

**extremely lenient sanction for domestic violence with a visible physical injury.** This incident occurred in another jurisdiction which did not arrest the officer, but did refer the matter to the District Attorney's Office.

**The adjudicator appeared to blame the victim for precipitating the violence by her behavior.** The rationale stated that the victim "left town, staying away several days more than she had planned. She did this without notifying her husband or family. The lack of respect was beginning to show and furthered itself in the conversation just prior to the allegation." Such biased language perpetuates the notion that the victim somehow deserved to be abused or caused the violent behavior of the attacker.

**(g) Pattern of conduct not recognized**

Between 1991 and 1993, one training officer was named in five domestic violence-related complaints (employee #130 on the Matrix; incident 93-4 includes two complaints). The first complaint involved grabbing his girlfriend, also an officer, by the neck, throwing her to the ground, and attempting to choke her, causing bruising. The subsequent complaints involved allegations of physical and sexual assault, violating a Department stay-away order, breaking the wrist of the same female, and closing the truck door on her left arm. A number of additional sustained allegations in the officer's personnel package, not domestic violence-related, concerned lack of judgment, questionable veracity, and ethical shortcomings.

The investigations into the above complaints were either "not resolved" or "exonerated" due to inconsistent and conflicting statements by the complainant and accused, and lack of independent witnesses. However, the officer was "admonished" in one instance for violating a stay-away order. The adjudicator rationalized that the officer violated the order because of his affection for his girlfriend. There was no consideration given to the fact that there was a history of allegations of domestic violence.

Finally, as a result of the last complaint for domestic violence, the officer was removed from the Department. This followed his entry of a "no contest" plea to spousal battery in another county after which he failed to consistently attend a court-mandated intervention program.

Each of the investigations, individually, was conducted appropriately and thoroughly. However, **had the repeated allegations of domestic violence been recognized in the aggregate, the Department may have been able to intervene** in the escalating problems between these two individuals. It should not have taken five complaints of domestic violence against this officer for the Department to recognize his pattern of conduct, take steps to protect his girlfriend (who had become his wife), and protect the City from liability.

**(h) Vindictive and untruthful complainants**

In 1987, a police officer served a fifteen-day suspension for a sustained act of domestic violence. During the course of their relationship, his girlfriend who later became his wife and subsequently ex-wife, was the complainant in four personnel complaints for domestic violence from 1990 through 1995 (Employee # 126 on the Matrix).

Each of the investigations appropriately resulted in an “unfounded” finding on all counts. All allegations were thoroughly investigated, all appropriate witnesses were interviewed, physical evidence was collected, and the recommendations and conclusions were made objectively. The complainant later recanted all of her allegations and admitted that she was using the complaint process to “get back” at her husband.

**The Department faces a challenge in separating legitimate allegations from untruthful claims.** The Task Force reviewed several investigations in which the Department clearly spent considerable resources conducting investigations in which the complainant lied about the occurrence. Domestic violence is such a serious issue that it is vital for the Department to aggressively investigate all allegations. It is unfortunate that scarce resources must sometimes be spent investigating allegations which have been initiated for other than truthful motivations. The Department should consider prosecuting false claims, utilizing Penal Code Section 148.6 (False Allegations of Misconduct Against Peace Officers).

**(I) Inappropriate use of “Miscellaneous Memorandum”**

In 1996, two detectives married to each other were involved in a domestic violence incident. The resultant investigation was subsequently handled in a preferential manner. The detectives became involved in a verbal argument. The dispute escalated and the female detective struck her husband with a bag of garbage and a cardboard pizza box. The husband then pushed or slapped his wife, causing her to lose her balance and fall backwards. During the fall, the wife collided with the kitchen counter and fractured her ribs.

This investigation originally resulted in a sustained allegation against the male detective. However, the investigation was later re-classified as a Miscellaneous Memorandum because, according to the adjudicator, “the personnel investigation showed a lack of criminal behavior or administrative behavior.” The adjudicator stated that both employees were extremely embarrassed about their actions, and consequently the complaint should be re-classified as a Miscellaneous Memorandum.

