



governmentattic.org

"Rummaging in the government's attic"

Description of document: Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Office of Inspector General (OIG) Investigations Closed during FY2025

Requested date: 29-December-2025

Release date: 26-February-2026

Posted date: 16-March-2026

Source of document: Freedom of Information Act Request
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Inspector General
45 L Street NE
Washington, D.C. 20554
[ArkCase FOIA](#)
[FOIA.gov](#)

The governmentattic.org web site ("the site") is a First Amendment free speech web site and is noncommercial and free to the public. The site and materials made available on the site, such as this file, are for reference only. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals have made every effort to make this information as complete and as accurate as possible, however, there may be mistakes and omissions, both typographical and in content. The governmentattic.org web site and its principals shall have neither liability nor responsibility to any person or entity with respect to any loss or damage caused, or alleged to have been caused, directly or indirectly, by the information provided on the governmentattic.org web site or in this file. The public records published on the site were obtained from government agencies using proper legal channels. Each document is identified as to the source. Any concerns about the contents of the site should be directed to the agency originating the document in question. GovernmentAttic.org is not responsible for the contents of documents published on the website.



OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554
www.fcc.gov/inspector-general

February 26, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Re: FOIA Control No. 2026-000250

This letter responds to your Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for “1) A copy of the final report, closing memo, or equivalent concluding document for each Inspector General investigation closed during CY2025. 2) A copy of the list of Inspector General investigations closed during CY2025, including relevant data fields such as the subject or topic of the investigation, the case number, closing date, and opening date.” FCC received your request on December 24, 2025. You perfected your request on December 29, 2025. We assigned your request FOIA Control No. 2026-000250.

FCC OIG searched all records subject to FOIA for responsive records. Of the 34 pages of responsive records located, we are producing 24 pages. We are withholding the remaining 10 page record in full under Exemptions 3, 6, and 7 for the reasons discussed below.

We are withholding the responsive record under FOIA Exemption 3.¹ Exemption 3 covers records protected by statute when the statute either “(A) requires that the matters be withheld from the public in such a manner as to leave no discretion on the issue, or (B) establishes particular criteria for withholding or refers to particular types of matters to be withheld.”² The record must fall under a statute that “satisfies one of [these] distinctive requirements.”³ The withheld document falls under such a statute. Specifically, we considered the OIG’s statutory responsibilities under the Inspector General Act, 5 U.S.C. § 401, et seq., especially §§ 405(f)(5),

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(3).

² *Id.*

³ See *Long v. IRS*, 742 F.2d 1173, 1178 (9th Cir. 1984); *Irons & Sears v. Dann*, 606 F.2d 1215, 1220 (D.C. Cir. 1979); *Am. Jewish Cong. v. Kreps*, 574 F.2d 624, 628 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

407(b), and 420(b)(2)(B) as well as 41 U.S.C. § 4712. We have determined that disclosure would be prohibited under the applicable statutes, which Exemption 3 is intended to protect.

We are also withholding the responsive record under FOIA Exemption 6.⁴ Exemption 6 protects “personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Balancing the public’s right to disclosure against the individual’s right to privacy, we have determined that release of this information would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. The information we are withholding includes the name and personally identifying information of individuals who were the subject of an investigation, individuals who were encountered during the investigation, and the names and personally identifying information of investigators. We have determined it is reasonably foreseeable that disclosure would harm the privacy interest of the person mentioned in these records, which Exemption 6 is intended to protect.

Additionally, we withheld the responsive record under Exemption 7(C), which protects “records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes [the production of which] could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”⁵ Balancing the public’s right to disclosure against the individual’s right to privacy, we have determined that release of this information would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. The redacted information includes the names and personally identifying information of individuals who were/are employed at this agency, as well as the names and personally identifying information of individuals subject to investigation or individuals who were encountered during the investigation. We compiled these names during the course of an investigation – balancing the public interest against the individuals’ right to privacy favors not releasing these names. We have determined it is reasonably foreseeable disclosure would harm the FCC OIG or the Federal government’s law enforcement activities, which Exemption 7 protects.

