



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

July 10, 2023

Office of the Military Department Inspector General

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

Honorable Robert Rivas, Speaker of the Assembly

Honorable Bob Archuleta, Chair, Senate Military and Veterans Affairs Committee

Honorable Pilar Schiavo, 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, April 1, 2023, through June 30, 2023, the Military Department Inspector General completed three (3) investigations, reports enclosed. The Military Department Inspector General completed 9 assistance cases.

The Office of the Military Department Inspector General has five (5) open assistance cases and no open investigations.

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

Sincerely,

Julian H. Bond
Colonel (CA)
Inspector General

Enclosure

**REDACTED REPORT OF RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION
CMD-IG-23-006**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY**: On or around 12 October 2022, the California Military Department IG (CMD-IG) received allegations of Whistle Blower Reprisal (WBR) from a SSG on State Active Duty (SAD). On 9 November 2022, the CMD-IG was directed by The Acting, Adjutant General (TAG) to investigate allegation(s) of WBR.

2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS**: SSG/SAD

3. **ALLEGATION**: This office investigated a LTC and a SFC on SAD for the alleged reprisal for the complainant for making protected communications (PCs) to the chain of command (CoC) and the Inspector General (IG). Below are the specific allegations investigated by this office:

a. Determine whether a LTC reprised against a SSG by detailing the member to another section in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.

b. Determine whether a SFC reprised against a SSG by influencing a detail of the member to another section in violation of CMVC 56 was **substantiated**.

c. Determine whether a LTC reprised against a SSG by initiating (threatening) a Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in violation of CMVC 56 was **substantiated**.

d. Determine whether a SFC reprised against a SSG by influencing a PIP in violation of CMVC 56 was **substantiated**.

e. Determine whether a LTC reprised against a SSG by initiating (threatening) a Proposed Disciplinary Action (PDA) in violation of CMVC 56 **substantiated**.

f. Determine whether a SFC reprised against a SSG by influencing a PDA in violation of CMVC 56 **substantiated**.

4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS**: The complainant alleged reprisal for making PCs to the CoC and the IG. This office determined that the unfavorable personnel actions (UPAs) taken and threatened to be taken against the complainant were in reprisal for PCs made to the CoC and the IG.

This office determined that a SFC influenced the initial UPA that resulted in the complainant being detailed from her position to another section. This office determined that the LTC initially depended heavily on information received from the SFC. This office determined by preponderance of credible evidence that the LTC DID NOT detail the complainant in reprisal for making a PC. This office further determined that the preponderance of credible evidence DID substantiate the allegation that a SFC influenced the detail action on the complainant in reprisal for her making a PC.

This office also determined that by preponderance of credible evidence that the LTC and SFC threatened to take a PIP and PDA on the complainant in reprisal for her making a PC.

**REDACTED REPORT OF RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION
CMD-IG-23-009**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** The California Military Department Inspector General (CMD-IG) Office received a complaint from a SSG on or around (o/a) 15 October 2022. Complainant alleges that a LTC, requested to follow the complainant's personal social media account. On 19 October 2022, MG Matthew Beevers, Acting Adjutant General, directed the CMD-IG to investigate and report on the allegation that a LTC violated the complainant's private and civil liberties. The specific allegation is listed below:
2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS:** SSG/SAD
3. **ALLEGATION:** Determine whether a LTC violated the complainant's private and civil liberties in violation of AR 25-22, para 1-12 was **not substantiated**.
4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:** Complainant did not provide evidence that a LTC attempted to request to follow her on social media. This office found a lack of evidence to substantiate the allegation that the LTC violated the complainant's civil liberties if he attempted to access her social media. This office did determine that the LTC was concerned regarding the complainant's social media post.

Although, this report did not substantiate the allegation on the LTC, we did find that the LTC should have conducted an investigation/inquiry into the social media post to determine if the complainant's post did violate a regulation/policy, especially considering the use of the information to support a disciplinary action on the complainant.

**REDACTED REPORT OF RESULTS OF INVESTIGATION
CMD-IG-23-014**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY**: The California Military Department Inspector General (CMD-IG) office received an Inspector General Request for Assistance (IGAR) dated 20 September 2022. The IGAR contained multiple issues pertaining to a ChalleNGe academy. During the course of an assistance inquiry this office uncovered the following: That a State Active Duty (SAD) SSG was temporarily detailed to another ChalleNGe Academy and that detail did not comply with CMD Regulation 600-1. On 2 November 2022, Acting Adjutant General, MG Matthew Beevers directed the CMD-IG to investigate and report on the allegation that a SAD LTC wrote a false official statement regarding the detail.
2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS**: Anonymous
3. **ALLEGATION**: Determine whether a LTC wrote a false statement(s) in violation of UCMJ 107 was **not substantiated**.
4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS**: This office determined that based on witness statements, the justification outlined in the memorandums dated 7 and 12 October 2022, Subject, Temporary Detail Assignment for a SSG, signed by the LTC were inaccurate. This office further determined that there was insufficient evidence that the LTC knew the justification for temporary detail on the SSG was inaccurate. This office determined that the LTC did not have an intent to deceive when the LTC signed the detail memorandums.