



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

312 SOUTH HILL STREET, THIRD FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90013
(213) 974-6100
<http://oig.lacounty.gov>

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS

HOLLY J. MITCHELL

LINDSEY P. HORVATH

JANICE HAHN

KATHRYN BARGER

MAX HUNTSMAN
INSPECTOR GENERAL

December 3, 2025

TO: Michael Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates 
Assistant Inspector General

**SUBJECT: Monthly Report for October 2025 on Internal Affairs Bureau
Investigations, Closed-Circuit Television Review, and Searches at
Barry J. Nidorf and Los Padrinos Juvenile Halls**

This monthly report reviewing the Los Angeles County Probation Department's (Probation Department) compliance with the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigations, closed-circuit television review, and search mandates outlined in the Order Amending Stipulated Judgment (Amended Order) for the Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH) and the Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH) covers the month of October 2025.

Review of IAB Cases

The Amended Order in paragraph 18 requires the Office of Inspector General to report the number of new IAB referrals, open cases, and results of investigations conducted by the Probation Department. The Probation Department provided documentation to the Office of Inspector General indicating the following:

Summary of Amended Order Compliance

October 2025

Referrals ¹	Opened Cases ²	Results of Completed Investigations
10	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 1 investigation was <i>Sustained</i> (1 <i>administrative</i>)▪ 24 investigations were <i>Not Sustained</i>▪ 0 investigations were <i>Unfounded</i>▪ 0 investigations were <i>Exonerated</i> <p>(115 total number of current open cases - 89 <i>administrative</i>, 26 <i>criminal</i>).</p>

The Office of Inspector General did not review the underlying facts of the investigations to form an opinion as to whether the results were appropriate, or if the investigations were conducted properly.

Closed-Circuit Television

The Amended Order (paragraph 20) requires that the Office of Inspector General randomly select two days per month to determine the Probation Department's compliance with the Department's Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) review protocol. The Office of Inspector General is to review documentation and video recordings of use-of-force incidents and assess whether: (1) the incident violates Department policies, the Amended Order or state law, (2) the incident has been properly identified and elevated to the appropriate Department staff and (3) the video recording was tampered with. Substantial compliance requires verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.³ The Probation Department

¹ New cases referred to IAB for consideration for investigation.

² Cases opened for investigation by IAB during the month of October.

³ The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

reported that its protocol for reviewing CCTV was recently implemented.⁴ The Office of Inspector General reviewed CCTV video recordings to assess proper documentation of use-of-force incidents as well as the identification by Department staff of possible violations of law, judgment, or policy, and the proper elevation of such incidents for review.

Methodology

The Office of Inspector General constructed a sample of two days of CCTV video recordings relating to use-of-force incidents at BJNJH and LPJH for the month of October 2025. Office of Inspector General staff reviewed Physical Incident Reports (PIR), Safe Crisis Management Incident Reviews (SCM), as well as available CCTV video recordings. The Amended Order requires monthly verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Probation Department properly identifies and elevates use-of-force incidents that are not in compliance with its policies, the original stipulated judgment, or state law.

October 2025 – Los Padrinos

Case Summary 1

A youth (Youth 1) attempted to engage in a fight with another youth in the living unit.⁵ A Deputy Probation Officer (DPO 1) intervened and stood between the two youths. Youth 1 was escorted out of the living unit to his room by DPO 1 and assisting staff without further incident. CCTV for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
NO	N/A	NO

⁴ A review of the Department's compliance with the new protocol will be reported in the November monthly report.

⁵ SCM LPJH 2025-5177.

Case Summary 2

Two youths started to argue in a living unit, and Youth 1 threw a pitcher of water at Youth 2.⁶ Youth 3 and Youth 4 attempted to fight Youth 1. A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and secured Youth 1 as a second DPO (DPO 2) secured Youths 3 and 4. DPO 1 escorted Youth 1 out of the living unit. DPO 2 and a third DPO remained in the living unit and counseled Youth 2. Child Safety Assessments were not conducted in a timely manner.⁷ Youth 1 was not assessed until 1 hour and 34 minutes after the incident, Youth 2 was not assessed until 1 hour and 36 minutes after the incident, Youth 3 was not assessed until 1 hour and 37 minutes after the incident, Youth 4 was not assessed until 1 hour and 40 minutes after the incident, CCTV for this incident was not available.⁸

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none">Staff failed to conduct Child Safety Assessments in a timely manner.	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none">The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

⁶ SCM LPJH 2025-5183.

