



United Nations

Nations Unies

**OFFICE OF INTERNAL OVERSIGHT SERVICES
INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION**

*This Report is protected by paragraph 18 of
ST/SGB/273 of 7 September 1994*

**REPORT OF THE INVESTIGATION OF AN ALLEGATION OF
SEXUAL ABUSE AGAINST A**



REDACTED REPORT

ID Case No. 0748-05

30 MAY 2007

STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

This Investigation Report of the Investigations Division of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services is provided upon your request pursuant to paragraph 1(c) of General Assembly resolution A/RES/59/272. The report has been redacted in part pursuant to paragraph 2 of this resolution to protect confidentiality and sensitive information. OIOS's transmission of this Report does not constitute its publication. OIOS does not bear any responsibility for any further dissemination of the Report.



TO:

FROM:

SUBJECT: Report of the investigation of an allegation of sexual abuse against a
OBJET: [REDACTED]

1. The Investigations Division of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (ID/OIOS) received, from [REDACTED] an allegation of sexual abuse against a staff member of [REDACTED] in [REDACTED]. It was alleged that a [REDACTED] (hereinafter referred to as [REDACTED]) had been sexually abused during [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] pursuant to [REDACTED] accident.

2. [REDACTED] alleged that:

a. On [REDACTED] was the [REDACTED] that was involved in an accident with a [REDACTED] and that, thereafter, [REDACTED] received [REDACTED] where [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] for the period [REDACTED].

b. [REDACTED] returned to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] to have [REDACTED] removed and during this time was sexually abused by [REDACTED] who allegedly inserted [REDACTED] into [REDACTED].

c. [REDACTED] returned to the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] for further [REDACTED] and on this occasion the same subject again sexually abused [REDACTED] by allegedly inserting [REDACTED] into [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED].

d. [REDACTED] was unable to offer resistance during the alleged rape of [REDACTED] because the subject had allegedly injected [REDACTED] with an unknown substance that made [REDACTED] dizzy and weak. However, [REDACTED] was able to leave [REDACTED] shortly thereafter and returned home.

3. ID/OIOS conducted an investigation of the allegations, which included, but was not limited to, the interview of [REDACTED]; other civilian witnesses and UN personnel – including the subject; the collection and analysis of available documents; examination of the alleged rape scene and identification of the subject via a photograph array.

4. During the course of the ID/OIOS investigation [REDACTED] identified, via a photograph array, the subject as [REDACTED], a [REDACTED] at the said [REDACTED].

5. ID/OIOS established that [REDACTED] joined the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] and was [REDACTED] for a [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] duties consisted of [REDACTED] based on the recommendation of the [REDACTED].

6. ID/OIOS has completed its investigation, which found that there was no corroborating evidence in support of [REDACTED] allegations; to the contrary, ID/OIOS uncovered an accumulation of discrepancies and contradictions on the part of [REDACTED] which cast serious doubt on [REDACTED] credibility, namely:

a. [REDACTED] stated that, after the rape of [REDACTED], and whilst returning home [REDACTED] reported the rape, via telephone, to [REDACTED] (hereafter referred to as [REDACTED]). However, [REDACTED] denied having received such a phone call and stated that [REDACTED] reported the alleged rape to [REDACTED], in the latter's [REDACTED], [REDACTED] after it allegedly occurred.

b. [REDACTED] gave evidence that [REDACTED] was a dishonest and untruthful person.

c. [REDACTED] gave inconsistent and contradictory evidence on the sequence of events. In particular [REDACTED] told a witness, [REDACTED], that the alleged rapist [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS the contrary.

d. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that the subject pulled [REDACTED] apart on the [REDACTED] and then inserted [REDACTED] into [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] was unable to offer resistance due to the debilitating effects of an earlier intravenous injection. However, [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] fought against the rapist and that items of [REDACTED] clothing were torn during the struggle. [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] that the subject exerted force against [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] fainted after the act; that [REDACTED] subsequently revived [REDACTED] and then escorted [REDACTED] to the [REDACTED] and there threatened [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] reported the rape [REDACTED] gave no such evidence to ID/OIOS.

e. With respect to the sexual abuse with a [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that the rapist inserted [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] in a violent manner on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. It is difficult to believe that this could be done without causing some degree of trauma to [REDACTED]. However, [REDACTED] notes no [REDACTED] abnormality. Notwithstanding, ID/OIOS takes note of [REDACTED] – given pursuant to [REDACTED] s [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] – that given that [REDACTED] such an assault may or may not leave bruises in [REDACTED]. However, ID/OIOS also notes that [REDACTED] did not report the alleged sexual abuse to [REDACTED] during [REDACTED] examination.

