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

ERIC BATES
INTERIM INSPECTOR GENERAL

November 24, 2026

TO: Michael P. Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates
Interim Inspector General

SUBJECT: Monthly Report for September 2026 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 September 2026.

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

September 2026

Referrals[1]	Opened Cases[2]	Results of Completed Investigations
1	10	▪ 4 investigations were *Sustained (1 criminal and 3 administrative)* ▪ 0 investigations were *Not Sustained* ▪ 0 investigations were *Unfounded* ▪ 8 *Bureau Determination*[3] (90 total number of current open cases - *72 administrative, 18 criminal*).

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

[1] New cases referred to IAB for consideration for investigation.

[2] Cases opened for investigation by IAB during the month of September 2026.

[3] These eight cases represent cases completed by Probation Department contract investigators, who do not make findings or recommendations. Upon completion, these cases are returned to the Performance Management Unit for determination of findings by the Bureau Senior Director.

the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.[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. The Office of Inspector General also reviewed CCTV logs and monitored Department compliance with its CCTV protocols.

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 September 2026. 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.

September 2026 – Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall

Case Summary 1

Multiple youths physically attacked a youth (Youth 1) in a classroom.[5] Two Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) issued verbal commands to stop fighting. The youths continued to fight with Youth 2 throwing a chair and striking Youth 1. DPO 1 deployed several bursts of OC spray to stop the attack, while DPO 2 attempted to restrain Youth 2 and Youth 3 from re-engaging in attacking Youth 1. DPO 2 deployed OC spray to stop the further attack of Youth 1. All youths were escorted to the living unit and secured in their assigned rooms. The youths affected by OC spray were decontaminated and medically assessed, however all youths were assessed approximately 1 hour beyond the required timeframe.[6] CCTV video for this incident was

[4] The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

[5] SCM LPJH 2026-3444.

[6] 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 indicated that the delay in medical assessment was due to the occurrence

available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Staff failed to appropriately supervise, address and restructure youths' behavior prior to incident. ▪ Child Safety Assessments were not completed in a timely manner.[7]	NO ▪ The SCM Reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

Case Summary 2

A youth exhibited aggressive behavior toward staff in a living unit.[8] Three DPOs confronted the youth attempting to de-escalate his behavior, but the youth failed to comply with the officers' instructions. DPOs 1 and 2 performed a team takedown, placing the youth in a prone position on the floor. The youth was handcuffed and escorted to his assigned room. The youth was medically assessed 10 minutes beyond the required timeframe. CCTV video for this incident was available.

of multiple incidents.

[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 CSA shall be completed within *one hour* of being notified." (Emphasis added)

[8] SCM LPJH 2026-3542.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Youth was not medically assessed timely.	NO ▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

September 2026 – Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall

Case Summary 1

Two youths started to fight in a living unit.[9] Two DPOs intervened and secured the upper torso of Youth 1, separating him from Youth 2. DPO 1 performed a takedown of Youth 1, placing him on the floor. DPO 2 extended his arm to prohibit Youth 2 from re-engaging in the fight. Each youth was subsequently escorted to their assigned room. Youth 1 was medically assessed in a timely manner, but Youth 2 did not receive a medical assessment.[10] CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ DPOs failed to submit reports timely. ▪ Youth was not medically assessed after physical intervention.	YES ▪ The SCM reviewer did not properly identify the policy violations.	NO

[9] SCM BJN 2026-1304.

[10] SYTF 1008.6 provides: "Any youth involved in a physical intervention incident in facilities shall be referred to medical staff for assessment when it is reasonable and safe to do so, following containment of the occurrence."

Case Summary 2

As a handcuffed young adult was being escorted to a medical housing unit, he exhibited aggressive behavior and failed to comply with staff instructions.[11] Three DPOs placed the young adult in a prone position on a bed. The DPOs used de-escalation techniques and removed the handcuffs once the young adult calmed down. The young adult was offered a medical assessment within the required timeframe, but the young adult refused to be assessed. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Child Safety Assessment was not completed timely. ▪ DPOs failed to submit reports timely.	NO ▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

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]

[11] SCM BJN 2026-1339.

