

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY**  
**EMPLOYEE RELATIONS COMMISSION**

---

In the Matter of )

ASSOCIATION FOR LOS ANGELES DEPUTY )  
SHERIFFS, )

Charging Party, )

vs. )

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, )

Respondent. )

---

UFC No. 018-24

**DECISION AND ORDER**

**Background**

This Decision and Order (“D&O”) arises out of an Unfair Practice Charge (“UFC”) challenging the failure or refusal of the County of Los Angeles (“Respondent” or “County”) to produce certain documents known as investigator logs relating to deputy sheriffs represented by the Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs (“Charging Party” or “ALADS”) (collectively “Parties”).

On May 9, 2024, the UFC was filed by the Charging Party; on May 22, 2024, the UFC was amended. On July 22, 2024, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Los Angeles County Employee Relations Commission (“Commission” or “ERCOM”), the UFC came before us and was moved to hearing.

Prior to November 21, 2023, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (“LASD” or “Department”) adhered to a past practice of producing investigator logs to attorneys who are responsible for representing ALADS members: deputy sheriffs who are subject to disciplinary proceedings. An investigator log is a routine form completed by criminal and Internal Affairs Bureau (“IAB”) investigators who conduct investigations into allegations of misconduct. The investigator log documents the activities of the assigned investigator from the initiation of the investigation until it is completed and forwarded to superiors for approval and/or decision as to how to proceed. The investigator logs are part of a process that can and does lead to discipline.

On November 21, 2023, an attorney representing an ALADS member in a disciplinary appeal requested that the Department provide the IAB investigator log for the matter. On November 30, 2023, the Department took the position that it had no legal obligation to produce the IAB investigator log and denied the request. Instead, the Department agreed to provide summaries of the investigator logs. The UFC alleges that the Respondent ran afoul of its duty to share information potentially relevant to negotiable subjects of bargaining by unilaterally changing past practice without providing the Charging Party with notice and an opportunity to bargain, all in violation of Section 5.04.240 (A)(1) and (A)(3) of the Los Angeles County Employee Relations Ordinance (“ERO”).

Ms. Irene Ayala was assigned to serve as Hearing Officer (“HO”). On January 28 and April 22, 2025, HO Ayala conducted in-person hearings. The Parties were each afforded a full and fair opportunity to present relevant arguments and evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses under oath.

### **Decision**

On August 1, 2025, HO Ayala issued her Report and Recommendation (“HO Report”), which concluded that the Respondent had violated Sections 5.04.240 (A) (1) and (3) of the ERO. The HO Report made certain related findings and recommendations.

On September 8, 2025, the Respondent filed exceptions to the HO Report. On September 15, 2025, the Charging Party filed a response thereto.

On September 29, 2025, at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission, we considered the above filings, heard oral argument, and reviewed the full record. By unanimous vote, we agreed that Sections 5.04.240 (A) (1) and (3) of the ERO were violated by the Respondent and adopted the HO Report with one clarification: the investigator logs shall be produced to attorneys for ALADS members only. In particular, we adopted the HO Report’s conclusions as follows:

1. The Respondent unilaterally changed the past practice of providing ALADS members and their attorneys with copies of investigator logs in disciplinary cases.
2. The investigator logs contain relevant information necessary the representation of ALADS members who are subject to disciplinary proceedings and confirmation of the Respondent’s compliance with the statute of limitations requirements of Section 3304(d) of the California Government Code, as well as the tolling provisions of subsections (d)(1) through (8). Noncompliance with these mandatory, statutory requirements prevents the Respondent from imposing discipline on the deputy sheriff accused of misconduct. Statute of limitations and tolling dates are listed in the investigator logs, but are not routinely provided to ALADS attorneys in summaries of those documents.

//

3. The Respondent failed to give the Charging Party notice and an opportunity to bargain over what amounts to a mandatory subject of bargaining – namely, discipline.

//

//

## **Order**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Hearing Officer's Report is adopted with the clarification noted above.
2. The Respondent violated Sections 5.04.240(A)(1) and (A)(3) of the ERO when it unilaterally changed the past practice of providing investigator logs to attorneys representing ALADS members who are subject to disciplinary proceedings, whether through the Civil Service Commission or the grievance process delineated in the applicable Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") between the Parties.
3. The Respondent violated Sections 5.04.240(A)(1) and (A)(3) of the ERO when it unilaterally changed the aforementioned past practice without providing and an opportunity to bargain over what amounts to a mandatory subject of bargaining – namely, discipline.
4. The Respondent will cease and desist from failing to provide investigator logs related to disciplinary matters to attorneys representing ALADS members who are subject to disciplinary proceedings. The Respondent will return to the status quo and provide the investigator logs pursuant to the past practice described above until such time as either bargaining or impasse procedures have concluded.
5. The Respondent will post appropriate notices – including but not necessarily limited to email notice – to members of the employee representation units represented by ALADS regarding this D&O.

***IT IS SO ORDERED.***

Dated at Los Angeles, California, on November 19, 2025.



---

**Christopher David Ruiz Cameron, Chair**



---

**Patti Paniccia, Commissioner**