

I'm in receipt of the summary investigation. Witness #1 was fully aware of the investigation and proactively alerted documents and provided false statements during his investigation. Witness #1 directed employees to alter the weapons log entry and conveniently lost the logs with intent to misplace during the investigation. Witness #1 directed his employee to alter the documents by making up time and dates back logging for approximately three months. It should be known; the employee made a complaint about Witness #1 ordering him to do an illegal act. The complaint / employee went to his immediate supervisor about his complaint. Witness #1 was in fact wearing his personal firearm while on duty. There are several witnesses that can corroborate his illegal action. Witness #1 attempted to back track the logs that were missing due to wearing his personal firearm while on duty. Witness #1 committed additional acts of color of authority when he ordered his employee to commit falsification of government back logs / documents.

Title 18 U.S.C. § 926B - Carrying of **concealed** firearms by qualified law enforcement officers (Law Enforcement Officer Safety Act (LEOSA)).

LEOSA is only **applicable** if the firearm is **concealed** pursuant to personal firearms. The fact wasn't him carrying a personal firearm concealed on federal property. The argument was, he was carrying his personal firearm exposed while on duty in uniform making him in violation.

Definition :Concealed carry, or **carrying a concealed weapon (CCW)**, is the practice of carrying a weapon (usually a sidearm such as a handgun), either in proximity to or on one's person or in public places in a manner that **hides or conceals** the weapon's presence from surrounding observers.

Definition : "Open carry," in contrast, refers to bearing **visible** firearms in public places.

There is no documentation by the DOD or Commanding officer granting the Law Enforcement Officer permission and authority to carry POF's while on duty / in uniform. LEOSA does not apply...

Witness #1 provided false statements advising while in uniform with his exposed POF he was checking in/out his govt issued firearm. The on-duty LT who captured the picture was never interviewed / interviewed properly during the investigation. According to the eyewitness, that picture of Witness #1 was already on duty and Witness #1 was not checking in / out his GOVT firearm. The fact of the matter is, Witness #1 drove his GOVT marked police vehicle with his exposed POF in uniform to Starbucks after the picture was captured. . The on-duty LT coincidentally followed him in Starbucks knowing Witness #1 was in violation carrying his POF.

Witness #1 gave a false statement. He explained verbally without visible proof that his rifles / ar15 was in accordance with California law. I know based off personal observation that his firearm is illegal and not in compliance. Witness #1 provided additional false statements due to the fact, he claimed approximately 5 firearms are registered at NTC fort Irwin. The question should have been, " how many firearms do you possess in your residence " . Witness #1 owns more than 5 firearms. I know, he inherited additional firearms including non-compliant rifles after his brother passed away.

Witness #1 provided a false statement about shooting his POFs on the shooting range. In fact, there was a complaint about his illegal action by the past training LT in 2022 who advised him of his illegal possession. The other LT who later passed away escorted Witness #1 off the range when he was caught shooting his POF's in 2022. Witness #1 was utilizing GOVT ammo for his personal rifles. Witness #1 was verbally counseled by training LT in which the documented counseling went in his employee file. Witness #1 became Chief ; he was shooting frequently at the range with his personal AR 15. Witness #1 made false statements when he stated they only shot POF's at the range for LEOSA qualification. Witness #1 provided a false statement due to the fact, GOVT firearm qualification are duplicated for LEOSA qualifications, so you don't have to shoot your POFs. LEOSA approved GOVT firearm qualification for LEOSA holders.

Whistle blower comments (OSC File No. DI-23-000193)

Based off the above investigation, Witness #1 was one step ahead on covering up and altering documents. Additionally, LEOSA is being misinterpreted. Witness #1 knows LEOSA is for concealment POF's and not for exposed POF's while on duty and in uniform. Since the investigation, there have been several complaints & investigation on Witness #1 for integrity and color of authority. Additionally, Witness #1 has been observed several times carrying his POF on duty in uniform driving a marked government police vehicle.

Respectfully submitted.

Whistleblower.

[REDACTED]