[12] Detention Services Bureau (DSB) Manual 700, Section 715 and Secure Youth Treatment Facility Manual 700, Section 715 provides: Staff shall search youths' 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

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

For this reporting period, the Office of Inspector General included Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK) in its continued review of the Probation Department's compliance with its search policies and state law, and accurate documentation of searches. The Residential Treatment Services Bureau (RTSB) policy, to which CVK is subject, requires a daily search of youths' room or camp dorm area; including bed area, sheets, blankets, desks, any personal items that are in the room, door jams, windows and light fixtures.[14] Per Department policy, these searches should be completed on each shift, and also include all areas that youth have access to (Required Searches). Based on this policy, there should be *two* total searches per living unit per day.

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 September 2026. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 960 work shifts at BJNJH, 1111 at LPJH and 496 shifts at CVK for September 2026.[15]

---

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.

[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] RTSB 1316 Searches in Detention Facilities.

[15] The daily searches reviews were conducted in all 17 units at BJNJH, all 19 units at LPJH, and all nine living units at CVK. 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. No such searches were conducted at either facility in September 2026.

The Office of Inspector General randomly selected and reviewed four days of living unit searches conducted by Probation Department staff during the morning and evening shifts across all units at BJNJH, LPJH and CVK.[16] 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 a 96% compliance rate at BJNJH and a 93% compliance rate at LPJH, meaning the Probation Department is in compliance with the Amended Order.

The Office of Inspector General found an 86% compliance rate at CVK, and it is not in compliance with the Amended Order.

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall

Of the sampled four days of unit searches at BJNJH in September 2026, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

64 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit – 62 times; 97% of the sampled living units.
3 searches per unit – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
2 search per unit – 2 times; 3% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
0 *searches per unit*- 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

[16] The four days reviewed were September 5, 2026, September 11, 2026, September 12, 2026, and September 26, 2026. 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.)

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 97% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.

Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall

As noted above, the Probation Department policies require each living unit to be searched twice during the morning and evening shifts, for a total of four (4) searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in September 2026, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

74 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit – 69 times; 93% of the sampled living units.
3 searches per unit – 0 time; 0% of the sampled living units.
2 searches per unit – 5 times; 7% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
0 searches per unit – 0 times; 0% 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 93% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick

Of the sampled four days of living unit searches at CVK in September 2026, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

36 Sampled Living Unit Searches
2 searches per unit – 31 times; 86% of the sampled living units.
1 search per unit – 5 times[17]; 14% of the sampled living units.
0 *searches per unit* – 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at CVK, the Probation Department conducted one search per shift (two searches per day), as required by its policy in 86% of the sampled living units and is therefore out of compliance with the Amended Order.

Body-Scan Searches

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in September 2026. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 229 body scans at BJNJH and 792 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for September 2026: 13 for BJNJH and 54 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 member of the same sex/gender as the youth being searched.[18]

[17] Documentation provided by the Probation Department that failed to clearly identify an AM or PM search, or where the Office of Inspector General could not determine an AM or PM shift were calculated as "0"; indicating no search was conducted.

[18] 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.

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 10 of the 13 (76%) body scans conducted. In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 13 of the 13 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is out of compliance with the Amended Order regarding entering body-scan information into PCMS and in compliance with conducting same sex/gender body scans. [19]

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 52 of the 54 (96%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 53 of the 54 (98%) 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.[20]

For CVK, the Probation Department did not provide documentation for body scan searches conducted, stating that there is no body scan unit at CVK and such searches are not applicable at the facility at this time.[21] The Department stated that it is not required to perform body scans but rather utilize the body scan units whenever it's reasonably practicable in place of a pat down search, strip search or body cavity search. Directive 1519, the Department's body scan policy, provides:

---

[19] The Office of Inspector General also noted that 100% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

[20] Directive 1519 requires all staff members to complete comprehensive training prior to the operation of the body scanners. This comprehensive training includes a two-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 annual refresher training. The Office of Inspector General noted that only 53% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

[21] The Probation Department reports that it is not required to have a body scan unit at CVK and if there is a need to conduct a body scan, the youth would be transferred to BJNJH or LPJH.