These circumstances involved possible misconduct, and there was enough evidence to support at least a “not resolved” finding. It may not be clear what exactly occurred, but it is clear that a physical encounter took place. The re-classification of this complaint to a Miscellaneous Memorandum removed information which may have been helpful in the future if a pattern of behavior emerges.<sup>37</sup>

## V. RELATED SUBJECTS

### A. COMPARISON OF PERSONNEL INVESTIGATION(S) WITH SPECIFIC CASES CITED BY REPORTER HARVEY LEVIN, CHANNEL 2, APRIL 28 AND 29, 1997

Reporter Harvey Levin, in a special Channel 2 News feature entitled "To Protect and Abuse," claimed that the Los Angeles Police Department was negligent in its handling of domestic violence complaints involving its employees. Levin raised some valid concerns and increased public consciousness in this critical area. However, his factual presentation contained a number of inaccuracies. In the preparation of this report to the Police Commission, the Task Force identified several cases that were specifically referenced by Mr. Levin. The following discrepancies were noted:

- In a case not specifically identified by Levin, he reported that officers from an outside agency who had responded to the scene of a domestic dispute were asked by a Department supervisor to wait for five minutes while he first entered the house. The implication was that Department personnel were engaged in a "cover-up" of an incident outside the City. According to statements of the outside agency and the Department supervisor who responded to the scene, the local agency requested that he wait outside until they entered the location and handled the call. The supervisor complied with the agency's request.

Mr. Levin also reported that **both** parties involved in the incident were Department employees. The alleged suspect was identified as an officer and the female as a detective. Levin indicated the Department initiated disciplinary action against the female detective but did not pursue the male officer. The Task Force review revealed the male was a civilian who had never been employed by the Department. Because the incident occurred outside of Los Angeles, the decision to pursue charges against the civilian rested with that agency.

- Levin cited an incident that occurred in 1990 as an example of the Department failing to arrest its own employees. In reality, the responding officers properly followed the Department's domestic violence guidelines at the time of the incident. The officers were precluded from making a felony arrest because there were no visible injuries and the victim stated she was not in need of medical attention even though the victim had dialed "9-1-1" to summon officers to the scene. The officers subsequently completed a Preliminary Investigation Report.

During the Department's investigation that followed, the victim refused to allow photographs of a bruise on her thigh that resulted from the incident. She also refused to

cooperate with detectives who attempted to proceed with the criminal investigation. As a result, the case was not filed.

- Levin's report contained an on-camera interview of the former wife of an employee accused of domestic violence. Levin concluded from the interview that the employee was not arrested, fired, or demoted, and was not required to relinquish his gun. The implication by Levin was that the employee was not punished for his acts of domestic violence. In fact, the allegations of domestic violence were thoroughly investigated by the Department and were sustained. The Task Force verified that the officer served a 30-day suspension for this incident.

The initial information regarding this domestic violence incident was provided to the Department months after the altercation by a friend, not by the employee's former wife. The employee was, therefore, not arrested at the onset of the investigation because there were no visible injuries. The outside jurisdiction presented the case for filing; however, the prosecutorial agency declined to file criminal charges, citing, "...victim has never made a complaint to police" and "the case was not provable beyond a reasonable doubt."

- In another case not specifically identified by Levin, an employee allegedly punched his wife in the stomach, rupturing her liver. Levin included this as an example of allegations which were not, in his opinion, properly pursued.

The employee's wife did suffer an injury resulting in a ruptured liver, which was reported to the Department by her daughter. During the initial investigation, the wife maintained that she had fallen in the couple's bedroom and landed on a barbell. According to her, she and her husband had been involved in a verbal argument, but he was not in the room when she fell. The wife refused to allow Department investigators to review her medical records, and her doctor refused to speak to the Department investigator. The case was not presented for criminal prosecution.

