



From October 1, 2025, through November 30, 2025, the OIG's Force Investigation Review Team completed its review of 20 California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR or the department) closed use-of-force investigation cases. The OIG evaluated the department's overall performance in the 20 closed use-of-force investigations, as illustrated in the table at right.

**The OIG's Overall Assessment of 20 Investigations for October Through November 2025**

| Rating             | Number of Investigations |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Adequate           | 2                        |
| Improvement Needed | 4                        |
| Inadequate         | 14                       |
| <i>Totals</i>      | 20                       |

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

For each monitored investigation, the OIG evaluated the performance of the Office of Internal Affairs' investigators to determine whether they conducted thorough and timely investigations. The OIG also evaluated whether hiring authorities made reasonable decisions about those completed investigations. The OIG assessed the Office of Internal Affairs and hiring authorities within the department as follows:

**The OIG's Assessment of CDCR's Performance of 20 Investigations for October Through November 2025**

| Rating             | Performance                |                  |
|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
|                    | Office of Internal Affairs | Hiring Authority |
| Adequate           | 5                          | 3                |
| Improvement Needed | 5                          | 5                |
| Inadequate         | 10                         | 12               |
| <i>Totals</i>      | 20                         | 20               |

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

Below we present summaries of the 20 closed use-of-force investigations the OIG reviewed during this reporting period.



OIG Case Number  
0030

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On January 15, 2023, two officers allegedly tripped, kicked, punched, and threw an incarcerated person to the floor. One of the officers allegedly threatened the incarcerated person by stating, "I'm going to find you."

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator incorrectly documented the incident date as January 15, 2024, when the incident occurred on January 15, 2023. The investigator also did not identify that the deadline for taking disciplinary action had expired prior to the Office of Internal Affairs assigning the case to the investigator on June 5, 2024. In addition, the investigator referenced another unrelated investigation in his report. The hiring authority delayed referring the allegations of staff misconduct it received on January 31, 2023, to the Centralized Screening Team until May 30, 2024, 15 months and 30 days thereafter and three months and 30 days after the deadline for taking disciplinary action, if warranted, had expired. On December 30, 2024, the Office of Internal Affairs provided its report to the hiring authority. Although the hiring authority delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 30, 2025, 31 days after receiving the investigative report, the OIG determined the deadline for taking disciplinary action had expired on January 31, 2024, 11 months and 30 days before the hiring authority made a finding.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The OIG found deficiencies in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator incorrectly documented the incident date as January 15, 2024, when the incident occurred on January 15, 2023, and did not identify that the deadline for taking disciplinary action had expired prior to the Office of Internal Affairs assigning the case to the investigator on June 5, 2024. The investigator also referenced another unrelated investigation in his report.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority delayed referring the allegations of staff misconduct it received on January 31, 2023, to the Centralized Screening Team until May 30, 2024, 15 months and 30 days thereafter and three months and 30 days after the deadline for taking disciplinary action, if warranted, had expired. On December 30, 2024, the Office of Internal Affairs provided its report to the hiring authority. Although the hiring authority delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 30, 2025, 31 days after receiving the



investigation report, the deadline for taking disciplinary action had expired on January 31, 2024, 11 months and 30 days before the hiring authority made a finding.

**OIG Case Number**  
0031

**Rating Assessment**  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

On April 14, 2024, an officer allegedly struck an incarcerated person in the face without justification and falsified a report regarding the incident.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations against the officer. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Overall Assessment

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not interview the officer who was a subject of the investigation or any of the officers who saw the officer use force against the incarcerated person. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on October 25, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until February 7, 2025, three months and 13 days thereafter. Because the investigation was insufficient, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs' performance was inadequate. The investigator documented in the investigative report that no further investigation was possible because the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint refused to participate in the interview. Despite knowing the names of the officer who allegedly struck the incarcerated person in the face and the officers who witnessed the incident, the Office of Internal Affairs investigator did not interview any of these individuals.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not interview the officer who was a subject of the investigation or any of the officers who observed the officer use force against the incarcerated person. The hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on October 25, 2024,



but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until February 7, 2025, three months and 13 days thereafter.

