



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

The following individuals submitted comments on agenda item:				
Agenda #	Relate To	Position	Name	Comments
Public Comment		Favor	Tod Tod	Hotel vouchers bring to general relief Department Public Social Services would help at risk homeless college students household grades 2.0 only can go community college take care disabled sibling hopefully comment is considered.
		Other	Kyle D Haab	<p>Dear Supervisor Mitchell's Office / Board of Supervisors,</p> <p>I am submitting this as a formal request for Board-level review and a written corrective ownership determination.</p> <p>This matter has been repeatedly raised through public comment, written submissions, County contacts, LAHSA / HMIS channels, County Fraud / OCI, County Counsel, LAPD, the District Attorney, state legislative offices, federal oversight contacts, and legal-aid attempts. It should not be treated as a new complaint or as a private dispute.</p> <p>The County's public image is transparency, accountability, housing stability, family support, and protection of vulnerable residents. My family's experience has been the opposite: repeated referral loops, procedural responses, no final ownership determination, no corrective-action status, no confirmed cross-agency linkage, and no clear answer on who owns the consent, records-use, funding, police-report, and family-impact issues.</p> <p>The central unresolved issue is consent and authorization:</p> <p>What lawful consent, Release of Information, HMIS authorization, referral authorization, participant authorization, data-sharing agreement, or other written authority allowed CRCDC / Project Tipping Point or related entities to contact my household while we were in Tennessee, use my information, process housing/support records, communicate with landlords, initiate or support rental assistance, and create or rely on records that later affected housing stability and family-law consequences?</p> <p>This issue cannot be resolved by sending me to ordinary family-law self-help. Family-law self-help cannot cure a County-funded consent and records-use problem that materially affected family-law consequences.</p> <p>JCOD has confirmed the direct County oversight pathway. JCOD confirmed that the Board of Supervisors approves CFCI funding allocations, that JCOD administers CFCI, that Amity Foundation served as third-party administrator, that Amity had a grant agreement with CRCDC using CFCI funds, that CFCI funds were used for rental assistance issued on my behalf between August 2024 and June 2025, that CRCDC used funds for nine months of rental assistance at \$1,000 per month, that the assistance was categorized under Program Area 3 / Youth Housing, and that the contract number was CFCI-</p>



PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

PA3-056-2023.

That establishes a County oversight chain:

Board of Supervisors ? CFCI ? JCOD ? Amity Foundation ? CRCD ? rental assistance issued on my behalf.

But JCOD did not identify the lawful consent or authorization basis for the contact and records-use chain. It did not identify any April 2023 Ruth's Place consent, HMIS authorization, Release of Information, referral authorization, participant authorization, data-sharing agreement, or other written authority that allowed CRCD to use a one-day Ruth's Place / HMIS contact as the basis for later March 2024 outreach, communications with my household in Tennessee, Project Tipping Point intake, housing support, landlord communication, or rental-assistance processing.

That is why County corrective action is required.

LAHSA's own records also make this more serious. The issue was not merely my personal suspicion of fraud or theft. LAHSA's HMIS / Clarity note dated October 15, 2025 states that LAHSA staff followed up with me after receiving instruction from leadership on how to handle the matter and that I was advised to take the case through law enforcement because it was "indeed fraud and a form of theft." That is why LAPD report C259045687 was made. LAPD report C269013241 later corrected or expanded the same underlying matter.

Christopher Williams' April 23, 2026 response, copying fraud@auditor.lacounty.gov, further confirms that LAHSA and County Fraud / OCI are procedurally connected. Mr. Williams confirmed that Christopher Redd was the LAHSA investigator who worked on my case and that Mr. Redd is no longer available for LAHSA matters. That does not resolve the issue. It raises the question of who now has custody of Mr. Redd's review file, notes, emails, findings, referral records, closure records, or communications with County Fraud / OCI.

LAHSA's CPRA responses did not resolve the corrective-action issue. LAHSA objected on HMIS / participant confidentiality grounds, redirected me to HMIS Support / Freshservice, and closed the CPRA response without issuing a corrective-action or ownership determination.

County Counsel also has not resolved the ownership issue. County Counsel responded that some of my requests asked questions or sought clarification / confirmation and that CPRA does not require the County to answer questions. I understand that procedural position, but it does not answer who owns consent review, correction, preservation, cross-agency linkage, referral status, or final closure.

The District Attorney's Office now has a pending administrative-handling



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

CPRA track regarding how my submissions involving CRCD / Project Tipping Point, Consumer Protection, Real Estate Fraud, Cervantes-related property issues, LAHSA, County Fraud / OCI, and LAPD reports were received, routed, referred, or handled.

The LAPD reports also identify multiple legal lanes. The reports classify the matter as identity theft and reference categories including application for employment, bank-account information, fictitious identification, misuse of Social Security number, real-estate documents, school-loan documents, ACH/payment documentation, and unauthorized DHCS linkage. Those categories implicate potential legal issues including identity theft, false personation, forgery or falsified documents, theft by false pretenses, grand theft, computer/data misuse, medical or benefit-record misuse, real-estate document issues, and school/workforce-program document issues. I understand these are not criminal charges or prosecutorial findings, but they show why the County cannot fairly treat this as only a family-law self-help matter.

This is also a family-integrity and access-to-justice issue. I am low-income, self-represented, and have not been able to obtain full legal representation for the combined civil and criminal posture of this matter. Legal-aid and self-help referrals have not addressed the consent, County-funded program, records-use, housing, law-enforcement, and family-law causation issues together. Private firms have declined representation largely on scope, economics, complexity, or non-merits grounds. My First Amended Complaint is currently being screened in federal case CV26-802-UA before Judge Alka Sagar. I understand screening is not a merits finding, but I have been documenting everything to preserve my claims because ordinary administrative channels have not corrected the harm.

The Board should also understand that public offices do not have to be the original wrongdoer to become part of the continuing harm. When public offices have repeated notice of alleged misconduct involving public systems, family harm, disputed records, law-enforcement reporting, and County-funded program actors, but refuse to identify records, preserve files, cross-reference related cases, issue a status letter, or identify the responsible office, that creates apparent institutional complicity through non-correction.

I am not asking the Board to decide criminal liability, custody, or every legal issue. I am asking the Board to direct a written ownership/status determination answering:

1. Who owns the County review of the lawful consent / authorization basis for CRCD's March 2024 contact and later records use?
2. Who owns correction or dispute annotation of HMIS, participant, referral, housing, rental-assistance, or agency records affected by disputed consent?
3. Who owns preservation of all records tied to CFCI-PA3-056-2023, including



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	JCOD, Amity, CRCD, rental assistance, referrals, communications, consent records, payment records, participant records, and metadata? 4. Who has custody of Christopher Redd's LAHSA review file, notes, emails, findings, referrals, closure rec
Paul Brown	
Perry Goldberg	Hoping the Board will consider these important concepts regarding how the Ethics Commissioners will be selected and compensated.
William Flores-Lemus	<p>April 27, 2026</p> <p>Ref: Complaint</p> <p>Dear, Board of Supervisor Hilda L. Solis Board of Supervisor Hollie J. Mitchell Board of Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath Board of Supervisor Janice Hahn Board of Supervisor Kathryn Barger</p> <p>Request: Forward this complaint to Los Angeles County Employees.</p> <p>Ricardo Daniel Garcia #178111 Justine Marie Esack #183784</p> <p>(I) A response to The Public Defender's Office and Haydeh Takasugi's email, sent on February 2, 2026.</p> <p>Refer to the emails sent to The Los Angeles County Board Of Supervisors Executive Office the same day and Jan 26, 2026.</p> <p>My response to The Public Defender's Office and Haydeh Takasugi. I claim has purposely and repeatedly refused. To account for their mistakes and to _____ missing letter.</p> <p>In addition, their failure to establish a proper chain of custody. After his letter was opened and read in front of me by Valaura Baker on May 2025.</p> <p>I claim was lost or purposely taken out by The Public Defender's Office Haydeh Takasugi or Ria Snoek.</p> <p>(II) I claim the inconsistency by The Public Defender's Office. In attempting to use a letter that was previously rejected. As to contacting _____ on Jan 6, 2026 to verify a letter they do not have.</p> <p>I claim Haydeh Takasugi purposely leaves out no investigation was conducted. From May 2025 to November 6, 2025. To verify the authenticity of</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

the letters of character.