Fourteen months later, the wife alleged that her husband did in fact strike her in the stomach causing the ruptured liver. However, two months later, she reverted to her original story. The Department conducted a thorough investigation, but absent any independent witnesses to the event, coupled with the victim's changing stories, it could not sustain the allegation.

**B. CIVIL LITIGATION INVOLVING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IN WHICH THE DEPARTMENT WAS THE DEFENDANT**

According to Senior Assistant City Attorney G. Daniel Woodard, Supervisor of the Civil Liabilities Division in the City Attorney's Office, who has been in the Civil Liabilities Division in excess of 15 years, there has only been one lawsuit and one pending claim involving domestic violence in which the City was a party to the lawsuit. Mr. Woodard also stated that information about domestic violence litigation is not captured separately by the City Attorney's automated data system.

The *Ramos* case, which was recently settled for \$2,150,000.00, involved a police officer whose wife was having an affair. The officer had a violent argument with his wife during which he shoved and punched her and pointed his service pistol at her. His superiors took his gun away and assigned him to desk duty for a short period, but soon restored him to field duty and returned his weapon. Thereafter, he confronted his wife and her lover, and with his service pistol shot and killed them both, then himself.

The jury found that the City was negligent in restoring the officer's service pistol to him in violation of Department policy. The plaintiffs alleged that the Department does not prosecute police officers when they are accused of domestic violence, and this leads to an atmosphere of condoning such activity in violation of the civil rights of the accusers and their families.

In May of 1997, as a result of the publicity generated by the settlement of the *Ramos* case described above, a claim was presented to the City of Los Angeles on behalf of the spouse of a current Department officer. The claim alleges that the officer physically battered his spouse and son on numerous occasions. It further charges that despite complaints to the Department, misconduct was never alleged against the officer. This claim is pending.

**C. OMNIBUS CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 1996**

This bill, signed September 30, 1996, prohibits individuals convicted of misdemeanor crimes involving domestic violence from owning or possessing a firearm. The prohibition applies to persons convicted of misdemeanors occurring prior to the law's enactment. The law is made specifically applicable to governmental agencies including law enforcement officers. The Department is obligated to examine its ranks to ensure that officers who fall within the law do not carry a firearm.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup>

See Recommendation No. 43.

The Department is currently in the process of assessing how many of its employees fall within the prohibitions of the law. The Department has reviewed current criminal histories of its employees which have been obtained from the Department of Justice as well as researched court files to determine whether the facts of an incident involved domestic violence. The Department is continuing to research the number of officers subject to domestic violence restraining orders who may also be subject to the law.

Employees may avoid the proscriptions of the law by returning to court to request that their conviction be either expunged or set aside. An employee may also avoid the law if he/she successfully completes a diversion program.

It should be noted that the statistics in this section are different than the conviction statistics reflected in Section III, Parts E and F, because this section includes officers who may have been convicted **prior** to the beginning date of this study.

The following statistics have been provided to the Domestic Violence Task Force by the Department's Legal Affairs Division:

1.	The number of officers convicted of a domestic violence offense that occurred prior to employment by the Department.	0
2.	The number of officers convicted of a domestic violence offense that occurred after becoming employed by the Department.	7 *
3.	The number of officers who had their conviction expunged between 1990 and 1997.	1
4.	The number of officers with convictions who are still on the Department.	7 *
5.	The number of officers who had convictions expunged and are still on the Department.	1
6.	The number of officers who had their weapons taken away due to the federal domestic violence law.	7 **

\* This number includes the one officer in Item 3 who had his conviction set aside under Penal Code Section 1203.4 (Discharged petitioner).

\*\* This number includes one officer who did not have a domestic violence conviction, but is subject to the federal law due to a current Domestic Violence Restraining Order.

**D. DEPARTMENT GUIDE TO DISCIPLINE**

The Department Guide to Discipline was approved by the Police Commission in its open session on June 24, 1997. The purpose of the Disciplinary Guide is to objectify ranges of discipline for misconduct committed by employees. In that way, adjudicators will be more fairly and consistently able to select appropriate discipline.

