Date Closed		Disposition
7/5/20	This investigation potentially involves over 1.2 million in Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) fraud. The bulk of the funds, a	Lack of HUD nexus (b)(7)(
	\$775,486 loan was received through a PPP program call the Restaurant Revitalization Fund. The funds provided under the Restaurant Revitalization Fund loan were supposed to be used to support a business. The allegations are (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	
	received a payment from the Restaurant Revitalization Fund (RRF) in the amount of \$775,486 on (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) business bank account. Then a total of \$750,000 was transferred from the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) personal checking and savings bank accounts. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) these funds were deposited in a (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) personal checking and savings bank accounts. These funds were then moved into a Coinbase account and used to purchase cryptocurrency on the same day as the original RRF deposit, (b)(6), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) converting	
	these RRF funds to personal use is not permissible. This complaint is being opened to conduct further investigation into this matter.	
7/6/20		Lack of evidence/information
200300000000000000000000000000000000000	SMHA. $\binom{(b)(6)}{7}\binom{(b)}{9}$ did not disclose to SMHA the potential conflict of interest $\binom{(b)(6)}{9}\binom{(b)}{9}$ and SMHA.	
7/12/20	On or about November 2021, the U.S. Attorney's Office -Western District of Pennsylvania requested the assistance from the U.S. Department (HUD) Office of the Inspector General (OIG) – Pittsburgh Field Office regarding fraud allegations involving the Emergency Rental	Lack of HUD nexus, (b)(7)(E)
	Assistance Program (ERAP) which is apart of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act). This is a multijurisdictional investigation (IRS- CI), U.S. Department of Labor (DOL OIG), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms	
7/17/20	(ATF), U.S. Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration (TIGTA), Allegheny County Police Department (ACPD), and HUD OIG.	Coop Adjudicated
7/17/20	The complainant stated that her application for housing was denied by the Bloomfield Housing Authority. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The complainant stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Case Adjudicated
	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The complainant stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The complainant stated that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	
	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The complainant stated that she has spoken with attorneys and is pressing charges against the subject. The complainant stated that she is still in desperate need of	
	housing assistance and does not know how to obtain assistance without dealing with this corrupt housing authority. The complainant was referred to the Office of Public and Indian Housing Customer Service Center to get more information on how to obtain housing assistance.	
	1955 W. 1956 W. 1957 W	
7/17/20		Case Adjudicated
7/10/00	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) MHC is the lead agency for the Macomb County Continuum of Care (CoC) and receives HUD funding. This complaint is being initiated to investigate if HUD and/or federal funds were misappropriated.	
7/18/20	This complex is currently undergoing renovations after many years of requesting increases in rent through HUD for updates that are never done after being approved. The current renovation work is being done while residents are still in the units but this poses a serious health risk to tenants as there are multiple	Lack of evidence/information
	reasons including lead in dust, pest infestations and extreme lack of oversight on the work being done by migrant workers. While no lead abatement processes have taken effect place residents are being subjected to fumes and contaminated construction debris, which they have to clean and dispose of, destruction and theft of personal property and 7 day work weeks of the construction company's control as possible. The complex is currently a major eyesore in the community and very dangerous given that it houses low income women	
	and children who will be and have be greatly affected by the exploitation, abuse, and exposure to construction environments. These issues have been brought to the attention of management to no avail. During construction no attempt is made by work crews to shield residents belonging from contamination, by	
	way of using drop cloths or dust removers, there is also no urgency in responding to requests for lead disclosure documentation. There should be considered waste due the infrastructure issues as well as extreme and	
	excessive pest infestation throughout the entire complex. To support these claims multiple families are available and willing to discuss the matter, email correspondence with previously mentioned lead requests, and photos are available. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	
	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	
		(b)(7)(E)
//19/20	My Mortgage Inc., was first made aware on 10/1/21 by one of the investor's Fraud Risk Group that upon review of another lender's loan where the investigation led to confirm misrepresentation of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and and one of our loans was identified. The investor did not detect an MLO to (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the alteration of Assets with a single Commonality, the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) are altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the altered that no MMI Employee was involved in the a	Case Adjudicated
	investor did not detect an MLO to (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) relationship similar to the other lender. Base on this information MMI proceeds to pull the loans that have the documents, that the way the documents were provided we were not able to determine if they were altered, Verification of assets came back as not factual.	
