



ROBERT G. LUNA, SHERIFF

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

## Use of Force Training Audit

Antelope Valley Stations

Project No. 2025-32-A

Prepared By:

**Audit and Accountability Bureau**



2025

**Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department  
Audit and Accountability Bureau**

**LASD Compliance with Public Recordings Rights Audit  
Antelope Valley Stations  
Project No. 2025-32-A**

**AUDIT REPORT**

**PURPOSE**

The Audit and Accountability Bureau (AAB) conducted the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD or the Department) Compliance with Public Recording Rights Audit under the authority of the Department, pursuant to the United States Department of Justice<sup>1</sup> (US-DOJ) Antelope Valley (AV) Settlement Agreement (Agreement),<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 106, which states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

- a. Ordering a person to cease taking photographs or recording video;*
- b. Demanding that person's identification;*
- c. Demanding that the person state a reason why he or she is taking photographs or recording video;*
- d. Detaining that person;*
- e. Intentionally blocking or obstructing cameras or recording devices (not including physical barricades or screens used as part of a tactical operation or crime scene);*
- f. Seizing and/or searching a camera or recording device without a warrant;*
- g. Using force upon that person;*
- h. Detaining or arresting an individual for violating any other law where the purpose of the detention or arrest is to prevent or retaliate for recording police activity.*

This audit focused on the actions of Department members, if any, and the treatment of members of the public who were lawfully present while photographing and or publicly recording the law enforcement activities of Department members.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement. No. CV 15-03174, United States v. Los Angeles County et al. \(D.C. Cal. April 28, 2015\)](#)

The AAB conducted this audit under the guidance of the Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS).<sup>2</sup> This is the first audit for the LASD Compliance with Public Recordings Rights Audit. The AAB determined whether the evidence obtained was sufficient to provide reasonable assurance for the audit findings.

## **BACKGROUND**

On April 28, 2015, the County of Los Angeles, the Department, and the US-DOJ entered into the Agreement with the goal of ensuring police services are provided to the AV community in a manner that fully complies with the Constitution and laws of the United States.<sup>3</sup> The Department is responsible for implementing the mandated stipulations of the agreement, ensuring both public and deputy safety, while fostering renewed public trust in the LASD.

The Agreement includes requirements that law enforcement not interfere, obstruct, or hinder an individual's attempt to record police activity in public spaces.<sup>4</sup>

Members of the public, including the press, have a First Amendment right to observe, photograph, and record video or audio of law enforcement activities occurring in any public area where they have a lawful right to be present.<sup>5</sup> However, there are established legal boundaries and exceptions that govern the scope of public recording.

Members of the public recording law enforcement activities are subject to certain limitations, such as interfering with law enforcement operations, inciting others to violate the law, harassing a witness or suspect, or positioning themselves too close to the activity, creating a clear safety hazard to themselves, others and Department members. Denying a citizen the right to film in a public space may constitute a violation of the First Amendment. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate how Department members at the AV Stations respond to these situations to ensure the rights of citizens are not violated.

## **OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY**

The auditors evaluated incidents to determine the Department's compliance with paragraph 106 of the Agreement. This audit provided an opportunity to identify areas for process improvement and implement corrective actions where necessary.

The Department's compliance was measured in accordance with the Agreement Compliance Metrics (compliance metrics) provided by the AV DOJ Compliance Unit, and additional guidance from the AV Monitoring Team (MT). An audit work plan was submitted to the MT and the US-DOJ for input prior to the start of the audit.

---

<sup>2</sup> The GAGAS, also known as the Yellow Book, is issued by the Comptroller General of the United States through the U.S. Government Accountability Office and refers to Government Auditing Standards, July 2018 Revision, Technical Update April 2021.

<sup>3</sup> United States of America v. The County of Los Angeles and The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department. Case Number CV 15-03174, April 28, 2015.

<sup>4</sup> A public space is an area that is open to the general public for use or recreation, such as a park, plaza, or street.

<sup>5</sup> Manual of Policy and Procedures 3-01/080.16 – Photography, Audio, and Videotaping by the Public and Press.

## Audit Scope and Criteria

The scope of this audit assessed the Department members' interactions and treatment of the individuals who were publicly recording law enforcement activities.

Auditors reviewed incidents to determine occurrences in which Department members might potentially be found to:

- Verbally threatened or harassed individuals recording them;
- Demanded identification or justification for recording without a legitimate reason;
- Physically blocked camera(s) or attempted to seized recording devices;
- Used force related to public recording;
- Unnecessarily detained or arrested individuals solely for recording police activities;
- Prevented or retaliated against anyone for recording law enforcement activities.