The FOIA requires that “any reasonably segregable portion of a record” must be released after appropriate application of the Act’s exemptions.⁶ The statutory standard requires the release of any portion of a record that is nonexempt and that is “reasonably segregable” from the exempt portion. However, when nonexempt information is “inextricably intertwined” with exempt information, reasonable segregation is not possible.⁷ Withholding the record is consistent with our responsibility to determine if any segregable portions can be released. To the extent we do not release non-exempt material, that material is inextricably intertwined with exempt material.

We also reviewed the withheld record to determine if discretionary release is appropriate.⁸ We determined the statutes under Exemption 3 did not allow for discretionary release in this

⁴ 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6).

⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(C).

⁶ 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(sentence immediately following exemptions).

⁷ *Mead Data Cent. Inc. v. Dep’t of the Air Force*, 566 F.2d 242, 260 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

⁸ See President’s Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, Freedom of Information Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 4683 (2009).

context. Further, the materials protected from disclosure under Exemption 6 are not appropriate for discretionary release in light of the personal privacy interests involved. Finally, we determined the material protected from disclosure under Exemption 7 was not appropriate for discretionary release in light of the law enforcement sensitivities involved.

We are required by both the FOIA and the Commission's own rules to charge fees associated with the costs of searching for, reviewing, and duplicating the requested information.⁹ To calculate the appropriate fee, requesters are classified as: (1) commercial use requesters; (2) educational requesters, non-commercial scientific organizations, or representatives of the news media; or (3) all other requesters.¹⁰

Pursuant to section 0.466(a)(8) of the Commission's rules, you have been classified for fee purposes under category (3) as an "all other requester."¹¹ As an "all other requester," the Commission assesses charges to recover the full, reasonable direct cost of searching for and reproducing records that are responsive to the request; however, you are entitled to be furnished with the first 100 pages of reproduction and the first two hours of search time without charge under section 0.470(a)(3)(i) of the Commission's rules.¹² The production in response to your request required fewer than two hours of search time, and was provided in electronic form. Therefore, you will not be charged any fees.

You may seek review of this determination by filing an application for review with the Office of General Counsel within 90 calendar days of the date of this letter.¹³ Your appeal must articulate specific grounds for review, identify factors warranting further consideration of the issue presented, and specify the relief being sought.¹⁴

If you would like to discuss this response before filing an application for review to attempt to resolve your dispute without going through the appeals process, you may contact the Commission's FOIA Public Liaison for assistance at:

FOIA Public Liaison
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Managing Director
Performance and Program Management
45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554

⁹ See, 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A), and 47 C.F.R. § 0.470.

¹⁰ 47 C.F.R. § 0.470.

¹¹ 47 C.F.R. § 0.466(a)(8).

¹² 47 C.F.R. § 0.470(a)(3)(i).

¹³ 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.461(j), 1.7 (documents are considered filed with the Commission upon their receipt at the location designated by the Commission), and 1.115.

¹⁴ See, 47 C.F.R. §§ 0.251(j) (applications for review may be dismissed for failure to articulate specific grounds for review), 1.115(b) (an application for review must specify with particularity the questions presented for review and specify the factor(s) (from an enumerated list) warranting Commission consideration of the questions).

202-418-1379

FOIA-Public-Liaison@fcc.gov

If you are unable to resolve your FOIA dispute through the Commission's FOIA Public Liaison, the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS), the Federal FOIA Ombudsman's office, offers mediation services to help resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration
8601 Adelphi Road—OGIS
College Park, MD 20740-6001
202-741-5770
877-684-6448
ogis@nara.gov
<https://www.archives.gov/ogis>

Thank you for your interest in FCC OIG work.

