



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Montgomery County, Maryland



MEMORANDUM OF INVESTIGATION

TO: Richard S. Madaleno
Chief Administrative Officer

FROM: Megan Davey Limarzi, Esq. 
Inspector General

DATE: September 18, 2026

SUBJECT: Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by a MCPD Executive

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) recently concluded an investigation regarding allegations of misconduct by a Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) executive. The investigation was predicated on allegations received from complainants to the OIG hotline.

The complaints alleged that the executive failed to take leave in situations where doing so was required. Complainants asserted that the executive was on extended medical leave at the beginning of 2026 but did not record or take the appropriate leave. They also reported that the executive and several other high ranking MCPD employees attended a golf outing while “on the clock” without taking leave and further alleged that the executive consumed alcohol while at the event.

The complaints further alleged that the executive misused County resources for personal gain by bringing a relative who is also employed by the County to an out-of-state work conference.

Our investigation found that between July 1, 2024, and July 5, 2026, the executive did not record having taken any form of leave, despite being occasionally unavailable during regular work hours. A lack of available documentation prevented us from determining the total number of hours that this occurred. We did, however, identify at least five days (totaling 40 hours), including the day of the golf tournament referenced in the complaint, during which the executive was out of the office and no leave or other adjustment was made to make up the time.

The executive explained that they believed the additional hours they routinely worked each pay period compensated for the time they were away. They stated that “99% of the time” they work more than 40 hours each week and never adjusted their work schedule to make up for the extra hours.

The executive, by position, is exempted from following the County’s *Personnel Regulations*¹ and therefore not having taken leave in instances where they were unavailable for duty does not

¹ MCPR, 2001, Section 2-2. General Provisions. Applicability of Personnel Regulations.

violate County policy. Similarly, there does not appear to be any other County policy that imposes time and attendance requirements on the executive's position.² However, MCPD directive FC300 requires that "no employee will be absent from duty without leave."

Our investigation also found that police executives and managers were uncertain about when they were required to take leave to attend events during their normal workday. Some made a distinction between attending in a personal capacity versus attending as an official representative of the department. For example, attendance at the golf outing was viewed by some as representing MCPD (and therefore not requiring leave), while others considered it a personal event that did require the use of leave.

We substantiated the allegation that the executive's relative, who is also a County employee, accompanied them to a work-related conference. While the executive initially told us that they were not involved in selecting their relative to go with them, we later learned this was not true and that they in fact selected the relative to attend.

Additionally, we determined that the executive directed that a County vehicle be provided to an Office of the County Attorney (OCA) employee without establishing necessary parameters on the use of the vehicle. As a result, the OCA employee used the vehicle for personal matters, including transporting non-County individuals, as well as regularly commuting between work and home. Work to home use of County vehicles requires approval by the County's Chief Administrative Officer. That approval was not requested or obtained in this instance.

Background

On June 16 and 18, 2026, the OIG received complaints through its hotline alleging misconduct by the executive. We focused our investigation on three allegations outlined in the complaints:

- Failure to take leave in instances where they were required to do so.
- Consumption of alcohol at a golf event during working hours.
- Misuse of County funds by taking a relative to a conference.

The OIG also evaluated the executive's actions in providing a County vehicle to an OCA employee.

MCTime is the County's official time and attendance system, used to record employee work hours and leave, document supervisory approval, and process payroll. TeleStaff is an automated workforce scheduling and communication platform used primarily by the County's public safety agencies, including Fire Rescue Service, MCPD, and the Department of Corrections. MCPD uses TeleStaff to manage employee schedules, track work hours and leave, and capture supervisory

² Although department directors and other executives may not be required to take leave when they are absent from work, they continue to earn leave which may be cashed out and/or applied to their retirement calculations.

approval for timecards of employees below the rank of lieutenant. TeleStaff does not process payroll. Instead, at the end of each pay period, TeleStaff records are transferred into MTime for payroll processing.

Applicable Law and Policy

Certain delineated County merit system employees are exempted from following Montgomery County Personnel Regulations.³

Montgomery County Payroll Policies Section 4. Time Reporting

- “Employees have a duty to comply with government guidelines with respect to time and attendance. Supervisors have a duty to be familiar with those procedures as well as the basic provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) covering time reporting and record keeping. In addition, Supervisors are required to review, edit and approve timecards utilizing MTime, the enterprise wide employment system.”

