



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*

**REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF THREATS AGAINST THE LIFE
OF [REDACTED]**

REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0792-05



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.

INVESTIGATION INTO THREATS AGAINST THE LIFE OF [REDACTED]

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] containing threats against the life of [REDACTED] was received at the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] contained a [REDACTED] and alleged that the [REDACTED] had been engaged in the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] of [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] contained a threat that if the [REDACTED] was not removed from the [REDACTED] would be killed and copies of the [REDACTED] as well as to [REDACTED]. Identical [REDACTED] were forwarded to other [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] attributed the correspondence to the [REDACTED]. The threat and allegations were made against [REDACTED], who at the time was a [REDACTED].

2. An ID/OIOS investigation was subsequently initiated to inquire into both the origin of [REDACTED] and the veracity of the allegation that the [REDACTED] was involved in the [REDACTED]. During the investigation ID/OIOS examined the relationship between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. This relationship became the focus of the investigation after ID/OIOS learned that the relationship had deteriorated to such an extent that [REDACTED] had previously assaulted [REDACTED]. The catalyst for the breakdown of the relationship was said to be [REDACTED] with a [REDACTED].

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Between [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] claimed the lives of almost [REDACTED] and led to a complete [REDACTED]. It displaced [REDACTED] resulting in some [REDACTED]. In [REDACTED] a [REDACTED] comprehensive [REDACTED] and prompted the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was established by [REDACTED] in order to support the implementation of the [REDACTED] the strength of [REDACTED].

4. [REDACTED] commenced [REDACTED] worked in [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] was appointed [REDACTED]

5. [REDACTED] a position as [REDACTED] remained in that [REDACTED] obtained a position [REDACTED] obtained a position in a [REDACTED]

6. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] became involved in a serious relationship whilst both were [REDACTED] This relationship continued through [REDACTED]

III. APPLICABLE LAW

7. [REDACTED] Penal Code

Chapter 14. Section 14.27 (1)

'A person is guilty of criminal coercion if, with the purpose to unlawfully to compel another to engage in or refrain from conduct he threatens to:

- (a) Commit and criminal offense; or*
- (b) Accuse anyone of a criminal offense; or*
- (c) Expose any secret or publicize an asserted fact tending to subject any person to hatred, contempt or ridicule or to impair his credit or business repute'.*

8. [REDACTED] Penal Law

Chapter 40, Part Three, Title H, Section 135.60

'A person is guilty of coercion in the second degree when he compels or induces a person to engage in conduct which the latter has a legal right to abstain from engaging in, or to abstain from engaging in conduct in which he has a legal right to engage, by means of instilling in him a fear that, if the demand is not complied with, the actor or another will:

- 1. Cause physical injury to a person; or*
- 2. Cause damage to property; or*
- 3. Engage in other conduct constituting a crime; or*
- 4. Accuse some person of a crime or cause criminal charges to be instituted against him; or*
- 5. Expose a secret or publicize an asserted fact, whether true or false, tending to subject some person to hatred, contempt or ridicule [...].'*

9. United Nations Staff Regulations

Regulation 1.2 - Basic rights and obligations of staff

'Staff members shall uphold the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. The concept of integrity includes but is not limited to probity, impartiality, fairness, honesty and truthfulness in all matters affecting their work and status.'

10. United Nations Secretary-General's bulletin on the use of information and communications technology resources and data (ST/SGB/2004/15)

Section 4.1 provides:

'Authorized users shall be permitted limited personal use of ICT resources, provided such use:

- (a) Is consistent with the highest standard of conduct for international civil servants (among the uses which would clearly not meet this standard are use of ICT resources for purposes of obtaining or distributing pornography, engaging in gambling, or downloading audio or video files to which a staff member is not legally entitled to have access);*
- (b) Would not reasonably be expected to compromise the interests or the reputation of the Organization.'*

Section 5.1 provides:

'Users of ICT resources and ICT data shall not engage in any of the following actions;

- (c) Knowingly, or through gross negligence, using ICT resources or ICT data in a manner contrary to the rights and obligations of staff members.'*

11. Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse (ST/SGB/2003/13)

Section 1 - Definitions

'For the purposes of the present bulletin, the term "sexual exploitation" means any actual or attempted abuse of a position of vulnerability, differential power, or trust, for sexual purposes, including, but not limited to, profiting monetarily, socially or politically from the sexual exploitation of another.'

