

July 31, 2024

The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the U.S. House of Rep.
The Capitol Room H-230
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Ron Johnson
Ranking Member Subcommittee on Investigations
328 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, DC
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Barry Loudermilk
Chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee
2133 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Debra L. Fischer
Ranking Member Senate Rules Committee
448 Russell Senate Office Building.
Washington, DC 20510

The Honorable Bryan Steil
Chairman, Committee on House Admin.
1526 Longworth House Office Building
15 Independence Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Anthony D'Esposito
Member, Committee on House Admin.
1508 Longworth House Office Building
15 Independence Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mister Speaker and respective members:

I submit this document as a whistleblower and affirmatively request appropriate whistleblower protection.

This document is being offered to the appropriate oversight entities for the purpose of making allegations of misconduct and to provide evidence of malfeasance and other improper conduct at the highest levels of the United States Capitol Police (USCP) and within the USCP Office of the Inspector General (OIG). These include allegations of criminal and grossly unethical conduct. The goal in writing this document is to present allegations and overwhelming evidence of unethical and illegal conduct sufficient to allow the United States Congress to investigate and corroborate these allegations. Ultimately, this will initiate the essential reform needed within the USCP leadership, OIG, legal offices, and oversight entities. I hope the implementation of this reform will start with a public admission of guilt and apology by the USCP Chief and an appropriate settlement for all victims of sustained misconduct.

Allegations:

1. Chief J Thomas Manger and other members of the USCP have and continue to retaliate against January 6th USCP whistleblowers and obstructed U.S. Congress's rightful oversight of the USCP.
2. The OIG conducted a fraudulent investigation of USCP whistleblowers and created a fraudulent report on the retaliation to deceive the Congress and to conceal criminal and inappropriate actions they committed along with that of executive level members of the USCP.

3. Chief Manger utilized this manufactured OIG report to support a false public narrative.
4. The IG was encouraged to retire for violating the law for failing to protect USCP whistleblowers and exposing their identities to USCP senior leaders, which directly triggered the retaliation. The compromised OIG then conducted a sham investigation and created a false report on these whistleblowers to cover up all parties' unlawful violations of regulations and law.
5. The USCP executive team, USCP's Office of General Counsel (OGC), with the U.S. Capitol Police Board (USCPB) approved the unmistakably false OIG report.
6. The USCP leadership and legal team utilized the fraudulent investigation and respected independence of the OIG to literally "gaslight" (a word not used lightly) the whistleblowers challenging their mental health for believing any retaliation was occurring against them.
7. The impact to USCP whistleblowers significantly altered their and their families' lives.
8. Chief Manger, OGC, the USCP executive team and each member of the USCPB personally failed to protect USCP whistleblowers by their actions, inactions when personally notified and failed oversight.
9. On July 26, 2023, Chief Manger, under oath, provided overtly fraudulent testimony to a joint Congressional hearing (Senate Rules Committee and the Committee on House Administration).
10. Chief Manger's subsequent untruthful testimony to Congress on July 26, 2023, was made with the USCPB.
11. The U.S. Capitol Police Board is overtly incapable or unwilling to conduct the necessary oversight of the USCP, and at worst some members of the USCPB were complicit in the retaliation against USCP whistleblowers.

The last allegation is supported by an analysis of many other OIG reports that include topics related to January 6th and the surveillance of Members of Congress. The analysis of these OIG reports and supporting documents will be released in subsequent reports for review and dissection.

Evidence:

Though hundreds of pages of evidentiary documents exist related to these allegations alone, for simplicity and ease of communication I will rely on only enough pages of substantial documents (Most already in your possession) and verbal comments necessary to prove the prima facie allegations.

1. Complaints to the OIG reference whistleblower retaliation
2. OIG's Report reference "Whistleblower Retaliation" (USCP 2021-I-0004)
3. USCP Rules of Conduct
4. USCP Policy on Discrimination and Sexual Harassment
5. USCP Penalty Matrix related to Retaliation
6. July 26, 2023, testimony by Chief Manger to joint Congressional Committee

7. Letters of Appeal written to Chief Manger by a whistleblower
8. Multiple letters between Committees in OIG
9. Response from Chief Manger to letter of appeal
10. Email to USCPB reference whistleblower retaliation
11. Rolling Stones Article with USCP comments ridiculing whistleblowers
12. Feb 8, 2023, POGO article on USCP Whistleblowers
13. Statements from staff reference the OIG being pressured to retire for failing to protect the USCP whistleblowers

Timeline:

Pre-January 6th: Numerous critical intelligence warnings were provided by members of the USCP Interagency Coordination Division (IICD) to the USCP Intelligence leaders Intelligence forecasting the violence that occurred on January 6th.

