

---

**From:** Paul Hennessy <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 1, 2026 7:50 AM  
**To:** Police Commission  
**Cc:** cityatty.help@lacity.org; communityrelationsoig@lacity.org  
**Subject:** Public Comment: Terminate All Partnerships With Flock Safety

**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.**

To the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners:

As a citizen of LA, I demand the Los Angeles Police Department terminate the use of the Flock “Safety” ALPR system to monitor the people of this city.

Flock doesn’t just capture license plates. Flock’s ALPRs capture people’s movement, location, date, time, images of drivers and passengers, dog walkers, and more. You know this and I disapprove of it being used to spy on people Flock is an expansion of the mass surveillance state. Flock weaponizes our movement data to expand the presumption of guilt.

This will no doubt be used as a weapon against the people. Automatic License Plate Readers cannot be reformed with better privacy policies or data-sharing guardrails. It will no doubt be used for Trump administration tactics of exerting power of people. They have to be abolished.

ALPR cameras and surveillance technology do not keep us safe. They punish people, make mistakes, and can be taken to court. Angelenos need investment in housing, public health, infrastructure and services that meet our basic needs. We don’t need more surveillance technology.

Tell LAPD to terminate all partnerships with Flock immediately. The Los Angeles Police Department must terminate all partnerships with Flock “Safety.”

I demand that LAPD, the Board of Police Commissioners, the LA City Council, and the Mayor do not enter into any new partnerships with other ALPR companies (Axon, Vigilant Solutions, etc.).

-Paul

---

**From:** Joni Fullard <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Sunday, May 3, 2026 5:47 PM  
**To:** Police Commission  
**Cc:** OIG Complaint  
**Subject:** Addendum 2 to March 2, 2026 Public Comment — 63-Day Institutional Breakdown — Fullard  
**Attachments:** April 6, 2026 Submission Timestamp.png; Executive Director Sibley's April 20 letter.jpg; Fullard\_Commission\_Addendum2\_63Day\_2026-05-03.pdf

**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.**

President Shields and Members of the Police Commission,

Please find attached Addendum 2 to my March 2, 2026 public comment. This addendum documents 63 days of institutional failure, multiple legal violations, censorship of public comment, and Executive Director Sibley's provably false justification for that censorship. I am submitting this as public comment for the May 5, 2026 Commission meeting and request that it be posted to the public comments section of the meeting materials, pursuant to the Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54954.3), and distributed to all Commissioners. This submission is being sent on May 3, 2026, well in advance of any submission deadline for the May 5 meeting.

Respectfully,  
Syreeta Joni Fullard  
[REDACTED]

## ADDENDUM 2 TO MARCH 2, 2026 PUBLIC COMMENT

Date: May 3, 2026

TO: Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners

President Rasha Geroges Shields

Vice President Dr. Daniel K. Tabor

Commissioners: Fabian Garcia, Teresa Sanchez-Gordon, Jeff E. Skobin

Executive Director Django Sibley

CC: Office of the Inspector General

Inspector General Matthew J. Barragan

Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu

RE: Addendum 2 — 63-Day Institutional Breakdown Spanning Two Commission Presidencies

President Shields and Members of the Police Commission,

Sixty-three days have passed since my March 2, 2026 public comment submission requesting independent civilian oversight of LAPD misconduct. The institutional failures documented in this addendum occurred under former President Teresa Sanchez-Gordon's leadership and have continued under President Rasha Geroges Shields' leadership, demonstrating systematic rather than individual dysfunction.

As of today, May 3, 2026, neither the Commission nor the Office of the Inspector General has provided substantive oversight or response, despite explicit requests for response within specified timeframes. This failure is not merely administrative oversight—it is evidence of the very institutional obstruction I documented in my original submission.

### TIMELINE OF INSTITUTIONAL FAILURES

March 2, 2026: I submitted public comment requesting independent civilian oversight of LAPD harassment, retaliation, and institutional misconduct. The Commission acknowledged receipt and referred the matter to the Inspector General without independent review.

March 2, 2026 (same day): Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu forwarded my complaint to LAPD Internal Affairs—routing my complaint about LAPD's failures back to LAPD itself for self-investigation.

March 3, 2026: I objected that LAPD investigating itself defeats the purpose of civilian oversight and requested a 14-day response from the Inspector General. No response was received.