The Disciplinary Guide establishes the following punishment ranges for domestic violence-related offenses:

<b><u>OFFENSE</u></b>	<b>1st</b>	<b>2nd</b>	<b>3rd</b>
<b>Commit a felonious act of domestic violence</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>Commit a high grade misdemeanor</b>	<b>B-E</b>	<b>D-E</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>Commit a misdemeanor</b>	<b>A-E</b>	<b>A-E</b>	<b>B-E</b>
<b>Use physical force during domestic violence incident</b>	<b>A-E</b>	<b>C-E</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>Cause police to respond to domestic violence incident</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Violate a domestic violence restraining order</b>	<b>A-C</b>	<b>B-E</b>	<b>E</b>
<b>Fail to comply with a court order</b>	<b>A-B</b>	<b>B-C</b>	<b>C-E</b>

**Key:**

- A: Written penalty through 4 days suspension**
- B: 5 - 9 days suspension**
- C: 10 - 14 days suspension**
- D: 15 - 22 days suspension**
- E: Board of Rights**

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. ORGANIZATION OF INTERNAL AFFAIRS

1. A specialized unit should be created within Internal Affairs Division with primary responsibility to conduct investigations of Department personnel for domestic violence-related incidents. The head of the unit must be trained in Major Assault Crimes (MAC) investigations. All domestic violence investigations involving employees should be handled by Internal Affairs Division, and not by the accused employee's division of assignment.
2. In order to provide better service to the public and to the Department, Internal Affairs Division should designate an information/research officer. The information/research officer would be responsible for monitoring the progress and status of all active cases so that complainants, commanding officers, and other involved parties can be promptly informed. This officer could also provide investigators and adjudicators with an employee's prior disciplinary history and other factors that may have a bearing on an investigation and subsequent adjudication. Additionally, the information/research officer could monitor the compliance of those Department employees who are "on contract."<sup>39</sup>
3. The Domestic Violence Unit within Internal Affairs Division should continue maintaining the statistics on the domestic violence matrix (Attachment A). In that way the Department will soon be able to analyze a decade of domestic violence statistics.

### B. ARREST

4. A detained Department employee should be treated in the identical manner as a private citizen. In "call out" situations, a crime report should be taken in every instance where a crime is alleged by the complainant or there is evidence that a crime occurred. An arrest should be made in every instance where it is legally mandated and the Department has jurisdiction.

---

<sup>39</sup>

A "contract" is an agreement between the accused employee and the Department for a specified period during which the employee generally agrees to participate in alcohol or domestic violence related counseling and the Department agrees to defer the disciplinary action until the contract has been completed.

5. In every domestic violence incident, a specially trained Internal Affairs Division investigator should either provide telephonic advice or respond to the scene to advise the responding officers. Until this occurs, the Department's domestic violence expert should be consulted.
6. Responding officers should be better informed as to resources available for victims such as counseling and shelters and shall provide victims with the State mandated information available on Department Form 70-15.40.
7. Responding officers should make better use of Emergency Protective Orders (EPO) against Department personnel and obtain an EPO when they believe the victim could be in imminent danger, whether or not the victim gives consent.
8. Responding officers should be particularly attuned when responding to domestic violence incidents to look for potential child abuse.<sup>40</sup>
9. The senior supervisor at the scene of a domestic violence incident should be authorized to approve the booking of a Department employee rather than a bureau commanding officer. The supervisor who approves booking should be named in the police report, which should also include the reasoning regarding the decision to book.

### C. INVESTIGATION

10. Investigations in which the victim recants should nonetheless be vigorously pursued. The Department should institute a "no drop" policy similar to the Los Angeles City Attorney and District Attorney. The "no drop" policy places the burden of going forward on the Department, and removes the ability of the crime victim and/or suspect to influence the decision to proceed with the investigation.
11. Internal Affairs Division personnel do not have a clear understanding of the definition of domestic violence, thus resulting in allegations being mis-classified. Additional training is necessary as to the definition of domestic violence, other crimes commonly associated with domestic violence disputes, and proper response by law enforcement.
12. Internal Affairs Division should develop a checklist for use during the investigation and adjudication of domestic violence cases to ensure completeness and uniformity. Investigators should consider videotaping the scene and the victim's injuries.