That The Public Defender's Office or Haydeh Takasugi can not provide any evidence of an investigation that was conducted.

(III) Haydeh Takasugi states a petition was filed on October 2, 2025.

As no investigation could have been conducted prior or after not having _____missing letter.

The court filing was six months after May 2025 I submitted a petition for Certificate of Rehabilitation/ Pardon.

That establishes a short window of time from October 2, 2025 to November 5, 2025 to conduct a proper investigation.

I have previously claimed The Public Defender's Office and Haydeh Takasugi. Has repeatedly denied all my legal requests. Also, a written response on the times and dates. The authors of the letters of character were contacted.

Refer to Email November 6, 2025

I stated in my email dated January 26, 2026, upon request I could provide text messages to establish that fact.

In having phone communication with the two authors. That stated no calls, messages were logged in their phones.

I claim that Haydeh Takasugi knew _____letter was missing and from May 2025 to November 26, 2025 meeting with her no investigation was conducted.

Refer to email sent by Haydeh Takasugi in November 26, 2025.

On May 13, 2025 I submitted a cover letter Referenced Additional Letters of Character. That mentioned _____ and spouse, _____ and Mr._____.

Refer to Haydeh Takasugi's email sent December 12, 2025, Those images did not include _____letter.

A image of my cover letter was scanned for the record.

(IV) TO ADDRESS

Haydeh's Takasugi's claim in a email sent on February 2, 2026. She stated, "You refused to give the District Attorney additional time to get in touch with your references."



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

RESPONSE

How did Haydah Takasugi come to that legal conclusion I refused?

When did I say that on the record?

Why does the District Attorney have to get in touch with my references?
When the responsibility to conduct an investigation is by The Public Defender Office.

Is Haydeh Takasugi stating that two investigations are required. One from The Public Defender's Office and The District Attorney?

I have repeatedly asked to be placed back on court calendar as to other requests being denied by Haydeh Takasugi.

(V) I claimed DPD Carlos Bido knew no investigation was conducted prior November 6, 2025.

I request that he provide a statement to clarify if he knew a investigation was conducted prior to November 6, 2025.

The email sent by Haydeh Takasugi on Feb 2, 2026, she referred me to DPD Carlos Bido.

I previously emailed Haydeh Takasugi and stated that DPD Carlos Bido was ineffective counsel. That did not object to the Political Non Legal Language intentionally used by The District Attorney.

That biased the Judge denying me to submit additional documentation. To strengthen my petition for a Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon.

Refer to email
November 6, 2025
November 11, 2025

In previously The Public Defender's Office denying me. To submit additional documents in May and November 26, 2025.

(VI) Haydeh Takasugi states,
"The only mechanism to get your petition back before the court is to draft a new Certificate of Rehabilitation."

RESPONSE

What is the reason the previous Certificate of Rehabilitation is being voided?

The subtext argument Haydeh Takasugi is asserting. Is that I have no options. Denying me the ability to be informed through counsel and to provide my consent.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

As to dismissing all my prior complaints and requests for accountability.

In a email response on
January 26, 2026 to Haydeh Takasugi and previous documented attempts, on
January 8, 16 and 19 2025.

I requested counsel from.
Ricardo Daniel Garcia #178111
Justine Marie Esack #183784

To address
The Public Defender's Office and
Haydeh Takasugi's incompetence. In refusing to respond to my past requests.

In addition, for them to explain to me in a written response. Why a new
petition in a Certificate of Rehabilitation needs to be resubmitted?

Haydeh Takasugi continues to deny me due process. In her refusal to
respond to my requests for accountability. That is creating barriers hindering
my ability to make informed decisions.

Informed decisions are made by competent counsel that builds trust.

I previously stated, in good faith I completed my part in providing
documentation, for a petition for a Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon.

Also, I provided a follow up courtesy call reminder to all The Board of
Supervisors. To investigate my claims and provide a solution to establish
accountability.

I request that The Board of Supervisors facilitate a in person meeting with.

Ricardo Daniel Garcia #178111
Justine Marie Esack #183784

Due to I have no trust in
Haydeh Takasugi in her repeated incompetence.

Nor do not have confidence in DPD Carlos Bido being effective counsel.

My request is the only mechanism to address my compliments and provide
legal counsel to me. To regain trust that has been previously spoiled by
Haydeh Takasugi.

To make empowered informed decisions and move forward. With my petition
of a Certificate of Rehabilitation. To restore my full State and Federal rights.

Signed,



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	William Flores-Lemus
William Flores-Lemus	<p>Date: April 27,2026</p> <p>Dear Board of Supervisors Executive Office.</p> <p>Chief Director Edward Yen. Deputy Executive Officer Steven Hernandez.</p> <p>Board of Supervisor Hilda L. Solis Board of Supervisor Hollie J. Mitchell Board of Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath Board of Supervisor Janice Hahn Board of Supervisor Kathryn Barger</p> <p>Compliant Towards Los Angeles County Public Defender's Office.</p> <p>Ricardo Daniel Garcia #178111 Justine Marie Esack #183784 Haydeh Behbehani Takasugi #173084 Monnica Thelen #180661</p> <p>Follow Up Executive Office Human Resources Department Complaint Towards. The Board of Supervisor's Office Chief of Staff Sonia Lopez.</p> <p>Refer to emails sent to Sonia Lopez and The Public Defender's Office sent in order by dates.</p> <p>11/6/2025, 11/10/2025, 11/12/2025, 11/13/2025, 11/26/2025 (From Haydah Takasugi) 11/28/2025, 12/2/2025, 12/3/2025, 12/8/ 2025, 12/ 11/2025, 12/12/2025, 12/17,/2025, 1/6/2026, 1/9/2026, 2/2/2026, 2/4/2026, 2/9/2024, 2/17/2026, 2/23/2026, 3/2/2026, 3/9/2026,3/16/2026, 4/6/2026, 4/13/2026</p> <p>January 26, 2026 Communication with Haydah Takasugi in denial seeking counsel to make informed choices with.</p> <p>Ricardo Daniel Garcia #178111 Justine Marie Sack #183784.</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

(I) I William Flores-Lemus am submitting this declaration to be truthful. To the best of my knowledge in events. In a complaint towards the mentioned.

I claim The Los Angeles Public Defender's Office. Is fully aware of my complaint and legal requests.

In addition, not representing me to my best interests. As I exhausted all means requesting written accountability directly from them.

In good faith I completed my part in providing documentation for a Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon.

As I properly notified
The Los Angeles County Board of Supervisor Hollie J. Mitchell's Office.

In claims of complaints and legal requests. That have not been contested and repeatedly denied by The Los Angeles Public Defender's Office.

I assert The Public Defender's Office has purposely delayed and obstructed. The process for the petition to continue under California State Law.

In denying me due process in The Public Defender's Office. Through their actions do not want. The petition of a Certificate of Rehabilitation/ Pardon to be successful.

To deprive me full State and Federal rights as a resident of California. I intend to address this. To the proper OCR State and Federal agencies for an official review.

I assert that The Public Defender's Office are acting as rouge
Los Angeles County Department.

Using their institutional legal knowledge and expertise.

To not account for their mistakes in not wanting. A official Human Resource Department compliant filed against individuals in their office.

Follow Up Executive Office Human Resources Department Complaint
Towards.

The Board of Supervisor's Office
Chief of Staff Sonia Lopez.

I assert that Sonia Lopez's actions created a bias in The Public Defender's Office. In them denying the process of the petition of Certificate of Rehabilitation/ Pardon.