7/20/20	23 On May 23, 2022, the HUD OIG Richmond Field Office was contacted by another federal law enforcement agency, some of the targets of their investigation may have live in, or otherwise have ties to units receiving Public Housing	Lack of HUD nexus (b)(7)(E)
7720720	or Section 8 rental assistance.	Edek of Hos Hexas
7/21/20	A proactive review of HUD systems revealed that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) had a high rate of defaulted FHA loans. (b)(6) originated 195 FHA mortgages, many of which involve the same developers, and 56 of these loans resulted in claims. During the complaint stage of the	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	investigation, it was discovered that in 5 out of the 6 loans reviewed, the income on the FHA loan application was inflated when compared to the salary from the state wage commission.	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
7/24/20	The U.S. Trustee's Office alleged that Pacific Standard Holdings is using the bankruptcy process to delay the foreclosure of various properties. In some cases, multiple bankruptcies are being filed in the Northern District of Texas for the same property using multiple straw-owners. Information developed indicates	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	that while the foreclosure is delayed, and the mortgage is not being paid, various renters are leasing the homes. To date, approximately 40 different properties have been identified with approximately half of the mortgages insured by FHA. Exact losses are not yet known.	
7/24/20		
7/24/20	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	(b)(7)(E)
7/24/20	123 HUD OIG received allegations of Theft from the CHA OIG alleging that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) failed to obtain performance bonds and certificates of insurance for vendors participating in the CHA Job Order Contracting (JOC) Program despite being paid. As part of the JOC contract, CHA	Case Adjudicated
500 * 20,000 0* Copt. 50	reimburses the vendors for payments made for performance bonds and certificates of insurance.	**************************************
7/24/20	The complainant is reporting the subject for FHA loan fraud. Subject is a realtor who helps individuals received FHA first time buyer loans. The complainant claims that subject places unknown individuals on deeds for his clients if his clients don't make enough money to receive the FHA loan. Subject then allows	(b)(7)(E)
	the unknown people on the deeds to take over the homes and sell his clients' homes. The complainant claims that subject sells the home and the person who is on the deed splits the payment after selling the home. The complainant would like this issue to be investigated.	
= 10 + 10 0	(b)(c) (b)(7)(c)	
7/24/20	Information was provided to HUD-OIG from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) CHA-OIG relating to (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) CHA-OIG relating to (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The received a contract from the CHA for over \$250,000 to install a computer lab in a multi-family building. It is a leged that after (b) received the contract that they then hired and entered into a contract with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The received a contract from the CHA for over \$250,000 to install a computer lab in a multi-family building. It is a legedly did not disclose the work was to be done by (b) allegedly did not disclose the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) allegedly did not disclose the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completing the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and submitted paperwork for payment claiming to be completed as the work was to be done by (c) and (c) are the work was to be done by (c) and (c) are the work was to be done by (c) and (c) are the work was to be done by (c) and (c) are the work was to be done	Case Adjudicated
	themselves. It is also alleged that (b), (did not meet the section 3 employment requirements. In addition to this contract (b) has been awarded (b) (c), (b) (7)(C) and the work for approximately \$180,000 (c) alleged (b) completed work for other (b) contracts as well.	
	(6). (and not help discontinuous as well.	
7/25/20	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) CPD Director contacted our office regarding (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) It appears, the President (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and may have a conflict of interest in obtaining a subsidized property for his son.	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
45 19		10.5 77
7/25/20	23 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	(b)(7)(E)
7/25/20	22 C 44 /22 /2342 LWD 24 C 5 L 1 LWD	
//25/20	On 11/20/2018, HUD OIG SA discovered a HUD-subsidized Shelter Plus Care/Continuum of Care head of household via the Fugitive Felon Initiative "data dump" and also discovered the head of household was (1) previously subject to lifetime registration as a sex offender in (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and (3) is currently a fugitive wanted for "sex offender registration violation." The State of (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) will not extradite from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) will not extradite from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and (c)(b)(c) will not extradite from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and (c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(c)(Case Adjudicated
	violation of 18 USC 1001(a)(2), False Statements, a Felony, and 18 USC 2250, Failing to Register as a Sex Offender.	