---

<sup>40</sup> Research has found that there is a high correlation between domestic violence committed against adults and child victims within the same family. The statistics show that approximately 50% of children present in domestic violence environments are themselves victims of child abuse.

13. Internal Affairs investigators should be required to obtain the prior disciplinary history of any employee whose case they are investigating and do a computer inquiry to determine whether any prior crime reports have been taken naming the employee. If the employee has been accused in a prior instance of domestic violence, a summary of the circumstances of each prior investigation should be included in the investigator's case notes so that the history may be reviewed by the adjudicator.
14. In cases where the victim has recanted, investigators should consider interviewing domestic violence experts, particularly about "battered women's syndrome"; in Board of Rights hearings where the victim has recanted, testimony should be elicited from the Department's domestic violence experts.

**D. ADJUDICATION**

15. Arbitrary and general terms such as "this act of defiance" should be avoided. Phrases such as "the victim refused to prosecute" or "the victim recanted" should be replaced with a specific description of the words and emotional state of the victim.
16. Adjudicators who themselves have been subjects of sustained domestic violence allegations or domestic violence victims within recent years should be required to recuse themselves from adjudicating such investigations or sitting on Boards of Rights. Neither should they be allowed to work in Internal Affairs Division.
17. A finding of "unfounded" should be carefully evaluated in instances where a complainant recants the original allegation. A finding of "not resolved" or "sustained" may be more appropriate, particularly if there is corroborative evidence.
18. Adjudicators should pay particular attention to extrinsic evidence in investigations where the victim has recanted: transcript of 911 tape; pictures of injuries; fresh complaint made to friend or neighbor; spontaneous statements of the victim and accused made to the first law enforcement responders; and, evidence of violence in the home such as broken dishes, furniture, and doors.
19. All command staff adjudicating domestic violence cases should be extensively trained in domestic violence concepts such as the "cycle of violence" and other control issues.
20. Allegations of domestic violence should be separated from other unrelated charges and clearly addressed when heard before a Board of Rights. Board members should articulate their rationale in support of findings and assign proportionate penalties for each guilty charge.

21. In adjudicating investigations where alcohol was a factor, adjudicators should consider recommending alcohol/domestic violence contracts regardless whether abuse of alcohol is charged as a separate allegation.

**E. REFERRAL TO PROSECUTING AGENCIES**

22. Every domestic violence investigation with prima facie evidence of criminal misconduct should **immediately** be presented to the appropriate prosecuting agency once the criminal portion of the investigation has been concluded. Specialized domestic violence investigators must be trained to promptly and thoroughly complete domestic violence investigations. Cases are now generally presented at the **end** of the investigation which can take up to one year. Misdemeanor domestic violence prosecutions have a one-year statute of limitations.
23. The information/research officer, should follow-up on **all** cases referred to the District Attorney or City Attorney. No follow-up system currently exists.
24. A clear policy must be drafted regarding the criteria for presenting cases for prosecutorial review. This policy should reflect the same policy used for filing against citizens.
25. The hand-written log book maintained at Internal Affairs Division which records referrals to prosecuting agencies should be computerized and maintained as part of the domestic violence matrix as described in Recommendation Number 3.

**F. DISCIPLINE**

26. The Department should consider the inclusion of "contracts" in all sustained complaints involving domestic violence which should include, but not limited to, mandated counseling.
27. In serious cases of domestic violence the Department should recognize that an employee who is unable to police himself/herself should not be allowed to police others. Employees who have become a liability to the Department should be terminated.
28. The suspensions imposed for sustained and repeated acts of domestic violence have been exceedingly light and should be increased commensurate with the seriousness of any assaultive crime.

