apparently has a court appointed attorney (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is seeking information on the \$247,000 reverse mortgage. It should also be noted that information provided by the HL reveals that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has a 20 year old conviction for mortgage fraud against HUD.</p>	Investigation failed to substantiate allegations.
7/12/2013	<p>The Housing Authority of Portland submitted a referral for investigation alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former Section 8 tenant, failed to report the income of an unauthorized tenant and convicted violent felon and now (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	All judicial action is complete, no further action is necessary.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/24/2012	On June 17, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) United States Department of Housing & Urban Development, Office of Inspector General (HUDOIG) spoke with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Washington Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Division of Fraud Investigations, Omak, WA who identified (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been receiving housing assistance since November 19, 2009 and not reporting any earned income earned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who according to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is an undocumented tenant and a deported felon. DSHS also has an open investigation on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	All investigative activity has been completed, no further activity needed.
2/21/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) supplied fraudulent information in order to obtain an FHA loan in the amount of \$314,200 on a property in Tacoma, WA.	single borrower investigation. No industry professionals linked to the investigation.
2/21/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided false documents to obtain an FHA insured loan for \$354,184 on a property in Tacoma, WA	Single Borrower investigation. No industry professionals identified.
12/19/2012	The Josephine County Housing Development Council submitted a referral for investigation alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Section 8 landlord, leased her Grants Pass, Oregon residence to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(C) and attempted to conceal the ownership by utilizing an LLC	All investigative and judicial activity is complete.
7/12/2013	On 3-9-2010, the Housing Authority of Billings notified the OIG that tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) admitted to having two unreported occupants in her (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) unit for 4-5 years, one of whom is presently under investigation by the Billings Police Department for sexual assault of a minor, and the other is a registered violent offender who failed to register in Yellowstone County, MT. Loss unknown at this time, but is believed to be in excess of \$10,000.	All judicial action is complete, no further investigative activity needed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/21/2012	<p>MEMORANDUM FOR: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigation, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Kansas City, KS</p> <p>FROM: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Program Integrity (Hotline) Division, (GFI) SUBJECT: HOTLINE REFERRAL (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Response Due Date: February 22, 2010</p> <p>The allegations described in the attachments were reported to the Office of Inspector General (OIG), Program Integrity Division (Hotline). The attached complaint is being referred to you for investigation in accordance with established OIG policy and procedures. Please determine the merits of each allegation listed on the attached Report of Conduct. When your investigation is complete, provide a closing report to the Program Integrity Division (Hotline) that briefly describes: How the allegations were investigated. Whether the allegations were substantiated or unsubstantiated. What penalties were associated with the substantiated allegations. Unless there is consent form signed by the complainant, and provided to you with this referral, the referred information should be considered confidential and subject to the provisions of the Privacy Act. Please make every effort to protect the identity of the complainant during your investigation. Please note that all or part of your closing report to this OIG-Hotline referral may be available to the complainant under the Freedom of Information Act. If you have any questions, please contact (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/11/2013	<p>On July 21, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of the Inspector General for Investigation (OIG), received a written and telephonic referral regarding three subjects who have or are receiving federal assistance from a HUD program. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Joint Terrorism Task Force, stated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to report their true and accurate income and biographical information to include their social security numbers. Allegedly, the three subjects have received federal housing assistance for which they obtained by fraudulent activity. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided the following summary: There is reasonable cause to believe, based upon information obtained from a federal investigation, that violations of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1956(a)(2)(A) and Title 18, United States Code, Section 1960 have been committed. Information has been provided that leads this Applicant to conclude that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) transported or attempted to transport monetary instrument of funds into or out of the United States with intent to promote a federally unlicensed money transmitter business under Federal law.</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
1/30/2013	<p>This complaint is being opened to address mortgage fraud complaints/investigations with the United States (b)(5) Task Force, which was initiated in response to OIG Bulletin (b)(7)(E)</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/3/2013	<p>On December 15, 2010, HUD-OIG (b)(5) met with the Iowa Department of Economic Development (IDED) concerning (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the contractor who is overseeing the federal disaster funds associated with the flooding in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Previously, HUD-OIG had an open complaint number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) C concerning (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). New information received from the IDED indicates that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be a landlord and may have received tenant rental funds that stemmed from disaster assistance. The IDED suggested that the receipt of these rental funds may result in a conflict of interest. Furthermore, the IDED indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) charges excessive fees to administer the Jumpstart program and has received approximately \$1.2 million in fees from the City of Cedar Rapids. The IDED hired an accounting firm to audit the Jumpstart files and business practices. HUD-OIG, Kansas City has two other active Jumpstart Program investigations (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), which will be merged into this investigation.</p>	Declined for prosecution. All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete.
12/21/2012	<p>The Denver Homeownership Center reported (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that FHA mortgagor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have used fraudulent employment information to qualify for an FHA loan. Specifically, during a mortgage loan audit, US Bank discovered that the borrower's employment could not be verified.</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
3/29/2013	<p>The city of Saint Louis, according to recent (b)(5) statistics, has the highest reported level of violent crime in the United States. One of the goals of this initiative is to detect violent felons or individuals who are fugitives or registered sex offenders and remove them from HUD subsidized housing in the Saint Louis metro area. This will be done in an effort to assist in providing safe and sanitary housing to the residents and neighbors of HUD assisted facilities. The information will be developed by (b)(5);(b)(7)(E)</p> <p>systems. A second focus of this initiative is to investigate crimes related to PIH rental housing assistance programs. Both tenant and landlord fraud cases will be investigated as part of this initiative.</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/17/2012	Allegations that Credit Advisors is billing HUD for Housing Counseling Services conducted for clients, when no work is being done. Information is being falsified in the computer systems to make it appear that clients are being served, when in fact, these clients have not been seen.	Unable to substantiate allegations. Administratively closed.
7/5/2013	Based on interviews related to HUD OIG Investigation Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), allegations have been made regarding the landlord and owner of property (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Pueblo, Colorado received additional monies (side rent agreement) to allow unauthorized occupants to reside in the residence.	All anticipated judicial and administrative actions have been completed.
8/5/2013	On April 19, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD Office of Public Housing, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD Office of Public Housing, met with the reporting agent to discuss possible theft from the Alamosa Housing Authority by the current (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised she was informed today by the Alamosa (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is suspected of altering training documents in order to obtain a travel advance from the Housing Authority and making unauthorized charges for fuel and meals on the Housing Authority's credit card.	Case was declined for criminal prosecution. Allegations have been provided to Office of Public Housing.
12/21/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C), known as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to the State of Nebraska and Social Security, received assistance from the Douglas County Housing Authority by providing a false Social Security number and false name.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
1/23/2013	HUD OIG received the following complaint from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) -potential criminal case that looks like it has both HUD and Social Security involvement. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) DWS part is \$24,376.43 and goes from 01/01/2005 - 01/31/2007 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly obtains stolen copper wire then scraps it. He says that he splits the proceeds 50/50 but won't reveal who the supplier is so that can't be verified. Amounts are based on receipts from the salvage site. Because the income fluctuates from month to month DWS averaged it over the year. Jan - Dec 2005 = \$6,848.50/month Jan - Dec 2006 = \$5,505.00/month Jan 2007 = \$2,538.75	Prosecutors felt that the matter was handled administratively when the tenant was evicted.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/7/2012	<p>On May 20, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Public Housing (OPH), HUD and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) OPH, HUD. Specifically, (b)(6);(b) received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for STAFFORD HOUSING AUTHORITY (SHA), that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) SHA, paid herself an excessive salary. Furthermore, that labor costs for SHA seemed unusually high and more recently payroll taxes were delinquent, among other issues. (b)(6);(b) advised she analyzed various financial statements for SHA and it appeared (b)(6);(b) paid herself a salary of approximately \$125,625 from approximately October 2009 to October 2010. (b)(6);(b) advised she would provide the reporting Agent SHA financial statements among other documents, at a later time. (b)(6);(b) explained (b)(6);(b) is the only employee for the SHA and she is responsible to manage approximately 30 subsidized units. Furthermore, the SHA has a Board of Directors that is comprised of 4 or 5 members.</p>	Declined for prosecution -- unable to substantiate allegations.
12/21/2012	<p>HUD-OIG received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Waterloo Iowa Housing Authority, regarding two separate fraud cases. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b) HCV participant since 12/1/06, has resided with her landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) since entering the program. (b)(6);(b) allegedly signed a homestead exemption form with the county stating that he has lived in the home since 11/30/06. Also, the utilities have been listed in (b)(6);(b) name throughout the entire period in question. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also received information that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b) HCV participant, has had (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) living with her since 2004 and has failed to report him as a household member on certifications. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) have at least one child together. (b)(6);(b)(7) is a city employee and earns approximately \$38,000 - \$40,000 per year.</p>	Lack of prosecutive response.
3/21/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with Brighton Housing Authority employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding an unrelated matter. During the meeting (b)(6);(b)(7) stated he had been told by Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) participant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that she pays an additional payment of \$80.00 a month to the landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to continue to reside in her rental property.</p>	All anticipated judicial, civil and administrative actions have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/28/2013	The OIG received a complaint that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Section 8 Choice Voucher Tenant, had been receiving assistance and had failed to report that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had not been living in her unit for approximatley one year.	All foreseeable administrative an judicial actions have been completed.
12/21/2012	On September 13, 2011, the US Attorney's office advised the St Louis HUD-OIG office that the St Louis Human Development Corporation (HDC) is suspected of misusing Stimulus funds granted to them by St Louis city on behalf of HUD and various other federal programs. The CEO of HDC, (b)(6);(b)(6);(b) is preparing to retire amidst allegations of misconduct. An initial interview with a HUD CPD representative revealed that the practices of both the St Louis City Board of Directors, along with HDC need to be looked into at the program level at a minimum. (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(5)	Unable to substantiate allegations. Administratively closed.
7/18/2013	OIG Audit identified that a CPA has been providing misleading audit reports for FHA lenders.	Declined for prosecution due to lack of prosecutive merit; however, (b)(6); was debarred. All forseable action complete.
10/17/2012	Received information from confidential source alleging that the Community Development Corp. of Kansas City (CDC-KC) received a \$2 million grant for the redevelopment of Citadel Plaza located in Kansas City, MO. It is alleged that the CDC-KC received double payments for redevelopment expenses from the grant funds and from the City of Kansas City, Missouri.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/3/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted a bid for the un-armed security contract for the ESLHA high rises in April 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was initially awarded the contract, however, the East Saint Louis Housing Authority (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) retracted the offer and awarded the contract to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was awarded the contract even after the East Saint Louis Housing Authority contract review board made up of public housing managers scored (b)(6); the lowest on the bid evaluation forms. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a potential victim, alleged that it is impossible to for (b)(6) to fulfill the contract for the amount that they bid and still pay prevailing wages etc.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
11/7/2012	Received an allegation from the Jackson County, Missouri Prosecutor's Office that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) transferred property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Kansas City, Missouri to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) via Quit Claim Deed and had (b)(6); obtain a reverse mortgage. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly cashed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) lump sum reverse mortgage payment in the amount of approximately \$64,000.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
12/21/2012	This is a spin-off investigation of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a Section 8 Landlord and real estate investor, is suspected of purchasing and selling properties using false income and tax documents to qualify borrowers for FHA financing.	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fled justice and is a fugitive. Charges against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were dismissed and will be reconsidered if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is apprehended. All action complete at this time.
4/30/2013	The basis for our investigation are referrals received from (b)(5) and through active participation on the (b)(5)	All anticipated judicial and administrative actions have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/31/2013	<p>On September 30, 2008, the OIG received an informal referral from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Utah State Office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) made multiple false certifications to HUD in connection with FHA-insured mortgage loans. Allegedly, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) represented himself as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) when in fact his professional (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been suspended by the State of Utah, Division of Occupational and Profession Licensing (DOPL) since February 11, 2005. Between February 11, 2005 through September 30, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) created and submitted multiple (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of manufactured homes and provided them to mortgage brokers in the Cedar City, Utah area for the purpose of obtaining FHA-insured loans. As (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) presented the informal referral she displayed photographs of a manufactured home certified by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which appeared structurally unsound through a layman's eyes. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained an official referral to the OIG was in-process. Where FHA borrows safety appeared in question a limited preliminary investigation began before the arrival of the official referral received on December 1, 2008. On October 1, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was interviewed by OIG and confessed to submitting eighteen (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of manufactured homes while DOPL had suspended his LPE license. The agent specifically cautioned (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to stop conducting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of manufactured homes for the purpose of obtaining 'FHA'-insured loans.</p>	All anticipated judicial and administrative actions have been completed.
