



# 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

January 20, 2026

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

FROM: Eric Bates   
Interim Inspector General

**SUBJECT: Monthly Report for November 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 November 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

November 2025

Referrals <sup>1</sup>	Opened Cases <sup>2</sup>	Results of Completed Investigations
5	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ 5 investigation was <i>Sustained</i> (1 criminal and 4 administrative)</li><li>▪ 15 investigations were <i>Not Sustained</i></li><li>▪ 0 investigations were <i>Unfounded</i></li><li>▪ 0 investigations were <i>Exonerated</i></li></ul> <p>(103 total number of current open cases - 77 administrative, 26 criminal).</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

---

<sup>1</sup> New cases referred to IAB for consideration for investigation.

<sup>2</sup> Cases opened for investigation by IAB during the month of November.

the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.<sup>3</sup> 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 November 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.

## November 2025 – Los Padrinos Juvenile Hall

### Case Summary 1

Two youths started to fight in a living unit. A Deputy Probation Officer (DPO 1) intervened and pulled Youth 1 by the shirt causing Youth 1 to fall to the floor, as a second DPO (DPO 2) detained Youth 2.<sup>4</sup> Both youths were escorted to their rooms without further incident. Both youths were medically assessed in a timely manner. CCTV for this incident was available.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance. The Probation Department's recently revised CCTV protocol was implemented in October 2025 and was not reviewed for this reporting period. The Office of Inspector General will report on the new protocol in its December monthly report.

<sup>4</sup> SCM LPJH 2025-5318.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Staff utilized a non-permitted use of force technique.</li></ul>	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	NO

## Case Summary 2

Two youths started to argue in a living unit.<sup>5</sup> A DPO (DPO 1) intervened, secured Youth 1 by his upper torso, and escorted him out of the living unit. Youth 1 was not medically assessed in a timely manner. Youth 1 was medically assessed 33 minutes after containment of the incident.<sup>6</sup> CCTV 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"><li>▪ Youth was not medically assessed in a timely manner.<sup>7</sup></li></ul>	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	NO

---

<sup>5</sup> SCM 2025-5538.

<sup>6</sup> The Probation Department reported that the delay was due to staff continuing to de-escalate the youth and staff addressing the incident.

<sup>7</sup> 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.”

## November 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall

### Case Summary 1

Two youths started to fight in a living unit.<sup>8</sup> A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and gave an OC spray warning before deploying OC spray on both youths. Both youths stopped fighting and a second DPO escorted Youth 1 out of the living unit as DPO 1 stayed with Youth 2. Both youths were escorted out of the living unit for decontamination. However, Youth 1 was not medically assessed nor decontaminated within the required timeframe following the incident. Youth 1 was decontaminated 23 minutes and medically assessed 48 minutes after containment of the incident. 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"><li>Youth was not properly decontaminated nor decontaminated in a timely manner.<sup>9</sup></li><li>Youth was not medically assessed in a timely manner.</li></ul>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	<p>NO</p>

---

<sup>8</sup> SCM BJN 2025-2022.

<sup>9</sup> DSB Section 1006 (E) provides: Youth shall be decontaminated immediately but no later than ten (10) minutes after containment of the incident. If decontamination within ten (10) minutes is not feasible; justification must be provided in the PIR. In addition, DPO 1 took Youth 1 and left him unattended in the restroom for decontamination against Probation Department policy and Title 15, section 1357(b)(3). DSB 1000 (E) provides, “All youth exposed to OC spray shall be directly supervised until the youth are thoroughly decontaminated . . . youth exposed to OC spray shall not be left unattended . . . until that youth is fully decontaminated or is no longer suffering the effects of the OC spray.” Title 15, section 1357(b)(3) provides, “. . . youth who have been exposed to chemical agents shall not be left unattended until that youth is fully decontaminated or is no longer suffering the effects of the chemical agent.”

## Case Summary 2

Two youths started to fight in a living unit.<sup>10</sup> Two DPOs and a Detention Services Officer (DSO) intervened and gave a warning that OC spray would be used if the youths did not stop fighting. The youths separated but later re-engaged in fighting due to the Probation Department staff failing to keep the youths separated. DPO 1 deployed OC spray to both youths causing the youths to stop fighting. Youth 1 was escorted to the restroom for decontamination. Both youths were timely medically assessed, but Youth 2 was not timely decontaminated. Youth 2 was decontaminated 20 minutes after containment of the incident. 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"><li>Youth was not decontaminated in a timely manner.</li><li>DSO was unaware youth was under “no OC spray” conditions.<sup>11</sup></li></ul>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	<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

---

<sup>10</sup> SCM BJN 2025-1999.

<sup>11</sup> DSB 1005 (B): Officers are expected to be aware of those youth with disabilities, medical, mental health, or other issues, and any youth that is medically contra-indicated from being exposed to OC spray.

youths' rooms on the living unit during the morning and evening work shifts (Required Searches).<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

## 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 November 2025. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 586 work shifts at BJNJH and 996 work shifts at LPJH for November 2025.<sup>14</sup>

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.<sup>15</sup> The Office of Inspector General determined compliance primarily based on information provided in the Department's search logs.

---

<sup>12</sup> Detention Services Bureau (DSB) 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.

<sup>13</sup> 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.

<sup>14</sup> The daily searches reviewed were conducted in all 18 units at BJNJH and all 19 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 5 such searches in November 2025, and 3 at LPJH.

<sup>15</sup> The four days reviewed were November 13, 2025, November 15, 2025, November 19, 2025, and November 20, 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>.)

## Findings

### *Unit Searches*

The Office of Inspector General found that LPJH met the requirements for conducting the Required Searches meaning the Probation Department is in compliance with the Amended Order. However, BJNJH failed to conduct the Required Searches and is not in compliance with the Amended Order.

### **Barry J. Nidorf Juvenile Hall**

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

71 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 25 times; 35% 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> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 46 times; 65% 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 35% of the sampled living units and is therefore not 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 per morning and evening shifts, for a total of four (4) searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in November 2025, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:



76 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 72 times; 95% 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> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 4 times; 5% 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 95% 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 November 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 226 body scans at BJNJH and 770 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for November 2025: 59 for BJNJH and 141 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.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> 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 29 of the 59 (49%) body scans conducted.<sup>17</sup> In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 59 of 59 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is in compliance with the Amended Order regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths but not in compliance regarding properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.<sup>18</sup>

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 137 of the 141 (97%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 138 of 141 (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.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> The Office of Inspector General also noted that only 84% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

<sup>19</sup> 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 74% of the body scans were conducted by Probation Department staff with certification for conducting body scans.

## 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 *a/ways* 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 medical assessments are conducted in a timely manner, and (7) reassign field staff to the juvenile facilities to provide appropriate supervision of the youths.

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