	——Approved for Releas Closure M			
Conc Number 11 0035 I	(b)(3)			
Case Number: 11-0035 l	(0)(0)	Date of Entry:	10/31/2013	
Investigator:			(b)(——(b)(1) 3)
	Allegation	Information	(6)(
Fictitious, and Fraudulent Claims. (U//FOGO) The OIG examined The OIG compared the hours records for contractor facilities (U//FOGO) On 24 January 2011, the OIG from 2003 to the present. A week with occasional shift work. As a sal cards daily and submitted them to their selection. (U//FOGO) The OIG provided Mr. Gomez existed.	time at the facility for the charged to NRO contract The comparisite employee aried employee supervisor every two weeks callist of 24 days which claimed those hours, at was unsure of the number worked.	eek on site for five a facility 49 percented and directly on his timecards, awo full work years with facility accesson revealed 1,283 worked from 9 recorded 80 how and allowed and the cout provided no exert of breaks allowed and a worked from 9 claimed 1 c	A provide weeks or more of a nine we tof the time despite his stary charged NRO contracts he would have violated 18 from 1 languages, 2009 through the street of the street of the work of the work of the work of the street of the work	sactive survey identified beek period. From 26 July tus as a full-time U.S.C.§287, False, (b)(3) (b)(7)(c) gh 31 December 2010. Fel records, and access supervised with 4:00PM, five days a byte completed to (b)(3) (b)(7)(c) where no badge records whereabouts. The properties of the
(U/7FOUO)—On 26 May 2011, the OIG into worked for Northrop Grumm 8:00AM and left work between 3:00PM a day to go to the deli for a snack, talk to the minutes each. worked 80 his charged to the contract he approximately January 2010 received computer based training (CBT) for the time he worked and understood to worked and worked and understood to worked and worked and understood to worked and w	erviewed	provided the folloont. between 11:00AM average and activities not deed, but claimed he not properly charge of time for hours he ork time to performat least some of nat NRO OIG would tacted OIG and related of the material account. The amount of the secount.	stated he arrived at work be and 1:00PM. ged six smoke breaks per dalirectly supporting the content of did not accurately accounting time to the contract. Eastated he had no intention did not intend to work. The work related to his person time was charged continue to work the case ayed that inforwas debriefed of all clearant ble. During the 2009 to 2010 time work time	ract could not be for hours worked. In ach year, n of defrauding anyone owned a nal company. ed to contract line items . NRO OIG periodically med that his last day ces on 1 July 2011. (b)(3
(U//FOUC) Northrop Grumman perform OIG. The OIG took no exception to North	ed an independent analysi:	s and disputed 30	of the 1,283 mischarged ho	

SECRET//TK//NF//25X1 Approved for Release: 2017/11/28 C05100614 attended as a (U//FOUC) attended Indoctrination. Site Personnel Security verified new NSA civilian employee. (U//FOUC) As a result of the OIG investigation, Northrop Grumman implemented (b)(4)(b)(3)(b)(7)(c)(U//FOUQ). On 9 November 2012, at the request of the United States Attorney's Office (USAO) the OIG analyzed badge records and the time cards for or the time period 12 May 2012 to 5 October 2012. The time period covered recent employment as an NSA civilian. Analysis revealed approximately 42 hours or 5.3% of unaccounted for time. The OIG presented the facts of this case to the USAC which declined prosecution due to Northrop Grumman's cooperation, full reimbursement to the government, improved internal controls, and no evidence of continued mischarging by as a government employee. (5//TK//NE) The investigation revealed sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that actions constituted a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 287, False, Fictitious, and Fraudulent Claims, by mischarging 1,253 hours to NRO contracts, resulting in a loss to the government and issued a Treasury check for Northrop Grumman reimbursed to contract The NRO OIG completed a Report of Investigation dated 6 February 2014. There are no further loss to contract actions required by this office. It is recommended that the case be closed as substantiated. (b)(1)Last Investigative Step: (b)(3)Substantiated (Unresolved) UnsubstantiatedReferred Resolution:

Case Closure Justification

Additional Information:

SECRET//TK//NF//25X1 Approved for Release: 2017/11/28 C05100614

	OIG Management Approval	
Notes	Signature	Effective Date
(b)		04/01/2014
	OIG Management Approval	
Notes	Signature	Effective Date
	IG Counsel Approval	
Notes	Signature	Effective Date

Page 3 of 3