



July 14, 2023

Re: Inspector General Quarterly Report (2nd Qtr. 2023)

Dear Honorable Clerk Iris Martinez and Executive Staff:

This report is written in accordance with the best practices prescribed by the Association of Inspector Generals (AIG) Green Book, to apprise you of the activities of the Office of the Inspector General (OIG) during the period beginning April 1, 2023, through June 30, 2023.

### **OIG Q2 Complaints**

The OIG received a total of 149 complaints during Q2.<sup>1</sup> Of the 149 complaints, 32 complaints came from internal referrals and 117 came from an external sources (hotline, mail, web or direct call) including five cases referred from the Office of the Independent Inspector General. Out of the 149 complaints, 108 were classified as Management Inquiries, 19 were classified as Disciplinary Reports, and 22 opened as case files investigated by the OIG.

Additionally, the OIG had 43 open cases pending at the beginning of Q2, seven cases from 2022Q2, six cases from 2022Q4, and 31 cases from 2023Q1. 15 of the 43 cases pending at the beginning of 2022Q1 are now closed. In Q2, the OIG closed a total of 17 cases. Five cases were administratively closed, with 12 case files closed via summary report.

### **OIG Summary Reports**

During the second quarter of 2023, the OIG closed 17 total case files with 12 closed as summary reports. The following is a general description of the cases closed via summary report, the OIG's findings, and basis for the findings. Specific identifying information was withheld for confidentiality.

---

<sup>1</sup> Upon receipt of a complaint or inquiry for information, a review process is conducted to determine if the OIG has jurisdiction over the complaint. Case Files are opened on all complaints and after preliminary review, if evidence exists that warrants closure or referral to another agency an administrative closure memo will be drafted. In cases where a full investigation is conducted, a summary report is generated and forwarded to LR for further disciplinary proceedings where applicable. In some cases, another CCC department is best suited to address the complaint. A Management Inquiry will be opened, and the OIG will draft an administrative closure when the issue is addressed.

**CF 22-06-289.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-290.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-296.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-300.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-308.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-323.** At this time, this case will not be summarized. This case is part of a larger scale investigation involving numerous cases and will be discussed at a later stage.

**CF 22-06-332.** The OIG received a forwarded complaint by Teamsters Local 700 Business Agent [REDACTED] from complainant, Clerk [REDACTED], that alleged Manager [REDACTED] verbally abused her, neglected her performance of duties, and violated the Code of Ethics by failing to perform her duties as a supervisory employee. Further, Manager [REDACTED] ignored the actions of [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] violated General Rule and Regulation (GRR), 4.1.2, in that [REDACTED] engaged in a verbal altercation with another employee using abusive language and yelling, "I'm a manager. Who are you? I'd fire you if I were your manager...I don't have to know you, I'm a manager", and "You can go in (CDC) [REDACTED] office and tell her what I said, ain't shit gonna happen to me" to [REDACTED]. She violated GRR, 4.1.11, negligence in performing duties in that her unprofessional behavior was demonstrated by her abusive language and yelling at subordinate employees outside the scope of her authority while off duty, having called in sick. [REDACTED] violated the Code of Ethics (COE), in that G) Employees shall adhere to all policies, General Rules and Regulations, and other standards of conduct of the Clerk of the Circuit Court in that she failed to perform her duties. Additionally, [REDACTED] violated Section Seven concerning Supervisory Employees of the Clerk of the Circuit Court, in that A) Supervisory employees shall be held to a higher standard of conduct than other employees. [REDACTED] failed to exhibit the higher standards of supervisory employees by her abusive language and yelling at [REDACTED]. Therefore, the allegation against [REDACTED] was SUSTAINED. [REDACTED] engaged in a verbal altercation with another employee by yelling at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] conceded that her tone with [REDACTED] could be considered adversarial. Thus, [REDACTED] violated (GRR), 4.1.2. [REDACTED] also violated GRR, 4.1.11, negligence in performing duties in that [REDACTED] failure to act on subordinate employees' behalf regarding [REDACTED] actions exhibits a manager's "Code of silence." Further, [REDACTED] violated Supervisory Employees of the Clerk of the Circuit Court, A) Supervisory employees shall be held to a higher standard of conduct than other employees by failing to act against [REDACTED] when she was aggressively addressing subordinate employees. The OIG found the allegations against [REDACTED] as SUSTAINED.

