NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY/CENTRAL SECURITY SERVICE

INSPECTOR GENERAL

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

8 July 2015; Revised 21 July 2015

IV-15-0015

Alleged Falsified Doctor's Note

(U) This report might not be releasable under the Freedom of Information Act or other statutes and regulations. Consult the NSA/CSS Inspector General Chief of Staff before releasing or posting all or part of this report.

(U) OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

(U) Chartered by the NSA Director and by statute, the Office of the Inspector General conducts audits, investigations, inspections, and special studies. Its mission is to ensure the integrity, efficiency, and effectiveness of NSA operations, provide intelligence oversight, protect against fraud, waste, and mismanagement of resources by the Agency and its affiliates, and ensure that NSA activities comply with the law. The OIG also serves as an ombudsman, assisting NSA/CSS employees, civilian and military.

(U) AUDITS

(U) The audit function provides independent assessments of programs and organizations. Performance audits evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of entities and programs and their internal controls. Financial audits determine the accuracy of the Agency's financial statements. All audits are conducted in accordance with standards established by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(U) INVESTIGATIONS

(U) The OIG administers a system for receiving complaints (including anonymous tips) about fraud, waste, and mismanagement. Investigations may be undertaken in response to those complaints, at the request of management, as the result of irregularities that surface during inspections and audits, or at the initiative of the Inspector General.

(U) INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

(U) Intelligence oversight is designed to insure that Agency intelligence functions comply with federal law, executive orders, and DoD and NSA policies. The IO mission is grounded in Executive Order 12333, which establishes broad principles under which IC components must accomplish their missions.

(U) FIELD INSPECTIONS

(U) Inspections are organizational reviews that assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Agency components. The Field Inspections Division also partners with Inspectors General of the Service Cryptologic Elements and other IC entities to jointly inspect consolidated cryptologic facilities.

I. (U) SUMMARY

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

(U//~~FOUO~~) On 21 July 2015, the OIG revised this report to make two administrative changes. Please refer to Appendix E for information concerning the changes.

(U//~~FOUO~~) The NSA Office of the Inspector General (OIG) opened an investigation based on an allegation that [redacted] an NSA employee, [redacted] submitted a false doctor's note to his supervisor.

(U//~~FOUO~~) In addition to obtaining sworn testimony from [redacted], the OIG reviewed the doctor's notes [redacted] submitted, interviewed [redacted] supervisor, and obtained relevant information from his doctor's office.

(U//~~FOUO~~) Analysis of nine doctor's notes (also known as verification letters) revealed that one dated 23 September 2014 appeared to have been copied and manufactured from an earlier note dated 03 September 2014. [redacted]'s doctor's office confirmed that it retained copies of all verification letters provided to patients and, after reviewing the nine verification letters, corroborated the validity of all but the one dated 23 September 2014. During his interview on 16 March 2015, [redacted] initially denied the allegation. However, [redacted] subsequently admitted that he created the 23 September 2014 doctor's note by altering the dates on the doctor's note dated 03 September 2014.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

(U//~~FOUO~~) The OIG concluded based on a preponderance of the evidence that:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged; and
2. [redacted] knowingly made false statements to the OIG on 16 March 2015, when he told the OIG that he had never made his own doctor's note, to include copying another note and changing the date on the note,

in violation of NSA/CSS Personnel Management Manual (PMM) Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E).[1]

(U//~~FOUO~~) A copy of this report will be forwarded to Employee Relations (MR) for information and any action deemed appropriate. Additionally, a summary of the investigative findings will be provided to Special Actions, Q242, and [redacted]'s supervisor.

[1] (U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] may have also violated 18 U.S.C. § 1001 by knowingly and willfully submitting the fraudulent doctor's note to his supervisor in September 2014, and making false statements to the OIG on 16 March 2015. The OIG reported this potential criminal violation to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Maryland on [redacted]

(b)(6)

II. (U) BACKGROUND

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

(U) Introduction

(U//~~FOUO~~) On 08 October 2014, the OIG received a complaint that [redacted] in September 2014, provided his supervisor a false verification letter from his doctor to excuse his absence from work on 23 September 2014.

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] has been assigned to the [redacted] since [redacted] and has been an employee at NSA since [redacted]

(b)(6)

(U) Applicable Authorities

(U) The investigation looked at possible violations of the following authorities:

(U) NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Section 2-1, Work Environment, Paragraph (K) False Statements;

(U) NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Section 2-2, Personnel and Security Standards, Paragraph (E).