MCPD directive FC0300 May 7, 2024, MCPD Department Rules mandates the following:

- Rule 6 – Punctuality
 - A. No employee will be absent from duty without leave or without authorization from the employee’s supervisor.
 - B. No employee will leave the work site prior to the end of the scheduled workday without the approval of a supervisor.
 - C. An employee who fails to report for duty as scheduled or who leaves the work site prior to the end of the scheduled workday without the approval of a supervisor may be considered absent without leave and placed in a non-pay status for the period in question and be subject to appropriate disciplinary action.
- Rule 12 – Conduct Unbecoming
 - No employee will commit any act which constitutes conduct unbecoming an employee of the department. Conduct unbecoming includes, but is not limited to, any criminal, dishonest, or improper conduct.

Section 19A-14(a) (Misuse of prestige of office; harassment; improper influence) of the County’s ethics law stipulates that “a public employee must not intentionally use the prestige of office for private gain or the gain of another.”

Montgomery County Code, Section 2-151(m)(2) states that “giving false or misleading information in connection with any audit, study, or investigation” is a class A violation under County law.

³ Montgomery County Personnel Regulations, Section 2-2 (Applicability of Personnel Regulations)

Inquiry and Outcome

Use of Leave and Consuming Alcohol While on Duty

The OIG reviewed time and attendance records available in MCtime and TeleStaff for the executive and found that aside from a recent vacation in July 2026 in which they recorded 40 hours of annual leave, records indicate the executive has no other documented use of leave since July 2024. This included periods when they provided notification to other County officials that they would be out of the office. Neither system showed that the executive at any point adjusted their work hours to make up for the hours they indicated they would be away from the office.

For the dates that the executive notified others that they would be out of the office, their Microsoft Outlook calendar also indicated that they were “out of the office”. Their Outlook calendar also did not show adjustments to their schedule to make up for the absences. The following table shows a comparison between dates when the executive stated they would be away from the office and their Outlook calendar:

Table: Comparison of Notifications and Outlook Calendar

Notification	Outlook Calendar
Out of Office March 28 - April 1, 2025	Shows out of office 8A-6P March 28 and March 31, but shows appointments on March 28
Out of Office May 30 - June 2, 2025	Shows out of office 8A-4P May 30
Out of Office January 5 – February 1 for extended/medical leave	Weeks of 5 th , 12 th , and 19 th indicated as out, but a number of appointments that appear to be recurring are also listed
No notification May 8, 2026	Shows <i>Police Foundation Golf Tourney</i> May 8 th , 8A start

During an interview with OIG investigators, the executive stated that prior to July of 2026, they had not taken any leave as an executive, but was occasionally away from the office attending to personal matters. The executive explained that they did not take leave because they believed the additional hours they routinely worked each pay period offset the time they were away. The executive acknowledged taking time throughout the workday to go to doctors’ and other appointments without taking leave or documenting adjustments to their schedule.

A review of the executive’s leave balance as of July 7, 2026, showed they had accumulated 296 hours of annual leave and 8,863 hours of sick leave. The executive earns 208 hours of annual leave per year. They are permitted to carry over 240 hours of annual leave from year to year. Any amounts over that limit are transferred to their sick leave balance. By not taking any leave during their tenure, the executive continued to contribute towards their sick leave balance, a portion of which could be credited towards their pension.

The executive said that although they notified their boss that they would be out of the office from January 5 through February 1, 2026, they were only completely unavailable to work on January 5th and 6th. They claimed that they resumed normal working hours on January 7th. An MCPD

employee that routinely works with the executive told us that the executive came into the office a few times in January 2026 but was generally not working. Another MCPD employee stated that they did not remember the executive attending scheduled meetings during the early part of the scheduled absence but remembered them being present at meetings/events later in January.

The executive confirmed that they attended the golf tournament noted in the complaint, but said they did so in a private capacity. They admitted that while they did not take leave to attend the event, they would have expected other police employees who attended to do so.

The executive told investigators that they consumed approximately two alcoholic beverages while attending the golf tournament. Photographs posted on the event website show the executive in civilian attire and apparently unarmed. The executive also stated that they drove their personal vehicle to and from the event. If the executive was not on duty during the golf outing, their alcohol consumption would not violate County policies prohibiting drinking or intoxication while on duty, if they applied to them. However, the executive's timesheet shows no leave was taken that day.

The executive could not remember whether they were out of the office and unavailable for work on March 31, 2025, and May 30, 2025, or why they had notified their boss that they would be. Similarly, they could not explain why their Outlook calendar showed that they were out of the office on those days.