**OIG Case Number**  
0032

**Rating Assessment**  
*Inadequate*

#### Incident Summary

On April 4, 2024, an officer allegedly threw a chemical agent emitting grenade into an incarcerated person's cell.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

#### Overall Assessment

Overall, the department's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on May 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until July 15, 2025, 13 months and 15 days thereafter, which was also five months and 11 days beyond the deadline to impose disciplinary action against the officers.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was adequate.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on May 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until July 15, 2025, 13 months and 15 days thereafter, which was also five months and 11 days beyond the deadline to impose disciplinary action against the officers, if warranted.

**OIG Case Number**  
0033

**Rating Assessment**  
*Inadequate*

#### Incident Summary

On April 15, 2024, a control booth officer allegedly intentionally closed a housing unit door on an incarcerated person multiple times as the incarcerated person returned to his housing unit. The control booth officer allegedly used offensive language toward the incarcerated person and threatened to search his cell.



## Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

## Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask the officer who was a subject about the discrepancy in the video-recording when a gap in the recording suddenly showed the incarcerated person at the yard door talking to the officer but did not capture any of the conversation prior to that point. The investigator also failed to document in his report the discrepancy in the video-recording. The investigator did not ask sufficient questions of the officer who witnessed the argument between the control booth officer and the incarcerated person to obtain necessary information for the investigation. The investigator did not document any attempt to identify or interview any of the incarcerated people who witnessed the incident. The investigator also failed to include in the investigation report the allegation that the control booth officer used offensive language toward the incarcerated person. The hiring authority improperly deemed the Office of Internal Affairs investigation sufficient although the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation. The hiring authority failed to identify the investigator did not include the allegation that the control booth officer used offensive language toward the incarcerated person in the investigation report. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on September 30, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 14, 2025, three months and 15 days thereafter.

## Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask the officer who was a subject about the discrepancy in the video-recording when a gap in recording suddenly showed the incarcerated person at the yard door talking to the officer but did not capture any of the conversation prior to that point. The investigator also failed to document in his report the discrepancy in the video-recording. The investigator did not ask sufficient questions of the officer who witnessed the argument between the control booth officer and the incarcerated person to obtain necessary information for the investigation. The investigator did not document any attempt to identify or interview any of the incarcerated people who witnessed the incident. The investigator also failed to include in the investigation report the allegation that the control booth officer used offensive language toward the incarcerated person.

## Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority improperly deemed the Office of Internal Affairs investigation sufficient although the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation. The hiring authority failed to identify



the investigator did not include the allegation that the control booth officer used offensive language toward the incarcerated person in the investigation report. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on September 30, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 14, 2025, three months and 15 days thereafter.

OIG Case Number  
0034

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On July 3, 2024, an officer allegedly punched an incarcerated person in the back of his neck. The officer and two additional officers allegedly slammed the incarcerated person into a wall and then to the ground head-first, causing the incarcerated person to lose consciousness.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's findings because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not identify a separate allegation that three officers ignored the incarcerated person when he told the officers that he was not compatible to be housed with another incarcerated person and did not obtain all pertinent video evidence related to this allegation. The investigator did not interview the officers who were subjects and an officer and incarcerated person who witnessed the incident. The investigator interviewed the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint but did not question him about his allegations that officers ignored his safety concerns of sharing a cell with another incarcerated person, or about an officer who punched him on the back of his neck, and that he lost consciousness because of the officers' use of force. The investigator reviewed video-recorded evidence but did not identify that one officer punched the incarcerated person in the back of his neck and did not include as an exhibit to the report the departmental standards for staff performance related to use-of-force strike zones. The hiring authority deemed the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation. The hiring authority did not identify and include the allegation that three officers ignored the incarcerated person's concerns that he was not compatible to be housed with another incarcerated person. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 17, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 23, 2025, one month and seven days thereafter.



## Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not identify a separate allegation that three officers ignored the incarcerated person who told them he was not compatible to be housed with another incarcerated person and did not obtain all pertinent video evidence related to this allegation. The investigator also did not interview the officers who were subjects and an officer and incarcerated person who were witnesses of the incident and did not ask all relevant questions in his interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint. The investigator reviewed video recorded evidence and did not identify that one officer punched the incarcerated person in the back of his neck and did not include as an exhibit to the report the departmental standards for staff performance related to use-of-force strike zones. In addition, the investigator did not adequately document in the investigative report his interview with the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint.

## Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority deemed the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation. The hiring authority did not identify and include the allegation that three officers ignored the incarcerated person who told them he was not compatible to be housed with another incarcerated person, despite the investigator providing the information in the investigative report. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 17, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 23, 2025, one month and seven days thereafter.

**OIG Case Number**  
0035

Rating Assessment  
**Improvement Needed**

### Incident Summary

On September 14, 2023, an officer allegedly discriminated against an incarcerated person based on his race by shoving him into a wall, while the incarcerated person was out of the prison at a courthouse.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

### Overall Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the department's performance. The investigator did not clarify if the attorney representing the incarcerated person, who was present when the officer allegedly shoved the incarcerated person observed the force and submitted a report or statement. The investigator also did not clarify if outside law enforcement or other people in the courtroom observed the incident, submitted reports or statements,



and if video cameras at the courthouse captured the incident. The hiring authority received the investigation from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 22, 2023, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until March 27, 2024, three months and six days thereafter.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The OIG identified a deficiency in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator did not clarify if the attorney representing the incarcerated person who was present when the officer allegedly shoved the incarcerated person observed the force and submitted a report or statement. The investigator also did not clarify if outside law enforcement or other people in the courtroom observed force, submitted reports or statements, and if video cameras at the courthouse captured the incident.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The OIG identified a deficiency in the hiring authority's performance. The hiring authority received the investigation from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 22, 2023, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until March 27, 2024, three months and 6 days thereafter.

OIG Case Number  
0036

Rating Assessment  
Adequate

#### Incident Summary

On November 17, 2023, an officer allegedly threw a food tray at an incarcerated person through a food port and kicked the food port. The officer allegedly told other officers he regretted he could not deploy pepper spray on the incarcerated person and called the incarcerated person a derogatory name.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation that an officer threw a food tray at an incarcerated person through a food port and kicked the food port. The hiring authority sustained the allegation that the officer called the incarcerated person a derogatory name and issued training to the officer.

#### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was adequate.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs Investigator's performance was adequate.



## Hiring Authority Assessment

The OIG identified a deficiency in the hiring authority's performance. The hiring authority received the completed investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on January 30, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until April 2, 2024, two months and three days thereafter.

**OIG Case Number**  
0037

**Rating Assessment**  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

On October 11, 2023, a sergeant and five officers allegedly grabbed a handcuffed incarcerated person by the neck and arm, slammed his head and body to the floor, and jumped on him and put their knees on his neck and back while he was on the floor. One of the officers allegedly directed profane language toward the incarcerated person.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to document his efforts to locate the incarcerated person who paroled after filing the complaint, to conduct a clarifying interview to reconcile inconsistencies between his verbal and written allegations. The investigator failed to include in his investigative report an officer's observation that the incarcerated person tripped over the bottom lip of the holding cell and did not summarize the report of the sergeant who was a subject of the complaint and had since retired from the department. The investigator and the hiring authority failed to add to the investigative report the allegation that an officer allegedly used profane language toward the incarcerated person, thus the hiring authority did not make a finding on that allegation.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs Investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to add to the investigative report the allegation that an officer allegedly directed profane language toward the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint. The investigator failed to document his efforts to locate the incarcerated person who paroled after filing the complaint, to conduct a clarifying interview to reconcile inconsistencies between his verbal and written allegations. The investigator failed to include in his investigative report an officer's observation that the incarcerated person tripped over the



bottom lip of the holding cell and a synopsis of the report of the sergeant who was a subject of the complaint and retired from the department.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation. The hiring authority also failed to add to the investigative report the allegation that an officer allegedly directed profane language toward the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint and thus did not make a finding for this allegation.

OIG Case Number  
0038

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

On November 9, 2023, two officers allegedly slammed an incarcerated person onto a table, and one of the two officers allegedly made racially derogatory comments toward the incarcerated person.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations against the officers. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's findings because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to advise the incarcerated people who were witnesses of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending. The investigator also failed to include in the investigative report the allegation the incarcerated person raised during his interview that the officers who were subjects falsified their reports about the incident. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on July 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until September 26, 2024, one month and 26 days thereafter.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to advise the incarcerated people who were witnesses of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending. The investigator also failed to include in the investigative report the allegation the incarcerated person



raised during his interview that the officers who were subjects falsified their reports about the incident.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The OIG identified a deficiency in the hiring authority's performance. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on July 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until September 26, 2024, one month and 26 days thereafter.