### **G. RECORD-KEEPING**

29. A special order should be issued mandating that sustained acts of misconduct be properly documented in the performance evaluation for the corresponding rating period. Evaluating supervisors should be told that they will be held accountable through the disciplinary process if they prepare a performance evaluation which omits available and relevant disciplinary information. Before an evaluation may be signed off, the commanding officer must review it to ensure that available disciplinary information has been recorded. The Bureau of Special Investigations should audit performance evaluations annually and make such audits available to the OIG.
30. A data base should be developed which captures **all** allegations of misconduct alleged against employees, regardless whether they have been sustained. This would enable a "pattern of conduct" to be more readily recognized.
31. Separate statistics should be maintained for all sustained domestic violence related violations, not only the most serious allegation. Without such a system, domestic violence allegations may not be captured in statistical reports.
32. Internal Affairs Division should require there be one document in the same location within each investigation, which captures the following: date of incident, Internal Affairs number, Police Report Incident number, when, by whom and to whom the case was presented to at the prosecuting agency, what resulted from the presentation, criminal case number, information regarding court ordered counseling, date referred to batterer's program, notification to complainant as to status of case, names of investigators, history of administrative action, and results of investigation.

### **H. EARLY DETECTION**

33. Before any meaningful intervention program can take place, Department leaders must acknowledge the existence of the problem. Police managers must educate all employees and themselves about the nature of domestic violence, emphasizing detection and encouraging intervention.
34. First-line supervisors must be trained to look for indicators of employee domestic violence and be prepared to guide employees toward an appropriate intervention program. For example, some symptoms of potential abuse which may be observed by supervisors are: jealousy, controlling behavior, unrealistic expectations, isolation, blaming others for their feelings and/or problems, hypersensitivity, Jekyll and Hyde personality, history of battering, threats of violence, breaking or striking objects, or use of force during an argument.

35. Managers should refer employees for treatment to available programs as soon as they become aware of an alleged episode of physical aggression by a Department employee. The Department should develop a batterers' program under the direction of the Behavioral Science Services Section.
36. Employees who have been disciplined for domestic violence should meet with their commanding officer before returning to work.
37. Victims of domestic violence by Department employees should be referred to counseling.

#### **I. ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

38. The Department should institute better controls on sustained complaints and all personnel files. The Task Force was unable to analyze two investigations because they were missing from personnel files. The Department should establish a method of storing duplicate copies of sustained complaints.
39. The Department should institute a clear policy regarding the promotion and transfer of employees who have sustained allegations of misconduct.
40. The Department should continue extensive training on the "primary aggressor" concept to make sure that it is being correctly applied by field officers and Internal Affairs Division investigators.
41. Behavioral Science Services Section should conduct a study to determine the underlying causes for the disparity in the high proportion of Hispanic and Black employees accused of domestic violence.
42. A follow-up letter should be sent to neighboring counties who received Chief Williams' letter of November 19, 1996, to ensure that the Department's request for notification if its employees are involved in domestic violence incidents is being accommodated.
43. Legal Affairs Division should publish written guidelines regarding the definition it is utilizing to determine whether an employee falls within the guidelines of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1996.
44. The Department should undertake a more detailed study to determine the reason for the large disparity in rates of sustained allegations between civilians and sworn personnel.
45. The Department should undertake a more detailed study to determine the reason for the disparity in rates of sustained allegations between male and female employees.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The issue of domestic violence is much more visible today than it has been in the past. This increased visibility has coincided with a shift in the public's attitude and legislative changes toward domestic violence. The public has recognized that domestic violence is more than a family issue. It is a criminal act that must be as vigorously investigated and prosecuted as any other crime.<sup>41</sup>

Traditionally, as demonstrated through the statistics in this report, law enforcement agencies have "gone easy" when addressing domestic violence committed by law enforcement personnel. Some of the reasons for laxity in pursuing Department personnel have applied equally to lay investigations. Victims are often reluctant to pursue their assailants due to loyalty to or dependence upon the abuser. However, with respect to the public, prosecution takes place regardless of the victim's wishes.