Post January 6th: Several commanders and five (5) analysts participated in filing complaints with the USCP OIG concerning the failures of USCP Intelligence leaders in relaying critical intelligence information.

Note: All five analysts faced frequent adverse personnel actions in violation of clear and established USCP policy and were eventually separated from the Department. None of the other analysts (those that did not make any complaints about the failures of the USCP Intelligence leaders) had any personnel actions against them during the subsequent time period.

April 7, 2021: The OIG received complaints from three (3) analysts alleging harassment, discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation. These analysts were mostly alleging the entirety of the actions by IICD leadership were in retaliation for complaints filed related to January 6th. They in no way were alleging sexual harassment or racial discrimination. One analyst simply stated the actions against her was “a direct result of their filing an after-action report against IICD leadership reference January 6th.”

April, 2021: The OIG fails to take the appropriate action to protect the analysts from the retaliatory supervisors while the case is investigated (Note: foreshadows the predetermined findings).

April 27, 2021: The OIG receives another complaint from an analyst concerning retaliation.

June 14, 2021: The OIG completes case (USCP 2021-I-0004) reference whistleblower retaliation (Attachment). The investigation shows the OIG **failed** to investigate the leadership of the USCP for the primary if not only allegation against them “Retaliation” against a

whistleblower. It in fact **only** investigated USCP management for sexual harassment and discrimination based on race, age, color, sex, national origin, genetic information, disability, religion and military service. This was not the allegation nor the concern of Congress in multiple inquiries of the OIG.

- August 2021: Members of the USCP leadership team provided sensitive and protected information to “blackball” a USCP whistleblower and damage their employability.
- October 21, 2021: Committee on House Administration’s letter to OIG reference “Protection for and confidentiality of witnesses and whistleblower.”
- October 2021: After a whistleblower letter is published, Chief Manger, Members of the USCP Executive Team and others publicly ridicule whistleblowers at meetings.
- October 25, 2021: The USCP Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR) meets with a whistleblower and their attorney in a false allegation case filed against the whistleblower by a member of the USCP Intelligence leadership team. The respondent and attorney made it very clear, the analyst was being retaliated against because they were a whistleblower and should be protected.
- October 27, 2021: Whistleblower emails the OIG filing a new complaint of retaliation by USCP leadership. Whistleblower explains how the new retaliation is a direct result of the prior OIG complaint for retaliation.
- November 1, 2021: Response letter from OIG to Committee on House Administration which states that the OIG “Has never disclosed any information that could potentially result in retaliation against an employee.” The OIG further states that the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989 and Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012 doesn’t apply to the USCP employees or the OIG.
- November 10, 2021: OGC attempted to undermine the credibility of whistleblowers by providing sensitive OIG and OPR complaint information on whistleblowers to committee staff.
- November 18, 2021: Email to OIG from whistleblower reiterating this status as a whistleblower alleging continued retaliation from USCP management.
- November 20, 2021: Whistleblower from October 27, 2021, after **NOT** receiving any response from the OIG, re-emails the OIG writing, “Greetings. I am resending this complaint as no one has acknowledged receiving it.”

November 29, 2021: Whistleblower and their attorney meet with the OIG reference the October 27th email alleging further retaliation against the whistleblower.

Note: *There is no OIG report in the record for these allegations being investigated as the only case on record and provided to the Committee on House Administration was completed on June 14, 2021. In fact, no report exists for all whistleblower retaliation complaints filed by analysts from June 14, 2021, forward. These included many documented complaints of whistleblower retaliation with Chief Manger, the USCP and OPR.*

December 1, 2021: Joint letter from Committee on Rules and Administration and the Committee on House Administration requesting an investigation reference “Retaliation against whistleblowers.”

