

BOARD MEMBERS

EILEEN DELANEY
Chair
MARYANNE PINTAR
Vice Chair
ROBERT SPRIGGS JR.
Secretary
ANDREW HAYES
DR. R. LEE BROWN
NADIA KEAN-AYUB
BONNIE KENK
ARIANA FEDERICO MONDRAGON
TIM WARE
GARY I. WILSON
VACANT – DISTRICT 3



EXECUTIVE OFFICER
PAUL R. PARKER III

County of San Diego

CITIZENS' LAW ENFORCEMENT REVIEW BOARD

555 W BEECH STREET, SUITE 220, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-2938
TELEPHONE: (619) 238-6776 FAX: (619) 238-6775
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/clerb

The Citizens' Law Enforcement Review Board made the following findings in the closed session portion of its November 8, 2022, meeting held via the Zoom Platform. Minutes of the open session portion of this meeting will be available following the Review Board's review and adoption of the minutes at its next meeting. Meeting agendas, minutes, and other information about the Review Board are available upon request or at www.sdcounty.ca.gov/clerb.

CLOSED SESSION

a) PUBLIC EMPLOYEE DISCIPLINE/DISMISSAL/RELEASE

Discussion & Consideration of Complaints & Reports: Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 to hear complaints or charges brought against Sheriff or Probation employees by a citizen (unless the employee requests a public session). Notice pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 for deliberations regarding consideration of subject officer discipline recommendation (if applicable).

DEFINITION OF FINDINGS	
Action Justified	The evidence shows that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.
Not Sustained	There was <u>insufficient evidence</u> to either prove or disprove the allegation.
Sustained	The evidence supports the allegation and the act or conduct was not justified.
Unfounded	The evidence shows that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.
Summary Dismissal	The Review Board lacks jurisdiction or the complaint clearly lacks merit.

CASES FOR SUMMARY HEARING (6)

ALLEGATIONS, BOARD FINDINGS & RATIONALES

21-065/JORDAN

1. Excessive Force – Deputies 1 and 2 “rubbed” a rash “raw”.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Complainant Christopher L. Jordan alleged, “I was making a scene in intake holding... so I got extracted. Acceptingly until w/o my knowledge, I was in cuffs, they rubbed these bumps raw right out of my arms while I had hands behind back.” A review of the CCTV footage from Vista Detention Facility (VDF) on 05-24-21 did not corroborate Jordan’s allegation. Jordan became uncooperative during intake, and a use of force ensued. Jordan was placed in the prone position and “leg chains” were applied. Deputy 1 stated in his report “Due to Jordan's agitated state and apparent level of intoxication, Deputy 2 and I determined Jordan would be placed into a sobering cell.” CCTV footage showed deputies escorted Jordan to a “sobering cell” where mechanical restraints were removed without further incident. No misconduct was observed. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Unidentified deputies administered a “shot” without Jordan’s consent on 05-24-21.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Jordan alleged unidentified deputies “Took me outside shot me up with something in my butt. I never said ok.” A review of the CCTV footage from VDF on 05-24-21 showed Jordan from the time he was in intake until he was placed into a “sobering cell.” At no point was Jordan observed receiving any forced medication or being taken

“outside.” Further, SDSD reports did not corroborate Jordan’s allegation. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

3. Excessive Force – An unidentified lieutenant “maced” Jordan on 06-18-21.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Jordan alleged he was again arrested and that an unidentified lieutenant “comes up behind me spit mask was lifted and I was maced in my left tear duct point blank and they put spit mask back on and tightened it.” SDSD records showed Jordan was released from VDF on 06-02-21 and again arrested and booked into VDF on 06-18-21. A review of BWC footage associated with the arrest showed Jordan had to be physically escorted into booking at VDF because he refused to walk, dropped his weight to the floor and was actively resisting the deputies directives. At no point was it observed Jordan was “maced.” Further, at no point was it observed a “spit sock” was placed on Jordan. A review of the BWC and associated arrest report from the 06-18-21 incident revealed no lieutenant was involved in the use of force. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

