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

MAX HUNTSMAN
INSPECTOR GENERAL

October 17, 2025

TO: Mike Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates
Assistant Inspector General

SUBJECT: Monthly Report for August 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 August 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

August 2025

Referrals[1]	Opened Cases[2]	Results of Completed Investigations
5	7	▪ 5 investigations were *Sustained (4 administrative, 1 criminal)* ▪ 22 investigations were *Not Sustained* ▪ 0 investigations were *Unfounded* ▪ 0 investigations were *Exonerated* (151 total number of current open cases - *125 administrative, 26 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.

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

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

Substantial compliance requires verification by the Office of Inspector General that the Department is compliant with its CCTV review protocol.[3]

As noted in previous monthly reporting, the Probation Department for this reporting period did not have a protocol or policy for reviewing CCTV; thus, there is no way to measure compliance with Departmental policies that do not exist.[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.

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 August 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.

August 2025 – Los Padrinos

Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in a living unit.[5] A Deputy Probation Officer (DPO) intervened and gave the youths a warning that Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray would be used if the youths did not stop fighting. The youths stopped fighting, and a Detention Services Officer (DSO) assisted in escorting the youths to their rooms. The youths were

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

[4] 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 utilizing CCTV for review of possible misconduct.

[5] LPJH-2025-4177

not medically assessed within 30 minutes; Youth 1 was taken for a medical assessment 44 minutes after the incident was contained, and Youth 2 was medically assessed 1 hour and 49 minutes after incident containment. CCTV for this incident was available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.[6]	UNKNOWN ▪ The SCM was not available for review.	NO

Case Summary 2

Four youths started fighting in a living unit.[7] Two DPOs intervened and instructed the youths to stop fighting and gave the youths a warning that OC spray would be used if the youths did not stop fighting. The youths continued to fight and DPO 1 deployed OC spray causing the youths to stop fighting. Additional DPOs assisted with escorting the youths to their rooms. The youths were not medically assessed within 30 minutes but were later taken for a medical assessment 52 minutes after the incident. CCTV for this incident was not available.[8]

[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."

[7] LPJH 2025-3966.

[8] The video recording of the use of force was obstructed by a youth placing a shirt over the camera in the living unit just prior to the incident.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES ▪ Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.[9] ▪ DPO 1 failed to state in the PIR the amount of OC spray used. ▪ Child Safety Assessments were not conducted in a timely manner.[10] ▪ Probation Department Director failed to review the video recording of the incident. ▪ The Physical Intervention Packet was incomplete.	NO ▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	NO

[9] The Probation Department reported the delay in medical assessment of the youths was due to an emergency medical incident involving another youth.

[10] 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.) The Probation Department identified a violation of this policy, but the initial interviews of the 7 youths did occur within one hour, and the final youth was interviewed 2 hours and 21 minutes after the incident.

August 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in their living unit.[11] A DPO intervened and instructed the youth to stop fighting. The youths continued to fight and the DPO deployed OC spray causing the youths to stop fighting. A second DPO assisted, and the youths were escorted to their rooms. Youth 1 was decontaminated and provided new clothing, However, Youth 2 reportedly refused to decontaminate, receive new clothing, and medical assessment. The CCTV video for this incident was available, but the video recording did not sufficiently capture the incident as it occurred in a blind spot.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
NO	NO	NO

Case Summary 2

Two youths started fighting in the recreation area.[12] A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and instructed the youth to stop fighting. DPO 1 gave an OC spray warning before deploying OC spray on both youths. The youths continued to fight and the DPO deployed OC spray causing the youths to stop fighting. A second DPO (DPO 2) assisted and grabbed Youth1 by the upper torso, separating the two youths. The youths were medically assessed timely. CCTV video for this incident was available.

[11] SCM BJN 2025-1214.

[12] SCM BJN 2025-1237.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
NO	NO	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).[13] 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.[14]

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 August 2025. In

[13] 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.

[14] 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.

response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 915 work shifts at BJNJH and 1101 work shifts at LPJH for August 2025.[15]

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.[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 that BJNJH and LPJH met the requirements for conducting the Required Searches and is in compliance with the Amended Order.

Barry J. Nidorf

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

63 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit - 62 times; 98% of the sampled living units.
3 searches per unit - 1 time; 2% 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.

[15] The daily searches reviewed were conducted in all 12 units at BJNJH and all 21 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 6 such searches in August 2025, and 8 at LPJH.

[16] The four days reviewed were August 4, 2025, August 11, 2025, August 17, 2025, and August 27, 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.)

63 Sampled Living Unit Searches
0 searches per unit - 0 times; 0% of the sampled living units.

The Office of Inspector General's review found that at BJNJH, the Probation Department conducted two (2) searches per shift (four (4) searches per day), as required by its policy in 98% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.

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 four (4) searches per day. Of the sampled searches at LPJH in August 2025, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

84 Sampled Living Unit Searches
4 searches per unit - 76 times[17]; 90% of the sampled living units. *3 searches per unit* - 2 times; 2% of the sampled living units. *2 searches per unit* - 7 times; 8% of the sampled living units.

[17] The Probation Department conducted three room searches in the Medical Observation Unit (MOU) on one of the sampled days, where only three youths were assigned. Only one youth was assigned to the unit during the morning shift, so the Department staff searched the only occupied bedroom, and the remaining two rooms were searched in the afternoon. The Department reported that the morning search of the MOU satisfies the intent of its search policy requirement that at least two youth's rooms be searched per shift, because only one youth was assigned to and occupied a single room. Unless circumstances necessitate, for example, staff failing to lock a vacant room or a recently vacated room is suspected to have recently contained contraband, there is no need or requirement for an unassigned and unoccupied room to be searched based on the policy language, which states staff "shall search youth's rooms." Accordingly, the Office of Inspector General found the Department in compliance with the required number of daily searches for this unit.

84 Sampled Living Unit Searches
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 (2) searches per shift (four (4) searches per day), as required by its policy in 90% 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 August 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 255 body scans at BJNJH and 1061 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for August 2025: 46 for BJNJH and 153 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.[18]

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 41 of the 46 (89%) body scans conducted.[19] In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 46 of 46 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is in compliance with the Amended Order

[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.

[19] In addition to the body scans conducted at BJNJH, there were three authorized strip searches. The reviewed documentation indicated that Probation Department staff completed the searches and documentation in accordance with Department policy in all three searches.

regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths but not in compliance regarding properly entering body-scan information into PCMS.

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 139 of the 153 (91%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 146 of 153 (95%) 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.

Conclusion

The Office of Inspector General continues to recommend: (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 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