



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES  
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

---

*This Report is protected by paragraph 18 of  
ST/SGB/273 of 7 September 1994*

**INVESTIGATION REPORT OF AN ALLEGATION OF SEXUAL  
EXPLOITATION AND ABUSE AGAINST [REDACTED]**

**REDACTED REPORT**

**ID Case No. 0508-06**

**06 DECEMBER 2007**

**STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL**

This Investigation Report of the Investigations Division of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services is provided upon your request pursuant to paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/272. The report has been redacted in part pursuant to paragraph 2 of this resolution to protect confidentiality and sensitive information. OIOS's transmission of this Report does not constitute its publication. OIOS does not bear any responsibility for any further dissemination of the Report.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

**II. APPLICABLE LAW ..... 1**

    A. UNITED NATIONS STAFF REGULATIONS AND RULES..... 1

    B. RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL LAW ..... 3

**III. METHODOLOGY ..... 4**

**IV. BACKGROUND ..... 4**

**V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS..... 4**

    [REDACTED] INVESTIGATIVE INQUIRY..... 4

    [REDACTED] INVESTIGATION..... 5

    C. ID/OIOS INVESTIGATION ..... 5

**VI. FINDINGS..... 10**

**VII. CONCLUSIONS ..... 11**

**VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 11**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. On [REDACTED] the Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received an allegation that [REDACTED] had sexually exploited and abused a [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as [REDACTED]). ID/OIOS was informed that the allegation was also investigated by the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]).
2. ID/OIOS established t [REDACTED] th the assistance o [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] who works at [REDACTED] lured [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] where, on [REDACTED] threatened and then had sexual intercourse with [REDACTED] thereafter gave [REDACTED] to keep silent on the matter. Prior to this, on or about [REDACTED] enticed [REDACTED] to engage in sexual relations with [REDACTED] upon promises of [REDACTED].
3. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] er referred to as [REDACTED] later retracted their initial statements to the [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS. ID/OIOS found that the retraction was the result of the probable bribery of [REDACTED], who it was found, had contact with [REDACTED] before the retraction.

**II. APPLICABLE LAW****A. UNITED NATIONS**

4. Agreement between [REDACTED] regarding the status of the [REDACTED]:

[REDACTED] enjoy the status of "[REDACTED] under Article VI of the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations. In accordance with that status, they enjoy inter alia immunity for the purposes of official acts they perform.

[REDACTED] are, however, subject to the jurisdiction of the host country/territory in respect of any criminal offences that may be committed by them in the host country and any disputes/claim of a civil nature not related to the performance of their official functions.

5. Code of Conduct [REDACTED] provides:

Rule 4 states:

*"Do not indulge in immoral acts of sexual, physical or psychological abuse or exploitation of the local population or United Nations staff, especially women and children."*

6. Directives for Disciplinary Matters Involving [REDACTED]

*Serious Misconduct: Any act, omission or negligence, including criminal acts, that is a violation of [REDACTED] standard operating procedures, directives, or any other applicable rules, regulations or administrative instructions that results in or is likely to result in serious damage or injury to an individual or to the [REDACTED]. Serious misconduct includes, but is not limited to:*

*Sexual abuse and exploitation of any individual, particularly children.*

7. ST/SGB/2003/13:

Sec. 3.2 subsections a, c and d of the Secretary General's Bulletin, ST/SGB/2003/13 states *inter alia*:

(a) *Sexual exploitation and sexual abuse constitute acts of serious misconduct and are therefore grounds for disciplinary measures, including summary dismissal;*

(c) *Exchange of money and goods for sex or other humiliating, degrading or exploitative behavior, is prohibited; and*

(d) *Sexual relationship between United Nations Staff and beneficiaries of assistance undermine the credibility and integrity of the work of the United Nations and are strongly discouraged.*

Undertaking and Declaration by Experts [REDACTED]:

An excerpt from paragraph 5 states:

*[T]o further protect the most vulnerable populations, especially women and children:*

*Sexual activity with children (persons under the age of 18) is prohibited regardless of the age of majority or age of consent locally unless legally married to someone under the age of 18-years but over the age of majority and consent pursuant to the law of the nationality of the expert.*

