



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

April 6, 2022

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, January 1, 2022 through March 31, 2022, the Military Department Inspector General completed one investigation, report enclosed. The Military Department Inspector General completed three assistance cases.

The Office of the Military Department Inspector General has eight 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

Enclosure

**Report of the Results of Investigation  
MDIG-21-019**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** The Adjutant General (TAG) Directive, dated 25 May 2021, to investigate allegations of Whistle Blower Reprisal (WBR) and improprieties by State Active Duty (SAD) officials.
2. **COMPLAINANT STATUS:** SAD Servicemember, SSgt
3. **ALLEGATIONS:**
  - a. A SAD 1LT reprised against a SAD SSgt by giving her a Developmental Counseling Statement that initiated a Commander Inquiry for misconduct and inappropriate behavior in violations of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
  - b. A SAD 1LT reprised against a SAD SSgt by submitting a Proposed Disciplinary Action (PDA) for separation from SAD in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
  - c. A SAD SGT reprised against a SAD SSgt by influencing the PDA for separation from SAD in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:** A SAD SSgt alleged that she was reprised against for making protected communications (PCs) to an SAD 1LT and a SAD SGT. This office determined that the unfavorable personnel actions (UPAs) that resulted in the SAD SSgt's separation from SAD had an independent basis. This office determined that the preponderance of credible evidence did **NOT SUBSTANTIATE** the allegations that a SAD 1LT or SGT reprised against a SAD SSgt for making PC(s).