December 6, 2021: Whistleblowers provided Chief Manger with specific allegations and information related to retaliation to include Office of Human Resources (OHR) employees advising them to get lawyers, high-ranking officials witnessing retaliation and other evidence of these unlawful actions. This five-page appeal to Chief Manger requested he review and remedy the retaliation to this whistleblower. The whistleblower states:

I believe these actions being taken against me are in retaliation for the OIG complaints I have been filing against my supervisors, especially [REDACTED] of IICD. I have made protected whistleblower disclosures to the OIG and Congress. As I previously indicated, since the retaliation continued, additional complaints were filed with the OIG as recently as three weeks ago. There is no doubt that the actions taken against me are related to my whistleblowing. I continue to be subjected to whistleblower retaliation.

December 17, 2021: Chief Manger’s response to the whistleblower dismisses the new allegation of whistleblower retaliation (Another clear violation of policy). Incredibly, Manger justifies his actions by blaming the whistleblower for not providing him enough proof in their appeal that they are in fact a whistleblower. Manger writes:

You further allege that you are a whistleblower and that you have made multiple OIG complaints about your supervisor [REDACTED] and Acting Assistant Chief Sean Gallagher. You provide no facts indicating that you engaged in

whistleblower activity or that you fall within any statutory whistleblower protection.

At minimum, Manger fails to even investigate policy failure and determine if the whistleblower meets whatever his bastardized definition of the term is, which reveals his true beliefs on protecting whistleblowers from retaliation.

December 28, 2021: The USCPB are sent documents related to the retaliation against the analyst whistleblowers. There is never a response from any member of the USCPB including those that boldly purport in open committee hearings that, "Whistleblowers must be protected and can't be retaliated against".

January 12, 2022: Letter from Committee on House Administration (CHA) to the USCP OIG which requests an update on prior requests and asserts that the CHA does not support the OIG's assertion that they kept whistleblower information confidential from the USCP. This request further clarifies the OIG's legal requirement to protect whistleblowers.

January 21, 2022: Letter from the OIG to House Administration reference January 12, 2022, request for clarification. This includes the copy of the OIG investigation on whistleblowers (USCP 2021-I-0004). Most importantly, the OIG acknowledges they did in fact disclose information but contend the OIG could not have made any improper disclosures because the whistleblowers failed to specifically request that the OIG protect their anonymity and the OIG didn't ultimately corroborate the whistleblower allegations. Critical to the allegation of the whistleblowers was the Chief and other executive level employees violating and weaponizing the performance evaluation system to retaliate against employees, which is really the only way they could terminate an employee. The OIG simply didn't investigate this even though there was overwhelming evidence because they stated it was, "Outside the OIG's purview".

In short, the OIG didn't investigate the retaliation because the method the USCP Executive Team and USCP OGC utilized (one of the only ways to terminate an employee) was outside the OIG's scrutiny. Is this believable?

January 12, 2022: Committee on House Administration request the IG to have his investigation on whistleblower retaliation independently reviewed. There is no record that this was ever completed.

February 1, 2022: Chief Manger is sent an appeal from a whistleblower. In this letter the whistleblower writes:

- *“In the weeks that followed January 6th, many of the analysts filed negative After-Action Reports through the multiple outlets offered to USCP employees. Since that time, the people in IICD who filed the negative After Action Reports have been harassed and retaliated against by [REDACTED].”*
- *“I should be covered by Whistleblower protections because I have reported issues regarding the gross mismanagement of IICD since November 2020 and intelligence failures to the OIG and USCP management, as well as met with the Committee on House Administration and the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.”*
- *“It is unconscionable that I have been subjected to this hostile and toxic work environment. Why was I never removed from [REDACTED] command, even temporarily, after filing complaints? Several of my co-workers are also being harassed and retaliated against by [REDACTED]. Why is this allowed to continue after more than 100 complaints have been filed with USCP management, OIG, and the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights?”*
- *“This last year has been pure hell for me and is the worst, by far, of my nearly 32-year law enforcement career...”*

February 22, 2022: OIG provides letter to whistleblowers reference their retaliation complaint falsely stating they “Conducted a thorough and impartial investigation” into allegations of “retaliation, discrimination, harassment and other misconduct and concluded there was no evidence to support any claim of violations of 2053.013, Rules of Conduct (**Only discrimination and harassment**) or 2053.011, Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy.”