**CF 22-12-547.** The OIG was presented with allegations that clerk [REDACTED] had a physical altercation with clerk [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] repeatedly stepped on the back of her heels while walking. [REDACTED] further alleged a verbal exchange between her and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] she was kicking the back of her feet. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] acknowledged she was kicking [REDACTED] feet and told [REDACTED] to move out of the way. [REDACTED] stepped aside to avoid being struck. No independent witnesses verify

either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] stories. Therefore, the OIG found the incident between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] INCONCLUSIVE. No evidence of [REDACTED] being bullied was presented. Thus, the allegation of bullying was NON-SUSTAINED. Multiple employees were interviewed; however, it could not be confirmed that [REDACTED] yelled at another employee. The OIG found that allegation to be INCONCLUSIVE. [REDACTED] violated 4.1.11 in being negligent in her duties in that she used a loud voice in front of exempt staff and members of the public in an abrasive, unprofessional, and disruptive manner, as SUSTAINED. Additionally, [REDACTED] violated the Code of Ethics, Section Six: Performance of Duties, because she did not perform her duties properly and diligently. [REDACTED] did not courteously carry out her responsibility to the public by [REDACTED] being abrasive, unprofessional, and disruptive. The allegation was SUSTAINED.

**CF 23-01-017.** The OIG received a complaint that alleged employee [REDACTED] of rude behavior and unprofessional attitude towards a customer which caused the customer “mental shock and embarrassment.” The customer complained to [REDACTED] managers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The customer claimed that [REDACTED] was unwilling to help her with filing an indigent petition and that [REDACTED] raised her voice and told her “If you have \$380.00 then you wouldn’t have to worry about a 298.” The OIG interviewed [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and the customer. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] did not witness [REDACTED] be rude to the customer and [REDACTED] denied the allegations. The OIG did not find any evidence to support the customers allegations that [REDACTED] violated GRR 4.1.2, verbal or physical altercations with another employee or a member of the public, the use of abusive language, yelling, fighting, pushing, or other physical contact. The OIG found the allegations INCONCLUSIVE.

**CF 23-02-049.** The OIG received an email investigation request from CDC [REDACTED] regarding Incident Report [REDACTED] filed by Executive Assistant [REDACTED]. The incident report described the [REDACTED] housekeeper [REDACTED] allegations of harassment, intimidation, and destruction of various restrooms at the Daley Center by Office Clerk [REDACTED]. Approximately one week later, the OIG received a second email and "Expedited Investigation" request from CDC [REDACTED] regarding Incident Report [REDACTED]. The incident report described the expedited need for investigation due to the reoccurrence of the incidents described in Incident Report [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] documented fifteen incidents with handwritten notes and photos from her surveillance efforts from 2021-2023. None directly proves [REDACTED] was in the restroom before or after the documentation. [REDACTED] direct superior of seven-plus years, CDC [REDACTED], relayed that [REDACTED] is combative when she is corrected on tasks and doesn't get along well with other employees. However, [REDACTED] does her work and hasn't had any disciplinary write-ups. [REDACTED] denied having any issues with housekeepers or colleagues. [REDACTED] stated she only converses with housekeepers and co-workers when they greet her. On three occasions, [REDACTED] entered the bathroom shortly after [REDACTED] and observed a mess. Clerk [REDACTED] stated twice she watched [REDACTED] enter the restroom while it was clean, waited until [REDACTED] exited, and noted that it was left dirty. [REDACTED] stated many people, including the public, use these restrooms and often leave them in complete disarray. She said that she is clean and has been complimented by colleagues for her cleanliness. The OIG found that based on the preponderance of physical and verbal evidence GRR 4.1.12 and GRR 4.1.5- The theft, misappropriation, or destruction of property belonging to another, including the property of Cook County, the Clerk's Office, The Circuit Court, an employee, or a member of the public is INCONCLUSIVE as the allegation had no independent witnesses physically verifying either of their stories. Additionally, there was not any physical or verbal evidence of [REDACTED] being harassed or intimidated by [REDACTED]. Therefore, the OIG found the allegation of harassment and intimidation as NON-SUSTAINED.

