



FORUMS OFFICER.COM HOMEPAGE

[Today's Posts](#) [Mark Channels Read](#) [Member List](#) [Calendar](#)

[Home](#) > [Forum](#) > [Employment & Careers](#) > [Law Enforcement Job Center](#)

If this is your first visit be sure to check out the frequently asked questions by clicking here [FAQ](#). You must be registered, logged in and approved before you can post. Posting approval may take a few business days. To start viewing messages, select the forum that you want to visit from the selection below. You may have to [register](#).



## USSS Applicants Consider Refusing a Polygraph Exam from Special Agent Ellen Ripperger

POSTS LATEST ACTIVITY

Search Page 2 of 2 Filter

Yesterday, 10:43 PM #16

Originally posted by [La\\_Bamba](#)

*Couple of things here. I think you're blurring the lines between criminal and alleged administrative/ethical wrong doing. For instance, you never tell us when the test administrator was ever under oath to allegedly commit perjury? Secondly, and someone correct me if I am wrong but when has pre-employment polygraph results ever been considered "evidence?" Third, if you feel your accusations are true why on earth would you want to work for an organization that does this?*

*Im not sure posting this here was the most professional and for lack of a better term, "smart" move. Moreover, you better hope your ducks are in order because the agent you specifically named could absolutely sue you civilly for libel. Although unlikely it certainly could be a possibility. Just saying sir or ma'am, you have to be smarter than this if you want to be successful in this field. You aren't the first applicant whose ever felt they were wronged by their poly examiner and you won't be the last. My advice is take your lumps and move on to the next agency. If you're paying an attorney I would immediately stop because he's giving you bad advice. My guess though is your not because he/she would have never allowed you to post this. Best of luck.*

Special Agent Ellen Ripperger stated under oath at deposition that she knew the audio of the polygraph exam in question was being recorded properly because she could see the audio recording meter move during the exam. Yet when ordered to produce the audio recording by a judge, the USSS polygraph exam audio recording shows no movement of the audio meter through 90% of the examination. Either Special Agent Ellen Ripperger lied under oath and she purposely never recorded this polygraph examination, or someone at the United States Secret Service destroyed the recording. There are no other plausible explanations. Both are serious crimes. The issue is not that the applicant in question failed the polygraph exam, it is the failure to produce the audio of the exam when ordered to do so by a judge. This applicant is entitled to the same due process of law as anyone else. Those calling him names for demanding it have no business in law enforcement, and it shows questionable judgement at best.

Further, two additional Special Agents, Special Agent Ed Alston and Special Agent Thomas Christopher signed the quality control worksheets for the audio of this exam certifying it was intact and audible, that random checks were made of the audio recording throughout the entire polygraph examination, and that it was legible. So where is the audio? It was destroyed. It was destroyed because if it ever sees the light of day, it is the end of polygraph programs. If there was no misconduct on the part of the USSS, they would simply produce the audio and this entire matter would be resolved.

It is simply implausible to believe that the low audio recording warning indicator failed on the Lafayette Polygraph Software (which is enabled by default), that the Lafayette Polygraph Software recording level meters showed a normal recording when one was not happening due to a "faulty microphone", and that two Quality Control Special Agents made false statements when they certified the audio of this exam was legible. Like Judge Judy says, that doesn't make sense, and if it doesn't make sense it's not true.

Yesterday, 10:46 PM #17

Originally posted by [Indians56](#)

*Bingo...I would delete anything with a name, that SA is more than able to sue in civil court, remember, they do more than just administer polygraphs. I'm not a fan of them, and haven't had great experiences, but putting an agents name out there is bush league especially if it endangers them somehow..*

Disagree. Everyone who does anything controversial, be it politician, private citizen, or celebrity, is mentioned by name whether it be an article, police log, or news clip irrelevant of guilt or innocence. To assert law enforcement officers deserve special consideration when in the midst of controversy is providing them a benefit which is neither justifiable nor prudent. We are all responsible for our actions.

Yesterday, 10:53 PM #18

Originally posted by [Indians56](#)

*Bingo...I would delete anything with a name, that SA is more than able to sue in civil court.*

Incorrect. A person cannot be sued for slander if (1) they are telling the truth and (2) if no accusation is made. Both conditions are true here. Read the post CAREFULLY.

Yesterday, 11:22 PM #19

How about you just go crybaby somewhere else. You failed. Flunked. Got dropped. Get over it. You aren't getting hired, especially after your post.

Guess you didn't think that out, eh professor..?

What a maroon.

Now go home and get your shine box!

Previous 1 2



What's Going On

There are currently 9690 users online. 358 members and 9332 guests.

Most users ever online was 19,482 at 11:44 AM on 09-29-2011.

Tag Cloud

academy advice background investigation california corrections employment florida hiring hiring process holster interview lapd law enforcement new york nypd police sheriff texas training trooper



Get fast, relevant product information... ANYTIME. ANYWHERE. ANY DEVICE.

Visit the PRODUCT GUIDE