There was, in fact, no investigation for retaliation.

April, 2022: The OIG was encouraged to retire for failing to protect Whistleblowers as required by law. (Committee Staff)

May 3, 2022: The OIG’s retirement is printed in the media.

June 2022: Chief Manger, Deputy Chief Gallagher and other members of the USCP Executive Team and the OGC openly ridiculed and slandered whistleblowers in front of subordinate personnel at a command staff meeting.

June 8, 2022: Rolling Stones writes an article about whistleblower’s retaliation at the USCP. The USCP violates the retaliation policy yet again by publicly disparaging the whistleblower stating, “It is not unusual for

leaders appointed to bring change to be met with resistance,” according to a Capitol Police statement, “These improvements have been essential, even if certain individuals on the team did not embrace them.” Furthermore, another member of the intelligence leadership team utilized a spokesperson to communicate their ridicule. The spokesperson stated the whistleblowers were “Disgruntled and vindictive employees”.

Most important in this article, the USCP utilized the fraudulent OIG Report to gaslight the whistleblowers, stating that the OIG investigated the reprisal allegations and deemed them unfounded. Again, this was never investigated.

October 12, 2022: The OGC provides information to discredit testimony of a whistleblower summoned to testify at a January 6th defendant’s trials.

This is another clear and very public example of a violation of the USCP’s policy on *Retaliation* and a failure of leadership by Chief Manger.

February 8, 2023: Project on Government Oversight releases article on the retaliation against USCP whistleblowers citing the lack of a real investigation by the OIG. Author Joe Spielberger writes:

Although the Capitol Police has denied any wrongdoing, including retaliating against the whistleblowers, there are real questions regarding how thoroughly and robustly the Capitol Police’s watchdog has examined misconduct claims. A January 2022 letter from then-Representative Rodney Davis (R-IL) alleges the Capitol Police inspector general, after interviewing several whistleblowers, “concluded summarily – with no real investigation – that their complaints were without merit.” The Capitol Police has fired or proposed firing at least five analysts who say they have raised concerns about the pre-January 6 intelligence problems.

July 26, 2023: Chief Manger, testifying to a joint committee of Congress, perpetuates a fraud on the U.S. Congress when he stated, “*There are regulations that prevent the discrimination and harassment of employees that I think can be expanded to protect whistleblowers.*”

The lie of omission here is the failure to acknowledge the USCP policy on record (the one never investigated), specifically approved by the Chief of Police, that broadly protects whistleblowers.

It is appropriately titled “**RETALIATION**” signed off on by the Chief of Police. Again, *Rules of Conduct, Rule C11, Retaliation: Employees will not harass, ridicule, or retaliate in any form against a complainant, employee or any witness for complaining or otherwise offering evidence in an internal or external, criminal or administrative investigation.*

It was Chief Manger’s 2nd and most odd statement, “Whistleblowers should be protected...True whistleblowers should be protected” that further shows the ongoing fraud and facts of what really happened. First, Chief Manger attempts to remove whistleblower protections from brave individuals that are obviously whistleblowers and according to USCP policy are protected. Chief Manger’s statement reveals that the analysts were not protected from the inappropriate retaliation because they didn’t meet Chief Manger’s definition of “whistleblower”.

November, 2023: Chief Manger continues to retaliate against whistleblowers by failing to interview an exceptionally qualified whistleblower for a position. Instead, Chief Manger appointed an employee to Assistant Chief that failed to meet the minimum qualifications for the position.

This is another clear example of a violation by Chief Manger of the USCP’s policy on *Retaliation*.

Facts:

The January 6th USCP whistleblowers filed many complaints with the USCP OIG, the Senate Rules Committee, the Committee on House Administrations and the January 6th Committee reference the intelligence failure of USCP intelligence leadership.

The OIG **NEVER** interviewed any of these analysts for his flash report on Intelligence for January 6th. This in spite of numerous emails from many analysts to include a highly respected analyst stating that he needed to be interviewed as he had specific details related to intelligence failures by USCP Intelligence Commanders. It seems the OIG would want this information for their investigation. The OIG ignored every single analyst.

The OIG, by his own admission, subsequently revealed the whistleblowers’ identities and complaints to USCP leadership.