Section 2 - Scope of application

2.2 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] are prohibited from committing acts of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse, and have a particular duty of care towards women and children, pursuant to section 7 of Secretary General's Bulletin ST/SGB/1999/13 [...]

Section 3 - Prohibition of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse

3.2 (a) Sexual exploitation and sexual abuse constitute acts of serious misconduct and are therefore grounds for disciplinary measures, including summary dismissal [.]'

IV. METHODOLOGY

12. ID/OIOS inquired into the origin of the threat [redacted] and the allegations that [redacted] was involved in the [redacted] and [redacted] of [redacted]. These inquiries included, but were not limited to, the collection and analysis of all available information and documents and interviews with [redacted]. ID/OIOS also conducted a record of interview with [redacted].

V. INVESTIGATIVE DETAILS

Receipt of Complaint

13. On [redacted] [redacted] had received a [redacted] containing correspondence that threatened [redacted]. The [redacted] was [redacted] to [redacted]. There was no [redacted] however the back of [redacted]. The [redacted] appeared to have been [redacted] produced. There were no other markings on the [redacted] that would indicate that the [redacted] had been forwarded through the [redacted]. The [redacted] appeared to have been left in the [redacted].

14. Inside the [redacted] was a [redacted]. The [redacted] with [redacted] was of a [redacted] depicted the same [redacted]. The [redacted] was addressed to [redacted] and accused [redacted] of [redacted]. The [redacted] called for [redacted] to be removed from [redacted] by [redacted] or [redacted] was a [redacted]. The [redacted] threatened to place the [redacted] and to forward the [redacted]. The [redacted] of [redacted] that they were in possession of other [redacted] although there was no indication as to the nature of those [redacted]. The [redacted] also referred to the [redacted] of the [redacted] former [redacted] and a [redacted] and [redacted] undertook to forward [redacted] to the [redacted] at the [redacted] bottom of the [redacted].

15. A [redacted] on the bottom of the [redacted] identical [redacted] were sent to:

[redacted]

[REDACTED]

16. ID/OIOS attempted to obtain the [REDACTED] sent to the recipients listed above and successfully retrieved [REDACTED] forwarded to [REDACTED]. Upon examination, the [REDACTED] were all identical. However, there were slight variations in the [REDACTED]. In particular, the [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] - [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] was a mistake that had been repeated in [REDACTED].

17. [REDACTED] was identified as [REDACTED]. At the time the [REDACTED] was received at [REDACTED] was [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] responded to the threat by directing [REDACTED] to remain on leave pending the outcome of a threat assessment. [REDACTED] subsequently returned to [REDACTED].

Inquiries in [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Inquiries.

18. ID/OIOS attempted to establish whether the [REDACTED] had been forwarded to [REDACTED] through the [REDACTED] and whether it had originated, as the [REDACTED] from [REDACTED].

19. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was shown a copy of the [REDACTED] that had been forwarded to [REDACTED]. On viewing the [REDACTED] stated that the fact that the [REDACTED] and did not appear to be [REDACTED] so would not have been sent through [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] is also required to have the [REDACTED] and if this is absent from [REDACTED] the [REDACTED] is then returned to the [REDACTED] for those details to be completed. As this [REDACTED] has the appearance of being private [REDACTED] would not be sent through [REDACTED] without [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also stated that [REDACTED] previously worked in [REDACTED] and is aware that the [REDACTED] so the details of the [REDACTED] would have been [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] accompanies the [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] is [REDACTED] when it is delivered, someone has to [REDACTED] said that the absence of a [REDACTED] meant that it was not entered on the [REDACTED]. In [REDACTED] opinion, the absence of [REDACTED] combined with the nature of [REDACTED] meant that in all likelihood the [REDACTED] had been carried into [REDACTED] and delivered [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] added that the [REDACTED] would have raised suspicion in the [REDACTED] and it would not have been [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] also commented that the [REDACTED].

[redacted] could only have been entered by someone that knew the actual [redacted] directory.