Refer to sections (VII) & (VIII).



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

In her email sent on Jan 6, 2025 accusations towards me. Using her political position of privileged power. In retaliation several hours after I emailed her addressing her lack of concern of my claims as a constituent.

Forwarding the email to The Public Defender's Office. Which created harm in portraying me in a negative manner to them.

(II) On May 13, 2025 I submitted a letter Referenced Additional Letters of Character. That mentioned _____ and spouse, _____, Mr _____.

Refer to email sent by
Haydah Takasugi on
December 12, 2025

The purpose in submitting a petition of The Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon. Is to restore all my State and Federal rights as a resident of California.

I stated to the paralegal Valera Baker in several communications with her. After submitting a second expanded letter of character from _____.

I explained my intent was not to create an adversarial environment with The Public Defender's Office or The District Attorney.

I claim that Valera Baker asked me if I was a _____ Veteran to use in court. My response was that was not relevant.

I explained to her that my past two honorable military service was used against me in court by The District Attorney.

Requesting to submit additional relevant documents. To strengthen my petition in a Certificate of Rehabilitation/ Pardon. That request was denied directly by The Public Defender.

I claim after Valera Baker asked me in reference to _____ letter. If I could ask his spouse to write an additional letter. To substitute Mr. _____ letter that was rejected by The Pubic Defenders Office.

I responded to her that I did not want to impose towards him or his wife.

After I directly handed the letter to the paralegal Valera Baker. As she opened the letter and read it in front of me in May 2025.

I claim that Haydah Takasugi or Ria Snoek did not professionally account for that letter. In a proper chain of custody.

I claim The Public Defender's Office took out or lost the letter and refuses to take responsibility for their mistakes.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

(III) On November 6, 2025 I was informed prior to court by The Public Defender. That the letters of character were not verified.

I claim The District Attorney used Political Bias Non Legal Language. In the term "_____".

The court CASE _____ reflects the record that two _____ were registered with The State of California.

In addition, The Record reflects those items on that the list The District Attorney verbally stated.

Where not on the warrant issued those items were illegally taken never returned. By Law Enforcement and used in court against me by The District Attorney.

I claim the intent by The District Attorney was to purposely bias the judge.

The public defender on November 6, 2025 during court. Did not contest that Political Bias Non Legal Language.

In addition, he knew that there was no investigation to verify the authenticity of the letters of character.

I claim that the language used by The District Attorney created an immediate bias in judge in her physical facial reaction.

As she immediately denied my request to submit documents strengthening the petition of Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon.

I went to The Public Defender's office and spoke to Sean K. McDonald. Briefly speaking with him by his reaction to my questions. I believed he knew no investigation was conducted to contact _____ and _____.

I stated to him my objection that the exact same in tone and words. By The District Attorney was used ten years prior in court.

I stated to The Public Defender that if I confirmed to Valera Baker. I was _____ Veteran and the Political Bias None Legal Language. In the term "_____" would be on the permanent transcript record.

In that transcript would be presented to The Governor in creating a potential bias towards my petition.

(IV) On Nov 6 2025 6:21 PM
I emailed Haydah Takasugi and requested of a new investigator be appointed. To contact me prior and coordinate.



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

	<p>With the authors of the letters of characters. To inform them to expect a call. In avoiding any future problems of communication.</p> <p>I requested that the previous investigator respond and provide the times and dates. That the authors of the letter of character were contacted. That request has been denied by The Public Defender's Office.</p> <p>I claim Haydah Takasugi and The Public Defender's Office having full knowledge did not call or . From May 2025 to November 26, 2025. To verify the authenticity of the letters of character.</p> <p>Upon request text messages will be provided that two authors of the letter of character were not contact.</p> <p>Refer to emails dated. On November 10, 2025 6:07 PM November 12, 2025 1:39 PM November 13, 2025 6:44 PM November 28, 2025 11:06 AM</p> <p>I notified The Board of Supervisor's Office and Haydah Takasugi of my requests and compliant.</p> <p>(V) Prior to meeting with Haydah Takasugi I sent a email on November 12, 2025</p>
William Flores-Lemus	<p>Date April 27, 2026</p> <p>To The Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>Board of Supervisor Hilda L. Solis Board of Supervisor Hollie J. Mitchell Board of Supervisor Lindsey P. Horvath Board of Supervisor Janice Hahn Board of Supervisor Kathryn Barger</p> <p>Request: Forward this complaint to Los Angeles County Employees.</p> <p>Ricardo Daniel Garcia Justine Marie Esack</p> <p>(I) In response to Valuara Baker's and Haydeh Takasugi's emails sent February 9, 2026, February 10, 2026.</p> <p>Timeline I submitted three initial letters from _____ and from _____ and correct</p>



**PUBLIC REQUEST TO ADDRESS
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA**

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

HILDA L. SOLIS
HOLLY J. MITCHELL
LINDSEY P. HORVATH
JANICE HAHN
KATHRYN BARGER

Correspondence Received

phone numbers.

In the petition for a Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon

Refer to email sent on
December 6, 2025.

I previously stated.

On May 13, 2025 I submitted a cover letter Referenced Additional Letters of
Character. That mentioned _____ and spouse, _____ Mr. _____.

Refer to Haydeh Takasugi's email sent December 12, 2025, Those images
did not include _____ letter.

A image of my cover letter was scanned for the record.

(II) In May 2025 I was asked by Valuara Baker to request to the author from
_____ to extend her letter I later turned in.

A second letter was from Mr. _____ that was rejected. Due to that reference
not knowing me in the required time.

I submitted a third substitute letter from from _____ with the correct phone
contact.

In the attempt by The Public Defenders Office to re use the rejected reference
in Mr. E.C. Brown's letter.

Only included his title and phone contact. I was informed later that his
daughter was contacted by mail. In potentially violating her privacy.

(III) In the meeting with Haydeh Takasugi on November 25, 2025.
There was no need to add any additional references. Due to submitting three
previous letters with the correct phone contacts.

To address the chain of custody of retuning the packet that was sent to me by
The Defender's Office. That packet was sealed and handed directly them.

In a email sent to Haydeh Takasugi on November 28, 2025 I stated.

In response I submitted an additional letter from _____. As the chain of
custody of all letters were sealed post marked and hand delivered directly to
The Public Defender's Office.

In the chain included the receptionist that recorded the day I submitted the
letters as I asked for a receipt. In her saying that was not necessary. Then to
the paralegal Valaura Baker going directly Ria Snoek.

I assert there was no need from me to open the sealed packet sent to me. In
understanding in keeping the integrity of the contents.

				<p>(IV) Valuara Baker's scope of practice is of a paralegal and not legal counsel.</p> <p>I have repeatedly requested for a in person meeting be facilitated by The Board of Supervisors with.</p> <p>Ricardo Daniel Garcia Justine Marie Esack</p> <p>That are aware of my complaints and legal requests that have been denied. I have previously stated they alone could address my concerns.</p> <p>To regain trust that has been previously spoiled.</p> <p>(V) The conclusion I have is The Public Defender's Office does not want to represent me to my best interest. Due to their refusal to deny my repeated requests and to account for their incompetence.</p> <p>Their delay is depriving me of due process in regaining my State and Federal rights. That is negatively hindering my ability to make informed choices.</p> <p>These empowered decisions are made by competent counsel that builds trust premised on my consent.</p> <p>I previously stated, in good faith I completed my part in providing documentation, for a petition for a Certificate of Rehabilitation/Pardon.</p> <p>Signed, William Flores-Lemus</p>
		Item Total	7	
Grand Total			7	

Legal Impact Statement and Authority Framework

Family Integrity / Access to Justice / Civil-Criminal Routing / County Corrective Action

Prepared for	Legal-aid review, Board follow-up, public accountability, court-adjacent declaration support
Prepared by	Kyle Haab 657-557-4459 kyle.dietz99@gmail.com
Matter	CRCD / Project Tipping Point / CFCI-PA3-056-2023 / LAHSA / HMIS / County Fraud / LAPD / County Counsel / DA / family-law harm
Important note	This is an issue map for legal review and public accountability. It is not a final pleading and is not a substitute for legal counsel.

