

INSPECTOR GENERAL ACTION REQUEST

For use of this form, see AR 20-1. The responsible agency is the Office of The Inspector General and Auditor General.

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT OF 1974

AUTHORITY: Title 10, USC, Section 3039.

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: To secure sufficient information to make inquiry into the matters presented and to provide a response to the requestor(s) and/or take action to correct deficiencies.

ROUTINE USES: Information is used for official purposes within the Department of Defense; to answer complaints or respond to requests for assistance, advice or information; by Members of Congress and other Government agencies when determined by The Inspector General and Auditor General to be in the best interest of the Army; and in certain cases in trial by court martial other military matters as authorized by the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

DISCLOSURE OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER AND OTHER PERSONAL INFORMATION IS VOLUNTARY. HOWEVER, FAILURE TO PROVIDE COMPLETE INFORMATION MAY HINDER PROPER IDENTIFICATION OF THE REQUESTOR, ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE REQUESTED ACTION(S) AND RESPONSE TO THE REQUESTOR.

LAST NAME - FIRST NAME - MIDDLE INITIAL <small>(b)(6)</small>	GRADE <small>(b)(6)</small>	SSN <small>(b)(6)</small>	DDT TELEPHONE <small>(b)(5)</small>
--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	--

COMPLETE PRESENT MILITARY ADDRESS (If no military address, state current civilian address, including Zip Code.)
 HHC XVIII ABN Corps
 Ft Bragg, NC

SPECIFIC ACTION REQUESTED

INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THIS REQUEST (Use additional sheets if necessary; list inclosures if applicable.)

1. (b)(6) must process RJS # 41-04 IAW AR 735-5 and enforce the standard of conduct required for the Survey Officer, (b)(6). On 15 Sept 04, RJS # 41-04 was initiated by (b)(6) primary hand-receipt holder for the property book section. During the course of the investigation by the survey officer she recommended I be held financially liable. The survey officer has not conducted an investigation, by interviewing & obtaining witnesses from all persons involved in this matter. I have been forced to conduct the investigation myself. The survey officer has not interviewed (b)(6), the PBO, or many of the witnesses that stated (b)(6) gave the equipment, while I was away @ ANCAC, but failed to prepare hand receipts. (b)(6) has prolonged this RJS far beyond the time allotted by AR 735-5. Most importantly, JAG has found her recommendations are ~~not~~ legally insufficient, but this RJS has gone to JAG.

DO NOT consent to the release of information contained within this Inspector General Action Request and the use of my name during the IG Inquiry

Have you taken action to resolve this issue/complaint through your chain of command/NCO Support Channel?
 YES or NO

This information is submitted for the basic purpose of requesting assistance, correcting injustices affecting individual, or eliminating conditions considered detrimental to the efficiency or reputation of the Army. I fully understand that I may be held accountable for any statements which are proved to be knowingly untruthful.

DATE (YYYYMMDD) 20050726	SIGNATURE <small>(b)(6)</small>
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

again for legal review again. [REDACTED] has not added any additional facts to this case, but she will not look at all the facts in this case. I have rebutted all statements she made, with proper evidence.

On about 7 Jan 05, I requested, thru my chain of command, to speak with [REDACTED], in the presence of [REDACTED]. I wanted to know who was assuming responsibility as the PBO, since [REDACTED] was deploying on 8 Jan 05. I was told that I had to assume his duties as PBO. I expressed concern to [REDACTED] & my chain of command that I had not been given to opportunity to conduct an inventory IAW AR 710-2 with the outgoing PBO. I was also extremely concerned, that the survey officer was recommended I be held financially liable for the loss of equipment. I told my command, I felt it was unfair to be forced into a position to take over property records valued over 50 million dollars, if they felt I was responsible for failing to properly supervise a soldier who lost equipment valued at \$5,000.00. I was told that no one else could do it, so I would have to. I started conducting the inventory of the property records, and discovered numerous deficiencies. Hand-receipts had not been signed. Sensitive & cyclic inventories had not been conducted. Numerous sensitive items & other equipment could not be found. After conducting causative research, I discovered that when the Rear Hand receipt holder conducted her inventory all equipment was present, however when HHC XVIII ABC and 22nd MPAD actually deployed, they took additional equipment without reporting to the hand receipt holders. Although I recommended the command mandate 100% inventory they have not. Therefore, after numerous months, hand receipts are not signed. I am directly responsible for this equipment as the PBO, since it has not been signed for by a hand-receipt holder. *I have a list of all equipment discrepancies attached. The command is fully aware of these shortages & discrepancies but have not taken action IAW AR 735-5, AR 710-2, & Da Pam 710-2-1.*

*There are numerous hand receipt discrepancies that I have noted during my Change of PBD Inventory, on each command and staff brief, and to the command. It includes numerous sensitive items, well as MTOE equip, computer etc, valued well over \$100k.