OIG Case Number  
0039

Rating Assessment  
**Improvement Needed**

### Incident Summary

On February 14, 2024, an officer allegedly deployed pepper spray on two incarcerated people who were fighting and struck one of the incarcerated people in the facial area even though he had stopped fighting and had covered his head and face.

### Disposition

The hiring authority sustained the allegation and issued the officer a letter of instruction.

### Overall Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the department's performance. The investigator did not ask all necessary questions during his interview with the incarcerated person who was involved in the use-of-force incident. The investigator failed to ask the incarcerated person pertinent questions about the officer's actions to ascertain the incarcerated person's version of events. The investigator did not inform the incarcerated person of the reason for the interview. The investigator interrupted the incarcerated person several times throughout the interview limiting the incarcerated person's responses about the officer's application of force even though the investigator had not informed the incarcerated person of the reason for the interview. In addition, the investigator had trouble formulating clear and deliberate questions during the interview and initially confused the incarcerated person by identifying the incorrect incident date. The investigator also failed to advise the incarcerated person of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator failed to ask the incarcerated person pertinent questions about the officer's actions to ascertain the incarcerated person's version of events. The investigator did not inform the incarcerated person of the reason for the interview. The investigator interrupted the incarcerated person several times throughout the interview limiting the incarcerated person's responses about the officer's application



of force even though the investigator had not informed the incarcerated person of the reason for the interview. Additionally, the investigator had trouble formulating clear and deliberate questions during the interview and initially confused the incarcerated person by identifying the incorrect incident date. The investigator also failed to advise the incarcerated person of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was adequate.

OIG Case Number  
0040

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On February 5, 2024, two officers allegedly twisted an incarcerated person's arms behind his back and threw him forward out of his wheelchair onto the ground after he requested to exit the housing unit during an active alarm. After forcing the incarcerated person to the ground, the two officers and a third officer allegedly applied pressure to the incarcerated person's head and torso area, causing the incarcerated person to experience difficulty breathing. The third officer also allegedly struck the incarcerated person in the head and torso with a closed fist. After officers handcuffed the incarcerated person, the third officer allegedly threw the incarcerated person's pen and made a discriminatory statement related to his physical disability. Two additional officers and a counselor allegedly observed the incident and failed to report it.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations against the three officers. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's findings because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation. During the investigation, the hiring authority identified two additional officers and one counselor who allegedly failed to report the force they observed and directed the investigator to conduct further investigation specific to the additional allegations. The hiring authority sustained the allegation against one officer who failed to report the force he observed and issued a salary reduction of 5 percent for two months. The hiring authority did not sustain the allegations against the other officer and the counselor who failed to report the force they observed.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not identify and interview all relevant witnesses to the use of force and did not ask all necessary questions during interviews. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring



authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until February 7, 2025, one month and seven days thereafter.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator failed to identify and interview all relevant witnesses to the use of force and failed to ask all necessary questions during interviews. The investigator also failed to document in the investigation report a detailed summary of the incident from video-recorded evidence.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority should have deemed the investigation to be insufficient because the investigator did not identify and interview all relevant witnesses and did not ask all necessary questions during interviews. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on December 31, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until February 7, 2025, one month and seven days thereafter.

OIG Case Number  
0041

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

#### Incident Summary

On December 5, 2023, an officer fired several less-lethal rounds to stop two incarcerated people from fighting and allegedly failed to assess her target between each round. A second officer allegedly threw a chemical agent emitting grenade at the two incarcerated people after they stopped fighting. Both officers allegedly lied in their written reports regarding the incident.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's findings because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

#### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask an officer who was a subject whether she assessed the safety of the backstop prior to firing several less-lethal rounds at the incarcerated people who were fighting. The



investigator interviewed the second officer who was a subject and did not show the officer video recordings to address the allegation or obtain clarification about the officer's actions during the incident. The investigator did not obtain and review all available written reports relevant to the use of force and did not prepare a thorough and accurate investigation report. The hiring authority deemed the investigation sufficient and determined the findings for each allegation even though the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask an officer who was a subject whether she assessed the safety of the backstop prior to firing several less-lethal rounds at the incarcerated people who were fighting. The investigator interviewed the second officer who was a subject and did not show the officer video recordings to address the allegation or obtain clarification about the officer's actions during the incident. The investigator did not obtain and review the complete incident report relevant to the use of force and did not prepare a thorough and accurate investigation report.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the hiring authority's performance. The hiring authority deemed the investigation sufficient and determined the findings for each allegation even though the investigator did not conduct a thorough investigation. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

OIG Case Number  
0042

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

#### Incident Summary

On September 19, 2020, officers allegedly struck an incarcerated person and planted a knife on him. The officers allegedly falsified reports that indicated they discovered the knife on the incarcerated person during a clothed-body search.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

#### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not perform any interviews as part of the investigation and relied solely on written and photographic



evidence. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring authority failed to identify that the investigator did not identify two officers who allegedly struck an incarcerated person, planted a knife on him, and allegedly falsified reports that indicated they found the incarcerated person had a knife during a clothed-body search. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not conduct any interviews during the investigation. The investigator failed to identify two officers who allegedly struck an incarcerated person, planted a knife on him, and falsified reports that indicated they discovered a knife on the incarcerated person during a clothed-body search.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring authority failed to identify that the investigator did not identify two officers who allegedly struck an incarcerated person, planted a knife on him, and allegedly wrote false reports that an incarcerated person was discovered with a knife during a clothed-body search. The hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

OIG Case Number  
0043

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

#### Incident Summary

On April 14, 2024, a sergeant and an officer allegedly deployed pepper spray through a food port at the face of an incarcerated person who was secured in a cell without any justification.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

#### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask a sergeant and an officer who were subjects in the investigation questions about how the incarcerated person who was in a cell posed a threat. The investigator failed to ask



the sergeant why he approached the incarcerated person a second time and deployed pepper spray instead of remaining at a safe distance. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to ask questions about how the incarcerated person who was in a secured cell, posed a threat. The investigator failed to ask the sergeant why he approached the incarcerated person a second time and deployed pepper spray instead of remaining at a safe distance.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation. The hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

**OIG Case Number**  
0044

Rating Assessment  
Improvement Needed

#### Incident Summary

On March 29, 2024, an officer allegedly slammed an incarcerated person's arm in a cell door.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

#### Overall Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the department's performance. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the office of Internal Affairs on October 29, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 10, 2025, two months and 12 days thereafter.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was adequate.



## Hiring Authority Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the hiring authority's performance. The hiring authority received the investigation report from the Office of Internal Affairs on October 29, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until January 10, 2025, two months and 12 days thereafter.

**OIG Case Number**  
0045

**Rating Assessment**  
*Inadequate*

### Incident Summary

On October 31, 2023, three officers allegedly pulled an incarcerated person from his bed and threw him into a wheelchair. The three officers allegedly escorted the incarcerated person in a wheelchair to the stairwell and dragged him from the wheelchair to the top of the stairs. The same officers allegedly grabbed the incarcerated person by his legs, carried him to his cell, threw him on the floor, and stepped on him when they removed his waist restraints.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations. The OIG did not concur with the hiring authority's determination because the investigation was insufficient. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator and hiring authority failed to identify and interview incarcerated people who may have witnessed the incident. The Office of Internal Affairs received the complaint on November 6, 2023, and did not assign an investigator to the case until March 13, 2024, four months and seven days later. The hiring authority found the investigation to be sufficient even though the investigator did not thoroughly conduct the investigation.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator did not conduct all relevant interviews. The investigator failed to interview an incarcerated person who was allegedly present during the incident, and other incarcerated people who were in the area. In addition, the Office of Internal Affairs received the complaint on November 6, 2023, and did not assign an investigator to the case until March 13, 2024, four months and seven days after receipt.



## Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority relied upon an insufficient investigation to determine a finding regarding the alleged misconduct. The investigator did not interview incarcerated people that the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint identified were present during the incident. Instead of making a finding, the hiring authority should have returned the case to the Office of Internal Affairs for further investigation.

