



FORMAL P-008 COMPLAINT

Wed, Sep 16, 2026 at 9:38 AM

To: Anthony Dimas <anthony.dimas@co.mckinley.nm.us>

Mr. Dimas,

I am writing directly to you in your capacity as **McKinley County** Manager to formally invoke **McKinley County** Policy P-008 concerning complaints previously submitted to **McKinley County**, subsequent conduct by Sheriff James Maiorano III, and the County's handling of those complaints.

I want one point established at the outset:

I do not concede that September 16, 2026 is the operative submission date under §7.4.2.

On August 17, 2026, I submitted a written complaint to **McKinley County** concerning identified conduct by Deputy Miguel Bittony and Sgt. Savannah Benally and expressly requested supervisory review of whether that conduct complied with MCSO policy, training, and accepted investigative standards.

This email does not create that complaint on September 16.

It formally invokes the County Manager's responsibilities under P-008 concerning an existing complaint, the manner in which that complaint was handled, and subsequent related conduct by Sheriff Maiorano.

I. P-008 assigns this process to the County Manager

Section 7.2.1 provides that alleged Code violations by an elected official, employee, appointed official, or volunteer are to be reported to the County Manager, who is to ensure a prompt, objective, and thorough investigation.

Section 7.3.1 states that the County Manager is to accept all complaints or allegations of misconduct submitted to the County by citizens or public servants, whether covered by the Code of Conduct or not, and monitor them to ensure they are appropriately dealt with.

Section 7.3.2 requires the County Manager to inform the complainant where the complaint is in the process and when the matter is concluded.

Section 7.3.3 assigns the County Manager responsibility for directing the complaint to the appropriate reviewing authority, determining the need and level of investigation, and determining responsibility for any necessary investigation.

Section 7.2.3 makes the County's remedies non-exclusive and permits referral to another agency with competent jurisdiction. The existence of a separate certification complaint, prosecutorial review, Attorney General referral, or other outside process therefore does not answer what **McKinley County** did with complaints submitted to **McKinley County**. Section 7.4.3 likewise provides that if a complaint is determined to be a non-Code issue, the County Manager shall refer it to the appropriate process under the appropriate policy or ordinance.

I am not asking you to prejudge any allegation.

I am asking you to determine when these complaints were submitted, what happened to them, what process governs them, and whether the County has complied with its own policy.

II. Confidentiality under §7.3.5

Because this complaint is being submitted and processed under P-008, I expect the County Manager's Office and all persons involved in its routing, review, investigation, or legal consultation to comply with §7.3.5.

That provision states that complaints filed under the policy are to remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law, so that the County can conduct its self-critical analysis, and that confidentiality extends to persons on a "need to know" basis.

Accordingly, I expect distribution of this complaint and its supporting materials to be limited to persons who legitimately need access for the complaint process.

I recognize that applicable law, including IPRA or another legal obligation, may require disclosure of particular records. I am not asking the County to withhold anything it is legally required to disclose.

I am asking the County to follow its own confidentiality rule while this matter is under review.

Please also preserve records showing to whom this complaint and its supporting materials are forwarded, disclosed, or

distributed during the complaint process.

III. The complaint record predates September 16

August 14: documented case-handling concerns

By August 14, I had already placed MCSO on written notice that ordinary victim communication had failed.

I told Chief Deputy Eric Jim and other MCSO personnel that my victim case-status requests had gone unanswered and that, more than a month after the incident, I was still being forced to piece together basic information about my own case.

Later that day, I documented another serious discrepancy.

MCSO told me in writing:

"Your case has been sent to the District Attorney's Office."

I contacted the District Attorney's Office as instructed. At that time, staff there could locate no referral, intake, case log, or record showing receipt of the matter using the available identifiers.

I immediately reported that discrepancy back to MCSO, provided my recording of the call, requested an explanation, and requested records showing whether, when, and how the referral actually occurred.

I am not presently asking you to treat August 14 as the operative date of the Bittony/Benally investigative-misconduct complaint.