Although I have recommended a 100% inventory, and all shortages be accounted for IAW AR 735-5 and AR 710-2, this has not happened. As a result, 100% accountability of Dragon Bde's Property Records has not been established. *I am extremely concerned, because IAW AR 710-2, Da Pam 710-2, and AR 735-5, I am directly responsible for all equipment not signed for by hand receipt. The command has failed to respond to my requests, and I am Not confident that they will be fair and impartial when R/S and 15-6 investigations have to be submitted for these losses. I will not be the fall guy again, for their failure to take appropriate actions.

The command has failed to ensure property accountability as well as take necessary actions to prevent the loss of gov't property. IAW AR 735-5 (command responsibility), AR 7102, and Da Pam 710-2-1

On numerous occasions I brought it to the command's attention that [REDACTED], PB NCO, was having severe financial problems. He had asked WO1 Swait to sign documents for turn-in, but he was actually planning to keep the equipment. Although [REDACTED], told him he could not do that and refused to sign the documents, this was a clear indication that he should not be working in a office that primary duties are to properly account for property. Second, while I attended ANCOG, this soldier repeatedly allowed unaccompanied access to the storage room, where the computers, later lost, were stored. [REDACTED] have to give him a direct order to go back into the room with the soldiers that were taking property out. He also spoke with [REDACTED] who expressed no concern about it. Third, [REDACTED] have provided statements to the command that [REDACTED] gave them equipment without preparing handreceipts. This equipment, was on the RJS, as lost. I recovered the equipment, and again requested this soldier be removed from my section. I believe the in-action, or failure to act, by the command, was a direct result of equipment being lost. They take no responsibility, that is [REDACTED], takes no responsibility. But easily places blame on me, when I have done everything humanly possible. I counseled him numerous times, which later led to a Bar-to-Re-enlistment, but it was too late when the finally responded.

This command has shown discrimination to enlisted personnel specifically logistician. I would like to address these situations, with an attempt to show they have not made fair & equitable decisions

1. [REDACTED], a soldier in HHC Supply, was forced into a court marshal, when he refused to accept a Field Grade Article 15. In this case, his subordinate took in weapons in the Arms Room, but failed to prepared properly H/R and log the weapon in. However, [REDACTED] was out of state, on leave when the incident occurred. [REDACTED] was cleared of all charges, but has not recovered from this injustice directed by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].
2. Second, I was TDY @ ANECC and on leave for nearly 5 months. When I returned, I informed directed the incoming/outgoing handreceipts holder to conduct an inventory. Discrepancies & losses of equip was discovered. [REDACTED] was the PBO and supervisor of this soldier during my absence, but the command & survey officer found that he had no responsibility to act IAW with all applicable regulations, but I, on the other hand, should have been able to supervise [REDACTED] soldier from another state. This, I submit to you, is not fair and reasonable.
3. [REDACTED], failed to properly sign in weapons. He was chaptered from the Army. However the white soldier, that brought the weapon to the Arms Room, who too failed to prepare a handreceipt, as well as the Armorer for the losing Arms Room, who failed to do the same, were not punished in any way.

These are just 3 cases there are many others. Commanders, officers, and warrant officers, are required to live by the same standards of conduct as NCO's and enlisted personnel. Too often, this command, specifically [REDACTED] & [REDACTED], fail to take appropriate actions and be fair and impartial when recommending both rewards and punishment.

On or about mid to late March 05, I was getting out of my car at the Brigade Hqs parking lot, when [redacted], USAG supply Sgt, approached me. He said he had purchased a watch for [redacted], that cost over \$300, with his Govt Impact Card, and [redacted] told him that he had lost it. He asked me what should he do in this situation. I advised him to notify the CDR/ISG, and account for the shortage IAW AR 735-5. I further told him to prepare a Statement of Charges or Report of Survey IAW AR 735-5. I asked [redacted] if this watch was on the roster book. He said he did not see it listed, because [redacted] had lost it. I advised him of the regulatory requirement to ensure property purchased with the Impact Card is approved by the Property Book Office, and added to the property book upon receipt. He said he would comply. I then proceeded to go upstairs to work in the S-4 shop.

