

U.S. Department of Justice  
Federal Bureau of Prisons  
Washington, DC

---

**Office of Internal Affairs  
Report for Fiscal Year 2018**



Executive Summary of Findings .....	1
Reporting Incidents of Misconduct .....	3
Guidance for Reporting Allegations of Staff Misconduct .....	3
OIA “Complaints” .....	5
Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations .....	6
Local Investigation Guidance .....	6
Reported Misconduct .....	8
USA Patriot Act .....	10
Closed/Sustained Misconduct .....	11
BOP Employees Statistics .....	11
BOP Employees Disciplinary Process .....	13
BOP Employees Disciplinary Action Statistics .....	14
BOP Employees Gender Statistics .....	15
BOP Employees Job Discipline Statistics .....	18
Residential Reentry Center Employees/Drug Treatment Contractors .....	19
Staff in Privatized Facilities .....	20
Contract Employees/Volunteers Working in a BOP Facility .....	21
Public Health Service Employees Working in a BOP Facility .....	22
Physical Abuse of Inmates .....	23
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 13 – Civil Rights .....	23
Statistics .....	24
Introduction of Contraband .....	25
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 87 – Prisons .....	25
Statistics .....	27
Sexual Abuse of Inmates .....	28
Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 109A – Sexual Abuse .....	28
Statistics .....	32
Representative Case Summaries .....	33
Appendices .....	43
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2017 .....	43
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2016 .....	44
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2015 .....	45
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2014 .....	46
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2013 .....	47
Updated Data - Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2012 .....	48
Types of Misconduct .....	49
OIA Special Agent Monitoring Assignments .....	53

## Executive Summary of Findings

---

- There was a 12.5 percent increase in the number of misconduct allegations reported for all types of staff in Fiscal Year 2018, as compared with Fiscal Year 2017. The rate of reported misconduct allegations among BOP employees increased 8.7 percent from Fiscal Year 2017.
- There was a 6.3 percent increase in the number of cases opened in Fiscal Year 2018, as compared with Fiscal Year 2017.
- Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed an increase of 8.3 percent; cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed an increase of 16.5 percent; and cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed a decrease of 0.05 percent.
- The most frequently reported type of misconduct in Fiscal Year 2018 was Unprofessional Conduct. Failure to Follow Policy and Abuse of Inmates placed second and third, respectively.
- The categories of reported misconduct showing an increase from Fiscal Year 2017 are as follows: Abuse of Inmates (28.29 percent), Sexual Abuse of Inmates (48.33 percent), Inappropriate Relationships with Inmates (7.20 percent), Personnel Prohibitions (11.14 percent), Unauthorized Release of Information (19.48 percent), Breach of Security (8.06 percent), Unprofessional Conduct (18.68 percent), Failure to Follow Policy (5.18 percent), Other On-Duty Misconduct (1.79 percent), Other Off-Duty Misconduct (17.33 percent).
- During Fiscal Year 2018, three cases involved Patriot Act violations. As of October 16, 2018, two cases remained open pending investigation. No cases involving Patriot Act Violations were sustained.
- The most frequently sustained categories of misconduct among BOP employees with a sustained decision as of October 16, 2018, were Personnel Prohibitions and Failure to Follow Policy.
- As of October 16, 2018, the most frequently sustained category of misconduct among both male and female BOP employees for whom a decision had been made was Personnel Prohibitions. For those BOP employees with a sustained decision as of October 16, 2018, the rate was highest among UNICOR staff.
- As of October 16, 2018, the most frequently sustained category of misconduct for Residential Reentry Center employees was Inappropriate Relationships with Inmates. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct for staff in privatized facilities was Inappropriate Relationships with Inmates.

## Executive Summary of Findings

---

- As of October 16, 2018, there were five sustained allegations of Physical Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2018, stemming from four separate incidents. Two inmates involved sustained minor/slight injury. Two inmates involved sustained minor/no injury. Two subjects with a sustained allegation of Physical Abuse of Inmates were BOP employees. One of the BOP employees was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation. One of the BOP employees resigned as a result of the sustained allegation. Three subjects with a sustained allegation of Physical Abuse of Inmates were staff at a privatized facility. One of the privatized employees was terminated. One of the privatized employees resigned. One of the privatized employees received a three day suspension. No staff involved were criminally prosecuted.
- As of October 16, 2018, 498 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were reported. Twenty allegations were sustained. There were 20 individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband.
- During Fiscal Year 2018, 617 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. As of October 16, 2018, six allegations of Sexual Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2018 were sustained.



# Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

---

## Staff Reporting

In accordance with the Bureau's Standards of Employee Conduct, staff who become aware of any violation or alleged violation of the Standards of Employee Conduct must report said allegations/violations to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the Office of Internal Affairs (OIA), or the Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

Additionally, the OIG has established a toll-free hotline (1-800-869-4499) which is available to report DOJ employees' misconduct, to include potential areas of fraud, waste, or abuse in government. Bureau Staff are encouraged to use the OIG hotline if they wish to remain anonymous, and/or perceive fear of retaliation/reprisal.

To report violations directly to the OIA Central Office, please submit a written complaint to:

Federal Bureau of Prisons  
Office of Internal Affairs  
320 First Street, NW, Room 600  
Washington, DC 20534

Written complaints may also be sent via fax to (202) 514-8625.

## CEO Reporting

Upon becoming aware of any possible violation of the Standards of Employee Conduct (either through a report from staff or personal knowledge), the CEO at the institution, Regional Office or Central Office Division, or his/her designee, is to report the violation to the OIA **within 24 hours**. Details and definitions are as follows:

- Classification 1 cases are defined as allegations, which, if substantiated, would constitute a prosecutable offense (other than offenses such as misdemeanor arrests).
- Classification 2 cases are defined as allegations which involve violations of rules, regulations, or law that, if substantiated, would not likely result in criminal prosecution, but constitute serious misconduct.
- Classification 3 cases are defined as allegations of misconduct, which ordinarily have less impact on institutional operations.

**Note: Classification 1 and 2 cases must be reported to the OIA immediately. As a particular investigation unfolds, the severity of misconduct may increase or decrease, thereby moving it into another classification.**

## Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

---

Again, written notification to the OIA will be made **within 24 hours** (not to include weekends and holidays) from the time management official(s) learn of the matter. When there is suspected criminal conduct, the CEO may refer the matter *simultaneously* to the OIA and the local OIG or Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) office.

### Submitting Initial Information

A Referral of Incident form (BP-A715.012) is used to organize the information to be provided (for contract employees use form BP-A774.012). Be sure to include the following information:

- The identity of the complainant(s), subject(s), witness(es), and victim(s);
- The details of the allegation(s); and
- **All corroborating evidence.**

**The subject of the allegation or complaint must not be questioned or interviewed prior to receiving clearance from the OIG and the OIA's approval.** This is to ensure against procedural errors, as well as to safeguard the rights of the subject(s).

### Supporting Documentation

A Referral of Incident form (BP-A715.012) and all supporting documentation (e.g. victim or witness statements, medical reports, photos, BP-583/586, and related memoranda), must be sent to the OIA immediately.

If an inmate alleges physical or sexual abuse by a staff member, and has not received a medical examination, the CEO **must** arrange an immediate, confidential medical examination and forward a copy of the results to the OIA as soon as possible. PREA related protocols must be followed, accordingly.

Contact the OIA immediately if there is any question as to the classification of the misconduct. It is important to note that case classifications are often based upon limited information.

All signed Referral of Incident forms (BP-S715.012 or BP-S774.012), in tandem with appropriate predating information, should be scanned as a single file (via .pdf, Adobe Acrobat) and sent directly to the OIA via e-mail: OIA BOPNet GroupWise mailbox, "BOP-DIR/InternalAffairs-Referrals~." The signed Referral of Incident form should appear on the top of the file with all supporting documentation underneath.

# Reporting Incidents of Misconduct

---

## Complaints

Matters designated by the OIA as complaints are forwarded to the CEO via memorandum. Such complaints will be categorized as follows: Complaint for Information, Complaint for Disposition, and Complaint for Investigation.

Additionally, correspondence received by the OIA, which has been determined to not include any discernable allegation of staff misconduct, will be forwarded to the CEO directly.

During Fiscal Year 2018, the OIA reviewed 793 items, which did not contain any discernable allegation of staff misconduct. These matters were forwarded to the CEO directly.

A **Complaint for Information** will be sent via memorandum in the event the OIA has reviewed a referred matter, and determined the allegation(s) do not rise to a level of staff misconduct.

During Fiscal Year 2018, the OIA opened 290 matters as a Complaint for Information.

A **Complaint for Disposition** will be sent via memorandum for CEO edification and review. A summary of the CEO's findings is not required by the OIA. Should the CEO determine, however, that any misconduct might have occurred, he/she will make an appropriate referral back to the OIA in accordance with policy. These complaints are generally received from external sources (e.g. deferred by OIG) for OIA review.