I am asking you to recognize that the record did not suddenly begin three days later. The August 17 complaint arose against an already documented breakdown in communication and case handling.

August 17: written complaint concerning Bittony and Benally

On August 17, I wrote directly to Chief Deputy Eric Jim, copying MCSO Records and Calandra Elliott, and asked him to review a specific documented pattern in Deputy Bittony's questioning.

I identified multiple innocent or exculpatory explanations that Bittony introduced, repeated, or reinforced before obtaining a substantive interpreter-assisted account from the accused.

I expressly asked:

"Is it consistent with MCSO policy, training, or accepted investigative practice for an investigating deputy to introduce and repeatedly reinforce possible innocent explanations for an accused person before obtaining that person's substantive account through an interpreter?"

I further asked:

"If this is an accepted MCSO interviewing practice, please identify the policy, training, or protocol that supports it."

And:

"If it is not, please explain how MCSO evaluates the interview documented above."

I also specifically raised Sgt. Benally's supervisory review and asked whether her review was substantive and whether supervisory review was expected to identify and address an interview sequence of that nature.

I expressly stated:

"I am not asking you to speculate about Deputy Bittony's intent. I am asking whether this documented method of questioning meets MCSO's standards."

That was not merely a records request.

It was a written allegation concerning employee conduct submitted to **McKinley County** and a direct request for supervisory review against MCSO standards.

My position is that August 17, 2026 is the operative submission date of that complaint for purposes of §7.4.2.

If the County disagrees, please identify the specific policy language and factual basis supporting a different date.

August 18: direct command escalation

On August 18, I escalated the concerns directly to Sheriff James Maiorano III in a detailed request for direct command review.

That submission raised specific issues concerning what I reported and physically demonstrated, the four-contact count, my position in my own seat, the accused's request for a translator, repeated indications of limited English proficiency, what allegation Bittony actually communicated, alternative explanations introduced by the investigator, statement attribution, material report omissions, witness handling, and Sgt. Benally's supervisory review.

IV. Sheriff Maiorano then personally declared the investigation "sufficient"

On August 21, Sheriff Maiorano responded:

"I reviewed the report and video from Deputy Bittony."

He then stated:

"Based on that information, the investigation conducted by Deputy Bittony and approved by Sgt. Benally is sufficient."

By that point, the concerns before him were specific and documented.

The County's review should therefore determine what Sheriff Maiorano actually reviewed, what he considered, what he did not consider, what investigative standard he applied, and what factual analysis supported his conclusion.

V. What did Sheriff Maiorano actually review?

Please determine whether Sheriff Maiorano's August 21 review addressed each of the following:

The complete allegation I reported, including four separate contacts, my physical demonstrations, my position in my own seat, repeated buttocks contact, the reported progression toward my private area, and unresolved mechanics of the contact.

The written report's treatment of my account, including omission of the explicit four-contact count and the difference between the driver's more specific account and the shorter summary of my own statement.

The accused's request for a translator, his statement that he spoke only "a little bit" of English, later statements that he did not speak proper English, and documented comprehension problems during questioning.

Whether qualified language assistance was available or considered, including qualified bilingual personnel, authorized interpreters, telephonic interpretation, or another approved language resource.

What allegation was actually presented to the accused, including repeated generic "touching" formulations despite Bittony already possessing a substantially more specific allegation.

The innocent or accidental explanations introduced or reinforced by Bittony, including sleeping, movement, accidental hand movement, seat-space theories, and bag contact.

The innocent explanation Bittony physically demonstrated to the accused, which the accused rejected.

The civilian restaurant worker's role, including whether he was qualified or authorized to interpret, what statements came directly from the accused, what came from the civilian, what was added or summarized, and whether the report accurately distinguished those sources.

Every material statement attributed to Shubham in the report, including the exact source and timestamp for the statement that he "did his best not to touch [REDACTED] while in his seat."

The seat-space issue, including Shubham's direct response that he was sitting in his own area and the later translated or paraphrased responses obtained after repeated questioning.