**B. RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL LAW**

## 8. [REDACTED] Penal Code:

**(a) Rape**

Sec. 14.70, Cap 14 D states:

*A male who has sexual intercourse with a female not his wife has committed rape if:*

*(a) He compels her to submit by force, or by threat of imminent death, serious bodily injury, or kidnapping, to be inflicted on any human being;*

*The female is less than sixteen years old, provided the actor is sixteen years of age or older.*

**(b) Corruption of Minors**

Sec. 14.75, Cap 14 D states:

*"A male who has sexual intercourse with a female not his wife or any person who has engaged in deviate sexual intercourse with another has committed an offence if the other person is under sixteen years and the actor is at least five years older than the other person".*

*Grading: The offence is a third degree felony, except when the actor is less than twenty-one years old, in which event it is a first degree misdemeanour.*

**(c) False imprisonment**

Sec. 14.52, Cap 14 C states:

*"A person commits a misdemeanor of the first degree if he knowingly restrains another unlawfully so as to interfere substantially with his liberty".*

**(d) General provisions relating to sections on sexual crimes against the person**

Sec. 14.78, Cap 14 D:

Mistake as to age:

*"When the criminality of conduct depends on child being below the age of sixteen, it is no defence that the actor did not know the child's age, or actually believed the child to be older than sixteen".*

### III. METHODOLOGY

9. The ID/OIOS investigation was conducted in concert with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. It entailed the collection and analysis of all available information and documents, including the [REDACTED] preliminary inquiry and the [REDACTED] investigation file; the interview of civilian witnesses and UN personnel, including the subject, [REDACTED].

### IV. BACKGROUND

10. On [REDACTED], [REDACTED] attended a [REDACTED] to confront [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] about the alleged rape of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was on leave and [REDACTED] was not [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]'s remonstrations attracted the attention of other [REDACTED]. Eventually, the [REDACTED] reported the incident to the [REDACTED] and a preliminary inquiry was ordered. Subsequently, [REDACTED] also reported the matter to the [REDACTED] for investigation.

11. [REDACTED] was born on [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] and was [REDACTED] and is currently a [REDACTED], on [REDACTED]. Upon arrival in [REDACTED] was initially [REDACTED] and was then [REDACTED], as a [REDACTED].

### V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

12. ID/OIOS reviewed the [REDACTED] preliminary inquiry and the [REDACTED] of the allegations and details its findings below.

#### A. [REDACTED] INVESTIGATIVE INQUIRY

13. In this inquiry [REDACTED] alleged that [REDACTED] (a local [REDACTED] stationed in [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]) facilitated [REDACTED] meeting with [REDACTED]; that [REDACTED] lured and falsely imprisoned [REDACTED] by locking [REDACTED]; and that thereafter, [REDACTED] raped [REDACTED] after threatening to hurt [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] attempted to raise any alarm. ID/OIOS ascertained that in both inquiries, [REDACTED] had clearly described [REDACTED] and the contents therein.

14. ID/OIOS ascertained that [REDACTED] interviewed several witnesses who confirmed having seen [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and of the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had allegedly given to [REDACTED]. Investigators confirmed that [REDACTED] owned the [REDACTED] that was recovered from [REDACTED]. Moreover, [REDACTED]'s initial account was

corroborated by witnesses to whom [REDACTED] had given a firsthand narration of the sexual intercourse with [REDACTED].

#### B. [REDACTED] INVESTIGATION

15. ID/OIOS ascertained that the [REDACTED] had interviewed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] witnesses and that all witnesses corroborated [REDACTED]'s account, as outlined in paragraph 13 above. Further, ID/OIOS ascertained that the [REDACTED] interviewed [REDACTED], who denied the rape allegation, stating that [REDACTED] never had any [REDACTED] any [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] could not recall sending [REDACTED] on any errand on [REDACTED].

16. On [REDACTED] in the presence of [REDACTED] investigator and ID/OIOS, executed a search warrant at [REDACTED] and therein located, *inter alia*, [REDACTED] beneath the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

17. Photographs of [REDACTED] showed the [REDACTED] to be consistent with the description provided by [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] various interviews with [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS.