However, approximately 18 Jul 05, [redacted] a co-worker, brought it to my attention that [redacted] had just told [redacted] that someone had broken into [redacted] office and stole a watch [redacted] some TA-50. I immediately called the supply room, because I recalled the conversation I had with [redacted] previously. [redacted] the incoming supply Sgt, answered the phone. I asked her was the watch [redacted] lost several months ago, the same watch he's claiming was just stolen. She asked [redacted] was this the same watch. [redacted] said it was the same watch that was previously missing. I asked was there any evidence of a forced entry, and if anyone had called the MP's to get a police report. They said [redacted] was handling this matter.

A few days later, [redacted] expressed her concerns to me. She said [redacted] K. [redacted] [redacted] in reference to the TA-50 and watch [redacted] he had lost, [redacted]

Wanted [redacted] to replace the equipment for him. [redacted]
[redacted] said she witnessed [redacted] take his personal TA-50
as well as his subordi- TA-50, and give it to [redacted]
[redacted] replace the equipment he had lost. I advised [redacted]
to report this matter to the command at once. Unfortunately,
the soldiers were very afraid and intimidated by [redacted]
they didn't report anything. — End of statement —

26 Jul 05



2. [redacted] has lost a watch purchased with the govt Impact card valued over \$500, and TA-50. He has not taken action IAW AR 735-5 to account for the loss. He has further directed the supply [redacted] to replace the equipment. [redacted] asked my advice of what to do. I told him to account for the loss by preparing RJS or statement of charges. He did not submit either. What he did do however, is take his soldiers & his own personal TA-50, and give it to [redacted] as requested. I believe this is legally and morally wrong. [redacted] has recommended I be held liable for some equipment my soldier lost, while I was attending ANCOG, @ Ft. Lee, Va, but he has not taken responsibility for his own loss. Further, JAG has already informed him, in writing, that the survey is legally insufficient. He has forced me to maintain accountability of equipment valued over \$50 million, but wants to take \$643.80, the amount recommended financially liable on RJS 41-04.

↑
*

Department of the Army Inspector General Action Request System

Friday, August 12, 2005

Electronic 1559

Page 1

FJ050314

Case Number : FJ050314 Close Date : 12-August-2005 Open Date : 26-July-2005

Suspense Date : External Suspense Date :

Complaint Made To : Army IG Receipt Mode : Walk-In

Case Status : Closed Non-IG Referral :

Initiator Information Name Last [redacted] First : [redacted] M.I. : [redacted] SSN : [redacted]

Component : Active Army Grade : [redacted] Gender : [redacted]

Acknowledge Date : Home UIC : Race : [redacted]

Complainant Information Name Last : [redacted] First : [redacted] M.I. : [redacted] SSN : [redacted]

Component : Active Army Grade : [redacted] Gender : [redacted]

Home UIC : Race : [redacted]

Case Label : Multiple issues with PBO and chain of command. Home IG :

Problem Area : Perceived double standards by subordinates.

Notification Date : 12-August-2005 Inspector General : [redacted]

Location : Fort Bragg, North Carolina

Subject Information :	Last Name :	First :	M.I. :	SSN :
	Component :	Grade :	Gender :	
	Race :	Organization ID :		

Other Issues
or
Allegations :

Function : YB Commander's Action/Decision
 Determination :
 User Data : TIM Category : C Operation :
 Organization ID : XVIII Airborne Corps & Ft. Bragg

Function : YB Commander's Action/Decision
 Determination :
 User Data : TIM Category : C Operation :
 Organization ID : XVIII Airborne Corps & Ft. Bragg

Function : YB Commander's Action/Decision
 Determination :
 User Data : TIM Category : C Operation :
 Organization ID : XVIII Airborne Corps & Ft. Bragg

Synopsis :

On 26 July 2005 [b)(6)] HHC, XVIII ABN Corps, came to the XVIII ABN Corps and Fort Bragg Inspector General's Office (FBIGO). [b)(6)] discussed multiple issues regarding her PBO and chain of command. [b)(6)] main issue was with a report of survey, which was initiated on 15 September 2004. [b)(6)] complaint was that the survey officer recommended she be held financially liable for the property that was lost by [b)(6)] primary hand receipt holder for the property book section, even after the legal review for the report was found insufficient. During the inquiry a check was made into the status of [b)(6)] report of survey. It was determined that the second SJA review was also found legally insufficient and [b)(6)] was afforded her due process rights. During the initial meeting [b)(6)] discussed other issues, which she felt were not being handled properly.

