



INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORT

2006-11-0331

April 26, 2007

IDENTITY THEFT OF SECOND VICTIM

Inspector General David O. Thomas, after an investigation by Special Agent Mike Mischler, reports as follows:

This is a companion case to 2006-10-0287. Both cases involve the criminal offense of identity theft committed by the same defendant. This case involves the second victim.¹

This case originated on November 15, 2006, when the victim contacted the Office of Inspector General (OIG) requesting help because she believed she had been the victim of identity theft. She reported that someone had generated an email address in her name and ordered over \$600 worth of merchandise from a business.

The OIG only has jurisdiction over the wrongdoing by Executive Branch state employees and those doing business with the state. The victim, however, suspected that the defendant, who worked for a state agency, was the one who had committed the offenses against her.

The investigation was launched by Special Agent Mike Mischler and it was discovered that the defendant had previously worked with the victim. The defendant was

¹ The names of the victim and defendant are redacted in this report to prevent the further victimization of those affected by the defendant.

upset with the victim because the victim had reported the defendant to supervisors for claiming work hours when the defendant had not worked.

The defendant was confronted by her supervisor about the false work claims and the defendant resigned. The defendant then retaliated against the victim for reporting her by generating emails to their supervisor, claiming to be persons who were customers of the business and who claimed to have been treated rudely by the victim. After numerous similar false reports were made, the victim was required by her supervisors to undergo anger-management training at work due to the false allegations in the false emails.

When these companies were contacted for an interview with these specific persons who had made the complaints, it was discovered these persons had never worked for these companies.

The defendant, a state employee, was further developed as the suspect and the investigation revealed that the false emails were coming from the defendant's computer.

The investigation was submitted to the county prosecutor and the defendant was charged with the felony offense of identify theft.

Dated this 26th day of April, 2007.



David O. Thomas, Inspector General