Sincerely,

**Travis
Farris**

Digitally signed
by Travis Farris
Date: 2026.02.26
08:38:13 -05'00'

Travis J. Farris
Counsel to the Inspector General
Federal Communications Commission

Enclosures

cc: FCC FOIA Office

Federal Communications Commission Office of Inspector General

FOIA Report for All Cases in All States
between 01/01/2025 and 12/23/2025

CASE NUMBER	PROGRAM	STATE	CLOSING DATE
OIG-HC-12-0037	High Cost	Colorado	03/31/2025
OIG-X-12-0058	External	New York	05/08/2025
OIG-LI-13-0042	Low Income	District of Columbia	07/18/2025
OIG-LI-15-0021	Low Income	District of Columbia	07/21/2025
OIG-LI-16-0005	Low Income	California	10/01/2025
OIG-LI-16-0019	Low Income	Oklahoma	10/03/2025
OIG-LI-16-0020	Low Income	California	10/01/2025
OIG-HC-18-0001	High Cost	Pennsylvania	05/08/2025
OIG-I-18-0007	Internal	District of Columbia	06/23/2025
OIG-B-21-0003-A	Broadband	Wyoming	04/24/2025
OIG-T-21-0010	TRS	Pennsylvania	05/12/2025
OIG-B-22-0012	Broadband	New Jersey	04/17/2025
OIG-I-23-0006	Internal	District of Columbia	03/31/2025
OIG-B-23-0009	Broadband	District of Columbia	03/27/2025
OIG-I-23-0010	Internal	District of Columbia	03/19/2025
OIG-I-23-0012	Internal	District of Columbia	03/31/2025
OIG-I-24-0002	Internal	District of Columbia	11/14/2025
OIG-AU-24-0004	Auctions	District of Columbia	04/17/2025
OIG-I-24-0005	Internal	District of Columbia	12/08/2025
OIG-I-24-0007-WB	Internal	District of Columbia	06/23/2025
OIG-I-25-0002	Internal	District of Columbia	03/05/2025
OIG-I-25-0005-WB	Internal	District of Columbia	07/24/2025
OIG-B-25-0017	Broadband	Alaska	05/08/2025



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 27, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
SUBJECT: OIG-HC-18-12-0037

On November 11, 2008, OIG-Investigations initiated an investigation of Blanca Telephone Co. (Blanca), an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier (ILEC) operating in parts of Alamosa and Blanca counties in Colorado, pursuant to a referral by the Universal Service Administrative Co. (USAC). Blanca filed claims for High Cost funds as a cost-of-service carrier.¹ During the course of a routine audit, USAC's auditors observed indicia of fraudulent related-party transactions and inter-company expenses.

OIG's investigation identified a significant source of improper claims that USAC auditors did not identify: Blanca fraudulently exploited an exception under the Commission's rules claiming it was operating a Basic Exchange Telephone Radio Service (BETRS) to provide telephone service to its customers.² Blanca claimed to be using BETRS to provide telephone service to augment its wireline plant in several of its service areas. Blanca, however, was not operating BETRS – instead, it was operating a mobile cellular system using its two FCC-authorized cellular licenses to provide service both inside and outside its service areas.³ Cellular service is an unregulated

¹ As a cost-of-service High Cost claimant, Blanca was required to prepare a cost-of-service study annually with USAC and the National Exchange Carrier Association (NECA). USAC used the information to compute the High Cost funds it distributed to Blanca, and NECA used the information Blanca and other ILECs provided to enable it to set and administer the fees long distance companies paid to access local telephone networks such as Blanca and other ILECs.

² BETRS is a distinct type of fixed wireless service operating on different frequencies than a cellular network. The FCC allowed carriers to receive High Cost funds based on the costs of constructing and operating BETRS by which companies could provide service in rural areas too expensive to serve with wireline plant.