During Fiscal Year 2018, the OIA opened 1,722 matters as a Complaint for Disposition.

A **Complaint for Investigation** will be sent via memorandum for additional fact-finding and inquiry. The CEO response should be inclusive of the following: statements from complainants and/or witnesses; any supporting documentation affiliated with complaint findings; and CEO recommendations in a signed memorandum. In the event the CEO believes misconduct may have occurred in the course of reviewing this matter, the CEO will submit a referral referencing the OIA complaint number provided. Documentation for investigative complaints should be sent via e-mail to the OIA GroupWise mailbox: "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs-Local Investigative Packets~"

During Fiscal Year 2018, the OIA opened 79 matters as a Complaint for Investigation.



## Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations

---

The CEO must receive OIA approval prior to initiating a local investigation. Investigator must forward the complete investigative packet for all misconduct investigations directly to the OIA for approval **prior** to forwarding it to the CEO for action. These procedures apply to **all** local staff misconduct investigations in which BOP employees are the subject (Classification 1, 2, and 3 allegations), regardless of whether any misconduct will be sustained.

### Where to Send Local Investigative Packets

Local investigative packets should be sent via e-mail to the OIA GroupWise mailbox: "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs-Local Investigative Packets~" (not to be confused with OIA's main resource mailbox, "BOP-DIR/Internal Affairs~"). The subject of your e-mail message should include the OIA case number and the facility mnemonic code (e.g., 2019-00001-BUX).

To ensure local investigative packets are reviewed by the OIA in a timely manner, packets should **not** be sent to either any individual OIA staff member or directly to any OIA field office.

### Format for Local Investigative Packets and What to Send

Local investigative packets should include the investigative report (signed by the investigator) and all supporting documentation (e.g. affidavits, memorandums, video files, etc.). Note: The Summary of Investigation for Classification 3 Cases form (BP-A716.012) is no longer applicable and should not be used.

Documents must be scanned as .pdf format (Adobe Acrobat), and saved as follows:

Investigative Report (OIA Case Number)  
Affidavits and MOIs (OIA Case Number)  
Supporting Documentation (OIA Case Number)

**Do not send documents in other formats (e.g., .tif files, .docx files).**

**Do not send an e-mail that exceeds 14.0 MB in size (including attachments).**

Affidavit files should include the "Warning and Assurance to Employee Required to Provide Information" (BP-A194.012), if applicable, as well as the signed oath for each individual. The investigative packet should not include national policy or any documents not specifically related to the investigation (e.g., staff rosters, inmate SENTRY information, etc.).



# Review of Local Staff Misconduct Investigations

---

## Time Guidelines

Local investigators must complete investigative packets and forward to the OIA within **120 calendar days** of the date a local investigation was authorized by the OIA.

Once received, the OIA will complete their review of the local investigative packet within 10 business days. The local investigator will be advised as to whether the investigative packet is approved, or if additional information is required. This information will be sent via e-mail to the local investigator with a copy to the CEO. If additional information is required, the local investigator should forward the additional information to the OIA within 30 calendar days, who will again notify the local investigator and CEO if the packet has been approved. Once approved, the local investigator should forward the investigative packet to the CEO for appropriate action with **all** requisite “Review of Local Investigative Packet” forms attached.

**No disciplinary proceedings or other notifications to subject(s) should occur prior to the OIA's approval of the investigative packet.**

## Reports from the OIA

The OIA sends the CEO a monthly report of all local staff misconduct investigations which have extended past established deadlines. SIAs/SISs should continue to work with the monitoring Agent assigned to their facility on an ongoing and recurring basis. SIA/SIS should provide updates on any outstanding matters. The Agent will provide guidance, as needed.

## Reported Misconduct

All allegations of misconduct received by the OIA are reviewed and classified. Allegations classified as Category 1 or 2 matters are immediately referred to the OIG for review and disposition. The OIG determines which matters they will accept for investigation and possible criminal prosecution and defers other matters to the OIA for investigation. The OIA coordinates with the OIG and/or the FBI when investigations may lead to criminal prosecution or when there are allegations involving the deprivation of an individual's rights under color of law.

### NOTES

Due to the dynamic nature of the OIA database, figures in this report are subject to change. During the course of an investigation, evidence may indicate circumstances other than those initially reported, causing data to be added, deleted, and/or changed. There is no nexus between reported and sustained allegations.

The number of subjects exceeds the number of cases throughout this report as some cases have multiple subjects. Also, some subjects may be charged with multiple types of misconduct in a single case, causing the number of allegations to be higher. Finally, individual employees may be subjects in more than one case.

Allegations referred to as "Inmate Related" included some type of inmate involvement, while allegations referred to as "Non Inmate Related" occurred in the workplace but did not include inmate involvement. For a complete list of the types of misconduct included in each category, please reference the Appendices section of this report.

\*\* Unless otherwise noted, the figures for this report (Fiscal Year 2018) were generated on October 16, 2018.

For those matters deferred for investigation, the OIA determines, after consulting with relevant BOP management officials, whether an on-site investigation is warranted, or if the matter can be investigated at the local institution level. Allegations categorized as Classification 3 offenses are referred to the OIG via computer extract on a monthly basis.

During Fiscal Year 2018, the OIA opened 4,670 cases involving 5,837 BOP employees, 22 contract employees working in BOP facilities, 46 Public Health Service (PHS) employees working in BOP facilities, one volunteer working in BOP facilities, 115 contract/residential reentry center employees, four drug treatment contractors, and 145 employees working in privatized facilities.

These 4,670 cases represent a slight 6.3 percent increase from the 4,392 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2017. The rate of reported misconduct among BOP employees increased 8.7 percent from Fiscal Year 2017.

The 4,670 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018 were classified as follows:

Classification 1	1,120
Classification 2	1,381
Classification 3	2,169

## Reported Misconduct

Cases classified as Classification 1 offenses showed an increase of 8.3 percent, while cases classified as Classification 2 offenses showed an increase of 16.5 percent. Cases classified as Classification 3 offenses showed a decrease of 0.05 percent.

Table 1: Types of Reported Misconduct - Fiscal Year 2018					
Types of Misconduct	Number of Reported Allegations				
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL	% Change from 2017
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,695</b>	<b>4,662</b>	<b>551</b>	<b>10,908</b>	<b>+12.50</b>
Abuse of Inmates	1,025			1,025	+28.29
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	623			623	+48.33
Introduction of Contraband	372	126		498	-1.31
Discrimination	1	3		4	-60.00
Fiscal Improprieties	142	305		447	-11.49
Bribery	84	8		92	-23.08
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	601			601	+7.20
Investigative Violations		90		90	-15.09
Personnel Prohibitions		908	50	958	+11.14
Unauthorized Release of Information	119	65		184	+19.48
Inattention to Duty	369	434		803	±0.00
Breach of Security	248	208		456	+8.06
Unprofessional Conduct	796	961		1,487	+18.68
Failure to Follow Policy	677	542		1,219	+5.18
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	593		593	+19.32
Other On-Duty Misconduct	638	419		1,057	-5.96
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			501	501	+17.33

**Table 1** provides a breakdown of those categories of misconduct reported during Fiscal Year 2018.

**Note:** A single case may contain multiple allegations; therefore, the number of misconduct allegations exceeds the number of opened cases.



## Reported Misconduct

---

### USA Patriot Act

In the aftermath of September 11, 2001, Congress passed the USA PATRIOT Act, signed into law by President George W. Bush on October 26, 2001. One of the provisions of the Patriot Act addressed reporting any potential abuse(s) of individual civil rights and liberties by DOJ employees involving violence, discrimination, or threats. Accordingly, the Patriot Act mandated that the OIG widely advertise receiving allegations and any associated investigations of violence, discrimination, or threats on the part of a DOJ employee; particularly when such cases are directed toward individuals or groups associated with the public's perception of "extremist ideology" pertaining to an individual's religious beliefs, place of birth, and/or appearance. Patriot Act allegations typically reported to the OIA involve alleged mistreatment or unprofessional behavior of BOP staff toward/around certain inmates, their visitors, or members of the public.

**Due to the sensitivity of these allegations, they are automatically classified as Classification 2 or higher offenses; they should be forwarded immediately to the OIA.** All Patriot Act violation allegations are referred to a Special Operations Unit at OIG Headquarters, devoted to reviewing and investigating such alleged misconduct.

Of the 4,670 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018, three cases involved Patriot Act violations. As of October 16, 2018, two cases remained open pending investigation.

Of the 4,392 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2017, 11 cases involved Patriot Act violations. As of October 16, 2018, three cases remained open pending investigation, and eight cases were closed. No allegations were sustained.



## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### NOTES

All figures in this section relate to cases, which were opened during Fiscal Year 2018 and were closed as of October 16, 2018. Figures are subject to change as additional cases are closed, and only relate to cases which were sustained and not sustained.

Please refer to the appendices section of this report for the types of misconduct sustained against BOP employees in cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018.

As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made on 1,037 (22.2 percent) of the 4,670 cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018. The remaining 3,633 cases (77.8 percent) were still open pending investigation. Of the 1,037 cases closed, the majority, 952 (91.8 percent), were investigated at the institution level (“local investigation”) with authorization and monitoring provided by the OIA. Of the 1,037 cases closed, 61 (5.9 percent) were OIA on-site investigations, 23 (2.2 percent) were investigated by the OIG, and one (0.1 percent) was investigated by the Office of the Surgeon General.

Of the 1,037 cases closed, 227 (21.9 percent) were sustained. Misconduct was sustained against 179 BOP employees, six contract

employees working in BOP facilities, two PHS employees working in BOP facilities, five contract/residential reentry center employees, one Drug Treatment Contractor, and 53 employees working in privatized facilities.

### BOP Employees

Out of 35,148 active-duty BOP employees, there were 5,837 BOP employees identified as subjects of alleged misconduct in cases opened during Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 19.6 percent of those employees. Of the 19.6 percent (or 1,144 employees), 15.6 percent (179) had a sustained decision (0.52 percent of total BOP employees). Of the 5,837 BOP employees for whom a case was opened during Fiscal Year 2018, as of October 16, 2018, 389 were unidentified.

**Table 2** (on the following page) reflects the categories of misconduct sustained against BOP employees with a decision as of October 16, 2018. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct was Personnel Prohibitions.

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 2: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2018 With 22.2 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>264</b>
Abuse of Inmates	3			3
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	4			4
Introduction of Contraband	3	8		11
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	2	11		13
Bribery	1	1		2
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	16			16
Investigative Violations		0		0
Personnel Prohibitions		47	3	50
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	3		4
Inattention to Duty	16	18		34
Breach of Security	7	12		19
Unprofessional Conduct	4	16		20
Failure to Follow Policy	14	27		41
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	16		16
Other On-Duty Misconduct	5	7		12
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			19	19

# Closed/Sustained Misconduct

---

## Disciplinary Process

Once a subject is investigated and the allegations are sustained, the type of disciplinary action taken is left to the deciding official, generally the CEO. Since each case is unique, with varying degrees of seriousness attached to the allegation of misconduct, disciplinary actions may vary from case-to-case. In addition, a subject may be charged with multiple types of misconduct in any particular incident(s). The *Douglas* factors<sup>1</sup> must be considered when deciding the appropriate penalty to impose on employees if the penalty will be an adverse action.

## *Douglas* Factors

The *Douglas* factors derive from the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB)<sup>2</sup> decision, *Douglas v. Veterans Administration*. In *Douglas*, the MSPB identified a non-exhaustive list of twelve factors which deciding officials must evaluate in determining the appropriate penalty to impose in cases of sustained employee misconduct. The specific *Douglas* factors are as follows:

- The nature and seriousness of the offense;
- The employee's job level and type of employment;
- The employee's disciplinary record;
- The employee's past work record, including length of service and duty performance;
- The effect of the offense on the employee's ability to perform and its effect on the supervisor's confidence in such ability;
- The consistency of the penalty with penalties imposed upon others for like or similar misconduct;
- The consistency of the penalty with the BOP's table of penalties (Program Statement 3420.11, Standards of Employee Conduct);
- The notoriety of the offense or its impact on the BOP's reputation;
- The clarity with which the employee was on notice of any rules violated or warned about the conduct in question;
- The employee's potential for rehabilitation;

---

<sup>1</sup>See *Douglas vs. Veterans Administration*, 5 M.S.P.R. 280 (1981).

<sup>2</sup> The Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) is an independent, quasi-judicial agency in the Executive branch that serves as the guardian of Federal merit systems. The MSPB has jurisdiction over appeals of agency adverse actions (to include removals, suspensions of more than 14 days, and reductions in grade or pay), among other matters.

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

---

- Any and all mitigating circumstances surrounding the offense (e.g., job stress/tension, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment or bad faith, malice or provocation on the part of others involved);
- The adequacy and effectiveness of alternative sanctions.

The CEO is required to consider only relevant *Douglas* factors, and need not consider all the *Douglas* factors in every case. In addition, some of the *Douglas* factors may weigh in favor of a serious penalty, while others may weigh in favor of mitigation. It is incumbent upon the CEO to choose the appropriate penalty within these guidelines.

### Statistics

As of October 16, 2018, the following actions were taken against (or by) those BOP employees with a sustained decision (FY18):

Written Reprimand.....	61
Resignation.....	37
Suspension .....	50
No Action.....	8
Retirement.....	10
Termination .....	9
Oral Reprimand.....	0
Combined With Action in another OIA Matter.....	1
Demotion.....	4
Other .....	2

The specific types of misconduct most frequently sustained against those individuals for whom no disciplinary action was taken were Personnel Prohibitions and Failure to Follow Policy.



## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

---

### Gender

There were 4,218 male BOP employees identified as misconduct subjects in Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 20.5 percent of those 4,218 male employees. Of the 20.5 percent (or 866 male employees), 15.8 percent (137) had a sustained decision (0.52 percent of total male BOP staff).

There were 1,230 female BOP employees identified as misconduct subjects in Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 18.0 percent of those 1,230 female employees. Of the 18.0 percent (or 221 female employees), 21.3 percent (47) had a sustained decision (0.49 percent of total female BOP staff).

**Tables 3 and 4** (on the following pages) reflect the categories of sustained allegations for male and female BOP employees with a sustained decision as of October 16, 2018. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct among male BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct among female BOP employees was Personnel Prohibitions.

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 3: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Male BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2018 With 22.2 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	3			3
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	1			1
Introduction of Contraband	1	6		7
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	2	8		10
Bribery	1	1		2
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	14			14
Investigative Violations		0		0
Personnel Prohibitions		36	2	38
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	2		2
Inattention to Duty	11	14		25
Breach of Security	6	12		18
Unprofessional Conduct	2	11		13
Failure to Follow Policy	9	23		32
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	9		9
Other On-Duty Misconduct	5	5		10
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			17	17

Those categories of misconduct highlighted in red were sustained with greater frequency among male BOP staff than among female BOP staff.

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

Table 4: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Female BOP Employees - Fiscal Year 2018 With 22.2 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	0			0
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	3			3
Introduction of Contraband	2	2		4
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	0	3		3
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	2			2
Investigative Violations		0		0
Personnel Prohibitions		11	1	12
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	1		2
Inattention to Duty	5	4		9
Breach of Security	1	0		1
Unprofessional Conduct	2	5		7
Failure to Follow Policy	4	4		8
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	7		7
Other On-Duty Misconduct	0	2		2
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			2	2

Those categories of misconduct highlighted in red were sustained with greater frequency among female BOP staff than among male BOP staff.



## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### Job Discipline

As of October 16, 2018, 179 BOP employees identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2018 had a sustained decision. Of the 179 BOP employees with a sustained decision as of October 16, 2018, 149 were bargaining unit employees and 30 were non-bargaining unit employees.

**Table 5** reflects the rate of misconduct among the various job disciplines.

<b>Table 5: Discipline of BOP Employees With Sustained Misconduct - FY 2018 With 22.2 Percent Closed</b>			
<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Total Employees</b>	<b>Number of Employees With Sustained Misconduct</b>	<b>Rate Per 100 Total Employees</b>
Human Resources	421	2	0.48
Mechanical Services	2,344	11	0.47
Psychology Services	1,101	5	0.45
Recreation	742	3	0.40
CEOs Office and Staff	884	2	0.23
Food Service	1,628	10	0.61
Computer Services	224	0	0.00
Correctional Services	15,926	101	0.63
Health Services/Safety	2,528	17	0.67
Unit Management	2,881	5	0.17
Religious Services	298	1	0.34
Records/Inmate Systems	983	1	0.10
Education & Vocational Training	1,018	2	0.46
Financial Management	1,546	2	0.20
Central Office/Staff Training Centers	1,754	12	0.68
UNICOR	449	5	1.11
Inmate Services	343	0	0.00
Other*	207	0	0.00

\* "Other" staff includes those assigned to special programs (i.e. ICC).

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### Residential Reentry Center Employees and Drug Treatment Contractors

There were 115 contract/residential reentry center employees identified as misconduct subjects in Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 41.2 percent of those 115 employees. Of the 41.2 percent (or 47 employees), 10.6 percent (5) had a sustained decision.

