



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

October 5, 2020

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 and assistance cases completed by the Inspector General's office.

This reporting quarter, July 1, 2020 through September 30, 2020, the Military Department Inspector General completed one investigation; the Report of Results of the Investigation is enclosed. The Military Department Inspector General completed eleven assistance cases.

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

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

Sincerely,

Saul Rangel
Colonel (CA)
Military Department Inspector General

Enclosure

California Military Department Inspector General

**Report of the Results of Investigation
MDIG-20-022**

1. **PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY:** TAG Directive, dated 2 April 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
3. **ALLEGATIONS:**
 - a. A Title 32 Technician Colonel (Col) reprised against a Title 32 Technician Captain (Capt) by detailing him out of his technician position in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
 - b. A Title 32 Technician Col reprised against a Title 32 Technician Capt by removing him from the technician chain of command, via the emailed organizational chart in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
 - c. A Title 32 Technician Col reprised against a Title 32 Technician Capt by issuing a technician No Contact Order in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
 - d. A Title 32 Technician Col reprised against a Title 32 Technician Capt by issuing a 3 day technician suspension in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**
 - e. A Title 32 Technician Lieutenant Colonel (LtCol) reprised against a Title 32 Technician Capt by giving him a proposed 10-day technician suspension in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
 - f. A Title 32 Technician LtCol reprised against a Title 32 Technician Capt by detailing him out of his technician position in violation of CMVC 56 was **not substantiated**.
4. **SUMMARY AND FINDINGS:** This office determined the following: 1) insufficient evidence exist to confirm the Capt's alleged protected communication(s) (PC(s)), as required by 10 U.S.C. 1034 to substantiate WBR; 2) the Unfavorable Personnel Actions that the complainant alleges were a result of PC(s) he made to the Col and/or LtCol would have likely occurred absent the PC(s). This office determined that the preponderance of the credible evidence did NOT SUBSTANTIATED the allegations that the Col or LtCol reprised against the Capt for making PC(s).