³ While Blanca used its cellular licenses, rather than BETRS, to augment LEC service to its own customers, it received millions of dollars in roaming fees from customers of other cellular carriers traveling in and out of Blanca's service areas, including roaming fees generated from customers of an adjoining Verizon cellular system in which Blanca's owner held a separate partnership interest, which OIG discovered during its investigation.

service, and Blanca disguised the costs on its books to operate its mobile cellular system as costs to provide regulated telephone service, i.e., BETRS, and included these costs in its cost-of-service filings to support its claims for High Cost Funds. Blanca therefore received more funds than it was otherwise entitled to receive as a mobile cellular carrier.⁴

OIG referred the results of its investigation to the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Colorado ("USAO-CO). USAO-CO opened a joint investigation with OIG of Blanca in 2011. USAO-CO and OIG interviewed the company's owner and several of the company's employees, including its engineers and its bookkeeper. USAO-CO and OIG also interviewed representatives of NECA.⁵

After analyzing Blanca's books and records and cost-of-service filings, OIG determined that Blanca received \$6,748,280 in High Cost funds during the period 2005 to 2010 attributable to listing the costs in providing both regulated wireline and non-regulated cellular service on its books without conducting the proper allocation between regulated (wireline and BETRS costs) and non-regulated costs (mobile cellular costs) under the FCC's rules. During the course of the investigation, OIG referred the matter to the FCC's Office of Managing Director (OMD) with the concurrence of USAO-CO and advised OMD of Blanca's fraudulent conduct. On June 2, 2016, OMD issued a Demand for Payment to Blanca for the \$6,748,280 Blanca received attributable to this conduct. Upon Blanca's failure to repay the funds, OMD instituted an offset of the *bona fide* High Cost monthly disbursements Blanca was otherwise entitled to receive and continued to receive against its outstanding debt. The United States Attorney's office determined not to initiate a false claims suit against Blanca, and on September 15, 2022, advised OIG it had closed its investigation. In November 2023 the debt was satisfied by the offsets, and besides the \$6,748,280 repayment, Blanca remitted an additional \$ 2,415,923.28 in interest on the debt and penalties.⁶

This investigation therefore should be closed.

⁴ Carriers that provide mobile cellular service (CECTs) may be eligible to receive some High Cost Program funds, but the formula awarding the funds is less advantageous and does not reimburse carriers for their direct costs of providing service as does the formula used to compensate Blanca as a provider of wireline service.

⁵ The NECA interviews prompted NECA to conduct its own on-site investigation of Blanca's plant during which it confirmed Blanca's operation of its cellular system augmenting service to its wireline customers. NECA thereupon directed Blanca by letter dated January 28, 2013, to revise its 2011 Cost Study and related filings.

⁶ Blanca filed a series of appeals to the Commission and the Tenth Circuit and finally filed a writ of certiorari with the Supreme challenging the Commission's action, and all were denied.



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: May 2, 2025

SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

CASE NUMBER: OIG-X-12-0058

Morwood Oaks Management Associates, *et al.* (Relators)¹ filed a *qui tam* action under the False Claims Act (FCA) in the United States District of the Eastern District of New York, asserting that Sprint Nextel Corp. (Sprint), Verizon Communications, Inc., AT&T Inc., and CenturyLink, Inc., Qwest Communications International Inc. and Qwest Corp. (collectively, “Defendants”), defrauded the Universal Service Fund (USF) by underreporting revenues subject to the Universal Service Fund (USF) and thereby violated the FCA. OIG initiated an investigation into the matter with the Office of the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of New York.

The investigation did not substantiate the allegations and on June 26, 2014, DOJ entered a Notice of Election to Decline Intervention in the Complaint. Subsequently, the case was unsealed and dismissed.

For the forgoing reasons, this investigation is closed.

¹*United States, ex rel. Morwood Oaks Management Associates, John Doe 1 and John Doe 2; Morwood Oaks Management Associates, individually, John Doe 1 individually; and John Doe 2, individually v. Sprint Nextel Corp., Verizon Communications, Inc., AT&T, Inc., Centurylink, Inc., Qwest Communications International, Inc. and Qwest Corp., Case No. 10- CV-3826 (“Complaint”).*

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: July 1, 2025
SUBJECT: REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
CASE NUMBER: OIG-LI-13-0042