I. Core legal framing

This is a civil and criminal access-to-justice problem involving family integrity, disputed consent, public-program records, County-funded housing assistance, law-enforcement routing, and agency non-correction after repeated notice.

The strongest framing is not simply “fraud.” It is a disputed consent and records-use chain that produced housing instability, law-enforcement reports, agency routing, and family-law consequences, while public offices failed to identify correction ownership after notice.

II. Ongoing harm statement

The harm is ongoing because no office has corrected or owned the disputed consent and records-use chain. My family remains affected by housing instability, family-law consequences, lack of counsel, inability to correct records, and fragmented law-enforcement / agency routing.

LAHSA redirected or withheld records under HMIS / participant confidentiality without providing a corrective-action determination. County Counsel treated key questions as CPRA clarification questions rather than answering ownership. The DA administrative-handling track remains pending.

The County-funded oversight issue is also ongoing because JCOD confirmed the Board-approved CFCI / JCOD / Amity / CRCD funding pathway for rental assistance under CFCI-PA3-056-2023, but no County office has identified the lawful consent, ROI, HMIS authorization, referral authority, or data-sharing basis for the CRCD / Project Tipping Point contact and records-use chain.

As long as those records remain unidentified, uncorrected, and uncross-referenced, my family is prejudiced in civil, family-law, criminal-reporting, housing, and federal screening proceedings.

III. Key legal terms

Term	Application to this matter
Family integrity interference	Agency/program conduct and non-correction affected housing stability, reunification posture, visitation, and the ability to protect parent-child relationships.
Procedural due process problem	A family cannot meaningfully challenge or correct agency records if offices refuse to identify records, custody, consent, ownership, or closure status.
Substantive due process / parental liberty interest	Parent-child relationships and family integrity are fundamental interests, especially where

	state-connected systems affect custody, visitation, or reunification.
Meaningful access to courts / access to justice	Lack of counsel plus withheld or fragmented records prevents meaningful participation in family, housing, civil, and federal proceedings.
Circular referral / no-ownership failure	Each office refers the matter elsewhere; no one issues a final correction, preservation, ownership, or closure determination.
Failure to correct after notice	Agencies were repeatedly notified but did not correct, annotate, preserve, cross-reference, or identify ownership.
Constructive notice / actual notice	Public comments, CPRAs, agency emails, police reports, and legal filings show offices knew or should have known the issue existed.
Administrative fragmentation	The same facts are split between LAHSA, County Counsel, OCI, LAPD, DA, JCOD, City, AG, and federal channels.
Record-custody dispute	Agencies disagree or avoid stating who holds key consent, HMIS, CRCD, JCOD, Amity, LAHSA/Redd, County Fraud, LAPD, or DA records.
Tainted factual predicate	Later family/housing decisions may rest on unauthorized contact, disputed records, or unsupported agency narratives.
Evidentiary prejudice	The ability to prove causation, consent, reliance, and harm is impaired because records are withheld, fragmented, or not cross-referenced.
Deliberate indifference / willful blindness	Possible civil-rights terminology where an agency has notice of rights-impacting harm and fails to act; should be evaluated by counsel.
Ratification / institutional complicity through non-correction	If public offices know of alleged misconduct and allow records or consequences to persist without correction, they risk appearing to ratify the harm.
Negligent supervision / failure to supervise	Possible civil theory where County-funded contractor or grantee activity was not properly overseen.
Failure to preserve / spoliation concern	Risk if Redd's LAHSA file, HMIS audit trails, CRCD/Amity records, JCOD funding records, DA/OCI records, or LAPD routing records are not preserved.
Civil-criminal overlap	Civil claims require records and correction; criminal reporting requires law-enforcement/prosecutor routing. Agencies are fragmenting the same facts across both systems.

IV. Civil and criminal legal lanes

The LAPD reports classify the matter as Identity Theft and identify additional categories including application for employment, bank-account information, fictitious identification, misuse of Social Security number, real-estate documents, school-loan documents, ACH/payment documentation, and unauthorized DHCS linkage. These categories implicate several potential legal lanes for counsel or investigators to evaluate.

Identity theft / unauthorized use of personal identifying information	California Penal Code § 530.5
False personation	California Penal Code § 529
Forgery / falsified documents	California Penal Code § 470
Grand theft / theft exceeding statutory threshold	California Penal Code § 487
Theft by false pretenses / fraud by representation	California Penal Code § 532
Unauthorized computer/data access	California Penal Code § 502
Medical identity / benefit-record misuse / privacy issue	Penal Code § 530.5; HIPAA / DHCS privacy review where applicable

Real-estate document issue	Penal Code §§ 530.5, 470, 487, 532; real-estate-fraud administrative handling
School/workforce-program document issue	Penal Code §§ 530.5, 470, 502; student-aid or workforce-program review where applicable

These statutory references are issue identifiers for legal review. They are not a claim that charges have been filed or that a prosecutor has made a finding.

V. Family integrity / due process authorities

Fourteenth Amendment, U.S. Constitution	Due process anchor for fundamental liberty interests and procedural fairness.
Troxel v. Granville, 530 U.S. 57 (2000)	Recognizes parents' fundamental liberty interest in the care, custody, and control of their children.
Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745 (1982)	Recognizes natural parents' fundamental liberty interest in the care, custody, and management of their children; the interest does not vanish merely because temporary custody problems exist.
Moore v. City of East Cleveland, 431 U.S. 494 (1977)	Supports broader family-integrity / family-household protection principles.
California Welfare and Institutions Code § 16000	Policy of preserving and strengthening family ties and providing reunification services where required by law.

VI. Access to courts / meaningful participation authorities

Boddie v. Connecticut, 401 U.S. 371 (1971)	Due process can protect access to courts where the state controls the forum for resolving fundamental family-status issues.
M.L.B. v. S.L.J., 519 U.S. 102 (1996)	Poverty cannot be used to block meaningful appellate review in severe parental-rights contexts.
Lassiter v. Department of Social Services, 452 U.S. 18 (1981)	No blanket automatic right to appointed counsel in all civil parental-rights proceedings; due process analysis is fact-specific.
ADA Title II, 42 U.S.C. § 12132	Public entities must provide equal access to public services, programs, and activities where disability is involved.
Section 504, 29 U.S.C. § 794	Prohibits disability discrimination in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance.

VII. Public transparency / CPRA authorities

California Constitution, Article I, § 3(b)	The people have a right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business; writings of public officials and agencies are open to public scrutiny.
Government Code § 7921.000	Access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right.
Government Code § 7922.600	Requires reasonable assistance to help identify responsive records or overcome practical barriers where applicable.
Government Code § 7922.525	Reasonably segregable portions of public records should be made available after deletion of exempt portions.
Government Code § 7922.000	Public-interest balancing provision for withholding records.
Government Code § 7927.705	Allows withholding when disclosure is prohibited or exempted by federal or state law, but does not eliminate need for valid basis and segregability

	analysis.
Evidence Code § 1040	Official-information privilege; requires statutory basis or public-interest balancing where applicable.
Government Code § 7923.000	Provides for court relief to enforce public-records access rights.

VIII. Privacy / consent / HMIS / health-record authorities

California Constitution, Article I, § 1	Privacy is an inalienable right under California law.
HUD HMIS Data and Technical Standards Final Notice, 69 Fed. Reg. 45888 (July 30, 2004)	Supports HMIS privacy/security framing and regulated homeless-services data handling.
45 C.F.R. § 164.524	HIPAA right of access to protected health information in designated record sets, where HIPAA applies.
45 C.F.R. § 164.508	HIPAA authorization requirements for uses/disclosures requiring authorization, where HIPAA applies.
Confidentiality vs. correction principle	Confidentiality cannot be used as both a shield against public disclosure and a sword against the participant's ability to identify consent, correct records, and prevent continued reliance on disputed information.

