



MILITARY DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
9800 Goethe Road - P.O. Box 269101
Sacramento, California 95826-9101

January 2, 2019

Office of the Military Department Inspector General

Honorable Toni G. Atkins, President pro Tempore of the Senate

Honorable Anthony Rendon, Speaker of the Assembly

Honorable Bob Archuleta, Chair, Senate Veterans Affairs Committee

Honorable Jacqui Irwin, Chair, Assembly Veterans Affairs Committee

Pursuant to Military and Veterans Code section 55, this letter constitutes the Military Department Inspector General's quarterly report regarding investigations completed by the Inspector General's office.

This reporting quarter, October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018, the Military Department Inspector General completed one investigation. Enclosed is the Report of Results of Investigation. The Military Department Inspector General completed five assistance cases.

The Office of the Military Department Inspector General has three open assistance cases and one open investigation.

Please direct any questions or comments concerning this quarterly report to the Military Department Inspector General at (916) 854-3483.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Saul Rangel", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Saul Rangel
Colonel (CA)
Military Department Inspector General

Enclosure

**REPORT OF THE RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION
MDIG-17-001**

1. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:

a. To conduct an investigation into the allegations of Whistleblower Reprisal (WBR) in accordance with (IAW) the California Military Veterans Code (CMVC) 56 "California Military Whistle Blower Protection Act".

b. TAG Directive, dated 1 May 2017, to investigate alleged improprieties and allegations of whistle blower reprisal by Army officials.

2. COMPLAINANT STATUS: California Military Department (CMD) State Active Duty (SAD) Servicemember

3. ALLEGATIONS:

a. An SAD supervisor improperly reprised against a SAD Servicemember by issuing a Memorandum, SUBJECT: Administrative Leave in violation of the CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.

b. An SAD Supervisor improperly reprised against a SAD Servicemember by placing her on administrative leave pending a command directed detail assignment in violation of CMVC 56, CMD 600-1, chapter 4-2 was **not substantiated**.

c. An SAD Supervisor improperly reprised against a SAD Servicemember by not renewing her SAD orders in violation of CMVC 56 and CMD 600-1, chapter 4-7 was **not substantiated**.

4. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS: The preponderance of the evidence indicates that the SAD Supervisor, **did not** reprise against the SAD Servicemember for a protected communication.