The identified incidents of public recording interferences were reviewed. All relevant documentation and body-worn camera (BWC) recordings related to specific audit objectives were evaluated. Any deficiencies or deviations were identified and documented. Furthermore, patterns of legal or policy errors were identified and reported.

## Audit Population and Sampling

The selected audit period was February 1, 2025, through April 30, 2025. The auditors selected this three-month audit period because it provided a contemporary, manageable scope which allowed timely identification of issues. The audit population consisted of AV Stations' incidents that had the potential to exhibit law enforcement interferences with public recording activities.

The audit population included:

- Administrative investigations;
- Civil claims and litigations;
- Obstruction arrests;<sup>6</sup>
- Use of Force (UOF) incidents;
- Watch Commander's Service Comment Reports (WCSCR);<sup>7</sup>
- Incidents associated with booked cellphones or recording devices.<sup>8</sup>

The auditors reviewed a total of 178 incidents, consisting of administrative investigation, civil claims and litigations, obstruction arrests, UOF incidents, WCSCRs, and any incident with recording devices booked as evidence from the AV Stations to determine if potential incidents of public recording rights violations occurred.

---

<sup>6</sup> Penal Code 69(a) resisting an executive officer, Penal Code 148(a)(1) resisting, delaying, or obstructing any public officer, and Penal Code 243(c)(2) assault and battery on a peace officer.

<sup>7</sup> A WCSCR is a Department form used by the public to file either a Personnel or Service Complaint against the Department.

<sup>8</sup> Incidents with a 69(a), 148(a)(1), and 243(c)(2) charges were reviewed.

The auditors reviewed all associated documentation to determine if Department members interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Of the 178 incidents reviewed specifically for this audit, the auditors determined there were no indicia of public recording rights being violated.

**Incidents Reviewed**

AV Station	Population					
	Administrative Investigations	UOF Incidents	Obstruction Arrests	Litigations & Civil Claims	WCSCR	PRELIMS
Lancaster	6	42	16	7	33	0
Palmdale	4	15	11	5	39	0
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>AV Total</b>	<b>178</b>					

**Administrative Investigations**

The administrative investigations reviewed for this audit were extracted from the Risk Management Bureau’s Performance Recording and Monitoring System (PRMS).<sup>9</sup> The auditors generated a PRMS report capturing all administrative investigations associated with the AV Stations during the selected audit period. A total of ten administrative investigations with “Founded” dispositions were identified: six for Lancaster Station and four for Palmdale Station.

Each administrative investigation was vetted by auditors to determine whether Department members violated public recording rights. The auditors reviewed all relevant documentation, including incident reports, supplemental reports, supervisor reports, memoranda, and associated correspondence to determine if any public recording rights violations occurred. The auditors determined there were no indicia that Department members interfered with, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged members of the public, who were not violating any laws, from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present.

---

<sup>9</sup> The PRMS is a web-based application that systematically records data relevant to incidents involving Uses of Force, Shootings, and Commendations/Complaints regarding Sheriff’s Department personnel. In addition, PRMS tracks the progress of Administrative Investigations, Civil Claims & Lawsuits, Discovery Motions, Employee Commendations, Preventable Traffic Collisions, Custody Complaints, and Special Conditions that the Department handles.

### Civil Claims and Litigations

The civil claims and litigations reviewed in this audit were extracted from the PRMS. The auditors generated PRMS reports capturing all civil claims and litigation associated with the AV Stations during the selected audit period. A total of six civil claims were identified: two for Lancaster Station and four for Palmdale Station. In addition, auditors identified six litigations: five for Lancaster Station and one for Palmdale Station.

Each civil claim and litigation were vetted by auditors to determine whether any Department members violated public recording rights. The auditors reviewed all relevant documentation, including claim forms, lawsuit notifications, legal documents, incident reports, supplemental reports, disposition worksheets, supervisor reports, memoranda, and associated correspondence to determine if potential incidents of public recording rights violations occurred. The auditors determined there were no indicia that Department members interfered with, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged members of the public, who were not violating any laws, from taking photographs or recording video of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present.

### Obstructions Arrests

The obstruction arrests reviewed in this audit were identified by reconciling data from two sources: The Department's Obstruction Arrests Database and the Performance Oversight and Intervention Tracker (POINT), covering incidents from the AV Stations within the selected audit period. Reconciling data from both systems ensured all obstruction arrests from the selected audit period were identified and reviewed. A total of 27 obstruction arrests were identified: 16 for Lancaster Station and 11 for Palmdale Station.

