

SUMMARY OF NEW INTERNAL DEA REPORT ON COLOMBIAN “SEX PARTIES”

On April 6, 2015, the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform requested that Michele Leonhart, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), produce internal documents relating to allegations that DEA agents engaged in “sex parties” in Colombia with prostitutes funded by drug cartels.

On April 13, 2015, the DEA produced 88 internal reports issued by its Office of Professional Responsibility (OPR). One report in particular—Case Number PR-ZE-2012-0085—went into great detail about these allegations.

Although press reports indicated that instances of DEA sexual misconduct occurred between 2005 and 2008, this new internal OPR report indicates that these activities began much earlier—and some date back as far as 2001.

In producing this internal report to the Committee, the DEA redacted the names of employees, victims, and other individuals, but the cover letter warned that even with these redactions, releasing the report in its entirety could “expose complainants, witnesses, and victims.”

To accommodate the agency’s request not to disclose the entire report, excerpts from the report are set forth below that do not identify individuals, but are particularly relevant to the Committee’s inquiry.

- “The investigation revealed that while the three agents were assigned to the Bogota Country Office, SSA [Target 9] received an AK-47 rifle from an AUC member during the course of a jungle operation and maintained it in his possession until shortly before departing post over one year later.” (p.6)
- “SA [Target 3] and SA [Target 9] allegedly received AK-47 rifles from a member of a “Parra-military terrorist organization” after meeting with them in the jungle. The AK-47 rifles were transported back via a CNP vehicle to inside the US Embassy walls where they were placed in an armored diplomatic vehicle.” (p.8)
- “He would obtain prostitutes for agents from the DEA Bogota Country Office. He would pay the girls to come to the parties and then the agents would pay the girls directly for any sex they wanted. He recalled getting prostitutes for at least 15-20 parties for the DEA agents.” (p.8)
- “He said while the agents were having sex, he would stay at the party and provide protection for the agents weapons and personal belongings.” (p.8)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 1] was interviewed and stated he remembered four specific parties he paid prostitutes to attend. The agents then had to pay the prostitutes \$150 USD to have sex with them. Mr. [Cooperator 1] said the agents would then go into separate bedrooms with the prostitutes while he watched their personal belongings.” (p.10)

- “Mr. [Cooperator 1] said that during October or November 2004 he received \$40,000 USC from SA [Target 3] to set up an office in ... Colombia. Mr. [Cooperator 1] said he would rent undercover apartments for DEA and the agents would use them for parties with prostitutes.” (p.11)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 5] stated he recalled ASAC [Witness 2]’s farewell party, in 2003 or 2004, where a part of the money requested from a operational budget was utilized for his party. Mr. [Cooperator 5] stated that Mr. [Cooperator 1] organized ASAC [Witness 2]’s party and paid 500,000 pesos (approximately \$261 USC) for each prostitute with funds from an operational budget. Mr. [Cooperator 5] stated operational budgets were presented to DEA to cover operational costs and the budget presented would allow for additional funds which were used for prostitution and parties for agents.” (p.13)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 2] stated he believed Mr. [Cooperator 1] gained information from the US agents by ‘getting their guard down’ through the use of prostitutes and paying for parties. Mr. [Cooperator 1] bragged about the parties with prostitutes and how he ‘sold’ the relationship/closeness with the agents to Mr. [Cooperator 2]. Mr. [Cooperator 1] stated he could easily get the agents to talk.” (p. 15)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 2] stated that CNP officers were paid at least 1.5 million USC for their information. Mr. [Cooperator 2] stated he remembered one time they were paid \$500,000 USC for their assistance with his properties where he was able to sell them before they were seized.” (p. 15)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 1] stated if money was left over, SA [Target 3], SA [Target 4], SA [Target 9], and SA [Target 6] would utilize the remainder of the money for parties and it was the ‘daily routine,’ to use the extra money in this manner.” (p.17)
- “SA [Target 7] admitted he engaged in prostitution on one occasion. SA [Target 7] stated he held two parties at his residence where prostitutes were present.” (p.18)
- “SA [Target 7] stated that ‘going away’ parties were possibly funded by operational funds. SA [Target 7] stated money was so easily distributed to CNP officers that anything was possible.” (p.19)
- “Mr. [Cooperator 5] stated he did not recall if SA [Target 7] engaged in prostitution; however, he recalled SA [Target 4], SA [Target 3], ASAC [Witness 2], and SA [Target 6] engaging in prostitution.” (p.20)
- “NOTE: SA [Target 7] and SA [Target 9] both stated GS [Target 2] would provide women for any party.] GS [Target 2] stated the married ‘guys’ were ‘out of control,’ and they did ‘the most running around (referring to having girlfriends in addition to their wives).” (p.22)
- “SA [Target 6] was interviewed and stated he engaged in prostitution six to seven times during his tenure in the Bogota Country Office (CO). SA [Target 6] stated he hosted GS

[Target 4]’s bachelor party at his residence and they all gave money for GS [Target 4] to engage with a prostitute. SA [Target 6] stated his ‘going away’ party was held at SA [Target 5]’s residence and a prostitute was paid for and provided to SA [Target 6].” (p.25)

- SA [Target 6] stated Mr. [Cooperator 1] provided [beauty queen] for his going away party which was held at SA [Target 5]’s residence. SA [Target 6] stated [beauty queen] was provided to him and he had sex with her.” (p.25)
- SA [Target 3] was interviewed and stated he attended parties where prostitutes were present. SA [Target 3] stated all agents knew when dancers/strippers attended parties that they were prostitutes.” (p.26)
- SA [Target 3] stated if an agent stated he did not know if the dancers/strippers who attended parties were prostitutes; they would be lying.” (p.26)

Punishments

The internal OPR report references ten DEA agents who were investigated for their actions. In many of these cases, recommended punishments were reduced without explanation. The internal report does not discuss punishments for DEA supervisors who may have known about these allegations and failed to report them.

Employees	Alleged Offenses	Recommended	Imposed
Agent GS-13	Poor Judgment	3-day suspension	2-day suspension
Agent GS-13	Conduct Unbecoming	administratively closed after retirement	concurred
Agent GS-14	Improper Association with a Criminal Element	3-day suspension	1-day suspension
Agent GS-14	Failure to Follow Instructions; Conduct Unbecoming; Poor Judgment	5-day suspension	3-day suspension
Agent GS-13	Conduct Unbecoming	5-day suspension	3-day suspension
Agent GS-14	Conduct Unbecoming; Improper Association with a Criminal Element	14-day suspension	9-day suspension
Agent GS-13	Conduct Unbecoming; Poor Judgment	14-day suspension	10-day suspension
Agent GS-15	Conduct Unbecoming; Improper Solicitation/ Acceptance of a Gift	Letter of Caution	concurred
Agent GS-14	Conduct Unbecoming; Failure to Follow Instructions; Poor Judgment	14-day suspension	8-day suspension
Agent GS-13	Abuse of Authority	Letter of Clearance	concurred