



OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

HALL OF JUSTICE

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF



October 14, 2020

Mr. Brian K. Williams
Executive Director
Civilian Oversight Commission
World Trade Center
350 South Figueroa Street, Suite 288
Los Angeles, California 90071

Dear Mr. Williams:

PROPOSED RESOLUTION

I have reviewed your proposed resolution expressing grave concerns regarding Sheriff Villanueva's leadership scheduled to be discussed on October 15, 2020, at the Civilian Oversight Commission (COC) meeting.

In the 9th "whereas" paragraph, you assert "Sheriff Villanueva has repeatedly failed to comply with a subpoena compelling the production of evidence related to the [Kobe] Bryant investigation." In addition, Inspector General Max Huntsman has repeatedly told the COC that the Sheriff had ignored the "Kobe Bryant Subpoena."

In case you are not aware, once Sheriff Villanueva was served the "Kobe Bryant Subpoena," the Sheriff subsequently filed timely and proper objections to this subpoena based on statutes and case law calling out the categories in the subpoena where objectionable. Filing objections is NOT ignoring a subpoena. It is the Sheriff's legal right and appropriate remedial action.

In fact, your counsel contacted Sheriff's counsel within a few days of receiving the Sheriff's objections to the "Kobe Bryant Subpoena" to tell our counsel that he had received the objections and would get back to our counsel to meet and confer about the objections; which occurred in July 2020 over three months

211 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

A Tradition of Service
— Since 1850 —

ago. To date, your counsel has never again contacted Sheriff's counsel about the objections nor filed any motion in response to the "Kobe Bryant Subpoena."

Based on the foregoing, I can only surmise your legal counsel has concluded Sheriff Villanueva's objections to the subpoena were proper.

In your 11th "whereas" paragraph, you assert that the Sheriff has "summarily ignored the commissions subpoena and then challenged it in court" rather than attend the COC meeting. Again, this statement is also inaccurate.

The Sheriff was emailed a separate subpoena, hereinafter, "PMK Subpoena," however the subpoena was poorly drafted and did not require the Sheriff's attendance, notwithstanding your contention. The Sheriff provided the "person most knowledgeable," ("PMK") Assistant Sheriff Bruce Chase, to testify about the matters in the subpoena.

In case you are not aware, your counsel filed a motion to enforce the "PMK subpoena." When the Sheriff filed an opposition to this motion, your counsel sought to continue the hearing twice. The Sheriff has actually sought to have the matter advanced earlier to get the issue resolved and your counsel has vigorously opposed it. The County's motion is now set for November 20, 2020.

To that end, I hope you will reconsider your resolution and instead choose to discuss these issues with me directly in a more meaningful way going forward.

Sincerely,

ALEX VILLANUEVA, SHERIFF


TIMOTHY K. MURAKAMI
UNDERSHERIFF