



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*

OVERVIEW REPORT ON ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT BY



REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0648-06

21 FEBRUARY 2008

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.



[REDACTED]

SUBJECT: Overview report on allegations of misconduct by [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

1. In [REDACTED], the Investigation Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received allegations of possible misconduct by some [REDACTED] and based [REDACTED]. Similar allegations were made by [REDACTED].

2. On [REDACTED] in the spirit of the revised draft model memorandum of [REDACTED] requested the [REDACTED] for assistance in investigating these allegations. [REDACTED] appointed a [REDACTED] for this on the understanding that before the joint investigation commenced, ID/OIOS would complete its preliminary fact-finding inquiry to determine whether the allegations were credible and warranted a full joint investigation.

3. During the course of its preliminary inquiries, ID/OIOS received additional allegations. Following an initial assessment, ID/OIOS identified [REDACTED] of allegations of varying credibility:

- a) Allegations of inappropriate relations between [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED]
- b) Allegations of inappropriate relations between [REDACTED] and other [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

- c) Allegations of misconduct by [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]
- d) Allegations of illicit [REDACTED] transactions by [REDACTED]; and
- e) Allegations of miscellaneous general misconduct, such as [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]

4. ID/OIOS conducted field-based inquiries, which include [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. Investigators interviewed [REDACTED] personnel and conducted a number of site examinations. In addition to the limited scope of its mandate, the ID/OIOS investigation was hampered by several factors unique to [REDACTED]—for example, the [REDACTED] environment hindered the investigation; witnesses resided in [REDACTED] locations not easily accessible by road or air; and some witnesses were unwilling to cooperate with an UN inquiry.

5. Based on information obtained during the course of its inquiries, ID/OIOS found that most of the allegations were either based on hearsay or contained no leads that adduced credible evidence. Thus they did not yield to a meaningful investigation. ID/OIOS also determined that many of the remaining allegations were unsubstantiated or supported by uncorroborated statements, while in some instances credible evidence was adduced to conclude that the alleged misconduct did not occur. In [REDACTED] however, there was some corroboration of the initial allegations as detailed below.

Purchase of [REDACTED] and unlawful detention

6. During the initial stages of the inquiry, ID/OIOS received information from [REDACTED] that members of the [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] had procured [REDACTED] from a [REDACTED]. It was further alleged that this [REDACTED] was [REDACTED], resulting in the [REDACTED] illegal arrest and detention in the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] was allegedly released upon [REDACTED] by other [REDACTED].

7. ID/OIOS found that while corroborative of each other's accounts, the sources that provided the initial information were generally reporting hearsay evidence. ID/OIOS also interviewed the alleged [REDACTED] as well as several independent witnesses involved in various aspects of the alleged transaction.

8. The evidence obtained from the [REDACTED] and other individuals involved in various stages of the incident was generally consistent. However, there were some contradictions. Abundant evidence indicated that an individual living in [REDACTED], which was a regular stop along the [REDACTED] procured a [REDACTED] of what appeared to be [REDACTED] and sold it to members of [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Statements diverged as to the origin of [REDACTED], whether a middleman was used in the transaction, and whether the [REDACTED] was authentic.

9. ID/OIOS interviewed [REDACTED] for [REDACTED] who purported to have brought [REDACTED], whom [REDACTED] believed to be the buyers of the [REDACTED], to an appraiser in [REDACTED], who determined that the [REDACTED] was actually [REDACTED] from a [REDACTED]. This same witness provided the names of the [REDACTED] individuals in question and upon viewing a [REDACTED] array, identified [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] as the [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]

question. Pursuant to this discovery, the witness stated that [REDACTED] ordered the arrest of [REDACTED]

10. The circumstances of the [REDACTED]'s arrest were generally corroborated, but significant differences existed in the recounting of the details. Generally speaking it was agreed that the [REDACTED] was arrested in [REDACTED] by members of [REDACTED], who were again conducting a [REDACTED] in the area. [REDACTED] was brought to the [REDACTED], where the [REDACTED] accused [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] (subsequently interviewed by ID/OIOS), of [REDACTED] them counterfeit [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] was then detained in [REDACTED] within the [REDACTED] and told that [REDACTED] release was contingent on [REDACTED] return of the [REDACTED] had been [REDACTED] for the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] told investigators that whilst in detention [REDACTED] was physically assaulted, was required to perform [REDACTED], and was sexually propositioned by one of [REDACTED]

11. [REDACTED] was able to describe the details [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] had been detained, including very specific details that could not be known to someone who had never been [REDACTED]. The allegation that the [REDACTED] was detained against [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED], was corroborated by [REDACTED], including [REDACTED]'s working [REDACTED]. There were discrepancies in describing the length of [REDACTED], the source(s) of the order to detain [REDACTED], and the exact circumstances of [REDACTED] release. Specifically, there was broad corroboration that [REDACTED] was released only after [REDACTED] returned the [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED]; however, the [REDACTED] was in question, as was the identities of those who provided the [REDACTED].

12. During an ID/OIOS [REDACTED] procedure, the [REDACTED] positively identified [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] in the transaction. The [REDACTED] also implicated an individual [REDACTED] believed to be the [REDACTED], and responsible for authorizing [REDACTED] eventual release. Shown a [REDACTED] array, [REDACTED] identified [REDACTED] as this person. [REDACTED] other witnesses corroborated the involvement of these [REDACTED] in this incident.

13. [REDACTED] that remains unclear is the association of the [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]—a point that is significant given the implicit misconduct in [REDACTED] engaging in financial and illegal [REDACTED] transactions with a member of [REDACTED]. While some parties describe the [REDACTED] as being a member of [REDACTED], there is more support that [REDACTED] was a [REDACTED], an elusive distinction. While [REDACTED] were issued and carry [REDACTED] labeling them as such, [REDACTED] are generally defined in terms of various nebulous factors, including [REDACTED] association, ideological accord and/or physical proximity coupled with any of the former factors.

14. Inquiries conducted so far have yielded sufficient evidence to conclude that [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] an undetermined amount of [REDACTED] for [REDACTED], later found to be fake, to the [REDACTED], who had [REDACTED] connections. The [REDACTED] was subsequently detained at [REDACTED] for an undetermined length of time with [REDACTED] release contingent

[REDACTED]

on [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED]. The [REDACTED] finally collected enough [REDACTED] and was released, allegedly after [REDACTED].

Assessment

15. ID/OIOS concludes that there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that [REDACTED] purchased counterfeit [REDACTED] and unlawfully detained a [REDACTED]. In particular, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were identified as being involved in this misconduct.

16. With regard to the other identified allegations, the ID/OIOS inquiry did not adduce sufficient evidence to make any conclusive findings against [REDACTED].

17. ID/OIOS notes that some of the allegations, which are based on hearsay and therefore remain untested or for which no corroboration was found during this preliminary inquiry, may have the potential to damage the reputation of the [REDACTED]. In this regard, the [REDACTED] authorities may wish to consider other avenues of inquiry, which fall outside the purview of ID/OIOS investigations.

Recommendation

18. ID/OIOS makes the following recommendation in view of the findings of this preliminary inquiry:

19. It is recommended that [REDACTED] informs the [REDACTED] about the findings of this report with a request that they take appropriate action against [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

20. ID/OIOS requests that [REDACTED] informs the [REDACTED] that it is available to brief its designated officials in [REDACTED], as may be required.

21. Should you have any questions or comments on any of the matters contained in this report, please do not hesitate to [REDACTED].

22. Thank you and kind regards.

cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