IX. Federal civil-rights / municipal-liability vocabulary for counsel review

42 U.S.C. § 1983	Civil action for deprivation of federal rights under color of state law.
Monell v. Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)	Municipal-liability framework requiring policy, custom, practice, official decision, or deliberate indifference; not respondeat superior alone.
42 U.S.C. § 1985	Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights; should be used only if facts support agreement/coordination.
Civil Code § 52.1 / Bane Act	California claim involving threats, intimidation, or coercion interfering with rights; should be evaluated carefully by counsel.
Civil Code § 51 / Unruh Act	California civil-rights/public-accommodations statute; potentially relevant where business establishment or service-provider discrimination is implicated.

X. Claims / issues counsel should evaluate

1. Procedural due process / meaningful access to courts: whether agency non-transparency and fragmented record custody prevent meaningful participation in family/civil proceedings.
2. Substantive due process / family integrity: whether public or publicly connected conduct interfered with parent-child relationships, reunification posture, or visitation by creating/maintaining disputed records and housing instability.
3. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 municipal liability: whether County/City/LAHSAs conduct, custom, policy, failure to train/supervise, or deliberate indifference caused deprivation of federal rights.
4. ADA / Section 504 / disability-access issues: whether disability-related needs, SSI, IEP history, program access, housing access, or court access were ignored or denied.
5. CPRA / writ of mandate / declaratory relief: whether agencies failed to assist, improperly withheld records, failed to search, failed to identify custodians, or used CPRA procedure to avoid producing records sufficient to show status/custody.
6. Privacy / consent / HMIS / health-record access: whether the April 2023 Ruth's Place / HMIS contact lawfully authorized later 2024 outreach, data use, referral, housing activity, and records reliance.
7. Negligent supervision / negligent referral / negligent misrepresentation: whether County-funded or publicly connected providers made representations, used records, or processed support without lawful authority.
8. Fraud / identity misuse / theft reporting: whether law-enforcement and DA records show proper intake, coordination, and preservation after LAHSA's leadership-directed referral.

9. Spoliation / preservation concern: whether Redd's LAHSA file, HMIS logs, CRCD/Amity records, JCOD funding records, DA/OCI records, or LAPD routing records are at risk.
10. Retaliation / chilling / obstruction of public accountability: whether the cease-and-desist letter or agency avoidance chilled legal aid, legislative assistance, or public accountability despite the public-program nature of the matter.

XI. Condensed paragraph for public comment or agency follow-up

The ongoing harm is that my family remains trapped between civil and criminal systems while agencies refuse to identify who owns consent, correction, preservation, and cross-agency linkage. Family-law self-help cannot cure a County-funded consent and records-use problem. LAHSA's confidentiality response did not correct the record. County Counsel's CPRA-question response did not identify ownership. The DA administrative-handling track is still pending. JCOD confirmed the Board-approved CFCI / JCOD / Amity / CRCD funding pathway, but no County office has identified the lawful basis for CRCD's contact and records use. This creates ongoing prejudice to family integrity, housing stability, criminal reporting, civil claims, federal screening, and meaningful participation in judicial procedures.

XII. Direct request for relief / action

11. Who owns the consent / authorization review for CRCD's March 2024 contact and later records use?
12. Who owns correction or dispute annotation of HMIS, participant, referral, housing, or agency records affected by disputed consent?
13. Who owns preservation of LAHSA / Christopher Redd review records and related files?
14. Who owns cross-reference between LAHSA Ref. 2526KH-A, HMIS ID 8F8CD9D8B, County Fraud / OCI 2025-23289 and 2026_23965, LAPD C259045687 and C269013241, DA CPRA #2026-0406-1059, County Counsel records, CFCI-PA3-056-2023, and CRCD / Project Tipping Point records?
15. Who will issue a written closure, pause, declination, referral, or status letter if no agency will assist?
16. What corrective action has been taken to prevent continued harm to my family while the consent, records-use, housing, police-report, and family-law consequences remain unresolved?

Prepared by:

Kyle Haab
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com

Request for Board-Level Corrective Ownership Determination

CRCD / CFCI-PA3-056-2023 / LAHSA / OCI / Family Harm

April 23, 2026

To: Supervisor Holly Mitchell's Office / Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

Primary contact: Ahliyah Sanford, asanford@bos.lacounty.gov

From: Kyle Haab
1551 E. 106th St., Unit 3/4
Los Angeles, CA 90002
657-557-4459 | kyle.dietz99@gmail.com

Subject: Request for Board-level corrective ownership determination regarding CRCD / Project Tipping Point, CFCI-PA3-056-2023, LAHSA / HMIS, County Fraud / OCI, LAPD reports, and continuing family-law harm

I. Purpose of this request

I am submitting this as a formal request for Board-level review and a written corrective ownership determination.

This matter has been repeatedly raised through public comment, written submissions, County contacts, LAHSA / HMIS channels, County Fraud / OCI, County Counsel, LAPD, the District Attorney, state legislative offices, federal oversight contacts, and legal-aid attempts. It should not be treated as a new complaint or as a private dispute.

The County's public image is transparency, accountability, housing stability, family support, and protection of vulnerable residents. My family's experience has been the opposite: repeated referral loops, procedural responses, no final ownership determination, no corrective-action status, no confirmed cross-agency linkage, and no clear answer on who owns the consent, records-use, funding, police-report, and family-impact issues.

II. Central unanswered issue: consent and authorization

The central unresolved issue is: What lawful consent, Release of Information, HMIS authorization, referral authorization, participant authorization, data-sharing agreement, or other written authority allowed CRCD / Project Tipping Point or related entities to contact my household while we were in Tennessee, use my information, process housing/support records, communicate with landlords, initiate or support rental assistance, and create or rely on records that later affected housing stability and family-law consequences?

This issue cannot be resolved by sending me to ordinary family-law self-help. Family-law self-help cannot cure a County-funded consent and records-use problem that materially affected family-law consequences.

III. County oversight pathway confirmed by JCOD / CFCI

JCOD has confirmed a direct County oversight pathway. As preserved in my records, JCOD confirmed that the Board of Supervisors approves CFCI funding allocations, that JCOD administers CFCI, that Amity Foundation served as third-party administrator, that Amity had a grant agreement with CRCD using CFCI funds, and that CFCI funds were used for rental assistance issued on my behalf between August 2024 and June 2025. JCOD further confirmed that CRCD used funds for nine months of rental assistance at \$1,000 per month, that the assistance was categorized under Program Area 3 / Youth Housing, and that the contract number was CFCI-PA3-056-2023.

Board of Supervisors -> CFCI -> JCOD -> Amity Foundation -> CRCD -> rental assistance issued on my

behalf

The unresolved gap: JCOD did not identify the lawful consent or authorization basis for the contact and records-use chain. It did not identify any April 2023 Ruth's Place consent, HMIS authorization, Release of Information, referral authorization, participant authorization, data-sharing agreement, or other written authority that allowed CRCD to use a one-day Ruth's Place / HMIS contact as the basis for later March 2024 outreach, communications with my household in Tennessee, Project Tipping Point intake, housing support, landlord communication, or rental-assistance processing.

IV. LAHSA leadership-directed law-enforcement referral

This was not merely my personal suspicion of fraud or theft. LAHSA's HMIS / Clarity note dated October 15, 2025 states that LAHSA staff followed up with me after receiving instruction from leadership on how to handle the matter and that I was advised to take the case through law enforcement because it was "indeed fraud and a form of theft." That is why LAPD report C259045687 was made. LAPD report C269013241 later corrected or expanded the same underlying matter.