**CF 23-02-066.** The OIG received a request for an investigation regarding the allegation that clerk [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] failed to promptly quash and recall a defendant's traffic warrant. In Assistant Operations Manager [REDACTED] Incident Report, she wrote that [REDACTED] left her office yelling loud enough for coworkers and customers to hear that she requested managerial assistance and was being denied help. The OIG interviewed all employees related to the investigation. During [REDACTED] interview, she stated [REDACTED] was not yelling but was complaining loudly. On the day of the incident, [REDACTED] assisted a judge with quashing and recalling the order of local warrant, evidenced by Clerk Martinez's and the judge's stamped names and [REDACTED] signature. Further, the defendant's Traffic Court Sheet was stamped with Clerk Martinez's and the judge's names and signed by [REDACTED]. Based on a preponderance of the evidence in reference to GRR, 4.1.2, the OIG found that [REDACTED] did not yell at another employee or a member of the public, so the allegation was NON-SUSTAINED. The OIG lacked sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations, 4.1.11 and 4.1.6, as CCSO failed to respond to General Counsel [REDACTED] request to interview two deputies. Had the OIG interviewed the deputies, the inquiries could have provided information for the OIG to determine the case definitively. Therefore, based on a preponderance of the evidence, the OIG found allegations against [REDACTED] pertaining to GRRs 4.1.6, insubordination, 4.1.11, negligence in the performance of duties, and Code of Ethics; Section Six Performance of Duties (E) by failing to properly carry out an order of the court as INCONCLUSIVE.

**CF 23-03-085.** The OIG received a request for investigation that alleged employee [REDACTED] took unauthorized leave from a work area or assignment, was under the influence of alcohol or drugs at work and neglected to perform his duties. The OIG reviewed three incident reports related to the incident, a CCSO Missing Persons Report, and a statement from [REDACTED] Security Lieutenant. [REDACTED] wrote that on March 1, 2023, she gave [REDACTED] an assignment and at 3:30 [REDACTED] went on break. [REDACTED] followed up approximately 30 minutes later and discovered he was not back at his desk. [REDACTED] managers called his cellphone, and he did not answer. At 4:34 [REDACTED] checked again for [REDACTED] and discovered he never returned from his break. The managers went to [REDACTED] desk and found his cellphone, jacket, and bag. [REDACTED] notified ACDC [REDACTED], CCSO Daley center staff, and [REDACTED] parents. [REDACTED] parents were able to track his location from [REDACTED] apple watch which pinned him across the street from the Daley Center. The CCSO searched for [REDACTED] without success. [REDACTED] returned to the Daley Center to retrieve his belongings between 7PM and 8PM and called his manager at 7:30 PM that he was on his way home with his father and was not feeling well. On April 6, 2023, [REDACTED] disappeared from his work assignment again from 12:43 until 4:18 PM. The OIG interviewed all witnesses and complainants. [REDACTED] and managers interviewed share that [REDACTED] struggled with alcohol and was actively engaging in EAP. However, [REDACTED] managers believed he may have been impaired but did not have an odor of alcohol coming from his breath. The OIG found the allegations that [REDACTED] violated GRR 4.1.1, INCONCLUSIVE because the OIG had insufficient evidence that [REDACTED] was under the influence of drugs or alcohol at work. However, the OIG found the allegations that [REDACTED] violated Grr 4.1.10 and 4.1.11 SUSTAINED, in that [REDACTED] abandoned his work assignment on two separate days without permission and neglected to perform his duties.