⁷ DSB Section 1008 (B) provides: “Upon being notified that a physical intervention incident has occurred, the duty supervisor shall immediately conduct a Child Safety Assessment (CSA) involved in the incident. The designated duty supervisor shall respond to the location/building where the incident occurred. The CSA shall be completed within one hour of being notified.”

⁸ The use of force occurred in the gymnasium which did not have cameras on the date of this incident. Cameras have since been installed.

October 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

Case Summary 1

Two youths attacked a third youth in the restroom.⁹ A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and instructed the youths to stop fighting. DPO 1 gave an OC spray warning before deploying OC spray on both youths. Youth 1 stopped fighting, but Youth 2 continued attacking Youth 3 until a second DPO assisted and separated Youth 2 and Youth 3. The youths were not medically assessed within the required 30-minute timeframe following containment of the incident.¹⁰ Youth 1 was assessed 58 minutes after containment, Youth 2 was assessed 1 hour and 20 minutes after containment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none">Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none">The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

Case Summary 2

Five youths attacked another youth in the living unit.¹¹ Three DPOs intervened and one DPO issued an OC warning and then deployed OC spray causing the youths to stop fighting. The youths were escorted to their rooms but were not decontaminated nor medically assessed in a timely manner. Youths 1 and 2 were assessed 1 hour and 6 minutes after containment, Youth 3 refused assessment 1 hour and 16 minutes after

⁹ SCM BJN 2025-1986.

¹⁰ DSB Section 1008 (C) provides: “Any youth involved in a physical intervention incident in DSB facilities shall be referred to medical staff for assessment no later than thirty (30) minutes following containment of the occurrence.” The Probation Department reported that the delay was due to visitation occurring at the facility.

¹¹ SCM BJN 2025-1805.

containment, Youth 4 was assessed 1 hour and 13 minutes after containment, and Youth 5 was assessed 1 hour and 33 minutes after containment. The delayed medical assessments were reportedly due to safety concerns escorting multiple youths to the medical facility. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.▪ Staff failed to conduct Child Safety Assessments in a timely manner.	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	<p>NO</p>

Search Logs

The Amended Order Detailed Plan in paragraph 25 requires the Office of Inspector General to review a randomly selected representative sample of searches conducted by the Probation Department to determine the Department's compliance with its search policies and state law and that searches were accurately documented. The Amended Order mandates that the Department follow its policies and state law in 90% of all searches. The Department's policy requires a *minimum* of *two* random searches of youths' rooms on the living unit during the morning and evening work shifts (Required Searches).¹²

¹² Detention Services Bureau Manual 700, Section 715 and Secure Youth Treatment Facility Manual 700, Section 715 provides: Staff shall search youth's rooms daily. At the minimum, two (2) random room searches shall be conducted per each AM and PM shift. Searches should be scheduled in a manner that does not create a pattern for the youth to predict such searches. During the search, if any weapons or contraband are found, staff shall complete a Special Incident Report (SIR) and follow the procedures per the Crime Scene Evidence Preservation/Evidence Handling policy.

Based on this policy there should be four total searches per living unit per day. In addition, the Department conducts body scans of youths in its interdiction efforts.¹³

Methodology

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all searches conducted for all living units in both work shifts for the month of October 2025. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 1032 work shifts at BJNJH and 1166 work shifts at LPJH for October 2025.¹⁴

The Office of Inspector General randomly selected and reviewed four days of living unit searches conducted by Probation Department staff during morning and evening shifts for all units at BJNJH and LPJH.¹⁵ The Office of Inspector General determined compliance primarily based on information provided in the Department's search logs.

Findings

Unit Searches

The Office of Inspector General found that BJNJH and LPJH met the requirements for conducting the Required Searches, meaning the Probation Department is in compliance with the Amended Order.

¹³ Directive 1519 provides: Staff members conducting the body-scan and those within sight of the visual display shall be of the same sex as the youth being scanned or adhere to the youth's stated gender search preference as indicated on the Unit Classification form (Penal Code § 4030; 15 CCR 1360). The body scanner viewing monitors shall not be in direct view of other youth.

