



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL  
1700 ARMY PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON DC 20310-1700

US ARMY INSPECTOR GENERAL AGENCY  
REPORT OF INVESTIGATION  
(Case 13-034)

SEP 16 2013

**NAME / POSITION:** Brigadier General (BG) Bryan T. Roberts, former Commanding General (CG), US Army Training Center (USATC) and Fort Jackson, Fort Jackson, SC

**ALLEGATION / FINDING # 1:** The allegation that BG Roberts engaged in two inappropriate relationships was substantiated.

**ALLEGATION / FINDING # 2:** The allegation that BG Roberts improperly used government resources was substantiated.

**BACKGROUND:**

1. On 13 February 2013, the US Army Criminal Investigation Command (CID), Quantico, VA, was notified of a complaint from the (b)(7)(C) Fort Jackson, SC. The (b)(7)(C) stated that he received a call and text messages from a female who alleged that she was assaulted by a "senior military officer" who worked on Fort Jackson. The female in question refused to fully identify herself and refused to disclose any information pertaining to the senior officer's identification. CID later identified the complainant as (b)(7)(C) a non-Department of Defense (DOD) affiliated female, and the "senior military officer" as BG Roberts.
2. In sworn statements to CID, (b)(7)(C) indicated that she met BG Roberts in May 2011 and entered into a consensual, sexual relationship with him two months later. The relationship continued until February 2013. On 13 February 2013, while at BG Roberts's quarters on Fort Jackson, (b)(7)(C) got into a fight with BG Roberts over her cellular phone when (b)(7)(C) inadvertently called BG Roberts's wife. The altercation turned physical when she slapped BG Roberts, and he bit her lip. When BG Roberts bit her, her lip bled and required her to seek medical attention. (b)(7)(C) also suffered an eye injury. (b)(7)(C) alleged that during the course of their relationship, she had three other physical altercations with BG Roberts. Three of the four incidents required her to seek medical attention.
3. During the course of the CID investigation, telephone records indicated that BG Roberts maintained frequent contact with (b)(7)(C) GS-12, (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) and (b)(7)(C) GS-14, (b)(7)(C). In a CID interview, (b)(7)(C) admitted that she too had a consensual, sexual relationship with BG Roberts while he was serving as the Deputy CG (DCG), USAREC. In addition, (b)(7)(C) told investigators that BG Roberts said that while he was previously deployed to Iraq, his wife accused him of having an affair with his (b)(7)(C). The (b) in question was later identified as Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) (b)(7)(C) now serving as the (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) LTC (b)(7)(C) was a major at the time and served as BG Roberts's (b)(7)(C) when he was a colonel.

SAIG-IN (ROI 13-034)

4. CID investigated the allegation that BG Roberts assaulted (b)(7)(C) On 12 April 2013, CID referred the allegations that BG Roberts engaged in inappropriate and/or sexual relationships, and improperly used government resources to the Department of the Army Inspector General (DAIG) Agency for appropriate action.
5. On 19 August 2013, The Inspector General directed a DAIG investigation pending final receipt of the CID investigation and the Article 15 proceedings.
6. DAIG notified BG Roberts on 21 August 2013, and LTC (b)(7)(C) on 15 May 2013, that they were subjects in a DAIG investigation. LTC (b)(7)(C) was notified that the investigation centered on an inappropriate relationship with a senior official. BG Roberts was notified that the investigation centered on the allegations that he engaged in inappropriate, sexual relationships and improperly used government resources.
  - a. Both BG Roberts and LTC (b)(7)(C) declined to testify.
  - b. The only evidence of a potentially inappropriate relationship between BG Roberts and LTC (b)(7)(C) came from (b)(7)(C) statement to CID. (b)(7)(C) stated that BG Roberts told her that his wife accused him of an inappropriate relationship with his (b) but BG Roberts denied the affair. As noted, both BG Roberts and LTC (b)(7)(C) refused to answer any questions. On 12 June 2013, DAIG contacted (b)(7)(C) BG Roberts's wife, and she also declined to testify. Due to the lack of any additional investigative leads, DAIG did not continue its investigation of this alleged inappropriate relationship.
7. On 2 August 2013, the CID Report of Investigation – Final/SSI-0039-2013-CID043-36745-5C2B determined BG Roberts assaulted (b)(7)(C) on three separate occasions. The Commander, US Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), imposed an Article 15 on BG Roberts for assault, adultery, and conduct unbecoming an officer. After being found guilty of all three offenses at the Article 15 proceeding, BG Roberts received a written reprimand and was ordered to forfeit \$2,500 pay per month for two months.
8. BG Roberts appealed the finding from the Article 15, but his appeal was denied.
9. This investigation will focus on the allegations that BG Roberts engaged in inappropriate and/or sexual relationships, and improperly used government resources. It will not focus on any of the offenses that were the subject of the Article 15 proceedings.

