

- (3) The allegation of On 03 May 2013, 1st Lt Owen, who was not qualified as a CAP pilot, handled the controls of a CAP aircraft below 1000 feet AGL in violation of CAPR 60-1, para 2-2h, is classified as **SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General found a substantial number of facts or amount of information supporting the allegation.

- (4) The allegation of On 03 May 2012, Major Fernandes, while serving as pilot in command (PIC) but who was not qualified as a CAP instructor pilot or CAP check pilot, allowed 1st Lt Owens, who was not qualified as a CAP pilot, to handle the controls of a CAP aircraft below 1000 feet AGL in violation of CAPR 60-1, para 2-1e, is classified as **SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General found a substantial number of facts or amount of information supporting the allegation.

- (5) The allegation of Major Fernandes took unfair advantage of a Flight Release Officer by concealing and/or misrepresenting material facts in violation of CAPR 1-1, para 3c, when on or about 03 May 2012 he obtained a flight release for his own proficiency, when the true purpose of the flight was instruction of 1st Lt Owens, is classified as **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General determined from the facts presented the act or acts complained of did not occur, was justified according to applicable directives, or that there was not a preponderance of evidence to support the allegation.

- (6) The allegation of GAWG is billing the USAF for flight time that was actually flown for purposes other than what was claimed and reported in violation of CAPR 1-1, paras 1, 3 and 4.y, is classified as **SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General found a substantial number of facts or amount of information supporting the allegation.

- (7) The allegation of Lt Col Slagle has been grounding pilots (by Operations Chain of Command Authority) and that none of these pilots were provided proper written notice of the suspension of CAP flying privileges as required by CAPR 60-1, para 2-7 (a)(2).y, is classified as **SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General found a substantial number of facts or amount of information supporting the allegation.

- (8) The allegation of Your removal from the "AOBD for Frostbite" exercise as reprisal for disclosing CAP regulatory, and possibly FAAA, in violation of CAPR 1-1, paras 1,3 and 4 is classified as **NOT SUBSTANTIATED**.

The Inspector General determined from the facts presented the act or acts complained of did not occur, was justified according to applicable directives, or that there was not a preponderance of evidence to support the allegation.