> "Body Scanning may be used at intake, after visiting, and other circumstances that can jeopardize the safety and security of the youth while respecting their dignity and rights. The following requirements shall apply to the use of the Body Scanner: All youth, except those suspected or confirmed to be pregnant, shall undergo a body scan during the intake process . . . Youth returning from any transportation outside the facility shall be scanned upon return to the facility prior to transfer to housing unit or being integrated with other youth."

The Probation Department's policy is unclear whether the Department is required to perform body scans at all facilities. The Department's body scan policy does not contain language specifically excluding any RTSB facility or camp from conducting such searches. Additionally, the Office of Inspector General did not identify any Department policies that exclude, prohibit, or absolve any RTSB facility or camp from conducting body scan searches. The Office of Inspector General has determined that implementing that body scan searches at CVK is appropriate given that youth girls and gender expansive youth are now housed at the facility. Accordingly, the Office of Inspector General continues to recommend that a body scan unit be deployed at CVK and all youth returning to the facility be subjected to body scan screening in accordance with Department policy.

Because a body scanner is not being used at CVK, the Office of Inspector General could not review body scanning documentation to determine compliance with its body scanner policy nor determine its compliance with the Amended Order in this area.[22]

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) continue to conduct living unit searches as required by policy, (3) continue to enter body-scan information into the PCMS system, (4) continue to 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

[22] The Probation Department reported the policy was only intended to apply to those facilities with a body scanner and the requirements section of the policy therefore only applies when a facility uses a body scanner. However, the Department has reported that it has obtained an estimated cost for a body scanner and is in the process of purchasing it in the next fiscal year for the facility.

preference of the youth, (5) ensure that medical assessments are conducted in a timely manner, and (6) that a body scan unit be deployed at CVK and all youth returning to the facility be subjected to body scan screening in accordance with Department policy.

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

Guillermo Viera Rosa

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
PROBATION DEPARTMENT

9150 EAST IMPERIAL HIGHWAY – DOWNEY, CALIFORNIA 90242
(562) 940-2501

TO: Eric Bates, Interim Inspector General
Office of Inspector General

FROM: Aaron Broom
Compliance Officer, Probation

SUBJECT: **RESPONSE TO MONTHLY REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER 2026 ON INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU INVESTIGATIONS, CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION REVIEW, AND SEARCHES AT BARRY J. NIDORF AND LOS PADRINOS**

The Probation Department Compliance Division submits this formal response to the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) Monthly Report for September 2026 on behalf of its operational leadership. The response reflects the Department's review and assessment of the matters identified by the OIG, including relevant operational considerations, actions taken, and measures underway to address identified deficiencies and areas of concern.

The Department remains committed to ensuring accountability and achieving sustained compliance with applicable legal, regulatory, and policy requirements. The Chief Executive Office's Probation Compliance Office (CEO PCO) has assisted in coordinating the development of this response with the appropriate operational stakeholders to ensure the Department's position is accurately and comprehensively represented. The comments below reflect feedback from Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH), Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH), Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK) and the Department's Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB).

Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) Review

- Based on IAB's review of the LPJH and BJNJH case summaries and assessments, the Department concurs with the OIG's findings, except for the assessment for SCM BJNJH 2026-1304. The Department agrees that SCM LPJH 2026-3444, SCM LPJH 2026-3542 and SCM BJNJH 2026-1339 were accurately summarized and assessed.
- Regarding SCM BJNJH 2026-1304, both youths received medical assessments on the date of the incident (September 10, 2026), in accordance with SYTF Manual Section 1008.6. Additionally, five Deputy Probation Officers (DPO) submitted their reports on the day of the incident, and timely report submission continues to be discussed during BJNJH's weekly Physical Intervention Meetings.

Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) Review – Facility Comments

Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall (LPJH)

- Regarding SCM LPJH 2026-3444 and SCM LPJH 2026-3542, in which the OIG found that medical assessments and Child Safety Assessments (CSA) were not completed in a timely manner, LPJH issued a memorandum on July 30, 2026, clarifying expectations and establishing reasonable timeframes for youth to receive medical assessments following use-of-force incidents. The guidance recognizes the operational considerations involved in safely securing youth, coordinating medical personnel and ensuring assessments are completed without unnecessary delay.
- With respect to SCM LPJH 2026-3444, some assessments were delayed due to the number of youths involved in the incident and the operational demands associated with ensuring their safety. The officer involved was enrolled in block week training, as well as individualized use-of-force and Crisis Intervention Training (CIT), to address the identified concerns. The officer subsequently resigned from the Department for reasons unrelated to this matter.
- LPJH will reinforce compliance with the July 30, 2026, memorandum and with expectations for the timely notification, completion and documentation of CSAs. Directors will continue to ensure supervisor accountability through direct oversight and incident reviews, and unit Directors will continue to monitor compliance, identify delays and address deficiencies through corrective action when warranted.

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH)

- Regarding SCM BJNJH 2026-1304, the Department respectfully disagrees with the OIG's finding that Youth 2 was not medically assessed. The youth's medical assessment was documented in the SCM reviewer's narrative and reflected in the Medical Summary, and the Physical Intervention Packet (PIP) included both youths' PEMRS medical assessments. Because both youths' medical assessments and follow-up were documented, and the officers' reports were submitted on the day of the incident, the Department also disagrees that the SCM reviewer failed to identify and elevate policy violations in this incident.
- Regarding SCM BJNJH 2026-1339, the Department concurs with the OIG's findings that the Child Safety Assessment (CSA) and the officers' reports were not completed timely. For context, the young adult remained escalated at the time of the incident and was not in an appropriate condition to participate in a CSA; the Officer of the Day subsequently completed the CSA. In addition, although the officers' reports were not submitted on the day of the incident, they were received in time for the SCM reviewer to complete the required review by the applicable deadlines.

Search Logs – Required Unit Searches

The OIG found LPJH (93 percent) and BJNJH in compliance with required living unit searches.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK)

- The OIG found that CVK conducted required searches in 31 of 36 sampled living-unit days (86 percent). CVK acknowledges the identified deficiencies and has addressed the findings with the appropriate personnel to ensure corrective action is taken. CVK remains committed to maintaining consistent compliance with established search requirements and ensuring that staff adhere to applicable policies and procedures.
- Consistent with our responses to the OIG's prior reports, a court has not yet determined whether CVK falls under the settlement agreement with the DOJ and, if so, whether the agreement applies to the entire facility or only to those areas housing pre-disposition youth.

Body-Scan Searches

The OIG found LPJH in compliance with entering body-scan information into PCMS (96 percent) and conducting same sex/gender body scans (98 percent), and BJNJH in compliance with conducting same sex/gender body scans (100 percent).

Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall (BJNJH)

- The OIG found that BJNJH entered body-scan information into PCMS for 10 of 13 sampled scans (76 percent). On June 24, 2026, BJNJH issued written direction to staff outlining documentation requirements for body scans and PCMS entries. Corrective actions remain ongoing, with continued management oversight to reinforce compliance and ensure consistent implementation of these requirements.

Campus Vernon Kilpatrick (CVK)

- Although the Department continues to believe its body-scan policy does not require a scanner at CVK, the Department procured a youth body scanner for the facility, which has been installed and is now operational. Vendor-led training for staff has been completed, and the scanner is in use in accordance with established policy.

The Department continues to review the incidents identified by the OIG and to address any areas of concern to ensure ongoing compliance with applicable policies, procedures and requirements. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the OIG's September 2026 report and remain committed to continuing to work collaboratively with the OIG to achieve and sustain full compliance across all three facilities.