5/22/2013	<p>Received complaint from (b)(5) that FHA insured borrower (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) his former Real Estate Agent and other unnamed person(s) were allegedly involved in an equity ripping scheme related to the property address of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) South Jordan, UT 84095 or FHA binder number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Preliminary investigation substantiated enough information received from the CHS to justify opening an investigation. Although the FHA loan remains active the status is noted as delinquent, first legal action to commence foreclosure. The unpaid balance is roughly \$487,000.</p>	All anticipated judicial and administrative actions have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/29/2012	This case is being opened to track work on CDBP funds spent by the City of East St Louis CPD office. Previous investigative work has been and continues to be worked under (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) This action splits out the CPD aspect from the other listed file.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete.
10/19/2012	Received allegations from the Kansas City, Kansas Housing Authority that multiple counterfeit checks were passed at Wal-Mart which contained the Housing Authority bank account information. Specifically, counterfeit checks were passed which listed the payees as: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) An investigation was initiated by the Kansas City, Kansas Police Department, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Obtained copies of the counterfeit checks and housing authority account information which reveals that numerous fraudulent checks were passed using the housing authority General Fund checking account which contains operating subsidy, capital fund payments, and ARRA funds. As a result, agent recommends opening case for further investigation. In addition, investigation has been initiated to investigate allegations that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 tenant, used the KCK HA checking account number to make numerous unauthorized purchases to various merchants.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
1/7/2013	HUD-OIG received a complaint from the Cedar Rapids Police Department alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owner of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided false statements in order to receive an increased amount of Jumpstart funds. Specifically, it was reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided documentation that showed that his lease was \$2,000 per month and it is reported that his lease was only \$500 per month. By inflating his lease amount, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received grant money that he was not entitled to receive. The Jumpstart program was identified as an Iowa recovery initiative developed to address the financial needs of Iowans affected by the 2008 storms, flooding and tornadoes.	Case was in the process of being consolidated to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pending prosecutive consideration. In the interim, on December 27, 2012, the case was declined for prosecution. All foreseeable actions complete.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/19/2012	<p>Information was received from the Nebraska AG's office alleging that FHA Mortgage Originator, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), FHA lender (b)(6);(b)(7) was originating FHA and Conventional Mortgage loans containing false and forged documentation. Since April 2006, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has originated 146 FHA loans. This complaint is being opened to investigate the FHA exposure regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	All foreseeable criminal and civil actions complete.
12/21/2012	<p>This case was originally opened as a complaint ((b)(6);(b)(7)(C)) in AI. USPIS received information from a source that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was changing HUD1 Settlement Statements in order to kick back money to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The information specified that the activity was taking place out of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) office co-located with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The source advised that the activity was taking place on all loans involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA and conventional. According to Neighborhood Watch, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) conducts a large volume of FHA loans. (b)(5)</p>	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
3/13/2013	<p>This investigation was predicated by a complaint from the U.S. Trustees office. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is involved with equity skimming in the Ogden area. To date, four FHA properties have taken a loss after a Quit Claim Deed was signed by the homeowner of the property to companies associated with Foreclosure Solutions.</p>	Case was inadvertently re opened in (b)(7)(E) after it was closed in April 2012. It is being re closed with no changes made to the case file.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/6/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Receiver for HEDFC, relayed the following: He recently completed the sale of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Kansas City, Missouri, which he foreclosed on in October 2009 due to their non-payment of their obligations to MHDC and HEDFC. The (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) She oversaw the demise of that organization with losses to HEDFC on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and other properties in excess of \$3 million at HEDFC. Part of this was inherited but it appeared that cash was going into that organization from rents and grants that was not being used to maintain the properties. They were collecting over \$10,000 per month on the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 33 rental units and not paying utility bills, the first mortgage, or maintaining the properties in a safe manner. There was also over \$40,000 that was supposed to be used to renovate a six-plex that disappeared somewhere from an escrow account without any work done on the six-plex. HEDFC has settled the final amounts on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) but still have four of six homes to sell that may further increase the losses above \$3 million. This amount does not include the \$3 million spent on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in 1994-1996 for complete renovation of those 33 units at that time or amounts paid to Old Northeast by Jackson County, the City of Kansas City, MO, and other organizations over the years. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Old Northeast was funded for administrative expenses using HUD funds for many years.</p>	Lack of prosecutive merit/unable to substantiate the allegations. Also, statute of limitations issues.
3/29/2013	<p>Information was received that the City of East St Louis (CESL) Economic Development Office (EDO) may be misspending funds allotted to it's Housing Rehabilitation program. OIG Audit is currently looking at the issue and has discovered potential misspent funds. The program area being reviewed is FY 07 & 08, which is about \$1.3 million in expenditures. It appears that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be involved in approving expense payments in conjunction with various contractors, to be determined later. This complaint is being opened to meet with Audit and the USAO, Southern District of Illinois. It is contemplated this will be a civil/criminal investigation when all the data is completed. The estimated time of audit completion is end of month June 2010.</p>	Declined for prosecution due to lack of prosecutive merit.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/2/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a GNND participant, purchased a OND home in July 2006 and has only completed one required annual program certification. Based upon a review of property records for the condo owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) prior to her participation in the GNND program, it appears that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) transferred her ownership interest in the condo out of her name to participate in the GNND program. The condo was quit claimed back to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in May 2010. The end of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 3 year commitment in the GNND program ended August 18, 2009, however, HUD has not released its subordinate deed of trust because (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not complete all required certifications.	Case is being administratively closed because HUD program staff advised that there were no program violations.
12/19/2012	An anonymous complaint alleges fraud in the CDBG funded project (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Kansas City, KS. City (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns one of the five homes built with the funding, his business partner (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owning two others and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owning another one. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a member of the city's CDBG Budget Committee. There are also allegations of misuse of earlier HUD funding	Declined for prosecution due to inability to substantiate allegations.
11/7/2012	HUD-OIG Kansas City is currently investigating a counterfeit payroll check ring (case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) I) in which several businesses were victimized including numerous housing authorities across the Kansas City Metro area. The investigation revealed a separate counterfeit operation of which the USAO Western District of Missouri expressed an interest in prosecuting. Investigation revealed several counterfeit payroll checks that contained the Housing Authorities of Kansas City and Independence Missouri bank account information. Information received suggests that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may be the leaders/organizers of the counterfeit ring.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete.
12/19/2012	HUD's QAD reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) FHA Mortgagor (FHA Case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)) failed to report all liabilities to the lender at the time of loan application or underwriting.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative action complete. Fails to meet consideration for DEC action per current DEC protocol.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/21/2012	QAD discovered potentially false bank statements used to qualify (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for an FHA loan originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Declined for prosecution. All foreseeable actions complete.
11/9/2012	This investigation is being opened to address complaints received from citizens, housing authorities and law enforcement. Specifically, this investigation will address complaints of housing assistance fraud in the State of Kansas and Missouri.	All foreseeable criminal and administrative actions complete with the exception of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (appears to have fled) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (pending prosecutive opinion). Case agent leaving agency, and case should be closed.
2/20/2013	This case was initiated from a news article from a Tacoma area newspaper indicating that the Marting Luther King Housing Development Association of Tacoma may have misspent large amounts of grant money on risky investments that lost money. The MLKHDA received CDBG and CPD grants through the City of Tacoma. (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(5)	Investigation declined.
11/29/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a WSHA contract from his blood relative (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (the WSHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to rebuild/remodel a WSHA unit that was damaged in a fire. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was later terminated for a separate issue and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was hired to replace him. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) never completed the contract and hired (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) back a WSHA maintenance employee and had him and other WSHA maintenance employees complete the work and charge the costs to HUD.	Investigation declined by USAO due to low dollar loss.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/30/2013	<p>On September 4, 2008, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) replied to a voicemail previously left by an individual who wishes not to be identified at this time. The individual made allegations regarding significant misconduct by former employees of the IRHA, to include public corruption, misappropriation of funds and contract fraud. Due to the individual's schedule, they were unable to provide additional details until a subsequent call to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on September 8, 2008. On that date, during a telephonic conference call between the individual, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the individual reiterated the aforementioned allegations and provided names of parties involved; Specifically, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of IRHA, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of IRHA, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who was hired as an (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and subsequently promoted to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a position for which she was not qualified. The individual stated the parties were using IRHA funding, or ill gotten gains, to purchase vessels, using IRHA money to purchase gasoline for personal vehicles, authorizing housing in exchange for sexual favors, approving low contract bids and allowing excessive change orders. The individual advised (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is now working for the contractor which was selected by IRHA.</p>	All investigative activity has been completed.
8/28/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) claims to have documentation showing (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used false statements to obtain mortgage loans. (b)(6);(C) is currently a certified appraiser and is involved with numerous FHA loans currently in various stages of default. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used to work as an (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and used her position to get the fraudulent loans approved.</p>	All judicial/administrative action has been completed. Case closed.
1/16/2013	<p>On October 27, 2008, this office received a HOC/QAD referral, dated October 22, 2008 (QAD (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), an FHA approved mortgagee, reports that seven loans originated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contained false income verifications.</p>	All judicial (criminal & civil) and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/15/2013	<p>On December 28, 2009, the Los Angeles HUD-OIG office received a Financial Management Review of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Los Angeles, alleging that the former Managing Agent of the captioned project diverted or advanced resources to the benefit of other entities without specific HUD approval. A referral for investigation was made due to the scope of non-compliance with HUD regulations and the potential for fraud.</p>	<p>All investigative actions have been completed. Prosecution declined. Case closed.</p>
3/19/2013	<p>Evidence suggests that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Long Beach, California, used strawbuyer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to purchase a HUD REO property on or about June 10, 2003 located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Rialto, California 92377. Other evidence reveals that shortly after the sale of this property, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) grant deeded the property back to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in November 2003 using a D.B.A. of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to obtain and become eligible for Section 8 housing. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is accused of submitting false identification/information and fraudulently receiving benefits from the County of San Bernardino Housing Authority while posing as an eligible Housing Choice Voucher recipient/tenant when in fact she was actually the owner/landlord directing the HAP payments to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received housing benefits from January 2004 to March 2007 causing HUD a total loss of \$17,649. In October 2004, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) grant deeded the property back to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed and reported. No admin action taken. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/10/2013	<p>In 2005, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Phoenix, AZ, secured a \$22,500,000 FHA insured loan to rehabilitate (b)(6) units. The units were reported as rehabbed and they claimed that 93% of the apartments were occupied at the time of application. The loan went into default in May 2008 and the mortgage was assigned to HUD in October 2008 with an unpaid principle balance of \$23,132,000. In November 2008, the occupancy rate was reported as 40%. HUD OIG Audit began a review of the funding and expenses which disclosed that reserve funds were diverted and used to pay relocations costs, etc. In addition, a \$1,000,000 grant/loan was received by the project from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) specifically designated for rehabilitation costs. It appears that this grant/loan was not used for rehabilitation and HUD was never notified that these funds were available at the time of closing. On July 10, 2009, HUD OIG Audit referred their findings of this matter to the Office of Investigations for investigative review. A HUD HQ review suggested that the occupancy rates in 2005 were probably overstated and HUD OIG Investigations may review this issue.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete. No evidence of criminal activity was found. Referral of investigative findings made to HUD OIG Office of Audit resulting in civil money penalty judgment against subject company. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/3/2013	<p>In July 2007, HUD-OIG management staff met with HACLA senior staff to discuss a number of issues pertaining to HACLA, to include issues regarding various HACLA internal investigations. During the meeting, HACLA advised that one of their employees, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was possibly engaged in fraudulent activity; (b)(6);(b)(7) may have been fraudulently steering contracts to his friends/family members. This office learned that HACLA referred this case to the District Attorney's Office for possible prosecution. This office has made contact with the ADA assigned to this case, but as of this date she has only vaguely familiarized herself with the investigation, and a DA investigator has not yet been assigned. This office has expressed to the DA's office an interest in the investigation. Further meetings between all parties are pending. This office (HUD-OIG) will determine if this allegation has merit and proceed with the appropriate course of action. **UPDATE**: Aug. 15, 2007, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with HACLA investigator and was briefed in more detail regarding caption investigation. Documents, files, and computers were taken into custody by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as potential evidentiary items. Items were taken due to HACLA's prior uncooperative nature with regard to HUD-OIG HACLA investigations. Additionally, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) appeared deceptive and/or was not totally forthcoming with all information. (b)(6) initially denied possessing any relative file, yet files were moments later found stored in his office. Aug. 16: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with LA ADA and DA investigator for a joint interview with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at the LA DA Office, where (b)(6) reiterated information previously provided to the DA Office. No additional valuable</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>	All judicial actions for three defendants in this case have been completed and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/11/2012	<p>On September 26, 2007, HUD-OIG was notified by HUD (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Community Planning and Development, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a sponsor, had purchased real property using HUD monies allocated by the City of Long Beach, the grantee. HUD-OIG was asked to determine whether (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is in breach of contract with the City of Long Beach. UPDATE: On 2/20/08, this case was converted from a complaint status to investigation status for further inquiry. As of this date, awaiting further information from the Long Beach City Prosecutor's Office regarding their audit of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Result of which should further substantiate the original allegation.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. No evidence was obtained to conclude that suspected fraudulent activity engaged in by ARS resulted in any financial harm/loss to HUD. This case is being closed due to minimal impact on HUD programs.</p>