**ALLEGATION # 1: The allegation that BG Roberts engaged in two inappropriate relationships was substantiated.** Evidence contained in a CID Report of Investigation indicated that BG Roberts engaged in inappropriate, sexual relationship with (b)(7)(C) Phone records further indicated that BG Roberts engaged in an inappropriate relationship with (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) were subordinate civilian employees.

[Investigating Officer (IO) Note: These inappropriate relationships were not addressed in the Article 15 proceedings.]

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT  
AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

**STANDARDS:**

1. Section §3583 of title 10, United States Code (USC), states all commanding officers and others in authority in the Army are required to show in themselves a good example of virtue and honor and are guard against and suppress all dissolute practices and to correct, according to the laws and regulations of the Army, all persons who are guilty of them; to take all necessary and proper measures, under the laws, regulations, and customs of the Army; and to promote and safeguard the morale, the physical well-being, and the general welfare of the officers and enlisted persons under their command or charge.

2. Army Regulation (AR) 600-100 (Army Leadership), 8 March 2007, states, in paragraph 2-1, that all leaders are responsible for setting and exemplifying the highest ethical and professional standards as embodied in the Army Values.

**DOCUMENTS / TESTIMONY:**

1. On 19 March 2013, CID obtained BG Roberts's government cellular records to determine the frequency of his communications with (b)(7)(C). Those records not only reflected calls between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) but they also reflected that BG Roberts had 241 calls between him and (b)(7)(C) over a four month period, and 936 calls between him and (b)(7)(C) over a six-month period. These calls included calls made in the late evening, in the early morning, on weekends, and on holidays.

2. With respect to (b)(7)(C) the CID Agent's Investigation Report, dated 11 April 2013, reflects that (b)(7)(C) stated that she and BG Roberts engaged in a consensual, sexual relationship that began in December 2010 and lasted approximately six months. At the time, BG Roberts was assigned as the DCG, USAREC, and (b)(7)(C) was a (b)(7)(C) civilian employee. (b)(7)(C) explained that she and BG Roberts maintained regular contact with each other during his deployment in Iraq (from September to December 2011).

a. (b)(7)(C) stated that during the course of their relationship (December 2010 to June 2011), while BG Roberts was assigned to Fort Knox, she stayed at BG Roberts's quarters on Fort Knox, KY. After BG Roberts moved to Fort Jackson, SC, in March 2012, (b)(7)(C) travelled to Fort Jackson to visit him. On two different occasions, BG Roberts stayed with her in guest housing on Fort Jackson.

b. When BG Roberts travelled to Norfolk, VA, in a temporary duty (TDY) status, (b)(7)(C) stayed with him for two to four days. A review of BG Roberts's TDY vouchers indicated that BG Roberts was TDY in Hampton, VA, from 21 to 26 July 2012. Hampton was approximately 16 miles from Norfolk, VA.

c. (b)(7)(C) stated BG Roberts was never physically abusive towards her. She ended the relationship because it was "not going anywhere." The last time she saw BG Roberts was in December 2012.

3. With respect to (b)(7)(C) during a DAIG interview, (b)(7)(C) testified that she met BG Roberts when he became the CG, USATC, on or about March 2012. She visited BG Roberts's quarters approximately 40 to 50 times, but less than 5 times while he was there.

