



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION
27130 TELEGRAPH ROAD
QUANTICO, VA 22134

March 11, 2025

Mr. Abbas Dharamsey
Open Source Anomalous

Dear Mr. Dharamsey:

This is in further response to your request for release of Exhibits: 1, 27, 51, 58, 76, 109 and 144 pertaining to Report of Investigation (ROI) 0012-2003-CID186-34232-8B from within the files of the Department of the Army Criminal Investigation Division (DACID). Your request was received February 10, 2025, and assigned control number FA25-1473

Enclosed, please find the Exhibits responsive to your request. The names of law enforcement personnel, as well as names, social security numbers and other personal items of information pertaining to third parties have been withheld. The withholding of this information constitutes a partial denial pursuant to Title 5, USC, Section 552, Exemptions (b)(6), and (b)(7)(C) of the FOIA, because release would violate the personal privacy of other individuals mentioned in the report. We also applied Exemption (b)(7)(D) to withhold information that could reveal a confidential source and/or information provided by a confidential source. Moreover, disclosing the withheld information would harm an interest protected by these exemptions.

Be advised that Exhibit 144, has been closed by our field element, upon further review of the ROI it states not attached as an exhibit, please review previous release FA24-4441.

This letter constitutes a partial denial of your request, made on behalf of the Director, DACID, the Initial Denial Authority for DACID records.

You have the right to appeal to the Office of the Army General Counsel, the Army's appellate authority. If you decide to appeal at this time, your appeal must be submitted within 90 days of the date of this letter. In your appeal, you must state the basis for your disagreement with the partial denial and you should state the justification for its release. Your appeal is made through this Division and should be addressed to the Chief, Department of the Army, 27130 Telegraph Road, Quantico, Virginia 22134 for forwarding to the Office of the Army General Counsel. Please note that your appeal should address information denied in this response and cannot be used to make a new request for additional or new information.

You have the right to seek dispute resolution concerning this action. If you intend to do so, you may contact the Army FOIA Public Liaison by email at usarmy.belvoir.hqda-esa.mbx.rmda-foia-public-liaison@army.mil. Please put "Dispute" in the subject line.

You may also seek dispute resolution services by contacting the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at 877-684-6448 or by emailing OGIS@nara.gov.

Questions regarding this response should be addressed in writing to the address shown on the letterhead or by emailing mariya.l.julien.civ@army.mil.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mariya Julien for".

Michelle Kardelis
Chief, FOIA/PA Division

Enclosures

9 December 2002

AGENT'S INVESTIGATION REPORT

INTERVIEW OF COOPERATING WITNESS:

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Special Assistant for Strategic Communications, Army Objective Force Task Force (OFTF) , is currently involved in a scheme to unlawfully direct the award of large dollar valued procurements to several companies, including SY TECHNOLOGY, INC (STI), her current employer. (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C) portrays herself as a government employee, but is really a contractor, employed by STI, detailed to the OFTF. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) works for Lieutenant General (LTG) John RIGGS, Director, OFTF. LTG (retired) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) former Vice Chief of Army Staff, is a corporate officer for STI. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) intentionally conceals the fact that she is a contractor, and alludes that she is a senior Army civilian employee. This allows her to operate freely and without being questioned.

In her current position, (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) has access to various types of sensitive information, including procurement sensitive information. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) utilizes her authority and position to exploit this information and unlawfully influence procurement awards related to the OFTF. Just recently, (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) illegally manipulated the awarding of a contract valued at \$1.5 million to STI, her own company. (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

In addition to the violations of the Procurement Integrity Act, (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) is engaged in travel fraud and misuses Military Transport Aircraft. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) travels worldwide without proper authority at the Army's expense. (b) (7)(D)

(b) (7)(D)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT 1

1

Ranking Army Officers, including senior Staff Judge Advocate Officers, who have attempted to expose the misconduct being committed by (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) have been sharply criticized and transferred out of the OFTF. (b)(7)(D)

(b)(7)(D)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C) appears to be an influential person in Washington D.C. and at the Pentagon. She has several friends at the senior Army leadership level and is acquainted with members of Congress and United States Senators. (b)(7)(D)

(b)(7)(D)

There are persistent rumors that (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) is involved in an adulterous relationship with LTG RIGGS, her direct supervisor. (b)(7)(D)

(b)(7)(D)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C) is believed to be a former Army Lieutenant Colonel, who was required to appear before a show-cause board and forced into retirement. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) may have been the subject of a CID Report of Investigation for fraud several years ago.