March 17, 2026: The 14-day deadline passed with no response.

March 30, 2026: I sent a follow-up documenting 27 days of non-response and requested a 7-day response. No response was received.

April 1, 2026: The 30-day deadline from my original submission passed with no substantive oversight.

April 6, 2026: I submitted Addendum 1 documenting 35 days of oversight failure and requested a substantive response within 14 days. This addendum was submitted via email to [policecommission@lapd.online](mailto:policecommission@lapd.online) at 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time) on April 6, 2026, for the April 7, 2026 Commission meeting. I explicitly requested posting to the public record pursuant to the Brown Act (Gov. Code § 54954.3).

April 7, 2026: The Commission meeting occurred. Only two public comments were posted to the public record. My April 6 addendum was not posted.

April 8, 2026: I sent a letter to the Commission requesting explanation for the failure to post my public comment and requesting a 7-day response.

April 14, 2026: Commission elected new leadership. Rasha Gerges Shields became President, replacing Teresa Sanchez-Gordon.

April 15, 2026: The 7-day deadline from my April 8 letter passed with no response.

April 20, 2026: The 14-day deadline from my April 6 addendum passed with no response. On this same day, Executive Director Django Sibley sent a letter claiming my April 6 addendum "did not meet the submission procedure" because materials "must be received by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled meeting."

April 20, 2026: I submitted a California Public Records Act request seeking all correspondence I submitted to the Commission, all internal communications about my submissions, all responses, and Commission policies on posting public comments. The 10-day response deadline under Government Code § 6253(c) was April 30, 2026.

April 30, 2026: The CPRA 10-day response deadline passed with no response.

May 3, 2026 (today): Sixty-three days since original submission. No substantive oversight provided at any level. Multiple legal deadlines violated. CPRA request ignored.

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S PROVABLY FALSE JUSTIFICATION FOR CENSORSHIP

On April 20, 2026—twelve days after I requested explanation for the failure to post my April 6 addendum—Executive Director Django Sibley sent a letter claiming my submission "did not meet the submission procedure" because materials "must be received by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled meeting."

This claim is demonstrably false.

I submitted my April 6, 2026 addendum at 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time) on April 6, 2026—eight hours before the 5:00 PM Pacific deadline Executive Director Sibley now claims was required. I have email confirmation showing submission at 12:00 PM Eastern Time (9:00 AM Pacific Time) April 6 for the April 7 meeting.

Executive Director Sibley's April 20 letter is not an explanation—it is a fabricated excuse created twelve days after my request for explanation. When the false justification is easily disproven by my submission timestamp showing submission eight hours before the claimed deadline, it reveals deliberate bad faith rather than administrative error.

The Commission censored my public comment documenting oversight failures, then took twelve days to coordinate a false justification for that censorship. This is not administrative oversight. This is documented institutional dishonesty.

## LEADERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY ACROSS TWO PRESIDENCIES

These failures span two Commission presidencies:

Under President Teresa Sanchez-Gordon (March 2 - April 14, 2026):

- March 2: Acknowledged receipt and deflected complaint to Inspector General without independent review
- March 2: Inspector General immediately forwarded to LAPD Internal Affairs for self-investigation
- March 3 - April 14: Forty-three days of complete non-response to objection
- April 6: My addendum submitted eight hours before deadline
- April 7: My addendum censored from public comments (only two comments posted)
- April 8: Request for explanation ignored

Under President Rasha Gerges Shields (April 14 - present):

- April 20: Executive Director Django Sibley sent provably false excuse for censorship
- April 30: CPRA 10-day response deadline violated
- May 3: Continued complete non-response to all substantive requests

The change in Commission leadership has not changed the pattern of institutional obstruction.

## INDIVIDUAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The following individuals in positions of authority have failed to fulfill their oversight obligations:

Inspector General Matthew J. Barragan:

- Failed to provide independent oversight as statutorily required
- Deferred to LAPD Internal Affairs for self-investigation rather than conducting independent review
- Failed to respond to objections for sixty-three days
- Failed to clarify what civilian oversight authority exists when Commission and Inspector General both defer to LAPD self-investigation

Assistant Inspector General Florence Yu:

- Forwarded my complaint about LAPD to LAPD Internal Affairs on March 2, routing complaint about LAPD failures back to LAPD for self-investigation
- Failed to respond to my March 3 objection for sixty-three days
- Failed to provide any independent review

Former President Teresa Sanchez-Gordon (March 2 - April 14, 2026):

- Presided over Commission during initial deflection to Inspector General
- Presided over forty-three days of non-response to objection
- Presided over censorship of my April 6 addendum
- Failed to ensure independent civilian oversight during her presidency

President Rasha Gerges Shields (April 14 - present):

- Inherited ongoing oversight failure
- Presided over Executive Director's provably false excuse for censorship (April 20)
- Presided over CPRA violation (April 30 deadline missed)
- Continued pattern of non-response under new leadership

These are not abstract institutional failures. These are specific individuals in positions of authority who have failed to fulfill their responsibilities to provide civilian oversight of LAPD.

## LEGAL VIOLATIONS DOCUMENTED

The Commission's sixty-three days of institutional failure constitute multiple violations of law:

### Brown Act Violations (Gov. Code § 54954.3):

The Commission violated the Brown Act's transparency requirements by failing to post my April 6, 2026 public comment to the public record. Only two public comments were posted for the April 7 meeting, raising serious concerns about selective posting practices. The Brown Act requires that written communications submitted to legislative bodies be made available to the public. The Commission's failure to post public comments denies the public access to communications about LAPD oversight and violates transparency requirements.

### California Public Records Act Violations (Gov. Code § 6253(c)):

On April 20, 2026, I submitted a California Public Records Act request seeking all correspondence I submitted to the Commission, all internal communications about my submissions, all responses, and Commission policies on posting public comments. Government Code § 6253(c) requires agencies to respond within ten days. The ten-day deadline was April 30, 2026. As of May 3, 2026, the Commission has not responded to my CPRA request, violating the California Public Records Act.

### Due Process Violations:

The Commission has failed to provide constitutionally required due process by refusing to provide independent oversight for sixty-three days, routing my complaint to LAPD for self-investigation, ignoring objections to that routing, and denying any meaningful review of documented LAPD failures.

### Commission Charter Violations:

The Commission has failed to fulfill its charter obligations to provide independent civilian oversight of LAPD. By immediately deflecting complaints to LAPD for self-investigation and failing to respond to objections for sixty-three days, the Commission has abdicated its statutory oversight duties.

### First Amendment Violations:

The Commission engaged in viewpoint-based censorship by selectively posting only two public comments for the April 7 meeting while suppressing my detailed documentation of oversight failures. This constitutes content-based discrimination in violation of the First Amendment.

## THE PATTERN

My original submission stated: "When the department is allowed to investigate itself, accountability becomes performative." The institutional response over sixty-three days has confirmed this.

The Commission referred my complaint to the Inspector General, who forwarded it to LAPD Internal Affairs—the department I reported. My objection to this self-referential process was ignored for sixty-three days.

When I documented thirty-five days of this failure in an addendum, the Commission censored it from the public record. When I requested explanation, the Executive Director fabricated a provably false excuse about missing a deadline I met by eight hours.

When I requested public records through the California Public Records Act, the Commission violated the ten-day response requirement.

The Commission cannot respond to complaints. The Commission cannot post public comments. The Commission cannot tell the truth about why comments are censored. The Commission cannot comply with public records laws.

This is not civilian oversight. This is institutional obstruction compounded by documented dishonesty.

#### EXTERNAL CONFIRMATION OF SYSTEMATIC OBSTRUCTION

The Commission's obstruction of my complaint is not isolated. Police accountability organizations have recently documented that "under Mayor Bass, the Commission and the City Attorney have been complicit in blocking the people's right to access public records as a matter of LAPD policy."

The same Commission that has failed to provide oversight of my complaint for sixty-three days, that routed my complaint to LAPD for self-investigation, that censored my public comment documenting these failures, and that violated public records laws is the same Commission that systematically blocks transparency to protect LAPD from accountability.

My case is evidence of this documented pattern.