SAIG-IN (ROI 13-034)

The visits were to resolve maintenance issues with his quarters. She did not recall conducting business alone with BG Roberts. She never met Mrs. Roberts and had no knowledge of BG Roberts being a violent person. She was unaware of any inappropriate relationships that BG Roberts may have had with other women.

a. During the DAIG interview, (b)(7)(C) was informed that DAIG had phone records that reflected over 900 phone calls exchanged between her and BG Roberts. 50 percent of the calls were made in the late evening, early morning, weekends, and on holidays. The evidence indicated that on Saturday, 4 August 2012, two calls were made after 0200, and on Saturday, 26 August 2012, there were 11 phone calls made between (b)(7)(C) and BG Roberts throughout the day starting at 0830 and ending at 2325, one call lasting 91 minutes.

b. When (b)(7)(C) was asked the purpose of phone calls placed at 0200, 2300, and a total of three calls made on Christmas (b)(7)(C) testified "I don't know." When asked the purpose of the calls made on the weekends, she initially testified that she did not know and later stated that it could be "to talk about motorcycles or work-related issues."

c. (b)(7)(C) testified that she was BG Roberts's "sounding board." She provided an "opportunity for him to vent" . . . and to "discuss changes at Fort Jackson." She testified that she maintained a "cordial, relaxed friendship" with him. She did not know how she would describe her relationship with BG Roberts. She later testified that she thought of BG Roberts as a "boss and friend."

**ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION:**

1. With respect to (b)(7)(C) the evidence established that BG Roberts, a married senior official, engaged in an inappropriate, sexual relationship with (b)(7)(C) a civilian government employee, that began in December 2010 while BG Roberts was serving as the Deputy CG, USAREC.

a. (b)(7)(C) served in the (b)(7)(C) and was effectively under BG Roberts's chain of command. Based on (b)(7)(C) admissions of a sexual relationship with BG Roberts, the evidence established that BG Roberts, while married to someone else, wrongfully had sexual relations with (b)(7)(C) a subordinate employee. The sexual relationship between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) was improper.

b. BG Roberts continued a pattern of inappropriate behavior while serving as the CG, USATC. The evidence established that BG Roberts continued an on-and-off relationship with (b)(7)(C) while maintaining constant contact with (b)(7)(C) both while he was married to someone else.

2. With respect to (b)(7)(C) although she denied having an inappropriate and/or sexual relationship with BG Roberts, the evidence indicated that the time and frequency of the 936 phone calls between (b)(7)(C) and BG Roberts in a six-month period was consistent with an inappropriate relationship. (b)(7)(C) testimony was less than credible when she testified that she could "not recall" the specific purpose for the late evening, early morning, weekends, and holiday phone calls. (b)(7)(C) "cordial, relaxed friendship" with BG Roberts exceeded an acceptable senior/subordinate relationship with his constant interaction with her. As the CG,

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.**

SAIG-IN (ROI 13-034)

USATC, BG Roberts's constant contact with (b)(7)(C) raises significant questions regarding BG Roberts's judgment in establishing such a close personal relationship with a subordinate Fort Jackson civilian employee.

3. As a general officer, serving as the DCG, USAREC, and then the CG, USATC, Fort Jackson, BG Roberts was expected to demonstrate a good example of virtue and honor, and to exemplify the highest ethical and professional standards as embodied in the Army Values. BG Roberts failed in these expectations by having a sexual relationship with (b)(7)(C). BG Roberts further failed to demonstrate exemplary conduct when he entered into an inappropriate relationship that exceeded an acceptable senior/subordinate relationship with (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) were both subordinate civilian employees.

**CONCLUSION:** The preponderance of credible evidence established that BG Roberts failed to demonstrate a good example of virtue and honor, and failed to exemplify the highest ethical and professional standards as embodied in the Army Values. The allegation that BG Roberts engaged in two inappropriate relationships was substantiated.

**ALLEGATION # 2:** The allegation that BG Roberts improperly used government resources was substantiated. Cellular phone records and e-mail messages indicated that BG Roberts misused government resources to facilitate personal relationships with women other than his wife.

**STANDARDS:**

1. Section 2635.704 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, Use of Government Property, states an employee has a duty to protect and conserve government property and will not use such property, or allow its use, for other than authorized purposes.
2. DOD 5500.07-R (Joint Ethics Regulation (JER)), states in subsection 2-301, that Federal Government communication systems shall be for official use and authorized purposes only. Authorized purposes include brief communications made by DOD employees while they are traveling on Government business to notify family members of official transportation or schedule changes. They also include personal communications from the DOD employee's usual workplace that are most reasonably made while at the workplace. Authorized purposes may include personal communications from the employee's workplace only when they (1) do not adversely affect the performance of official duties, (2) are of reasonable duration and frequency and whenever possible made during personal time, (3) serve a legitimate public interest, and (4) do not put Federal communications systems to uses that would reflect adversely on DOD or the Army.