9/16/2013	<p>Alaska Special Prosecutor (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised HUD-OIG Las Vegas that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has collected welfare in Alaska and Nevada from 2003 to 2008. HUD-OIG determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is on Sec. 8 housing through the Clark County Housing Authority. HUD-OIG will present facts to the CCHA in anticipation of possible termination of benefits.</p>	<p>Matter has been denied of prosecutorial interest. Subject has been disallowed by PHA of Section 8 participation.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/16/2013	<p>HUD-OIG Las Vegas received an allegation from an anonymous informant that former Las Vegas HUD Multi-Family (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have tried to influence the results of a recent HUD management review of Catholic Charities. HUD-OIG has determined that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently working as a contractor for Catholic Charities. The allegation also stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has told Catholic Charities that if they didn't hire him as a contractor that they would have difficulties getting HUD grant funding in the future. HUD-OIG will investigate the allegations further.</p>	<p>Given the declination to prosecute and lack of loss/personal gain, HUD-OIG does not recommend any further investigation and suggests the case be closed.</p>
3/8/2013	<p>On May 12th and 13th, 2010 a telephone call was received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was concerned as she represented a buyer in a transaction she believed could be illegal. The transaction was that the buyer she represented, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been requested by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), the selling agent in a "short sale" transaction, to pay \$2,800 to the second lender in order for him to "go away." (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated when she asked how this would be handled in escrow she was told by the escrow officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that this would be handled "outside of escrow." It was explained to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that the \$2,800 would show up on the HUD-1 settlement statement as loan origination funds. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated the listing agent, the escrow company and the lender are all located in the same building and she believes they are associated in some way. Deputy DA for Orange County, California, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said if sufficient evidence was acquired he would prosecute this case. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further authorized a consensual non-telephonic recording of the impending meeting, to take place at 1630hours, May 13, 2010.</p>	<p>pros declined. case closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/20/2012	<p>On December 17, 2009, an e-mail message was received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Ventura County Housing Authority, explaining that a person identified as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged to her that Section-8 recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was renting a room to (b)(6) at Section-8 address (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Simi Valley, CA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further advised that she has been paying (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) approx. \$700 per month for rent since April of 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stated to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that the landlord is now trying to get rid of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and things are getting nasty. The complaint alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have an unauthorized tenant and unreported income.</p>	<p>The local DA office initially charged both subjects, but later dismissed all charges (at no fault of HUD-IG). Both subjects have been terminated from the Rental Assistance Program. Case closed.</p>
5/15/2013	<p>On April 21, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for Inglewood Housing Authority informed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of information she had received from Inglewood PD that Section 8 Participant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have provided false statements to the Inglewood Housing Authority on her Section 8 Personal Declaration. The Inglewood PD relayed to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was on felony probation until 2011 and her minor son was arrested for gun possession inside of the home.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed and reported. No administrative or civil actions by HUD warranted. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time and this case is closed.</p>

<u>Date Closed</u>	<u>Investigative Description</u>	<u>Disposition</u>
10/29/2012	The case agent, in conjunction with state and local agencies is investigating alleged program violations occurring at federally subsidized residences in city of Highland, CA. An investigation was initiated to determine if the head of households are defrauding the Section 8 program by not reporting income and allowing unauthorized tenants to reside in their residences.	All investigative activities have been completed and judicial actions monitored and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/10/2013	<p>On January 7, 2009, this office received a hotline complaint, alleging that Multi-Family Section-8 authorized tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not reside in her Anaheim, CA subsidized housing, and instead earned income and lived in San Diego, CA. Angeles and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is the subsidized unit's head of household, applied to reside together in their subsidized unit, and have received HUD monies since 2006.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed and reported. Defendants have paid all ordered restitution. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
9/16/2013	<p>The HUD-OIG Las Vegas Field Office received information that North Las Vegas Housing Authority (NLVHA), Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received purported grant funding for her non-profit, Nevada Community Associates (NCA) and failed to report such to the NLVHA. It is alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received approximately \$300,000 in Federal grant funds for NCA. NCA is said to provide tutoring for low income elementary school students as well as alcohol and substance abuse counseling for adults. It is believed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not provide said services. Investigation thus far does not show any Federal Grant Funding for NCA, however, it has been alleged by anonymous sources that former NLVHA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with approximately \$300,000 for the NCA. Current (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who is also the City of North Las Vegas (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) recalls seeing a contract between (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (NCA) and the NLVHA, however, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicates he cannot locate said contract. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) will continue to search for contract. NOTE: This case crosses over with a current HUD-OIG audit inquiry into approximately \$4.5 million dollars of missing NLVHA HAP funds. HUD Las Vegas (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) believes that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and other former NLVHA employees may have diverted the missing funds to non-profits such as NCA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) further suggested that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have diverted some of the missing funds into non HUD assisted programs because such programs have little to no oversight.</p>	<p>Matter has been adjudicated.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/16/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Las Vegas Housing Authority advised HUD-OIG that landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is renting his Section 8 home to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	Matter has been adjudicated.
9/17/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Las Vegas Housing Authority advised HUD-OIG that LVHA Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is leasing a Section 8 home from the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of her child (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has resided in the Section 8 household unbeknownst to the LVHA.	Matter has been adjudicated.
10/2/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Las Vegas Housing Authority (LVHA) advised HUD-OIG that Section 8 tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was defrauding the LVHA by failing to accurately report her household income and composition. (b)(6);(b)(7) further advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was collecting side payments of \$175.00 per month unbeknownst to the LVHA.	In September of 2012, USAO advised that it would not continue to pursue False Clamis Act action against (b)(6);(b)(7). As a result all criminal and judicial actions have been completed and reported. This case will be closed with no further investigation warranted at this time.
9/16/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Las Vegas Housing Authority advised HUD-OIG that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was defrauding the LVHA by failing to accurately report her household income and composition.	Matter has been criminally adjudicated.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/20/2012	<p>On 4/15/07, this office was contacted by the District Attorney Investigators for Ventura County requesting assistance in an investigation of an (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a section-8 head of Household tenant . The allegations are: 1) There is an unauthorized tenant in the Section-8 House, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 2) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the Section-8 Recipient, but (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has power of attorney. 3) Allegedly (b)(6);(b)(7) does not live at the residence but lives in Egypt. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The assigned DA investigator secured a search warrant on the subject residence, seeking evidence of unreported income and/or unreported family composition. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD-OIG, is to participate with the search warrant, report the findings, and continue the investigation.</p>	All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.
3/13/2013	<p>At the request of former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the Las Vegas HUD-OIG Field Office, has initiated an operation targeting fraud/unreported income and composition at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The operation is designed to result in multiple arrests and search warrants being served.</p>	(b)(5)
9/16/2013	<p>at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an LVHA Section 8 tenant, has been married to her Section 8 landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), since began receiving Section 8 assistance in March 2001. It is further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sold the Section 8 home that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) resided in on 6/6/06 and continues to receive Section 8 subsidies for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on the same property.</p>	Matter has been adjudicated.
9/16/2013	<p>Several sources to include (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the Las Vegas HUD (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the newly formed Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA), may have conflicts of interest relating to properties owned and operated by the SNRHA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) formerly worked for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a local businessman and property investor who had significant financial ties with the LVHA, NLVHA, CCHA (which are now merged into the SNRHA). Preliminary research shows that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a non-profit now associated with the SNRHA. How the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) interplays with the SNRHA is unknown at this time, however, it is being researched</p>	Matter has been investigated, with an adjudication of one allegation.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/18/2013	<p>On June 30, 2010, Phoenix Office of Public Housing personnel forwarded printed out e-mail fraud referral and copies of tenant file documents received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Flagstaff Housing Authority (FHA). In the referral, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that FHA tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had failed to report his receipt of \$3,082 a month in VA benefits from October 2008 through October 2009 to FHA resulting in a loss to FHA of \$10,751. Upon being notified that FHA had learned of his failure to report these benefits, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) subsequently vacated his Public Housing unit on January 22, 2010.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed and reported. Defendant Sentenced. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
4/4/2013	<p>On July 7, 2010 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) met with representatives from Housing Authority City of Ventura to discuss tenant fraud under the Housing Choice Voucher Program. Program administrators identified numerous allegations of fraud and asked HUD-OIG to investigate these matters as time permits.</p>	<p>All judicial/administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.</p>
1/8/2013	<p>Following a 2010 HECM database review by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), HUD OIG - Phoenix reviewed Arizona-based loans and opened a proactive investigation.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. Criminal prosecution declined by USAO. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/18/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) former partner of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Atlanta, GA, provided information about his prior employer. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) claimed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) conspired with the Guam Housing and Urban Renewal Authority (GHURA) to secure HUD projects. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) said that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), who works for GHURA. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) position allowed him to award tax credit projects to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) thought that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was receiving benefits/funds from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to award these contracts/projects. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and GHURA have created a scoring system for bidding on projects which doesn't allow any other contractor to secure contracts. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is currently in the process of setting up the same scoring system with the Saipan Housing Authority.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete. No evidence of fraudulent activity found. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time and case will be closed due to minimal impact on HUD programs.</p>
10/1/2012	<p>In June 2009, HUD OIG received information (b)(5) regarding a possible real estate fraud scam. It was alleged that an individual named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used straw buyers to purchase and rent homes to low-income families participating on the Section 8 program in Fresno, California. It was further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received the housing assistance payments intended to pay rent for the aforementioned homes, but failed to pay their corresponding mortgages. These homes subsequently went into foreclosure.</p>	<p>Matter has been substantiated.</p>
11/2/2012	<p>On May 14, 2008, the HUD OIG Sacramento Office was notified by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program, Placer County Housing Authority that HCV recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may not have been residing in his subsidized unit.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/27/2012	<p>Information was received from the Senior Customer Liaison for the FHA, Office of Business Development, in the Sacramento Field Office pertaining to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) an underwriter for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The information received indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had completed an audit on numerous bad loans that had been associated with (b)(6);(C). A query of the Neighborhood Watch system revealed that of the 20 loans identified by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) seven were in claim status and 13 were in active status, but were in default. The total claims amount for the seven loans was \$1,778,956 as of November 30, 2009.</p>	no substantive wrongdoing found. Case closed.
12/3/2012	<p>Information was received from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Real Estate Fraud Unit, Stanislaus County DA's Office, alleging that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) committed fraud in connection to an FHA (b)(6);(b)(6);(b)(7) loan. (b)(6);(b) is a Stanislaus County employee and she allegedly purchased a home as an investment property, but claimed owner occupancy. Furthermore, she is allegedly renting the property to the prior owner of the property.</p>	No further investigation warranted - no prosecutive merit. Case closed.
12/14/2012	<p>On April 30, 2008, the Marin Housing Authority contact Acting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding a permanent Housing Authority employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who has been living with a friend since 2003. In July 2003, (b)(6) removed herself from the Section 8 Voucher. The friend, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6), should be the only tenants residing under that Section 8 Voucher. Allegations are that (b)(6); has never moved out and is considered an unauthorized tenant and unreported income for both (b)(6) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	(b)(5)
12/14/2012	<p>In October of 2008, HUD OIG's San Francisco Field Office received a written referral from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD OIG, Region 11, regarding Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It was alleged that (b)(6);(b) received housing assistance payments from the Houston Housing Authority on behalf of HCV tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to rent out her property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Richmond, California from approximately September 2006 through November 2007 for a total of \$12,336. It was further alleged that (b)(6);(b) also received Federal Emergency Management Agency Disaster Housing Assistance Program funds on behalf of (b)(6);(b) to rent out that same property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Richmond, California during the same time period for a total of \$17,862.</p>	(b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/14/2013	The referral was forwarded to this office from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Region 9. According to the memo from the Santa Ana HOC, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported to the HOC Quality Assurance Division via the Neighborhood Watch system that FHA Case Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may contain possible fraud. The attachment to the HOC memo listed (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as the borrower and the property address as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Antelope, California 95843. Furthermore, in the audit results section, under finding 1 explanation, "Falsified pay stub" was listed.	complete.