7/27/20	23 Complainant advised that the HMHA ED may be using HMHA employees and funds to remodel his home.	Lack of evidence/information
	123 The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Inspector General (HUD-OIG) received information alleging criminal and administrative violations by (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	possible kickback, between (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) was awarded a contract for renovation work at (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) website is now being hosted by (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) a consulting firm owned by (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	· // // /
	lare longtime friends.	
8/2/20	23 Lakewood Housing Authority (PHA), Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) recipient (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) appears to be residing in HCVP property that his (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Lack of evidence/information
	was recalled and then reissued on $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ resided in a home that his $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ resided in a home that his $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and the "owner" of the property became $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ and $(b$	4
	LLC. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) came onto the HCVP on (b)(6), (b) (a) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The water bill for (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance for when admitted to the program (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and leased in place. He was already living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance and living in the unit where he ended up receiving assistance and living in the unit where he ended up receiving a	
	would not be able to receive assistance while residing in that nome.	
8/2/20	123 A complainant alleged that the Rebuild Florida Program has stalled replacing her manufactured home in order to pay the hotel owners state funds that would be then donated to political campaign donations. This investigation is deemed administratively closed due to the case already been referred to and	(b)(7)(E)
100 4 0 00 4 04000	accepted by the County Attorney's Office.	
8/2/20	HUD OIG received a referral from the Virginia Bureau of Financial Institutions (BFI). The BFI advised that their office received a complaint regarding Loan Originator, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) Commonwealth Mortgage, Inc. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	fraudulent income documentation.	
8/2/20		Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	the HUD-OIG office in St. Louis, MO via FHFA-OIG. FNMA advised FHFA-OIG that to date their initial investigation revealed an estimated 1 million dollars in loss. This Complaint has been opened in order to determine (b)(6), dealings with FHA REO properties and any exposure/vulnerability placed upon HUD.	
8/2/20	23 On February 7, 2016, Special Agent (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and informed that the McAllen FBI office had received an anonymous complaint informing that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) awarded a city improvements contract for a (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Case Adjudicated
0,2,20	complainant informed that $(b)(6)$, had sole sourced the contract by avoiding the procurement process. $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)$ was also a person of interest in the $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$ case. $(b)(6)$, $(b)(7)(C)$	A CONTROL CONTROL OF THE STANDARD OF THE CONTROL OF
	received CDBG funding for construction of a park in the amount of \$349,065.68 which was awarded to (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	
8/4/20		Case Adjudicated
	discovered over one million dollars in funding associated with the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) project had been misappropriated by one of their contractors. The contractors. The contractors as a project coordinator for over 10 years on this particular project. City staff also received a letter from	
	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (DBNHS' counsel) to the owner of (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (DBNHS discovered that lien waivers from suppliers have been forged; (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (DBNHS, indicated on a phone call that DBNHS has found that invoices have also been	
01.1	forged. Based on these allegations, an investigation is warranted.	Coso Adiudicate d
8/4/20	This investigation was referred by federal law enforcement. It was relieved that a real estate agent used businesses that they controlled to fraudulently employee clients, who did not in fact work there to show employment history to qualify for mortgages. The real estate agent pled to an Information and was sentenced to 36 months' probation.	Case Adjudicated
8/4/20	is alleged that Herbert Harris and others are fraudulently obtaining FHA insured and conventional properties that are vacant and facing foreclosure in order live in them, rent them or sell them to unsuspecting homebuyers.	Case Adjudicated
	123 HUD OIG received information from a Housing Authority alleging that a Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP) participant falsified housing forms from 2014 through present when they failed to report true household composition and income. More specifically, they HCVP participant neglected to report that	Case Adjudicated Case Adjudicated
	they were married, and their spouse was employed on a fulltime bases and resided at the subsidized unit.	