(U) Applicable excerpts from the above authorities are contained in Appendix A.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

III. (U) FINDINGS

(U//~~FOUO~~) ALLEGATION 1: Did [redacted] knowingly make or present a false document to his supervisor in violation of NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E)?

(U//~~FOUO~~) CONCLUSION: *Substantiated.*

(U//~~FOUO~~) ALLEGATION 2: Did [redacted] knowingly make false statements to the OIG in violation of NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E)?

(U//~~FOUO~~) CONCLUSION: *Substantiated.*

(U) Evidence

(b)(6)

(U) **Documentary Evidence**

(U) **Medical documentation (doctor's notes; also known as verification letters).**

(U//~~FOUO~~) On 08 October 2014, [redacted]'s supervisor, [redacted] provided the OIG nine doctor's notes provided to her by [redacted] from [redacted] in Baltimore, Maryland. The doctor's notes, which range in dates from 16 June 2014 to 23 September 2014, are attached in Appendix B.

(U//~~FOUO~~) The doctor's note dated 23 September 2014[2] includes the following language:

> *This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on September 23, 2014.*

(U//~~FOUO~~) The letters dated 03 September 2014 and 23 September 2014 contain a signature block with [redacted] signed in cursive and [redacted] typed beneath. Both of these letters also have a black dot in the left margin between the last paragraph and the signature block. None of the other letters have this black dot.

(U//~~FOUO~~) In the letter dated 23 September 2014, in the first paragraph, "September 23, 2014" appears in a different font than the rest of the letter and is not aligned with the other text in the sentence.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

[2] (U//~~FOUO~~) According to [redacted] testimony, she found the note on her desk on 30 September 2014.

(U/~~/FOUO~~) **Email from [redacted] Office Manager at [redacted] Baltimore, Maryland.**

(U/~~/FOUO~~) On 27 February 2015, the reporting Investigator sent [redacted] an email summarizing a meeting earlier in the day between [redacted] and the Investigator (during which [redacted] reviewed the nine doctor's notes). On the same day, [redacted] provided written confirmation that the Baltimore, Maryland location of [redacted] which is the location provided in the letterhead on all nine of the aforementioned [redacted] doctor's notes, has no record of providing [redacted] a doctor's note (referenced in the email thread as a 'verification letter') dated 23 September 2014.

(U/~~/FOUO~~) [redacted] also confirmed the validity of the other eight [redacted] doctor's notes regarding [redacted], and that her office keeps a copy of all verification letters provided to their patients. This email exchange is attached as Appendix C.

(U) **Testimonial Evidence**

(b) (6)

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

(U) **Discussions:**

(U/~~/FOUO~~) [redacted] Office Manager at [redacted] Baltimore, Maryland.

(U/~~/FOUO~~) On 27 February 2015, the reporting Investigator met with [redacted] at [redacted] in Baltimore, Maryland. In chronological order and without drawing attention to any note in particular, the reporting Investigator provided [redacted] the nine aforementioned doctor's notes (Appendix B), and asked her if she could confirm their validity.

(U/~~/FOUO~~) After checking her office records, [redacted] stated that eight of the notes match the records in her office, but that her office has no record of the note dated 23 September 2014. [redacted] stated that her office keeps a copy of all such documents (i.e., verification letters) provided to their patients. [redacted] also stated that her office has no record of [redacted] visiting the office on 23 September 2014.

(U) **Interviews:**

(U/~~/FOUO~~) [redacted] the [redacted] was interviewed on 29 January 2015, and provided the following sworn statement:

(U/~~/FOUO~~) [redacted] works in the [redacted] which is in the [redacted] organization. She supervises four individuals, including [redacted] She has supervised [redacted] since August 2013. [redacted] is a Property Administrative Officer, and his work schedule is [redacted] It is challenging for her to find duties for him, and some of his current duties include making [redacted]

(U/~~/FOUO~~) [redacted] is the only employee she supervises that has to provide her leave documentation, a requirement which is in place per advice from Employee Relations (MR). She has presented numerous Memoranda for the Record (MFRs) to [redacted] due to actions such as

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36

using Sick Leave (S/L) for going to the vet, sleeping on the job, watching TV on the high-side (e.g.,), and his improper use of work hours/breaks. did not always sign the MFRs presented to him, but the presentations were witnessed. In November 2014, MR suspended for five days for sleeping while on duty. Recently, was found sleeping again, but this has not been presented to him yet. previous supervisor was

(b)(6)

(U//~~FOUO~~) was previously an office manager for but had problems performing his duties. works with MR to find things for to do. requested a management consultation concerning , and believes it is scheduled for next week. believes that is stubborn, and demonstrates problems with authority (including with past supervisors). Also, does not cooperate with . has approval to use leave pursuant to the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and he does so. He has low leave balances, and believes he uses his leave as he accrues it.