There were four drug treatment contractors identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 75.0 percent of the four drug treatment contractors. Of the 75.0 percent (or three drug treatment contractors), 33.3 percent (one) had a sustained decision. The one allegation of Investigative Violations was sustained against the drug treatment contractor.

Table 6: Sustained Misconduct – Residential Reentry Center Employees / Drug Treatment Contractors – FY 2018			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	5		
Investigative Violations		1	
Unauthorized Release of Information	0	1	
Inattention to Duty	1	0	
Failure to Follow Policy	2	0	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	1	0	

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### Staff in Privatized Facilities

There were 145 employees working in privatized facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2018. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 71.0 percent of those 145 employees. Of the 71.0 percent (or 103 employees), 51.5 percent (53) had a sustained decision.

**Table 7** provides a breakdown of the categories of misconduct sustained against employees working in privatized facilities. The most frequently sustained category of misconduct for staff working in privatized facilities was Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates.

Table 7: Types of Sustained Misconduct for Staff in Privatized Facilities - Fiscal Year 2018 With 71.0 Percent Closed				
Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
Abuse of Inmates	3			3
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	2			2
Introduction of Contraband	2	2		4
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	0	1		1
Bribery	0	0		0
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	19			19
Investigative Violations		9		9
Personnel Prohibitions		2	1	3
Unauthorized Release of Information	1	0		1
Inattention to Duty	7	7		14
Breach of Security	4	4		8
Unprofessional Conduct	3	8		11
Failure to Follow Policy	9	2		11
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions			0	0
Other On-Duty Misconduct	5	5		10
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			2	2



## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### Contract Employees and Volunteers Working in BOP Facilities

There were 22 contract employees and one volunteer working in BOP facilities identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2018.

As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 45.5 percent of the 22 contract employees. Of the 45.5 percent (or 10 contract employees), 60.0 percent (six) had a sustained decision.

As of October 16, 2018, a decision had not been made for the one volunteer with an allegation of misconduct.

Table 8: Sustained Misconduct - Contract Employees/Volunteers – FY 2018			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Introduction of Contraband	0	1	
Inappropriate Relationship with Inmates	3		
Inattention to Duty	1	0	
Breach of Security	1	0	
Other On-Duty Misconduct	2	0	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			1

## Closed/Sustained Misconduct

### PHS Employees Working in BOP Facilities

Of the approximately 784 PHS employees working in BOP facilities, 46 were identified as misconduct subjects during Fiscal Year 2018 (5.9 percent). As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 19.6 percent of those 46 PHS employees. Of the 19.6 percent (or 9 PHS employees), 22.2 percent (2) had a sustained decision, for a sustained rate of 0.26 percent of total PHS employees working in BOP facilities.

Table 9: Sustained Misconduct – PHS Employees – FY18			
Allegation	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty
Breach of Security	0	1	
Unprofessional Conduct	0	2	
Failure to Follow Policy	0	1	
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			1

# Physical Abuse of Inmates

---

## Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 13 - Civil Rights

### §241 Conspiracy against rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having exercised the same; or

If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured --

They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.

### §242 Deprivation of rights under color of law

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

If bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or may be sentenced to death.



## Physical Abuse of Inmates

---

### Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2018, 474 allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates were either reported to the OIA, or detected during the course of an investigation. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 23.2 percent (or 110) of those allegations. Allegations of Physical Abuse are tracked by the degree of injury sustained by the inmate(s)--life threatening injury, serious injury, minor/slight injury, minor/no injury (harassment), and superficial injury (injuries associated with the normal use of restraints). Five allegations of Physical Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2018 were sustained as of October 16, 2018, stemming from four separate incidents. Two inmates involved sustained minor/slight injury. Two inmates involved sustained minor/no injury. Two subjects with a sustained allegation of Physical Abuse of Inmates were BOP employees. One of the BOP employees was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation. One of the BOP employees resigned as a result of the sustained allegation. Three subjects with a sustained allegation of Physical Abuse of Inmates were staff at a privatized facility. One of the privatized employees was terminated as a result of the sustained allegation. One of the privatized employees resigned as a result of the sustained allegation. One of the privatized employees received a three day suspension as a result of the sustained allegation. None of the involved staff was criminally prosecuted.

# Introduction of Contraband

---

## Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 87 - Prisons

### §1791 Providing or possessing contraband in prison

(a) Offense.-Whoever-

(1) In violation of a statute or a rule or order issued under a statute, provides to an inmate of a prison a prohibited object, or attempts to do so; or

(2) being an inmate of a prison, makes, possesses, or obtains, or attempts to make or obtain, a prohibited object;

shall be punished as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) Punishment.-The punishment for an offense under this section is a fine under this title or-

(1) imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(C) of this section;

(2) imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(A) of this section;

(3) imprisonment for no more than 5 years, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(B) of this section;

(4) imprisonment for no more than one year, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(D) or (c)(1)(E) of this section; and

(5) imprisonment for not more than six months, or both, if the object is specified in subsection (d)(1)(F) of this section.

(c) Any punishment imposed under subsection (b) for a violation of this section by an inmate of a prison shall be consecutive to the sentence being served by such inmate at the time the inmate commits such violation.

(d) Definitions.-As used in this section-

(1) the term “prohibited object” means:

(A) A firearm or destructive device or a controlled substance in Section I or II, other than marijuana or a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (C) of this subsection;

## Introduction of Contraband

---

(B) marijuana or a controlled substance in schedule III, other than a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (C) of this subsection, ammunition, a weapon (other than a firearm or destructive device), or an object that is designed or intended to be used as a weapon or to facilitate escape from a prison;

(C) a narcotic drug, methamphetamine, its salts, isomers, and salts of its isomers, lysergic acid diethylamide, or phencyclidine;

(D) a controlled substance (other than a controlled substance referred to in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of this subsection) or an alcoholic beverage;

(E) any United States or foreign currency; and

(F) any other object that threatens the order, discipline, or security of a prison, or the life, health, or safety of an individual;

(2) the terms “ammunition,” “firearm,” and “destructive device” have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 921 of this title;

(3) the terms “controlled substance” and “narcotic drug” have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 USC, §802); and

(4) the term “prison” means a Federal correctional, detention, or penal facility or any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of our pursuant to a contract or agreement with the Attorney General.



## Introduction of Contraband

### Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2018, 498 allegations of Introduction of Contraband were either reported or detected during the course of an investigation. As of October 16, 2018, a decision had been made for 18.7 percent (or 93) of those allegations. Of the 18.7 percent, 21.5 percent (20) were sustained:

Table 10: Introduction of Contraband		
Type of Contraband	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related
Soft Item	3	0
Weapons*	0	3
Unauthorized Electronic Device	1	8
Cigarettes/Tobacco	1	
Other Unspecified Drugs	2	2

\*Includes 1 Handguns and 2 Weapon classified as "Other"

There were 20 individuals involved in the sustained allegations of Introduction of Contraband. Fifteen of these individuals were BOP employees (10 male and five female). Eight of the BOP employees worked in Correctional Services, five worked in Health Services/Safety, one worked in Psychology Services, and one in Recreation. Four of the individuals with a sustained allegation were staff working in privatized facilities and one was a contract staff working in a BOP facility.

# Sexual Abuse of Inmates

## Title 18, United States Code, Chapter 109A - Sexual Abuse

### §2241 Aggravated Sexual Abuse

(a) By force or threat. - Whoever, in the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly causes another person to engage in a sexual act -

(1) by using force against that other person, or

(2) by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both.

(b) By other means. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly -

(1) renders another person unconscious and thereby engages in a sexual act with that other person; or

(2) administers to another person by force or threat of force, or without the knowledge or permission of that person, a drug, intoxicant, or other similar substance and thereby -

(A) substantially impairs the ability of that other person to appraise or control conduct; and

(B) engages in a sexual act with that other person;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or life, or both.

### §2242 Sexual Abuse

Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly -

(1) causes another person to engage in a sexual act by threatening or placing that other person in fear (other than by threatening or placing that other person in fear that any person will be subjected to death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping); or

## Sexual Abuse of Inmates

---

(2) engages in a sexual act with another person if that other person is -

- (A) incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct; or
- (B) physically incapable of declining participation in, or communicating unwillingness to engage in, that sexual act;

or attempts to do so shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years or for life.

### §2243 Sexual Abuse of a Ward

(b) Of a ward - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in a sexual act with another person who is -

- (1) in official detention; and
- (2) under the custodial, supervisory, or disciplinary authority of the person so engaging;

or attempts to do so, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than 15 years, or both.

### §2244 Abusive Sexual Contact

(a) Sexual contact in circumstances where sexual acts are punished by this chapter. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States or in a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of or pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in or causes sexual contact with or by another person, if so to do would violate -

- (1) subsection (a) or (b) of section 2241 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than ten years, or both;
- (2) section 2242 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than three years, or both;
- (3) subsection (a) of section 2243 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than two years, or both;
- (4) subsection (b) of section 2243 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title, imprisoned not more than two years, or both.
- (5) subsection (c) of section 2241 of this title had the sexual contact been a sexual act, shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for any term of years or for life.