20. ID/OIOS attempted to identify the origin of the [redacted]. Local inquiries revealed that the [redacted] could have been produced at any one of hundreds of [redacted].

▪ Interview with [redacted]

21. ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] at [redacted]. [redacted] was shown a copy of the [redacted] containing the threat to [redacted] read the [redacted] and told ID/OIOS that the [redacted] in parts of the [redacted] and in particular, the [redacted] which commenced, [redacted] was very similar to the [redacted] used by former [redacted]. [redacted] also said that [redacted] believed that the [redacted] was identical to the [redacted]. [redacted] examined the [redacted] on the [redacted] and stated that [redacted] had never heard of [redacted] and that [redacted] didn't know of anyone who may have been associated with such [redacted]. [redacted] commented that [redacted] is currently [redacted] of the [redacted] and as part of [redacted] is probably required to have [redacted].

22. [redacted] was also asked about the reference in the letter to [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] has been assigned and driven [redacted]. [redacted] assumed [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] was aware that [redacted].

23. ID/OIOS asked [redacted] to provide background on [redacted] with [redacted]. [redacted] said that [redacted] commenced a relationship with [redacted] whilst they were both [redacted]. [redacted] said they obtained [redacted] and although [redacted] had a background in [redacted] the [redacted] was in the [redacted]. [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] didn't like this [redacted] and wanted to work in [redacted]. [redacted] said when [redacted] sought to establish an [redacted] was nominated for the [redacted] however, the [redacted] wanted someone with more [redacted] experience. [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] was subsequently selected for the [redacted] and this was the catalyst for the breakdown of their relationship.

24. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that during this period, [redacted] complained of being under pressure from [redacted] to end their relationship because [redacted] and they could see no future for [redacted]. [redacted] said at this time [redacted] also accused [redacted] of stealing [redacted] and not doing enough to [redacted] another [redacted]. [redacted] told investigators that just prior to [redacted] securing a [redacted] [redacted] sensed that [redacted] was about to end their relationship. [redacted] said [redacted] later heard from [redacted] that [redacted]. However, this person ended the relationship and returned to [redacted]. [redacted] said that [redacted] seemed to become very bitter about [redacted] and this sometimes manifested itself in violent behaviour.

25. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] was a friend of [redacted] and at various times had tried to [redacted] between the [redacted]. As a result of [redacted] met [redacted] in [redacted] in early [redacted] and then again in [redacted].

26. [redacted] told investigators that between [redacted] and [redacted] visited [redacted]. One [redacted] during this visit, they were in [redacted]. [redacted] accused [redacted] of being involved in [redacted]. [redacted] said [redacted] denied [redacted] accusation but [redacted] then inflicted a [redacted]. The [redacted] was serious enough to [redacted] and required [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] contacted a [redacted] who attended at [redacted] [redacted] dressed [redacted] an [redacted] and some [redacted].

27. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that a [redacted] was held between [redacted] in [redacted]. [redacted] said that [redacted] believed [redacted] arrived in [redacted] he [redacted] said they stayed at [redacted] until [redacted] and that the [redacted] was under [redacted] and the [redacted] with one of [redacted]. [redacted] said that one [redacted] was walking [redacted] out of the [redacted]. [redacted] said [redacted] wanted a [redacted]. [redacted] so that [redacted] could keep it with [redacted]. [redacted] said [redacted] took a number of [redacted]. [redacted] was shown the [redacted] and confirmed that [redacted] although [redacted] had never seen a [redacted]. [redacted] during their [redacted] said that [redacted] flew back to [redacted] and so the [redacted] could have been [redacted].

28. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that a [redacted] returned to their respective [redacted]. [redacted] said [redacted] told [redacted] that as [redacted] was the only one who had benefited from the relationship [redacted] wanted [redacted] stated that [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] would be [redacted] soon and [redacted] would ensure [redacted].

29. [redacted] told investigators that in [redacted] traveled to [redacted] to visit [redacted]. [redacted] said on [redacted] received a [redacted] from [redacted] telling [redacted] that [redacted] had received [redacted] from an [redacted] under investigation for [redacted] and [redacted] would be [redacted]. [redacted] said the [redacted] apparently said that [redacted] would soon be without [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] is listed in the [redacted] was aware of the [redacted].

30. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that things seemed to settle down until [redacted] left [redacted]. [redacted] stated that [redacted] received a [redacted] that there had been a threat made to [redacted].

return to [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] knew straight away that [REDACTED] was the source of the threat.

31. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] ([REDACTED]), the [REDACTED] inspected their archived records and stated that a [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] for the duration of [REDACTED]

32. [REDACTED] accompanied ID/OIOS to [REDACTED] and confirmed that this was the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] had occupied in [REDACTED] ID/OIOS subsequently [REDACTED] and compared it to [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] The interior of [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] sent to [REDACTED] were entirely consistent.

Additional Threats

33. On the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] contacted ID/OIOS and advised that [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] from an unidentified [REDACTED] said that the [REDACTED] had been received at around [REDACTED]

34. On [REDACTED] ID/OIOS were informed that correspondence similar to that received at [REDACTED] in the latter part of [REDACTED] had been received at [REDACTED] was addressed [REDACTED] and had a [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] inside this [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] Inside the [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] also contained a [REDACTED] that had been received at [REDACTED] The other [REDACTED] were addressed to [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] These addresses were [REDACTED]

Inquiries in [REDACTED]

35. ID/OIOS subsequently conducted a number of inquiries in [REDACTED] The purpose of these inquiries was to ascertain whether [REDACTED] had any involvement in [REDACTED] the threatening material that had been received [REDACTED]

36. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] was the vendor contracted to supply [REDACTED] ID/OIOS and shown the [REDACTED] that are [REDACTED] and did not produce [REDACTED] said the [REDACTED] could have been made by any one of hundreds of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was interviewed by [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED]

▪ [REDACTED]

37. ID/OIOS also made inquiries with the [REDACTED]. Copies of [REDACTED] that had been forwarded to [REDACTED] were shown to [REDACTED] head of [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] would not generally be accepted [REDACTED] it would be [REDACTED] ID/OIOS inspected the [REDACTED] however there was no record of such a [REDACTED]

▪ [REDACTED] Records

38. ID/OIOS also conducted inquiries with [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] number were obtained for the period [REDACTED] ID/OIOS analyzed the [REDACTED] and identified [REDACTED] that were made on [REDACTED] to a [REDACTED] said was the [REDACTED] and lasted [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] was logged at [REDACTED] and lasted [REDACTED]

▪ [REDACTED]

39. The personnel file for [REDACTED] was examined by ID/OIOS. A [REDACTED] completed on [REDACTED] listed [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] was on [REDACTED]. An [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. An evacuation at [REDACTED] did not actually return to [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] form indicated that [REDACTED] traveled to the [REDACTED] for that [REDACTED] period with a [REDACTED]

▪ [REDACTED] Investigation

40. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] had been issued with a [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] was subsequently obtained from the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS took possession of [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] was then examined by [REDACTED]. As part of that examination, the investigator analyzed the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] to store [REDACTED] information such as the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

associations. The investigator discovered [REDACTED] According to [REDACTED] the location where the [REDACTED] had been found contained [REDACTED] The [REDACTED] was found specifically under [REDACTED]

Interview with [REDACTED]

41. [REDACTED] was interviewed by ID/OIOS on [REDACTED] shortly after [REDACTED] said the relationship had been the subject of much tension and they had made a number of unsuccessful attempts at reconciliation. [REDACTED] told investigators that after [REDACTED] learned that [REDACTED] was having an affair with [REDACTED] named [REDACTED] that this had caused [REDACTED] considerable embarrassment and stress.

42. [REDACTED] was asked whether [REDACTED] was in possession of any information that [REDACTED] was involved in [REDACTED] for the purpose of [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had heard rumors that [REDACTED] had been involved with [REDACTED] but had no direct information that [REDACTED] was involved in [REDACTED] was asked to identify the source of the rumors, but [REDACTED] refused to do so, telling investigators that the source was [REDACTED] who [REDACTED] did not want to involve in the matter.

43. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] said when they first met, [REDACTED] separated from [REDACTED] although [REDACTED] later found this to be untrue. [REDACTED] told investigators that sometime during their relationship, [REDACTED] had given [REDACTED] [REDACTED] said despite their difficulties, [REDACTED] had never considered contacting [REDACTED] and telling [REDACTED] relationship with [REDACTED] had never visited [REDACTED]; nor had [REDACTED] or called the [REDACTED]

44. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that on [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] to a [REDACTED] who wanted to [REDACTED] and tell [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] made the [REDACTED] would be [REDACTED] said sometime later [REDACTED] and they spoke about the sexual dalliances of [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] asked about the relationship between [REDACTED] had also been in a relationship with [REDACTED] over an extended period of time. [REDACTED] was asked why [REDACTED] had earlier stated that [REDACTED] had never spoken to [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] believed that [REDACTED] had been asked whether [REDACTED] had ever [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] stood by [REDACTED] answer. [REDACTED] was then asked whether [REDACTED] had contacted [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] had made no such [REDACTED] and that as far as [REDACTED] was aware no further [REDACTED] had been made on [REDACTED] by any of [REDACTED]

45. [redacted] was asked to detail [redacted] over the last [redacted] [redacted] said [redacted] and returning to [redacted] Whilst in the [redacted] [redacted] to sign [redacted]

46. [redacted] was also asked about [redacted] in [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] had visited [redacted] on [redacted] to try and resolve their differences. [redacted] admitted that during [redacted] [redacted] stated that although the [redacted] it did [redacted] and was [redacted]

47. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that [redacted] stayed with [redacted] at the [redacted] and they stayed [redacted] [redacted] was then [redacted] showing the exterior and interior of [redacted] was asked whether the [redacted] to the one [redacted] said that it looked [redacted] but that [redacted] was unable to recall the specifics of the [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] stayed at [redacted] [redacted] sometime around [redacted] and that the purpose of the liaison was to try and resolve difficulties they were experiencing in the relationship. [redacted]

48. [redacted] was subsequently shown [redacted] be taken by ID/OIOS of the interior of [redacted] [redacted] again denied taking [redacted] and when asked, conceded that the background of the [redacted] were very [redacted]

49. [redacted] was asked whether [redacted] of any information that would identify the origin of [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] had heard rumors that [redacted] had [redacted] [redacted] stated that [redacted] had heard that [redacted] had [redacted] where [redacted] refused to disclose the source of the information and said that it was simply a rumor.

50. [redacted] was then provided with a [redacted] and a [redacted] and asked to write [redacted] and then [redacted] wrote, [redacted]

51. [redacted] was then shown a [redacted] with file number [redacted] and had no idea of where it had originated. [redacted] was also shown [redacted] of the [redacted] [redacted] was also [redacted]

shown the [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] seen [redacted] no idea where they originated. It was subsequently pointed out to [redacted] that the [redacted] in one of the [redacted] had made the same mistake when [redacted] was asked to [redacted] was unable to explain this coincidence.

52. [redacted] was subsequently told that a [redacted] had been conducted and that the string of characters, [redacted] had been recovered from [redacted].

53. [redacted] was again asked whether [redacted] had authored [redacted] stated that whilst [redacted] had never seen the [redacted] before the interview, [redacted] may have encouraged someone else to produce the material. [redacted] had [redacted] named [redacted] were from [redacted] but who had been [redacted] stated that [redacted] told [redacted] that [redacted] had an issue with [redacted] because of rumours that [redacted] had been [redacted]. It was pointed out to [redacted] that this was completely at odds with [redacted] earlier statements. [redacted] stated that [redacted] wished to tell investigators everything [redacted] knew about the allegations against [redacted] and the material that had been forwarded to [redacted].

54. [redacted] stated that [redacted] had been very close to [redacted] and that they had [redacted] stated that [redacted] always harbored suspicions that [redacted] and this was confirmed sometime later. [redacted] said that [redacted] with [redacted] of time after [redacted] later [redacted] also began [redacted] by assigning [redacted] and giving [redacted] to complete. [redacted] said [redacted] got the impression that [redacted] was becoming increasingly embarrassed to [redacted]. Nevertheless, [redacted] said that because of their [redacted].