(U//~~FOUO~~) called out of work on 23 September 2014, and reminded him that he needed to provide her a doctor's note verifying his absence. On 30 September 2014, found a doctor's note on her desk concerning leave on 23 September 2014. believes that left the doctor's note on her desk.

(U//~~FOUO~~) When she reviewed the 23 September 2014 note, believed something was 'off' with letter. She never told of her concerns as to the authenticity of the note. One of her concerns is that some of the language on the note appears to be slanted in comparison to the other text. She then compared the 23 September 2014 document to other S/L notes had provided her, and thought that the 23 September 2014 note looked similar to one dated 03 September 2014. For example, both notes appear to have the exact same placement of the signature above the ' signature block. Further, a similar 'dot' appears to be in the same place on both notes (above and to the left of "Sincerely" – see Appendix B). does not provide her original copies of doctor's notes - he always provides copies to her.

(U//~~FOUO~~) a Property Officer in the was interviewed on 16 March 2015, and voluntarily provided the following sworn testimony:

(U//~~FOUO~~) is a Property Officer in and has been in the office for about six or seven years.

(U//~~FOUO~~) After reviewing the nine doctor's notes (Appendix B), was unable to verify the authenticity of the notes. However, offered to verify the notes with his doctor's office. After being told that the OIG had already validated the notes with 's doctor's office, stated that he still needed "to verify that to make sure that you're [OIG] correct on your verification as well."

(U//~~FOUO~~) When asked whether he provided the 23 September 2014 doctor's note to his supervisor, stated that "if you [OIG] have it, I must have." Every record that he has

provided to his supervisor regarding medical leave is from a doctor's office. He has never made his own doctor's note, nor has he ever copied a note and changed the date.

(U//~~FOUO~~) Regarding the apparent peculiarities concerning the 23 September 2014 doctor's note, to include that the signature of the medical provider on it appears to be a perfect match to the signature on the 03 September 2014 doctor's note and the pronounced slant of the 'September 23, 2014' portion of the note, he stated that he would "have to investigate this one because I don't know."

(b)(6)

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] could think of no reason why the Baltimore [redacted] office would have all of the [redacted] doctor's notes (Appendix B) except for the 23 September 2014 note. Even if the 23 September 2014 note is "off," he still wants to check to see if he was actually at the doctor's office that day and if the office has some other record of him being there.

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] explained: "I'm almost certain I was there on the 23rd, but I need to check to see if I was there because the only reason is, I could think of … because it's been awhile is, this could have probably been put together, but I still think I was there on the 23rd … the date's there because I didn't give her [redacted] a form from the … doctor, so I put that there, but I'm pretty sure I was there because I didn't get the regular ones like these [indicating the other leave records from '[redacted] … and this was added until I got one from them."

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted] added the date on the 23 September 2014 doctor's note, and did so while at work. Although he stated that he did not use the 03 September 2014 note as template for the 23 September 2014, he also stated that "he made a copy and typed that in." "I just copied over it and typed that date in there because I know I was seen on the 23rd and that was the note that I provided."

(U//~~FOUO~~) Currently, due to his use of FMLA, he does not provide leave documentation to his supervisor. However, it was a requirement for him to do so in the Fall 2014 timeframe. Generally, he would hold all of his leave documentation until the end of a pay period, at which time he would provide it to his supervisor. He confirmed that he made a copy of a previous doctor's note and typed the date in. He believes that he went to the doctor's office on the 23 September 2014 and received medical treatment. However, because he did not get a note, he subsequently tried to provide a note. He does not remember adding the '09/23/2014' language to the note, but recalls adding the 'September 23, 2014' language ("I know I put that [the 'September 23, 2014' language] there"). However, he acknowledges that the insertion of the '09/23/2014' language "probably did co-inspire [sic] with" adding the 'September 23, 2014' language.

