



## March 2025 Centralized Screening Monitoring Team Case Blocks Published in May 2025

During March 2025, the OIG's Centralized Screening Monitoring Team monitored and closed 978 grievances. The OIG assessed the 978 grievances as follows:

The OIG disputed 57 screening decisions, and the Centralized Screening Team agreed with the OIG in 49 of those cases. This resulted in the Centralized Screening Team referring an additional 29 allegations to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit and an additional 13 allegations for review as allegations of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index, for a total of 42 additional staff misconduct investigations or reviews.

The OIG found the Centralized Screening Team made an incorrect decision in 45 cases, failed to identify every allegation within a complaint 53 times, failed to identify the need for a clarification interview nine times, and opened 14 new grievances solely to correct a mistake they made in a prior screening decision.

This document presents six notable cases monitored and closed by the OIG during March 2025.

### The OIG's Assessment of 978 Grievances for March 2025

Rating	No. of Grievances
Adequate	875
Improvement Needed	49
Inadequate	54

Note: 5% of the grievances our office monitored received an *improvement needed* rating, and 5.5% received an *inadequate* rating.

Source: Analysis prepared by staff of the Office of the Inspector General.

OIG Case Number  
25-0103488-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

Between July 6, 2024, and July 29, 2024, two sergeants allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person for assisting a second incarcerated person following an unreasonable force incident. The sergeants allegedly targeted the incarcerated person, solicited other incarcerated people to give false testimony against the incarcerated person in exchange for enhanced privileges, and fabricated documents and reports about the incarcerated person. On July 8, 2024, a captain allegedly told the incarcerated person one of the sergeants tried to falsify a rules violation report against the incarcerated person, but the captain did not let him. The captain allegedly told the



incarcerated to “be careful” and “make amends with” that sergeant because he “had an axe to grind.” On July 29, 2024, a lieutenant allegedly told the incarcerated person the same sergeant bragged about getting the incarcerated person removed from the yard by manipulating the confidential source process. Two other incarcerated people allegedly told the incarcerated person the two sergeants solicited them for false testimony against the incarcerated person in exchange for privileges.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed an allegation that incarcerated people told an incarcerated person a sergeant targeted him back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new complaint and referred two allegations of retaliation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department’s performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening failed to summarize the incarcerated person’s complaint completely, noting only other incarcerated persons claimed a sergeant targeted an incarcerated person. The incarcerated person actually reported two sergeants targeted him in retaliation for assisting another incarcerated person following an unreasonable force incident, which resulted in “getting people in trouble,” that a captain and a lieutenant advised the incarcerated person of misconduct by one of the sergeants that targeted the incarcerated person, and the sergeants falsified documents about the incarcerated person after soliciting false statements from other incarcerated people in exchange for more privileges. Despite the prison being a prison required to use face-value screening, the Centralized Screening Team failed to refer the allegations of retaliation, falsifying documents, or harassment to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit. Following the OIG’s elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new complaint and referred two allegations of retaliation to the Office of Internal Affairs’ Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
25-0103793-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On December 5, 2024, an officer allegedly discriminated against an incarcerated person by denying them nonbinary clothing despite their laundry card approving them for nonbinary clothing. The officer allegedly stated, “nothing’s change[d] since the last time you asked. You have to choose either female or male clothing, not both.”



## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the discrimination allegation against the officer back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team opened a new grievance to refer the discrimination allegation to Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

## Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify an allegation that an officer discriminated against an incarcerated person by denying them nonbinary clothing despite their laundry card indicating they were approved. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team amended their decision and opened a new grievance to refer the discrimination allegation to Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

OIG Case Number  
25-0103840-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
*Inadequate*

## Incident Summary

On January 29, 2025, staff allegedly documented an incarcerated person refused to attend her classification committee meeting, when they allegedly never called her to attend. An officer allegedly admitted if committee ran behind and incarcerated people were not immediately ready, staff documented they refused to attend. On January 31, 2025, the incarcerated person alleged an officer admitted to taking her property and copies of her notebook.

## Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the classification committee and property allegations back to the prison as routine policy claims. The OIG did not concur. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation of dishonesty back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

## Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Initially, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that staff falsified documentation claiming an incarcerated person refused to attend her classification committee meeting, when they allegedly never called her to attend as an allegation of staff misconduct. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the allegation that staff falsified documents back to the prison as an allegation of staff misconduct not on the Allegation Decision Index, rather than to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit for dishonesty.



