



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

June 2, 2025

TO: Mike Dempsey
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates 
Assistant Inspector General

**SUBJECT: Monthly Report for April 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 April 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

April 2025

Referrals	Opened Cases	Results of Completed Investigations
5	Unknown ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none">3 investigations were <i>Substantiated</i> (3 administrative)1 investigation was <i>Unsubstantiated</i> (1 administrative)3 investigations were <i>Inconclusive</i> (3 administrative)5 investigations were <i>Insufficient evidence</i> (5 administrative) <p>(199 total number of current open cases - 169 administrative, 30 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-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 The Probation Department failed to provide the number of cases opened in the month of April, 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.²

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 do not exist.³ 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 April 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.

April 2025 – Los Padrinos

Case Summary 1

A youth was confined to his room and his dinner was brought to him by three Deputy Probation Officers (DPO).⁴ As the DPOs opened the youth's door to give him his dinner, the youth knocked the plate of food out of the hand of DPO 1 and attempted to push past the DPOs. A Senior DPO (Sr. DPO) responded and assisted in preventing the youth from exiting his room and was able to guide the youth back into his room. CCTV video for this incident was available.

² The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

³ 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.

⁴ Safe Crisis Management (SCM)-LPJH-2025-1591.

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

Case Summary 2

A handcuffed youth (Youth 1) was being escorted by a DPO to the medical facility after participating in a fight with a second youth.⁵ As soon as the DPO and Youth 1 exited the living unit, Youth 1 attempted to go in the opposite direction toward the girls' living unit. The DPO attempted to redirect Youth 1 toward the medical unit but Youth 1 resisted and pushed against the DPO. The DPO decided to return Youth 1 to the living unit, but the youth refused to move. Youth 1 dropped to the ground, and two Senior DPOs secured the arms of Youth 1 and carried him to his room. A medical assessment was conducted on Youth 1 in his room. 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">Youths were not medically assessed in a timely manner.⁶Missing PIRs from 2 DPOs and 1 Sr. DPO.Missing Child Safety Assessment/	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.	<p>NO</p>

⁵ SCM-LPJH-2025-1901.

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."

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
Questionnaire by a director. <ul style="list-style-type: none">PIP was incomplete.		

April 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

Case Summary 1

Two youths (Youth 1 and Youth 2) were engaged in a verbal argument in a living unit.⁷ During the argument, a DPO instructed both youths to stop. A third youth (Youth 3) intervened and told the youths to stop arguing. Youth 1 stopped but Youth 2 continued to be verbally aggressive and made inciting statements to Youth 3. The argument between Youth 2 and Youth 3 escalated, causing the DPO to step between the two youths. Youth 3 went around the DPO and both youths exchanged punches. Two Detention Services Officers (DSO) assisted and stepped between the youths, stopping the fight. Additional Probation Department staff arrived, and escorted Youth 2 and Youth 3 to the medical unit for assessment, and later cleared and returned them to their rooms. Both youths were confined to their rooms and assessed by mental health staff. CCTV video for this incident was available.

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

⁷ SCM No. BJNJH-2025-0524.

Case Summary 2

A youth (Youth 1) exited the living unit office and immediately engaged in a fight with a second youth (Youth 2).⁸ A DPO instructed the youths to stop fighting while stepping between the youths, as a DSO assisted by grabbing Youth 1. A Senior DSO exited the unit office and assisted the DPO with Youth 2. During the intervention, the DSO and Youth 1 forcefully went to the floor. The Probation Department staff in the living unit were unable to keep the youths separated, which resulted in the youths reengaging in two additional fights. Youth 2 was ultimately escorted from the living unit by the DPO. Both youths refused to see the medical staff and were confined to their rooms. CCTV video for this incident was available.

Based on the video review, it appears that the Probation Department staff failed to keep the youths separated after the initial fight. The Department staff failed to escort the youths to their respective rooms when it was clear that the youths were continuing to argue and that there was a likelihood the physical fight would resume if the youths were not removed from each other's presence.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none">The DPO and DSO failed to properly intervene and separate the youths.	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none">The SCM reviewer properly identified policy violations.	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

⁸ SCM No. 2025-0552.

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).⁹ 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.¹⁰

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 April 2025. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 608 work shifts at BJNJH and 974 work shifts at LPJH for April 2025.¹¹

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.¹² The Office of Inspector General determined compliance primarily based on information provided in the Probation Department's search logs.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ 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 233 such searches in April 2025, and 3 at LPJH.

¹² The four days reviewed were April 4, 2025, April 6, 2025, April 11, 2025, and April 23, 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 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 they conducted, and therefore the Probation Department 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 April 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per unit as follows:

47 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> – 45 times; 96% 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> - 1 time; 2% 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> – 1 time; 2% 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 96% of the sampled living units and is therefore in compliance with the Amended Order.¹³

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 April 2025, the Probation Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

84 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 64 times; 76% of the sampled living units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 1 time; 1% of the sampled living units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 6 times; 7% 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> – 13 times; 16% 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 only 76% 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 April 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 142 body scans at BJNJH and 1226 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of 12 searches for April 2025 for BJNJH and 179 searches for LPJH.

¹³ The Probation Department reported that at BJNJH, it conducts daily searches of *all* living units, not just two units as required by policy.

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.¹⁴

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 12 of the 12 (100%) body scans conducted.¹⁵ In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 12 of 12 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths.

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 179 (0%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 48 of 179 (27%) of the body scans conducted on the youths.

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 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.

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ In addition to the body scans conducted at BJNJH, there were also three authorized "strip searches." The reviewed documentation indicated that Probation Department staff completed the searches and documentation in accordance with Department policy.

Mike Dempsey, Monitor

June 2, 2025

Page 11

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