**CF 23-03-135.** The OIG received an incident report where employee [REDACTED] alleged [REDACTED] sexually harassed and verbally abused her. The OIG interviewed [REDACTED], CDC [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] and CDC [REDACTED] both stated that [REDACTED] made it very clear that [REDACTED] has never made any unwelcome advances of sexual nature toward her verbally, nonverbally, or physically. Further, both employees confirmed that [REDACTED] believed she was being sexually harassed because [REDACTED] claimed that she has bid on many higher positions and was never chosen, while the women who were intimate with [REDACTED] were. CDC [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] both denied all [REDACTED] allegations. The OIG lacked sufficient evidence to corroborate [REDACTED]

allegations. First, ██████ understanding of sexual harassment did not constitute a sexual harassment complaint as it pertained to her. Next, ██████ denied making any sexual advances toward ██████. ██████ confirmed this and made it very clear to ██████ and to the OIG that ██████ never made any sexual advances toward her personally. Finally, ██████ and ██████ both confirmed that ██████ does not have the power to promote anyone. The OIG found the allegations against ██████ for violation of the Sexual Harassment Policy, GRR 4.1.3, Code of Ethics, Section 1 (A), (C); and Section 7(G), NON-SUSTAINED. ██████ further alleged that ██████ raised his voice at her. The OIG does not doubt that ██████ felt upset about the situation and believed she was being yelled at, but based on ██████ and ██████ statements, the basis of ██████ sexual harassment complaint, and ██████ dislike of ██████, it is more likely than not that ██████ may have amplified the details of her story, therefore, the OIG found the allegations of violation of GRR 4.1.2, 4.1.12; Code of Ethics Section 6 (G); and Section 7 (A), INCONCLUSIVE.

**CF 23-05-217.** The OIG received a complaint forwarded by HR from employee ██████ that alleged ██████ judges are demeaning, disrespectful, verbally abuse, and throw files at clerks. ██████ alleged that when the clerks voiced their complaints of mistreatment to the CCC Administration the clerks receive discipline and letters threatening their jobs instead of the CCC Administration “enforcing protective protocols” for the clerks. The OIG reviewed letters and emails from the ██████ judges regarding complaints about ██████ and other clerks. Additionally, the OIG interviewed ██████, other ██████ court clerks, AC ██████, CDC ██████, and CDC ██████. Judges are not within the OIG’s jurisdiction, but it is worth noting that ██████ and ██████ former CDC, ██████, made similar complaints about three of the same ██████ judges. Most of the interviewed employees stated that the ██████ judges are particular about how they run their courtroom and that they are demanding. The OIG discovered the main complaint the judges have regarding the clerks is missing files, while the clerks’ issues mainly stem from their disagreement with the judges’ decision or the judges’ treatment of the defendants. The CCC clerks do not have a say in how the ██████ Judges make their rulings, nor do they have a say about how the courtroom should be run, however, the CCC court clerks do deserve to be treated with respect and deserve patience. The majority of the Judges’ complaints stem from missing court files and the court clerks’ training. Although the OIG agrees that the court clerks’ duty is to ensure the court runs well and has no missing files, ██████ has undergone a shift with newly hired employees and newly promoted employees being trained. Given ample time, ██████ must take necessary steps to ensure that all clerks are trained efficiently and properly. The OIG believes that the CCC and the Chief Judges’ Office should continue to work together to better their relationship and productivity. Further, CCC should look further into the complaints from judges before issuing disciplinary action against the clerks, this way the clerks do not feel their jobs are being threatened and feel as if they are being heard by the administration.

