

Appendix C

Corporate Fraud Investigation Case Studies

Case Study One – Housing Benefit and Council Tax Reduction

Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) Compliance Team notified the Corporate Fraud team that that Housing Benefit and Council Tax Reduction claimant had undeclared capital in excess of £20,000.00. DWP Compliance closed their case as Low Level Fraud.

Corporate Fraud investigated the CTR aspect which resulted in the following. The funds were recovered but no further action was taken as the customer was 92 years of age and in poor health:

No.	Reduction / Benefit	Dates	Amount
1	Excess CTR	01/04/2013 to 07/10/2013	£448.53
2	HB Overpayment	17/03/2008 to 07/10/2013	£21,615.78
3	CTB Overpayment	17/03/2008 to 31/03/2013	£4,238.76
Total recovery			£26,303.07

Case Study Two – Data Matching

We received a Housing Benefit Matching Service referral for a claim which disclosed previously undeclared capital. DWP referred to their Compliance Team who interviewed the customer who made statement about capital and provided bank statements showing capital in excess of £16,000. DWP Compliance closed their case as no further action.

Corporate Fraud investigated the Council Tax Reduction aspect and the result was as follows:

No.	Reduction / Benefit	Dates	Amount
1	Excess CTR	01/04/2013 to 21/02/2016	£3,615.75
2	HB OP	17/12/2012 to 25/10/2015	£15,217.62
3	CTB OP	17/12/2012 to 31/03/2013	£349.40
Total recovery			£19,182.77

Case Study 3 – An Administration Penalty

Customer failed to declare an increase in self- employed income. The partner also held a position of trust and was involved in the claim. A lengthy investigation involved interviewing the customer and the partner under caution. The customer admitted that the increases should have been declared to the council and understood it would have affected her entitlement to the reduction.

It was decided to offer the customer an administrative penalty as an alternative to prosecution. The customer is no longer on benefits and now has a new job. A prosecution may have impacted negatively on their new role and therefore it was decided that a penalty was the most appropriate course of action.

The penalty of £1297.36 was offered and accepted, the customer had also repaid the excess reduction she had received which was £2594.72. In total the work of the Corporate Fraud Team meant the customer repaid £3892.08 to the council.

Case Study 4 – Housing Fraud

The team received a referral that a tenant was illegally subletting their property to their son. The tenant had asked if they could assign their property to their son as they were thinking of moving in with their daughter. They were told they couldn't and if they moved in with their daughter they would need to terminate their tenancy. The daughter was also a Housing Association tenant and had spoken to her Housing Association about her parents moving in with her. Corporate Fraud visited the properties on numerous occasions and eventually found the tenant in and after some discussion notice to quit the property was given there and then. The property was recovered for re-allocation by the Housing Association.

Case Study 5 – Elections Fraud

A referral was received regarding potential electoral register fraud, with two people trying to register at an address where they did not reside. The resident at the address had post from CDC in 2 other people's names. The 2 people were trying to be placed on the electoral register at this property.

Corporate Fraud team visited the property and took statements from the residents who confirmed that they did not know either party and they had not given anyone permission to register at their address.

Following this the application was rejected and they were prevented from joining the register