Law enforcement personnel who are the victims of domestic violence have unique difficulties. Typically, they may be reluctant to report incidents viewed by their peers as a demonstration of physical weakness. Department employees and those who are not members of the Department who become victims are often acutely aware of their spouse's well-respected status on the Department. Hence, they may believe that their allegations may not be taken seriously due to documented past practices of the Department. Department employees as well as involved parties also have a strong financial incentive not to cooperate in a domestic violence investigation.

The Department's aggressive and innovative investigations of domestic violence committed by members of the public must be extended to its own personnel. Department investigations must be vigorously pursued even if the victim wants to drop any administrative or criminal charges. Policies and procedures of the Department in addressing this issue must be developed and implemented, using the recommendations contained within this report as a starting point.

The Department's cooperation with the OIG's investigation and acceptance of our systemic recommendations should be lauded. The agreement by Chief Lewis to initiate a specialized domestic violence unit within Internal Affairs Division is an important first step. The OIG is prepared to assist the Department in any way to move forward on this serious issue.

---

<sup>41</sup> Domestic Violence is the major cause of injury to women between 15 and 44, a major cause of female homicide, a contributing cause of suicide, and a leading cause of birth defects.

## VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was completed less than 60 days from the date the Task Force began working on May 19, 1997. The project could not have been accomplished without the incredibly dedicated and industrious efforts of the five loaned Task Force personnel and the entire permanent staff of the Office of the Inspector General, all of whose names appear on the cover of this report.

Department personnel from other units contributed their already stretched time and energy to answering the Task Force's endless questions and requests for data. For those efforts we would like to publicly thank:

### **POLICE DEPARTMENT**

Katrina Campbell, Police Officer III  
C. L. Carter, Captain II  
Connie Castruita, Detective III  
Debby Dresser, Police Officer III  
Gary Hansen, Police Sergeant II (retired)  
Susan Hubenthal, Senior Clerk Steno  
Lorraine Jordane, Police Officer II  
Rita Knecht, Lieutenant II  
Leslie Lutz, Lieutenant II  
Sandra Jo MacArthur, Sergeant II  
Raymond Mark, Warehouse Worker I  
James McMurray, Commander  
Helen Mondy, Principal Clerk Police III  
Chandra Mosely, Principal Clerk Police III  
Brenda O'Brien, Management Analyst II  
Larry Shelley, Lieutenant II  
Rick Smith, Lieutenant II  
JoAnn Stout, Police Officer II  
Christopher Tan, Police Officer II  
Pete Trilling, Lieutenant II  
Phil Trotter, Sergeant II  
Paul Vernon, Sergeant II  
Ramona Voge, Chief Clerk Police II  
Cliff Weiss, Senior Management Analyst II  
John White, Deputy Chief (retired)  
Timothy Williams, Detective III  
Margaret York, Captain III

Legal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Legal Affairs Division  
Training Division  
  
Internal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Employee Relations Administration  
Medical Liaison Section  
Training Division  
Personnel Division  
Operations-Headquarters Bureau  
Personnel Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Legal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Legal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Internal Affairs Division  
Records and Identification Division  
Police Commission  
  
Operations-Headquarters Bureau  
Internal Affairs Division

**LOS ANGELES CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE**

Alana Bowman	Assistant City Attorney
Maureen Siegel	Assistant City Attorney
G. Daniel Woodard	Assistant City Attorney

**MAYOR'S DOMESTIC VIOLENCE TASK FORCE**

Marcia Kellotat  
Anne Marie Lardeau  
Patricia Prickett

**LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE**

Lydia Bodin	Deputy District Attorney
Scott Gordon	Special Assistant to the District Attorney
Marlene Sanchez	Deputy District Attorney
Donna Wills	Head Deputy District Attorney

**ADDITIONAL CONSULTANTS**

Merrick Bobb	Special Counsel
Karen Andres	Attorney

We would also like to express our appreciation to the commanding officers of the following divisions for their willing cooperation in allowing the loan of their personnel to the Task Force: Communications Division; Internal Affairs Division; South Traffic Division; Southeast Area; and Southwest Area.