1. That [b)(6)] purchased a watch for over \$300.00 that he had since lost and was never added to the property book.
2. That [b)(6)] told others his office was broken into and some stole the watch, which was allegedly/previosly, reported missing, and his TA-50 gear.
3. [b)(6)] kept coming to the supply room to see [b)(6)] in reference to his missing TA-50 gear and that [b)(6)] had to give [b)(6)] his and other subordinate Soldiers personal TA-50 gear to replace the items stated where stolen from his office.

On 29 July 2005, [b)(6)] was directed by [b)(6)] to interview [b)(6)] about issues [b)(6)] brought to the FBIGO. She advised she had not seen the watch but heard it had come up missing in November or December of 2004. She stated she did not believe a report of survey had been done on the watch.

On 1 August 2005 [b)(7)(C)] interviewed [b)(6)] Supply Sergeant/Impact Card Holder for HHC XVIII ABN Corps. He advised he purchased four watches in November 2004 and the following personnel had signed for the watches: [b)(6)] and [b)(6)] Since the deployment the forth watch

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Dissemination is prohibited except as authorized by AR 20-1.

This document contains information EXEMPT FROM MANDATORY DISCLOSURE under the FOIA, Exemptions 1, 2, 5, 6 & 7 Apply.

was kept in the supply room and [redacted] had received one of the other watches. [redacted] provided the receipt card receipt, a copy of the purchase order, information sheets for the watch and three hand receipts for watches. [redacted] testified that [redacted] did not purchase the watch, the watch was \$215.95, the watch was missing not stolen and that he believed LTC Ellis was preparing to either do a statement of charges or replace the watch. [redacted] further testified that [redacted] did not state the watch was stolen when someone came into his office and took his TA-50 gear. [redacted] also testified that he gave [redacted] a duty belt, canteen, canteen cup, canteen cover, suspenders and a holster out of excess gear, which he had personally collected/found over the time he has spent in the Army. [redacted] was given a teach and train session regarding, accountability, purchase orders, property book management and the reporting of lost and stolen items.

On 2 August 2005 [redacted] interviewed [redacted] who was mentioned by [redacted] as being present during the conversation between [redacted] and [redacted]. He advised that [redacted] stated watch was still missing as of 18 July 2005 and felt he may have indicated it was taken when someone came into his unsecured office and removed his TA-50 gear. [redacted] was asked to clarify if [redacted] stated this and he readdressed his answer. He stated he took it to mean that but that [redacted] stated that the TA-50 gear was missing as well as the watch, which had already been reported to [redacted].

On 2 Aug 2005 [redacted] and [redacted] interviewed [redacted] CO, HHC XVIII ABN Corps, regarding purchases made with units GPC. [redacted] is the GPC certifying official. [redacted] reviewed all GPC purchases over the last twelve months, which [redacted] brought with her. She admitted the purchase requests were being done after purchases were being made, numerous items were not being placed on property book, several questionable/unauthorized purchases had been made and items were not being hand receipted.

On 4 Aug 2005 a review of the issues and [redacted] complaint documents gathered and additional issues, uncovered during preliminary analysis, were discussed by [redacted] to [redacted]. [redacted] briefed the IG, [redacted] who in-turn spoke to the XVIII ABN Corps Chief Of Staff [redacted]. On 11 August 2005 [redacted] discussed the issues [redacted] brought to the IGs attention with the Chief of Staff.

The following recommendations were made by [redacted]

- a. Prompt payment of watch lost by [redacted]
 - b. Address the solicitation, made by [redacted] for free TA-50 gear and discuss the perceived double standard by his subordinates.
 - c. Coordinate a refresher course to address approval/justification, authority procedures, post authorization of purchases, failures to post key purchases (watches) to property book, non-itemized purchase authorizations and processing of receipts.
 - d. Refresher course on IMPAC Card Admin for USAG Cdr and Supply Sergeant followed up with an unannounced compliance inspection of their books in 90 to 120 days.
2. Since no standards were violated, the decision was made by [redacted] to handle all the complaints concerns as issues and close the case as assistance.