(U//~~FOUO~~) The 23 September 2014 doctor's note is the only one that he ever made up. He is taking medicine for depression and for anxiety. His supervisor is pressuring him. He is getting help from the Agency's Disability Affairs Office (DAO) and external to the Agency. "I needed a note . . . I needed something to take care of that situation [supervisor pressure]." He made up the

note and gave it to [redacted] in order to avoid confrontation. The stress he feels in the office and the effects of his medication may have influenced his decision to forge the doctor's note.

(U) Analysis and Conclusions

(U//~~FOUO~~) NSA/CSS PMM Chapter 366, Section 2-1(K), states: "Employees will not knowingly make or present a false or fraudulent statement or claim…" Under applicable legal standards, a person "knowingly" makes a false statement whenever he or she acts with knowledge of its falsity or acts with reckless disregard of whether the statement is true.[3]

(U//~~FOUO~~) PMM Chapter 366, Section 2-2, states that employees must be trustworthy, reliable, and of excellent character, judgment and discretion, and "dishonest" conduct would bring into question these character traits.

(U//~~FOUO~~) During his interview, [redacted] eventually admitted that he knew that the 23 September 2014 doctor's note he presented to his supervisor, [redacted], was not authentic. [redacted] testified that he created the 23 September 2014 doctor's note by changing the dates used on a doctor's note dated 03 September 2014. In an attempt to justify his absence from work, [redacted] deliberately created a false document and presented it to his supervisor.

(U//~~FOUO~~) Before admitting to his misconduct, [redacted] also provided sworn testimony to the OIG that he had never created his own doctor's note. Further, [redacted] denied that he had ever used another doctor's note as a template in order to create a new doctor's note with a different date. [redacted] subsequently acknowledged that he created the 23 September 2014 doctor's note by changing the dates used on a legitimate doctor's note.

(U//~~FOUO~~) The preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusions that:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged; and
2. [redacted] knowingly made false statements to the OIG during his testimony on 16 March 2015, when he told the OIG that he had never made his own doctor's note, to include copying another note and changing the date on the note,

in violation of NSA/CSS PMM Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E).

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

[3] *See, e.g., U.S. v. Lange*, 528 F.2d 1280 (5th Cir., 1976); 31 U.S.C. 3729.

IV. (U) RESPONSE TO TENTATIVE CONCLUSION

(U/~~/FOUO~~) On 04 June 2015, the OIG notified [redacted] of the tentative conclusions. In his 12 June 2015 response, [redacted] acknowledged that he provided his supervisor a doctor's note that he had fabricated, and identified workplace pressures and medication as potential causes for his actions.

(U~~//FOUO~~) In his response, [redacted] refuted that he provided the doctor's note to his supervisor on 30 September 2014, as stated in the OIG's tentative conclusions, noting that he was out of the office on Annual Leave on 30 September 2014. Upon review, the OIG amended the respective date throughout this report to "in September 2014" instead of "on 30 September 2014."[4]

(U~~//FOUO~~) Other than the information concerning the 30 September 2014 reference, [redacted] response did not provide any additional information that caused the OIG to conduct further investigation or make further changes to the tentative conclusions; therefore, the rest of the conclusions remain unchanged.

(U~~//FOUO~~) A copy of the tentative conclusions sent to [redacted] and his response are attached as Appendix D.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

[4] (U~~//FOUO~~) As noted in the report, 30 September 2014 was the date that [redacted] supervisor found the doctor's note on her desk. As noted in his response to the tentative conclusions (see Appendix D), [redacted] is unsure of the specific date he provided the note to his supervisor. However, given that he admitted to creating the doctor's note and presenting it to his supervisor, the specific date that he provided the note to his supervisor is not a critical fact and would not affect the OIG's conclusions.

V. (U) CONCLUSIONS

(U//~~FOUO~~) The preponderance of the evidence supports the following conclusions:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged; and
2. [redacted] knowingly made false statements to the OIG during his testimony on 16 March 2015, when he told the OIG that he had never made his own doctor's note, to include copying another note and changing the date on the note,

in violation of NSA/CSS PMM Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E).

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

VI. (U) DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS

(U//~~FOUO~~) A copy or summary of this report of investigation will be provided to:

1. MR, Employee Relations.
2. Q242, Special Actions.
3. [redacted] supervisor.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

[redacted]
Senior Investigator

Concurred by:

[redacted]
Assistant Inspector General
for Investigations

APPENDIX A

(U) Applicable Authorities

(U//~~FOUO~~) NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Personal Conduct, Section 2-1, Work Environment

Employees will not engage in any conduct that creates a hostile work environment and/or interferes with an individual's work performance.