Material victim-side information omitted or narrowed in the written report, including the four-contact count and Bittony's recorded clarification that I was "just in your seat."

Sgt. Benally's actual supervisory role, including what she personally observed on scene, what briefing she received, what evidence she knew existed, what she reviewed, what instructions she gave, and whether "REVIEWED BY Benally, Savannah" represented substantive review or administrative approval.

Available witnesses. Approximately 36 passengers were aboard the bus. Shubham himself repeatedly suggested asking nearby people. Photographs preserved from immediately after the outcry and during the response visibly document multiple people physically present around the bus while the incident was being addressed. I do not claim those photographs establish what any person saw or heard. They do establish that identifiable potential witnesses or onlookers were present and available for inquiry concerning seating, movement, the confrontation, immediate reactions, statements, the driver's intervention, or other surrounding circumstances.

Why no meaningful passenger canvass is documented, including whether any attempt was made to identify or contact the people visibly present in those photographs.

The bus driver as an independent witness, including what she observed, what she was told, her intervention, the calls for law enforcement, the ticket photograph, and her refusal to return the accused to that bus.

The repeated reassurances given to the accused while evidence gathering remained incomplete, including the sequence in which he was told he was not going to jail approximately five seconds before Bittony stated that he still had to gather all the evidence.

The introduction of a possible financial or fabrication theory, including the suggestion that I might "want money or something," Bittony's response, the later "people do stuff like this" discussion, and what factual basis, if any, supported that line of discussion.

The evidence actually gathered and preserved, including MCSO body-camera and dash-camera material, cellphone recordings, photographs, Greyhound material, driver information, notes, CAD and dispatch material, and later supplemental evidence.

Gallup Police evidence, including whether Sheriff Maiorano knew of or reviewed GPD body-camera material, officer observations, notes, my initial statement or physical demonstration, or other evidence generated before MCSO assumed primary responsibility.

Greyhound Incident GH034799, including whether MCSO requested, obtained, preserved, reviewed, incorporated, or transmitted that contemporaneous third-party incident record.

The two cellphone videos identified during the encounter, including whether either was copied, uploaded, evidence-numbered, preserved, or transmitted to the prosecutor.

Suspect identification and locating information, including the accuracy and completeness of the name, date of birth, telephone number, address, apartment or unit information, identification documents, ticket information, and interstate locating information.

The timing and factual basis of the no-arrest or no-further-investigation decision, particularly in relation to Bittony's acknowledgement that evidence gathering remained incomplete.

Whether the matter was screened with or referred to MCSO Investigations, and if not, why the patrol-level investigation

was considered sufficient.

The District Attorney referral chronology, including what was actually transmitted, when, by whom, what report version was used, and what evidence accompanied it.

What exact report Sheriff Maiorano reviewed, including its version, date, supplements, associated notes, and supporting records.

What exact "video" Sheriff Maiorano reviewed, including which officer's recording, whether the complete relevant recording was viewed, and what portion or duration was reviewed.

Whether Sheriff Maiorano reviewed Sgt. Benally's own body-camera footage before declaring the investigation she approved sufficient.

Whether he performed a report-to-recording comparison, particularly because my command-review request expressly raised differences between information known during the investigation and information appearing in the written report.

Which investigative, language-access, report-writing, evidence, and supervisory policies or standards he relied upon.

Whether his review produced any contemporaneous notes, analysis, findings, follow-up instructions, corrective requests, assignments, or other documentation.

If no contemporaneous review documentation exists, what factual analysis supported the categorical conclusion that the investigation was "sufficient."

This is not a request that the County Manager personally reinvestigate every fact from July 16.

It is a request to determine what the Sheriff actually did when he represented that he had conducted command review and concluded that the investigation was sufficient.

VI. The September 3 records response makes that question more important

I later sought records specifically designed to identify what Sheriff Maiorano reviewed, accessed, relied upon, or generated before making his August 21 determination.