The OIG revealing the names of the whistleblowers to USCP leadership directly led to the retaliation against them.

Every single analyst that filed these whistleblower complaints faced retaliation for filing these complaints and providing evidence. All were separated from the Department.

The whistleblowers filed scores of complaints of retaliation with a variety of USCP officials and entities to include the OPR, the OIG and up to include the Chief of Police,

and the USCPB imploring for protection and assistance. Their responses ranged from gross malfeasance to silence.

It appears the Chief, OIG or OGC, before any investigation never had any intention to protect the whistleblowers from retaliation. If they had, they would have immediately separated the supervisor pending the outcome of the investigation and counseled the supervisor not to take any personnel actions against these employees. This is the USCP practice. In this case, the supervisor was not only left in place, but the retaliation increased in severity. This only happens with the approval of the Chief and with the outcome of the whistleblowers' compliant predetermined.

There is clearly documented evidence held by the USCP that the USCP leadership and OGC violated the Performance Evaluation and Communication Systems (PECS) to retaliate against the USCP whistleblowers in clear violation of the policy. (Note: PECS is one of two mechanisms the USCP can use to terminate an employee). This explains why the OIG attempts to justify circumventing investigating the PECS component of the whistleblowers' complaints.

The OIG failed to acknowledge most of the retaliation complaints, interview the complainants, investigate their allegations or even follow-up with the whistleblowers.

The OIG failed at a rudimentary level to even interview all respondents. For example: Assistant Chief Sean Gallagher, who Chief Manger admits was a respondent, was never interviewed by the OIG for the analysts' complaints.

The OIG completes an investigative report that references "retaliation" but deceives readers including Congress by only investigating the USCP leadership and OGC for sexual harassment and discrimination, which was not the complaint. Obviously, the OIG, the Chief, and the OGC knew if they actually investigated for retaliation, it would have damning for executive leadership.

The OIG interviewed whistleblowers for a negligible amount of time, in one case approximately five (5) minutes. The OIG's report reveals the lack of questions to the analysts reference the retaliation against them by USCP leadership.

The OIG report revealed that the OIG never interviewed numerous high-ranking witnesses to retaliatory offenses to include members of the USCP's Office of Human Resources and section and division commanders of these employees. The OIG justifies this investigative failure by showing the whistleblowers did not prove their *prima facie* case of sexual harassment and discrimination (not their actual allegation). This appears to be their rationale for not fully investigating the allegations of the whistleblowers. (Note: This appears was simply a tactic employed by the OIG to not interview any actual witnesses to the offenses).

The OIG report inexplicitly and clearly shows that they failed to investigate USCP leadership and the OGC for the actual allegations filed, which was a violation of the USCP's Retaliation policy.

The USCP has a very specific policy that protects whistleblowers. It's dubious this policy was never identified in the investigation or by Chief Manger in his testimony. It is clear, unequivocal, and appropriately titled "**RETALIATION**", so it is easy for anyone (Chief, OIG, attorney or any employee) to find. *Rules of Conduct, Rule C11, Retaliation: Employees will not harass, ridicule, or retaliate in any form against a complainant, employee or any witness for complaining or otherwise offering evidence in an internal or external, criminal or administrative investigation.*

This omission is truly unacceptable.

The OIG states in its letter to the CHA that it does not have the authority to investigate USCP leadership for utilizing the PECS system to retaliate against whistleblower employees. (Note: This was the OIG's false justification for not investigating the actual physical evidence of the alleged offenses). If the OIG's position is correct, the USCP leadership can retaliate against anyone with the PECS system without any oversight. It's clear that the OIG, the Chief and the OGC knew this evidence was damning to the preconceived outcome and thus simply lied to hide evidence.

The OIG in his letter to CHA falsely contends that the whistleblowers had an affirmative requirement to specifically request anonymity and protection from the OIG, therefore he did not have an obligation to protect them. Protection of whistleblowers is an affirmative requirement of the OIG.

USCP leadership, General Counsel, and the USCPB are generally provided advance copies of all OIG reports for review and input. All these entities include a variety of individuals with USCP Command and OPR experience that are well versed in policies. Some of these entities had former commanders that committed retaliatory acts or were, by their own admission, witnesses to the retaliation against the analysts.

