

OFFICE: INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION (DOC)

TITLE: MISUSE OF STATE PROPERTY; GHOST EMPLOYMENT; NEPOTISM

CASE ID: 2019-04-0103 DATE: July 10, 2019

Inspector General Staff Attorney Kelly Elliott, after an investigation by Inspector General Director of Investigations, Darrell Boehmer, reports as follows:

The Indiana General Assembly charged the Office of the Indiana Inspector General (OIG) with addressing fraud, waste, abuse and wrongdoing in executive branch agencies of state government. IC 4-2-7-2(b). The OIG investigates allegations of criminal activity and Code of Ethics violations within state government. IC 4-2-7-3. The OIG may recommend policies and carry out other activities to deter, detect and eradicate fraud, waste, abuse, mismanagement and misconduct in state government. IC 4-2-7-3(2).

In April 2019, the OIG received complaints alleging two parole agents with the Indiana Department of Correction (DOC) violated the Code of Ethics. Specifically, the complaints alleged that these parole agents (Agent 1 and Agent 2) used their state vehicles for personal use and engaged in ghost employment by failing to attend scheduled appointments or complete initial interviews with parolees. The complaints also alleged that Agent 1 hired his wife to serve as an employee at DOC and maintained outside employment at a facility that employed other DOC parolees. The complaints made additional allegations that did not implicate the Code of Ethics, which the OIG referred to DOC for additional review.

OIG Director of Investigations, Darrell Boehmer, investigated the allegations. During the course of his investigation, Director Boehmer interviewed DOC employees regarding the allegations. Director Boehmer learned that Agent 1 and Agent 2 are required to travel often in order to perform their duties as parole agents. Agent 1 and Agent 2 are also able to flex their time accordingly.

Director Boehmer interviewed the parole agents' supervisor (Supervisor). The Supervisor explained that Agent 1's wife previously worked at the local DOC district office. She stated that Agent 1 was not involved in his wife's hiring and he did not have supervisory authority over her as a parole agent. The Supervisor confirmed that Agent 1 maintains outside employment. She explained that Agent 1's outside employer is located outside his assigned parole area; therefore, none of the parolees Agent 1 supervises as a parole agent would be working for the same outside employer. The Supervisor reviewed Agent 1 and Agent 2's use of their state vehicles. She found no evidence to indicate that Agent 1 or Agent 2 used their state vehicle for personal use. The Supervisor also explained to Director Boehmer that she had no concerns with Agent 1 or Agent 2's job performance.

Director Boehmer also interviewed Agent 1. Agent 1 confirmed he maintained outside employment. He stated he works at his outside employment in the evenings and on the weekends, outside of his DOC working hours. He explained that he has no hiring ability or supervisory authority at his outside employment. Agent 1 also stated he does not work with any of the parolees he supervises as a parole agent at his outside employment. He confirmed that his wife is a DOC employee, but she does not work in the same office as him. He stated he has not supervised his wife at DOC and was not involved in her hiring.

The OIG's investigation found insufficient evidence that Agent 1 or Agent 2 violated the Code of Ethics. For these reasons, the OIG is closing this case for insufficient cause. Should additional information be brought forward, the OIG may reexamine this initial evaluation.

Dated: July 10, 2019

APPROVED BY:

Lori Torres, Inspector General