#### WHAT I AM PLACING ON THE RECORD

I am documenting for the public record:

- Sixty-three days of non-response from both the Police Commission and Inspector General spanning two Commission presidencies
- Immediate routing of my complaint to LAPD for self-investigation
- Sixty days of silence in response to my objection to that routing
- Complete absence of independent civilian oversight at any level
- Censorship of my April 6 public comment from the public record
- Executive Director's provably false excuse for that censorship (claimed I missed 5:00 PM Pacific deadline when I submitted at 9:00 AM Pacific—eight hours early)
- Violation of Brown Act transparency requirements
- Violation of California Public Records Act response deadlines
- Multiple missed deadlines set in my submissions (March 17, April 15, April 20, April 30)
- Systematic deflection and obstruction rather than accountability
- Documented dishonesty in written correspondence from Executive Director

The Commission's statutory obligation to provide oversight does not disappear when complaints document institutional failures. The Commission's obligation to post public comments does not disappear when comments document Commission failures. The Commission's obligation to respond to public records requests does not disappear when requests seek evidence of those failures.

#### WHAT I AM REQUESTING

I renew my request for:

1. Independent review by a body not affiliated with LAPD
2. Clear statement of what civilian oversight authority exists when the Commission and Inspector General both defer to LAPD self-investigation
3. Explanation of why my complaint about LAPD's failures was routed to LAPD rather than reviewed independently
4. Substantive response addressing the concerns raised in my original submission
5. Posting of my April 6, 2026 addendum to the public record as required by the Brown Act
6. Response to my April 20, 2026 California Public Records Act request

If the Commission and Inspector General cannot provide independent oversight, cannot post public comments as required by law, cannot respond to public records requests within legal

deadlines, and cannot provide truthful explanations for these failures, state this explicitly so the public understands that civilian oversight is performative rather than functional.

I expect a substantive response within fourteen days of this submission.

## PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS

I preserve all rights to pursue accountability through any and all available legal channels.

## CONCLUSION

Sixty-three days of documented institutional failure across two Commission presidencies, multiple legal violations, censorship of public comment, fabricated excuses for that censorship, and deliberate non-response prove this system is designed to obstruct accountability, not provide it.

When civilian oversight immediately routes complaints about LAPD to LAPD, ignores objections for sixty-three days, censors documentation of these failures, lies about why, and violates transparency laws—it is not providing oversight. It is protecting LAPD from accountability.

The Commission has had sixty-three days and two presidencies to provide the independent civilian oversight it claims to offer. The Commission has instead demonstrated that "civilian oversight" means systematic obstruction of oversight.

Respectfully submitted for the public record,

Syreeta Joni Fullard

May 3, 2026

# LOS ANGELES POLICE COMMISSION

**BOARD OF  
POLICE COMMISSIONERS**

RASHA GERGES SHIELDS  
PRESIDENT

DR. DANIEL K. TABOR  
VICE PRESIDENT

FABIAN GARCIA  
TERESA SANCHEZ-GORDON  
JEFF E. SKOBIN

MARIA SILVA  
COMMISSION EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT



**KAREN BASS**  
MAYOR

DJANGO SIBLEY  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR


MATTHEW J. BARRAGAN  
INSPECTOR GENERAL

EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
POLICE ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
100 WEST FIRST STREET, SUITE 134  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-4112

(213) 236-1400 PHONE  
(213) 236-1410 FAX  
(213) 236-1440 TDD

April 20, 2026

Syreeta Joni Fullard



Dear Syreeta Joni Fullard

Your request for the addendum to be submitted as public comment for the public record and to be included in the April 7, 2026, Police Commission meeting materials did not meet the submission procedure and cannot be amended.. Addendum or materials for the Police Commission meetings must be received by 5:00 p.m. the day prior to the scheduled meeting.

We welcome your public comments in any of the future meetings.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "D Sibley".

DJANGO SIBLEY, Executive Director  
Board of Police Commissioners

# Addendum to March 2, 2026 Public Comment — 35-Day Oversight Failure — Fullard



**Joni Fullard**

to policecommission, oigcomplaint, bcc: Stoplapdspying, bcc: [redacted]

Mon, Apr 6, 12:00 PM ☆ 😊 ↶ ⋮

Members of the Police Commission,

Please find attached Addendum 1 to my March 2, 2026 public comment submission. This addendum is submitted as public comment for inclusion in the public record and Commission meeting materials, consistent with the Brown Act's public participation requirements (Gov. Code § 54954.3). This addendum documents 35 days of complete civilian oversight failure. I am also submitting this via certified mail to both the Police Commission and the Office of the Inspector General.