The electronic email addresses for (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) are:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

and

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

The license plate for the vehicle operated by (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(D)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Special Agent

U.S. Army CID
Laguna Niguel, California

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT
000002

Exhibit(s) 27

Page(s) 000003 thru 000005 referred to:

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Attn: Initial Processing Operations Unit

Record/Information Dissemination Section

200 Constitution Drive

Winchester, VA 22602-4843

4 June 2003

AGENT'S INVESTIGATION REPORT

COORDINATION WITH MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY:

On 4 June 2003, SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) and SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Federal Bureau of Investigation, coordinated with (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Internal Management Review, Missile Defense Agency, 7100 Defense Pentagon, Washington DC. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) related their office is currently investigating three DODIG Hotline Complaints relating to SY TECHNOLOGY. The complaints are:

DODIG Hotline Complaint (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) dated 25 Feb 03, which alleges DR (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Deputy Director, Joint National Integration Center, Shriever AFB, Colorado, a former Army Officer and friend of retired LTG (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) is unlawfully "throwing" contracts to SY TECHNOLOGY.

DODIG Hotline Complaint # (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) dated 17 Jun 02, which alleges SY TECHNOLOGY unlawfully received a contract valued at \$48M at an Army agency located in Alabama. In the report, retired LTG (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) name was specifically mentioned.

DODIG Hotline Complaint # (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) dated 29 May 02, which alleges SY TECHNOLOGY unlawfully received a contract valued between \$50-\$100M at an Army Agency located in Colorado Springs. In the report, retired LTG (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) name was specifically mentioned.

GS15 (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) substantially stated that the investigation by his office revealed potential contracting irregularities and a sole source award to SY TECHNOLOGY that appears improper. SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) and SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) requested MDA hold their investigation in abeyance and forward all records and documents to FBI/Army CID.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Special Agent

U.S. Army CID
Laguna Niguel, California

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT 51
000006

0012 - '03 - CID186 - 34232



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION DIVISION COMMAND
MAJOR PROCUREMENT FRAUD UNIT
6010 6th Street
Fort Belvoir, Virginia 22060

CISA-MPA

18 June 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Director, Internal Management Review, Missile Defense Agency, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

SUBJECT: Request for Records – Army CID / FBI Investigation

1. Army CID, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the U.S. Attorney's Office, Central District of California, are investigating allegations of fraud involving SY TECHNOLOGY, a company located in Los Angeles County, California.
2. Request your agency provide any and all records, work-papers, summary reports, or other documents, draft or final, related to any investigation pertaining to SY TECHNOLOGY. The records will be stored at the Laguna Niguel Fraud Resident Agency, Laguna Niguel, California.
3. The case Agent assigned to this matter is SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) Please direct any questions to him at (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Special Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

ENCLOSURE(1)

EXHIBIT

0012-03-CID186-34232 (Army CID Case #)
(b)(6) (b)(7)(C) (FBI Case #)

30 July 2003

AGENT'S INVESTIGATION REPORT

RECEIPT OF CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION LABORATORY REPORT:

On 30 July 2003, SA (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) received a copy of U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Laboratory Report (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) documenting the processing and transcription of a consensually monitored telephone call on 13 May 2003.

A copy of the report is enclosed. (*Enclosure 1*)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Special Agent

U.S. Army CID
Laguna Niguel, California

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive**

EXHIBIT
000008

76



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION LABORATORY
4553 N 2ND
FOREST PARK GA 30297-5122

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

0012-03-CID186-34232

CILA-BEP

22 July 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR SPECIAL AGENT IN CHARGE, LAGUNA NIGUEL FRAUD
RESIDENT AGENCY (CID), MPFU, USACIDC, POST OFFICE BOX 2429,
LAGUNA HILLS, CA 92654-2429

SUBJECT: Submitter Case Number: 0012-03-CID186-34232
USACIL Referral Number: 2003-CID131-1020
Suspect(s): (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