On 12 August 2005, this case was closed in IGARS and [redacted] was sent a final notification letter.

End-of-Report

1 Cases

26 Jul 05 [redacted] - [redacted] came to FBIGO with multiple issues regarding her PBO and chain of command. [redacted] and [redacted] reviewed the IGAR. A status check was made into the status of [redacted] report of survey. [redacted] was asked to complete a statement regarding issue with watch she claimed [redacted] had but was not accounted for properly.

26 Jul 05 [redacted] This office contacted Dragon Brigade reference 41-04. Was advised 41-04 it was back at legal for second review.

27 Jul 05 [redacted] - [redacted] brought statement regarding additional issues. Matter turned over to [redacted]

29 Jul 05 [redacted] - Interviewed [redacted] about issues [redacted] brought to this offices attention.

1 Aug 05 [redacted] - Interviewed [redacted], Supply Sergeant/Impact card holder for HHC XVIII ABN Corps.

2 Aug 05 [redacted] - Interviewed [redacted], who [redacted] stated was present to conversation between [redacted] and [redacted] Contacted [redacted] for follow-up questions.

2 Aug 05 [redacted] - Interviewed [redacted] CO, HHC XVIII ABN Corps, regarding purchases made with units GPC. [redacted] is the GPC certifying official. [redacted] reviewed all GPC purchases over the last twelve months, which [redacted] brought with her.

4 Aug 05 [redacted] - [redacted] reviewed complaint, documents and issues and briefed Mr. Mansfield.

5 Aug 05 [redacted] - [redacted] [redacted] and I briefed [redacted] of all documents, statements and evidence found during preliminary analysis. [redacted] advised he would speak to chief of staff [redacted] regarding issues surrounding purchases with GPC, property book management, accountability and improper handling of lost items.

11 Aug 05 [redacted] - Briefed by [redacted] who advised issues would be handled through chief of staff. A special inspection within the next quarter would be conducted as well as retraining.

12 Aug 05 [redacted] - Case closed in IGARS, final notification sent out to complainant.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. Dissemination is prohibited except as authorized by AR 20-1.

This document contains information EXEMPT FROM MANDATORY DISCLOSURE under the FOIA, Exemptions 5,6 & 7 Apply.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 8:40 AM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: Preliminary Analysis of Allegations against Senior Member Dragon Bde and Follow On Activity

Pls make a copy of this and see me with it.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 5:04 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: FW: Preliminary Analysis of Allegations against Senior Member Dragon Bde and Follow On Activity

This is (b)(6) action on above.

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 4:46 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: RE: Preliminary Analysis of Allegations against Senior Member Dragon Bde and Follow On Activity

Roger (b)(6)
I have already sent an email across to (b)(6) about the issues...specifically about points 1 and 2...think point 3 is excellent and would like to implement once we work through points 1 and 2...once I clear the issues with (b)(6) I will give you the thumbs up to engage with (b)(6) reference point 3...Thanks for your work on this...

ATW!

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: (b)(6)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 4:28 PM
To: (b)(6)
Subject: Preliminary Analysis of Allegations against Senior Member Dragon Bde and Follow On Activity

(b)(6)

As I close out the assistance case involving the disgruntled DRAGON BDE Property Book NCO and allegations of double standards in supply accountability:

Prompt payment for watch by (b)(6) will close out first allegation of officer loses stuff and does not pay.

On 2nd issue of officer solicits free TA-50 to avoid payment for unsecured TA50, preponderance of evidence indicated it was unsolicited receipt of excess/found on installation equipment. From a regulatory standpoint you may want to constructively discuss the implications of public acceptance of unsolicited and unauthorized excess TA50 as it does not make him a supply discipline role model and can easily be perceived as a double standard by subordinates.

8/11/2005

On procedural irregularities with IMPAC Card, ie questionable record of approvals/justifications, authority procedures, post authorization of purchases, failure to post key purchases(watches) to property book, non itemized purchase authorizations and a few missing receipts) I would like to coordinate w/ [redacted] support "a short (1-2 hr) refresher course on IMPAC Card Admin for USAG Cdr and Supply Sgt followed up with an unannounced compliance inspection of their books in 90-120 days. I believe it will get their attention and let them know this is serious business.

The above should fully take care of all issues.

