



# 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 30, 2025

TO: Mike Dempsey  
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates   
Assistant Inspector General

**SUBJECT: Monthly Report for March 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 March 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

March 2025

Referrals	Opened Cases	Results of Completed Investigations
16	Unknown <sup>1</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ 5 investigations were <i>Substantiated</i> (3 administrative and 2 criminal)</li><li>▪ 0 investigations were <i>Unsubstantiated</i></li><li>▪ 3 investigations were <i>Inconclusive</i> (3 administrative)</li><li>▪ 2 investigations were <i>Insufficient evidence</i> (2 administrative)</li></ul> <p>(217 total number of current open cases - 188 administrative, 29 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. 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 Probation 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Probation Department failed to provide the number of cases opened in the month of March, despite repeated requests by the Office of Inspector General.

Substantial compliance requires verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.<sup>2</sup>

As noted in the last report, the Probation Department 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.<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 March 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.

## March 2025 – Los Padrinos

### Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in the living unit.<sup>4</sup> A Detention Services Officer (DSO) intervened and gave a warning of the use of Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray (OC Warning), but the youths continued to fight and the DSO deployed OC towards Youth 1. A Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) came to assist and pulled Youth 1 away, but Youth 1 continued to resist. The DSO sprayed Youth 1 a second time and the youths stopped fighting. The youths were decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> SCM# LPJH-2025-1016.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Missing report from two DSOs and Assistant Director.</li><li>Missing Enhanced Supervision Sheet for both youths.</li><li>Incomplete Physical Intervention Packet (PIP).</li></ul>	YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Supervising staff failed to identify missing Physical Intervention Report (PIR) from DSOs report from Assistant Director, and Enhanced Supervision Sheets.</li></ul>	NO

### Case Summary 2

Two youths began fighting in a dayroom. A DPO instructed the youths to stop fighting while stepping between the youths and giving an OC warning. Youth 1 ran away from the DPO and both youths ultimately sat down in separate areas of the dayroom without any use of force. 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"><li>Missing PIRs from other DPOs present at the incident.</li></ul>	YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Supervising staff failed to identify missing PIRs.</li></ul>	NO

## March 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

### Case Summary 1

A youth reportedly began to verbally assault and threaten a Detention Services Officer (DSO) who attempted to gently push the youth to get him away from the DSO and the office door area.<sup>5</sup> The youth pulled away from the DSO and refused to move. The DSO grabbed the arm of the youth and a Group Supervisor, Nights Officer (GSO) and a DPO, attempted to carry the youth by his arms to his room. The youth pulled away from the GSN and DPO. The DSO walked to the other side of the living unit to unlock a door, leaving the youth with the DPO and GSN who attempted to get the youth to comply with their commands to get down on one knee. The DSO came back to the youth who was standing and talking to the GSN and DPO. The DSO then walked up to the youth and sprayed the youth in the face. The youth remained standing, and the DSO sprayed the youth an additional four times as the youth merely stood in front of the DSO. A Senior DSO and additional staff arrived, and the youth was escorted out of the living unit. The youth was decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

In the opinion of the Office of Inspector General, the DPO unnecessarily deployed OC spray on the youth. The youth was not an imminent threat to the DPO, the other youths or the institution and the use was not objectively reasonable as required by Probation Department policy.<sup>6</sup> The youth was merely standing in the living unit when the DSO walked up to him and sprayed him five times in his face. The youth's passive resistance to the Department staff's commands was not a sufficient reason to deploy OC spray.<sup>7</sup> In addition, the Office of Inspector General's review indicated that the PIRs were not consistent with the video recordings. The video recordings clearly show OC deployment five times on the youth but the PIRs indicate the youth was sprayed only three times.

---

<sup>5</sup> SCM Case No. BJNJH-2025-0459.

<sup>6</sup> DSB Manual Section 1006(C) provides: Chemical interventions should only be considered when objectively reasonable and when there is an **imminent threat** to the youth's safety or the safety of others, and only when de-escalation efforts have been unsuccessful. (emphasis added).

<sup>7</sup> DSB Manual Section 1005(F) provides: In cases where there is not an immediate physical threat, such as **prolonged passive resistance** or involuntary removals, there shall be a tactical plan developed to circumvent the use of force whenever possible. (emphasis added). In addition, DSB Manual Section 1003 provides: Obstinacy is not a form of resistance that generally requires the use of force if it does not present a threat to self or others.

This inconsistency and the unnecessary use of OC spray were not identified by the supervising staff responsible for reviewing use-of-force incidents.