The report was not returned to the OIG to investigate the obvious omission of the policy on "retaliation", the PECS violations and incidents witnessed by commanders. It should be noted that members of USCP leadership, the OGC, and USCPB employees are fully aware of the single most important policy of the USCP, the USCP Rules of Conduct for employees. As such, all these entities were party (witnesses or defendants) to the actual retaliation that occurred against the whistleblowers.

Upon approval of the report, the Departments leadership, the OGC and the USCPB utilized the OIG report to gaslight the whistleblowers, causing irreparable harm to them. They did this in person, in writing and for internal litigation. I contend they did it to push the analysts over the edge for the purpose of removing them from the Agency.

The scores of continued whistleblower retaliation complaints made by the analysts after June 14, 2021, were mostly ignored. The one interview documented was never reduced to a report and not provided to Congress.

When the whistleblowers appealed to Chief Manger for the unlawful retaliation, he shockingly dismissed their allegations because they didn't provide him with proof in their

appeal that they were in fact whistleblowers. Chief Manger writes, “You provide no facts indicating that you engaged in whistleblower activity or that you fall within any statutory whistleblower protection.” Oddly, Chief Manger does not even bother to investigate the whistleblower assertions at all. This is another indication, that the analysts is actually a whistleblower and Chief Manger wants plausibly deniability.

Chief Manger clearly and inexcusably fails to personally follow investigative leads, investigate new allegations of whistleblower retaliation and maliciously fails to confirm their status or protect actual whistleblowers. Chief Manger had an affirmative requirement to protect whistleblowers and their new allegations until it is proven otherwise. In this regard, he failed.

On July 26,2023, Chief Manger perjured himself and perpetuated an ongoing lie to the U.S. Congress when he stated, “*There are regulations that prevent the discrimination and harassment of employees that I think can be expanded to protect whistleblowers.*” Chief Manger perpetuates the lie started by the OIG and all those that were involved and approved the initial investigation. The lie of omission here is the failure to acknowledge the policy on record, specifically approved by the Chief of Police, that broadly protects whistleblowers.

Once again, there is in fact and always has been a very specific USCP policy that protects whistleblowers. It is appropriately titled “**RETALIATION**” signed off on by the Chief of Police. Again, *Rules of Conduct, Rule C11, Retaliation: Employees will not harass, ridicule, or retaliate in any form against a complainant, employee or any witness for complaining or otherwise offering evidence in an internal or external, criminal or administrative investigation.*

It is extremely odd that testimony prepared by his OGC, stated in front of the board and tacitly approved by all executive level employees is void of mentioning the actual regulation that protected these employees. Whether Chief Manger wanted to title them “Whistleblowers” or not these employees certainly met the definition of this policy as (at a minimum) they complained internally. The penalty for this violation includes up to termination and yet, the Chief during testimony echoes the same OIG failing to acknowledge this well-known rule even exists.

It was Chief Manger’s 2nd and most odd statement, “Whistleblowers should be protected...True whistleblowers should be protected” that further shows the ongoing fraud and cover-up between the OIG, USCP Leadership, the USCP OGC and the USCPB. In his January 12th, letter to Congress, the IG erroneously stated the analysts were not whistleblowers because they didn’t specifically request the OIG to protect their identities. Chief Manger now echoes this failed IG argument (obvious collusion between the OIG and Chief Manger) to assert that the January 6th whistleblowers were not actually whistleblowers. As stated, a whistleblower, in their appeal letter to Chief Manger, writes: “I should be covered by Whistleblower protections because I have reported issues regarding the gross mismanagement of IICD since November 2020 and

intelligence failures to the OIG and USCP management, as well as met with the Committee on House Administration and the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.”

This is not good enough Chief Manger to acknowledge whistleblower status?

Still, Chief Manger contends to the U.S. Congress the analysts weren't whistleblowers, in part because they never provided him proof. Also, echoing the same failed argument of the OIG in his January 12th letter to the Committee, but Chief Manger knows the OIG was encouraged to retire early because he unlawfully disclosed the identities of the whistleblowers to him (Chief Manger), the Executive Team and the OGC. Yet now Chief Manger states they were not whistleblowers exonerating himself of any legal or ethical responsibility to protect them.