9/30/2013	In August of 2010, (b)(5) contacted HUD OIG with allegations of possible Federal Housing Administration (FHA) Single Family Mortgage Insurance Fraud. It was alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) secured a FHA insured loan for the property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Berkeley, California, using fraudulent documents and information via a straw buyer. It was also alleged that the property is currently being used as a rental unit on the Section 8 program, and that the straw buyer is representing himself as the true owner to the Berkeley Housing Authority.	Case has been criminally adjudicated.
11/1/2012	On July 6, 2009, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Sacramento Office was notified by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), HUD Sacramento Field Office, that a Section 8 Project Based landlord maybe defrauded his tenants by not crediting them their authorized utility allowance. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) related she received information from the Butte County Housing Authority (BCHA) that tenants of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Apartments, located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Oroville, CA alleged that their landlord (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been demanding they pay their utility allowance to him; while the tenants are still required to pay their utilities to their provider. The information was discovered as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) properties went into foreclosure and HUD was working with the BCHA to try and keep the apartments affordable for low-income residents.	civil judicial action was declined. No further action warranted. case closed.
12/14/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former employee of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fraudulently used her social security for EIV registration even though she had stopped working for them since December 2003. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged that EIV had not been implemented in 2003.	(b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/27/2012	<p>(b)(5) During the review, 14 FHA loans were identified that were within the Eastern District of California, the area of responsibility for this office. (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5). One loan identified (b)(5) was FHA loan case number (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). At Sundara.</p>	All investigation is complete. Case closed.
12/27/2012	<p>On September 20, 2010, HUD OIG received a fax (b)(5) regarding the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). It was alleged that the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) allowed illegal tenants to occupy units at the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and that they paid substantial amounts of money to be accepted as Section 8 tenants. It was further alleged that from April 2007 to the present, approximately 20 units at the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) were rented for cash, and that some of the tenants continue to live at the apartments even though they have lost their respective Section 8 benefits.</p>	Matter was referred to CPD for administrative monitoring.
12/14/2012	This office has initiated this Rental Assistance Fraud Initiative (RAFI) to locate, identify and investigate recipients of U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rental subsidies within Oakland, California who are committing fraud.	Criminally adjudicated.
3/20/2013	<p>In August 2010, this office was contacted by members of (b)(5) (b)(5) in Indio, CA. (b)(5) requested the assistance of HUD-OIG to address (b)(5) occurring in federally subsidized housing within the City of Indio, CA.</p>	All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/8/2013	<p>On September 21, 2010, (b)(5) which was obtained from HUD OIG Headquarters (b)(5) and provided possible names of different mortgagors who used the same Social Security Numbers (SSN) to buy two different homes, often in different states. It was an indication that at least one of the home buyers was using the other person's SSN. In addition, a (b)(5) which included possible mortgagors who purchased homes with SSNs that may never have been issued by the Social Security Administration (SSA). Arizona properties were isolated and comparison of the SSNs within (b)(7)(E) the data base service for investigators, which showed that many of the duplicate and non-issued reported SSNs, were data entry errors done by the lender or HUD when they entered the SSNs into the FHA insurance system. Often the reported SSN was one number off their home buyers assigned SSN. A list of approximately 36 names was submitted to SSA OIG to confirm that the listed SSNs were, or were not assigned to the listed mortgagor. On the September 28, 2009 SSA OIG reported that 13 of 18 names did not match the SSNs listed within the mortgage file. A total of 17 HUD loan binders were received by HUD OIG and appear to contain false SSNs. This case will be presented to the Maricopa County Attorney's Office for prosecutive consideration.</p>	<p>All administrative and judicial actions have been completed and reported.</p> <p>Conviction/sentencing of three of the six subjects of this investigation pending due to believed flight to Mexico. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time and this case will be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/26/2013	<p>It is believed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have violated the Section 8 program rules/regulations by failing to report additional income. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained rental assistance via the Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing Program (VASH). In addition, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was a participant of the Veterans Administration (VA) travel reimbursement program (veterans are entitled to mileage reimbursement to/from a VA Medical Center from their residence. It is believed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted multiple reimbursement vouchers, to the VA, claiming he lived in Hemet California, when in fact he lived in Loma Linda California, approximately two miles from the medical center. Together, the loss to the VA and the San Bernardino County Housing Authority is over \$19,000.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. Even though indicators of fraud were present, criminal prosecution declined by USAO due to ambiguity in VASH program contract language. Two subjects of this investigation were terminated from program. It is recommended that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
5/16/2013	<p>The HUD OIG Los Angeles office received a HOC Referral letter dated November 8, 2010, Prime Lending A Plains Capital Company self reported to the HOC Quality Assurance Division that FHA Loan Nos. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contained fraudulent information. It is alleged that loan officer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have fraudulently originated or accepted fraudulent documents to secure an FHA insured loan. It is alleged that the source of funds and income documentation provided at the time of origination were allegedly fraudulent.</p>	<p>Initial allegation sent to Las Vegas OIG OI and is being addressed as part of separate investigation. No further investigation deemed warranted with regard to this case.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/4/2013	OIG received a complaint from the United States Secret Service requesting assistance with an identity fraud case. The complaint alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a Section 8 landlord, is using a false identity and organization in order to receive Section 8 subsidy from the Housing Authority of the City of Los Angeles for a property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) North Hollywood, CA.	Declined for prosecution. Case closed.
10/29/2012	US Bank reported to HUD, Quality Assurance Division via the Neighborhood Watch Self-Reporting system that the following FHA Loan # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which originated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) contained fraudulent information. US Bank stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who purchased the FHA property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Apple Valley, CA did not reside in the residence. US Bank further stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) mailing address was changed on August 14, 2008 to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Hesperia, CA. In May 2008, a credit report obtained by HUD Quality Assurance Division identified (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had closed another mortgage loan for the subject property in the amount of \$225,000 with Flagstar Bank.	Investigation of initial allegation completed. Whereas some indicators of fraudulent activity were present, it is deemed that default/claim of FHA-insured loan was the result of borrower job loss and not fraudulent activity. As a result, it is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/5/2013	A manual online review of Arizona sex offender registrants revealed matches to the City of Tucson Community Services Division Housing Choice Voucher Participant roster.	All judicial actions have been completed and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.
5/29/2013	A QAD referral based on a lender audit suggests that the borrower's purported employment records are inaccurate.	All judicial and administrative actions have been completed and reported. Charges against defendant dismissed. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/24/2013	<p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former employee of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) conveyed her concern of fraud occurring by staff at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was acceptable. (b)(6);(b)(7) further stated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) intentionally defrauded HUD by submitting fraudulent documents for funding, and allowed circumventing of the tenant waiting list by moving family members in residential rental units ahead of tenants approved for housing.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. While indicators of fraud were present, key witnesses were unable to be located and potential dollar loss to HUD could not be confirmed. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/8/2013	Audit referral indicates that City of Mesa officials may have falsely reported work hours for NSP funds.	Investigation of initial allegation completed. Criminal prosecution declined by USAO due to loss threshold issues. Civil penalties were pursued and assessed (PFCRA). Civil actions have been completed and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.
10/2/2012	On June 28, 2011, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), HID-OIG, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), (b)(5) received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former employee of the City of La Puente (CA), regarding possible fraud involving HUD Community Planning and Development (CPD) grant funds. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegations included questionable actions by the city related to how CDBG grant funds were continually awarded to a specific contractor, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)	No evidence found related to public corruption. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/1/2012	<p>On August 8, 2011, Multi-Family HUB (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) explained that her office had discovered on the desk of HUD employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a copy of his PIV employee pass which had been altered; the photo/name of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had been superimposed over his photo/name. Additionally, found on his desk were copies of his payroll statement which had also been altered to depict (b)(6);(b)(7) name. Other suspicious document items were found lying on (b)(6);(b)(7) desk. (b)(6);(b)(7) has a history of leave abuse, and is currently AWOL. HUD management is appropriately handling (b)(6);(b)(7) leave issue. This agency will investigate questionable issues pertaining to the alteration of (b)(6);(b)(7) security pass and other documents for any potential criminal usage. Investigation</p>	<p>employee was terminated from HUD employment in July 2012, and was convicted and sentenced in State court in August 2012. No further action warranted. Case closed.</p>
3/29/2013	<p>On December 1, 2010, HUD-OIG OI received allegations from HUD's Office of Labor Relations that contractors at the Harshfield Terrace Project located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Quartz Hill, CA 93536 were not following the prevailing wage guidelines and were instead writing paychecks to be divided among several laborers. Allegations were also made that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) falsified payrolls.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete. Prosecution of this case declined by USAO. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
3/15/2013	<p>(b)(5) requested the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), assist them with their investigation of possible political corruption within the City of Pomona (CA). The focus of HUD-OIG in the investigation is the possible misuse of Community Planning and Development (CPD) funds, including improper steering and awarding of such funds by city employees.</p>	<p>No HUD Nexus</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/10/2013	<p>OIG recieved a complaint from the HUD office of Labor advising OIG that there is an investigation being conducted by the Office of the Attorney General California Department of Justice on subcontractors for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), HUD funded projects. Various prime and sub-prime construction companies include Prime Contractors: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and Sub-Prime Contractors: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>Prosecution declined and SIR submitted under x-ref case: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Case closed.</p>
9/30/2013	<p>On January 27, 2011, HUD OIG received a referral from the Sonoma County Development Commission regarding (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Section 8 tenant. It was alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) violated program rules by failing to disclose his true income at two recertification appointments in 2008 and 2009. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged failure to report his true income resulted in an overpayment of rental assistance made on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) behalf of \$16,033.</p>	<p>This case has been criminally adjudicated.</p>
5/9/2013	<p>The allegation was initiated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Berkeley Housing Authority. It is allege that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 tenant, is renting out a bedroom in her Section 8 subsidized unit. It further alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) placed an advertisement posting on Craigslist.org in August 2010 stating that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a professional female looking to rent to another professional female. The Craigslist.org posting states to contact (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>Prosecutor's declination.</p>
10/1/2012	<p>This case is a spin off from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were the borrowers for FHA refinance loan number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on September 24, 2007. The lender for the loan was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employed as a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at the time of the loan. In June of 2008, the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) defaulted on FHA loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and at the same time purchased a HUD- REO property. The lender for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) purchase of the HUD-REO property was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) employer. FHA loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) went to claim and FHA eventually suffered \$269,252 loss. There are currently more than 30 FHA loans involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) listed on the 13 month default list totaling over six million dollars.</p>	<p>Investigation did not find any indication of fraud relating to FHA program.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/5/2013	AUSA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Eastern District of California requested assistance with investigation into FHA approved appraiser (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). JPMorgan Chase Bank has reported suspicious activity in at least one appraisal conducted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Initial database searches show (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the appraiser on two FHA loans which have gone to claim totaling \$570,223 in loss to FHA and ten FHA loans which are currently in default totaling over \$2 million in unpaid balances.	No indicators of fraud found. Case closed.
5/9/2013	The basis for our investigation information received from the Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance, Investigation Division, indicating they had an ongoing investigation into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). During their investigation they discovered (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was employed at Wal-Mart. A review of the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) records indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not report this income. On December 5, 2007, the ROI was completed and then referred to the United States Attorney's Office, Misdemeanor Unit. The case had been tracked and then administratively closed in January 2010 at the direction of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The case was tracked and reopened upon new judicial activity.	All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.
9/30/2013	Information derived from investigative matter (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a former (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a HUD-insured and subsidized multifamily housing complex in San Francisco, CA, may have accepted bribes from Korean or Asian families to move them up the waiting list for housing. (b)(6);(C) was subsequently fired by (b)(6);(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Upon her departure, (b)(6);(C) purported took several Section 8 tenant files with her. To date, these files have not been found.	Due to limited investigative resource and long period of inactivity relating to this case, this matter is recommended for administrative closure.
12/14/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), an ex-felon, may have stolen and used the identity of an 86-year-old woman named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in a scheme to re-route Section 8 payments from the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) to him. It was also alleged that (b)(6);(C) may have an insider at the SFHA Section 8 Department to assist in re-routing of Section 8 payments.	(b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/30/2013	In March 2011, HUD OIG met with the San Jose Police Department (SJPd), and the Section 8 program was discussed. The SJPd revealed that several residences they had been repeatedly dealing with were possibly on the Section 8 program and allegedly violating program rules.	(b)(5) case, it is recommended for administrative closure.