**CF 23-05-218.** The OIG received a complaint from employee ██████ that alleged CDC ██████ of racial discrimination, cruelty, humiliation, verbal intimidation, and threats. ██████ claimed that ██████ would yell obscenities, undermine her authority, and smoke his vape pen while speaking to her. ██████ further claimed that ██████ would intimidate her by stating that he was personally hired by Clerk Iris Martinez, his family is friends with Executive Clerk ██████, and by making the statement “you know this must go upstairs,” referring to the executive offices on the 10th floor at the Daley Center. ██████ wrote that ██████ would “constantly state, ‘you know no one likes you. Why doesn’t anyone on your team like you?’ and further threatened her by stating to ██████ that he was going to “get ██████ back” for not staying late one day. The OIG interviewed ██████, CDC ██████, and other ██████ employees. All employees

except for ██████ denied ever hearing ██████ make those statements and denied ██████ behaving in that manner. There is no question that ██████ perceived ██████ behavior and actions to be verbally abusive, threatening, intimidating, and racially biased. However, based on the interviews conducted, the OIG lacked sufficient evidence to find ██████ violated GRR 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.1.12; Code of Ethics Sections 6 & 7; nor the Anti-Discrimination and Harassment Policy, therefore the OIG found these allegations INCONCLUSIVE. As for the allegations regarding racial discrimination, ██████ complaint did not level up to racial discrimination because ██████ was enforcing CCC rules and both employees involved were violating dress code and cell phone usage policy, therefore the OIG found these allegations NON-SUSTAINED. Although the OIG did not sustain any of the allegation ██████ lack of willingness to participate in the investigation was prevalent and reached a point where his behavior caused detriment to his character and professionalism. Considering ██████ is a supervisor he is held to a higher standard of conduct than other employees. The OIG found it reasonable that ██████ could perceive ██████ personality as hostile or aggressive. Although no other employees complained about ██████ interactions with them, the OIG recommended ██████ undergo leadership training to grow and solidify his interpersonal skills.

### **Case Management**

Following up on the 2023Q1 report on the investigative process, the OIG focused on working with Labor Relations and Court Operations to formalize reporting and minimize multiple platforms for case tracking. During Q2, the OIG continued memorializing all external and internal complaints within the Clerk's Office.

In Q2, the OIG continued building out and transferring over all historical and current cases onto a new case management system, while still utilizing the case management system created in 2021Q3. The OIG worked with MIS and Microsoft to complete the new intake and case management system and will implement the new system in 2023Q3.

The OIG transferred all data and tasks that implemented and tracked information related to the functions of Labor Relations and Court Operations. This included the tracking and reporting of discipline, movements, and other employment actions. The OIG has also transferred the duties of the organization of a standing biweekly meeting to Labor Relations and HR. This meeting was created by the OIG for Labor Relations, Court Operations, Human Resources, Personnel Services, and General Counsel to discuss disciplinary issues that involve recently closed OIG investigations, disciplinary issues on employees in supervisory roles, management inquiry tracking, and grievance hearing updates.

Finally, in Q2, the OIG continued working on the 2022Q2 joint investigation with the Office of the Independent Inspector General (OIIG). Both offices entered a memorandum of understanding relative to the investigation. The joint investigation allows our office to extend certain powers held by the OIIG in the investigation of employees of the Clerk of the Circuit Court.

### **OIG Team**

In Q2, the OIG onboarded a new Deputy Chief. The OIG is now composed of an Inspector General, Deputy Chief, three Inspector General Investigators, and an Executive Assistant. Three members of the OIG team are certified by the Association of Inspectors General (AIG) as Certified Inspector General Investigators and one member is certified as an Inspector General. Five team members of the OIG are members of the AIG IL and National Chapter. The OIG will be attending the AIG Inspector


General Institute in August 2023, all investigators will become certified as either Inspector General Investigators, Inspectors, or Auditors.

**Criminal Prosecutions**

At the time of this report, OIG has two cases referred for criminal prosecution to CCSAO. There were no updates as to the status of charging decisions on either case.

Thank you for your time and attention, feel free to reach out with any concerns or questions.

Respectfully,



Anthony Nguyen  
Inspector General

cc: Tiffany Brooks, Chief of Staff  
Hon. Judge Gloria Chevere, Senior Policy Advisor  
Carmen Navarro-Gercione, Executive Clerk of Operations  
Mary Anne Spillane, Chief Human Resource Officer  
Alvin Portis, General Counsel