



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Date of transcription 10/24/2010

On October 24, 2010, JOHN DOE, P.O. Box 1234, San Francisco, CA 94102, telephone number 415-105-4321, was interviewed by Special Agent GRAHM L. CODER. Doe is an applicant for a position with the FBI. After being advised of the purpose of the interview and the identity of the interviewer, Doe furnished the following information.

Doe has been employed since January 1, 2010 as an attorney at the law firm of JOHNSON AND JOHNSON, 2600 MAPLE STREET, ANYTOWN, CALIFORNIA, telephone number 415-105-6543.

During Doe's Personnel Security Interview, Doe disclosed a written warning he received from Johnson and Johnson that he stated was performance related.

The background investigator (BI) concluded [see FD-302 of 10/14/2010] from the statements of Doe's supervisor, MICHAEL JOHNSON, that the warning was not performance related, but instead related to Doe's excessive use of alcohol at a company holiday party and "hookup" with a co-worker. Doe was asked to explain the discrepancy between what he said at the PSI and what the BI concluded.

Doe advised that the written performance warning was pretextual discipline that he accepted as part of a deal made with his supervisor, who is junior to the owner of the firm, KARL JOHNSON. The deal was made in order to avoid embarrassing the owner of the firm for his daughter JAMIE JOHNSON'S "slutty" behavior at the party.

According to Doe, he was fully performing in his job and did not drink excessively at the party, but Ms. Johnson made sexual advances to Doe anyway. Doe saw no reason to decline because he and Ms. Johnson work together and his firm has no rules against dating co-workers.

Investigation on 10/24/2010 at Washington, D.C. (telephonically)

File # 67B-HQ-7654321

Date dictated N/A

by John Doe (civilian) John Doe

Continuation of FD-302 of John Doe, On 10/24/2010, Page 2

Doe stated that after the "hookup" he was hoping to date Ms. Johnson. Ms. Johnson never returned his calls and started avoiding him at the office. Doe concluded that Karl Johnson told his daughter to avoid Doe, and told Doe's supervisor to discipline him in order to discourage Doe from further contact with Ms. Johnson

Doe stated that in the PSI, he truthfully answered the question that was asked and there were no follow up questions.

Leads:



Lead 1:

SAN FRANCISCO

AT SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Interview Ms. Johnson for her account of the events described by Doe.

Lead 2:

SAN FRANCISCO

AT SAN FRANCISCO, CA

Interview Karl Johnson for his account of the events described by Doe.

◇◇