		No Action Taken
8/10/20		No Action Taken
	managed (b)(6), (b)(7)(C). HUD CPD alleged that: (1) the TDSHC released grant funds without proper submission of environmental review certifications, (2) some of the funds may have been directed to other projects (while leaving some projects unfinished), (3) constructed a low income housing	
0/40/00	on a dumpsite filled with asbestos tiles and contaminated dirt leading to health problems for the tenants.	(b)(7)(E)
8/10/20	On March 16, 2022, HUD OIG case agent received a referral from complainant city Auditor's Fraud Hotline and Development Services Department based on findings of fraudulent documents submitted by subject developer as to remain compliant with the HOME loan program. In 2019 the city received an anonymous call from an ex-employee detailing all the illegal activities they witnessed pertaining to the submission of HOME compliance documents. As a result, a 2019 preliminary review conducted by the City Auditor's office also revealed that several documents used as part of the 2019 HOME compliance	(b)(')(=)
	review appeared to have been falsified.	
8/11/20	// \/^\ // \	Subject deceased/resigned/terminated

8/14/20	Investigative Description The Indianapolis Field Office of HUD Office of Inspector General was notified by the and private lenders. The Section 8 and Public Housing Director were comparing PPP loan data with tenant listings and tenant files for both the Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) and Public Housing Program. It appears that many of the PPP loans were applied for and the tenants had never reported having any business that they owned as would be required as part of the certification process done on an annual basis to continue to qualify for housing benefits administered through HUD and the Housing Authority. The Indianapolis Field Office met with the FBI in Merrillville Indiana to discuss the fraud issue.	Disposition Lack of HUD nexus (b)(7)(E)
8/14/20	The United States Attorney's Office Southern District of New York requested us to assist on this matter. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) is a HUD-approved lender headquartered in the Richmond, VA area. The nationwide lender mainly dealt with reverse mortgages, but also originated forward mortgages. Additionally, they packaged and sold Ginnie Mae securities on the secondary market. The lender recently closed its doors without notice or explanation. It was alleged that executives of the lender manipulated and inflated the prices of mortgage-backed securities it sold on the secondary market. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) had been in business since 2005 and abruptly closed at the beginning of May 2019. Recently, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) filed a civil suit against (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and its owner and CEO, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and its owner and CEO, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) of its termination as a Fannie Mae-approved Seller/Servicer.	Case Adjudicated
8/15/20	THEY (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) and others allegedly conspired to fraudulently deed over mortgage loans to entities they controlled, had properties sold, and then caused title companies to wire the payoff loan proceeds to the entities they controlled. These actions caused the original note on the property to never be paid off. (b)(6), (b) identified a total of 8 FHA properties and 10 non-FHA properties in question.	Case Adjudicated
8/15/20	3 On 09/11/2014, (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) received a call from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with he assistance of (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated he was working on an investigation with he deferal investigation.	Case Adjudicated
8/16/20	3 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) failed to disclose philanthropic donations from John Deere and Habitat for Humanity during the application process for HUD's Hurricane Harvey Homeowner Reimbursement Program (HRP), administered by the Texas General Land Office (GLO). The action resulted in a \$50,000 reimbursement and a potential duplication of benefits. On 9/10/2020 (b)(6), (b) telephonically spoke with GLO to obtain additional information regarding the allegation in order to substantiate the complaint.	Case Adjudicated
8/16/20	3 On December 2, 2022 (b)(6), (b)(7) with the U.S. Attorney's Office provided information regarding (b)(6), (b)(7) Allegedly, (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) applied for and received an FHA loan on property located at (b)(6), (b)(7)(c) applied for and received an FHA loan.	Lack of HUD nexus (b)(7)(E)
8/16/20	This office is in receipt of allegations from the Champaign Police Department that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) a non profit organization and CPD Grant sub recipient, has allegedly been misusing funds provided to them by the City of Champaign thru a HUD sponsored CPD grant. Specifically, it is alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. it is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. It is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country. It is also alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) to withdraw monies at several casinos throughout the country.	Case Adjudicated