1. Enclosed is the Laboratory Exhibit Listing and Final Reports for the following division: Imaging and Technical Support (Encls 1 and 2).
2. Two original reports have been produced. One report is enclosed, as stated, and the other is kept in the official files of this laboratory and maintained IAW AR 25-400-2 and CIDR 195-1.
3. IAW AR 195-2, requests and fund cites for court appearances of Laboratory Examiners will be made at least 10 working days prior to the date of court proceedings.
4. POC is the Laboratory Operations Assistant, DSN 797-7082/7110, CM (404) 469-7082/7110, FAX (404) 469-7112/DSN 797-7112.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

2 Encls

Deputy Records Custodian



AN ASCLD/LAB ACCREDITED LABORATORY (SINCE 1985)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT
ENCLOSURE (pp)

UNITED STATES ARMY
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION LABORATORY
4553 N 2ND
FOREST PARK GA 30297-5122

21 Jul 2003

Page 1 of 1

IMAGING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT DIVISION REPORT

SUBJECT: Submitter Case Number: 0012-03-CID186-34232
USACIL Referral Number: .2003-CID131-1020
Suspect(s): (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Exhibit:

CD of cassette Tape (Item 1, Doc 007-03).

Findings:

1. On 17 Jun 2003, the above listed processed copy was forwarded to American High Tech Transcription and Reporting. The CD was returned on 21 Jul 2003 along with the transcription (Encl. 1).

2. Submitter should be aware that transcriptions might not be completely accurate. The transcriber may not be familiar with military jargon or slang. Transcripts should be reviewed and annotated by the submitter for accuracy.

3. POC for this action is the undersigned at DSN 797-7490, Commercial (404)469-7490, FAX 3489 or

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Encl.
1. Transcription

Special Agent
Technical Services Coordinator

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT

000010

UNITED STATES ARMY
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION LABORATORY
4553 N 2ND
FOREST PARK GA 30297-5122

11 June 2003

Page 1 of 1

IMAGING AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT DIVISION REPORT

SUBJECT: Submitter Case Number: 0012-03-CID186-34232
USACIL Referral Number: 2003-CID131-1020
Suspect(s): (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Exhibit:

1 - Cassette Tape (Item 1, Doc 007-03).

Findings:

1. Four direct (without processing) Compact Disc's (CD) of Exhibit 1 were made and are enclosed. Two processed CD's were made. CD one is enclosed. CD copy one was forwarded to Technical Support for Transcription.

2. For best results the processed CD's should be listened to using a good quality CD player and good quality headphones.

3. Questions concerning this report may be directed to the examiner at DSN 797-7080, commercial (404) 469-7080 or e-mail at

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

Encl
As

Forensic Imaging Specialist

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT

000011

Exhibit 76

Page(s) 000012 thru 000019 withheld:

Third Party Information/ Not reasonably segregable
Exemption (s) (b)(6), (6)(7)(C)
5 U.S.C. Section 552

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR Special Agent (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Command, Laguna Niguel Resident Fraud Agency.

SUBJECT: Independent review of the audit of a DoD hotline complaint filed regarding the award of a NMD-JPO (National Missile Defense-Joint Program Office) contract.

Case Number: 0012-03-CID-186-324232

RFA Number: 0005-04-CID742

1. Purpose. The case agent requested my independent review of the subject audit as a former Army auditor. My objective was to review the tentative audit findings and determine whether the audit can support allegations of fraud. I performed a cursory review of the materials available and the support documents can be obtained from the lead investigative auditor (Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)) an auditor assigned to the DoD's MDA (Missile Defense Agency), stated that he already provided a copy of all support documents (about 8 binders of contract documents, task orders, e-mail messages and miscellaneous contract file information) to CID.

3. Scope & Methodology. I reviewed the audit documentation obtained and workpapers prepared by Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) I focused my review on the allegations outlined in his draft summary report, specifically, to evaluate whether the SMDC (U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Agency) contract for the GMD (Ground-based Midcourse Defense) SAC-M (Site Activation Command-Module) contract (DASG62-00-D-0004) was properly awarded to SY Technology, Inc. (the target of a parallel investigation). I worked on the subject case from 25 February 2004 through 27 February 2004 at the MDA located in Arlington, VA.