Christopher Williams' April 23, 2026 response, copying fraud@auditor.lacounty.gov, further confirms that LAHSA and County Fraud / OCI are procedurally connected. Mr. Williams confirmed that Christopher Redd was the LAHSA investigator who worked on my case and that Mr. Redd is no longer available for LAHSA matters. That does not resolve the issue. It raises the question of who now has custody of Mr. Redd's review file, notes, emails, findings, referral records, closure records, or communications with County Fraud / OCI.

V. Prior agency responses did not resolve correction or ownership

LAHSA / HMIS	LAHSA objected on HMIS / participant confidentiality grounds, redirected me to HMIS Support / Freshservice, and closed the CPRA response without issuing a corrective-action or ownership determination.
County Counsel	County Counsel stated that some requests asked questions or sought clarification / confirmation and that CPRA does not require the County to answer questions. That procedural response does not answer who owns consent review, correction, preservation, cross-agency linkage, referral status, or final closure.
District Attorney	The District Attorney's Office has a pending administrative-handling CPRA track regarding how submissions involving CRCD / Project Tipping Point, Consumer Protection, Real Estate Fraud, Cervantes-related property issues, LAHSA, County Fraud / OCI, and LAPD reports were received, routed, referred, or handled.
Family-law self-help	Self-help referrals address ordinary forms and procedure. They do not address the County-funded consent / records-use / housing / law-enforcement / family-law causation issue.

VI. Family-law, civil, and criminal impact

The LAPD reports classify the matter as identity theft and reference categories including application for employment, bank-account information, fictitious identification, misuse of Social Security number, real-estate documents, school-loan documents, ACH/payment documentation, and unauthorized DHCS linkage. I understand these are not criminal charges or prosecutorial findings, but they show why the County cannot fairly treat this as only a family-law self-help matter.

This is also a family-integrity and access-to-justice issue. I am low-income, self-represented, and have not been

able to obtain full legal representation for the combined civil and criminal posture of this matter. Legal-aid and self-help referrals have not addressed the consent, County-funded program, records-use, housing, law-enforcement, and family-law causation issues together. Private firms have declined representation largely on scope, economics, complexity, or non-merits grounds.

My First Amended Complaint is currently being screened in federal case CV26-802-UA before Judge Alka Sagar. I understand screening is not a merits finding, but I have been documenting everything to preserve my claims because ordinary administrative channels have not corrected the harm.

VII. Public integrity concern and need for neutral County action

I also need to note a potential public-integrity concern. Patty Lopez is publicly identified as a San Fernando City Councilmember and is also central to my family-law posture as the person involved with my children's placement/visitation circumstances. I understand the Board of Supervisors does not directly control the San Fernando City Council. However, the overlap between family-law consequences, public officials, County-funded rental assistance, and CRCDC / Project Tipping Point representations makes it more important that County offices not dismiss this as a private family dispute.

Public offices do not have to be the original wrongdoer to become part of continuing harm. When public offices have repeated notice of alleged misconduct involving public systems, family harm, disputed records, law-enforcement reporting, and County-funded program actors, but refuse to identify records, preserve files, cross-reference related cases, issue a status letter, or identify the responsible office, that creates apparent institutional complicity through non-correction.

VIII. Requested Board-level corrective action

1. Identify who owns the County review of the lawful consent / authorization basis for CRCDC's March 2024 contact and later records use.
2. Identify who owns correction or dispute annotation of HMIS, participant, referral, housing, rental-assistance, or agency records affected by disputed consent.
3. Identify who owns preservation of all records tied to CFCI-PA3-056-2023, including JCOD, Amity, CRCDC, rental assistance, referrals, communications, consent records, payment records, participant records, and metadata.
4. Identify who has custody of Christopher Redd's LAHSA review file, notes, emails, findings, referrals, closure records, or communications with County Fraud / OCI.
5. Identify who is responsible for cross-referencing LAHSA Ref. 2526KH-A, HMIS ID 8F8CD9D8B, LAHSA tickets 259260, 260627, and 267528, County Fraud / OCI references 2025-23289 and 2026_23965, LAPD reports C259045687 and C269013241, DA CPRA #2026-0406-1059, County Counsel records, and CFCI-PA3-056-2023.
6. Identify who is responsible for reconciling any CRCDC private-funding narrative with JCOD's confirmation of CFCI-funded rental assistance.
7. Identify what corrective action has been taken to prevent continuing harm to my family while consent, records-use, housing, police-report, and family-law consequences remain unresolved.
8. If Supervisor Mitchell's office or the County will not assist, issue a written closure, declination, referral, or status letter explaining that position.

IX. Requested written response

Mayor Bass's office referred me to Supervisor Mitchell's office. If Supervisor Mitchell's office is also declining or closing the matter, I am requesting that in writing. If your office believes LAHSA, DHS, County Counsel, County Fraud / OCI, LAPD, the DA, JCOD, Amity, CRCDC, or another office owns the issue, please identify the responsible office, contact person, and reference number in writing.

A family should not lose stability, legal access, or reunification opportunity because public agencies and publicly

connected providers refuse to identify who owns consent, correction, preservation, and accountability.

Please provide a written response identifying whether Supervisor Mitchell's office is reopening constituent review, referring this to a specific County office for corrective ownership, requesting written clarification from LAHSA / DHS / JCOD / County Counsel / Auditor-Controller / OCI, declining further assistance, or closing the matter.

Suggested supporting attachments

- JCOD / CFCI confirmation regarding CFCI-PA3-056-2023, Amity Foundation, CRCDC, and rental assistance.
- HMIS / Clarity note dated October 15, 2025 referencing leadership instruction and law-enforcement referral as "indeed fraud and a form of theft."
- Christopher Williams April 23, 2026 email copying fraud@auditor.lacounty.gov and confirming Christopher Redd worked on the case.
- LAHSA CPRA final response / Ref. 2526KH-A.
- County Counsel CPRA responses dated April 17, 2026 and April 23, 2026.
- District Attorney CPRA extension / administrative-handling track, CPRA #2026-0406-1059.
- LAPD reports C259045687 and C269013241 or cover pages / print reports.
- Evidence of repeated Board public comments and Mayor Bass referral to Supervisor Mitchell's office.
- Legal aid representation-gap correspondence, including LAFLA / LegalServer thread.

Respectfully,

Kyle Haab
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com



LAHSA investigator Christopher Redd

2 messages

Christopher Williams <cwilliams@lahsa.org>
To: Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>
Cc: LA County Fraud Hotline <fraud@auditor.lacounty.gov>

Thu, Apr 23, 2026 at 2:50 PM

Dear Mr. Haab,

I understand that you have asked the Los Angeles County Department of Auditor-Controller's Office of County Investigations to have the LAHSA investigator who worked on your case, Christopher Redd, to call you.

Mr. Redd moved to another position in another organization last month, and is no longer available to discuss LAHSA-related matters.

Is there a question that I may be able to help you with?

Thank you,

Chris



Christopher Williams (he/him)

Deputy Chief Risk Officer

Cell: 213-523-0938

Email: cwilliams@lahsa.org

www.lahsa.org

To drive the collaborative strategic vision to create solutions for the crisis of homelessness grounded in hope, compassion, and community.

*This transmission is intended only for the use of the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Be aware that most communications with LAHSA are subject to disclosure under the California Public Records Act. If you received this e-mail in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this communication or by telephone at **213-523-0938**. Thank you.*

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>
To: Christopher Williams <cwilliams@lahsa.org>
Cc: LA County Fraud Hotline <fraud@auditor.lacounty.gov>

Thu, Apr 23, 2026 at 3:04 PM

Dear Mr. Williams,

Thank you for confirming that Christopher Redd was the LAHSA investigator who worked on my case and that he is no longer available to discuss LAHSA-related matters.

Because Mr. Redd worked on this matter, I am requesting written clarification regarding the current status, record custody, and outcome of his review.