Regardless, the issue for Chief Manger, the OGC and the OIG is the USCP policy on “Retaliation” broadly and explicitly protects these employees regardless of Chief Mangers bastardized definition of a “whistleblower”. It does not matter if the employees meet Chief Manger’s definition of a whistleblower. The protection is triggered simply by them providing any information or making a complaint internally or externally.

Chief Manger can't state, “True whistleblowers should be protected” and at the same time refuse to take any investigatory action to determine if a person meets whatever definition of whistleblower he wants to apply? An ethical leader has the affirmative action to follow regulations and to protect these employees. Chief Manger’s failure to investigate is not just indicative of his true view of whistleblower protection and his intentions towards these employees, but an additional violation of USCP policy.

It should be noted that the USCPB was also sent clear documentation of the appeal along with Manger’s jaw dropping response. The USCPB failed to even acknowledge their emails. It was heart wrenching to watch a member of the USCPB testify to a joint committee hearing that *“Whistleblowers must be protected and can't be retaliated against”*, when in practice they turned a blind eye to it.

Allegations:

Almost every USCP official and officer is aware of the “retaliation” policy as it comes from the Rules of Conduct (The most important policy and only policy used to charge offenses). It is signed by the Chief of Police and impossible that the Chief, the OGC (who reviews all policy), the USCPB and the OIG are unaware that this policy exists.

Members of the USCP Intelligence team filed a multitude of complaints and offered evidence in internal and external investigations. This was all in reference to the USCP intelligence leaders failing to share critical intelligence information leading up to January 6th. Subsequently, these analysts were targeted by the USCP Intelligence leaders and the USCP leadership to include the Chief of Police. These analysts made countless complaints of retaliation for complaining and offering evidence in these internal and external investigations. Yet, they were never truly investigated.

The USCP violated so many aspects of the PECS policy to terminate or force employees out that a senior level manager in the Office of Human Resources called them prior and advised that they should get lawyers because the Agency was planning to fire them.

The OIG, under direction of the Chief of Police and the USCPB, investigated the complaints of retaliation specific to include PECS by analysts as exclusively allegations of sexual harassment and discrimination (racial and other legally protected classes only). The real violations of Retaliation and PECS were never investigated and dismissed by the OIG, just like his legal requirement to protect whistleblowers. The Chief and the Intelligence leadership were never investigated for the rule they undoubtedly violated Rule C-11: Retaliation.

The reason for all this is simple. The Chief, the OGC, the OIG and the Intelligence leaders violated and continue to violate the **Retaliation** policy. The Chief could never inform Congress that the Retaliation policy even exists. Clearly, this is lying by omission. Lying that there is a policy failure is much easier to explain than why he and his entire executive team authorized an obviously false and inaccurate report to be submitted to the U.S. Congress.

The tactic of not investigating the policies that are violated to cover up failures and hide the truth from the U.S. Congress is not limited to this OIG Report. It is reflected in the multitude of every Inspector General report I possess to include many related to January 6th and the surveillance of Members of Congress.

It is my intent to release these OIG reports in subsequent documents with the evidence to reveal to the U.S. Congress that USCP leadership, the OGC, the USCPB and the OIG were engaged in systemic behavior to deceive the U.S. Congress on a plethora of critical issues related to January 6th and the surveillance of Members of Congress

I respectfully request the allegations made in this document specifically related to whistleblower retaliation by Chief Manger, current and former members of the USCP, the OGC, the USCPB and the OIG are thoroughly investigated by an independent entity. Specifically, all the appropriate charges of USCP Policy, the law and the various code of ethic for every single complaint are thoroughly reviewed and examined.

Also, I request the U.S. Congress consider an overhaul of the USCP leadership, the OIG and the entirety of the current oversight process of the Agency to ensure a stop to these tactics and professionalization of the Department.

Finally, and most important to me is, I respectfully request that the U.S Congress consider the repeated and continued unethical actions that these USCP whistleblowers endured in their efforts to get the truth about the January 6th intelligence failures to the OIG and the U.S. Congress. Their plight is extraordinary, especially considering the Chief and the USCPB purport their devotion to protecting whistleblowers in public, but never offer any protection to the whistleblowers in their charge. The lives of these

employees and families were forever changed by malicious actors within the USCP trying to prevent the truth about the January 6th Intelligence failures from coming out.

Very Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

Retired Deputy Chief
USCP