LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT
COMPLAINT OF EMPLOYEE MISCONDUCT

This form is for reporting employee misconduct. Matters reported on this form that are other than employee misconduct will be referred to the responsible entity for appropriate action.

Please complete the form entirely and provide as much detail as possible. Once you have completed the form, you may return it to the Los Angeles Police Department by bringing it in person to any Los Angeles Police Station, sending it by mail to Los Angeles Police Department, Internal Affairs Division, Post Office Box 30158, Los Angeles, CA 90030, or sending it via facsimile to (213) 482-0413. You may also return the form to the Los Angeles Police Commission, Office of the Inspector General, in person or by mail, at 350 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1002, Los Angeles, CA 90071, or sending it via facsimile to (213) 687-7473.

Name: Kevin Perelman

Phone: 312-259-3686

Cell phone: 312-259-3686

Email address: Kevin@KevinPerelman.com

Preferred method of contact:

Best time to contact you: Any Time

Address: 26500 Agoura Rd, STE 102
Calabasas, Ca 91302

Primary language spoken: English

Date and time of occurrence: 12/28/2025 - 4:00 pm

Location of occurrence: West Hills, Ca

Names, Badge Numbers or Serial Numbers of Employees Involved (if known).

Officer Linton - #43696

Officer Espinoza - #44710

Officer Norris - #37704

Officer Charles Sean Dinse - who esculated the fire with his facebook account - #34920

Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of witnesses present at the time of occurrence (if known).

LIST ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES AND/OR WITNESSES UNDER THE "DETAILS" SECTION

Details (Explain what happened, when it happened and where it happened. If you do not know the involved employees' names or badge numbers, please describe them. Be as detailed as possible and include any information you have that will help us investigate your complaint.)

There are a good amount of employees involved in blocking me from taking police reports or watering down the reports. Or neglect from combining them to expose the coordinated situation or rotating groups told to do the same things to esculate it

Older Misconduct - Detective Shapiro Serial #: 43696

David Lin Serial #35371 - Blocking Reports, Antagonizing

Detective Angela Stewart

William D Jones: Serial #40366 - Blocking reports

If you have any questions, please call the Internal Affairs Division, Complaint Hotline, at (800) 339-6868.

Date: 1/6/2026

Signature:

Continuation

Details (Explain what happened, when it happened and where it happened. If you do not know the involved employees' names or badge numbers, please describe them. Be as detailed as possible and include any information you have that will help us investigate your complaint.)

Please see attached detailed document and USB Drive with Audio of event explained in the Misconduct Report

DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

To be completed by the supervisor receiving this form.

Supervisor's Name: _____ Serial Number: _____

Date and Time Received: _____ Division: _____

Final Disposition: _____

(i.e., forwarded to IAD; 01.28.00 initiated; sent correspondence to complainant.)

(Attach additional sheets, if needed.) CF NO.: _____ DIV. NO.: _____

01.81.06 (06/21)

Misconduct Complainant:

Kevin Perlman

Incident Date: December 28, 2025
Incident Location: Starbucks, 22815 Victory Blvd., Woodland Hills, CA links to all other locations across 25 or more years.

Bullet-Point Event Log – Police Misconduct & Collusion

Lead Officer Charles Sean Dinse Serial #34920

This event:
Steve Norris Serial #37704
Glenna Espinosa Serial #44710
Dashanay Linton Serial #43696

Other Events:

Detective Shapiro Serial #: 43696

Detective Angela Stewart

Some of the Officers' Refusal of Police Reports or Watered Down Police Reports, not on out of countless of reports they are modularizing, instead of putting the pattern of non-stop events together

William D Jones: Serial #40366

David Lin Serial #35371

Context and Foundation – Precursor to Event Log

- **Background:**

- For years, I have been the target of coordinated police operations and community actions that are designed to provoke, escalate, and entrap me on false or questionable grounds. These actions, as I have directly experienced, include group mobbing, intimidation, and the deliberate spread of defamatory rumors—both within official police records and in the broader community. The pattern of conduct appears premeditated and coordinated, aimed at unfairly labeling me, bringing unfounded charges, or reversing blame onto me, rather than addressing any legitimate wrongdoing.

There is a persistent pattern by which I am excluded or threatened with institutionalization, apparently based on subjective perceptions of my mental state rather than on facts or lawful cause. When I try to speak out or advocate for a peaceful resolution, those actions are regularly used against me, resulting in further harassment and retaliation from community members and police

officers and security companies. On multiple occasions, I have felt threatened and intimidated—including incidents involving both direct and implied threats to my safety and well-being—which has significantly hindered my ability to defend myself or seek meaningful help.

Discrimination, Shaming, Invalid Trespass Notice, and Coordinated Group Provocation

This ongoing pattern is, at its core, discrimination. I am being singled out and targeted due to a variety of constantly shifting and fabricated justifications—none of which are grounded in any legitimate business or public safety concern. The allegations used against me rotate over time: sometimes I am called "crazy," "unstable," "different," "weird," or "a threat;" on other occasions, my Jewish identity or other perceived differences are highlighted or whispered about as a pretext for exclusion or aggression. "Your Kind", The common factor is that these labels are always used to justify ridicule, shaming, or exclusion—regardless of my actual, lawful, and non-disruptive behavior.