12/14/2012	QAD Referral (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to occupy his FHA-insured property.	(b)(5)
12/14/2012	QAD referral # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a borrower of FHA loan # (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), may have been a strawbuyer on a fraudulent short sale transaction to purchase (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Castro Valley, CA, from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was facing foreclosure at the time of short sale. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) worked as a mortgage loan officer for Bank of America (BoFA) at the time, may have obtained the assistance of his longtime friend and coworker, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), to help originate the loan for his mother. The loan is currently active, but is 4 months in arrear.	(b)(5)
9/23/2013	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a certified Home Energy Rating System (HERS) Rater who works at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Sacramento, California alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) asked him to change his official test-in numbers for a HERS rating he had completed to qualify the property for an EEM loan. The HERS report was for property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Rancho Cordova, California.	Prosecution declined. Case closed.
12/14/2012	(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is alleged to own at least two real properties he failed to report to the Richmond Housing Authority.	(b)(5)
12/14/2012	It was reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not reside in her government subsidized multi-family unit. It is further alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is defrauding the IHSS program.	

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/12/2013	On January 1, 2012, HUD OIG interviewed the former Grants Administrator of the Housing Trust, (b)(6) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) regarding allegations of Community Planning and Development (CPD) fraud. (b)(6);(C) alleged that the City of San Jose failed to follow federal regulations regarding its distribution and use of CPD funds.	(b)(5)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
11/20/2012	The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG) will investigate alleged program violations occurring at federally subsidized residences within Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. All investigations will be initiated to determine if the head of households are defrauding the Section 8 program by not reporting income, unauthorized tenant(s) who reside in their residences.	All judicial actions have been completed and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.
9/17/2013	Southern Nevada Regional Housing Authority (SNRHA), (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised HUD-OIG that SNRHA Section 8 tenant, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is potentially defrauding the SNRHA by failing to accurately report her income.	Matter has been adjudicated.
3/14/2013	The HUD OIG Los Angeles office received an OIG Hotline Referral letter dated May 30, 2011, alleging the following persons have committed FHA Fraud when purchasing two homes in Los Angeles County, California. The referral alleged the following: Regarding properties located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Pomona, CA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the real estate agent involved in the transaction. The Notary Public who signed the deed is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The one who did the loan was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) unlicensed person. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (the real estate agent in the transaction) purchased the above property under FHA loan, using the straw buyers: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) In this transaction, the buyers never moved in to the properties. The one who is allegedly living at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) while she is collecting rents from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Regarding property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Gardena, CA 90247 ((b)(6);(b)(7)(C)). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the real estate agent involved in the transaction. The Notary Public who signed the deed is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) The one who did the loan was (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) unlicensed person. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (the Notary Public in the transaction) purchased the above property under FHA loan, using the straw buyer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who lives in the city of Whittier. In the transaction, the buyer never moved into the above property. The one who is living at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) he Notary public in the transaction).	Investigation of initial allegation complete. While indicators of fraudulent activity were present, no conclusive evidence was found to support pursuit of prosecution. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted and this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/12/2013	<p>The Housing Authority of Maricopa County (HAMC) received an allegation and supporting documentation from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who reported that he had lived, unreported, in HAMC Section 8 tenant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) residence from December 2009 through January 2011. (b)(6);(b) reported to HAMC that he had benefits income and that he had assisted (b)(6);(b) with household expenses. (b)(6);(b) further reported that he was a convicted felon and stated that he had been unaware, at the time, that he was not supposed to live in (b)(6);(b) Section 8 residence. (b)(6);(b) further advised that (b)(6);(b) (b)(6); (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was still living in (b)(6);(b) Section 8 residence after she reported that he had moved out in November 2010. Based upon the above evidence, HAMC terminated (b)(6);(b) Section 8 voucher on May 18, 2011 and established an initial loss figure of \$13,226 Initial investigation by HUD-OIG has confirmed (b)(6);(b)(7) numerous felony convictions for armed robbery and felony weapons possession and produced evidence of his residency in (b)(6);(b) Section 8 residence during the reported time period. Investigation has also produced evidence showing that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may still having been living in (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Section 8 residence after November 2010.</p>	<p>All judicial actions have been completed and reported. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
3/13/2013	<p>An anonymous Hotline complaint alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) resources was receiving kickbacks from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a local listing agent. According to the allegation, (b)(6);(b)(7) was receiving a disproportioned amount of HUD foreclosure listings in Las Vegas as a result of the kickbacks. The anonymous complainant alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7) provided kickback monies to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) at discreet locations, such as the restrooms of local casinos and hotels. The complainant also alleged some members of the Santa Ana Home Ownership Center (HOC) staff may be aware of the criminal activity and could be involved in it.</p>	<p>Allegation unfounded.</p>
9/30/2013	<p>Complaint indicates an allegation of fraud, conspiracy, mismanagement and bid rigging against the City of Carson, CA.</p>	<p>referred to CPD for oversight. No further action by OI at this time. Case closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/28/2013	<p>The City of San Diego, Office of the City Auditor conducted a review into an allegation that (b)(6);(b)(7)(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) knowingly submitted a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) reimbursement request for elevator construction cost for work that did not qualify for reimbursement. The City Auditor allege that construction of the elevator started prior to (b)(6);(b)(7) receiving approval for the build, and that (b)(6);(b)(7) submitted the request for approval of the construction of the elevator knowing the work was completed.</p>	<p>Initial allegation has been investigated. While indicators of fraudulent activity were present, subject repaid questioned costs to city of San Diego before decision made on prosecution. As a result, this case was declined by the USAO due to no monetary loss to HUD. It is recommended that this case be closed with no further investigation warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/11/2013	<p>HUD-OIG Audit reported that a review of the City of Phoenix NSP loans disclosed that a \$6.5 million loan was granted to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a multifamily entity partially owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) through other multiple companies. The review further showed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had contracted with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) another entity owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and his family, in violation of the conflict of interest section in the NSP loan agreement. The review further disclosed that the city contracted with a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a consortium, to do \$1.4 million in single family rehabilitation and consulting work. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) members include (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of which (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a member, as well as, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). In addition, according to Arizona Corporation Commission records, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) share the same domestic address: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Phoenix, AZ 85016</p>	<p>No evidence of criminal activity found. No judicial or civil actions taken. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>
1/9/2013	<p>On April 27, 2012, pursuant to an e-mail referral from the HUD-OIG Los Angeles Field office, reporting agent met with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) City of Maricopa, AZ. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reported that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) hired to perform the initial grading and initial utility installation on the construction of a domestic violence shelter funded with CBDG funds provided by the City of Maricopa to Against Abuse, a nonprofit agency, had failed to pay three vendors who had provided supplies to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the project. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received approximately \$235,000 in payment for its work on the project. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) president reportedly told the vendors that CDBG shelter funds had been spent on another project and that the vendors would be paid once (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) obtained funds from another project. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised that the three vendors were subsequently paid by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) however, this was after (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) submitted lien waivers to the City of Maricopa certifying that it had paid all its vendors in full. On May 1, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) advised reporting agent that one of the vendors, HD Supply, had notified her that the \$18,000 check (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had provided to HD Supply had been returned due to insufficient funds.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. While indicators of fraud were present, no evidence was found to confirm fraudulent activity. In addition, there was no financial loss to HUD related to the possible fraudulent activity. As a result, it is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
12/27/2012	In April 2012, HUD OIG San Francisco received a request for assistance from HUD OIG Chicago regarding case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) It was requested that two alleged strawbuyers, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) be interviewed.	Based upon the completion of these two interviews, it appears that no further investigative activity is warranted. It is recommended that this matter be closed administratively.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
1/7/2013	<p>MCAO advised HUD OIG that an associate of a gang member recently convicted of a home-invasion robbery had defrauded the Scottsdale Housing Authority. (This case was closed in August 2010 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)) due to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) fugitive status. With newly developed evidence, caption case is being established in order to pursue further charges against (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>Subject (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been indicted. Since indictment, it is believed that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has fled the country and is now residing in Mexico. Her return does not appear to be imminent. It is recommended that this case be closed at this time. If (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) later reenters the U.S. (arrest warrant is in system) and is detected and arrested, the possibility of re-opening this investigation will be explored at that time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/16/2013	<p>Nevada State Division of Housing employee (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is accused of running an unlicensed mortgage servicing company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Nevada and she is suspected of collecting mortgage payments for FHA loans she did not own or have a right to collect on behalf of the mortgage lender. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is employed by the Nevada Division of Housing and is responsible for providing FHA first-time housebuyer assistance to borrowers including information on FHA loan programs and homebuyer assistance qualifications. She is also responsible in her State job for mortgage servicing FHA first time homebuyer mortgages held by the State. The Division is subgrantee for NSP grant funding and is responsible for licensing mortgage servicers and providing oversight for mortgage servicers operating within the State of Nevada. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has worked in her position at the State since January 2008. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) does not have permission from the State, her employer, to run her own mortgage servicing company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and is not licensed by the State as a mortgage servicer. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been accused of sending fake mortgage payment stubs to borrowers in order to collect FHA mortgage payments as an unlicensed mortgage servicer, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and not remitting the payments to the mortgage lenders that hold the note.</p>	Subject of investigation passed away. Case recommended for closure.
5/9/2013	Qui tam matter involving an alleged double-billing by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Redwood City, CA, for the same work to HUD CDBG and FHIP programs.	Qui Tam matter declined by U.S. Attorney's Office.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/5/2013	A CDBG sub-grantee in Honolulu called ORI allegedly agreed to accept a \$90,000 donation in exchange for selecting a subcontractor called (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for a campground development. The correspondence detailing the alleged kickback, however, is from 2004 - making it time barred from prosecution for both 18 USC 666 and 874. This was confirmed with the Hawaii USAO on March 29, 2012.	Investigation of initial allegation complete. It was determined that potential fraudulent acts were outside of the statute of limitations. Prosecution declined by USAO, as a result it is deemed that no further investigation warranted at this time.
4/16/2013	An email message was received at "Report Fraud in HUD" on September 9, 2012, and subsequently forwarded to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) on September 19, 2012. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) assigned the case to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The allegation received was regarding possible fraud by two non-profit organizations: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It was alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had purchased properties through the First Look Program and subsequently sold them to investors; which appears to be in violation of the program.	Las Vegas office working more substantive case on same subject. Caption case closed at this time.
2/27/2013	On October 15, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) HUD, Office of Inspector General (OIG), reviewed information received from the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) fraud Working Group e-mail list related to possible FHA fraud. The e-mail indicated that a company, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), is falsely advertising they can do FHA loans, including a pilot program which has no mortgage insurance premiums for the first year. The company is not an FHA endorsed lender	complete

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/18/2013	<p>On October 17, 2012, HUD-OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received allegations from HUD Nevada CPD official, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) reference (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Las Vegas, Nevada 89121. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has approached banking officials from Chase Bank, and provided them with what appear to be fictitious documents bearing Housing and Urban Development, Office of Public and Indian Housing letterhead. The purported false documents suggest that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been awarded a \$13 million dollars from HUD for a FY 2012 Neighborhood Initiative Grant. According to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) produced said documents to Chase Bank to obtain a line of credit. The documents further show that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) from HUD's Real Estate Assessment Center purportedly signed said paperwork for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). A preliminary inquiry shows that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for HUD's REAC division in 2002-2003. The currently (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for HUD REAC is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), phone number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Further inquiry through the Nevada Secretary of State shows that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was listed as a Domestic Non-Profit Corporation as of June 18, 2012. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is listed as the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	No overt action or loss to HUD.