We could not locate any records that would have enabled us to calculate the total number of hours/days that the executive was not available for work and took no leave or adjusted their work schedule to make up the time. However, we identified five days (totaling 40 hours), including the day of the golf tournament referenced in the complaint, during which the executive was out of the office and no leave or other adjustment was made to cover the time.

Out-of-State Conference

The executive attended a conference in June of 2026. Our investigation substantiated that the executive's County-employed relative traveled with them to the event but did so in connection with MCPD-related duties. The executive told OIG investigators that they did not participate in the decision to choose their relative for the assignment; however, our investigation revealed this to be false and that the executive had indeed selected their relative to travel with them to the conference.

Other Observations

During our investigation we discovered that contrary to requirements in the County's *Payroll Policies*, MCPD policy only requires management review and approval of timecards for anyone below the grade of first-line supervisor and unit/district commanders. By exempting certain individuals from supervisory review of timecards, MCPD is removing controls that help ensure the accuracy of time claimed; track unexpected overtime and spot attendance trends; prevent fraud and ensure compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), which requires

employers to maintain accurate and complete records of hours worked for non-exempt employees.

Our investigation also identified confusion among police executives and managers regarding when they are required to take leave to attend events. In reviewing the use of leave related to the cited golf tournament, we found that some executives did not take leave because they believed they were representing MCPD, while others, including the executive, believed leave should have been taken and did not distinguish between attending in a personal capacity or in an official one.

We also found one instance where the executive directed that a County vehicle be provided to an OCA employee without establishing necessary parameters on the use of the vehicle. Because of this the OCA employee was assigned a vehicle and given no guidance regarding restrictions or permissible use. The employee subsequently admitted to regularly using the vehicle to commute from work to home, conducting personal business, and transporting persons not affiliated with the County. *Montgomery County Administrative Procedure 1-4 (Assignment and Use of County Vehicles and Use of Personal Vehicles While on County Business)* requires approval by the CAO for work-to-home use of a County vehicle. That approval was not requested or obtained in this instance.

Conclusion

We found that the executive was not truthful when they denied selecting their County-employed relative to accompany them to a conference which is a violation of Section 2-151(m)(2) of the County Code.

Our investigation substantiated allegations that the executive was absent and not available for work on at least five days (40 hours) without taking leave or adjusting their schedule to make up the time. The executive is exempt by virtue of their position from following the County's *Personnel Regulations*. They did, however, violate MCPD policy by being absent from duty without taking leave.

As a result of observations made during this investigation, we recommend:

1. The County, in consultation with its attorneys, determine whether to recover the equivalent of 40 hours of pay from the executive.
2. The County clarify expectations regarding time and attendance, use of leave, and other prohibitions or restrictions that may apply to individuals exempt from the personnel regulations.
3. MCPD update policy to require all supervisors to review and approve timecards, consistent with the County's *Payroll Policies*.
4. The County implement a policy clarifying when employees may attend events of a social nature during work hours without taking leave.

5. MCPD review the assignment of vehicles to civilian staff to ensure compliance with policy.

I am referring this matter to you for whatever action you deem appropriate. Additionally, I am sharing our findings with the County's Ethics Commission for their awareness and consideration.

cc: Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

Attachment: County's Chief Administrative Officer's Response

The OIG Provided the County's Chief Administrative Officer with a confidential version of this report on September 17, 2026, and received the following response on September 18, 2026.



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Richard S. Madaleno
Chief Administrative Officer

MEMORANDUM

September 18, 2026

TO: Megan Davey Limarzi, Inspector General

FROM: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer 

SUBJECT: Confidential Memorandum of Investigation – Alleged Misconduct

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the findings of the Office of Inspector General's investigation concerning allegations of misconduct. We are very disappointed that the investigation substantiated the absence of work without taking leave or adjustment to the schedule to make up the time as noted by the Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) policy. We are deeply concerned with the violation of § 2-151(m)(2) pertaining to this investigation. Trust is paramount in our service to the public and those in high-level positions must always uphold the highest standards, therefore appropriate action has been taken.

This investigation highlights the importance of ensuring established policies are clear, adhered to by all departments and enforcement is applied uniformly. We are firmly committed to applying all recommendations referred to in your report.

Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

cc: Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Office of the County Executive
John Markovs, County Attorney, Office of the County Attorney