

Closeout of M92020008

This case was forwarded to OIG by the Division of Grants and Contracts (DGC) in a memo dated 12/23/91. [REDACTED] (the complainant) sent the allegations to DGC by letter [REDACTED]

The complainant is a graduate student at the [REDACTED]. He receives support via a subcontract under NSF Grant [REDACTED] from the Division [REDACTED] Directorate [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] (the subject), who is the complainant's thesis advisor. The complainant made four allegations against the subject:

- (1) **plagiarism** - based on the subject's reference (in a letter [REDACTED] to the complainant) to a presentation made by the complainant as "our work"; complainant maintains that subject provided absolutely no input to the complainant's work.
- (2) **misuse of time spent while on "grant clock"** - subject requested/required complainant to perform personal errands, e.g. transportation of subject and his family to and from the airport, school, etc.
- (3) **refusal of subject to meet his obligations as thesis advisor** - subject refused to provide advice and guidance and made no contributions whatsoever to the complainant's work.
- (4) **retaliation by the subject and other university officials** - As the complainant's thesis advisor, the subject sent the complainant what was essentially a letter of reprimand about his unwillingness to work within the university system; the complainant's response to this letter included the allegations stated here. Complainant alleges that university officials responded to his allegations by requesting him to move from his office to a smaller room without a telephone.

The material provided by the complainant consisted of three letters: the subject's letter to the complainant, the complainant's response to it, and a letter from the complainant to the [REDACTED]

The complainant did not provide any factual evidence to support his allegations. When OIG requested that the complainant provide OIG with factual support for his allegations, the complainant indicated that he "would like to see the matter closed" and provided no supporting information. In the absence of any factual support from the complainant for these allegations this case was closed.

[REDACTED]
Evaluator, OIG, 6/4/92

Concurrence: James J. Zwolenik 6/10/92
James J. Zwolenik
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

[REDACTED]
Assistant Counsel to the Inspector General

an - rd