<b>Violation of Policy or Law</b>	<b>Failure to Identify and Elevate</b>	<b>Evidence of Video Tampering</b>
<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Unnecessary use of OC spray.</li><li>▪ Section L of the Safe Crisis Management Incident Review (SCM) packet was not completed. The documentation failed to document the youth's name and pre-existing conditions related to use of OC spray and failed to notate weight of the OC spray canister.</li><li>▪ Section Q of SCM packet had information that conflicted with the video evidence regarding the appropriate use of force.</li></ul>	<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Supervising staff failed to identify the unnecessary use of OC spray, and inaccurate PIRs regarding the number of OC deployments.</li><li>▪ Supervising staff failed to identify missing information from the SCM packet.</li></ul>	<p>NO</p>

## Case Summary 2

A youth reportedly made multiple threats to DPO 1 throughout the day in the living unit.  
<sup>8</sup> DPO 1 was monitoring youths' showers and Youth 1 again approached DPO 1 in a threatening manner with clinched fists. DPO 1 gave Youth 1 an OC Warning and then

---

<sup>8</sup> SCM Case No. BJNJH-2025-0469.

deployed OC spray to the face of Youth 1, causing Youth 1 to step back from DPO 1. A second DPO (DPO 2) attempted to intervene, but DPO 1 deployed a second burst of OC spray. Youth 1 moved to the far end of the living unit where a third DPO attempted to restrain Youth 1. DPO 1 again instructed Youth 1 to get down to the floor and deployed a third burst of OC spray when Youth 1 failed to comply with DPO 1's directive. The youth ultimately complied with the command. The youth was decontaminated and sent for medical assessment. CCTV video for this incident was available.

The Office of Inspector General's review indicated that the PIRs were not consistent with the video recordings. The PIR of DPO 1 failed to document the 3 deployments of OC spray on Youth 1. Also, in the opinion of the Office of Inspector General, there was no basis for the second and third deployment of OC spray as the youth was not an imminent threat to DPO1 at the time the youth was sprayed the second and third time.<sup>9</sup>

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Excessive use of OC spray on youth without justification.</li><li>Section L of the SCM packet was not completed. The documentation failed to notate the youth's name, and any pre-existing conditions</li></ul>	<p>NO<sup>10</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The initial SCM packet reviewer failed to properly complete Section L of the packet.</li></ul>	<p>NO</p>

---

<sup>9</sup> DSB Manual Section 1000(c) provides, "Chemical interventions should only be considered when objectively reasonable **and when there is an imminent threat** to the youth's safety or safety of others . . ." (Emphasis added.)

<sup>10</sup> The initial reviewer of the SCM packet, correctly identified the DPO's failure to refrain from use of OC spray as other staff attempted to intervene, as well as the DPO's continued use of OC spray as the youth was walking away from the DPO. However, the reviewer failed to properly complete section L of the packet. This omission has yet to be reviewed and identified by the Director, the next reviewing staff member.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
related to use of OC spray and failed to notate the weight of the OC spray canister.		

## 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).<sup>11</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>12</sup>

## Methodology

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all searches conducted for all living units in both work shifts in March 2025. In response, the

---

<sup>11</sup> 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>12</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.



Probation Department provided search logs for 497 work shifts at BJNJH and 999 work shifts at LPJH for March 2025.<sup>13</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>14</sup> 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 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. Therefore, LPJH is not in compliance with the Amended Order for Required Searches. The Office of Inspector General, however, did find that BJNJH did meet the requirements for conducting the Required Searches, and *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 March 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

---

<sup>13</sup> 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 76 such searches in March 2025. The Probation Department did not provide documentation of such searches at LPJH for March 2025.

<sup>14</sup> The four days reviewed were March 2, 2025, March 4, 2025, March 12, 2025, and March 24, 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>.)

#### **45 Sampled Living Unit Searches<sup>15</sup>**

*4 searches per unit*– 42 times; 93% of the sampled living units.

*3 searches per unit* - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

*2 searches per unit* - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

*1 search per unit* - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

*0 searches per unit* – 3 times; 7% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at BJNJH, the Probation Department conducted 2 searches per shift (4 searches per day), as required by its policy, in 93% of the sampled living units, and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.<sup>16</sup>

### **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 4 searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in March 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

#### **84 Sampled Living Unit Searches**

*4 searches per unit* - 74 times; 88% of the sampled living units.

*3 searches per unit* - 3 times; 4% of the sampled living units.

---

<sup>15</sup> Effective March 19, 2025, BJNJH added 1 new living unit which was included in the review date of March 24, 2025.

<sup>16</sup> Search logs for BJNJH indicates that it conducts daily searches of *all* living units, not only 2 units as required by policy.

### **84 Sampled Living Unit Searches**

*2 searches per unit* - 5 times; 6% of the sampled living units.

*1 search per unit* - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.

*0 searches per unit* - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at LPJH, the Probation Department conducted 2 searches per shift (4 searches per day), as required by its policy, in only 88% of the sampled living units, and is therefore not in compliance with the Amended Order.

### ***Body-Scan Searches***

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in March 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 247 body scans at BJNJH and 1196 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of 124 searches for March 2025 for LPJH and 17 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.<sup>17</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 *zero* of the 1196 (0%) searches conducted. The Department conducted

---

<sup>17</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.

required same sex/gender body scans in 61 of 124 (49%) 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 17 of the 17 (100%) body scans conducted.<sup>18</sup> In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 17 of 17 (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 and determining whether staff engaged in misconduct, (2) the Probation Department implement protocols and policies on CCTV review, (3) LPJH and BJNJH conduct living 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, (5) 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) the body-scan form be revised to include name of operator, and (7) 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

---

<sup>18</sup> In addition to the body scans conducted at BJNJH, there were also 3 authorized "strip searches." The reviewed documentation indicated that Probation Department staff completed the searches and documentation in accordance with Department policy.