Thanks



INSPECTOR GENERAL SENSITIVE INFORMATION - FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

The information contained in this e-mail and any accompanying attachments may contain Inspector General sensitive information, which is protected from mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC §552. It should not be released to unauthorized persons. If you are not the intended recipient of this information, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance on this information is prohibited. If you received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by calling (910) 396-7343.

8/11/2005

THIS OFFICE RECEIVED ALLEGATIONS THAT THE ACTING COMMANDER OF DRAGON BRIGADE [REDACTED] WAS APPLYING DUAL STANDARDS IN THE COMMAND'S SUPPLY DISCIPLINE PROGRAM (CSDP). THE SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS WERE THAT [REDACTED] HAD LOST A WATCH PURCHASED ON THE IMPACT CREDIT CARD IN THE NOVEMBER/DECEMBER 04 TIMEFRAME BUT A REPORT OF SURVEY WAS NOT INITIATED NOR WAS A STATEMENT OF CHARGES SUBMITTED. IT IS ALLEGED THAT APPROXIMATELY ONE MONTH AGO [REDACTED] STATED HIS OFFICE HAD BEEN ENTERED, WHILE HE WAS ON LEAVE, AND ITEMS FROM HIS TA 50-901 WERE STOLEN, ALONG WITH THE WATCH THAT WAS ALLEGEDLY LOST IN NOVEMBER 2004.

THIS OFFICE CONDUCTED A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS AND FOUND THAT APPROXIMATELY ONE MONTH AGO [REDACTED] REPORTED TO [REDACTED] THE COMPANY SUPPLY CLERK, THAT APPROXIMATELY SIX ITEMS OF [REDACTED] TA 50-901 WERE TAKEN BY UNKNOWN PERSONS FROM [REDACTED] UNLOCKED OFFICE, WHILE [REDACTED] WAS ON LEAVE. [REDACTED] 9 MM HOLSTER WAS ALSO STOLEN DURING THE SAME INCIDENT (PROPERTY BOOK ITEM). TWO WITNESSES INTERVIEWED BY THIS OFFICE, INCLUDING THE COMPANY COMMANDER, TESTIFIED [REDACTED] MADE REFERENCE TO THE MISSING WATCH AT THE SAME TIME HE WAS DISCUSSING HIS MISSING FIELD GEAR. [REDACTED] TESTIFIED [REDACTED] ASKED FOR A PRICE OF THE WATCH AND [REDACTED] ASSUMED [REDACTED] ASKED SO HE COULD REPLACE THE WATCH WITH A CASH PURCHASE. [REDACTED] ALSO VERIFIED THAT [REDACTED] HAD TOLD HIM IN THE NOV/DEC 04 TIMEFRAME THAT HE WAS MISSING THE WATCH IN QUESTION. THE COMPANY COMMANDER TESTIFIED [REDACTED] STATED THE WATCH HAD BEEN "TAKEN" FROM HIS OFFICE APPROXIMATELY ONE MONTH AGO. NO ACTION, TO DATE, HAS BEEN TAKEN BY [REDACTED] THE COMPANY COMMANDER OR [REDACTED] TO INITIATE RECOVERY OR REPLACEMENT OF LOST/STOLEN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY.

[REDACTED] THE SUPPLY SERGEANT, TESTIFIED THAT HE PROVIDED REPLACEMENT TA 50-901 AND A 9MM HOLSTER TO [REDACTED] "...FROM ITEM HE HAD FROM OVER TIME." AND THAT [REDACTED] DID NOT SIGN FOR THE ITEMS.

IT APPEARS [REDACTED] FAILED TO COMPLY WITH REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS BY:

- IMPROPERLY FAILING TO PROVIDE AN IMMEDIATE WRITTEN REPORT OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES SURROUNDING THE THEFT OF HIS TA 50-901 ITEMS AND THE THEFT OR LOSS OF A GOVERNMENT OWNED WATCH, IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 12-1b(1), AR 735-5.

- IMPROPERLY FAILING TO REPORT THE THEFT OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY TO THE MILITARY LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES FOR INVESTIGATION, IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 12-1b(2), AR 735-5.
- IMPROPERLY HAD A RELATIONSHIP WITH [REDACTED] THAT INVOLVED, OR APPEARED TO INVOLVE, THE IMPROPER USE OF RANK OR POSITION FOR PERSONAL GAIN WHEN HE ACCEPTED REPLACEMENT TA-50-901 ITEMS AND A 9 MM HOLSTER WITHOUT ADHERING TO CORRECT SUPPLY ACCOUNTABILITY AND ISSUE PROCEDURES, IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 4-14b, AR 600-20.