4. Findings. I reviewed a significant amount of the material that Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) collected. His MFR's (Memorandums for Record), which are his workpapers, are very difficult to read. They do appear to maintain the facts he verbally discussed, however, it would be difficult to recreate the audit without knowing the scope and methodology of his work. In other words, if he were to retire tomorrow, I would have a difficult time following all of the work because a valid audit trail wasn't in accordance with Government Auditing Standards. Also, he mentioned that they do not conduct peer reviews, which is another requirement in accordance with auditing standards (e.g. which is significant in the absence of a verifiable workpaper/supervisory review).

The only act of potential criminal behavior that I could definitely see as a potential case would be the OCI clause issue (Allegation #1 in Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) summary). I was not able to make a case for the improper selection of SY Technology for the award, however, that is because I didn't know the basis for selecting all three bidders for the contract. There was not sufficient documentation in the workpapers to help me determine whether the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT
000020

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

acceptance of three bidders was in the Government's best interest and in accordance with the FAR. While Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) attempts to make a case that SY Technology was not a reasonable selection, I would need more time to further review Allegation #2.

5. Other Matters. The current audit support materials obtained appear to be adequate for substantiating a potential case regarding false statements; however, additional work must be accomplished. The current audit folders need to be better prepared, organized and reviewed in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards. Currently the workpapers are not properly maintained in accordance with audit standards and need some additional work before a final report can be prepared to withstand the test of external scrutiny. While many of the facts can be found and explained with the assistance of the auditor, they cannot stand on their own merit or be easily followed and replicated. In fairness, the assigned auditor (Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)) stopped performing his investigative audit work once the CID team approached him to inquire the status of his work. He has not continued with his investigation nor finalized his audit work to date.

An external Agency should perform the follow-on audit work for the case to avoid inherent independence issues and ensure compliance with the GAO (General Accounting Office) auditing standards. The MDA general counsel office is directly involved with providing occasional legal guidance to the contract award agency (SMDC) and directly involved with reviewing the findings of the independent investigator/auditor assigned to this complaint. Furthermore, MDA funding is used to procure the subject contracts using U.S. Army contracts and administrators. Subsequently, while the MDA is not a direct subject of the investigation, they have not fully embraced investigating the Army contracts because they are DoD agency and it not directly relevant to them per say.

6. Conclusion. While the current audit workpapers need improved organization, I believe that the information obtained by Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) indicate the possibility of fraudulent statements made by the contractors to the U.S. Government. In particular, Westar, Corp. (prime contractor) and SY Technologies (sub-contractor) did not disclose their inherent knowledge of the SAC-M contract in their OCI (Organizational Conflict of Interest) statement. The contract terms required OCI submissions from prime and sub contractors to ensure procurement integrity, objectivity of service provided and to ensure no single company achieved a competitive advantage in the acquisition process. SY Technology has already responded to the OCI claim and feels that their previous contract work wasn't relevant and didn't present an unfair advantage. While the contractor would make such an obvious assertion, I cannot prove or disprove their assertion without some additional details and information.

7. Recommendations. While the audit workpapers need some work, I believe that the information obtained by Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) infer the possibility of fraudulent statements made by the contractors to the U.S. Government. In particular, dealing with the OCI (Organizational Conflict of Interest) clause regarding SY Technology's inherent knowledge of the SAC-M contract and their failure to disclose this material fact. Here are my recommendations for you to consider for supporting your current case:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT
000021

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- a) Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) should prepare a timeline of events, a hierarchy display of all contractors involved in the NMD corresponding contracts and a relationship diagram of contractors and acquisition personnel involved.
 - b) Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) should complete a summary of his workpapers and a cross-referenced version of his draft report.
 - c) A follow-on audit should be executed by an external organization (AAA or DoD). The auditors could then easily follow Mr. (b)(6) (b)(7)(C) recommendations to cross-referenced support documentation and easily validate the allegations. For example, the auditors will need to see all relating contracts that preceded the FY 99 contract to ascertain how much SY Technology learned in these contracts that gave them a competitive advantage in the follow-on contracts (which they didn't disclose).
 - d) If the auditors cannot make the criminal case (and I think they can based upon the cursory review conducted), I am certain that a breakdown in the procurement award process and management controls occurred to create this current situation.
8. Thank you for the courtesies and cooperation extended to me during my review. If you have any questions regarding this memorandum, please contact me at (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
- (b)(6) (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(C)
Special Agent

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
Law Enforcement Sensitive

EXHIBIT
000022