



MICHAEL A. HESTRIN
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

OFFICE OF
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
3960 ORANGE STREET
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92501-3643

June 16, 2026

The Honorable Jacqueline C. Jackson,
Presiding Judge
Superior Court of California, County of Riverside
4050 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92501

Re: Response to the 2025–2026 Riverside County Grand Jury Report, *Policy vs. Practice: An Investigation into Riverside County's Workplace Discrimination Procedures*

Dear Judge Jackson:

Pursuant to California Penal Code sections 933 and 933.05, enclosed please find the Riverside County District Attorney's Office response to the 2025–2026 Riverside County Grand Jury report entitled *Policy vs. Practice: An Investigation into Riverside County's Workplace Discrimination Procedures*.

The District Attorney's Office appreciates the time and effort devoted by the members of the Grand Jury in reviewing this important subject. The enclosed response addresses the findings and recommendations directed to this Office in accordance with the requirements of Penal Code section 933.05.

Copies of this response are being provided to the Riverside County Grand Jury and the Riverside County Clerk-Recorder, as required by law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

JENNIFER GARCIA
Assistant District Attorney

Fiscal Year 2025/2026 Grand Jury Report
Policy vs. Practice:
An Investigation into Riverside County's Workplace Discrimination
Procedures
Riverside County District Attorney's Office

GRAND JURY FINDINGS:

Grand Jury Finding #1:

F3. Public safety agencies are not following Policy C-25 requirements to cross reporting and/or forward C-25 complaints to HR.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #1:

Respondent disagrees partially with the finding.

The report appears to suggest that all complaints against staff should be cross-reported and investigated. However, both the law and the County's C-25 Policy require a cross-report only when allegations involve potential unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation based on a protected or perceived characteristic. Complaints involving general rude or discourteous conduct, such as overheard offensive language, do not fall within the scope of the C-25 Policy. The policy also expressly provides for a prima facie review upon receipt of a complaint, using the criteria set forth in Attachment A, "Basis for Filing a Complaint," to determine whether a potential C-25 violation exists before proceeding further.

The District Attorney's Office will cross reference C-25 complaints and outcomes going forward, however many C-25 complaints were submitted directly to the County Human Resources Department and forwarded to the District Attorney's Office. Thereafter, the District Attorney's Office communicated outcomes of the investigations to County HR as required by Board Policy C-25.

Grand Jury Finding #2:

F4. Public safety agencies are not following the Policy C-25 requirement to report disciplinary action related to C-25 complaints to HR.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #2:

Respondent agrees with finding.

Department comments: The District Attorney's Office will communicate any formal disciplinary action stemming from a C-25 filing to County Human Resources going forward.

Grand Jury Finding #3:

F5. HR is failing to take action to ensure compliance with Policy C-25 by the public agencies.

Response to Grand Jury Finding #3:

Respondent agrees with finding.

Department comments: The District Attorney's Office will cross reference C-25 complaints and outcomes going forward.

GRAND JURY RECOMMENDATIONS:

Grand Jury Recommendation #1:

Response to Grand Jury #1: *Not applicable to our Department.*

Grand Jury Recommendation #2:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Response to Grand Jury #2: *Not applicable to our Department.*

Choose an item.

Department comments:

Grand Jury Recommendation #3: R3. The Riverside County Civil Grand Jury recommends that HR and the Executive Office should conduct a comprehensive audit to verify public safety agencies' compliance with Policy C-25. The audit should examine compliance with reporting, updating historical records, the dispositions of and any "off-the-books Administrative Reviews" within three months from receipt of this report.

Response to Grand Jury #3:

Recommendation will not be implemented because it is not warranted or reasonable.

Department comments: The District Attorney will work with the assigned Human Resources Business Partner to develop a historical report related to the District Attorney's compliance with Board Policy C-25 as to C-25 complaints, investigations, and outcomes.