A journalist reported that sales agents employed by two carriers fraudulently enrolled her into the Lifeline program despite her ineligibility. Our investigation identified the marketing companies and individual sales agents responsible for the enrollments. We determined that one carrier immediately removed the responsible sales agent from Lifeline-related duties and, similarly, the majority of agents of the second carrier were removed as well. Total losses were under \$1,000. The investigation of one master agent was folded into CCN LI-15-0021. Accordingly, this case is closed.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: July 15, 2025
SUBJECT: REPORT OF INVESTIGATION
CASE NUMBER: OIG-LI-15-0021

We received allegations sales agents in several cities employed through a master agent for a single Lifeline provider created fraudulent enrollments and sold government-subsidized devices to individuals who were not qualified for program support. We investigated the sales channel nationwide and worked with the Department of Justice on the matter. We confirmed that there was identical fraudulent conduct being conducted by sales agents in various locations and identified several managers for local marketing companies that were involved in the scheme. Our investigation was ultimately declined by the Department of Justice. Accordingly, this case is *closed*.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: September 30, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-LI-16-0005

FCC OIG received and investigated allegations that a previous Lifeline subscriber had received 200 cell phones from a Lifeline provider that were not requested. The investigation concluded that the phones were never activated, and while this matter was subsumed into another investigation of the same Lifeline provider, no further action was deemed warranted with respect to these allegations.

Therefore, this matter is closed.



**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: September 30, 2025

SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

CASE NUMBER: OIG-LI-16-0019

During the course of a separate investigation (OIG-LI-12-0040), OIG identified suspicious activity that suggested a provider was fraudulently completing applications for Lifeline service on behalf of subscribers. Also, a former business associate of the provider under investigation provided documents indicating that the provider's management was knowingly permitting agents to improperly enroll subscribers. We investigated the matter and brought our results to the Department of Justice. DOJ declined the matter.

FCC OIG separately conducted investigations of the provider's sales agents. We assisted the prosecution of sales agents enrolling subscribers without their consent, resulting in a guilty plea. FCC OIG also identified sales agents in a single city that were responsible for enrolling deceased persons nationwide on behalf of the provider. We referred our analysis to the DOJ but that matter was declined. We will refer the agents that enrolled deceased persons to USAC for consideration of a lock-out from USAC's Representative Accountability Database (RAD).

As each component of the investigation is concluded, we recommend this matter be closed with no further action.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: September 25, 2025

SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

CASE NUMBER: OIG-LI-16-0020

On May 27, 2016, two former employees of a Lifeline provider filed a *qui tam* complaint under the False Claims Act. First, relators claimed the company was generating improper and fraudulent telephone usage to meet the requirements of the FCC's rules. Second, relators claimed that the company was enrolling ineligible subscribers by "shirking data reporting and subscriber acquisition requirements, resulting in ineligible subscribers and providing the company with an impetus to bilk the federal and state governments millions of dollars."

Our office opened a joint investigation with the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington and the United States Attorney's Office where the company was headquartered and where the alleged fraudulent activity occurred. Our investigation determined that the relators' allegations concerning fraudulent enrollments were erroneous because the state administrator where the enrollments occurred was responsible for determining the enrollment status of a subscriber rather than the company.

In addition to the *qui tam* allegations, OIG also proactively conducted an analysis of the company's subscribers which showed the company claimed Lifeline support for two or more accounts for the same individual simultaneously (a.k.a. internal duplicates) resulting in overclaims of \$108,466. The funds were recovered by USAC in June 2024. The company also discovered a mismatch of its call detail and billing system records, which resulted in its overclaiming for subscribers who had not used the phone service for almost two years, and it returned \$1,272,227.25 to the FCC.

The government declined to intervene in the *qui tam* case, and we closed our investigation based on our findings.