. . .

K. False Statements- Employees will not knowingly make or present a false or fraudulent statement or claim … or, knowingly and willfully falsify or conceal a material fact by a trick, scheme, or device.

(U//~~FOUO~~) NSA/CSS PMM, Chapter 366, Personal Conduct, Section 2-2 Personnel and Security Standards

Employees granted access to classified information and Sensitive Compartmented Information must be stable; trustworthy; reliable; of excellent character, judgment and discretion; and of unquestioned loyalty to the United States. Any conduct, including off-duty conduct that brings into question these character traits may be cause for appropriate security action and in some cases administrative action. The following illustrations are provided as examples and are not inclusive:

…

E. Criminal, dishonest, or other conduct that would reflect adversely on the individual's reliability or trustworthiness

APPENDIX B

(U) Doctor's Notes

(b) (6)

Today's Date: June 16, 2014

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

Name of Patient:

The above named patient had a medical visit today

Please take this into consideration when reviewing the time away from work/school.

Special Instructions:

[x] None

[ ] To be off the remainder of today, returning to the normal work / school schedule tomorrow.

[ ] To be off until the next scheduled appointment on _____.

[ ] Other _____

_____

The patient was seen by:

Office Representative Si

If there are any questions

[redacted]

(b) (6)

[redacted]

07/09/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on July 9, 2014.

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

(b) (6)

[redacted]

07/23/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on 07/23/2014

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

(b) (6)

08/06/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on August 6, 2014.

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

(b) (6)

[redacted]

08/20/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on 08/20/2014

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

(b)(6)

09/03/2014

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that was seen at or treated by this medical center on September 3, 2014.

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Today's Date: September 15, 2014

Name of Patient:

The above named patient had a medical visit today .

Please take this into consideration when reviewing the time away from work/school.

Special Instructions:

[ ] None

[x] To be off the remainder of today, returning to the normal work / school schedule tomorrow.

[ ] To be off until the next scheduled appointment on _____.

[ ] Other _____

_____

The patient was seen by:

Office Representative Signature

If there are any questions, please call the office at

(b) (6)

[redacted]

09/17/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on Septemebr 17, 2014.

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]

(b) (6)

[redacted]

09/23/2014

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

To Whom it May concern:

This is to verify that [redacted] was seen at or treated by this medical center on September 23, 2014

Please feel free to contact or write our office if there are any questions or problems. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

APPENDIX C

(b) (6) (U) Email Exchange

From:
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 4:36 PM
To:
Subject: RE: Confirmation of Our Meeting

(b) (6)

Hi

Yes this is correct. All dates were verified except for the September 23, 2014.

Please do not hesitate to call or email me for any additional information you may need.

Thank you!

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36

From:
Sent: Friday, February 27, 2015 4:21 PM
To:
Cc:
Subject: Confirmation of Our Meeting

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION: This email, including any attachments, is intended only for authorized recipients. This email may contain information that is confidential, sensitive, and/or protected by Federal law, including the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended.

(b) (3)-P.L. 86-36
(b) (6)

Thank you for taking the time to meet with me today and to go over the records I provided you concerning I provided you nine different documents, each one purported to be verification of an appointment had with your office ('verification letters'). The date range of the verification letters was 09 July 2014 through 23 September 2014. You provided me confirmation as to the validity of every verification letter except for the document dated 23 September 2014. Your office has no record of issuing a verification letter on 23 September 2014. Further, you informed me that your office keeps a copy of all verification letters provided to patients. A response from you confirming this information would be appreciated.

Thank you again for your time – I appreciate it, especially now that I have seen how busy it is in your office.

R/

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

Investigator, Office of the Inspector General National Security Agency

(b)(6)

APPENDIX D

(U) Response to Tentative Conclusion

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

From: [redacted]
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: (U) Tentative Conclusions - Response Requested
Date: Friday, June 12, 2015 5:41:44 PM

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

Introduction

I did not remember knowingly making a false statement to my supervisor by providing an altered Doctor's note until the OIG showed the note to me during the testimony on 16 March 2015. During the time in question, I was in a hostile work environment involving my supervisor. The environment caused me to take more medications than normal to treat my anxiety, depression and other conditions. I can only assume that the pressures I was under, along with the additional medication caused me to produce the doctor's note to avoid further harassment from my supervisor. The situation I was dealing with is well documented within EEO, Disability Affairs, Dispute Resolutions and Grievances as well as the OIG.