4. Misconduct/Procedure – Unidentified staff placed Jordan in a cell with no water pressure and did not provide him a lunch on unidentified dates.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Jordan alleged “Around June 7th, I am in intake with a USC Sweater on in a cell with no water pressure drinking out of the toilet... the cell door had a purple latex glove tied so the trustees couldn’t give me a lunch and they skipped feeding me I don’t know how many times.” Jordan’s statements throughout his complaint lead to questions related to his credibility and SDSD records do not indicate Jordan was in custody on 06-07-21. SDSD Detention Services Bureau (DSB) Vista Detention Facility Green Sheet, Section K.15.V states “Inmate meals will be served at the following times: Breakfast – Between the hours of 0400-0600 (hot pack/cold pack). Lunch – Between the hours of 1000-1200 (cold pack). Dinner – Between the hours of 1600–1800 (hot pack/cold pack).” Further, SDSD DSB policy and procedure Section I.59, states, “As such, toilets, wash basins and drinking fountains must be provided in temporary holding cells, staging cells, sobering cells, single-occupancy cells, double-occupancy cells, dormitories, etc.” At this juncture, there is no credible evidence Jordan was denied a meal or access to water. It should be noted, an “Observation Log” was created and maintained from 05-24-21 until 05-27-21, during Joran’s placement in a Sobering Cell. However, the log noted Jordan was in a cell with water and was observed drinking. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

22-041/POCKLINGTON

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 “expedited evictions” to receive political endorsements.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Complainant Pocklington stated, “Please see the attachments reporting corruption by Deputy 1 and Deputy 2 to receive endorsements [redacted] from politicians and “Pocklington alleged corruption by Deputy 1 to receive endorsement [redacted] from politicians.” As per CLERB rules and regulations 4.1 Authority, CLERB shall have authority to investigate complaints filed against peace officers or custodial officers employed by the County in the Sheriff’s Department or Probation Department. Furthermore, Deputy 1 resigned and is no longer with the SDSD. The review board lacks jurisdiction.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 used eviction requests as “leverage” against politicians [redacted] for Deputy 2.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Pocklington stated, “Deputy 1 used those requests as, “leverage”, against those politicians [redacted] for Deputy 2.” See Rationale 1.

3. Misconduct/Procedure– Deputy 2 “expedited evictions” to receive political endorsements.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Pocklington stated, “Please see the attachments reporting corruption by Deputy 1 and Deputy 2 to receive endorsements [redacted] from politicians”. As per SDSD P&P 2.43 entitled “Political Activity”, employees are prohibited from directly or indirectly, using, promising, threatening or attempting to use any official influence in aid of any political activity, or to affect the result of any election to political office, or upon any other corrupt condition or consideration. Furthermore, employees are prohibited from using their official capacity to influence, interfere with or

affect the results of an election. Pocklington submitted thirteen attachments he alleged showed evictions were expedited. The attachments that occurred beyond the one-year timeframe were eliminated from the dataset due to timeliness. As per CLERB's Rules and Regulations 4.1.2 entitled "Complaints: Jurisdiction", CLERB shall not have any shall not have jurisdiction to take any action in respect to complaints received more than one year after the date of the incident giving rise to the complaint, except that if the person filing the complaint was incarcerated or physically or mentally incapacitated from filing a complaint following the incident giving rise to the complaint, the time duration of such incarceration or incapacity shall not be counted in determining whether the one year period for filing the complaint has expired. The remaining evictions were analyzed in comparison to all the evictions that occurred from 04-06-21 to 04-06-22. The SDSA had three different processing timeframes. The first timeframe is the time from when the SDSA received the judgement to when the SDSA posted the notice of eviction. The second timeframe is the time from when the eviction was posted to when the notice of restoration took place. The third timeframe was set forth by the courts in which the writs of possession expired within 180 days. In order to investigate Pocklington's complaint of "expedited" evictions, all eviction cases filed by the SDSA with a notice of restoration that occurred from 04-06-21 to 04-06-22 were analyzed. The Office of Evaluation, Performance, and Analytics (OEPA) analyzed the data. Among 1,002 successful evictions (excluding 11 cases with more than one eviction attempt), the notice of eviction was served on average 5.1 days after the Sheriff's department received the case. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the notices of eviction were served within seven days and 95% within 11 days. Among all 1,013 total successful evictions, the notice of restoration was served on average 30.4 days following the notice of eviction and 75% of the notices of restoration were served within 33 days. Ninety-five (95%) of the notices of restoration occurred within 93.4 days. None of the evictions identified by the complainant were considered outliers. As per CA Civil Code 699.510, writs of possession expire after 180 days from when the writ was issued. According to CA Civil Code § 715.050, "Except with respect to enforcement of a judgment for money, a writ of possession issued pursuant to a judgment for possession in an unlawful detainer action shall be enforced pursuant to this chapter without delay, notwithstanding receipt of notice of the filing by the defendant of a bankruptcy proceeding." There was no legal determination on what constitutes a delay, as long as the evictions were executed within the 180-day period. Therefore, as long as the writs of restorations were issued prior to the 180-day timeframe, it was up to the department to determine prioritization. The evidence showed the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