(NOTE: [REDACTED] TESTIFIED THAT IF A PRIVATE HAD REPORTED SIMILAR LOSSES TO HIM THAT HE WOULD NOT HAVE REPLACED THE ITEMS BUT WOULD HAVE INITIATED A STATEMENT OF CHARGES OR A REPORT OF SURVEY.)

DURING THE COURSE OF THE PRELIMINARY PHASE IT BECAME EVIDENT THAT IMPAC CREDIT CARD PROGRAM WITHIN USAG IS WROUGHT WITH MISMANAGEMENT AND NONCOMPLIANCE. A REVIEW OF THE RECORDS (JAN 05 THRU JUL 05) REVEALED PURCHASES WERE MADE AND THEN THE PURCHASE REQUESTS WERE COMPLETED. THOUGH THE PURCHASES WERE APPROVED BY THE COMPANY COMMANDEER (APPROVAL AUTHORITY), SHE ACKNOWLEDGED THE PROBABILITY THAT THE FILES WERE ACTUALLY CREATED IN PREPARATION FOR THE RECENT ORA INSPECTION. THE FILES ARE MISSING RECEIPTS FOR NUMEROUS PURCHASES AND THE PURCHASE PROCESS ENSURE DETAILED ACCOUNTING FOR ITEMS ACTUALLY PURCHASED (I.E. FOUR TRANSACTIONS TO CROWN CLEANERS FOR A TOTAL OF APPROXIMATELY \$8000.00 FOR "REAL WORLD DEPLOYMENT." THOUGH THE COMMANDER STATED THE COST WAS FOR SEWING OF ITEMS ON UNIFORMS FOR DEPLOYING PERSONNEL, NO RECORD EXISTS TO SUPPORT THE NUMBERS OR TO VALIDATE THE ACCURACY OF THE CHARGES (I.E. NO BY NAME LISTING OF DEPLOYING PERSONNEL AND/OR NUMBERS OF ITEMS SEWN). THE LAST CHARGE WAS FOR \$2354.00, ON 16 MAY 05, BUT THE COMMANDER COULD NOT RECALL HOW MANY PERSONS DEPLOYED FROM DRAGON BRIGADE AFTER 16 MAY 05.

THE IMPAC CREDIT CARD RECORDS REFLECT ACCOUNTABLE ITEMS PURCHASED YET DO NOT REFLECT TO WHOM OR WHEN OR IF THESE ITEMS WERE ISSUED TO USERS (I.E. SIX COMPACT FLASH MEMORY DRIVES, RANGING FROM 256MB TO 512MB; FIVE USAF FLIGHT BAGS, ETC.) ADDITIONALLY IMPACT CREDIT CARD RECORDS DO NOT REFLECT PROPERTY BOOK OFFICER DOCUMENTATION, TO SUPPORT ADDING REQUIRED ITEMS TO THE UNIT'S PROPERTY BOOK.

THE IMPACT CREDIT CARD RECORD ALSO REFLECTS ITEMS PURCHASED NOT AUTHORIZED FOR PURCHASE WITH THE IMPACT CREDIT CARD, I.E.

THE WATCH LOST OR STOLEN FROM [REDACTED] ALONG WITH THREE OTHER IDENTICAL WATCHES, RECEIPTED TO [REDACTED] (DRAGON BRIGADE COMMANDER); [REDACTED] (DRAGON BRIGADE XO); AND [REDACTED] (DRAGON BRIGADE S3) (DEEMED BY [REDACTED] CONTRACTING, TO BE PERSONAL ITEMS AND NOT AUTHORIZED FOR PURCHASE.)

NOTE: IT IS NOT CLEAR WHICH WATCH [REDACTED] WAS IN POSSESSION OF AND IF IT WAS PROPERLY SUB-HANDED TO HIM BY THE INITIAL RECIPIENT.