9/27/2013	<p>On January 9, 2013, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sent an email forwarding an anonymous complaint received (b)(5). The complaint was regarding the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) in Oroville, California and it alleged that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the Housing Board (IHA) and the Tribal Council voted to create a special program to use HUD funds to pay the debts of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), a tribal council member, who was behind on her payments and facing foreclosure. Allegedly, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) owns two homes and would not have qualified for any tribal program and that the funds were supposed to be used to help build new houses for tribal members. The amount involved that was allegedly provided to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to pay her mortgage, penalties, and property taxes is \$150,000.</p>	Referred to SWNOP for administrative action as deemed appropriate by HUD. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
2/7/2013	<p>This investigation is opened pursuant to an allegation alleging that Housing Authority City of Los Angeles Section 8 recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) failed to disclose he is a registered sex offender. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was granted rental assistance benefits in 2007 and has failed to report his 290 status on every annual certification since. Thus, a violation of the rental assistance program.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation complete. While indicators of fraud are present, this case will be closed due to: minimal impact on HUD programs, low potential dollar loss to HUD, age and health condition of subject and administrative action has been proposed by housing authority as appropriate remedy.</p>
9/30/2013	<p>On January 23, 2013, the (b)(5) contacted HUD OIG and requested assistance. The U.S.M.S. requested assistance in locating a suspect in the shooting of an undercover law enforcement officer in Oakland, California. Further information about the following name and address was given to HUD OIG: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Vallejo, CA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>HUD-OIG satisfied USMS assistance request.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/4/2013	<p>Wells Fargo Bank alleges that bank customer (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) forged and withdrew \$90,000 from HECM recipient (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Bank records indicate (b)(6);(C) withdrew the money immediately after (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) death. It is recommended this allegation be opened for further investigative inquiry.</p>	<p>Investigation of initial allegation completed. Based on evidence gathered, there did not appear to be any criminal wrongdoing and the subject's activities had minimal impact on HUD programs. It is deemed that no further investigation is warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/20/2013	<p>On March 19, 2013, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a telephone call from VA OIG (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) stating that a veteran, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had told his social worker that his landlord, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been giving payoffs to Section 8 Inspectors to pass substandard units at inspections.</p>	<p>This investigation was converted and approved due to initial Complaint that was converted in system on 5/19/13. As of 5/20/13, it was clear that there would be no further investigation of allegation detailed in Complaint Intake. As a result, this investigation is closed.</p>
9/5/2013	<p>Shasta County Deputy District Attorney contacted HUD-OIG to request assistance with this investigation. HCV Participant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been allowing convicted sex offender (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to live in her HCV unit for the past nine months. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were fraudulently reporting his sex offender registration as transient to avoid detection by the Redding Housing Authority. (b)(6);(C) also had (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) living with her.</p>	<p>All judicial and administrative actions have been completed. Case closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/24/2013	<p>QAD alleges borrower submitted fabricated bank statements to qualify for a loan. The borrower purchased the property 1/2012 for \$460K with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as the loan originator. It appears she took out equity of \$47K in 2/2012. The property then goes into default 10/2012 and is sold 12/2012 for \$630k for an approximate gross gain of \$218k. The borrower listed her address as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) La Habra Heights, CA. The address was queried and we found a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) associated with the property, and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). The property was purchased by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 6/2007 for \$950k with a \$760k loan from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It appears that he took out equity of \$111k in 9/2007. The property then goes into default 1/2009. It appears that the property was refinanced 3/2010 for \$866k. The property goes into default again 12/2010 and is sold to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 3/2011 for \$560k (appears to be short sale to relative) with the lender being (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). It appears that she took out equity of \$113k 9/2011 and then sells the property for \$750k 9/2011 using (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) again. The overall approximate gross gain on the property for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is \$520k. We then queried LE databases to see properties bought and sold by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and found some FHA and some Conventional loans that had been acquired and sold in the same manner as described above. It also looks like the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) used strawbuyers and/or ghosts to equity skim both conventional and FHA properties. Both (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) were queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	No further action deemed warranted. Case closed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/27/2013	<p>QAD HUD HQ sent (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) a self report referral. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) sent the referral to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to check on the loans to see if any involve AZ. The purported subject apparently resides in AZ and so does the company.</p>	<p>Investigation inadvertently opened due to tickler conversion. Initial referral was reviewed by OI in April 2013 and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was advised that no action would be taken in Los Angeles. As a result, it is deemed that the preparation of a closing ROI and case opening docs is not warranted. There was no apparent indicators of fraud regarding loans in Arizona, this case will be closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/27/2013	QAD states that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) allegedly knew that there was a higher offer on an FHA property short sale. The short sale was for \$27,500 10/31/12 and the next sale was for \$68,200 on 11/19/2013. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) researched several (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) property transactions and did not find this to be a pattern. It appears that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) grossed approximately \$40K. The company and it's owner were queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	Case inadvertently opened due to tickler conversion. OI sent response to Santa Ana HOC on 5/1/13 informing them that no action would be taken. There was no intention to open for investigation. As a result, this case will be closed and it is deemed that preparation of closing ROI and case opening docs is not necessary.
6/27/2013	QAD referral states occupancy misrepresentation. HUD's SFNW database shows the loan was a streamline refinance and is occupied by a renter. A partial claim of \$12,539 has been paid and a loan modification was started with a claim amount of \$1k. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	After review of QAD referral by IA, it was deemed that it should be sent to HUD-OIG CFD for further review. No criminal activity apparent at this time.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/27/2013	QAD states property value is suspect. HUD's SFNW showed that loan is current, active, with no missed payments. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	Investigation inadvertently opened due to tickler conversion. OI sent response to Santa Ana HOC on 5/6/13 informing them that no action would be taken regarding QAD referral. As a result, it is deemed that the preparation of a closing ROI and case opening docs is not warranted and this case will be closed with no further action.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/23/2013	QAD states that borrower's signatures are not authentic. HUD's SFNW showed the loan as current, active, with no missed payments. Additionally, LE databases show the borrowers as occupants of the subject property. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) no hits.	<p>Caption case was inadvertently opened as an investigation. Mgt review and IA analysis determined that the QAD referral contains little to no viable investigative information. Said referral should have been "zero" filed. This "investigation" is being closed, (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/23/2013	<p>QAD referral states employment docs misrepresentation and possible foreclosure rescue scheme. HUD's SFNW showed loan as active, current, with no missed payments. LE databases show that current residents include borrower. LE database also shows previous owner at different addresss as of 3/29/13. Borrower and previous owner queried in (b)(7)(E) no hits.</p>	<p>Caption case was inadvertently opened as an investigation. Mgt review and IA analysis determined that the QAD referral contains little to no viable investigtative information. Said referral should have been "zero" filed. This "investigation" is being closed, (b)(5)</p> <div data-bbox="1587 732 1856 924" style="border: 1px solid black; height: 118px; width: 128px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/23/2013	<p>QAD states borrower provided letter that no other debts existed. However, a loan with Toyota has been discovered that was opened prior to loan closing. HUD's SFNW showed that loan is current, active, with no missed payments. A query of LE databases showed that the borrower bought several properties, refinanced, and then let them go into default within 3 months - 3 years (see Excel spreadsheet). The borrower also has a CA Real Estate License and is associated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C) It appears that the borrower is purchasing properties as investments (possibly rental). The pattern is consistent which constitutes probable default on the FHA loan. LE databases showed 5 Toyota vehicles registered to the borrower. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) no hits.</p>	<p>Caption case was inadvertently opened as an investigation. Mgt review and IA analysis determined that the QAD referral contains little to no viable investigative information. Said referral should have been "zero" filed. This "investigation" is being closed, (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/9/2013	<p>This case was developed out of the Financial Fraud Task Force - Fresno, formerly known as the Mortgage Fraud Task Force - Fresno. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of the United States Trustee, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Fresno, CA 93721 explained that since March 5, 2013, the US Trustee had received 35 bankruptcy filings of a suspicious nature. Most of the filings had the following similarities: all cases had been faxed, with vary similar signatures, a majority of the phone numbers were not valid, incomplete filings with notice of incomplete filing and notice of intent to dismiss, motion/application for waiver of Chapter 7 filing fees, mail sent by the clerk to debtors has been returned to court and marked undeliverable, unable to complete credit counseling statement, several of the property addresses have been listed on Fresno Craig's List as rentals, several cases social security were not valid or were deceased, several debtors have filed bankruptcies in other courts, a common creditor listed is Wells Fargo Bank, one of the runners for the courier service said he thought they received the documents from someone named (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>	<p>No nexus found. "Complaint/Investigation" is now closed.</p>
9/24/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected misuse of SSN. HUD's SFNW shows loan originated in 2001 and no missed payments until 2008. The loan is current and active. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	<p>Matter did not meet investigative guideline.</p>
9/24/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected occupancy misrepresentation. HUD's SFNW showed that the loan is current and active with no missed payments. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	<p>Matter did not meet investigative guideline.</p>
9/24/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected misuse of SSN. HUD's SFNW shows loan originated in 2003 and no missed payments until 2010. The loan is current and delinquent. Reason for delinquency shows unemployment. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	<p>Matter did not meet investigative guideline.</p>
9/24/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected misuse of SSN. HUD's SFNW shows loan originated in 1997 and no missed payments. The loan is current and active. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	<p>Matter did not meet investigative guideline.</p>
9/24/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected occupancy misrepresentation. HUD's SFNW showed that the loan is current and active with no missed payments. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.</p>	<p>Matter did not meet investigative guideline.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/24/2013	QAD referral states suspected occupancy misrepresentation. HUD's SFNW showed that the loan is current and active with no missed payments. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	Matter did not meet investigative guideline.
9/24/2013	QAD referral consists of 17 loans. Two loans are in NV (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) 7 loans are in CA (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and 8 loans are in AZ (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) This summary sheet is for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Referral for loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) states suspected SSN misuse. HUD's SFNW database shows the loan was a refi that originated in 2001 and is current, active, with no missed payments. Referral for loan (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) states suspected SSN misuse. HUD's SFNW database shows the loan originated in 2001 and the 1st missed payment was not until 2012. The loan is current and active. Both borrowers were queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity no hits.	Matter did not meet investigative guidelines.
9/24/2013	QAD referral states occupancy misrepresentation. HUD's SFNW shows loan is current and active with no missed payments. Borrower queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	Matter did not meet investigative guidelines.
9/24/2013	QAD referral states suspected occupancy misrepresentation. In addition the borrower did not disclose an additional real estate debt of \$80k. Borrower stated that she was going to sell the property in a short sale due to both borrowers anticipated unemployment in October 2012. HUD's SFNW database showed that this loan was a refi from a previous FHA loan. The original loan was a refi from a conventional loan. It's possible that the borrowers bought the property as investment property. The property has been sold in a preforeclosure sale with a claim of \$83K paid 3/2/13. Borrowers queried in (b)(7)(E) for activity, no hits.	Refer to Civil Audit Group.
