



MILITARY DEPARTMENT  
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL  
9800 Goethe Road  
Sacramento, California 95827-3561

January 3, 2023

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 Military and Veterans Affairs Committee

Honorable James Ramos, Chair, Assembly Military and Veterans Affairs Committee

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

This reporting quarter, October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022, the Military Department Inspector General completed two investigations, reports enclosed. The Military Department Inspector General completed three assistance cases.

The Office of the Military Department Inspector General has 12 open assistance cases and two open investigations.

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

Sincerely,

Saul Rangel  
Colonel (CA)  
Military Department Inspector General

**Report of the Results of Investigation  
CMD-IG-23-002**

**1. PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** The California Military Department Inspector General (CMD-IG) Office received a complaint regarding a State Active Duty (SAD) Brigadier General (BG) (CA), on or around (o/a) 18 August 2022. The complainant alleged an SAD BG (CA) mistreated his subordinate, a Colonel (COL) on SAD. The Office of The Adjutant General (TAG) directed the CMD-IG to investigate and report on the allegation that an SAD BG (CA) mistreated his subordinate.

**2. COMPLAINANT STATUS:** COL, SAD

**3. ALLEGATION:** Determine whether o/a 17 August 2022, a SAD BG (CA) treatment of a SAD COL was in violation of AR 600-20 (Command Policy).

**4. SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:**

**ALLEGATION:** This office determined that the allegations that a SAD BG (CA) mistreated a SAD COL was substantiated. This office determined that o/a 17 August 2022, a SAD BG (CA) did not treat a SAD COL with dignity and respect in violation of AR 600-20, para 1-6c. Further, this office determined that the SAD BG's (CA) behavior o/a 17 August 2022 did not foster a positive command climate in violation of AR 600-20, para 1-6c (1).

**Report of the Results of Investigation  
CMD-22-018**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** The Adjutant General (TAG) Directive, dated 31 May 2022, to investigate allegations of Whistle Blower Reprisal (WBR) and improprieties by State Civil Service (SCS) Officials.

2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS:** SCS Employee

3. **ALLEGATIONS:**

a. Determine whether a SCS employee (1) improperly reprised against the complainant for making PCs by taking the following action, RE: Notification of Potential Unlawful Appointment in violation of CMVC 56.

b. Determine whether a SCS employee (2) improperly reprised against the complainant for making PCs by influencing the following action, RE: Notification of Potential Unlawful Appointment in violation of CMVC 56.

4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:**

This office investigated the complainant's allegations that she was reprised against for making PCs to her Chain of Command, SCS employee (1) and SCS employee (2). This office determined that the unfavorable personnel action (UPA) that resulted in the complainant's determination for unlawful appointment had an independent basis. Evidence supports that the unlawful appointment was discovered because the complainant was applying for various positions with other State agencies; those agencies sent State Personnel an A01 check (request for records check) that resulted in the error (unlawful appointment) being identified.

Evidence further supports that both SCS employee (1) and SCS employee (2) had a requirement to report any potential unlawful appointments to Cal HR. SCS employee (1) and SCS employee (2) both testified that the CMD is a delegated department by CAL HR and if they do not report unlawful actions after discovery the department could lose its delegation. This testimony is supported by the signed delegation agreements between CalHr and CMD.

This office determined that the preponderance of credible evidence did NOT SUBSTANTIATE the allegations that SCS employee (1) or SCS employee (2) reprised against the complainant for making a PC.