4. Discrimination/Racial – SDSA evicted a black mother of two small children.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Pocklington stated, "The eviction, outline #1 put the black of 2 small children on the street." SDSA P&P 2.53 entitled, "discrimination" states employees shall not express any prejudice or harassment concerning race or color. As per CLERB's Rules and Regulations 4.1.2 entitled "Complaints: Jurisdiction", CLERB shall not have any shall not have jurisdiction to take any action in respect to complaints received more than one year after the date of the incident giving rise to the complaint, except that if the person filing the complaint was incarcerated or physically or mentally incapacitated from filing a complaint following the incident giving rise to the complaint, the time duration of such incarceration or incapacity shall not be counted in determining whether the one year period for filing the complaint has expired. The evidence submitted showed the date giving rise to the incident as March 2021. It has been over one year after the date of the incident giving rise to the complaint. The review board lacks jurisdiction.

5. Misconduct/Procedure – Mayor Todd Gloria, City of San Diego, and Chair Nathan Fletcher, Board of Supervisors, San Diego County, requested expedited evictions.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Pocklington stated, "Todd Gloria and Nathen Fletcher had requested evictions to be expedited during the height of COVID." As per CLERB Rules and Regulations section 4.1 entitled "Complaints: Authority", CLERB shall have authority to investigate complaints filed against peace officers or custodial officers employed by the County in the Sheriff's Department or Probation Department. CLERB has no authority to investigate Todd Gloria or Nathan Fletcher, who are non-sworn personnel. The Review Board lacks jurisdiction.

6. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 4 "directed evictions" for Deputy 1.

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Pocklington stated, "Deputy 4 was the point person for Deputy 1 directing these evictions for him". Deputy 4 provided information during the course of CLERB's investigation that was considered in arriving at the recommended finding. Deputy statements are confidential and cannot be publicly disclosed. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

7. Misconduct/Procedure – SDSA leadership engaged in "corruption".

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Pocklington stated, "The attachments point to Sheriff's Dept corruption by leadership." Pocklington submitted thirteen attachments he alleged showed corruption. The attachments that occurred beyond the one-year timeframe were eliminated from the dataset due to timeliness. As per CLERB's Rules and Regulations 4.1.2 entitled "Complaints: Jurisdiction", CLERB shall not have jurisdiction to take any action in respect to complaints received more than one year after the date of the incident giving rise to the complaint, except that if the person filing the complaint was incarcerated or physically or mentally incapacitated from filing a complaint following the incident giving rise to the complaint, the time duration of such incarceration or incapacity shall not be counted in determining whether the one year period for filing the complaint has expired. The remaining evictions were analyzed in comparison to all the evictions that occurred from 04-06-21 to 04-06-22, which SDDS provided all eviction data that occurred during this timeframe. OEPA analyzed the data. The SDDS had three different processing timeframes. The first timeframe is the time from when the SDDS received the judgement to when the SDDS posted the notice of eviction. The second timeframe is the time from when the eviction was posted to when the notice of restoration took place. The third timeframe was when the writ expired, the SDDS had 180 days to complete the eviction prior to expiration. In order to investigate Pocklington's complaint of "expedited" evictions, all eviction cases filed by the SDDS with a notice of restoration that occurred 04-06-21 to 04-06-22 were analyzed. Among 1,002 successful evictions (excluding 11 cases with more than one eviction attempt), the notice of eviction was served on average 5.1 days after the Sheriff's department received the case. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the notices of eviction were served within seven days and 95% within 11 days. Among all 1,013 total successful evictions, the notice of restoration was served on average 30.4 days following the notice of eviction and 75% of the notices of restoration were served within 33 days. Ninety-five (95%) of the notices of restoration occurred within 93.4 days. None of the evictions identified by Pocklington were considered outliers. Furthermore, SDDS records showed all evictions occurred prior to the 180-day writ expiration. There was no legal determination on what constitutes a delay, as long as the evictions were executed within the 180-day period. Therefore, as long as the writs of restorations were issued prior to the 180-day timeframe, it was up to the department to determine prioritization. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

8. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 3 prioritized evictions based on political influence.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Pocklington stated, "Deputy 3 on two occasions stated Todd Gloria and Nathan Fletcher had requested evictions to be expedited during the height of COVID". On 06-14-22 CLERB was notified, via email correspondence by Division of Inspection Services/CLERB liaison that Deputy 3 resigned 05-19-22. Pursuant to CLERB Rules and Regulations, Section 4.1 Complaints: Authority, stipulates that CLERB only has authority to investigate complaints filed against peace/custodial officers employed by the San Diego Sheriff's Department, therefore the Review Board lacks jurisdiction and was unable to continue the investigation. As per CLERB's Rules and Regulations Section 5.8 Termination, Resignation or Retirement of Subject Officer, "CLERB shall have the discretion to continue or terminate an investigation, if, after a complaint is filed and before CLERB completes its investigation, the Subject Officer terminates employment with the Sheriff's Department or the Probation Department. The Sheriff or the Chief Probation Officer or the Subject Officer shall notify CLERB when the Subject Officer's employment is terminated." CLERB lacks jurisdiction.

22-049/MONTANO

1. Use of Force Resulting in Great Bodily Injury – Deputies 1-4 used force toward Diego Montano at the Jamul Casino on 03-21-22.

Board Finding: Action Justified

Rationale: This case was reviewed in accordance with CLERB Rules & Regulations 4.3, Complaint Not Required: Jurisdiction with Respect to Specified Incidents. On 03-21-22, Diego Montano entered the Jamul Casino while he had an active Trespass Authorization Order which banned him from being on Jamul Casino property. The Trespass Arrest Authorization is a SDDS form signed by Jamul Security that authorized the SDDS to enforce all applicable trespass laws on the named person, Diego Montano. This form was reviewed by CLERB and valid at the time of this incident. SDDS and Jamul Casino documentation showed that Jamul security contacted SDDS for assistance the day of this incident. SDDS arrived on scene and were briefed on Montano's history of resisting officers, so additional deputies were contacted. SDDS documentation, Body Worn Camera (BWC) and Jamul Casino Surveillance Video verified Deputies 2 and 4 called Montano's name as they approached him. Montano quickly shook his head and deputies grabbed Montano by the arm. Montano stood up and "forcefully jerked" his arm away from the deputy and was non-compliant when deputies commanded him to place his hands behind his back. Deputies attempted to gain control, but Montano was non-compliant, actively resisted, and kicked his legs towards

Deputy 3. Deputies subdued Montano, handcuffed him, and escorted him out of the casino. Montano was then taken to Alvarado Hospital where he was treated for a hairline fracture to his thumb. Given the totality of circumstances, the force used towards Montano was reasonable and justified in accordance with SDSD policy and procedure. Addendum F, Use of Force Policy allows deputies to use hands-on control techniques to overcome a subject's resistance. Subtitle Force Options states that subjects must not gain the advantage in a physical confrontation; therefore, deputies may use a force option that exceeds the subject's force level. Montano was non-compliant and actively resisted deputies when he was approached by deputies at the casino. The evidence showed that the alleged actor conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

2. Excessive Force – Deputies 1-4 used force toward Diego Montano at the Jamul Casino.

Board Finding: Action Justified

Rationale: Diego Montano reported, "There was no need for the excessive use of force by the San Diego Sheriff's Department. Especially when the Jamul Casino Security guard let me in through the front door." Montano alleged that the force deputies used towards him was excessive. This case was initially reviewed in accordance with CLERB Rules & Regulations 4.3, Complaint Not Required: Jurisdiction with Respect to Specified Incidents. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper. See Rationale #1.