MCSO's September 3 response reported no responsive records in several categories designed to document Sheriff Maiorano's review and one responsive email in the communications category.

I do not contend that the absence of responsive records proves that no review occurred.

It does make the scope, methodology, timing, and documentation of the claimed review an appropriate factual question for the County Manager's investigation.

VII. Applicable MCSO policy versions need to be identified

On September 15, MCSO produced policies concerning sexual-assault investigations, limited-English-proficiency services, report preparation, and investigation and prosecution.

The copies produced bear a Lexipol publication date of July 29, 2026, after the July 16 incident.

I therefore do not assume that those exact versions governed the July 16 response.

Please identify the versions actually in force on July 16, any versions in force on August 21 when Sheriff Maiorano conducted his command review, the policies Sheriff Maiorano actually consulted if any, and whether the July 29 versions reflected preexisting MCSO standards, newly adopted standards, or revisions to earlier policies.

The conduct should be evaluated against the standards actually applicable at the relevant time.

VIII. August 21: AI restriction and the direct invitation to call

In the same August 21 communication, Sheriff Maiorano wrote:

"we will not continue to converse with you while you are utilizing Artificial Intelligence software."

He also stated that telephone communication remained available and that case questions would need to be handled over a recorded telephone call or through an in-person visit.

At 5:19:54 p.m. CDT, two minutes after his message, I replied directly:

"Call me directly - let's chat, Sir. [REDACTED]"

At 5:20:51 p.m. CDT, 57 seconds later, Streak generated a first-view notification for that tracked thread.

The native Streak email states:

“People on thread: James Maiorano”

“Device: PC”

James Maiorano is the only person listed by Streak under “People on thread” in that notification.

I recognize the limitation of email tracking. It does not independently establish which human was physically sitting at the computer or that every word was read.

It is nevertheless contemporaneous evidence that the tracked thread containing my telephone number and express invitation to call registered a PC view 57 seconds after I sent it.

That evidence should be compared with MCSO’s actual telephone, voicemail, and case-contact records.

IX. August 25: a single point of contact is not the issue

On August 25, Sheriff Maiorano sent an internal communication to the Sheriff Department and copied Deputy County Manager Brian Money and County Manager Anthony Dimas.

It instructed personnel receiving email from me not to respond directly and instead to forward the communications to Chief Deputy Eric Jim.

The communication also stated that I was:

“utilizing AI software attempting to flood the office with IPRA requests”

and:

“attempting to make complaints about MCSO staff”

and that I:

“will not take our calls or call us back.”

It also referenced my contacts with outside agencies.

I want to make an important distinction.

I do not object, by itself, to an agency designating one point of contact.

Centralizing communications can be legitimate and orderly.

My concern is whether the designated point of contact actually functioned as a point of contact, or whether the directive resulted in substantive communications and complaints being routed into silence.

One point of contact is one thing.

No meaningful point of contact is another.

Please determine what Chief Deputy Jim was instructed to do with forwarded communications, what response obligations remained in place, and what system existed to ensure that victim questions, complaints, and other substantive communications were actually answered.

X. The statement that I would not take or return calls requires factual review

Four days before the August 25 email, Sheriff Maiorano told me telephone communication was available and required for case questions.

Two minutes later, I expressly invited him to call me and supplied my telephone number.

Fifty-seven seconds after that invitation, the tracked thread registered the Streak view described above.

I am not claiming those facts establish the complete history of every call attempt.

I am asking the County to test Sheriff Maiorano's categorical statement that I "will not take our calls or call us back" against actual records, including outgoing MCSO call records, incoming call records, voicemail records, case-contact records, records of calls or attempted calls by Sheriff Maiorano or other personnel, and my August 21 written invitation.

Please determine what factual basis existed for that statement before it was distributed to MCSO personnel and County management.

XI. The "flood" characterization also requires a factual basis

The records activity Sheriff Maiorano characterized as an attempt to "flood" MCSO arose from specific unresolved issues.