18. However, on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], retracted their initial statements to the [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS. [REDACTED] asserted that [REDACTED] had not been raped by [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was never in [REDACTED]; that the [REDACTED] recovered from [REDACTED] were not [REDACTED]; that [REDACTED] stole the [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] and had only used [REDACTED] as a way of avoiding punishment from [REDACTED].

#### C. ID/OIOS INVESTIGATION

19. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that on [REDACTED] visited the [REDACTED] to buy [REDACTED] was approached by [REDACTED] who propositioned [REDACTED], on behalf of [REDACTED], to have a sexual relationship with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] later reinforced the proposal by giving [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and a promise to [REDACTED].

20. [REDACTED] informed ID/OIOS that at about [REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]; that [REDACTED] locked [REDACTED] therein until [REDACTED] eventually [REDACTED] from outside and entered the [REDACTED] then threatened to "do something bad to [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] yelled". [REDACTED] then allegedly undressed [REDACTED] undressed [REDACTED] and put on [REDACTED] and then raped [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] felt pain in [REDACTED] and made several attempts to free [REDACTED] by slapping and pushing [REDACTED], but [REDACTED] efforts were futile. Thereafter, [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] containing some [REDACTED] and warned [REDACTED] to keep the matter secret. Though [REDACTED] did not observe any [REDACTED] stated that after the sexual intercourse,

[REDACTED] experienced [REDACTED] pain. At about [REDACTED] left [REDACTED] and returned to [REDACTED] with the [REDACTED].

21. [REDACTED] to [REDACTED], discovered the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]'s possession. When queried, [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] forcefully had sexual intercourse with [REDACTED] immediately visited the [REDACTED] to confront [REDACTED], but [REDACTED] had already proceeded [REDACTED]. When [REDACTED] returned home from [REDACTED] related the same account to [REDACTED].

22. [REDACTED] viewed an array of [REDACTED] photographs of persons of similar physical features, which included a photograph of [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as being the person who raped [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] had a [REDACTED] with a [REDACTED]; a [REDACTED] with some [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]; a [REDACTED] with some [REDACTED] and no [REDACTED]. This description was corroborated by other witness statements and the execution of a search warrant by the [REDACTED] in the presence of ID/OIOS.

23. On [REDACTED] identified the [REDACTED] recovered from [REDACTED] as being [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had left them in [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] had raped [REDACTED]. Thereafter, [REDACTED] did not visit the [REDACTED] again.

24. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS travelled to [REDACTED] to interview [REDACTED] and was informed by the [REDACTED]'s retraction of their initial statements regarding the allegation. ID/OIOS immediately re-interviewed [REDACTED]. Prior to the interview of [REDACTED], ID/OIOS observed that [REDACTED] something into [REDACTED] in an apparently threatening manner. When [REDACTED] was asked about [REDACTED]'s action, [REDACTED] replied that it was "nothing". ID/OIOS considered it best for [REDACTED] to be interviewed in the presence of an independent person. When efforts to secure the assistance of social workers of a local [REDACTED] failed, [REDACTED] was invited to witness the interview.

25. [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] had retracted [REDACTED] initial statement to the [REDACTED] and denied ever being in [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] neither knew nor saw [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS considered [REDACTED]'s retraction suspect given that in [REDACTED] earlier statement to ID/OIOS on [REDACTED] was quite clear and thorough in [REDACTED] description of the items [REDACTED], including the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] had not begged for [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was never given any [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also denied ownership of [REDACTED] recovered from [REDACTED] and further denied having sexual intercourse with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that on [REDACTED] stole [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] to pay for [REDACTED] scheduled for [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also claimed to have stolen [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] on an earlier occasion. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] intended [REDACTED] to use [REDACTED] as cover to evade punishment from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] have neither met nor knew [REDACTED] and even though [REDACTED] reside in [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] does not know their [REDACTED], adding that [REDACTED] is changing [REDACTED] and will not be with them anymore. [REDACTED] denied contact with [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] initial statement and [REDACTED] did not receive any [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] designates and/or anyone else.