3. False Arrest – Deputy 2 arrested Diego Montano at the Jamul Casino.

Board Finding: Action Justified

Rationale: Diego Montano reported, "There was no need for the excessive use of force by the San Diego Sheriff's Department. Especially when the Jamul Casino Security guard let me in through the front door." Diego Montano alleged false arrest on behalf of the deputies. Associated documents verified multiple SDSD Trespass Arrest Authorizations were issued and stated that Montano was permanently excluded from Jamul Casino from 09-20-21 to 04-30-22. The Arrest Authorization form also noted that a casino supervisor notified Montano of this order. According to SDSD documentation and as stated above, deputies responded to a "No Trespass" order. Jamul Casino contacted SDSD and requested assistance. Deputies responded and acted in accordance with SDSD P&P Section 2.51 Arrest, Search and Seizure which states that all arrests, searches, and seizures shall be made under official department business and in accordance with the law. SDSD had authority to arrest Montano due to violation of California PEN§ 602. Trespass. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper. This case was initially reviewed in accordance with CLERB Rules & Regulations 4.3, Complaint Not Required: Jurisdiction with Respect to Specified Incidents. See Rationale #1.

22-062/DOODA

1. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 1 refused Dooda's entry to a courthouse.

Board Finding: Action justified

Rationale: Nashwan Dooda alleged, "While, I was trying to take my belonging from the tray, a deputy sheriff, who was standing next by, asked me if there is something in my pocket. I said no, I just came through metal detector and I squeezed my pocket so the deputy can see that there's nothing there. The deputy told me 'You have two options: Either you can leave or allow me to search you.'" San Diego Superior Court Order No. 010122-01 states, "Judicial notice is taken of the increasing acts of violence that occur within the courthouses in this country, state and county, and to their occupants. Thus, there is a clear need to protect the courts and those within it from a danger of violence. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all persons entering or otherwise present in any facilities within which courts conduct official business shall submit to any request by the Sheriff, or other authorized security personnel, to participate in a weapons screening process involving metal detection and x-ray equipment... individuals may choose not to enter the facility rather than submit to the weapons screening process. The Sheriff, or other authorized security personnel, is authorized to inspect any item that is otherwise lawful to possess to determine whether it poses a danger to the security of the courthouse." Ultimately, Dooda entered a place where visitors were subject to a security screening. Dooda did not agree to a search after Deputy 1 identified something in Dooda's pocket and was subsequently directed to leave. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

2. Excessive Force – Deputy 2 "pushed" Dooda as he exited a Courthouse on 04-12-22.

Board Finding: Actioned Justified

Rationale: Dooda alleged, "(Deputy 2) came by and asked me to leave to courthouse. While, I was exiting the door,

(Deputy 2) put his hands on my back and pushed me.” SDDS policy Addendum F Section, Use of Force Guidelines, Arm guidance and firm grip, states, “When verbalization proves ineffective, arm guidance or a firm grip may suffice to overcome resistance. Arm guidance or a firm grip that results in injury requires documentation.” CCTV footage from the Courthouse on 04-12-22 showed the alleged incident. Footage showed Deputy 2 talking with Dooda and pointing to the exit. Dooda started to walk towards the exit but stopped. Deputy 2 briefly placed his hand on Dooda’s shoulder/upper arm, in what appeared to be an attempt to get Dooda to continue to walk towards the exit. Dooda then exited the Courthouse, engaged in a conversation with deputies while outside and left without further incident. In this instance, the use of force by Deputy 2, observed through CCTV, could be described as “arm guidance.” Additionally, as no injury occurred, no further documentation of the incident was required. Deputy 2 also provided information during the course of CLERB’s investigation that supported the recommended finding. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

3. Misconduct/Intimidation – Deputy 2 threatened Dooda with force.

Board Finding: Action Justified

Rationale: Dooda alleged, “(Deputy 2) threatened me multiple times that he will put me on the ground and use force on me while I was following his commands.” Addendum Section F, Use of Force Guidelines, De-escalation, states “Other De-escalation techniques deputies may consider using include but are not limited to the following... Communicating with a subject from a safe position using the following compliance techniques: Verbal persuasion, advisements (and) warnings.” As stated in Rationales #1 and #2, Dooda was directed to leave the Courthouse as he failed to complete the security screening. It was reasonable for a deputy to advise an individual they may be subject to arrest or have force used upon them for failing to follow a lawful directive from a peace officer. Deputy 2 provided information during the course of CLERB’s investigation that supported the recommended finding. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

4. Misconduct/Procedure – Deputy 2 denied Dooda’s entry to a Courthouse.

Board Finding: Action justified

Rationale: Dooda alleged, “I strongly believe that (Deputy 2) abused his authorities and denied me entering the building without any reason.” See Rationale #1. The evidence shows that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