¹⁴ The daily searches reviewed were conducted in all 12 units at BJNJH and all 21 units at LPJH. In addition to daily unit searches by unit staff, there are also occasional searches by Special Enforcement Operations (SEO) officers or unit staff, typically based on suspicion(s) and/or observed activities reported by unit staff. At BJNJH, SEO or unit staff conducted seven such searches in October 2025, and one at LPJH.

¹⁵ The four days reviewed were October 16, 2025, October 17, 2025, October 25, 2025, and October 26, 2025. In constructing the samples described in this report, the Office of Inspector General followed current government audit standards to obtain a statistically valid sample and used a research randomizer to select incidents. (Off. of the Comptroller of the United States, U.S. Accountability Office (2018), <https://www.gao.gov/yellowbook>.)

Barry J. Nidorf

Of the sampled four days of unit searches at BJNJH in October 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

69 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 68 times; 99% of the sampled living units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>1 search per unit</i> - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at BJNJH, the Probation Department conducted two searches per shift (four searches per day), as required by its policy in 99% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.

Los Padrinos

As noted above, the Probation Department policies require each living unit to be searched twice per morning and evening shifts, for a total of four searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in October 2025, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

77 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 75 times; 98% of the sampled living units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.

77 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>1 search per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at LPJH the Probation Department conducted two searches per shift (four searches per day), as required by its policy in 99% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.

Body-Scan Searches

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in October 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 200 body scans at BJNJH and 637 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for October 2025: 18 for BJNJH and 85 for LPJH.

The Probation Department is required to document each body scan in its electronic Probation Case Management System (PCMS). In addition, each body-scan search is required to be conducted by a Department staff of the same sex/gender as the youth being searched.¹⁶

For BJNJH, based on the Office of Inspector General's review of PCMS records and body-scan documentation, the Probation Department entered body-scan information into PCMS in 8 of the 18 (44%) body scans conducted.¹⁷ In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 18 of 18 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is in compliance with the Amended Order

¹⁶ Directive 1519 provides: Each youth's scan records shall be included in their file and PCMS to prevent exceeding annual scan limits upon transfer within juvenile facilities. Staff members conducting the body scan and those within sight of the visual display shall be of the same sex as the youth being scanned or adhere to the youth's stated gender search preference as indicated on the Unit Classification form (Penal Code § 4030; 15 CCR 1360). The body scanner viewing monitors shall not be in direct view of other youth.

¹⁷ In addition to the body scans conducted at BJNJH, there was one authorized strip search. The reviewed documentation indicated that Probation Department staff completed the search and documentation in accordance with Department policy.

regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths but not in compliance regarding properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.¹⁸

For LPJH, based on the Office of Inspector General's review of PCMS records and body-scan documentation, the Probation Department entered body-scan information into PCMS in 80 of the 85 (94%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 83 of 85 (97%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. LPJH is in compliance with the Amended Order regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths and properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.¹⁹

Conclusion

The Office of Inspector General continues to recommend that the Probation Department: (1) continue to properly review CCTV video recordings for misconduct involving uses of force and investigating and determining whether staff engaged in misconduct, (2) implement protocols and policies on CCTV review, (3) continue to conduct living unit searches as required by policy, (4) ensure that staff are entering body-scan information into the PCMS system, (5) ensure that body-scan searches are always conducted by a staff member of the same gender as the youth searched or the stated gender search preference of the youth, (6) ensure that the youth are de-contaminated after OC spray use within the time required, (7) ensure that child safety and medical assessments are conducted in a timely manner, and (8) reassign field staff to the juvenile facilities to provide appropriate supervision of the youths.

c: Guillermo Viera Rosa, Chief Probation Officer
 Fesia Davenport, Chief Executive Officer
 Edward Yen, Executive Officer
 Dawyn R. Harrison, County Counsel
 Wendelyn Julien, Executive Director, Probation Oversight Commission

¹⁸ The Office of Inspector General also noted that only 83% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

¹⁹ Directive 1519 requires all staff members to complete comprehensive training prior to the operation of the body scanners. This comprehensive training includes a (2) hour course which addresses system operations, fundamental safety protocols and radiation safety, as well as hands-on training in scanning and camera operation. After certification, staff are also required to complete an annual refresher training. The Office of Inspector General noted that only 46% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.