Among other things, I sought records because victim case-status inquiries had gone unanswered, because the initial production did not include all responsive body-camera material, because I was attempting to determine what had actually been sent to the prosecutor, and because I was trying to reconstruct investigative and supervisory activity that was not otherwise being explained to me.

On September 9, I wrote directly to Sheriff Maiorano, Deputy County Manager Money, and County Manager Dimas regarding both the AI-based communication restriction and the August 25 accusation.

I supplied supporting material from a recorded call with Kenneth H. Stalter, whom the **New Mexico** Department of Justice identifies as the plaintiff's-attorney representative on its IPRA Task Force and a co-founder of 505 Legal.

When I explained that I used ChatGPT to assist in drafting IPRA requests, Mr. Stalter responded: "You're allowed to. You're allowed to do that!"

I am not presenting Mr. Stalter's statement as a judicial decision, binding legal opinion, or substitute for the County's own legal analysis.

The narrower point is factual:

Using AI as a drafting tool is not itself evidence that a requester is intentionally attempting to "flood" a public office.

Please determine what evidence Sheriff Maiorano possessed for assigning that motive to me.

XII. County management had direct notice, and seven days later neither manager has substantively responded
The August 25 internal email itself was copied to Mr. Money and Mr. Dimas and expressly stated that I was attempting to make complaints about MCSO staff.

I do not claim that being copied on an email proves either recipient personally read, endorsed, approved, or acted upon it.

September 9 is different.

On September 9, I wrote directly to Sheriff Maiorano, Deputy County Manager Brian Money, and County Manager Anthony Dimas.

I challenged the AI communication restriction, the August 25 no-response directive, and the accusation that I was attempting to flood the Office.

I supplied supporting material and directly asked County management what action it would take.

I then sent a separate September 9 clarification expressly identifying the August 25 email and requesting correction of the motive attributed to me.

As of September 16, seven days later, I have received no substantive response from either Mr. Money or Mr. Dimas to those September 9 complaints.

That silence cannot simply be attributed to an inability to communicate with me.

On August 26, I emailed Mr. Money for an entirely unrelated reason to praise County employees Alissa Copi and Anna Padilla for the assistance they had provided.

Mr. Money responded and forwarded my recognition request onward.

Mr. Money also communicated with me on September 11 regarding an unrelated IPRA request.

I include those facts for a narrow reason.

There was no general communication barrier between Deputy County Manager Money and me.

When I wrote to praise County employees, he responded.

When the County needed to communicate concerning an unrelated records request, he responded.

When I directly raised the August 25 directive and asked County management to address the Sheriff's conduct, neither Mr. Money nor Mr. Dimas provided a substantive response during the following seven days.

I am not asking you to infer motive from that silence.

I am asking you to determine what happened internally after County management received those September 9 communications.

Please determine whether either September 9 communication was logged as a complaint or allegation of misconduct, whether either was referred or assigned, whether the County Manager's Office requested information from Sheriff Maiorano or MCSO, whether Human Resources or the County Attorney was consulted, whether anyone determined that P-008 applied or did not apply, and, if no action occurred, why not.

XIII. Sheriff Maiorano's own August 25 language bears directly on the operative-date issue

There is an additional problem with treating September 16 as the beginning of this complaint history.

Sheriff Maiorano himself wrote on August 25 that I was already:

"attempting to make complaints about MCSO staff."

If the County now contends that my August 17 written submission did not constitute a complaint or allegation of misconduct under §7.3.1, please reconcile that position with the Sheriff's own contemporaneous characterization of my activity as complaint-making.

Please identify the date the County considers my first complaint or allegation concerning Bittony or Benally to have been submitted, who received it, whether it was routed to the County Manager, why it was not routed if it was not, whether the August 18 command-review request was separately treated as a complaint, whether the August 25 communication triggered action by County management, and whether the September 9 direct communications triggered action.

XIV. Section 7.2.4 and the opportunity to correct

Section 7.2.4 provides reasonable notice and time to correct where a Code violation is unintentional or for good cause and not for personal motive.