The obstruction arrest reports, and associated documentation were extracted from the Sheriff's Electronic Criminal Document Archive (SECDA)<sup>10</sup> and the Los Angeles Regional Criminal Information System (LARCIS).<sup>11</sup> Each obstruction arrest incident was vetted by auditors to determine if a violation of public recording rights by law enforcement occurred. The auditors reviewed all relevant documentation, including but not limited to incident reports, supplemental reports, supervisor reports, memos, and associated correspondence to determine if potential incidents of public recording rights violations occurred. The auditors determined there were no indicia the evaluated obstruction arrests involved a Department member who interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public who was not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present.

---

<sup>10</sup> The SECDA is a digital archival system which stores crime/incident reports and booking records.

<sup>11</sup> The LARCIS is an automated database program designed to provide law enforcement personnel with real-time access to regional crime information.

## PRELIMS Evidence

To ensure auditors reviewed all incidents with an interference of public recordings by Department members, the auditors utilized the Property Evidence Laboratory Information Management System (PRELIMS)<sup>12</sup>, to identify incidents associated with recording devices or cellphones booked as evidence for charges 69(a)pc, 148(a)(1)pc, and 243(c)(2)pc for the AV Stations for the selected audit period.

To ensure the accuracy and completeness of the PRELIMS<sup>13</sup> reports, auditors consulted with a Senior Information System Analyst at Data Systems Bureau, who provided insight on how the system stores data and how to extract reports from the system.

The auditors generated PRELIMS reports of recording devices, booked as evidence at the AV Stations, for 69(a)pc, 148(a)(1)pc, and 243(c)(2)pc charges for the audit period. The PRELIMS reports indicated there were no AV Station incidents with recording devices booked as evidence for the charges mentioned above.

## Use of Force incidents

The auditors reviewed UOF incidents which were extracted from PRMS. The auditors generated a PRMS report of all UOF incidents for the AV Stations for the selected audit period. The auditors identified a total of 135 UOF incidents, 99 for Lancaster Station and 36 for Palmdale Station. Using a one-tailed statistical test with a 95% confidence level and a 4% error rate, the auditors selected a statistically valid random proportionate stratified sample of 57 UOF incidents<sup>14</sup>, 42 for Lancaster Station and 15 for Palmdale Station. Each UOF incident was vetted by auditors to determine if a violation of public recording rights by law enforcement occurred. The auditors reviewed all relevant documentation, including but not limited to Supervisor's Report on Use of Force reports, Watch Commander's Use of Force Review and Incident Analysis, Unit Commander's Use of Force Review and Incident Analysis, incident reports, supplemental reports, supervisor reports, memos, and associated correspondence to determine if potential incidents of public recording rights violations occurred.

The auditors determined there were no indicia the evaluated UOF incidents involved a Department member who interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public who was not violating any laws from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present.

---

<sup>12</sup> The PRELIMS is an electronic record of an official chain of custody and accountability system used for evidence and property tracking for the Department.

<sup>13</sup> The PRELIMS system accuracy is contingent upon the accuracy of the input data supplied by the users.

<sup>14</sup> The reviewed UOF incidents consisted of Non-Categorized Force Incidents (NCI), Category 1, and Category 2 use of force incidents.

### Watch Commander’s Service Comment Reports

The WCSCRs reviewed were extracted from the PRMS. The auditors generated a PRMS report of all WCSCRs for the AV Stations for the selected audit period. The auditors identified a total of 72 WCSCRs for the AV Stations, 33 for Lancaster Station and 39 for Palmdale Station. Each WCSCR was vetted by auditors to determine if a violation of public recording rights by law enforcement occurred. The auditors reviewed all relevant documentation, including Watch Commander’s Service Comment Report, Result of Service Comment Review, investigative memos, incident reports, supplemental reports, and associated correspondence to determine if potential incidents of public recording rights violations occurred.

The auditors determined there were no indicia the evaluated WCSCRs involved a Department member interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public who was not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present.

### Limited Scope Audits Population

In 2025, the AAB conducted the Public Complaints audit and Stops and Detentions audits in three parts. Separating these audits into parts (limited scope audits), allowed the auditors to provide timely feedback to the AV Stations. Each part addressed the requirements of the Agreement. The auditors reviewed associated documentation and BWC recordings for the limited scope audits’ populations to determine compliance with the terms of the Agreement. A slight overlap of evaluated incidents exists between the LASD Compliance with Public Recordings Right Audit population and the limited scope audits’ populations. However, the overlapping cases were evaluated independently from each audit. During these audits, there were no incidents which contained an interference with public recordings by Department members.