**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: May 2, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-HC-18-0001

FCC OIG initiated an investigation with Department of Justice Civil Division and the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Pennsylvania (collectively, DOJ) in response to a *qui tam* complaint filed on August 11, 2017, in *U.S. ex rel. Ranko v. Armstrong Group of Companies, et. al.*, Case No. 17-1052 (W.D. Pa.). The relator alleged the Armstrong Group of Companies (Armstrong Group), a private corporation, defrauded the FCC's Universal Service Fund (USF) High Cost Program by improperly reporting millions of dollars of non-regulated costs to USAC and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) each year resulting in millions of dollars of improper High Cost claims.

FCC OIG's investigation substantiated the allegations and a settlement was reached, pursuant to the Civil False Claims Act. As set forth in this [press release](#), Armstrong Group agreed to pay \$6,500,000 to the government and to enter into a robust corporate compliance agreement with the FCC.

For the foregoing reasons, the investigation is closed.



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 23, 2025
SUBJECT: Closeout Memorandum
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-18-0007

In 2017, FCC OIG was contacted by the Department of Justice (DOJ) following media reports of fictitious and fraudulent comments being filed in the Commission’s “Restoring Internet Freedom” proceeding. We conducted a thorough investigation of the allegations, which included the issuance of over one hundred subpoenas and the execution of four search warrants. Although we determined that a significant number of fictitious and fraudulent comments were filed in the proceeding, DOJ declined to prosecute.

During the investigation, we also identified opportunities for the Commission to improve its Electronic Comments Filing System (ECFS) and made recommendations to the FCC to help prevent abusive practices within ECFS. FCC implemented responsive actions to address most of FCC OIG’s recommendations. Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.



**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554
www.fcc.gov/inspector-general

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 11, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NO: OIG-B-21-0003-A

In 2020, we received an allegation that a member of Wyoming's Broadband Advisory Counsel abused his position by directing CARES Act funding to overbuild broadband in Wyoming. We determined that the matter was outside our jurisdiction because the funds in question were awarded not by the FCC but the Department of Treasury. Thus, in November 2020, we referred the matter to the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery (SIGPR). Thereafter, at the request of SIGPR, we provided assistance to the SIGPR agents, directing them to FCC public data on broadband deployment and helping them understand and interpret that data.

Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: May 12, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-T-21-0010

In 2021, we received allegations that Telecommunications Relay Services, Video Relay Service (VRS) providers were not in compliance with the registration requirements and had inadequate controls to verify documents collected from subscribers. Based upon a related audit conducted by FCC's TRS program administrator, and FCC OIG's subsequent investigation, we did not find evidence of fraud. Moreover, we determined that providers took a number of remedial measures, terminated questionable accounts, and improved their registration procedures. Finally, FCC OIG recommended that the FCC consider collecting any improper payments made to TRS providers.

Accordingly, this case is **closed**.



DATE: April 16, 2025

SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

CASE NUMBER: OIG-B-22-0012

We received allegations that sales agents employed by a master agent for an Affordable Connectivity Program provider created fraudulent enrollments and sold government-subsidized devices to individuals who may not have qualified for program support. Our investigation did not substantiate the complainant's allegations and attempts to elicit additional information from the complainant were unsuccessful. Accordingly, this case is closed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: December 19, 2024
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-23-0006

We received an allegation that an FCC employee owned stock in Google LLC (“Google”) or Google’s parent company Alphabet Inc. (“Alphabet”) in violation of Federal ethics laws regarding ownership of investments in companies regulated by the FCC.

We determined that while the FCC employee owned Google stock, ownership of Google stock by an FCC employee is not prohibited. Further, the FCC employee fully disclosed such ownership in annual financial disclosure reports and there was no evidence that the FCC employee violated applicable ethics laws or participated in any FCC matters in a capacity that created a conflict of interest under Federal law or created the appearance of a conflict of interest.

Accordingly, the allegations were not substantiated and this case is *closed*.



**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554
www.fcc.gov/inspector-general

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 26, 2025
SUBJECT: Closeout Memorandum
CASE NUMBER: OIG-B-23-0009

We conducted a proactive investigation to determine if the Commission has established an effective, timely process of addressing challenges to the National Broadband Map.