The September 9 communications expressly placed Sheriff Maiorano, Mr. Money, and Mr. Dimas on notice of the challenged August 21 and August 25 statements and requested correction.

Please determine whether §7.2.4 applies and, if so, whether any corrective action occurred after that notice.

If no correction occurred, please state that.

XV. Section 8.1 and no retaliation

Section 8.1 states that **McKinley County** does not tolerate retaliation against a person who in good faith reports a violation of the Code, County ordinances, or state law, whether the underlying complaint is ultimately determined to be well founded or unfounded.

My complaint activity was expressly referenced in the August 25 communication that simultaneously directed MCSO personnel not to respond to me directly.

I am not asking you to presume retaliatory motive from chronology.

I am asking you to determine whether §8.1 is implicated by the documented sequence.

Section 8.1 states that a person who feels retaliated against should submit a sworn complaint to the County Manager.

If you require a separate sworn submission, please identify immediately the required form, required oath or verification language, whether notarization is required, where it must be submitted, and any deadline or other procedural requirement.

I will comply with that procedure promptly.

XVI. Professionalism, integrity, and leadership

Please also determine whether the conduct described above complied with the substantive standards of P-008.

Section 2.3 expressly recognizes that professionalism is demonstrated by actions and, in some cases, inaction.

The Code also imposes heightened responsibilities concerning public confidence, integrity, leadership, and a culture of compliance.

The review should therefore address the August 21 AI-based restriction on continued written communication, the adequacy of the Sheriff's claimed command review, the August 25 communication and its characterization of my purpose, the statement that I would not take or return calls, the reference to my complaints about MCSO staff, the reference to my contacts with outside agencies, the operation of the designated single point of contact, what happened to the August 17 and August 18 complaints, what happened after County management received direct notice on September 9, and whether subsequent inaction complied with the County's own complaint-processing duties.

XVII. Operative submission date and the 90-day requirement

Section 7.4.2 states that all submitted complaints are to be resolved, determined, or dismissed within 90 days from submission.

It further provides that if a complaint is not resolved or determined within 90 days, the complaint shall be automatically dismissed unless the County Manager issues a written letter showing good cause and stating the time needed as an extension to resolve or determine the matter.

My position is that August 17, 2026 is the operative submission date for the underlying Bittony/Benally complaint.

Ninety calendar days after August 17 is November 15, 2026.

If the County calculates that period differently, please provide its calculation and the policy or legal basis for doing so.

Please confirm whether the County accepts August 17 as the submission date, what date it uses if it does not, the reason for rejecting August 17, the resulting §7.4.2 deadline, whether any written good-cause extension has been issued, and, if an extension is later issued, the date, stated good cause, and additional time specified.

A later escalation, supplement, additional evidence submission, or formal invocation of P-008 should not silently reset the date of a complaint already submitted to the County.

If the County contends otherwise, please identify the policy language supporting that conclusion.

XVIII. Election timing and public chronology

The 2026 general election is November 3, 2026.

The election therefore occurs before the 90-day date that results from an August 17 submission.

I am not asking **McKinley County** to alter the substance of its review, reach a particular conclusion, shorten a legitimate investigation, or treat this complaint differently because an election is approaching.

I am asking the County to comply with the complaint process it has already adopted, particularly §7.3.2's requirement that the complainant be informed where the complaint is in the process.

I also recognize §7.3.5's confidentiality provision.

I will maintain a contemporaneous public chronology using information and records lawfully available for disclosure, including the original complaint date, the date the County accepts or classifies the complaint, referrals and assignments that may lawfully be disclosed, status notifications provided under §7.3.2, any written extension, any period in which required status information is not provided, and the ultimate disposition and public findings, if any.

I will not publish material that remains lawfully confidential under §7.3.5.

That chronology may be made publicly available so members of the public, including **McKinley County** voters, can evaluate the documented handling for themselves.

I am not asking the County to produce a politically favorable result.

I am asking for a process whose chronology can speak for itself.