9/24/2013	QAD states the lender paid commission prior to the real estate officer was licensed. In addition the lender paid commission to a dead person. HUD's SFNW database showed no loss on any of the loans.	Matter did not meet investigative guidelines.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/30/2013	<p>HUD-OIG, Los Angeles Field Division, was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Ventura County District Attorney's Office, Economic Crimes Unit, regarding possible fraud involving a HECM loan associated with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a HECM loan for a property located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Ojai, CA. It is suspected that one of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is now deceased (post loan closing) and the other one does not live at the property.</p>	<p>Due to low dollar involvement, and other agency priorities, this case is being closed with no further action at this time. The closing ROI was forwarded to the HOC for action they deem appropriate. Case closed.</p>
9/5/2013	<p>On June 13, 2013, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Office of Inspector General (OIG), received information from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(5), regarding the possible misuse of HUD Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funds by the City of Inglewood (CA). It is alleged that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was able to purchase a NSP home from the city. This complaint is being opened to determine if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) improperly used his position as (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) to influence the outcome of the selection of winners of homes which were purchased by thr city with NSP funds as well as determine if there was a confclit of interest due to his alleged personal relationship with a participant in the program (including her employment with the City of Inglewood).</p>	<p>CPD notified of conflict of interest issue. No violation found. Case closed at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/28/2013	<p>This investigation is opened pursuant to a Notice of Final Debarment for the following: (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) RE: (b)(7)(E) It is recommended this case be closed following document approval.</p>	<p>Investigation opened to record outstanding debarments initiated under previous investigation (b)(7)(E) All debarments reported and no additional investigation warranted.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/29/2013	<p>In July 2008, the US Department of Labor/ OIG in Meriden, Connecticut requested assistance with an investigation involving (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is owned by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) performs on site development, demolition, trucking, and roll-off dumpster work in the state of Connecticut. (b)(6);(b)(7) bid on and was awarded a HUD contract with The Housing Authority of the City of New Haven. The project, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) consisted of two separate contracts. The first was for demolition in the amount of \$189,000 and the second was for asbestos abatement in the amount of \$989,000. After being awarded the bid, (b)(6);(b)(7) subcontracted the job to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), owned and operated by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Both HUD and the City of New Haven require that 25% of the workforce for the contract be minorities and New Haven residents, a/k/a Section 3. It appears that (b)(6);(b)(7) is using (b)(6) in order to fulfill this Section 3 requirement. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) set up a payroll system through which it pays (b)(6) employees. Originally (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) paid (b)(6);(b)(7), but (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was "skimming" money off the top and checks (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) issued to employees were bouncing. A review of certified payrolls shows that (b)(6) is using two companies to provide labor for this project. The first company is (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7) is run by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Both (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) pleaded guilty to Conspiracy to falsify records of an ERISA fund (18 USC 1027) in an OLRFI Connecticut office case. A second company is run by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Both companies provide primarily undocumented Polish workers to perform asbestos abatement. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is also using (b)(6) on many prevailing wage projects around the state. Most of these projects entail school asbestos abatement at schools. It appears that both companies are underbidding other contractors by a significant amount. A surprise inspection of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) project earlier this year by the City of New Haven discovered 15 illegal Polish workers on the site. There have been numerous complaints to the City of New Haven regarding workers not being paid or not receiving the prevailing wage. A review of HUD documents also appears to show false statements made by (b)(6);(b)(7) and the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Between approximately July 2005 and May 2007 (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6) paid (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) \$400,000 and \$660,000 respectively. It is unknown how much (b)(6);(b)(7) and (b)(6) have paid (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for the use of his workers. This is a joint case with DOL/OIG and the USAO has accepted the case. The case is being opened as a grand jury case because some of the records were obtained through grand jury subpoenas served in conjunction with OLRFI's Interenvironmental case number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C).</p>	<p>Investigation complete. Subjects charged on non HUD charges. Referrals made to DEC. Case is administratively closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/29/2013	<p>MEMORANDUM TO: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Office of Inspector General, 1AGI FROM: (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Quality Assurance Division, Philadelphia Homeownership Center, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) SUBJECT: Referral for Investigation QAD File No. (b)(6) Sponsor/ID No. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6) Loan Correspondent/ID No. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) FHA Case No. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) FHA Case No. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(Streamline Refinance) Borrower (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Property Address (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Lynn, MA 01905 FHA Case No. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) the streamline refinance transaction, was self-reported through Neighborhood Watch by Metlife Bank National Association (MB), the loan sponsor, due to its discovery during a quality control review that the borrower failed to disclose on the loan application a mortgage debt with Bank of America (BAC) that closed November 2006. The loan was a streamline refinance transaction and MB was not required to credit qualify the borrower. We determined there was no tie to MB since it did not review the borrower's credit report prior to closing. We also reviewed FHA Case no. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) the purchase transaction, which closed on December 10, 2008, prior to the closing date of the BAC mortgage. Our verification of the borrower's assets with BAC disclosed that the balances shown on the bank statements were altered. Specifically, the statements in the file indicated checking account balances of \$16,319 and \$17,078 as of November 12, 2008, and October 16, 2008, respectively. By contrast, BAC verified that the checking account balances were \$6,319 and \$7,078 as of November 12, 2008, and October 16, 2008, respectively. We were unable to tie the lender to the false bank statements. We received verification that the bank statements were false after we sent a findings letter to the lender. A copy of our findings letter to the lender is attached. With respect to the un-disclosed mortgage debt, we believe there is a tie to the lender. The credit report in the file, September 29, 2008, did not disclose a BAC mortgage debt, but did include a mortgage debt with HSBC that closed October 2006. The Uniform Residential Loan Application (URLA) indicated the borrower had owned his current residence at (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Lynn, MA for five years, but did not include this property in the REO section of the URLA. The file did not contain evidence that the borrower sold this property prior to closing, and was no longer responsible for payment of the mortgage debt, or whether the loan had been refinanced. Schedule E of the 2007 and 2006 IRS Transcripts and Tax Returns reflected rental losses of \$13,913 and \$7,166, respectively. If the borrower still owned this property and was responsible for a mortgage debt, any negative rental income was required to be treated as a recurring liability. Copies of the relevant documents are attached for your review. Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and refer to our file number (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)</p>	Case declined by USAO based on low or no loss to HUD.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
5/7/2013	<p>MEMORANDUM FOR: (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) HUD-OIG Investigations, 1AGI FROM: (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) Atlanta Homeownership Center, (b)(6) SUBJECT: Referral for Investigation of Fraud in Loan Origination Lender: (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) Lender ID Number: (b)(6)-(b)(7) FHA Case Number: (b)(6)-(b)(7) Borrower: (b)(6)-(b)(7) QAD File Number: (b)(6) During our recent review of (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) fraudulent activities were discovered involving the above referenced FHA-insured mortgage loan. F AMC was the sponsoring lender; Action Mortgage (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) was the originating lender. This information is referred to your office for whatever action you deem appropriate. Should you have any questions, please contact (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C). Quality Assurance Division at (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C). We request that you advise this office of any actions taken or updates in this matter. Please refer to QAD File Number (b)(6) in any correspondence or inquiry. SUMMARY Closing date: 12/18/09 Endorsement date: 01127110 Oldest unpaid installment reported: 06/01110 Date Claim for Insurance Benefits was filed: NA This loan was a fraudulent transaction involving the borrower as a strawbuyer. The borrower has freely admitted during an interview with our monitor that she never intended to occupy the property as her home and that she bought the property to flip it. She stated she wanted to get into the flipping business and was introduced to (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) who dealt with flipping properties and offered to collaborate with her to do a few properties. Based on our on-line research, (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) had his Rhode Island (RI) real estate license revoked back in 2000 and has been investigated by the RI Department of Business Regulation in 2006 for conducting business without a license and misrepresenting his involvement in real estate transactions. He also forged documents and signatures, produced a bad appraisal and gave money to the borrower to put into his bank account to show funds to close. He represented himself as a realtor operating under the name of (b)(6). He is also associated with (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6)-(b)(7) are also involved in the straw buyer transactions. (b)(6)-(b)(7) stated, 1 was not aware that this was illegal, 1 only gave (b)(6)-(b)(7) my Social Security Number; he did all the paperwork and arranged the transaction. (b)(6)-(b)(7) revealed she never met a mortgage representative from (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) and when asked if she knew (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) she never heard of him. She only dealt with (b)(6)-(b)(7) and his attorney, (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C). Further research revealed (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C), an agent with Nationwide Insurance and loan officer with (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C). The fax banner across the top of the sales contract's reflects (b)(6) fax number, (b)(6) was not the originating lender. (b)(6)-(b)(7) pulled her credit report, prepared legal documents and she went to his office and signed the closing documents on 12/21/09 but the documents were backdated to 12/18/09. She stated, I was aware at the time of closing I executed documents certifying I would owner occupy the property. She asked (b)(6)-(b)(7) about certifying owner occupancy, but he told her it was okay to sign the papers. She stated that there was no seller present and she did not know who the seller was. She said she brought no cash to closing. She purchased the property with \$0 investment. She said she received \$16,000 at closing from (b)(6)-(b)(7) as the initial return on her investment. The HUD-1 indicates she brought \$5,897.50 to closing but she explained that the amount was a wash against the real estate commission paid, which was to (b)(6)-(b)(7). He does not appear as a realtor on the sales contract nor does his name appear anywhere in the loan file. She said she later found out that (b)(6)-(b)(7) did not have a valid real estate license. She also said the two gift letters were fraudulent. They were fabricated by (b)(6)-(b)(7). She is aware that (b)(6)-(b)(7) sent the gift reverification back saying everything was ok; but, she is going to try and convince him to resend the form with the correct information that he did not complete the gift letter. After closing, (b)(6)-(b)(7) leased the property and apparently was pocketing more than the agreed amount of money. He kept the \$1,300 first and last month rent deposit monies. He did give her a few months of mortgage payments so she could pay the mortgage but was not giving her the share she was expecting. He also, and without her knowledge, prepared a quit claim deed giving him title to the property. She says he was assisted by (b)(6)-(b)(7)(C) also notarized all needed documents. She also mentioned an attorney by the name of (b)(6)-(b)(7) who helped them get the documentation prepared. (b)(6)-(b)(7) stopped giving her money and the property was foreclosed on 12/3/10. (b)(6)-(b)(7) retained an attorney when she realized she had done something illegal and that she had been taken advantage of by (b)(6)-(b)(7). Her attorney's final advice after negotiating with (b)(6)-(b)(7) was that it was her word against his and she may not win the battle. (b)(6)-(b)(7) has forwarded to our office a written summary of the events on 2/15/11, as well as, contact information for all the participants in this fraudulent transaction. She can be reached at (b)(6)-(b)(7) and her current address is (b)(6)-(b)(7) Narragansett, RI 02882. Attachments</p>	Declined by USAO.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/19/2013	<p>On October 5, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Office of Investigation, Office of Inspector General, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), One Newark Center, 12th Floor, Newark, New Jersey 07102 received a complaint via telephone from (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Monmouth County Prosecutors Office. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had information alleging salary padding at the Asbury Park Housing Authority (APHA) and allegations that a non-profit, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was receiving HUD grant money but the company is not providing services as the grant would require. In addition, on October 29, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the Newark Office of Investigations, Office of the Inspector General, received an anonymous written complaint from the Newark (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of Public Housing, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) who provided this document in person. The complaint makes several allegations of misuse of funds in the Asbury Park Housing Authority (APHA). The specific allegations relate to improper use of federal funds with respect to hiring family of board members. Additionally, the complaint alleges that the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) APHA board, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was awarded a contract to repair vacant APHA units. The complaint also alleges (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) of the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was hired even though she lacked the proper qualifications for the job. HUD OIG Newark currently had an open complaint regarding APHA. HUD OIG is working with the Monmouth County Prosecutors Office. This was documented under complaint (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) which was closed and further investigation of this complaint will be conducted under complaint (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). On October 6, 2010, HUD OIG Audit was contacted regarding any Audits which may have been conducted in the last few years. A HUD OIG Audit report was provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). Also LOCCS data runs were completed to determine funding for the last three years at the APHA funding for the last three years. In addition, on October 7, 2010, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also provided work papers relating to salary payments of PHA maintenance employees and timekeepers with irregularities. HUD OIG Newark Office of Investigation (Newark OI) conducted database checks and spoke with HUD program personnel regarding the non-profit entity. Newark OI was unable to identify a non-profit entity in Asbury Park with a name matching, or similar to, the one given by the complainant. MCPO indicated checks were conducted relating to the non-profit and they were unable to identify the entity as well. Therefore, Newark OI and MCPO were unable to substantiate the allegations due to the vague nature of the complaint. Newark OI and MCPO have received additional anonymous complaints relating to the APHA. The additional information alleges a potential conflict of interest exists between APHA board member(s) and APHA contractors as well as allegations indicating the APHA hired unqualified staff because of influential relationships. The information also indicates APHA may not have followed proper procurement procedures during two recent vehicle purchases. The reporting agent (RA) requested copies of the APHA procurement policy and travel policy. The RA provided copies of the aforementioned policies to (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). On January 19, 2011, the RA met with detectives from the MCPO to discuss the ongoing investigation. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated he was currently investigating the vehicle purchases, each under \$3000, to determine if the sales price of the vehicles was inflated. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) indicated additional information had been received by MCPO relating to an APHA proposal for property demolition. The information indicated (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) may have attempted to submit information that was not accurate as part of the proposal. MCPO indicated they believe the misinformation was never submitted but would like to monitor the demolition project closely. Based on this information the RA made a referral to HUD PIH program staff indicating information was received by Newark OI relating to potential administrative issues with the APHA proposal for demolition. The RA determined the status of the demolition application is "under review" by HUD's Special Application Center. Newark OI will continue to work with MCPO to address all allegations received.</p>	<p>The future actions from this case will be incorporated into (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p> <p>(b)(6);(b)(7)(C)</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/1/2013	<p>On March 19, 2012, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) received a request for assistance from (b)(5) involving a landlord receiving Section 8 funds from the Newton Housing Authority in Sussex County, New Jersey. According to SCPO, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Newark, New Jersey, 07104, falsely presented himself as the owner of at least one property which he subsequently rented to a Housing Choice program participant, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). A copy of the Housing Choice Voucher Program Tenant approval form indicates (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) submitted a request for approval to rent (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Highland Lakes, NJ on August 17, 2011. SCPO received a written statement from (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) the owner of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) on October 4, 2011. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) was not the owner of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) nor had she given (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) permission to rent the property to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) stated (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) told her of at least two other properties where he was renting in the area. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) stated he owned at total of 86 properties, 27 of them in Pennsylvania. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) also told (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) he knew how to beat the mortgage companies by getting people to leave properties in their name while he collects rent on them. Actions Taken On March 26, 2012, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) contacted the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Sussex County. In Sussex County, DCA manages the Housing Choice Voucher program. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) provided the following information. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) received no funds from the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property because DCA refused to approved the HAP contract. However, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) had another HAP contract with DCA for (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Highland Lakes, NJ. This contract has been in place since August 2011. According to DCA records (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) received approximately \$1,113 a month in rental subsidy for this property. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) agreed to provide copies of the files for (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) will coordinate pick up of documents with a meeting between HUD OIG, (b)(5) Actions Taken The RA and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) (b)(5)</p> <p>(b)(5)</p>	Investigation disclosed minimal HUD involvement below any prosecutive threshold.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
9/9/2013	<p>On November 6, 2012, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) telephonically contacted the Boston HUD-OIG office to report allegations of fraud by his former employer. (b)(6) worked as a (b)(6) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), for about one and one-half (1 1/2) years before he was terminated on July 20, 2012. (b)(6) is not a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) and basically did what he was told to do during his tenure as a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is a management company located at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Portland, Maine. The company serves as a the management agent for at least eighty (80) HUD complexes spread throughout the United States. (b)(6) believes that during his tenure (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was charging company expenses down to the HUD properties that it manages, which were in excess of the allowable expenses. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) also charged such things as company printing, postage, and training, down to HUD properties that it manages, but (b)(6) is not sure if those company costs were allowed to be charged to the multi-family HUD properties. In 2012 (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had a company award ceremony in Portland, Maine. (b)(6) believes that at least seventy (70) people were flown in from around the country and stayed at Maine hotels to attend the ceremony, which included awards and expensive prizes. (b)(6) believes that the award ceremony cost the company in excess of \$30,000. In July of 2012 (b)(6) noticed that the company was dividing the cost of the award ceremony among several HUD multi-family properties, and charging the ceremony cost as an administrative fee to the properties. (b)(6) identified at least \$8,000 in expenses among the properties that he was responsible for performing the accounting for. (b)(6) brought this fee expensing to the properties to the attention of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6) said something to the effect ...if HUD ever found out about it they would be livid... . The next day on July 20, 2012 (b)(6) was terminated from his employment with (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) received a letter which indicated that he was being terminated due to work performance concerns. (b)(6) was given two (2) weeks pay in lieu of notice and immediately removed from his position. (b)(6) had been disciplined one time while working for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for sending an email to a fellow employee about one of the female staff members in the office at (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6) was reprimanded for the email and believed that was the end of the incident.</p>	Allegation unfounded.