Our investigation did not identify any substantive issues. Accordingly, this case is **closed**.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: December 17, 2024
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-23-0010

We received allegations that FCC officials improperly allowed multiple FCC employees to own stock in violation of the Federal ethics regulations.

Our limited-scope investigation did not substantiate these allegations. Accordingly, this case is closed.

During the investigation, we did identify potential internal control weaknesses with the process that the Commission follows to identify prohibited investments. Accordingly, we recommend that the OIG Office of Audits consider an audit, evaluation, or other review of the Commission's (1) policies and procedures related to identifying section 4(b) prohibited holdings on Commission employees financial statements and (2) implementation of those procedures.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: December 27, 2024
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-23-0012

We received allegations of bias by the Commission in its handling of a specific merger review. Our limited-scope investigation did not substantiate the allegations and accordingly, this case is closed.

To address concerns raised about the lack of efficiency, timeliness, and transparency in the decision making process, this matter was referred to FCC OIG's Office of Audit for consideration of an audit or evaluation of the Commission's merger review process to assess: (1) the policies and procedures governing the process, and (2) implementation of those policies and procedures.



**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: November 14, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-24-0002

We investigated an allegation that an FCC employee was committing time and attendance fraud by holding a full time position with a government contractor at the same time that he held a full time position with the Commission. The allegations were substantiated. The dual employment began shortly after the Pandemic started and lasted for over three years before the arrangement was discovered.

The employee resigned from his FCC position shortly after FCC OIG requested an interview. We referred the matter to the Department of Justice (DOJ) and DOJ declined prosecution. We referred the matter to the Commission for suspension and debarment and we continue to support that administrative process. Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: December 16, 2024
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-AU-24-0004

We received allegations from a whistleblower that “least four – and possibly as many as 20” low-power television (LPTV) stations may have falsely certified eligibility for stations reported as silent or that otherwise failed to meet Congress’s statutory eligibility standard, and/or submitted improper reimbursement requests” from the Commission’s TV Broadcaster Relocation Fund.

Our preliminary inquiry into this complex matter identified a separate related proceeding potentially overlapping with the allegations raised. Further, we concluded that additional investigation may have compromised the identity of the whistleblower. Accordingly, this case is *closed*.



**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: December 5, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-24-0005

We supported an investigation being conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Office of Inspector General (OIG). The investigation involved potential criminal misconduct by an FCC employee when the employee worked for USDA. Our investigation found no evidence of criminal misconduct by the employee while employed at FCC. The employee was removed from FCC prior to completing the probationary period. Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

DATE: January 17, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-25-0002

We received concerns that a Commissioner misused their title in violation of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch in authoring a chapter in the Heritage Foundation's 2025 Presidential Transition Project. OIG did not find evidence that the Commissioner violated the misuse of position restrictions within Subpart G of the Standards of Ethical Conduct. Accordingly, this case is closed.



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

MEMORANDUM

DATE: July 22, 2025
SUBJECT: Closeout Memorandum
CASE NUMBER: OIG-I-25-0005

We received allegations that a contractor employee was forced to take a pay cut in retaliation for making a protected disclosure of fraud, waste, and abuse on an FCC contract.

Before the investigation could be completed, the complainant withdrew her allegations. Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.



**OFFICE OF
INSPECTOR GENERAL**
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

45 L Street NE, Washington, DC 20554
www.fcc.gov/inspector-general

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 7, 2025
SUBJECT: CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM
CASE NO: OIG-B-25-0017 (TelAlaska)

In 2024, we received an allegation that TelAlaksa was improperly seeking reimbursement from the FCC's Supply Chain Reimbursement Program (SCRP) for equipment that is not eligible for reimbursement. We interviewed the whistleblower, a former TelAlaksa employee who had been recently terminated. We also reviewed the 100+ internal documents he provided. The only specific allegation the whistleblower made about the SCRП was that TelAlaksa improperly included firewall expenses in its SCRП claims. We determined that this allegation lacked merit because the SCRП program guidance includes provisions permitting reimbursement for firewalls.

Accordingly, this case is closed with no further action taken.