

M E M O R A N D U M

October 20, 2026

TO: Audit Committee

FROM: Blaise DeFazio, Senior Legislative Analyst ^{BD}
Office of Legislative Oversight

SUBJECT: **Discussion:** Office of the Inspector General Memorandum of Investigation, *Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by a Montgomery County Police Department Executive*
Discussion: Office of the Inspector General Memorandum of Investigation, *Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney Employee*

On October 23rd, the Audit Committee will have a discussion on two Office of the Inspector General memorandums of investigation: *Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by a Montgomery County Police Department Executive* and *Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney Employee*. Those expected to attend the worksession are listed below.

Department	Representatives
Office of the Inspector General	Megan Davey Limarzi, Inspector General
Montgomery County Police Department	Acting Police Chief Darren Francke
Office of the County Attorney	John P. Markovs, County Attorney
Office of the County Executive	Fariba Kassiri, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer Michele El-Gamil, Office of Internal Audit Manager

1. Discussion on Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by an MCPD Executive

Inspector General Limarzi will present memorandum of investigation, [Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by a MCPD Executive](#), with an opportunity for the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Summary

The investigation was based on allegations of misconduct by a Montgomery County Police Department (MCPD) Executive. The investigation was predicated on complaints: (1) alleging that the executive failed to take leave in situations where doing so was required; and (2) alleging 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.

The results of the investigation found:

- 1) 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.
- 2) Police executives and managers were uncertain about when they were required to take leave to attend events during their normal workday.
- 3) The executive's relative, who is also a County employee, accompanied them to a work-related conference (substantiating the allegation). Furthermore, the executive was dishonest when asked about bringing this relative to the work-related conference.
- 4) The executive directed that a County vehicle be provided to an Office of the County Attorney employee without establishing necessary parameters on the use of the vehicle.

The Office of the Inspector General made the following recommendations:

- 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 their 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 civilian vehicle assignments to ensure compliance with policy.

The Chief Administrative Officer's (CAO) response to the memorandum of investigation is on page 4; the response indicated concurrence with the recommendations.

2. Discussion on Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney Employee

Inspector General Limarzi will present memorandum of investigation, [*Public Synopsis: Investigation of Alleged Misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney Employee*](#), with an opportunity for the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Summary

The investigation was based on anonymous complaints alleging misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney (OCA) employee. The first complaint alleged that the employee participated in official travel outside the scope of their duties and instructed an MCPD executive to use Signal, a secure messaging application, for County business to avoid requirements under the Maryland Public Information Act (MPIA). The second complaint alleged the employee was in a motor vehicle accident while potentially under the influence of alcohol and that someone within the MCPD “made it disappear.”

The results of the investigation found:

- 1) The employee did not travel outside the scope of their duties; all trips received appropriate approval and were related to their role and duties. However, not all trips were documented in eTravel as required.
- 2) The employee did not instruct an MCPD executive to use the Signal messaging application for County business to avoid MPIA requirements.
- 3) The employee violated the County policy in several instances. The employee failed to obtain departmental director approval for the use of the County vehicle, misused a County vehicle for multiple personal trips, inappropriately took the vehicle home on a routine basis, and failed to properly report a vehicle accident that occurred when the employee was in transit between a personal event and their residence. Contrary to the complaint, the employee was not under the influence of alcohol when the accident occurred.

The employee resigned during the investigation. The Inspector General referred this matter to the CAO for whatever further action they deem appropriate.

The CAO’s response to the memorandum of investigation is on page 5. The CAO indicated the County is committing to taking all necessary measures to ensure full adherence to the relevant Montgomery County Administrative Procedures and that all non-local travel is captured in the eTravel system.

CAO Response to OIG Memorandum of Investigation on Alleged Misconduct by a MCPD Executive



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

101 Monroe Street • Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-777-2550 • MD Relay 711 TTY • 240-777-2517 FAX
www.montgomerycountymd.gov

CAO Response to OIG Memorandum of Investigation on Alleged Misconduct by an Office of the County Attorney Employee



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

Marc Elrich
County Executive

Richard S. Madaleno
Chief Administrative Officer

MEMORANDUM

September 10, 2026

TO: Megan Davey Limarzi, Inspector General
FROM: Richard S. Madaleno, Chief Administrative Officer *RS*
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. Although the investigation did not substantiate the allegations in the complaint, we are very disappointed with the repeated misuse of a County vehicle and failing to properly report an accident to the proper personnel. Additionally, we are concerned about the lax administration and enforcement of the specified policies. These violations present significant risks and compliance issues for the County. We are committed to taking all necessary measures to ensure full adherence to the relevant Montgomery County Administrative Procedures (AP) referenced in your report and that all non-local travel is captured in the eTravel system.

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

101 Monroe Street • Rockville, Maryland 20850
240-777-2550 • MD Relay 711 TTY • 240-777-2517 FAX
www.montgomerycountymd.gov