



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

April 7, 2021

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 Jacqui Irwin, 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, January 1, 2021 through March 31, 2021, the Military Department Inspector General completed one investigation; the Report of Results of the Investigation is enclosed. The Military Department Inspector General completed five assistance cases.

The Office of the Military Department Inspector General has five open assistance cases.

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

Enclosure

Report of the Results of Investigation MDIG-21-005

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** TAG Directive, dated 5 November 2020, to investigate allegations of Whistle Blower Reprisal (WBR) and improprieties by Title 32 Technician officials.

2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS:** Air National Guard dual status Servicemember, Title 32 Technician, Technical Sergeant (TSgt)

3. **ALLEGATIONS:**
 - a. A Title 32 Technician Colonel (Col) reprised against a Title 32 Technician (TSgt) by giving him an Original Decision for Adverse Action that upheld a 2 day suspension in violations of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.

 - b. A Title 32 Technician Chief Master Sergeant (CMSgt) reprised against a Title 32 Technician (TSgt) by giving him a proposed 2 day technician suspension in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.

4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:** This office determined that the preponderance evidence indicates that the unfavorable personnel action (2 day technician suspension) that the complainant alleges was a result of protected communications (PCs) he made to the CMSgt would have likely occurred absent the PC(s). This office determined that the preponderance of the credible evidence did **NOT SUBSTANTIATE** the allegations that the Col or CMSgt reprised against the TSgt for making PC(s).