Please confirm:

1. who now has custody of Mr. Redd's case file, notes, emails, findings, referrals, closure notes, or related records;
2. whether the matter was closed, transferred, referred, or left pending after Mr. Redd left LAHSA;
3. who, if anyone, is now assigned to respond to questions regarding Mr. Redd's review;
4. whether LAHSA issued any findings, determinations, referrals, internal notes, or closure explanation concerning my complaints;

5. whether any records from Mr. Redd's review were provided to, discussed with, or referred to the Los Angeles County Auditor-Controller Office of County Investigations, including the Fraud Hotline.

The consent / authorization issue remains unanswered. Please confirm whether LAHSA, Mr. Redd, or any LAHSA-related system reviewed or obtained records sufficient to show what consent, Release of Information, participant authorization, HMIS authorization, data-sharing authorization, or other written permission allowed CRCD, LAHSA, Amity Foundation, AJCC / WorkSource partners, or related providers to collect, access, disclose, transmit, or rely on my personal information, household information, housing information, landlord information, lease materials, W-9 / ACH materials, case notes, referral records, supportive-services records, or program eligibility records.

Please specifically confirm whether LAHSA has records showing:

1. the date any consent or authorization was signed;
2. the scope of the consent or authorization;
3. the programs, agencies, providers, landlords, or partners covered by the consent;
4. whether the consent covered CRCD, Project Tipping Point, LAHSA, Amity Foundation, Vernon-Central / LATTC WorkSource, AJCC-related activity, housing assistance, landlord contact, or data-sharing activity;
5. whether consent existed before the March 18, 2024 referral/contact activity;
6. whether Mr. Redd reviewed the consent issue before leaving LAHSA;
7. whether any missing, incomplete, expired, or disputed consent issue was identified, referred, or preserved.

I am also requesting clarification regarding LAHSA's prior instruction that I report the matter to law enforcement based on concerns involving fraud and theft. Please confirm:

1. who made that instruction or recommendation;
2. whether it was based on LAHSA's review of records, my allegations, CRCD records, landlord-related records, payment records, consent records, or other information;
3. whether LAHSA documented the basis for advising law-enforcement reporting;
4. whether LAHSA itself made or considered making any referral to law enforcement, the County Auditor-Controller, OCI, County Counsel, LAHD, HUD, or another oversight body;
5. whether LAHSA determined the issue was outside LAHSA's administrative jurisdiction because it involved possible fraud, theft, misuse of funds, or unauthorized handling of records;
6. whether any such fraud/theft-related concern remains open, was closed, or was referred elsewhere.

I am also requesting clarification regarding any recording, photographing, audio-recording, video-recording, screenshotting, documenting, retaining, transmitting, or sharing of images, audio, video, or identifying information involving my minor children by CRCD, CRCD staff, Project Tipping Point, housing-support staff, or any related partner.

Please confirm whether LAHSA, Mr. Redd, or any LAHSA-related review identified, received, reviewed, preserved, or was informed of any records involving my minor children, including:

1. photos, videos, audio recordings, screenshots, intake records, household records, case notes, text messages, emails, or attachments involving my children;
2. the date, purpose, program, staff member, and system connected to any such recording or documentation;
3. what consent, parental authorization, guardian authorization, court authorization, media release, participant release, HMIS authorization, or other written permission was relied upon;
4. whether any images, audio, video, or identifying information involving my children were shared internally, externally, or with partner agencies;
5. whether LAHSA or Mr. Redd reviewed this minor-child consent issue before Mr. Redd left LAHSA.

My main question is this:

What did LAHSA determine, document, refer, or preserve in connection with Mr. Redd's review of my matter, including the unresolved consent / authorization issue, LAHSA's instruction that I report concerns involving fraud and theft to law enforcement, and any records

involving my minor children?

Please also preserve all records connected to Mr. Redd's handling of my matter, including emails, notes, case summaries, consent records, Release of Information records, HMIS-related records, communications with CRCD, communications with County departments, referral records, closure notes, records involving my minor children, and communications involving the Auditor-Controller / OCI.

Since the LA County Fraud Hotline is copied on this thread, I am also requesting that LAHSA clarify whether it considers this matter open, closed, referred, or outside LAHSA's jurisdiction, and whether OCI has been provided any records or summary related to Mr. Redd's prior involvement.

Thank you,

Kyle David Haab
1551 E. 106th St Unit 3/4
Los Angeles, CA 90002
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com
[Quoted text hidden]



Outlook-geha0fm0.png

14 KB



Call Follow-Up and Request for Receipt Confirmation of Prior Emails

6 messages

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 20, 2026 at 2:03 PM

To: Sanford, Ahliyah <asanford@bos.lacounty.gov>, HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov
Cc: Giza, Maeve <MGiza@bos.lacounty.gov>, Hills, LaJuannah <lhills@bos.lacounty.gov>

Ms. Sanford,

Thank you for speaking with me today.

This email is to briefly memorialize my understanding of our call. My understanding is that your office will get back to me within 1–2 business days regarding my follow-up, including the issues raised in my April 16 email concerning CRCD, County oversight, and the impact on our children’s case.

I also want to restate one specific request for transparency and record clarity: I have sent multiple emails to your office prior to April 16, and I am requesting confirmation of which of those emails were received and are being preserved as part of the record, and whether any were not received. I am making that request so there is a clear written record of what your office has, what it does not have, and what communications are being treated as part of the existing file.

Please confirm, when convenient:










1. that my April 16 email was received,
2. that your office intends to respond within 1–2 business days as discussed,
3. whether my prior emails to your office were received and preserved, and
4. if possible, which specific email dates or messages your office is treating as part of the current record.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Kyle Haab
1551 E. 106th St., Unit 3/4
Los Angeles, CA 90002
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com

9 attachments

-  **CPRA Kyle Haab 4.17.26(1).pdf**
333 KB
-  **letter_1776285674469_2675214(7).pdf**
99 KB
-  **Gmail - Confirmation of Our Call and Request for Clarification.PDF**
98 KB
-  **CRCD Partner and Stakeholder Statement.pdf**
92 KB
-  **CRCD-Privacy-Policy_2026.pdf**
203 KB
-  **Client Case Notes History.pdf**
95 KB
-  **Gmail - TBPR Investigative File 101977-2026-3-TT-INV (Haab_Morrison); NOTICE_ RULE 5.PDF**
135 KB
-  **2026-04-02 R INIT RESP.pdf**
1.1 MB
-  **Gmail - Final follow-up regarding CRCD, County oversight, and impact on our children’s case.PDF**
81 KB

Good afternoon Mr. Haab,

Thank you for your email, as well as the message you sent on April 16th.

Our office's policy is to respond to inquiries within 1–2 business days. If your messages were sent to the correct email address, please rest assured that they have been received.

Regarding your final question, I'm not entirely sure which record you are referring to. If you are asking whether emails sent to my address are being received, I can confirm that they are.

Please feel free to clarify your question, and I'll be happy to assist.

Best,

Ahliyah Sanford | *Deputy, Constituent Engagement*

Pronouns: She/Her/Hers

Office of Supervisor Holly J. Mitchell, Second District

Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors

O: (213) 974-2222 | **F:** (213) 680-3283

E: ASanford@bos.lacounty.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

Mon, Apr 20, 2026 at 5:35 PM

To: Sanford, Ahliyah <ASanford@bos.lacounty.gov>

Cc: Giza, Maeve <MGiza@bos.lacounty.gov>, Hills, LaJuannah <LHills@bos.lacounty.gov>

Ms. Sanford,

I am clarifying my request because there should be no misunderstanding at this point.

This matter concerns County responsibility tied to CFCI-PA3-056-2023, Program Area 3 / Youth Housing, and the related CRCD / Project Tipping Point housing and relocation chain. I am not asking whether emails sent to your address arrive in your inbox. I am asking what County office owns the matter, what lawful basis the County contends existed for the activity at issue, and what office is preserving and reviewing the operative record.

I am not requesting another general redirect, another self-help referral, or another simple confirmation of receipt.