XIX. Elected-official procedure

Section 7.3.9 provides a specific procedure if an investigation finds that a candidate or elected official violated the Code of Conduct or other established County policies, procedures, or guidelines.

That provision contemplates presentation of the matter to the Board of County Commissioners in Closed/Executive session and written findings of fact and conclusions of law that become part of the public record.

If an investigation results in such a finding concerning Sheriff Maiorano, please confirm that the applicable §7.3.9 procedure will be followed.

I am not asking the County to predetermine whether such a finding will be made.

XX. Preservation

Please preserve all records concerning these complaints and their handling, including emails, routing and forwarding records, complaint logs, case-management or tracking records, communications among the County Manager's Office, Deputy County Manager, Sheriff, Chief Deputy, Human Resources, County Attorney, and other reviewers, assignments, notes, interview records, review materials, applicable policy versions, findings, status notices, extension letters, telephone records relevant to the "will not take our calls or call us back" statement, records reflecting Sheriff Maiorano's August 21 review, records reflecting any corrective action after September 9, records concerning any decision that a complaint did or did not fall under P-008, and records showing distribution of this complaint and supporting materials.

XXI. Written processing confirmations requested

Please provide written confirmation of the following:

A. Acceptance and classification

Whether this correspondence and the underlying August 17 complaint are being processed under P-008.

B. Operative submission date

The date the County assigns to the August 17 complaint and the basis for that determination.

C. Earlier complaint handling

How the August 14, August 17, August 18, August 25, and September 9 communications were classified, routed, monitored, or otherwise handled.

D. Assignment

The person, office, County Attorney, outside agency, or other authority assigned responsibility for the review.

E. Objectivity

How the selected review structure satisfies §7.2.1's requirement for a prompt, objective, and thorough investigation where the complaint concerns the elected Sheriff, his command review, MCSO personnel, and MCSO's handling of complaints about those personnel.

F. Scope

Whether the review will encompass the underlying Bittony/Benally complaint, Sheriff Maiorano's command review, the AI restriction, the August 25 directive, the call statement, the "flood" characterization, the references to complaint activity and outside agencies, County-management notice, and subsequent handling.

G. Status reporting

How and when your office will provide the status information required by §7.3.2.

H. Deadline

The County's calculated §7.4.2 deadline and any written extension.

I. Non-Code referrals

If any issue is determined to be outside P-008, the process to which it is referred under §7.4.3, the date of referral, and the applicable timing requirements.

J. Retaliation procedure

Whether a separate sworn §8.1 complaint is required and, if so, the exact procedure for submitting it.

K. Elected-official procedure

The process that will apply if a violation by Sheriff Maiorano is found.

L. Confidentiality

Confirmation that this complaint and supporting materials will be handled in accordance with §7.3.5 and distributed only as legally required or on a legitimate need-to-know basis.

M. Preservation

Confirmation that records relevant to the complaint, its distribution, and its handling will be preserved.

Final point

I am not asking you to accept my conclusions.

I am asking you to investigate documented conduct.

I am not asking you to presume retaliation.

I am asking you to determine whether the County's own non-retaliation provision applies.

I am not asking you to substitute your judgment for a prosecutor.

I am asking you to determine what Sheriff Maiorano actually reviewed before declaring a challenged investigation "sufficient."

I do not object to a legitimate single point of contact.

I object to a process in which one point of contact becomes no meaningful point of contact at all.

And I am not asking MCSO to decide whether MCSO properly handled complaints about MCSO.

Policy P-008 assigns responsibility to the County Manager for accepting and monitoring complaints submitted to the County and determining the appropriate review process.

The complaint record did not begin today.

Please confirm receipt and provide the requested determinations concerning the operative submission date, classification, assignment, scope, status, confidentiality, and deadline.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
MCSO Case No. 2026-00010128
[REDACTED]

"After every chance for communication, compliance, and cooperation has been exhausted, only consequence remains."

 **P008_Supporting_Evidence_Packet_REVISED.pdf**
1348K