
From: Darcy Segura <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 8:49 AM
To: Police Commission
Subject: Public Comment for 2/24/26

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Members of the Los Angeles Police Commission,

I am writing to express serious concern regarding recent public warnings issued by the Los Angeles Police Department stating that students, parents, and community members could face criminal consequences for participating in student walkouts.

The message conveyed was clear: exercise your voice, and you may face legal liability.

This deserves scrutiny.

In Los Angeles, the public is frequently told that police must rely on discretion — that resources are limited and that not every violation rises to the level of enforcement. At the same time, the Los Angeles Unified School District has long treated student walkouts primarily as a matter for school discipline, not criminal enforcement, unless there is a significant threat to public safety. This makes recent public statements even more troubling in light of widely reported remarks by Jim McDonnell, Chief of the Los Angeles Police Department, indicating that the department would not prioritize enforcement of a California law requiring law enforcement officers, including federal agents such as those from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, to clearly identify themselves.

When discretion is used to decline enforcement in some cases, but the full weight of potential criminal consequences is emphasized in response to students engaging in civic protest, it raises serious questions about consistency, priorities, and whose actions are deemed worthy of enforcement.

When students organize peacefully and publicly to express their views, the tone shifts dramatically. The emphasis is no longer on discretion, but on criminal consequences. The full weight of the law is invoked — not in response to violence, but in anticipation of student civic expression.

This raises a fundamental question: when is the law treated as a tool for public safety, and when is it used as a warning to discourage participation?

Students who walk out are not acting out of convenience. They are acting out of conscience. They are engaging in the very kind of civic participation that our institutions claim to value and encourage.

When law enforcement responds to that participation primarily with warnings of prosecution, it creates the appearance of intimidation rather than protection. That perception carries real consequences. It

erodes trust. It undermines legitimacy. And it risks teaching young people that their voices are something to be managed rather than heard.

As the civilian oversight body responsible for ensuring accountability, transparency, and alignment with the public interest, I urge the Commission to review these statements and seek clear answers:

What specific enforcement actions are being contemplated?

What policies guided the decision to issue these warnings?

And how does this approach serve the Commission's mandate to protect both public safety and public trust?

In a democratic society, the appropriate response to student civic engagement is not intimidation.

It is reflection and accountability.

Respectfully,

Respectfully,

Darcy Segura

President

73rd & 74th Street Block Club

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: Voices For LAPD <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 4:03 PM
To: Police Commission
Subject: BOPC 2-24-26

ATTENTION: This email originated outside of LAPD. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear LAPD Police Commissioners, Chief Jim McDonnell, and the Los Angeles Community,

During the Police Commission meeting on Tuesday, January 27th, Jamie from the California Post asked Chief McDonnell for his reaction to the chaos that transpired during the session. Chief McDonnell expressed frustration with the weekly disruptions and vile conduct, noting that such behavior has a chilling effect on community members who wish to be heard but are intimidated by agitators. He stated, "The big frustration is not being able to do anything about it. We're told by legal counsel that they're protected by the First Amendment."

Anyone who attends these meetings, whether in person or virtually, has witnessed these sustained disruptions. Frequently, the Commission is forced to halt proceedings or clear the room entirely. This behavior directly infringes upon the rights of residents to participate in public comment.

I have previously addressed these repeated disruptions and called for accountability. While Chief McDonnell accurately described the problem, his comment regarding legal counsel raises a critical question: Who is advising the Chief that these actions are protected by the First Amendment?

California Penal Code Section 403 clearly applies to the intentional disruption of public meetings and should be enforced. While everyone has a right to be heard during public comment, no one has the right to interfere with the ability of others to express their thoughts.

We deserve Police Commission meetings that are free from intimidation and violence. Being escorted from the room is an insufficient consequence for repeat offenders. There must be meaningful enforcement of 403 PC to protect the constitutional rights of all residents. The public is watching to see if our local government will protect free speech or allow it to be usurped by a disruptive few.

Respectfully,

Voices For LAPD