OIG Case Number  
0046

Rating Assessment  
**Inadequate**

### Incident Summary

On March 1, 2023, three officers allegedly slammed an incarcerated person face first on the ground and attempted to break his left wrist and hand.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegation.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority delayed submitting the allegations to the Centralized Screening Team until November 27, 2023, eight months and eight days after policy required. The investigator requested additional video evidence, but because the hiring authority significantly delayed the referral, the department the relevant footage had already been purged pursuant to the department's 90-day video retention policy.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was adequate.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority delayed submitting the allegations to the Centralized Screening Team until November 27, 2023, eight months and eight days after policy required. The investigator requested additional video evidence, but because the hiring authority significantly delayed the referral, the relevant footage was purged pursuant to the department's 90-day video retention policy.



OIG Case Number  
0047

Rating Assessment  
Inadequate

### Incident Summary

On November 18, 2023, four officers allegedly entered an incarcerated person's cell, deployed pepper spray, and cut the incarcerated persons right forearm, back and shoulder with a razor.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to identify and address video evidence that revealed a separate potential use of unnecessary force when one officer who was a subject of the investigation deployed pepper spray at the facial area of multiple incarcerated people who exited the cell and did not appear to pose an imminent threat. In addition, the investigator failed to identify that the same officer failed to report that he deployed two additional bursts of pepper spray at one of the incarcerated people who was on the ground and appeared to be compliant. Furthermore, the hiring authority delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference by six months and 24 days.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was inadequate. The investigator failed to identify and address video evidence that revealed a separate potential use of unnecessary force when one officer who was a subject of the investigation deployed pepper spray at the facial area of multiple incarcerated people who exited the cell and did not appear to pose an imminent threat. In addition, the investigator failed to identify that the same officer failed to report that he deployed two additional bursts of pepper spray at one of the incarcerated people who was on the ground and appeared to be compliant. Furthermore, the investigator did not advise the incarcerated person who submitted the complaint of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending. The investigator should have identified and added the unrelated serious allegation to the existing investigation.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was inadequate. The hiring authority failed to identify and consider that video evidence revealed a separate potential use of unnecessary and undocumented force. The video showed one officer who was a subject of the investigation deploy pepper spray at the facial area of multiple incarcerated people who exited the cell and did not appear to pose an imminent threat. In addition, the hiring authority received the completed investigation from the Office of Internal Affairs on March 21, 2024, but delayed conducting the investigative and disciplinary findings conference until October 14, 2024, six months and 24 days thereafter.



OIG Case Number  
0048

Rating Assessment  
Improvement Needed

### Incident Summary

On January 4, 2024, a sergeant and an officer allegedly entered a cell and repeatedly punched and kicked an incarcerated person in the face and body. The officer and the sergeant allegedly continued to punch and kick him outside of the cell, drag him back into his cell by his feet, and continued to punch and kick him in the face and body.

### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

### Overall Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator asked leading and suggestive questions during the interviews of a psychiatric technician who witnessed the incident and a sergeant who was a subject of the investigation. In addition, the investigator failed to direct a psychiatric technician who was a witness and an officer who was a subject, as well as advise an incarcerated person who witnessed the incident of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending.

### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The OIG identified deficiencies in the Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance. The investigator asked leading and suggestive questions during the interviews of a psychiatric technician who witnessed the incident and a sergeant who was a subject of the investigation. The investigator also failed to direct the psychiatric technician, the officer, and an incarcerated person who witnessed the incident of the need to keep the investigation confidential while the investigation was pending.

### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was adequate.

OIG Case Number  
0049

Rating Assessment  
Adequate

### Incident Summary

On April 12, 2024, an officer allegedly aimed his pepper spray canister at an incarcerated person's face and pushed him against a fence. The officer allegedly dragged a second incarcerated person across the yard, slammed his head against a cell wall, and pressed his elbow and forearm into the incarcerated person's back. Three



officers allegedly witnessed the officers' use of force and failed to complete written reports regarding the incident.

#### Disposition

The hiring authority found insufficient evidence to sustain the allegations.

#### Overall Assessment

The department's performance was adequate.

#### Office of Internal Affairs Investigator Assessment

The Office of Internal Affairs investigator's performance was adequate.

#### Hiring Authority Assessment

The hiring authority's performance was adequate.