22-090/FENTON

1. Illegal Search/Seizure – Deputy 1 evicted Fenton on 04-06-22.

Board Finding: Action Justified

Rationale: Nancy Fenton alleged she was subjected to an “unlawful eviction fixated on making me homeless.” According to SDDS documents, an initial Writ of Possession and Notice to Vacate was served to Fenton on 02-28-22. SDDS documents showed the Notice of Restoration, i.e. “eviction”, occurred on 04-06-22. A review of SDDS documents showed appropriate procedure was followed in service of the eviction. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did occur but was lawful, justified and proper.

2. Misconduct/Retaliation– Deputy 1 returned to Fenton’s home on 04-06-22, “saying no one files a complaint against me.”

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Fenton alleged “(Deputy 1) return for revenge and retaliation saying no one files a complaint against me.” On 04-06-22, deputies arrived at Fenton’s home to complete a lawful eviction. A review of Deputy 1’s Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage does not corroborate Fenton’s allegation. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

3. Misconduct/Discourtesy – Deputy 1 ordered unidentified deputies to line up to view Fenton walk in front of them as they “laughed.”

Board Finding: Unfounded

Rationale: Fenton alleged “(Deputy 1) made me walk in front of these drooling sheriff’s... again (Deputy 1) ordered the sheriffs to line up on the steps and demanded that I walk in front of these seven sheriffs, they all laughed. It was as if (Deputy 1) had promised them a show.” A review of involved deputies BWC footage does not corroborate

Fenton's allegation. The evidence showed that the alleged act or conduct did not occur.

22-122/ROBINSON

1. Misconduct/Harassment – Multiple white male San Diego Police Department (SDPD) officers “touched and damaged” Robinson’s vehicle on 09-24-22.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Robinson stated, “On 09-24-22, cops harassed me touched my car off Commercial and 16th. They caused damage to my vehicles hood.” CLERB does not have jurisdiction to investigate complaints against the SDPD. CLERB Rules & Regulations, Section 4: Authority, Jurisdiction, Duties and Responsibilities of CLERB, Complaints: Authority. Pursuant to the Ordinance, CLERB shall have authority to receive, review, investigate, and report on complaints filed against peace officers or custodial officers employed by the County in the Sheriff’s Department or the Probation Department. This complaint is submitted for summary dismissal per CLERB R&R Section 15: Summary Dismissal, Summary Dismissal may be appropriate in the following circumstances: CLERB does not have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the complaint. Robinson was provided contact information and complaint forms for the Commission on Police Practices; Oversight Board for the San Diego Police Department and these complaints were forwarded to sdpdia@pd.sandiego.gov.

2. Misconduct/Procedure – Unidentified SDPD personnel refused to take and/or provide Robinson with a police report on 09-24-22.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Robinson stated, “On 09-24-22, I filed a police report and complaint and they refuse to take it.” See Rationale #1.

3. Discrimination – Multiple white male SDPD officers “discriminated” against Robinson due to her race, sex disabilities, and being “homeless” on/around 09-24-22.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Robinson stated, “On 09-24-22 I’ve been parking there for over 2 months and now they’re giving me issues out of nowhere... stalking me, harassing me I assume because I keep filing complaints against them but I truly believe it’s based off my race, me being a woman and homeless.” See Rationale #1

4. Misconduct/Harassment – An SDPD Officer stopped and “harassed” Robinson on/around 4th Avenue, in downtown San Diego on 09-29-22.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Robinson stated, “On 09-29-22, the officer pulled me over for no reason and claimed it was due to him not seeing my plates even though they were clear and visible. He made multiple claims that I had illegal items in my car.” See Rationale #1.

5. Misconduct/Harassment – An unidentified “mixed Latino male” SDPD officer “stalked” and “harassed” Robinson and her child around his school on 09-29-22.

Board Finding: Summary Dismissal

Rationale: Robinson stated, “On 09-29-22, this officer literally stalked and harassed me and my child. He followed me to my son’s school.” See Rationale #1.

End of Report

NOTICE

In accordance with Penal Code Section 832.7, this notification shall not be conclusive or binding or admissible as evidence in any separate or subsequent action or proceeding brought before an arbitrator, court or judge of California or the United States.