## Sexual Abuse of Inmates

---

(b) In Other Circumstances. - Whoever, in the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, or a Federal prison, or in any prison, institution, or facility in which persons are held in custody by direction of our pursuant to a contract or agreement with the head of any Federal department or agency, knowingly engages in sexual contact with another person without that other person's permission shall be fined under this title, imprisoned no more than two years, or both.

### § 2246 Definitions

(1) the term "prison" means a correctional, detention, or penal facility;

(2) the term "sexual act" means -

(A) contact between the penis and the vulva or the penis and the anus, and for the purposes of this subparagraph, contact involved the penis occurs upon penetration, however slight;

(B) contact between the mouth and the penis, the mouth and the vulva, or the mouth and the anus; or

(C) the penetration, however slight, of the anal or genital opening by another by a hand or finger or by any object, with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(D) the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of another person who has not attained the age of 16 years with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(3) the term "sexual contact" means the intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person with intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade, or arouse or gratify the sexual desire of any person;

(4) the term "serious bodily injury" means bodily injury that involves a substantial risk of death, unconsciousness, extreme physical pain, protracted and obvious disfigurement, or protracted loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty.

(5) the term "official detention" means -

(A) detention by a Federal officer or employee, or under the direction of a Federal officer or employee, following arrest for an offense; following surrender in lieu of an arrest for an offense; following a charge or conviction of an offense, or an allegation or finding of juvenile delinquency; following commitment as a material witness; following civil commitment in lieu of criminal proceedings or pending resumption of criminal



## Sexual Abuse of Inmates

---

proceedings that are being held in abeyance, or pending extradition, deportation, or exclusion; or

(B) custody by a Federal officer or employee, or under the direction of a Federal Officer or employee, for purposes incident to any detention described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, including transportation, medical diagnosis or treatment, court appearance, work, and recreation; but does not include supervision or under control (other than custody during specified hours or days) after release on bail, probation, or parole, or after release following a juvenile delinquency.

Note: Reference the most recent and relevant program statements pertaining to the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA): PREA G5324A.03; as well as Sexually Abusive Behavior Prevention and Intervention Program, 5324.12.

## Sexual Abuse of Inmates

---

### Statistics

During Fiscal Year 2018, 617 allegations of Sexual Abuse were either reported to the OIA or detected during the course of an investigation. Of the 671 allegations, 555 involved BOP employees, five involved PHS employees working in a BOP facility, 32 involved contract staff working in residential reentry facilities, 22 involved staff working in privatized facilities, two involved contract staff working in a BOP facility, and one involved a drug treatment contractor.

The allegations that appeared with the most frequency were Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature between male staff and male inmates, with 226 allegations reported, and Abusive Sexual Contact between male staff and male inmates, with 134 allegations reported.

As of October 1, 2018, six allegations of Sexual Abuse reported during Fiscal Year 2018 were sustained. Four hundred twenty (420) allegations reported during Fiscal Year 2018 were pending.

## Representative Case Summaries

---

Though the outcome, discipline and disposition of any investigated case may vary, the following are brief summaries of some of the cases, which were completed recently:

- **Physical Abuse of an Inmate – Minor/Slight Injury:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility engaged in physical abuse of an inmate, resulting in minor injuries. During his interview, the subject admitted using profanity towards the inmate in the presence of staff and other inmates. Specifically, the subject stated he told the inmate, "Be a fucking man and say it to my face." The subject stated he did place his hands around the inmate's neck, which the staff admitted was not within the use of force policy. The subject stated he told the Lieutenant following the incident, "[The inmate] said something and I snapped and grabbed him. I fucked up." The subject stated he was familiar with the use of force policy at the time of the incident. Staff witness statements, documentation and video evidence supported the subject's statement. Accordingly, the allegations of Physical Abuse of Inmates (Minor/Slight Injury) and Unprofessional Conduct was sustained. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2018-02511)

- **Excessive Use of Force:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility used excessive force during an immediate use of force incident. The subject observed an inmate on inmate fight and initiated an Immediate Use of Force. Video evidence of the incident shows the inmate was in the process of complying with staff instructions prior to the subject forcefully tackling the inmate. Once the inmate was on the ground, the subject is observed striking the inmate with a closed fist. The subject admitted the force used was excessive. Accordingly, the allegation of Excessive Use of Force was sustained. The subject received a 5-day suspension.

(OIA-2018-01869)

- **Excessive Use of Force – OC Spray, Endangering the Safety of an Inmate, Failure to Follow Policy:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility used excessive force by deploying OC spray on an inmate housed alone in the Special Housing Unit without justification. Specifically, the inmate was allegedly refusing to accept a cellmate assignment. The subject stated the inmate threatened to harm staff and inmates if he was forced to accept a cellmate. The subject instructed the inmate to submit to hand restraints. When the inmate refused to comply, the subject deployed his OC spray through the food slot. The subject deployed four bursts of OC spray and then departed the range. A second male Correctional Officer then shut off water to the inmate's cell. The subject who deployed the OC spray received a 2-day suspension. The subject who turned off the water received a 1-day suspension.

(OIA-2017-02947)



## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Threatening an Inmate/Verbal Abuse:**

A local investigation revealed a male Captain at a BOP facility threatened an inmate who refused to sign a medical consent form. Specifically, an inmate with a diagnosed psychological disorder had refused to take prescribed medication. Multiple witness statements corroborated the inmate was threatened that if she did not sign the consent form for her medications, staff would be forced to use electroconvulsive therapy. The subject then said, “We will put a helmet on your head and shock you and give you a shot in the ass.” The inmate signed the consent form, but the form was invalidated later that day because the form was signed under duress. The subject received a 5-day suspension. (OIA-2017-05695)

- **Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward - Male Staff/Female Inmate:**

An OIG investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility engaged in Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward with a female inmate. The OIG investigation substantiated that the subject was admittedly involved in an inappropriate sexual relationship with the inmate and committed violations of sexual abuse and sexual contact with the inmate. The inmate told the OIG that she had twice engaged in sexual intercourse with the subject in a supply closet located at the institution. When interviewed by the OIG, the subject confessed to twice having sexual intercourse with the inmate in a supply closet. The subject was arrested based on a criminal indictment, charging him with one count of Sexual Abuse of a Ward, 18 U.S.C. 2243(b). The subject pled guilty to the indictment and was sentenced to 5 years of probation. The subject resigned from his position with the BOP. (OIA-2018-00949/OIG-2018-001482)

- **Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward - Female Staff/Male Inmate:**

An OIG investigation revealed a female Health Services staff at a BOP facility engaged in Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward with a male inmate. The OIG reviewed recorded telephone conversations, which indicated the subject, traveled to be with the inmate the weekend after his release from the BOP facility to a residential reentry center. The OIG also confirmed the subject rented a hotel room where she engaged in sexual intercourse with the inmate. Time and attendance records, cellular telephone records, and credit card records for the subject corroborated she was absent from work on sick leave during the time period in question and utilized her personal credit card to rent a room at a hotel which was located six miles from the residential reentry center in which the inmate was located. The subject declined an interview with the OIG. The U.S. Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Texas declined federal prosecution. The subject resigned prior to the completion of the investigation. (OIA-2018-02970/OIG-2017-009179)



## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Abusive Sexual Contact - Female Staff/Male Inmate:**

An OIG investigation revealed a female Lieutenant at a privatized facility engaged in Abusive Sexual Contact with a male inmate. The OIG Report of Incident revealed sufficient evidence indicating the subject was involved in a sexual relationship with the inmate. The subject admitted under oath to providing the inmate with \$100.00, contacting the inmate by phone at the institution, and performing oral sex on the inmate. During an initial interview, the subject denied all allegations. However, after being presented with the evidence, she admitted to the allegations in addition to lying to the investigator. The Western District of Texas sought prosecution in this matter and the subject was ultimately acquitted of criminal charges. The subject resigned from her position following her interview with the OIG.  
(OIA-2018-00774/OIG-2018-001472)

- **Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature - Female Staff/Male Inmate:**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer at a privatized facility engaged in Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature with a male inmate. The Report of Incident revealed sufficient evidence to support UCSN. Eyewitness accounts support the allegation that the female staff allowed the inmate to hug the subject and grope her breasts and buttocks on the outside of her clothing. In addition, the inmate admitted the subject kissed the inmate and rubbed his chest on the outside of his clothing. The subject was terminated from employment.  
(OIA-2018-00586/OIG-2018-001126)

