



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

April 14, 2025

TO: Mike Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates 
Assistant Inspector General

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

This monthly report reviewing the Los Angeles County Probation Department's compliance with the Internal Affairs Bureau (IAB) investigations, closed-caption 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 February 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

February 2025

Referrals	Opened Cases	Results of Completed Investigations
19	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 15 investigations were <i>Substantiated</i> (11 administrative and 4 criminal)▪ 3 investigations were <i>Unsubstantiated</i> (3 administrative)▪ 4 investigations were <i>Inconclusive</i> (4 administrative)▪ 6 investigations were <i>Insufficient evidence</i> (6 administrative) <p>(220 total number of open cases to date - 192 administrative, 28 criminal).</p>

The Office of Inspector General did not review the underlying facts of the investigations to form an opinion if the results were appropriate, or if the investigations were conducted properly. The Office of Inspector General continues to recommend that the final determination of misconduct not be decided by the investigator, but rather a disciplinary committee. The Department reported that it is in the process of changing its process and the alleged misconduct will no longer be decided by the investigator. An implementation date was not provided.

Closed-Captioned Television

The Amended Order (paragraph 20) requires that the Office of Inspector General randomly select two days per month to determine the Department's compliance with the Department's Closed-Caption 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.¹

As noted in the last report, the Probation Department still does not have a protocol or policy for reviewing CCTV. Again, because there is no policy regarding review of CCTV, there is no way to measure compliance with Departmental policies that don't exist.² 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 February 2025. The Office of Inspector General staff reviewed Physical Incident Reports (PIR), 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.

February 2025 – Los Padrinos

Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in the living unit.³ A Detention Services Officer (DSO) intervened and grabbed Youth 1 by the upper torso, separating him from Youth 2. Youth 1 broke free of the DSO's hold and ran towards Youth 2 and started fighting. A Senior Detention Services Officer (Sr. DSO) intervened and gave a warning of the use of Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray (OC Warning), but the youths continued to fight. The Sr. DSO then deployed OC spray, and the youths stopped fighting. Youth 1 and Youth 2 were decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

¹ The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

² The Department has a *Video Review* form to note whether a video recording a use-of-force incident was reviewed by a supervisor, but there are no specific policies or directives regarding the utilizing CCTV for review of possible misconduct.

³ SCM 2025-0622

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
<p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PIR of staff utilizing OC spray failed to document the OC pre-canister weight.⁴ 	<p style="text-align: center;">YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supervising staff failed to identify missing OC pre-canister weight on PIR. 	<p style="text-align: center;">NO</p>

Case Summary 2

Based on staff reports, youths from two units were enroute to school when the youths from one unit began to antagonize youths from the other unit.⁵ The Officer of the Day (OD) observed two youths run “out of bounds” and gave instruction to have all of the youths returned to their living units. As Youth 1 walked to his room, he became aggressive and reportedly made threatening remarks toward the OD and threw a water bottle at the OD. Two DSOs attempted to take Youth 1 to his room, but the youth resisted which resulted in the DSOs and the youth falling to the floor. The youth was secured and taken to his room. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
<p style="text-align: center;">NO</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NO</p>

⁴ The PIR form requires that Probation Department staff note the pre-use and post-use weight of the OC spray canister when utilized in a Physical Intervention incident.

⁵ SCM 2025-0549.

February 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in the living unit over the use of a telephone. A DSO intervened and attempted to stop the fight by separating the youths.⁶ However, the youths continued to fight, and Youth 1 picked up a water canister and threw it at Youth 2. The DSO then deployed OC towards Youth 1 and both youths stopped. Youth 1 and Youth 2 were decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. 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">Section M of the OC decontamination form was not completed with the weight of the OC spray canister.	YES <ul style="list-style-type: none">Supervising staff failed to identify missing information.	NO

Case Summary 2

As reported by the Probation Department, a youth became upset at a DPO because the youth was told to clean his room at a later time. The youth started cursing at the DPO and kicked the glass section of the office door. The DPO instructed the youth to stop but the youth continued, threatened the DPO, and advanced toward her. The DPO issued an OC Warning and ultimately sprayed the youth. The youth ran away but turned back toward the DPO who gave an additional OC Warning and then deployed OC spray again, striking the youth in the face. The youth was decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

⁶ SCM 2025-0213

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
NO	N/A	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).⁷ 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.⁸

Methodology

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all searches conducted for both work shifts in February 2025. In response, the Probation Department

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

provided search logs for 719 work shifts at BJNJH and 1014 work shifts at LPJH for February 2025.⁹

The Office of Inspector General randomly selected and reviewed four days of unit searches conducted by Probation Department staff during morning and evening shifts for all units at BJNJH and LPJH.¹⁰ The Office of Inspector General determined compliance primarily based on information provided in the Probation Department's search logs.

Findings

Unit Searches

The Office of Inspector General found that Probation Department staff at BJNJH and LPJH failed to meet the requirements of the Amended Order, which requires that the Department comply with its search policy when conducting the Required Searches in living units at LPJH and BJNJH. The Office of Inspector General however, did find that both juvenile halls accurately documented the searches it conducted, and therefore is in compliance with the Amended Order for accurate documentation of searches.

Barry J. Nidorf

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

⁹ The daily searches reviewed were conducted in all 10 units at BJNJH and all 20 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 145 such searches in February 2025. The Probation Department did not provide documentation of such searches at LPJH for February 2025.

¹⁰In 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>.)

40 Sampled Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 38 times; 95% of the sampled units.
<i>1 search per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 2 times; 5% of the sampled units.

Los Padrinos

As noted above, the Probation Department policies require each unit to be searched twice per morning and evening shifts, for a total of 4 searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in February 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

80 Sampled Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 0 times; 0% of the sampled units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 1 time; 1% of the sampled units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 66 times; 82% of the sampled units.
<i>1 search per unit</i> - 11 times; 14% of the sampled units.
<i>0 searches per unit</i> - 2 times; 3% of the sampled units.

Even though the sample consisted of only morning or evening shift search information, the Office of Inspector General during its review, also reviewed the entire day of the four sampled days for the units. It found that at both BJNJH and LPJH, there were *zero* days

when the morning and evening shifts each conducted two searches per work shift on the same day. This resulted in *zero* days with four searches per day as required by policy.

Body-Scan Searches

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in February 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 117 body scans at BJNJH and 719 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of 85 searches for February 2025 for LPJH and 53 searches for BJNJH.

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.¹¹

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 only 4 of the 85 (5%) searches conducted. However, the Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 78 of 85 (92%) of the body scans conducted on the youths.

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 53 of the 53 (100%) body scans conducted. In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 53 of 53 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths.

Conclusion

The Office of Inspector General recommends: (1) the Probation Department properly review CCTV video recordings for misconduct involving uses of force and investigating

¹¹ 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.

Mike Dempsey

April 14, 2025

Page 10

and determining whether staff engaged in misconduct, (2) the Probation Department implement protocols and policies on CCTV review, (3) LPJH and BJNJH conduct unit searches as required by policy, (4) Department executive staff at LPJH ensure that its staff are entering body-scan information into the PCMS system, and (5) Department field staff be reassigned 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