### **Limited Scope Audits - Population**

AV Station	Public Complaints <sup>15</sup>	Stops and Detentions <sup>16</sup>
Lancaster	26	104
Palmdale	23	89
<b>AV Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>193</b>

<sup>15</sup> A total of 47 WCSCRs were reviewed for all three parts of the Public Complaints audits conducted in selected audit period.

<sup>16</sup> A total of 193 Stops and Detentions were reviewed for all five parts of the Stops and Detentions audits conducted in the selected audit period.

## **Audit Procedures**

The audit objectives, scope and methodology were developed with a focus on the Agreement, compliance metrics, and Department policies. The auditors reviewed the compliance metrics related to paragraph 106 of the Agreement to determine if the evaluated incidents met the established compliance metrics.

The auditors also reviewed the identified incidents' documentation and recordings, to determine if Department members interfered with, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from publicly recording police activity.

Furthermore, the auditors evaluated whether Department members tampered with, altered, deleted, or destroyed any photographic, video, or audio records, or equipment. Any high-risk behavior by Department members was documented and identified.

Lastly, auditors assessed whether corrective actions<sup>17</sup> were recommended to any Department member who violated a member of the public's First Amendment rights. If applicable, the auditors reviewed personnel files to determine if corrective actions were implemented.

## **Summary of Findings**

This audit consisted of two main objectives with a total of seven sub-objectives. The AV Stations were evaluated separately for each sub-objective. The results were combined to assess whether they complied with the compliance metrics.

---

<sup>17</sup> Corrective action consists of improvements taken to eliminate causes of non-conformities or other undesirable situations. Types of corrective action include Performance Log Entries (PLE), training, counseling, and discipline such as suspensions and terminations.

The table below indicates the audit objectives and their corresponding compliance metrics findings:

**Summary of Compliance Metrics Findings**

Obj No.	Audit Objectives	Lancaster %	Palmdale %	AV Total	Compliance Metrics %
<b>1</b>	<b>INTERFERENCE OF PUBLIC RECORDING OF POLICE ACTIVITIES</b>				
1(a)	<i>Ordering Cease of Photography or Video Recording</i>	100%	100%	100%	100% <sup>18</sup>
1(b)	<i>Demanding Identification and/or Reason for Publicly Recording</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%
1(c)	<i>Blocking or Obstructing Camera or Recording Devices</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%
1(d)	<i>Searching or Seizing Camera or Recording Device without Warrant</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%
1(e)	<i>Use of Force Related to Public Recording of Police Activity</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%
1(f)	<i>Detaining or Arresting an Individual for:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Recording</i></li> <li>• <i>Violation to Prevent/Retaliate for Publicly Recording Police Activity</i></li> </ul>	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>2</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF CORRECTIVE ACTION</b>				
2(a)	<i>Appropriate Actions Taken in Regard to Violations of Public Recording Rights</i>	100%	100%	100%	100%

The AAB acknowledges the compliance metrics may be subject to change in the future. The Auditors will adjust their methodology and criteria as necessary to align with any approved modifications agreed upon by all parties.

<sup>18</sup> Per Discussions with the MT, 100% is appropriate for the compliance metrics.

## Detailed Findings

This report provides detailed information on the findings noted during the audit for all objectives.

### Objective No. 1 – Public Recording Interference

This objective evaluated incidents in which Department members explicitly prohibited, interfered with, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public, who was not violating any laws, from taking photographs or recording video of law enforcement activities in any location where the member of the public is lawfully present.

#### Objective No. 1(a) – Ordering Cease of Photography or Video Recording

##### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

- i. Ordering a person to cease taking photographs or recording video;*

##### Procedures

The auditors reviewed the incident reports and associated documentation to determine whether Department members unlawfully ordered an individual to cease photography or video recording of law enforcement activities.

##### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who unlawfully ordered an individual to cease photography or video recording of law enforcement activities.

##### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 1(b) – Demanding Identification and/or Reason for Public Recording**

### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

- b. Demanding that person's identification;*
- c. Demanding that the person state a reason why he or she is taking photographs or recording video;*

### Procedures

The auditors reviewed incident reports, associated documentation, and, when necessary, BWC recordings to determine whether Department members unlawfully demanded an individual to provide identification and/or provide a reason for photographing or video recording law enforcement activities.

### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the 178 reviewed incidents involved a Department member unlawfully demanding an individual to provide identification and/or provide a reason for photographing or video recording law enforcement activities.

### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 1(c) – Blocking/Obstructing Camera or Recording Devices**

### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

*e. Intentionally blocking or obstructing cameras or recording devices (not including physical barricades or screens used as part of a tactical operation or crime scene);*

### Procedures

The auditors reviewed incident reports, associated documentation, and BWC recordings to determine whether Department members intentionally interfered with the members of the public and blocked, or obstructed cameras or recording devices from recording law enforcement activities.

### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who unlawfully and intentionally blocked, or obstructed cameras or recording devices from recording law enforcement activities.

### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 1(d) – Searching or Seizing Camera or Recording Devices without Warrant**

### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

*f. Seizing and/or searching a camera or recording device without a warrant;*

### Procedures

The auditors reviewed incident reports, associated documentation, and BWC recordings to determine whether Department members seized or searched a camera or recording device without a warrant from a member of the public who was lawfully present.

### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who unlawfully seized or searched for a camera or recording device without a warrant.

### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 1(e) – Use of Force Related to Public Recording of Police Activity**

### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

*g. Using force upon that person;*

### Procedures

The auditors reviewed UOF packages, associated documentation, and BWC recordings to determine whether Department members used force against a member of the public who was not violating any other law, solely to prevent them from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities.

### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who unlawfully used force against a member of the public who was not violating any other law, solely to prevent them from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities.

### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 1(f) – Detaining or Arresting an Individual**

### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, VIII. Use of Force, Subsection A, General Use of Force Policy and Principles, paragraph 106 (April 2015), states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. Such prohibited interference includes:*

- d. Detaining that person;*
- h. Detaining or arresting an individual for violating any other law where the purpose of the detention or arrest is to prevent or retaliate for recording police activity.*

### Procedures

The auditors reviewed incident reports, associated documentation, and BWC recordings to determine whether a Department member unlawfully detained or arrested a member of the public for recording law enforcement activities or to prevent or retaliate against such a recording.

### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who unlawfully detained or arrested a member of the public for recording law enforcement activities or to prevent or retaliate against such a recording.

### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **Objective No. 2 – Implementation of Corrective Action**

This objective evaluated whether management identified Department members who interfered with or discouraged the public from photographing or recording law enforcement activities and if any corrective actions were recommended.

### **Objective No. 2(a) – Appropriate Actions Taken in Regard to Violations of Public Recording Rights**

#### Criteria

Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Use of Force, Paragraph 106 states:

*LASD agrees to explicitly prohibit interfering, threatening, intimidating, blocking, or otherwise discouraging a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video (including photographs or video of police activities) in any place the member of the public is lawfully present.*

#### Procedures

The auditors reviewed the population and associated documentation to determine if the Department members who interfered with, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public, who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording video or audio in any place in which the member of the public is lawfully present, were identified and if corrective action was recommended. If any were identified, the auditors intended to review personnel files to determine if any corrective actions were implemented.

#### Findings

The AV Stations met the criteria (100%) for this objective because none of the reviewed 178 incidents involved a Department member who interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public who is not violating any other law, from taking photographs or recording videos of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public is lawfully present. No Department members were identified to have violated public recording rights; therefore, no corrective actions were recommended.

#### Recommendations

There are no recommendations because the AV Stations met the established compliance metrics of 100% for this objective.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the procedures performed and evidence obtained during the audit, the auditors conclude the AV Stations are operating effectively and performing their duties in accordance with the Agreement. The auditors identified no areas of concern; therefore, no audit recommendations were made.

In addition, the auditors determined there were no incidents in which Department members interfered, threatened, intimidated, blocked, or otherwise discouraged a member of the public, who was not violating any other law, from taking photographs or video recordings of law enforcement activities in any place the member of the public was lawfully present. The AAB conducted a thorough and comprehensive review that provided a clear assessment of compliance with Agreement paragraph 106.

## **DEPARTMENT APPLICATIONS**


- Axon LASD.evidence.com
- LARCIS - Los Angeles Regional Criminal Information System
- LASD Obstruction Arrest Database
- POINT - Performance Oversight and Information Tracker
- PRELIMS - Property Evidence Laboratory Information Management System
- PRMS - Performance Recording and Monitoring System
- SECDA - Sheriff's Electronic Criminal Document Archive

## **REFERENCES**

- United States Department of Justice – Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement, Case Number CV 15-03174 (April 2015)
- Antelope Valley Settlement Agreement Compliance Metrics (October 2019)

### Views of Responsible Officials

There were no findings or recommendations in this report and therefore a copy of the audit report was not provided to the auditee. The AAB presented the final audit report to the Division Director, Office of Constitutional Policing.



11/10/25

\_\_\_\_\_  
GEOFFREY N. CHADWICK      DATE  
Captain  
Audit and Accountability Bureau  
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department