Respectfully,  
Syreeta Joni Fullard



One attachment • Scanned by Gmail ⓘ Add to Drive



↶ Reply   ↶ Reply all   ↷ Forward   😊



---

**From:** Los Angeles Citizen <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 4, 2026 4:46 PM  
**To:** Police Commission  
**Subject:** BOPC 5-5-26

**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.**

LAPD Police Commissioners,

On 4-13-26 item 4A on the agenda was a monthly update entitled "immigration update" and in a letter presented for that meeting I addressed the inaccuracy of that wording. Quoting the ancient sage and great philosopher Kong Zi aka Confucius the importance of using correct terms was emphasized. For those of you who did not see that letter I humbly suggest it to you to be read.

That letter also called for a monthly update on the status of the implementation of community policing which is within the purview of the Los Angeles Police Commission and indeed its responsibility!

The people of Los Angeles in every community and neighborhood are entitled to know what meetings are taking place or not taking place in their communities. Meetings such as neighborhood watch, business watch, Coffee with a Cop, Clergy Council meetings, Basic Car Area meetings, Community Police Advisory Board meetings, etc. should be taking place facilitating communication and cooperation between our local LAPD officers and the people of the community. Both sides, the police and the community have a joint responsibility to do their part in implementing community policing for the safety and general welfare of everyone!

When are we going to see the monthly update on the status of the implementation of community policing?

In the last Police Commission meeting Commissioner Sanchez Gordon expressed that she is not receiving notifications on newsworthy incidents or events. She specifically referenced the catastrophe of personnel information within the department being leaked. In the interest of transparency and accountability, I have some questions for Commissioner Sanchez Gordon and her fellow commissioners.

1. Do you, the Police Commissioners, have LAPD police radios assigned to you so that you can monitor LAPD radio traffic and events?
2. How many crime scenes have you responded to to oversee the LAPD in action handling crime scenes and the impact on the community?
3. How many Police Protective League Meetings have you attended where you can hear and address the many issues of policing with the real experts on policing? Each meeting has a group consisting of all ranks and assignments representing diversity in every way.

4. How many divisional roll calls have you attended?

5. How many Community Relations/Senior Lead Officer units have you visited to meet and dialogue with the officers on the forefront of the implementation of community policing?

The Police Commission needs to perform its role of oversight and that can only be done properly if you personally see and hear for yourselves what is going on. We, as the public, have the right to know what you are doing to perform your role of oversight. Perhaps you could provide a monthly update on your oversight activities which would build trust and confidence that you are doing your jobs.

For the People,

Steve Reilly

---

**From:** Anna Mook <a[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, May 4, 2026 5:00 PM  
**To:** Police Commission; communityrelationsoig@lacity.org; cityatty.help@lacity.org  
**Subject:** Terminate Flock Contracts now

**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.**

To the Los Angeles Board of Police Commissioners:

I am deeply concerned and reject the Los Angeles Police Department's use of the Flock "Safety" ALPR system to surveil and stalk Angelenos.

Flock is a company that specializes in Automatic License Plate Readers (ALPRs) and other surveillance technology. But Flock does not just capture license plate data. Flock's ALPRs capture people's movement, location, date, time, images of drivers and passengers, dog walkers, and more. Flock is an expansion of the mass surveillance state, a technology that accelerates the mass deportation pipeline, criminalizes all Angelenos across the city including Black folks, immigrants, trans folks, youth, abortion seekers, sex workers and more. Flock weaponizes our movement data to expand the presumption of guilt.

I know Flock is one of the many enablers of the state's ability to monitor and criminalize marginalized communities. Automatic License Plate Readers cannot be reformed with better privacy policies or data-sharing guardrails. They have to be abolished.

ALPR cameras and surveillance technology do not keep us safe. Angelenos need investment in housing and services that meet our basic needs, not more surveillance technology that police and criminalize us.

I demand that the Board of Police Commissioners instruct LAPD to terminate all partnerships with Flock with immediate effect. I demand that the Los Angeles Police Department terminate all partnerships with Flock "Safety."

I demand that LAPD, the Board of Police Commissioners, the LA City Council, and the Mayor do not enter into any new partnerships with other ALPR companies (Axon, Vigilant Solutions, etc.).

Sincerely,  
Anna Mook