- **Introduction of Contraband - Soft Item Introduction:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility engaged in Offering/Giving Anything of Value and Soft Item Introduction. The subject was alleged to have threatened an inmate with OC Spray then later gave the inmate a box of crayons as an apology. The subject admitted to bringing in crayons and giving them to an inmate. Additionally, video documentation and information gathered during the investigation, it could be determined that the subject knowingly introduced the crayons into the institution for the purpose of giving them to the inmate. The local investigation revealed insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations of Failure to Follow Policy-OC Spray, Unprofessional Conduct and Threatening an Inmate/Verbal Abuse against the subject. The allegations of Offering/Giving Anything of Value and Soft Item Introduction were sustained. The subject received a 2-day suspension.  
(OIA-2018-00177)

## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Introduction of Contraband - Weapons Introduction:**

A local investigation revealed a female Health Services staff at a BOP facility engaged in Weapons Introduction - Other. The correctional officer at the screening site noticed what appeared to be a weapon on the computer screen of the x-ray machine. The subject admitted to bringing in an orange plastic handled knife that had a blade length of approximately 3 inches, and had an extended total length of approximately 7 inches. The subject admitted to having previously introduced the knife on other occasions. The subject stated she was not aware the knife was a prohibited item but upon reviewing Program Statement 3740.02, Staff Entrance and Search Procedures, concurred the knife was a prohibited item. The allegation of Weapons Introduction - Other is sustained. The subject received a 2-day suspension.  
(OIA-2018-02018)

- **Introduction of Contraband - Unauthorized Electronics Device, Failure to Follow Policy, and Breach of Computer Security:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility introduced an unauthorized electronics device and connected the electronic device to the BOP computer violating policy and breaching computer security by connecting the electronics device. The Computer Services Manager reported that he received an alert that an iPhone was plugged in to a BOP computer located in a unit officer station. Based on the Device Control Report and witness testimony, the allegations of Unauthorized Electronics Device Introduction, Breach of Computer Security, and Failure to Follow Policy were sustained. No disciplinary action was taken due to the subject's resignation prior to the completion of the investigation. Should the subject return to service, this case will be re-opened and discipline may be taken at that time.  
(OIA-2018-00039)

- **Abuse of Sick Leave:**

A local investigation reveals a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility abused his sick leave. Specifically, the subject was observed at a local restaurant at a time he was on approved sick leave. The investigation revealed the subject had requested sick leave in conjunction with his days off on four (4) separate occasions within a period of approximately six (6) months. The subject admitted he was not sick, but that he wanted to spend time with his family. Accordingly, Abuse of Sick Leave was sustained. The subject was terminated.  
(OIA-2017-05506)



## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Theft/Misuse of Government Funds and Misuse of Official Position/Badge:**

A local investigation revealed an off-duty male Teacher at a BOP facility entered a college executive staff office for personal business involving his daughter, who was enrolled at the college. The subject demanded to speak with a specific executive, flashing his Bureau of Prisons credentials. The subject was wearing a BOP blazer with the Department of Justice seal and identified himself as a Department of Justice employee, giving the appearance he was acting in an official capacity. The subject later mailed a personal letter to the college executive on Bureau of Prisons letterhead, signing the letter with the title, "USDOJ Federal Law Enforcement Officer." The letter was mailed from the institution and postage was paid by the BOP. Accordingly, the allegations of Misuse of Official Position/Badge, Theft/Misuse of Government Property and Theft/Misuse of Government funds was sustained. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2018-00031)

- **Theft/Destruction of Inmate Property and Falsification of Documents:**

A local investigation revealed a female Correctional Officer at a BOP facility engaged in theft and destruction of inmate property. Specifically, when an inmate failed to show evidence that he had legitimately purchased a set of sweatpants and a sweatshirt; the subject took the items from the inmate and threw them in an outside trash receptacle. The subject then logged in TRUSCOPE that the items had been confiscated, implying confiscation procedures had been followed and a confiscation form was completed. However, the items were not taken to the Lieutenant's Office as required and a confiscation form was never completed. Accordingly, the allegations of Theft/Destruction of Inmate Property and Falsification of Documents were sustained. The subject received a 10-day suspension.

(OIA-2017-03390)

- **Voucher Falsification and Theft/Misuse of Government Funds:**

An OIA investigation revealed a male Food Services Administrator at a BOP facility falsified his relocation vouchers. Relocation staff reported that the documentation submitted by the subject shows the subject's family, to include his spouse and three children, traveled with the subject and occupied temporary quarters with him. However, the subject had not had any of his household goods packed, loaded, or shipped, and the lodging receipt shows the subject only occupied one hotel room each night for a period of two months. The voucher also claimed meals were nearly \$70.00 for each meal; breakfast, lunch, and dinner for the first thirty days, and nearly \$60.00 for each meal for the second thirty days of temporary quarters. The subject admitted that his family had not occupied temporary quarters with him and that he had filled the voucher as if they had, resulting in the subject receiving extra compensation for his relocation to which he was not entitled. The subject received a 14-day suspension.

(OIA-2017-05481)

## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Misuse of Purchase Charge Card:**

A local investigation revealed a male Chaplain at a BOP facility misused his government issued charge card. Specifically, the subject self-reported he inadvertently used the charge card for an unauthorized transaction at a local Walmart. The subject immediately realized his mistake and had the customer service at Walmart reverse the charge. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2018-01300)

- **Misuse of Government Computers and Unprofessional Conduct:**

A local investigation revealed two (2) female Correctional Officers at a BOP facility misused government computers and acted in an unprofessional manner. The subjects each admitted to sending emails containing profane language, racial epithets and sexual innuendos. The emails were sent utilizing a government computer during duty hours in violation of policy. Training records for the subjects show that each had successfully completed yearly training for Information Security Awareness prior to the emails being sent by them. Therefore, the allegations of Misuse of Government Computers and Unprofessional Conduct were sustained. One subject received a 1-day suspension. The second subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2018-00997)

- **Bribery:**

An OIG/FBI joint investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility provided contraband to an inmate in exchange for money. The subject met with an FBI undercover agent (UCA) to receive Suboxone that was to be given to an inmate at the institution. The subject received a \$5,000.00 payment from the UCA to provide the Suboxone to the inmate. The subject was arrested during the meeting with the UCA. The subject admitted during his in custody interview that he had accepted \$5,000 to provide the Suboxone to the inmate. Institution video evidence shows the subject had provided tobacco to an inmate inside the institution. The subject was indicted on bribery (Title 18 United States Code 201) charges. The subject pleaded guilty to accepting bribes (Title 18 United States Code 201). The subject was sentenced to 24 months incarceration and 36 months supervised release. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2018-03592/OIG-2017-009390)



## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship and Misuse of Government Computers:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility printed pictures for an inmate using his office computer. Specifically, two (2) staff reported they observed the subject give the inmate a printout. The inmate stated the subject and other staff regularly printed pictures for inmates, but would not reveal the identity of the other staff. The subject said he printed the pictures for the inmate on three (3) occasions. The subject stated he has not done this for other inmates and has not received anything in return. The subject received a 13-day suspension.

(OIA-2018-00084)

- **Inattention to Duty, Endangering the Safety of an Inmate, and Lying During an Official Investigation:**

A local investigation revealed a female Health Services staff at a privatized institution provided the incorrect medication to inmates and attempted to cover up her mistake by hiding the incorrect medication packets. The subject lied during her initial interview with the investigative agent and later admitted to her mistake during a subsequent interview. The allegations of Endangering the Safety of Inmates, Inattention to Duty, and Lying During an Official Investigation were sustained. The subject resigned immediately following the interview.

