



# 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

September 9, 2025

TO: Mike Dempsey  
Monitor for California Department of Justice

FROM: Eric Bates   
Assistant Inspector General

**SUBJECT: Monthly Report for July 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 July 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

July 2025

Referrals <sup>1</sup>	Opened Cases <sup>2</sup>	Results of Completed Investigations
24	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>11 investigations were <i>Sustained</i><sup>3</sup> (9 administrative) (2 criminal)</li><li>10 investigations were <i>Not Sustained</i></li><li>0 investigations were <i>Unfounded</i></li><li>0 investigations were <i>Exonerated</i></li></ul> <p>(164 total number of current open cases - 137 administrative, 27 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.

### 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

---

<sup>1</sup> New cases referred to IAB for consideration for investigation.

<sup>2</sup> Cases opened for investigation by IAB during the month of July.

<sup>3</sup> The Probation Department on June 26, 2025, changed the title of its investigative findings to 1) *Sustained* – the actions were found to have violated the law or department policy based on a preponderance of evidence, 2) *Not Sustained* – there was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove misconduct, 3) *Unfounded* – the investigation clearly established that the allegation is untrue, 4) *Exonerated* – the investigation clearly established that the actions forming the basis of the complaint are not violations of law or departmental policy.

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.<sup>4</sup>

As noted in the last report, the Probation Department does not have a protocol or policy for reviewing CCTV and thus there is no way to measure compliance with Departmental policies that do not exist.<sup>5</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 July 2025. 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.

## July 2025 – Los Padrinos

### Case Summary 1

Two youths started fighting in a living unit restroom.<sup>6</sup> Two Deputy Probation Officers (DPOs) reportedly intervened and gave the youths a warning that Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) spray would be used if the youths did not stop fighting. DPO 1 attempted to step between the youths to separate them but was unable because the youths were moving. DPO 2 again gave the youths an OC spray warning, but the youths continued to fight, causing DPO 2 to deploy a burst of OC spray toward youth 1. The fight continued, and

---

<sup>4</sup> The Amended Order does not provide a numerical value for determining compliance.

<sup>5</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>6</sup> LPJH-2025-3432

DPO 2 deployed a burst of OC spray to youth 2 and DPO 1 was then able to separate the youth. The youths were escorted to their respective rooms and were not medically assessed for 42 minutes after containment of the incident, which is beyond the 30-minute time period allowed by Probation Department policy for a medical assessment.<sup>7</sup> Although CCTV for this incident was available, the view of the incident was limited because it occurred in a restroom that does not have full camera coverage.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Youth was not medically assessed in a timely manner.<sup>8</sup></li><li>PIR section regarding use of OC spray was incomplete</li></ul>	NO  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	NO

## Case Summary 2

Two youths attempted to fight each other in a classroom, but a DPO intervened and stepped between the two youths.<sup>9</sup> As the DPO attempted to escort Youth 1 out of classroom, Youth 2 ran toward Youth 1, knocking the DPO to floor. The DPO stood up and continued to stand between the two youths and a supervising DPO assisted and subdued Youth 2 by wrapping his arms around the chest of Youth 2. The youths were

---

<sup>7</sup> The Probation Department reported that the delay in providing medical care was due to Department staff responding to multiple incidents occurring at the facility.

<sup>8</sup> 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.”

<sup>9</sup> LPJH 2025-3339.

not medically assessed within 30 minutes; Youth 1 was taken for a medical assessment 54 minutes after incident was contained and Youth 2 was medically assessed 1 hour and 27 minutes after incident containment. CCTV for this incident was not available.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
YES <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Youth was not medically assessed in a timely manner.<sup>10</sup></li></ul>	NO <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	N/A

## July 2025 – Barry J. Nidorf

### Case Summary 1

A senior DPO (Sr. DPO) reportedly instructed a youth to go to his room, but the youth refused and hit the Sr. DPO with a closed fist.<sup>11</sup> A senior Detention Services Officer (Sr. DSO) assisted and gave an OC spray warning and then deployed OC spray on the youth. A DPO (DPO 1) arrived and assisted securing the youth and the youth was taken to his room. Later, the DPOs approached the youth's room to remove him for decontamination and reassignment to another room, but the youth reportedly continued to be aggressive and verbally assaultive towards the DPOs. The youth reportedly refused to come out of the room to decontaminate and instead used the running water in the room to decontaminate. Clean clothes and linen were placed inside the room. Approximately 15 minutes later, three DSOs and DPO 1 and a second DPO (DPO 2) entered the room to escort the youth to the new room assignment. After entry into the room, the youth reportedly hit Sr. DSO and DPO 1 with a closed fist. DPO 2 deployed OC spray and Sr. DSO and DSO 1 secured the youth and escorted the youth to the new

---

<sup>10</sup> The Probation Department reported the delay in medical assessment of the youths was due to movement of other youths at the facility.