**DOCUMENTS / TESTIMONY:**

1. BG Roberts's government cellular records reflected there were 1,207 phone calls between him and (b)(7)(C) between 2 August 2012 and 1 February 2013.

[IO Note: CID requested phone and e-mail records dating back to June 2011, but August 2012 was the earliest date that the cellular phone records were available, and June 2012 was the

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT  
AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

earliest date that e-mail records were available. CID was unable to retrieve text messages for (b)(7)(C) [redacted]. The text messages involving (b)(7)(C) [redacted] were provided by (b)(7)(C) [redacted].

2. With respect to (b)(7)(C) [redacted] BG Roberts's government cellular phone records from 4 August 2012 through 17 December 2012 indicated that BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) [redacted] exchanged 31 telephone calls. (b)(7)(C) [redacted] stated to CID that BG Roberts's government cellular phone number was the one number she used to contact BG Roberts. She saved BG Roberts's phone number in her phone as "BTRBG." On five different occasions, she changed her phone number to "protect his career." She stated that she and BG Roberts devised code words to say "I love you" in text messages because BG Roberts was worried about someone monitoring his phone. The phrase "Roger that!!!" meant "I love you," or the symbol "!!!" by itself meant that he loved her. They also used "ILY!!!" to say "I love you." (b)(7)(C) [redacted] also photographed an e-mail she received from BG Roberts's government e-mail account that stated, "I'm not trying to forget you." The date of the e-mail was unknown. BG Roberts's phone records indicated that 90 percent of the phone calls to (b)(7)(C) [redacted] occurred in late evening or early morning.

3. With respect to (b)(7)(C) [redacted], BG Roberts's cellular phone records from 2 August 2012 through 13 December 2012 indicated that BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) [redacted] exchanged 241 telephone calls. The phone records indicated that 60 percent of the phone calls occurred in late evening, in early morning, during weekends, and on holidays. Some of the phone calls occurred as early as 0500 in the morning and as late as 2400 at night. (b)(7)(C) [redacted] indicated that her phone conversations with BG Roberts were personal in nature. At the time the calls occurred, BG Roberts was the CG, USATC, and he had no professional reason for his communication with (b)(7)(C) [redacted]. The e-mail evidence from 25 June to 25 December 2012 from his government e-mail account, indicated the correspondence between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) [redacted] was official in nature; however, several e-mails were personal. In a 19 October 2012 e-mail, BG Roberts refers to (b)(7)(C) [redacted] as (b)(7)(C) [redacted]. In a 22 October 2012 e-mail, BG Roberts states to (b)(7)(C) [redacted] "You make my heart smile." In a 25 December 2012 e-mail, BG Roberts states, "Merry Christmas to you also (b)(7)(C) [redacted] . . . I've missed you very much. Bryan."

4. With respect to (b)(7)(C) [redacted] BG Roberts's cellular phone records from 2 August 2012 to 1 February 2013 indicated that BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) [redacted] exchanged 936 telephone calls, averaging more than five calls per day. The phone records indicated that approximately 50 percent of the phone calls occurred in late evening, in early morning, on weekends, and on holidays. Some of the phone calls occurred as early as 0200 in the morning and as late as 2300 at night. The records indicated that multiple calls were exchanged during the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year holidays. (b)(7)(C) [redacted] testified that she could not recall the exact nature of those phone calls. CID obtained a total of three e-mails exchanged between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) [redacted] from 29 December 2012 to 5 April 2013. All e-mails were generic in nature.

**ANALYSIS / DISCUSSION:**

1. Over a seven-month period from August 2012 to February 2013, BG Roberts used his government cellular phone to make more than 1,207 calls to three women. The evidence

SAIG-IN (ROI 13-034)

established that BG Roberts used his government cellular phone to facilitate inappropriate and/or sexual relationships with women other than his wife.

2. The JER states that Federal Government communication systems shall be for "official use" and "authorized purposes" only. According to the JER, "authorized purposes" may include personal communications from the employee's workplace only when they (1) do not adversely affect the performance of official duties, (2) are of reasonable duration and frequency and whenever possible made during personal time, (3) serve a legitimate public interest, and (4) do not put Federal communications systems to uses that would reflect adversely on DOD or the Army.