(OIA-2018-01620)

- **Advising Someone to Violate Policy:**

An OIA investigation revealed male Special Investigative Agent at a BOP facility advised the front lobby officer to allow a staff member to bring a personal mobile phone into the subject's office. The subject states he needed to review evidence on the phone for an approved staff misconduct investigation. The CEO was not made aware that the phone would be brought into the office and did not give approval. Although the subject's office was not within the secure confines of the institution, policy still requires the CEO's consent prior to allowing a prohibited item beyond the screening site. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2017-06762)

## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Conducting an Unauthorized Investigation:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility conducted an unauthorized investigation. Specifically, the subject utilized a BOP computer to investigate an inmate after locating a note on the inmate, which lead the subject to believe the inmate was maintaining several social media accounts while incarcerated. The subject used the Google search engine to investigate several social media accounts referenced on the inmate's note. Witness statements revealed the subject called a phone number found on the inmate's note, but that the subject did not speak to the person that answered the phone. The subject was not authorized to conduct an investigation of the inmate. The subject received a 1-day suspension.  
(OIA-2017-05356)

- **Failure to Report Violation of Rules/Regulations and Inattention to Duty:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility failed to report an incident that resulted in the damage of BOP property. Specifically, while on duty as Mobile Patrol officer, the subject was inattentive to safe driving practices and drove the vehicle into a guardrail. The subject did not report the incident and did not provide a memorandum until his supervisor questioned him about the damage the following day. Accordingly, the allegations of Failure to Report Violation of Rules/Regulations and Inattention to Duty were sustained. The subject received a 2-day suspension.  
(OIA-2018-00602)

- **Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs:**

A local investigation revealed a female Secretary at a BOP facility tested positive for illegal substances. Specifically, a random urinalysis tested positive for amphetamines, hydrocodone and hydromorphone. The subject denied the allegation and a second test was administered. The second test also tested positive for amphetamines, hydrocodone and hydromorphone. The subject was terminated.  
(OIA-2018-02380)

- **Inappropriate Supervisor/Subordinate Relationship:**

An OIA investigation revealed a male Associate Warden (AW) at a BOP facility engaged in an inappropriate relationship with his subordinate. Multiple staff reported observing the subject and subordinate acting suspicious around each other. On one occasion, staff reported observing the subordinate typing on the subject's computer while sitting on the subject's lap. The subject and his subordinate admitted to sending multiple sexually explicit text messages and pictures between the subordinate's personal mobile phone and the subject's BOP issued mobile phone. The subject and his subordinate admitted to engaging in oral sex and sexual intercourse on multiple occasions in the AW's storage office at the institution. The subject retired prior to disciplinary action.  
(OIA-2018-02842)



## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Absent Without Leave:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility was absent without leave (AWOL). Specifically, the subject called to request leave for his upcoming shift due to adverse weather conditions, but had no leave available to cover the absence. The subject requested leave without pay (LWOP), but it was denied due to additional questionable leave usage. The subject received a 3-day suspension. (OIA-2018-01840)

- **Unauthorized Release of Information and Misuse of Inmate Labor:**

A local investigation revealed a female Food Service Assistant at a BOP facility instructed an inmate to assist with the filing of staff Time and Attendance (T&A) documents. Specifically, multiple staff observed the inmate in possession of staff T&A documents. The inmate also admitted he had assisted the subject with T&A files. The subject received a written reprimand. (OIA-2017-01232)

- **Failure to Respond to an Emergency:**

A local investigation revealed a female Supervisor of Education at a BOP facility failed to respond to a body alarm. Specifically, while responding to a body alarm, staff observed the subject sitting in her office. At the conclusion of the emergency, staff observed the subject had remained in her office and had closed the door. The subject stated she heard the Control Center announce the body alarm, but prior to responding, her phone rang. The subject stated she decided to answer the phone to discover if the call was “urgent.” Accordingly, the allegation of Failure to Respond to an Emergency was sustained. The subject received a 3-day suspension. (OIA-2017-01401)

- **Failure to Properly Supervise an Inmate and Inattention to Duty:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility fell asleep while assigned to supervise an inmate at a local hospital during a medical escort trip. Specifically, hospital staff and the Lieutenant observed the subject asleep in the hospital hallway wearing earphones. The Lieutenant woke the subject and asked the location of the inmate and the other staff assigned to supervise the inmate. The subject responded by pointing to an empty hospital room. Accordingly, the allegations of Failure to Properly Supervise Inmates and Inattention to Duty were sustained. The subject received a 5-day suspension. (OIA-2018-01652)

## Representative Case Summaries

---

- **Failure to Follow Supervisor Instructions:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility refused to work a mandatory overtime shift. Specifically, the subject was instructed that he was the next staff to be mandated for an overtime shift. The Lieutenant offered the subject an hour and a half duty free break to make any necessary arrangements, but the subject still refused to work the shift and departed the institution. The subject stated he was aware that he was required to work the shift, but cited childcare concerns as the reason he did not follow the instruction. Accordingly, the allegation of Failure to Follow Supervisor Instructions was sustained. The subject received a 1-day suspension.

(OIA-2018-02139)

- **Discreditable Behavior:**

A local investigation revealed an off-duty male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility engaged in discreditable behavior. Specifically, video evidence and witness statements confirm that while off-duty at the bar located on base at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC), the subject grabbed the buttocks of a female bar employee. A FLETC instructor, who intervened and reported the incident to FLETC security, witnessed the incident. The FLETC security report, Glynn County Police investigation, Homeland Security Office of Professional Responsibility investigation and the BOP investigation all support that the subject did without permission grab the buttocks of the bar employee. Accordingly, the allegation of Off Duty Misconduct – Discreditable Behavior was sustained. The subject received a 2-day suspension.

(OIA-2018-01372)

- **Arrest and Conviction:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility was arrested and convicted for felony Nighttime Burglary. Specifically, the subject was arrested in connection with the death of his father's neighbor. After consuming several alcoholic beverages, the subject and his father grew angry after discussing the victim's alleged theft of the father's pressure washer. The subject and his father broke into the victim's house. The subject held down the victim while the father struck the victim in the head with a table leg, resulting in the death of the victim. The subject later attempted to dispose of the table leg by throwing it into a river. The subject was sentenced to 1-15 years in prison. The subject was terminated.

(OIA-2018-03260)

- **DWI/DUI:**

A local investigation revealed a male Correctional Officer at a BOP facility was arrested for DUI. Specifically, the subject was arrested for driving after consuming two (2) 24oz. beers and being stopped by local law enforcement. The subject plead guilty and was sentenced to 10 days in jail, 12 months supervised release, and \$1,761.00 in fines. The subject received a written reprimand.

(OIA-2018-01275)



**Table 11: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2017  
With 65.41 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>1195</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>1806</b>
Abuse of Inmates	22			22
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	6			6
Introduction of Contraband	13	59		72
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	6	99		105
Bribery	3	0		3
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	78			78
Investigative Violations		32		32
Personnel Prohibitions		291	10	301
Unauthorized Release of Information	7	5		12
Inattention to Duty	82	113		195
Breach of Security	45	99		144
Unprofessional Conduct	35	130		165
Failure to Follow Policy	127	179		306
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	125		125
Other On-Duty Misconduct	69	63		132
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			108	108

**Table 12: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2016**  
**With 84.22 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>701</b>	<b>1810</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>2722</b>
Abuse of Inmates	31			31
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	14			14
Introduction of Contraband	36	75		111
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	11	229		240
Bribery	11	1		12
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	119			119
Investigative Violations		53		53
Personnel Prohibitions		338	13	351
Unauthorized Release of Information	11	13		24
Inattention to Duty	89	211		300
Breach of Security	62	164		226
Unprofessional Conduct	46	219		265
Failure to Follow Policy	193	286		479
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	149		149
Other On-Duty Misconduct	78	72		150
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			198	198

**Table 13: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2015**  
**With 91.95 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>846</b>	<b>2499</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>3650</b>
Abuse of Inmates	35			35
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	23			23
Introduction of Contraband	36	80		116
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	15	228		243
Bribery	15	1		16
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	146			146
Investigative Violations		84		84
Personnel Prohibitions		468	20	488
Unauthorized Release of Information	16	10		26
Inattention to Duty	129	209		338
Breach of Security	65	181		246
Unprofessional Conduct	78	258		336
Failure to Follow Policy	180	271		451
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	172		172
Other On-Duty Misconduct	108	69		177
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			285	285

**Table 14: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2014  
With 96.67 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>887</b>	<b>1953</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>3147</b>
Abuse of Inmates	26			26
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	23			23
Introduction of Contraband	42	60		102
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	19	300		319
Bribery	17	1		18
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	151			151
Investigative Violations		88		88
Personnel Prohibitions		363	28	391
Unauthorized Release of Information	14	11		25
Inattention to Duty	142	280		422
Breach of Security	94	107		201
Unprofessional Conduct	92	281		373
Failure to Follow Policy	218	214		432
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	148		148
Other On-Duty Misconduct	91	100		191
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			279	279



**Table 15: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2013**  
**With 98.87 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>1912</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>3159</b>
Abuse of Inmates	32			32
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	26			26
Introduction of Contraband	52	59		111
Discrimination	1	0		1
Fiscal Improprieties	16	211		227
Bribery	15	1		16
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	151			151
Investigative Violations		105		105
Personnel Prohibitions		385	21	406
Unauthorized Release of Information	20	17		37
Inattention to Duty	123	235		358
Breach of Security	82	159		241
Unprofessional Conduct	105	250		355
Failure to Follow Policy	186	222		408
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	150		150
On-Duty Misconduct	75	118		193
Off-Duty Misconduct			342	342