f. [redacted] alleged that [redacted] and [redacted] had been previously raped, in [redacted], by [redacted] and that [redacted] had also been [redacted] during the incident. [redacted] stated that it was as a result of that previous experience that [redacted] did not cry for help during [redacted] alleged sexual assaults on [redacted]. ID/OIOS conducted inquiries with respect to that alleged [redacted] sexual assault, which included inquiries with [redacted] [redacted] stated had [redacted] ID/OIOS established that [redacted] commenced operations in [redacted] and their records show that [redacted] reported thereto in [redacted] and that [redacted] does not record any [redacted] injury. Moreover, ID/OIOS was informed by [redacted] that they are not equipped to treat rape victims, thus they would have referred [redacted] to [redacted] – ID/OIOS inquiries with those [redacted] revealed no record of [redacted]

g. During [redacted] initial interview with ID/OIOS on [redacted] [redacted] presented [redacted] on which was handwritten “ [redacted] and [redacted] stated that this was the name of [redacted]. [redacted] stated that a [redacted] had written the information for [redacted] refused to provide the document to ID/OIOS at that time. During [redacted] interview with ID/OIOS on [redacted] [redacted] produced a document on which was handwritten “ [redacted] and claimed that it was the same document as that which [redacted] had shown ID/OIOS on [redacted] and that it bore the name of [redacted] alleged rapist, which had been written and provided to [redacted]. ID/OIOS found that the document produced by [redacted] on [redacted] was not the same document produced to ID/OIOS on [redacted] – ID/OIOS noted that the paper was different, as was the handwriting. Furthermore, ID/OIOS interviewed [redacted] who denied having [redacted] for [redacted] and declared that [redacted] was illiterate.

h. ID/OIOS reviewed the attendance records of the former [redacted] [redacted] – there was no record of [redacted]’s alleged attendance at the [redacted] on [redacted] [redacted]

i. An ID/OIOS examination of the [redacted] where the alleged sexual assaults occurred revealed that the [redacted] are built of low walls, with a gap of almost [redacted] between the upper edge of the wall and the ceiling, thus making it unlikely that sexual assaults could have occurred without someone outside the room being alerted to the goings-on within the room. Moreover, ID/OIOS noted that the said [redacted] was located near [redacted] and opposite [redacted] with only a corridor between. ID/OIOS also noted that the room, like others in the [redacted] was not soundproofed.

j. It is unlikely that after having been allegedly sexually abused on [redacted] [redacted] member [redacted] would accept [redacted] from [redacted] assailant on [redacted] [redacted]

k. It is debatable that, having been allegedly administered a debilitating drug that affected [redacted] ability to resist [redacted] assailant, [redacted] could then exit the [redacted] and walk away in a short period of time thereafter the drug’s alleged administration.

1. ID/OIOS inquiries with [REDACTED] found that [REDACTED] had submitted a [REDACTED] claim (with respect to the accident referred to in [REDACTED] of this report), which was accompanied by a statement provided by [REDACTED] that detailed [REDACTED] visit to the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED], the day of [REDACTED] alleged second sexual assault. However, [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that after [REDACTED] alleged rape [REDACTED] immediately returned home and only stopped enroute to [REDACTED] to report the rape (as per [REDACTED] and thereafter continued home where [REDACTED] went to sleep.

m. [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that, after [REDACTED] discharge from the [REDACTED] was still suffering chest pains. Consequently, on [REDACTED] attended at the [REDACTED] ID/OIOS inquiries established that [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] at the [REDACTED] for the period [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] ID/OIOS was informed by [REDACTED] - the [REDACTED] - that during [REDACTED] was treated for bleeding of [REDACTED] and then for [REDACTED] as an [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] would not disclose how [REDACTED] sustained the injury to [REDACTED] emphysema treatment required the receipt of [REDACTED] injections per day, one [REDACTED] and one [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] continued this [REDACTED] until [REDACTED] told ID/OIOS that during [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] aide, [REDACTED], that [REDACTED] had been raped, but provided no further details of the alleged sexual assault.

n. ID/OIOS made numerous attempts to interview [REDACTED]; however, [REDACTED] refused to meet with investigators, which in itself raises curiosity and suspicion as to [REDACTED] possible involvement in [REDACTED] allegations.

7.

a. Admitted administering a [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] and that, whilst doing so, the door to the [REDACTED] being used was left open in accordance with [REDACTED] procedures.

b. [REDACTED] stated that the [REDACTED] procedure took no more than [REDACTED] and thereafter [REDACTED] left the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] immediately returned to the [REDACTED]

c. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] injury on [REDACTED] and did not see [REDACTED] again.

d. [REDACTED] denied [REDACTED]s allegations.

8. ID/OIOS concluded that [REDACTED]s allegations against [REDACTED] are unsubstantiated. ID/OIOS recommends that [REDACTED] provide a copy of this report to the [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] be informed that the allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse against [REDACTED] are unsubstantiated [REDACTED]. Your response, by [REDACTED] on any action taken or considered would be greatly appreciated. Should you have any questions or comments, please contact

[REDACTED]

9. Thank you and kind regards.

cc:

[REDACTED]