3. E-mails and text messages from BG Roberts's government accounts were not for "official use" but were personal, and sometimes intimate in nature. The evidence indicated that BG Roberts attempted to conceal his unauthorized use of government resources by developing code words with (b)(7)(C) or had (b)(7)(C) change her phone number. The 31 calls to (b)(7)(C) the 241 calls to (b)(7)(C) and the 936 calls to (b)(7)(C) were not a reasonable use of government communication systems. The evidence established that the calls did not serve a legitimate public interest and reflected adversely on DOD and the Army.

4. The JER further stipulates that authorized use of government communication systems includes personal communications from the DOD employee's usual workplace that are most reasonably made while at the workplace. The 1,207 government cellular calls exchanged between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C) occurred at varying times throughout the day, evening, night, weekends, and holidays to facilitate sexual and/or inappropriate relationships. The evidence indicated that the phone calls exchanged were not for authorized purposes, excessive, and not a reasonable use of a government communication system.

5. BG Roberts had a duty as a senior official to protect and conserve government property. BG Roberts's use of government resources to further his relationships with women other than his wife was inappropriate.

**CONCLUSION:** The allegation that BG Roberts improperly used government resources was substantiated.

**OTHER MATTER:** AR 380-67 (Department of the Army Personnel Security Program), 7 October 1988, states, in paragraph 8-2, that any derogatory information of the nature specified in paragraph 2-24 of the same regulation, be referred, by the most expeditious means, to the commander or security officer of the individual. Paragraph 2-4p lists as one criteria "[f]ailing or refusing to answer or to authorize others to answer questions or provide information required by a congressional committee, court, or agency in the course of an official inquiry whenever such answers or information concern relevant and material matters pertinent to an evaluation of the individual's trustworthiness, reliability, and judgment." On 16 May 2013, (b)(7)(C) refused to answer questions in the aforementioned investigation. This refusal meets the criteria as established in AR 380-67.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY. DISSEMINATION IS PROHIBITED EXCEPT  
AS AUTHORIZED BY AR 20-1.

SAIG-IN (ROI 13-034)

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. This report be approved and the case closed.
2. Refer this report to the Office of The Judge Advocate General for appropriate action.

(b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(C)

Investigator

(b)(7)(C)

Investigator



PETER M. VANGJEL  
Lieutenant General, USA  
The Inspector General

LIST OF EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT

**A Authority/Complaint**

- A-1: Directive
- A-2: Complaint
- A-3: Legal Reviews

**B Standards:**

- B-1: Title 10 USC, Section 3583, Requirement of Exemplary Conduct
- B-2: AR 600-100, Army Leadership, dated 8 Mar 07
- B-3: Title 5 CFR, Section 2635.704, Use of Government Property

**C Documents:**

- C-1: Witness Information Chart
- C-2: Tricare-Health Care Coverage Letter-Marital Status Information
- C-3: CID Report of Investigation – 2nd Status/SSI-0039-2013-CID043-36745-5C2B, 13 Feb 13
- C-4: Agent's Investigation Report, 11 Apr 13
- C-5: Affidavit Supporting Request for Authorization to Search and Seize, 14 May 13
- C-6: Telephone Records of (b)(7)(C)
- C-7: Telephone Records of (b)(7)(C)
- C-8: Telephone Records of (b)(7)(C)
- C-9: CID e-mail requesting phone records
- C-10: BG Roberts's Travel Voucher to Hampton, VA
- C-11: CID Report of Investigation – Final/SSI-0039-2013-CID043-36745-5C2B, 2 Aug 13
- C-12: Report of Proceeding Under Article 15, 7 Aug 13
- C-13: LTC (b)(7)(C) Officer Record Brief and OERs for the period she served as the (b)(7)(C) for BG Roberts
- C-14: E-mail, 16 May 13, subject: Subject Notification, from LTC (b)(7)(C) declining to testify and FOIA Request
- C-15: E-mail, 21 Aug 13, subject: BG Roberts, from attorney representing BG Roberts declining to testify
- C-16: E-mail between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C)
- C-17: E-mail between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C)
- C-18: E-mail between BG Roberts and (b)(7)(C)
- C-19: AR 380-67, 7 Oct 88

**D Testimony:** (b)(7)(C)

FOIA: No

**E Notifications:**

- E-1: LTC (b)(7)(C)
- E-2: BG Roberts (subject)