Comments

I am having trouble remembering details of making a false document on 23 September 2015. I am having repeated loss of concentration of producing a false document on 23 September 2015. Sometime during that day while feeling Pressure from supervisor and with me feeling my anxiety, Stress and Depression and High blood pressure, I took my medications to ease the pain and suffering I was receiving from my supervisor.

That must be when I reproduced this doctor's note, I actually thought that I had went to the doctor's as I had told OIG on 16 March 2015 and thought that I left slip there. When OIG asked about me making doctor's note, I had told truth, because I had no recollection of doing so. When I meet the OIG at their office, I had asked them to show me what their talking about and that is when I saw the comparison of duplicate forms and then that is when I said O, I must have done this and reproduced this. It is on the tape.

This is when I had realized that I made a stupid mistake, I feel now that it must be true and the worst things will happen to me and I am motivated to criticize myself for what happened.

Conclusion

I am not sure of the actual date the doctor's slip was turned in, but it was not on 30 Sep 2014. I was on A/L that day. This is what I saw when I pulled up my timesheet for this date. As far as I know, It could have been turned in on 23 September 15.

Suspension/Reprimand?

Do I need to involve my Phscharist, Primary Doctor's and any other Attorneys to fight my case?

Thanks

[redacted]

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 4:14 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: (U) Tentative Conclusions - Response Requested

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION: *This email, including any attachments, is intended only for authorized recipients. This e-mail message may contain information that is confidential, sensitive, and/or protected by Federal law, including the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended.*

[redacted],

The date of the forged document is 23 September 2014.

R/
[redacted]

(U//~~FOUO~~)
[redacted]
Senior Investigator
NSA/CSS OIG, Office of Investigations,
[redacted]
963-0924(s) [redacted]

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 4:00 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: (U) Tentative Conclusions - Response Requested

If possible Can you provide me with the date of the forged document.

Thanks

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, June 04, 2015 1:05 PM
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: (U) Tentative Conclusions - Response Requested

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION: *This email, including any attachments, is intended only for authorized recipients. This email message may contain information that is confidential, sensitive, and/or protected by Federal law, including the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended.*

[redacted],

(U//~~FOUO~~) This is to notify you of the tentative conclusion the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) reached in our investigation regarding the allegation that you submitted a false doctor's note to your supervisor. Our tentative conclusion reads as follows:

(U//~~FOUO~~) The preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that:

1. *[redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor on 30 September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged; and*
2. *[redacted] knowingly made false statements to the OIG during his testimony on 16 March 2015, when he told the OIG that he had never made his own doctor's note, to include copying another note and changing the date on the note,*

in violation of NSA/CSS PMM Chapter 366, Sections 2-1(K) and 2-2(E).

(U//~~FOUO~~) In accordance with the investigative process, you now have the opportunity to comment on the tentative conclusion and/or offer additional information before we close our investigation. You are not required to respond with regard to our tentative conclusion, and if you choose not to, please simply acknowledge receipt of this notification. However, if you choose to respond, please do so in writing by **12 June 2015**. Any comments and/or additional information you provide will be given full consideration in reaching our final conclusion.

R/

[redacted] (b)(3)-P.L. 86-36

(U//~~FOUO~~) [redacted]

Senior Investigator

NSA/CSS OIG, Office of Investigations

[redacted]

963-0924(s) / [redacted]

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED//~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

APPENDIX E

(U) Administrative Revisions

On 21 July 2015, the OIG made two administrative changes to the language in the report.

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36
(b)(6)

Change One:

In the Summary section,

(U//~~FOUO~~) The OIG concluded based on a preponderance of the evidence that:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he submitted a doctor's note that he manufactured;

was changed to:

(U//~~FOUO~~) The OIG concluded based on a preponderance of the evidence that:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged;

Change Two:

In the Conclusion section,

(U//~~FOUO~~) The preponderance of the evidence supports the following conclusions:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he manufactured;

was changed to:

(U//~~FOUO~~) The preponderance of the evidence supports the following conclusions:

1. [redacted] knowingly made a false statement to his supervisor in September 2014, when he provided her a doctor's note that he admittedly forged;

[redacted]
Senior Investigator

(b)(3)-P.L. 86-36