6/19/2013	<p>The Philadelphia HOC QAD referral indicates an unknown subject may have obtained FHA insured mortgage (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) using the stolen identity of (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), Dorchester, MA 02124. The mortgage is presently in foreclosure.</p>	To be investigated under case (b)(6);(b)(7)(C)

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
6/28/2013	<p>This case is predicated upon a November 12, 2010, criminal complaint filed in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland against Prince George's (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was charged and arrested for offenses related to Title 18, United States Code, Sections 1512(b)(2)(B) & 1512(c) (1 and 2) (Tampering with Witness and Evidence Relating to the Commission of a Federal Offense), 1519 (Destruction, Alteration, and Falsification of Records in a Federal Investigation), and 2 (Aiding and Abetting). Also stated in the criminal complaint was that on January 2006, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) that developers based in Prince George's County, Maryland were providing things of value to public officials in exchange for official acts that were favorable to these individuals and their companies. As early as 2007, a developer allegedly provided (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) with a check for \$100,000 to help secure HOME Investment Ownership funds for projects in Prince George's County, Maryland. The HOME Investment Ownership (HOME) funds are disbursed to developers via the Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development (PG-DHCD), which is funded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In November 2010, the same developer allegedly provided Johnson with additional payments of \$5,000 and \$15,000, in return for (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) official influence and authority to be used to benefit the developer. Over the past two years, HUD-OIG received information that alleged fraud by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as follows: On August 19, 2008, HUD-OIG opened Complaint Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) based on a July 6, 2008 The Washington Post news article. The article alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was involved in stirring HUD-subsidized development deals to persons or corporate entities that he had political, business or personal ties. On April 8, 2009, HUD-OIG opened Complaint Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) and subsequently Case Number (b)(6);(b)(7)(C). This anonymous complaint alleged (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for Prince George's County and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) for Prince George's County were using their elected positions to conspire to obtain kickbacks for new home construction through the Maryland National Capital Building Industry Association. The complainant alleged that land deeds showed one home price and the deed of trust showed an amount 2 to 3 times the price of the land deed. The complainant further alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) disguised his fraud under several self created initiatives like the Livable Community Initiative and The Historic Preservation Commission Development Initiative.</p>	All judicial action taken. HUD-OIG did not investigate this matter.
6/7/2013	Investigation opened to document the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) trial in May 2011.	All judicial action taken.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
4/25/2013	<p>Complainant phoned and indicated that he felt that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) the winning bidder on (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Evert, PA 15537, a HUD REO property, bidded \$11 more than him. Based on the \$11 amount he alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) had knowledge of his bid. The complainant further stated that the first time he bid on this property, the winning bid of \$17,100 fell through and he had the second winning bid of \$16,100 and should have been awarded the home. The complainant also alleges that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not truthful about the occupancy status on her REO bid. (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) through her company (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is now selling the property for \$92,500.</p>	<p>HUD OIG investigation complete. Allegations substantiated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) did not move into the property, that the bidding process appeared to have not followed the guidelines, and that the property was sold for profit within 6 months of its purchase by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) as owner-occupant. HUD program personnel notified of results and (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) business conducting (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) handled listing/sale of property. Two of their personnel now employed by HUD, and HVH branch in King of Prussia is closed.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
3/21/2013	<p>This case was initiated based on proactive efforts. Information was developed from the Fairfax County Department of Housing and Community Development (FCDHCD) relative to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C), a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant. Allegedly, through a complicated tangle of actions, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) failed to report income from a business (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and other financial interests. It is alleged that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In November 2002, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) entered into an equity share agreement with (b)(6):(b)(7)(C), who was the owner/landlord of the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property; 2. In March 2007, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) signed over the deed of the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) for the sum of \$10. Allegedly, in May 2007, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) entered into an agreement whereby a bank account was opened in (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) name, with a deposit of \$24,701.42, with the understanding that the money was (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). Allegedly, the \$24,701.42 was money paid by (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) as compensation to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) for her equity share of the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property per the previous agreement between (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C); 3. On a date unknown, allegedly (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) loaned (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) \$100,000. The \$100,000 was to be used by (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) to purchase the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property with the understanding that (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) would make a \$615.72 monthly deposit into a 401k plan which named (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) as the beneficiary; 4. On a date unknown, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) died. Allegedly, the \$100,000 loan from (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) is being challenged by (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) estate based on a belief the loan instrument executed was forged by (b)(6):(b)(7)(C); 5. Allegedly, just prior to his death, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) was in the process of purchasing the property located at (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Herndon, Virginia, however (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) passed away before the transaction was completed. It is alleged that in July 2008, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) borrowed \$20,000 from (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) in order to purchase the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property, however, never purchased the property. It is alleged (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) ultimately purchased the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property on a date unknown, and in October or November 2008, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) moved into the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property; 6. According to the FCDHCD, in May 2009, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) submitted a Request for Tenancy Lease Approval for the occupancy of the (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) property. FCDHCD advised (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) she did not qualify to lease the property under the Section 8 HCVP; and, 7. Allegedly, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) has operated a business involving the sale of birds (dba (b)(6):(b)(7)(C)), but has never reported income to the FCDHCD in connection with this business. 	Subject of investigation shot and killed herself.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
7/31/2013	<p>On February 2, 2011, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) spoke with (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) / Section 8 Programs, Denver Housing Authority (DHA) via the telephone at (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) had left a voice mail message for (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) to call her on February 1, 2011. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised that DHA was in the midst of an informal hearing with a Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program participant by the name of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C). (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) explained that the nature of the informal hearing involved the downsizing of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) subsidized unit from a four-bedroom unit to a three-bedroom unit. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised that DHA had recently discovered that (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide for the past ten years was actually (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) domestic partner of the last 25 years, and that (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and his domestic partner had a dependent child who was also residing in (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) subsidized unit. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) said (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) had ported to DHA from the Colorado Springs Housing Authority in 2000. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised that the Colorado Springs Housing Authority had already approved (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) for live-in aide eligibility, so when (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) ported to DHA, DHA honored (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide eligibility status. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) said (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide has been the same individual dating back to when (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) was being subsidized by the Colorado Springs Housing Authority. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised that based on the fact that (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide was actually (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) domestic partner, that (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide was not eligible to be (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) live-in aide, because 24 CFR 5.403 indicates that an eligible live-in aide must be an individual who would not be living in the unit except to provide the necessary supportive services for the elderly person, or near elderly person, or person with disabilities. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) said she would make copies of the potentially relevant documents from (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) tenant file and provide these documents to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) for his review. (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised that she would have the copies ready for (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) sometime next week. On February 9, 2011, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) went to DHA located at (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) in Denver, Colorado and pick-up a packet of documents related to (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) from (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Housing Choice Voucher / Section 8 Programs, DHA. On February 16, 2011, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) met with (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Denver District Attorney's Office and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) Denver District Attorney's Office, to discuss a potential criminal case involving an individual by the name of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and an individual by the name of (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) allegedly defrauding the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program at DHA. After hearing the nature of the allegations, (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) advised (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) and (b)(6):(b)(7)(C) that the Denver District Attorney's Office would open a criminal investigation related to this matter.</p>	All foreseeable administrative and judicial actions have been completed.

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
10/11/2012	<p>On March 27, 2008, this office was contacted by (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) Hawthorne Housing Authority (HHA), who alleged that Section 8 recipient, (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was committing fraud by failing to disclose her annual earned income. A discrepancy resulted when the HHA ran (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) EIV report, stating that she was a (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) working at the (b)(6);(b)(7)(C), wherein her Section-8 certifications listed her sole annual income as SSI.</p>	<p>All investigative activities have been completed. Defendant (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) has been charged and sentencing is pending based on her ability/willingness to pay ordered restitution. Sentencing has been postponed/continued since approximately May of 2009. Our office will no longer wait for final sentencing before closing case. Judicial docket will be monitored and if (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) is sentenced, investigation will be opened to report judicial action. Due to the substantial length of time that has elapsed with no sentencing, it is recommended that this case be closed with no further investigation warranted at this time.</p>

Date Closed	Investigative Description	Disposition
8/15/2013	<p>QAD referral states suspected misrepresentation of liabilities. In addition, the referral states that the case was referred to Citi's (servicer) fraud unit. Loan was originated by (b)(6)/(b)(7)(C). HUD's SFNW system shows first payment due 2/2008 with zero payments. Loan has claim status with claim paid: Total Paid DatePaid \$377,076.64</p> <p>11/16/09 \$614.25 08/20/10 \$6,764.32 01/14/10 HUD's SFNW shows originating lender (UCS) has 2 YR loan portfolio with EXTREMELY high serious delinquency to claim rate. Two underwriters are associated with a high series of claims: (b)(6)/(b)(7) with 4 claims between Nov 1996 and August 1998 and (b)(6)/(b)(7) with 15 claims between Nov 1995 and July 2008. Claim totals for 15 loans (still researching the additional 4) are at \$1,999,489.48. In addition, (b)(6)/(b)(7) had 21 terminated loans from May 1996 to Aug 2005 and (b)(6)/(b)(7) had 162 terminated loans from Oct 1995 to Feb 2008, which looked unusual. Further research needs to be conducted to determine why there are so many terminated loans. Additional Law Enforcement databases show that UCS has been involved in non-arm's length transactions. The databases also show 3 separate individuals associated with the company. Profiles and additional information for each are uploaded in (b)(6)/(b)(7) profile pages. Further, (b)(6)/(b)(7) has a criminal record (uploaded in profile section). A search of HUD's SFDW showed that two underwriter's were underwriting all of the loans. Further search showed that the one of the underwriters (b)(6)/(b)(7) was the president of the mortgage company. It also appears that (b)(6)/(b)(7)(C) might be the same individual. The other underwriter, (b)(6)/(b)(7) might be a front ID for (b)(6)/(b)(7)(C). but further research and interviews are needed to determine the relationship. The State of California Department of Corporations (Department) has filed a AMENDED ACCUSATION IN SUPPORT OF REVOCATION OF CALIFORNIA RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LENDER AND RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOAN SERVICER LICENSES. The reason for the accusation is that United California Systems (UCS) had failed to file application/loan and servicing reports and had relocated its business without notification to the Department. In addition, the Department found that (b)(6)/(b)(7)(C) pleaded nolo contendere to a charge of unlawful taking of vehicle in violation of Vehicle Code section 10851. At the time of entry of the plea, (b)(6)/(b)(7) was the president and primary stockholder of United International. UCS provided the Department copies of minutes from a special meeting of the board of directors of UCS. The minutes reflected that (b)(6)/(b)(7) resigned as president and relinquished control of ownership interest of 10% or more in United International. The minutes further stated that (b)(6)/(b)(7)(C) had been appointed vice president in charge of United International's daily affairs. Five of the loan files (current in statute) were reviewed and found to have patterns of fraudulent documents and extremely poor underwriting, fraught with mistakes.</p>	Prosecution declined. Case closed.