55. [redacted] told ID/OIOS that whilst [redacted] was promised the [redacted] only to be replaced [redacted] confronted [redacted] who offered little explanation and told [redacted] should consider leaving [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] undertook to assist [redacted] ultimately transferred to [redacted] despite increasing rumours that [redacted] were involved [redacted] stated that the difficulties [redacted] was experiencing [redacted] combined with the fact that [redacted] where [redacted] had no [redacted] suffered from [redacted] that required [redacted]. At this time [redacted] was also suffering [redacted].

56. [redacted] told investigators that [redacted] to resurrect the relationship over the ensuing [redacted] as well [redacted] that [redacted] had heard that [redacted] had been assisting [redacted].

[REDACTED] In order to make a point, [REDACTED] calculated that if [REDACTED] received the same amount as [REDACTED] then over the course of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was entitled to [REDACTED] in support and reimbursements. [REDACTED] demanded this [REDACTED] as compensation for [REDACTED] during their relationship.

57. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that whilst [REDACTED] met a significant [REDACTED] but [REDACTED] said sometime in [REDACTED] received [REDACTED] from a person who only identified [REDACTED] who asked [REDACTED] a favour. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was aware that [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] also told [REDACTED] and an unnamed [REDACTED] where they pretended to [REDACTED] competition. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] that whilst in [REDACTED] they had taken [REDACTED] and had [REDACTED] in [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was angry at this [REDACTED] and wanted to [REDACTED] ! [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] had told [REDACTED] to remain in [REDACTED] also stated that [REDACTED] that one of [REDACTED] who had been exploited in this manner had taken [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] convinced [REDACTED] to write to [REDACTED] with evidence to support the allegations rather than undermining the [REDACTED]

58. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to retype [REDACTED] said at this point [REDACTED] also provided [REDACTED] to whom [REDACTED] should address [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that they would create [REDACTED] which could be circulated and which would also discredit [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] communicated by [REDACTED] provided [REDACTED] to investigators. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] contacted [REDACTED] an [REDACTED] could collect [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] collected [REDACTED] and on reading [REDACTED] realized that [REDACTED] because it didn't make sense. [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] then contacted [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] instructed [REDACTED] to address the [REDACTED] and leave it at the [REDACTED]

59. [REDACTED] was asked why [REDACTED] assisted [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] when it clearly had threatening [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] believed the allegations made by [REDACTED] and wanted it brought to the attention of [REDACTED] denied having involvement in [REDACTED] and also denied having ever seen the [REDACTED] also denied having any knowledge of [REDACTED]

Additional Inquiries

60. ID/OIOS conducted [REDACTED] inquiries in relation to the information supplied by [REDACTED] obtained by ID/OIOS show that [REDACTED]

the number provided by [REDACTED] as called on [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] There were a [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
The total duration of [REDACTED]

61. ID/OIOS attempted to locate [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] provided by [REDACTED]. Despite conducting extensive inquiries with [REDACTED], investigators were unable to obtain any information that could lead to the identification of the person who used that [REDACTED]

62. ID/OIOS also conducted inquiries in order to locate and interview [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was purported to be working as a [REDACTED]. Despite extensive inquiries, ID/OIOS was unable to locate [REDACTED] for interview.

63. ID/OIOS also interviewed [REDACTED] to ascertain whether [REDACTED] had any involvement in the sexual exploitation of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was also asked whether [REDACTED] had ever heard [REDACTED] or had any friendships with individuals from [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had never heard of [REDACTED] who worked in [REDACTED]

64. [REDACTED] was also asked whether [REDACTED] had any relationships with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that [REDACTED] had [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said [REDACTED] had been in a relationship with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told investigators that whilst [REDACTED] customs meant that [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were aware of [REDACTED] and supported [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that the relationship is a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] subsequently produced [REDACTED] confirming that they were [REDACTED]

VI. FINDINGS

65. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] commenced a sexual relationship in [REDACTED]. The relationship continued when both were [REDACTED] remained in [REDACTED] despite the knowledge that [REDACTED] living in [REDACTED]

66. ID/OIOS established that the relationship between [REDACTED] began to deteriorate after [REDACTED]. The catalyst for this deterioration was [REDACTED] was involved in [REDACTED] was also upset at [REDACTED] selection for the [REDACTED] - a position that [REDACTED]

The decision to [REDACTED] and was supported by [REDACTED] apparent lack of [REDACTED]

67. ID/OIOS established that soon after [REDACTED], the relationship between [REDACTED] deteriorated further. Despite their [REDACTED] remained in contact and attempted to resurrect their failing relationship.

68. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] and stayed with [REDACTED] During that stay, they became involved in a heated argument after [REDACTED] of being involved with [REDACTED]. The argument culminated with [REDACTED] on the [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. A [REDACTED] between [REDACTED] and on this occasion the [REDACTED].

69. Despite the fact that [REDACTED] denied taken explicit [REDACTED] ID/OIOS considers [REDACTED] account of events to be less than credible. Conversely, [REDACTED] has proffered a credible, and in most cases, verifiable account that with respect to [REDACTED] is corroborated [REDACTED] and the fact that the background of [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] are remarkably similar.

70. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] were [REDACTED] using the [REDACTED] assigned to [REDACTED]. When questioned about [REDACTED] at first denied ever having spoken [REDACTED] investigators that [REDACTED] had initiated contact with [REDACTED] ID/OIOS accepts that [REDACTED] initiated contact with [REDACTED] and disclosed [REDACTED] relationship with [REDACTED].

71. ID/OIOS established that the lack of identifiers on the [REDACTED] probably means that the [REDACTED] were delivered [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] containing the threatening material [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and included their [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS considers that many of the [REDACTED] would only be known to [REDACTED] could only have been sourced from a [REDACTED]. ID/OIOS therefore considers that the [REDACTED] could only have been prepared by [REDACTED].

72. ID/OIOS established that at the time of this incident, [REDACTED] had a permanent residence in [REDACTED] was on leave in [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] was on [REDACTED] for this period with a [REDACTED].

73. [REDACTED] was asked a series of questions about the threatening material [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Initially, [REDACTED] denied any knowledge of the material. It was only after [REDACTED] was confronted [REDACTED]

with [REDACTED] from the [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] admitted [REDACTED]

74. ID/OIOS considers that by the latter part of [REDACTED] became increasingly distressed about the embarrassment [REDACTED] ID/OIOS found that [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] of the threatening [REDACTED] ID/OIOS also found that [REDACTED] delivered or caused to be delivered the material to the [REDACTED]

75. ID/OIOS assigns little credibility to [REDACTED] assertion that [REDACTED] acted on behalf of [REDACTED] or that [REDACTED] held a reasonable belief that [REDACTED] was engaged in [REDACTED] ID/OIOS considers that [REDACTED] was motivated by a desire to have [REDACTED] and therefore frustrate the relationship [REDACTED] was pursuing with [REDACTED]

76. ID/OIOS established that although [REDACTED] engaged in a sexual relationship with [REDACTED] the relationship has since been [REDACTED] and could not be considered exploitative. ID/OIOS found no evidence that [REDACTED] was involved in [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

VII. CONCLUSIONS

77. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] violated [REDACTED] Penal Law in that [REDACTED] attempted to compel [REDACTED] to engage in conduct which the latter has a legal right to abstain from engaging in by means of instilling a fear that if the demand was not complied with [REDACTED] would cause [REDACTED] or would publicize an asserted fact whether true or false, tending to [REDACTED] to hatred, contempt or ridicule.

78. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] violated Regulation 1.2 of the United Nations Staff Regulations by failing to uphold the highest standards of integrity.

79. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] violated Section 5.1 of the United Nations Secretary-General's Bulletin on the use of [REDACTED] in that [REDACTED] knowingly used [REDACTED] in a manner contrary to the rights and obligations of staff members.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

80. In view of the preceding findings, ID/OIOS makes the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: It is recommended that the [REDACTED] take appropriate action against [REDACTED] for violations [REDACTED]

of the United Nations Staff Regulation 1.2 and the provisions of Secretary General's Bulletin on the use of [REDACTED]

Recommendation 2: It is recommended that [REDACTED] consider the referral of this matter to [REDACTED] for any action they deem appropriate for possible violations of [REDACTED] Penal Law. ([REDACTED])