8/17/20	(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) alleges through her attorney that she was charged rental fees and late fees outside of the scope of her HAP contract and lease with her landlord—(b)(6), (b)(7)(C) The property manager at (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) a is (b)(7)(C) a is (b)(7)(C)	Case Adjudicated
8/18/20	3 HUD OIG received information from HUD. CPD, indicating that the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) of a local Municipality admitted to using Section 108 Loan Guarantee funds in the amount of \$2,578,164 to pay for the payroll of Municipality employees. Investigation disclosed that from about September 2014 through February engaged in a scheme to pay for non-program municipality expenses using over 5.3 million in HHS and HUD Section 8 program funds in violation of the respective program rules for which the funds were intended.	Case Adjudicated
8/18/20	3 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	(b)(7)(E)
	3 An independent Audit identified that the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) for the MRHA V allowed over \$80,000. in unsubstantiated disbursements, to include some for personal gain.	Declined to Prosecute
	have bid on and been awarded public contracts with the Atlantic City Housing Authority. As part of their bid packages, these contractors have provided the ACHA with fraudulent New Jersey Public Works Contractors Certificates in order to obtain contracts. From at least July 2012 to the present (the "Relevant Time Period"), (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) engaged in a regular practice of reckless origination and underwriting of government loans and falsely certified to the government that these loans were eligible for government insurance.	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E) Case Adjudicated
W2 1/V	An imposter seems to have acted as the management agent (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) for 3 multifamily Connecticut properties. They then submitted requests to Navigate, HUD's Project-Based Contract Administrator, to change the project account information for the	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	management agent. These accounts are used to receive federal rent subsidies. Navigate processed the account changes and wired \$191,000 into the fraudulent accounts. 3 On January 14, 2021, the HUD-OIG Hotline received allegations that officials from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) were misusing HUD funds. A complaint will be established by the HUD-OIG Las Vegas Field Office to further investigate.	Statute of limitations
8/29/20	3 OIG received a complaint alleging the (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	Case Adjudicated
9/4/20	3 On December 18, 2019, the Montana Department of Commerce telephoned (b)(6), (b) to report a suspected overpayment of approximately \$32,000. The following day, the MDOC provided (b)(6), (b) documents relating to (b)(6), (b) estimated the loss to be \$28,374 over the period of September, 2015, until July, 2019.	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
	Allegations received from HSI that Section 8 recipient has unauthorized occupants engaged in criminal conduct. A referral from HUD Public and Indian Housing, alleged that an executive director of a housing authority misused the housing authority's credit card for his/her own personal use. An investigation determined the Executive Director committed theft of housing authority funds. During August 2023, the case was presented to the courts. The Executive Director entered a guilty plea for theft of housing authority funds. The Judge ordered the Executive Director to probation until the restitution was paid or be committed to State Prison for approximately 10 years with 5 years' probation. Executive Director submitted payment for restitution and court costs.	Case Adjudicated Case Adjudicated
9/6/20	The owner of a HUD Multifamily alleges that the former property manager embezzled funds, including but not limited to, tenant rents, tenant security deposits and HUD subsidy. It was discovered that the allegations were true. The property manager was pled to an Information and was sentenced to 36 months probation and 50 hours of community service.	Case Adjudicated
9/6/20		Lack of evidence/information
9/7/20	Subject is a participant of the Section 8 program and alleged to be under reporting income and not residing in subsidized unit. The investigation revealed subject worked as a real estate agent and did not disclose his true income to the housing authority. The investigation was referred to Jacksonville Housing Authority processed the Subject for eviction.	Referred
R. M. P. L. C. L.		Case Adjudicated Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
(294 - 10)	This investigation was initiated pursuant to an investor complaint to the FBI by where she alleges the principal at (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) cheated her out of millions of dollars. The complainant alleges that the principal manipulated her to invest over \$5 million dollars with the promise that a Federal Housing	