I am requesting a direct written answer to the following:

1. What exact County office is responsible for the final County-side answer where the matter implicates CFCI-PA3-056-2023 and the related CRCD / Project Tipping Point housing chain.
2. What lawful basis, authorization, or County-approved funding/compliance framework the County contends justified the California-side activity at issue.
3. Whether my April 16 email and attachments are being preserved as part of the operative County record for this matter.
4. Whether my April 20 follow-up and attachments are being preserved as part of that same operative County record.
5. Whether my earlier emails to your office are being associated with that same record.

6. If your office is not responsible for providing that answer, the exact office, unit, and contact that is.

This issue has already been presented to your office as a County-funded-program matter affecting my children's case, not a general inquiry. County Counsel also indicated that documentation submitted in January resulted in referral of the matter to OCI case 2026_23965. My April 16 follow-up then specifically asked what County office had oversight responsibility for the CRCD / CFCI-PA3-056-2023 chain, what office handled compliance and enforcement, and what lawful basis or authorization was being relied on. Those questions remain unanswered.

So the issue is now straightforward:








If the County contends the conduct was lawful, identify the office, authority, contract/program basis, and preserved record supporting that position.

If the County does not contend that, then identify the office responsible for correction, escalation, or written disavowal of responsibility.

Please preserve this message with the existing record and respond in writing.

Kyle Haab
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com
[Quoted text hidden]

7 attachments

-  **image001.png**
5 KB
-  **image002.png**
6 KB
-  **image003.png**
3 KB
-  **image004.png**
1 KB
-  **image005.png**
1 KB
-  **image006.png**
1 KB
-  **image007.png**
1 KB

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>
To: maya.douglas@asm.ca.gov

Tue, Apr 21, 2026 at 1:47 PM

Im forwarding this as relevance towards my communications with county

[Quoted text hidden]

7 attachments

 **image002.png**
6 KB

 **image006.png**
1 KB

 **image001.png**
5 KB

 **image005.png**
1 KB

 **image003.png**
3 KB

 **image004.png**
1 KB

 **image007.png**
1 KB

Sanford, Ahliyah <ASanford@bos.lacounty.gov>

Tue, Apr 21, 2026 at 2:37 PM

To: Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

Cc: Giza, Maeve <MGiza@bos.lacounty.gov>, Hills, LaJuannah <LHills@bos.lacounty.gov>

Good afternoon Mr. Haab,

As noted in my previous emails, our office has forwarded your concerns to the appropriate departments for their review and investigation. Those departments have since responded to you directly. At this time, our office considers this matter closed.

If you have any further questions or require additional clarification, please reach out to the departments directly.

Best regards,

[Quoted text hidden]

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

Tue, Apr 21, 2026 at 2:56 PM

To: Sanford, Ahliyah <ASanford@bos.lacounty.gov>

Cc: Giza, Maeve <MGiza@bos.lacounty.gov>, Hills, LaJuannah <LHills@bos.lacounty.gov>, maya.douglas@asm.ca.gov

Ms. Sanford,

Thank you for your response.

For record-preservation purposes, I want to state clearly that my concern remains unchanged.

My prior April 7 and April 16 emails did not request general self-help guidance or a generic departmental referral. They requested identification of the exact County office responsible for the final County-side answer regarding consent basis, authorization, oversight, routing, preservation, and the impact of the CRCD / Project Tipping Point / County-funded housing chain on my children's case.

Your April 21 response states that your office forwarded my concerns to departments, that those departments responded directly, and that your office considers the matter closed. I am preserving that response as the Supervisor office's position.

To date, I still do not have a final written answer identifying:

1. the exact County office responsible for the final County-side response;












2. the lawful basis or authorization relied upon for the activity at issue;
3. the office responsible for oversight, compliance, routing, and preservation; or
4. whether the County is treating the consent-basis issue as unresolved or as closed.

I am therefore preserving your April 21 email as confirmation that the Supervisor's office closed its constituent lane without identifying the single County office responsible for those answers.

Please preserve this email with the existing record.

Thank you,
Kyle David Haab
657-557-4459
kyle.dietz99@gmail.com
[Quoted text hidden]

11 attachments

-  **image001.png**
5 KB
-  **image002.png**
6 KB
-  **image003.png**
3 KB
-  **image004.png**
1 KB
-  **image005.png**
1 KB
-  **image006.png**
1 KB
-  **image007.png**
1 KB
-  **Gmail - Final follow-up regarding CRCDD, County oversight, and impact on our children's case(1).PDF**
81 KB
-  **Gmail - Demand for written correction and final oversight response regarding 2025-23289, 2026-23965, and county authoriza(2).PDF**
85 KB
-  **Gmail - TBPR File 101977-2026-3-TT-INV (Haab_Morrison).PDF**
129 KB
-  **Gmail - RE_External Message_ Follow-Up Submission_ 2023 HMIS _ Ruth's Place Consent and Information-Sharing Concern.PDF**
162 KB



RE: Letter

2 messages

Crystal Izarraraz <izarrarazcrystal36@gmail.com>

Mon, Feb 16, 2026 at 1:08 PM

To: Kyle <Kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

To whom it may concern

This is a letter to state the impact that CRCD has done to rip our family apart and to gave us instability. We took a while couch surfing while I was pregnant with my twins, and when we got lucky of finding a Section 8 housing in Tennessee that showed we needed help, they gave us housing quickly because of my pregnancy. Once I gave birth in the 2-bedroom housing and came back, we came into an altercation where we were both detained and lost our twins because there was no guardian to watch them. Once we were doing a visitation with cps I got a random phone call from CRCD recruiting people to join their program. We said yes because my mother has already put a petition out for our kids, and we thought that would be a good idea to live out here in California while getting our rent covered. They never stated how long it would be. So we assumed it would be a permanent thing, we got excited, got the court to approve the petition with my mother, and came to California once they found us a place. If this weren't a permanent thing, we would have gotten our kids back by now and been able to stay in that 2-bedroom for \$185.00 a month. It was unfair how they couldn't help with our situation and should have told us beforehand that they knew our situation and still got us to move out here for basically nothing. Now we are living in an unapproved unit, and the instability of knowing where to be after this tore our family apart, and they proceed to not care what impact they've had on us.

Sincerely,

Crystal Izarraraz

520-719-9736

izarrarazcrystal36@gmail.com

Kyle <kyle.dietz99@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 18, 2026 at 9:34 PM

To: lpark@lafla.org

This is letter from my fiance which describes the impact

[Quoted text hidden]

Madam Chair and Hon. Supervisors:

I am a transit user in District 5.

Bottom Line Up Front: I urge you to exercise your authority on the LA Metro Board to encourage a resumption of broad fare checks. This is an equity, safety, and revenue protection issue.

For many riders using LA Metro is not always a pleasant experience because of the number of persons who do not pay the fares.

Metro has reduced fare checks by 98% since 2018. Before fall 2018, LA Metro Transit Security Officers did over 300,000 onboard fare checks per month. In 2025, TSOs did only 5,000 per month.

The latest data shows Metro did almost 6000 checks in February, mostly checks to see if riders could produce a Tap Card - not actually to see if they had paid.

Fares are now effectively optional, and too many riders are not paying.

Metro's own data shows most crime on the system is committed by non-paying riders. Unfortunately, some people appear to use transit as shelter during the day, riding trains or buses all day. I have also witnessed drug use on the A Line, and numerous incidents of antisocial behavior. It would only take one awful incident to put LA Metro on the national front page, as happened in Charlotte.

For those of us who pay our fares, checking to make sure every rider is paying is a matter of equity, fairness, and safety.

Fare checks would also roughly double fare revenue. Those funds could support both current operations and service enhancements.

Routine proof-of-payment checks of all passengers is a best practice. San Diego and Denver each conduct hundreds of thousands of checks monthly. Denver RTD did 5 million checks in 2025, with fewer officers than LA Metro.

I hope you can take up this issue. Fairness for farepayers, please.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

P.A. Brown
District 5 (San Gabriel Valley)