OIG Case Number  
25-0104913-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On August 28, 2024, an officer allegedly falsified a counseling rules violation report against an incarcerated person for unauthorized window coverings. The incarcerated person requested a review of the officer's body-worn camera recording and video recording for the rules violation report to be dismissed. On January 29, 2025, the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number be opened to address the falsified rules violation report allegation.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the counseling rules violation report back to the prison as a routine policy claim. The OIG did not concur and elevated the grievance for reconsideration of allegations of dishonesty. The Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations of dishonesty even after the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number be opened to address the incarcerated person's claims that the reporting officer did not advise incarcerated people to remove the window coverings, the front window was not covered as stated in the report, and that a rules violation report would be issued. Following elevation, the Centralized Screening Team elected to route the allegation of dishonesty back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. The department opened this grievance solely to address deficiencies in a prior grievance submitted by the incarcerated person, which the department failed to process appropriately or completely. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify allegations of dishonesty even after the Office of Appeals ordered a new grievance log number be opened to address the incarcerated person's claims that the reporting officer did not advise incarcerated people to remove the window coverings, the front window were not covered as stated in the report, and that a rules violation report would be issued. Following OIG elevation, the Centralized Screening Team disagreed, citing, "This should be referred to for Routine Review with ASM not on the ADI, it is policy to not have window coverings on any window within the cell nor is it the officers obligation to notify the IP population to remove coverings prior to searching. The dishonesty does not rise to the ADI as it is CDCR policy to not have any window coverings" and elected to route the allegation of dishonesty back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct, despite the fact the dishonesty allegation is staff misconduct on the allegation decision index and warranted a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.



OIG Case Number  
25-0104931-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On February 19, 2025, an incarcerated person alleged officers failed to turn off their body-worn cameras while subjecting incarcerated persons to unclothed-body searches before and after classes.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed an unclothed-body search allegation back to the prison as a routine policy claim. While the OIG concurred with that decision, the Centralized Screening Team failed to identify the allegation that officers recorded the unclothed-body searches with the body-worn cameras. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team referred the staff sexual misconduct allegation to Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team initially failed to identify an allegation that officers failed to turn off their body-worn cameras while conducting unclothed-body searches of incarcerated persons. Following the OIG's elevation, the Centralized Screening Team appropriately referred the alleged staff sexual misconduct to the Office of Internal Affairs' Allegation Investigation Unit. Notably, this incident occurred at a face-value screening prison, but as the Centralized Screening Team did not identify the allegation at all, they did not consider the alleged staff sexual misconduct or the body-worn camera violations based on face-value or on merit.

OIG Case Number  
25-0105357-CSMT

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On February 19, 2025, a physician allegedly retaliated against an incarcerated person by refusing to provide the incarcerated person medical treatment, claiming the incarcerated person had previously made a scene and also discontinued the incarcerated person's bottom bunk approval.

### Disposition

The Centralized Screening Team routed the allegations of unprofessionalism back to the health care staff as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. Prior to the OIG's review, the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team disagreed with the Centralized Screening Team's screening decision and recommended a referral to the Office of Internal Affairs to which the OIG agreed. Following a dispute by the health care



Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team and the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team disagreed and upheld their decision. The OIG did not concur.

### Case Rating

The department's performance was inadequate. Specifically, the Centralized Screening Team determined an allegation that a physician deliberately refused to provide medical care to an incarcerated person out of retaliation as a routine allegation of staff misconduct. The OIG discovered the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team also disagreed with the Centralized Screening Team's decision to route the allegation back to the prison as a routine allegation of staff misconduct and recommended the allegation be referred to the Office of Internal Affairs. Following a dispute by the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team and the OIG, the Centralized Screening Team disagreed and upheld their decision.

Notably, the health care Allegation of Staff Misconduct Screening Team informed the OIG that they would not dispute the Centralized Screening Team's upheld decision stating, "CCHCS will not further dispute and instead, intake the allegations into our examination (fact-finding process). This was not brought forth to my attention as the staff member determined elevation was not required. If any additional details found during our examination process is discovered to be a violation that warrants adverse action, the examination would be suspended and elevated to CST for AIU investigation."