26. When [REDACTED] was questioned as to how [REDACTED] had been able to describe [REDACTED] [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] only "guessed". When [REDACTED] was asked about the [REDACTED] that were discovered on [REDACTED] by [REDACTED] and the confirmation of [REDACTED] with whom [REDACTED] shared the [REDACTED] on an earlier occasion, [REDACTED] stated that "they all told a lie". To the question on why [REDACTED] chose to accuse [REDACTED] and not some other [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said "no reason".

27. On [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who corroborated [REDACTED] s initial statement. [REDACTED] admitted that on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] to propose a sexual relationship to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] behalf and that [REDACTED] had complied. Moreover, that [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that on the instruction of [REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED]; that [REDACTED] then locked [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] and handed over the [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] who later entered the [REDACTED] and had sexual intercourse with [REDACTED]. Thereafter, [REDACTED] confided in [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had had sexual intercourse with [REDACTED] expressed [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and informed [REDACTED] not to acquire another [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] rewarded [REDACTED] with a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] further stated that when [REDACTED] looked into [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and from the "up and down" movement of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] was having sexual intercourse with [REDACTED].

28. According [REDACTED], before [REDACTED] proceeded [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] forgot [REDACTED] and gave [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] return to [REDACTED]. However, [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] was ashamed and later returned the [REDACTED] and advised [REDACTED] to keep the [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] came to claim it back.

29. [REDACTED] stated that after the commencement of the ID/OIOS investigation, [REDACTED] sent [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]) to inform [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] that "the matter was [REDACTED]" and that [REDACTED] would like to discuss the matter with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is aware that [REDACTED] visited [REDACTED] thereafter and left a message for them with a relation of [REDACTED], but [REDACTED] is unaware of the contents of that message. [REDACTED] is also unaware if [REDACTED] eventually saw [REDACTED] and their discussion thereafter. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] could not contact [REDACTED] because [REDACTED] did not know how to locate [REDACTED] in [REDACTED].

30. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] e o [REDACTED] [REDACTED] confirmed [REDACTED] s initial story. [REDACTED] stated that on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], which [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] got from a [REDACTED] resident at the [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] On the [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and some [REDACTED] warned [REDACTED] against further visits to the [REDACTED] confirmed that [REDACTED] gave the [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. On the [REDACTED] being [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] got the [REDACTED] from the same [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] also informed [REDACTED] that the [REDACTED] raped [REDACTED] and gave [REDACTED] to conceal the incident. [REDACTED] subsequently visited the [REDACTED] to confront the [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] effort was fruitless. On [REDACTED], when [REDACTED] returned from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] related the incidents to [REDACTED]

31. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who confirmed that [REDACTED] had related the incident to [REDACTED] when [REDACTED] returned from [REDACTED]. Thereafter, [REDACTED] related [REDACTED] initial statement to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] informed ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] was born on [REDACTED]. On [REDACTED] identified the [REDACTED] that were recovered from [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] as those [REDACTED] had bought for [REDACTED].

32. However, in a subsequent interview, [REDACTED] retracted [REDACTED] earlier statements to ID/OIOS. [REDACTED] asserted that [REDACTED] neither entered [REDACTED] nor had sexual intercourse with [REDACTED]. When questioned regarding [REDACTED] confirmation of ownership of the [REDACTED] that were recovered from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] could not recall informing the [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS investigators that [REDACTED] owned the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] denied contact with [REDACTED] and/or any delegate from [REDACTED] after [REDACTED] previous interview with ID/OIOS. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had not received any threat, money and/or promises from [REDACTED] and/or [REDACTED] designates.

33. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED], the [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED], who admitted that [REDACTED] visited [REDACTED] to inquire about the allegation and advise [REDACTED] of the gravity of the allegation and the need for only the truth to prevail. The version of the allegation that [REDACTED] related to [REDACTED] was consistent with the initial statement of [REDACTED]. According to [REDACTED], [REDACTED] denied being delegated by [REDACTED] to appease [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] asserted that [REDACTED] visited [REDACTED] family of [REDACTED] own volition and that at the time of [REDACTED] visit to [REDACTED] was still [REDACTED]. However, [REDACTED] admitted that [REDACTED] [REDACTED] on several occasions and that they discussed the allegation. [REDACTED] admitted that during [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] did not have sex with [REDACTED], but admitted that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] used to give [REDACTED]

34. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] usually visited the [REDACTED] to get [REDACTED]. On one occasion, the date of which [REDACTED] could not recall, [REDACTED] met [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

took [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. At about [REDACTED] the following day, [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED], carrying a [REDACTED], coming from the direction of [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED]. On another occasion, a [REDACTED] (date unknown), [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] visit the [REDACTED] and requested to see [REDACTED], but was denied entry because [REDACTED] was not in the [REDACTED] at that time. The following day, [REDACTED] visited the [REDACTED] and asked [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] had seen [REDACTED] enter [REDACTED]. About [REDACTED], [REDACTED], went to the [REDACTED] and confronted [REDACTED] for taking [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] was allegedly raped.

35. On [REDACTED] D/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED], [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had heard rumours from an undisclosed source that [REDACTED] had a sexual relationship with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that after [REDACTED] proceeded [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] met [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] and requested to see [REDACTED] but were told that [REDACTED] had gone [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] further asked [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] had seen a [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] replied in the negative.

36. On [REDACTED] D/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had informed [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] of the alleged incident. [REDACTED] stated that, although [REDACTED] could not recall the dates, on [REDACTED], while [REDACTED] was sick, [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] talking with [REDACTED] in front of the [REDACTED]; however, [REDACTED] did not know what was discussed. In the [REDACTED], after each occasion, [REDACTED] had informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] slept with [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] had left the [REDACTED]. Subsequently, [REDACTED] sickness grew worse and [REDACTED] colleagues had a discussion about transferring [REDACTED] for better [REDACTED]. During the discussion, [REDACTED] gave [REDACTED] something that [REDACTED] believed to be [REDACTED]. The next day, [REDACTED] saw [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] and, upon [REDACTED] inquiry [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] came to confront [REDACTED] regarding the previous [REDACTED] incident. [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] meant the incident of [REDACTED] spending the [REDACTED].

37. On [REDACTED] D/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] who stated that [REDACTED] had reported the alleged incident to the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] immediately after [REDACTED] had heard it from [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]). [REDACTED] conducted the preliminary investigation and witnessed the execution of a search warrant in the [REDACTED].

38. [REDACTED] underwent [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], almost [REDACTED] after the rape incident. The [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] had no [REDACTED] injury and that there were neither [REDACTED] noted to [REDACTED]. The reason given by [REDACTED] for the delay in getting [REDACTED] was the unavailability of a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] claimed that [REDACTED] had repeatedly

taken [redacted] to the [redacted], but no [redacted] was available to conduct [redacted] of [redacted] due to other [redacted]

39. On [redacted] ID/OIOS interview [redacted] admitted knowing [redacted] and [redacted] and of often sending [redacted] on errands. In this and subsequent interviews, [redacted] stated that [redacted] never entered [redacted] that [redacted] had never had sexual intercourse with [redacted] and that [redacted] never gave [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] had no sexual relationship with any [redacted] nor had [redacted] ever requested anyone to acquire any [redacted] denied having [redacted] in [redacted]

40. [redacted] as asked to describe [redacted] that [redacted] has a [redacted] a [redacted] where [redacted] one [redacted] with its [redacted] which [redacted] in [redacted] some [redacted] a line where [redacted]; a small [redacted] a [redacted] and [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted]. The [redacted] has [redacted]. This description matches the description given by [redacted]; also identified photographs of the [redacted] that were taken during the execution of the search warrant at the incident scene as being [redacted] [redacted] confirmed that, at the time of the incident, [redacted] was the only occupant of [redacted] in the [redacted]

41. [redacted] admitted that [redacted] had had contact with [redacted] on [redacted]. The [redacted] on an unknown date, while [redacted] chatted with [redacted] and [redacted] at the [redacted] and the [redacted] when [redacted] to [redacted] to [redacted]. Significantly, when [redacted] was informed of the execution of the search warrant in [redacted] responded spontaneously that [redacted] discovered [redacted] underneath [redacted] when [redacted] was unpacking [redacted] in [redacted] but [redacted] was unaware of how the [redacted] got there.

