



---

**Before McKinley County votes: what MCSO's bodycam shows**

---

To: molly@gallupsunweekly.com

Thu, Aug 27, 2026 at 11:53 AM

Molly,

My name is [REDACTED] I have primary-source evidence from MCSO Case 2026-00010128 that I believe **McKinley County** residents should have the opportunity to see before they begin voting for Sheriff.

I am not asking you to intervene in my criminal case, influence its outcome, or take any position in an election. I am asking the **Gallup** Sun to review the underlying records and decide independently whether they warrant a story.

On July 16, 2026, while traveling through **Gallup** aboard a Greyhound bus, I reported that another passenger made unwanted contact with my buttocks and private area four times.

The bus driver intervened. Law enforcement was called. Greyhound would not allow the accused passenger back onto the bus.

What MCSO did next is captured on body camera.

At 11:35, the accused tells Deputy Miguel Bittony:  
"Again, I need a translator."

No translator is obtained.

At 11:43, Bittony acknowledges:  
"I know. There's no translator here, but I'm going to try. I'm going to talk to you."

Seconds later, Bittony tells him he must understand English because he is supposedly "arguing" with him.

The body camera does not show the argument Bittony relies upon as proof of comprehension.

At 17:06, the accused says:  
"I'm not arguing. I respect you, sir. I respect. By the way, I speak little bit."  
At 17:11, Bittony again says:  
"We don't have a translator."

Then, within one minute, Bittony asks where the bus came from.

The accused answers:

"Me? I'm from India."

Bittony has to explain that he meant where the bus originated.

The accused later says twice:

"I'm not speak proper English, sir."

The substantive questioning continues.

But the language issue is only part of what the recording shows.

I reported four contacts involving my buttocks and private area.

During questioning, Bittony reduces that allegation to generic "touching" six separate times. Six times.

He also supplies or reintroduces TEN alternative explanations for what might have happened rather than first obtaining the accused's account entirely in his own words.

Then the interview moves into something else entirely.

At 38:37, a civilian suggests that I might "want money or something."

Bittony responds:

"Possibly. I understand."

During the same sequence, Bittony says:

"People do stuff like this..."

The civilian then gives an analogy involving people deliberately causing accidents to obtain insurance money.

Bittony responds:

"**Oh**, yeah. Yeah. Definitely."

I had not demanded money, requested compensation, threatened a lawsuit, or connected my allegation to money in any way.

I am not asking your newsroom to assign meaning to one isolated sentence. I am asking you to watch the complete sequence and determine for yourself what Bittony meant by "people do stuff like this," why a financial or fabrication theory entered the investigation, and whether that was appropriate while evidence gathering was still incomplete.

There is another striking sequence.

Bittony tells the accused:

"You're not going to go to jail."

Immediately afterward, he acknowledges:

"I have to gather all the evidence."

Witnesses were available as well. The Greyhound driver had intervened, passengers had been awakened, and dozens of people were aboard the bus, yet significant potential witness evidence was not meaningfully pursued.

The written report also raises questions.

Bittony repeatedly told me that what I told him would go into the report and that what the accused told him would go into the report. Significant information captured on body camera was omitted, while parts of the written narrative raise questions about whether explanations originating with Bittony were adequately distinguished from statements actually supplied by the accused.

There is also an identification and follow-up issue.

MCSO recorded the accused as:

"SHUBHAM, NO GIVEN NAME."

He was a 21-year-old traveler from India, was not arrested or booked, and continued interstate travel after leaving **Gallup**.

On the day of the incident, I was already asking MCSO how I could use VINE/VINELink or otherwise follow the case when I did not have adequate identifying information.

MCSO knew who he was.

I did not receive the report identifying him until weeks later.

I eventually took these concerns directly to Sheriff James Maiorano.

Maiorano has spent 26 years serving **Gallup** and **McKinley County** in law enforcement.

After telling me he had reviewed Deputy Bittony's report and video, Maiorano concluded:

"The investigation conducted by Deputy Bittony and approved by Sgt. Benally is sufficient."

That is the central question I am asking the **Gallup** Sun to examine:

Does the underlying evidence support the Sheriff's conclusion that this was a "sufficient" investigation?

You do not have to take my word for any of it.

I can provide the complete body-camera footage, an exact timestamp guide, the investigative report, CAD/dispatch records, Sheriff Maiorano's written response, supervisory material, and the public-records correspondence that followed.

The body camera can be compared directly against the written record.

And timing matters.

**McKinley County** residents will soon begin casting ballots in the Sheriff's race.

I am not asking the **Gallup** Sun to endorse anyone or tell anyone how to vote.

I want voters to see the evidence before they vote.

If residents believe this investigation, and Sheriff Maiorano's decision to call it "sufficient," represent the standard they want from their Sheriff's Office, they can vote accordingly.

If they disagree, they deserve the opportunity to show that with their vote.

That opportunity disappears if the story comes out after the ballots are already cast.

Will you review the evidence?

I can provide the complete package immediately.

Thank you for your time, Ma'am.

[REDACTED]

MCSO Case 2026-00010128