	Administration (FHA) non-bank lender was in the process of initiating an "Initial Public Offering" (IPO) over the next several months which would have returned her investment plus a profit. Over time the personal relationship between the principal and complainant turned acrimonious, by the tales of the IPO offering and the constant falsehoods uttered by the principal.	(b)(7)(E)
9/11/20	3 (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	(-/(-/(-/
9/11/20	On March 29, 2013, during a liason meeting with FBI, Lowell field office, the following case was referred to HUD-OIG for investigative assistance: A few years ago, Salem PD received a complaint of a group of individuals purchasing homes and then breaking them up into multiple units selling the units at overinflated prices. In May 2012, the USAO had two people come forward and advised that they were scammed into purchasing homes that were overinflated and then went into foreclosure by (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) gain and the standard prices are provided the person with a \$10,000 to \$20,000 "rebate" to use for whatever. He had them open several bank accounts which he would initially place money into to pay the mortgages. He would pay the mortgages until he got them to purchase another home and then would stop payment shortly after. Three buyers have been interviewed so far; they were first time home buyers. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) FBI further indicated some of the loans were FHA.	Case Adjudicated
	The U. S. Attorney's Office, District of Massachusetts requested HUD OIG participation in the Benefits Fraud Task Force. The task force is made up of federal, state, and local law enforcement. HUD OIG will focus on subjects having a HUD program nexus. The complainant (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated that she and the victim (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) stated that she and the victim (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) paid in full by (b)(6), (b)(7	Case Adjudicated Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
9/15/20	This investigation was predicated upon information obtained from a news article that indicated the Nebraska State Auditor's office had conducted an audit, based on a hotline complaint to their office, wherein they concluded the former executive director of the Decatur Housing Authority (DHA), (b)(6), (b)(7)(had overpaid herself in salary by more than \$32,000. The audit was based on a 24-unit apartment complex, Maple Villa Apartments, that is managed by the DHA. In fact, this is the only portfolio of units under the DHA, which is considered a "micro" housing authority. According to the State Auditor's report, (b)(6), (c) (c)(6), (c)(7)(c)(6), (c)(7)(c)(6), (c)(7)(•
9/18/20	This complaint is a "spin-off" from HUD OIG (b)(7)(E) after it was discovered that Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program participant (b)(6), had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) deferred due to his businesses allegedly suffering had his own Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) and Economic Injury Disaster Loans (EIDL) d	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
9/21/20	This complaint is a referral from the Denver HOC advising of a bank self-report alleging fraudulent activities/serious violations found in the origination process of a loan. Specifically, it is alleged that a borrower misrepresented his assets when applying for the loan by providing fabricated bank statements, a false gift letter, and gift donor's cashier's check in furtherance of receiving an FHA insured 203k loan. The self-reporting bank was not complicit in the misrepresentation noted on this loan.	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
9/21/20	This office received a complaint from (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) According t (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) Accor	Case Adjudicated
9/22/20	3 Since 2017, the owner of (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) in Syracuse, NY, has been cited numerous by the Onondaga County Health Department for failure to remediate lead-based paint violations in his rental properties in and around the Syracuse, NY area.	Prosecution declined (b)(7)(E)
9/26/20	The Town Supervisor of Prattsville allegedly misappropriated Community Development Block Grant Disaster Relief funds (CDBG - DR).	Case Adjudicated
9/26/20	3 Our Office has been working an investigation pertaining to a Lender named (b)(6), (b)(7) (C) As a result of that investigation, it was determined that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (C) Is paying for borrowers monthly loans on their mortgage when they can not make the payment. (b)(6), (b)(7)(C) (C) (C) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D) (D	case Adjudicated

Date Closed	Investigative Description		Disposition
	9/26/2023 It is alleged that (b)(6), (b)(7)(C)	in Waterloo, lowa, stole money by manipulating tenant information. She allegedly re-certified tenants with the correct amount, then changed it in their system to reflect a lower tenant portion. The respective tenants continued to	No Action Taken
	pay the higher amount, while (b)(6), (b)(pocketed the difference. It is also alle	eged that (b)(6), (b) used the company credit card for unauthorized expenses.	