

## **2020-0007-INVI-P – Suspected Questionable Hiring Practices and a Promotion Due to Alleged Quid Pro Quo: Not Substantiated**

On January 27, 2020, the Architect of the Capitol (AOC) Office of Inspector General (OIG) received a complaint from an anonymous source questioning the hiring practices of a former Senior Rated (SR-00) jurisdictional leader. The complainant alleged the SR-00 approved the hiring of two AOC employees (Employee 1 and Employee 2) despite both having a criminal record. Further, the complainant alleged that Employee 1 received a promotion after investing in a company associated with the SR-00's spouse.

The OIG did not identify any evidence that Employee 1 or Employee 2 acted inappropriately by deceiving or concealing their criminal histories from the AOC. Both hiring actions were coordinated through the Human Capital Management Division. Both employees had traffic and misdemeanor offenses and were initially hired as temporary employees prior to the AOC's standardized background and suitability assessment policies. On April 13, 2017, the AOC implemented AOC Order 731-1, Pre-Employment and Contract Employee Suitability, which centralized the pre-employment and suitability assessment process and delegated administrative oversight to the Office of Security Programs.

The OIG did not identify any evidence that Employee 1 received a promotion based on investment in a company associated with the former SR-00's spouse. The law prohibits public officials from receiving any payments, things of value, or hidden ownership interests in return of official actions after the fact. We conducted a review of Financial Crimes Information Network reports pertaining to the suspects. The reports did not identify transfers of money between the parties or indicate financial interest by the parties in the company.

**Final Management Action:** The allegation lacked sufficient probable cause for fraud and kickbacks to continue a criminal investigation. Based on the policies and procedures in place on the date of hire for both employees, there was insufficient evidence to cite either employee. The case is closed.