RECOMMEND A COMPLETE AUDIT OF THE UNIT'S IMPACT CREDIT CARD PROGRAM TO ENSURE:

*RETRAINING OF PERSONNEL ON THE PROPER PROCEDURES FOR PURCHASES AND RECORD KEEPING

*TO IDENTIFY AND DISCONTINUE UNAUTHORIZED PURCHASES

*TO ESTABLISH ACCOUNTABILITY OF ITEMS PREVIOUSLY PURCHASED

*TO ENSURE FUTURE PURCHASES ARE PROPERLY ACCOUNTED FOR AND IF APPROPRIATE ADDED TO THE UNIT'S PROPERTY BOOK.

29/1d 05 0545

[redacted]
watch, report of survey, watch
case of missing. Nov-Dec 04,
didn't hear anything else about it.

[redacted] was told it was
missing. [redacted] No report
of survey ever done. Talk that

[redacted] watch was in walker, which
was broken into two weeks ago.

anything over \$100.00 should be on property books.
watch has not been seen. Co-stive
search is being completed.

[redacted] told her watch and TP-50
was stolen 2 weeks ago. Nov-Dec
watch was missing. [redacted] saw
[redacted] TP-50 gear.

TA-50

[redacted] saw ~~KIC~~ ~~etc~~ canteen,
canteen cover, pistol ~~part~~.



(b)(6) brought hand receipt book,
(b)(6) Soldier Issue file and
CDR. Command Impact purchase book, which had
no receipt ^{for} watch in 04 or 05.

AR 735-5 accountability (2)
DA BAM 710-2-1 ch 5 hand receipt
procedures.

AR 710-2 Appendix F Hand receipt

1.

1. unlawfully willfully purchased and \$300.00
item without.

(b)(6) BDO (b)(6)

1. False statement
2. loss of Gov property
3. Dereliction of duty

C

F

C

Nov
04

1. Have you ordered a watch for [redacted], high speed watch, [redacted] SGM, [redacted] took [redacted] didn't want his.

2. When was it reported missing. [redacted] told him watch had been mislaid placed has been sometime ago.

4. Aids or give you TA-50 gear? What gear was given. Two weeks ago, someone was in his office, took his gear. Went to CIF, found too much trouble, gave him a pistol belt cant/cover suspenders, ammo pouch which came from my home.

5. Report break in of wall locker. No report was done due to believing he would since he stated he had a handle on it.

7. Ever do report of survey on watch. MP report ever done. asked about price on watch, believes he was going to take a statement of [redacted] charges. Went on leave. unit price

8. Have a hand receipt for watch? Hand receipt done for [redacted] wasn't involved in switch believes they did hand receipt.

9. How much was the watch?
purchased from Apple SC at Pope
Impact card. receipt will have amount

10. Was it placed in the property
book? No, due to watch being
sent forward.

11. Why not? went forward.

Told him watch was misplaced, never
told him it was stolen from wall
locker. Believes he was going to pay

for watch due to conv. prior
going on leave when [redacted] ^{to} ~~inform~~
him about price of watch.

Unsure if it was to be on property
book.

TA-50 gear was personal stuff
[redacted] stated he has collected
over the years, which he received
from soldiers who ETS, or found
in the field.

has control of 4th watch.
purchased Nov 1 04, \$215.75.

[REDACTED] brought copy of
receipt.

SGM went with him, gave him
directive after Company Commander,

AR 600-20 Complaint

[REDACTED] believes [REDACTED] was
telling [REDACTED] that watch was
missing possible taken the same time
TA-50 gear was taken.

2 Aug 65

Spoke to [REDACTED] again, admitted
he gave pistol holster to [REDACTED]
without receipt along with other TA 50.
Watches were purchased, [REDACTED]
advised Nov missing 3 weeks ago
asked about amount was going to
replace it. No formal charges were
done, no hand receipt, 15 days
due survey statement of charges.

propose a complete audit
of impact purchases back to Jul 04
to identify accountability items and
reestablish/establish accountability of
required items.

examples i.e.: watches, orders,
easily perishable items.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] improperly received IP 50 gear
from [REDACTED] in violation of
AR 17-2-1.

ISSUE: purchase procedures.

ISSUE: accountability of all expendable
and durable items.

CSM gave guidance for improper purchase,
card holder failed to make proper
purchase.

Company commander authorized purchase
Items purchase have no accountability,
[REDACTED] failed to maintain accountability.

3 Aug 65
1700
CPT
Mayoras

Impac purchase request not listed.
Remembers signing purchase request
signed purchase order after [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] made purchase. Purchase
of watches not listed on transaction
register for Nov 64