**Table 16: Types of Sustained Misconduct for BOP Employees - FY 2012**  
**With 99.71 Percent Closed**

Type of Misconduct	Number of Sustained Allegations			
	Inmate Related	Non Inmate Related	Off-Duty	TOTAL
<b>Total</b>	<b>862</b>	<b>1756</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>2952</b>
Abuse of Inmates	27			27
Sexual Abuse of Inmates	27			27
Introduction of Contraband	47	55		102
Discrimination	0	0		0
Fiscal Improprieties	12	50		5562
Bribery	12	1		13
Inappropriate Relationships With Inmates	123			123
Investigative Violations		102		102
Personnel Prohibitions		407	24	431
Unauthorized Release of Information	11	12		23
Inattention to Duty	86	179		265
Breach of Security	108	144		252
Unprofessional Conduct	102	282		384
Failure to Follow Policy	204	228		432
Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions	0	173		173
Other On-Duty Misconduct	103	123		226
Other Off-Duty Misconduct			310	310

## Types of Misconduct

### Abuse of Inmates

Physical Abuse of Inmates  
Excessive Use of Force  
Threatening an Inmate/Verbal Abuse  
Retaliation

### Sexual Abuse of Inmates

Aggravated Sexual Abuse - §2241  
Sexual Abuse/Sexual Abuse of a Ward - §2242/2243  
Abusive Sexual Contact - §2244  
Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature

### Introduction of Contraband

Soft Item Introduction  
Weapons Introduction  
Escape Paraphernalia Introduction  
Money Introduction  
Marijuana Introduction  
Heroin & Derivatives Introduction  
Cocaine Introduction  
Other Unspecified Drugs Introduction  
Alcoholic Beverages Introduction  
Unauthorized Electronic Device Introduction  
Creatine/Weightlifting Supplement Introduction  
Cigarettes/Tobacco Introduction

### Discrimination

Discrimination

### Fiscal Improprieties

Time and Attendance Irregularities  
Abuse of Sick Leave  
Voucher Falsification  
Theft/Misuse of Government Funds  
Theft/Misuse of Government Property  
Misuse of Government Computers  
Improper Procurement Procedures  
Failure to Pay Government Charge Card  
Misuse of Travel Charge Card  
Misuse of Purchase Charge Card  
Misuse of SmartPay 2 Credit Card

## **Fiscal Improprieties (Cont.)**

- Theft/Misuse of Employees' Club Funds
- Theft/Misuse of AFGE/Union Funds
- Theft of Inmate Funds
- Theft/Destruction of Inmate Property
- Theft/Misuse of Contractor Funds
- Theft/Misuse of Contractor Property
- Failure to Account for Inmate Funds/Property
- Theft of Employee Funds/Property
- Misuse of UNICOR Resources
- Contract Fraud

## **Bribery**

- Bribery

## **Inappropriate Relationship With Inmates**

- Soliciting/Accepting Anything of Value
- Offering/Giving Anything of Value
- Improper Contact With an Inmate/Inmate's Family
- Appearance of an Inappropriate Relationship
- Misuse of Inmate Labor
- Preferential Treatment of Inmates
- Conduct Unbecoming a Correctional Worker

## **Investigative Violations**

- Concealing a Material Fact
- Refusing to Cooperate
- Lying During an Investigation
- Providing a False Statement
- Altering/Destroying Evidence/Documents
- Refusing to Submit to a Search
- Interfering With/Impeding an Investigation
- Advising Someone to Violate Policy
- Conducting an Unauthorized Investigation
- Lack of Candor

## **Personnel Prohibitions**

- Threatening/Intimidating Employees (relates to personnel actions)
- Failure to Report Violation of Rules/Regulations
- Falsification of Employment Records
- Misuse of Official Position/Badge
- Inappropriate Supervisor/Subordinate Relationship



## Personnel Prohibitions (Cont.)

- Engaging in Prohibited Personnel Practices
- Use/Abuse of Illegal Drugs/Alcohol
- Absent Without Leave
- Failure to Follow Leave Procedures
- Retaliation
- Refusing to Take a Drug Test

## Unauthorized Release of Information

- Unauthorized Release of Information
- Violation of FOIA/Privacy Acts

## Other On-Duty Misconduct

- Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature<sup>1, 2</sup>
- Inattention to Duty<sup>1</sup>
- Failure to Respond to an Emergency
- Failure to Properly Supervise Inmates
- Breach of Security<sup>1</sup>
- Breach of Computer Security<sup>1, 3</sup>
- Falsification of Documents
- Unprofessional Conduct<sup>1</sup>
- Failure to Follow Policy<sup>1</sup>
- Gambling/Promotion of Gambling
- Endangering the Safety of an Inmate
- Endangering the Safety of Others
- Providing False Information Other Than During an Official Investigation
- Insubordination
- Accidental Discharge of a Firearm
- Soliciting/Sale of Goods on Government Property
- Job Favoritism
- Workplace Violence
- Failure to Meet Performance Standards
- Failure to Follow Supervisor's Instructions<sup>1</sup>
- Fraudulent Workers' Compensation Claims
- Conduct Unbecoming a Management Official

## Off-Duty Misconduct

- Arrest and Conviction
- Failure to Report Arrest
- Failure to Pay Just Debts
- Failure to Obtain Outside Employment Approval
- DWI/DUI
- Domestic Violence

### Off-Duty Misconduct (Cont.)

Traffic Citation  
Carrying an Unregistered/Concealed Firearm  
Discreditable Behavior  
Falsification of Records/Documents  
Other Citation (Hunting, etc.)  
Conflict of Interest  
Other Off-Duty Misconduct

---

<sup>1</sup> Due to the frequency of this type of misconduct, it is identified distinctly throughout this report.

<sup>2</sup> The data for Unprofessional Conduct of a Sexual Nature (Non-Inmate Related) is combined with Unprofessional Conduct throughout this report.

<sup>3</sup> The data for Breach of Computer Security is combined with Breach of Security throughout this report.

# Monitoring Assignments

Effective August 20, 2018

Alderson, WV.....  
Aliceville, AL.....  
Allenwood, PA.....  
Ashland, KY.....  
Atlanta, GA.....  
Atwater, CA.....  
Bastrop, TX.....  
Beaumont, TX.....  
Beckley, WV.....  
Bennettsville, SC.....  
Berlin, NH.....  
Big Sandy, KY.....  
Big Spring, TX.....  
Brooklyn, NY.....  
Bryan, TX.....  
Butner, NC.....  
Canaan, PA.....  
Carswell, TX.....  
Chicago, IL.....  
Coleman, FL.....  
Cumberland, MD.....  
Danbury, CT.....  
Devens, MA.....  
Dublin, CA.....  
Duluth, MN.....  
Edgefield, SC.....  
El Reno, OK.....  
Elkton, OH.....  
Englewood, CO.....  
Estill, SC.....  
Fairton, NJ.....  
Florence, CO.....  
Forrest City, AR.....  
Fort Worth, TX.....  
Fort Dix, NJ.....  
Gilmer, WV.....  
Grand Prairie, TX.....  
Greenville, IL.....  
Guaynabo, PR.....  
Hazelton, WV.....  
Herlong, CA.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

Honolulu, HI.....  
Houston, TX.....  
Jesup, GA.....  
La Tuna, TX.....  
Leavenworth, KS.....  
Lee, VA.....  
Lewisburg, PA.....  
Lexington, KY.....  
Lompoc, CA.....  
Loretto, PA.....  
Los Angeles, CA.....  
Manchester, KY.....  
Marianna, FL.....  
Marion, IL.....  
Mendota, CA.....  
McCreary, KY.....  
McDowell, WV.....  
McKean, PA.....  
Memphis, TN.....  
Miami (FDC & FCI), FL.....  
MXRO, MD.....  
Milan, MI.....  
Montgomery, AL.....  
Morgantown, WV.....  
New York, NY.....  
NCRO, KS.....  
NERO, PA.....  
Oakdale, LA.....  
Oklahoma, OK.....  
Otisville, NY.....  
Oxford, WI.....  
Pekin, IL.....  
Pensacola, FL.....  
Petersburg, VA.....  
Philadelphia, PA.....  
Phoenix, AZ.....  
Pollock, LA.....  
Ray Brook, NY.....  
Rochester, MN.....  
Safford, AZ.....  
San Diego, CA.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)



## Monitoring Assignments

---

Sandstone, MN.....  
Schuylkill, PA.....  
Seagoville, TX .....  
SeaTac, WA.....  
Sheridan, OR.....  
SCRO, TX.....  
SERO, GA.....  
Springfield, MO.....  
Talladega, AL .....  
Tallahassee, FL .....  
Terminal Island, CA.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

Terre Haute, IN .....  
Texarkana, TX.....  
Thomson, IL.....  
Three Rivers, TX.....  
Tucson, AZ.....  
Victorville, CA.....  
Waseca, MN.....  
WRO, CA.....  
Williamsburg, SC.....  
Yankton, SD.....  
Yazoo City, MS.....

(b)(6); (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(F)

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**