42. [redacted] confirmed that [redacted] had discussed the allegation with [redacted] by [redacted] but denied sending [redacted] and/or anyone else to appease [redacted] and [redacted] also denied prior knowledge of [redacted] and [redacted] retraction of their statements. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had had no contact with [redacted] and [redacted] or [redacted] after [redacted] previous interview by ID/OIOS, and [redacted] neither gave nor promised [redacted] or [redacted] any [redacted]. Moreover, that [redacted] neither threatened, nor sent anyone to threaten [redacted] and [redacted] regarding the allegation.

## VI. FINDINGS

43. On analyzing the evidence set forth above, ID/OIOS finds that [redacted] raped [redacted] on [redacted]. Further, that [redacted] both threatened and bribed [redacted] to keep [redacted] sexual misconduct secret by giving [redacted] and [redacted]. However, [redacted] confided in [redacted] and shared some of the items given to [redacted] by [redacted] with [redacted]. Consequently, [redacted] exposed the rape after [redacted] discovered the [redacted].

44. ID/OIOS further finds that on this particular day, after previously approaching [REDACTED] invited [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] upon [REDACTED] request. [REDACTED] then escorted [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and locked [REDACTED]—in so doing [REDACTED] unlawfully imprisoned [REDACTED]. Thereafter, [REDACTED] returned the [REDACTED], who later entered the [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS found that [REDACTED] was acting upon the request of [REDACTED], thus [REDACTED] was the latter's agent.

45. ID/OIOS finds [REDACTED]'s subsequent retraction not credible given the preponderance of evidence that corroborates [REDACTED] initial statement. Further, that a reasonable inference can be drawn that [REDACTED] with the assistance of [REDACTED], prevailed upon [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to drop the charges against [REDACTED].

46. The evidence shows that [REDACTED] on several occasions after ID/OIOS's initial interview with [REDACTED] where after [REDACTED] visited [REDACTED]. From the sum of the admitted discussions between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], [REDACTED]'s subsequent visits to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and the subsequent retraction by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of their complaints to the [REDACTED] ID/OIOS infers that at the behest of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] convinced [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to retract their statements. ID/OIOS finds that in so doing, [REDACTED] interfered with the [REDACTED] and ID/OIOS investigations.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

47. ID/OIOS concludes that on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] falsely imprisoned and aided and abetted the rape of [REDACTED] thus violating Sections 14.70 Cap 14 D and 14.75 Cap 14 D of the [REDACTED] Penal Code.

48. ID/OIOS concludes that, on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] solicited [REDACTED] to lure [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and secure [REDACTED] therein; that thereafter [REDACTED] raped [REDACTED]. In so doing, [REDACTED] violated Sections 14.70 Cap 14 D and 14.75 Cap 14 D of the [REDACTED] Penal Code.

49. Based on circumstantial evidence, it is highly probable that due to [REDACTED] indirect influence through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] retracted their statements. ID/OIOS concludes that this conduct of [REDACTED] is inconsistent with the obligations expected of an international civil servant.

50. ID/OIOS concludes that [REDACTED]'s conduct constitutes "serious misconduct" as defined by the Directives for Disciplinary Matters Involving [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] violated Rule 4 of the Code of Personal Conduct for [REDACTED] and Section 3.2(a) of ST/SGB/2003/13.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

51. Based on the findings, ID/OIOS makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the [REDACTED] provide a copy of this report to the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] for appropriate action against [REDACTED] and that the results of such action be reported back to [REDACTED] for passage to ID/OIOS. ([REDACTED])

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that [REDACTED] consider referral of this matter to the [REDACTED] judicial authorities for any action deemed appropriate with respect of [REDACTED], including criminal prosecution. [REDACTED]

Recommendation 3: It is recommended that [REDACTED] inform the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] will not be accepted to any current or future [REDACTED]

-- // --