<sup>11</sup> SCM BJN 2025-1059.

room assignment. The youth refused medical assessment. The 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"><li>Contaminated clothes were not taken out of the youth's room.</li><li>DSO was unaware that youth was taking psychotropic medication.<sup>12</sup></li></ul>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations.</li></ul>	<p>NO</p>

## Case Summary 2

Two youths started fighting in their living unit.<sup>13</sup> A DPO (DPO 1) intervened and instructed the youth to stop fighting. A second DPO (DPO 2) assisted and gave an OC spray warning before deploying OC spray on both youths. The DPOs were able to secure both youths and they were taken to their respective rooms. The youths were decontaminated and medically assessed. However, the decontamination was 31 minutes after containment of the incident, which is greater than the 10 minutes post-containment permitted by the Department's policy. No justification for the delay was included in the PIR. CCTV video for this incident was available.

---

<sup>12</sup> DSB 1005 (B): Officers are expected to be aware of those youth with disabilities, medical, mental health, or other issues, and any youth that is medically contra-indicated from being exposed to OC spray. DSB 1005 (D): Officers shall make every effort to avoid physical interventions with youth whose known medical or mental health conditions involve the following: Psychotropic drugs or stimulant medications.

<sup>13</sup> SCM BJN 2025-1086.

Violation of Policy or Law	Failure to Identify and Elevate	Evidence of Video Tampering
<p>YES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ DPO was unaware of restriction of use of OC spray on youths.<sup>14</sup></li><li>▪ Youth was not decontaminated in a timely manner.<sup>15</sup></li></ul>	<p>NO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The SCM reviewer properly identified the policy violations</li></ul>	<p>NO</p>

## 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>16</sup> Based on this policy there should be four total searches per living unit per

---

<sup>14</sup> Restrictions of use of OC spray apply to some youths because of youths having Asthma or other medical conditions. These restrictions are expected to be known by Probation Department staff.

<sup>15</sup> DSB Section 1006 (E) provides: Youth shall be decontaminated immediately but no later than ten (10) minutes after containment of the incident. If decontamination within ten (10) minutes is not feasible; justification must be provided in the PIR.

<sup>16</sup> 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

day. In addition, the Department conducts body scans of youths in its interdiction efforts.<sup>17</sup>

## 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 July 2025. In response, the Probation Department provided search logs for 854 work shifts at BJNJH and 1062 work shifts at LPJH for July 2025.<sup>18</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>19</sup> 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, however, found that BJNJH met the requirements for conducting the Required Searches and is in compliance with the Amended Order. The

---

complete a Special Incident Report (SIR) and follow the procedures per the Crime Scene Evidence Preservation/Evidence Handling policy.

<sup>17</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.

<sup>18</sup> 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 4 such searches in July 2025, and 8 at LPJH.

<sup>19</sup> The four days reviewed were July 7, 2025, July 10, 2025, July 25, 2025, and July 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>.)

Office of Inspector General found that staff at LPJH failed to conduct the required number of searches necessary to comply with policy and the Amended Order.

### Barry J. Nidorf

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

58 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 55 times; 95% 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> - 2 times; 3% 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 95% 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 July 2025, the Department conducted searches per living unit as follows:

84 Sampled Living Unit Searches
<i>4 searches per unit</i> - 71 times; 84% of the sampled living units.
<i>3 searches per unit</i> - 4 times; 5% of the sampled living units.
<i>2 searches per unit</i> - 3 times; 4% 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> - 6 times; 7% of the sampled living units. <sup>20</sup>

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 85% of the sampled living units, which is lower than the 90% compliance rate required by the Amended Order. As to LPJH the Department failed to comply with this metric.

### *Body-Scan Searches*

The Office of Inspector General requested documentation relating to all body-scan searches conducted in July 2025. Based on documentation provided, the Probation Department conducted 213 body scans at BJNJH and 1058 at LPJH. The Office of Inspector General selected and reviewed a representative sample of searches for July 2025: 18 for BJNJH and 121 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

---

<sup>20</sup> LPJH failed to provide search documentation for units R1/R2 and S1/S2 for July 7, 2025, unit A for July 10, 2025, and unit O for July 25, 2025. These searches were therefore, calculated as zero searches conducted, and accuracy could not be determined.

required to be conducted by a Department staff of the same sex/gender as the youth being searched.<sup>21</sup>

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 16 of the 18 (89%) body scans conducted.<sup>22</sup> In addition, the Department conducted appropriate same sex/gender body scans in 18 of 18 (100%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. BJNJH is in compliance with the Amended Order 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 100 of the 121 (83%) sampled searches conducted. The Department conducted required same sex/gender body scans in 104 of 121 (86%) of the body scans conducted on the youths. LPJH is not in compliance with the Amended Order regarding conducting same sex/gender body scans of youths nor regarding 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

---

<sup>21</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.

<sup>22</sup> In addition to the body scans conducted at BJNJH, there was one authorized strip search. The reviewed documentation indicated that Probation Department staff completed the searches and documentation in accordance with Department policy.

Mike Dempsey, Monitor  
September 9, 2025  
Page 12

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