Notably, these accusations and the resulting mistreatment stem not from anything I have done, but from others' pre-meditated and repeated actions: group provocation, organized aggression, and deliberate exclusion initiated by employees of public businesses, community members, security companies, and police officers.

A particularly troubling and concrete example involves my minor, harmless trichotillomania an occasional and benign habit of eyebrow pulling once in a while. Rather than ignoring this inconsequential minor behavior, employees, community members, and police officers have fixated on it—using it to publicly shame, ridicule, and further escalate exclusion or adverse action against me. This benign medical trait, which most people would consider insignificant, is weaponized by groups as further "evidence" for the false narrative that I am unstable, dangerous, or deserving of removal.

What is most concerning is the continual, deliberate provocation: **employees, public business staff, community members, and police officers actively coordinate—often with one another—to instigate reactions, mock, and reinforce group narratives that depict me in a negative or threatening light.** These efforts are not spontaneous; they are carefully orchestrated campaigns meant to engineer incidents that can later be used to justify trespass notices, police reports, and increased, exponential targeting. While those involved may claim to be afraid or threatened, their actual behavior—marked by visible laughter, snickering, mockery, and belittling—demonstrates they are not truly fearful, but rather **amused and emboldened, much like bullies. The repeated pattern is one of "laughing anger," where those involved seem to enjoy provoking and humiliating me, taking satisfaction in their power to escalate, entrap, and control the narrative.** This conduct shows their real objective is not safety, but coordinated harassment and the creation of a false, self-justifying paper trail. The pretense of fear is simply a cover for ongoing retaliation and abuse that stands in stark contrast to the truth of my lawful behavior.

Crucially, calls to law enforcement arising from these coordinated provocations, as well as any reports, accusations, or written statements provided to the police, are made knowingly

and intentionally on the basis of forgery and fraud. These reports, often containing false accounts or manufactured allegations to cover up what they are doing, are then accepted—sometimes even encouraged—by police officers and incorporated into official records, despite the lack of genuine underlying conduct. This demonstrates not just isolated misunderstandings, but a deliberate and ongoing partnership between businesses, community members, security companies, and law enforcement to further a discriminatory and unlawful campaign against me.

Despite the absence of any legitimate grounds for action, these shifting justifications—especially the focus on minor habits or differences—are exploited by coordinated groups to trigger escalation: group ridicule, group defamation, fabricated police involvement, illegal arrests, trespass orders, and ongoing threats of more severe legal action.

Relevant Penal Codes and Statutory Violations:

- **PC § 602(n) (Trespass Notificatons):** Use of trespass for discriminatory or retaliatory purposes, not for valid business or safety reasons.
- **PC § 422.6 (Hate Crimes):** Harassment, intimidation, or deprivation of rights based on disability, appearance, perceived mental illness, or protected status.
- **PC § 470 (Forgery):** Knowingly creating or using false documentation or records as the basis for police or legal action.
- **PC § 118.1 (False Officer Report):** Knowingly authoring false or fraudulent official reports by police officers.
- **PC § 647(j) and 647c (Harassing and Offensive Conduct):** Public shaming, ridicule, or repeated offensive conduct.
- **Civil Code § 51 (Unruh Civil Rights Act):** Prohibits business discrimination and group exclusion based on harmless difference, perceived disability, or arbitrary trait.
- **PC § 646.9 (Stalking/Harassment):** Coordinated, ongoing harassment and provocation.
- **Americans with Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. § 12182):** Prohibits exclusion, humiliation, or denial of access based on disability, perceived disability, or related protected characteristic.

Summary:
The ongoing, systematic coordination among employees of public businesses, community members, security companies, and police officers—to provoke, ridicule, and exclude me based on harmless, protected traits, then knowingly submit fraudulent reports to law enforcement and maintain discriminatory actions under the cover of official process—constitutes not just bias, but an organized campaign of forgery, false reporting, group harassment, and deprivation of civil rights.

Incident Setting:

- I entered the Starbucks in West Hills to relax and get coffee, anticipating—based on extensive prior experiences—that this location, like so many others across the United States, might already be influenced by the long-standing defamation and exclusion campaigns directed at me. Wherever I go, I am met with hostile attitudes, negative perceptions, and even overt harassment before I arrive. The threats and group stalking have included repeated, explicit death threats such as: “No relaxing for you nigger,” “I’ve given you enough rope to hang yourself with,” “Have a good life now,” “World of Paranoia,” “You had better live a careful life,” “You’re too out of control for California,” “We are using the judicial system against you,” “Your kind,” “You had better accept what’s going on or it will get a lot worse for you,” and “You’re a snitch, you’re dead,” among others. Much of this continuing harassment is also linked to my Jewish heritage and other protected characteristics.

A critical part of this campaign has been the ongoing attempt to label me as mentally ill or unstable from a very early age—labels that have not been based on any legitimate mental health evaluation or clinical diagnosis. Instead, these characterizations were fabricated and perpetuated as part of ongoing profiling and illegal police monitoring of both myself and my family. Over time, police officers and community members have repeatedly weaponized these empty labels, amplifying rumors with no factual foundation to support targeted harassment, social exclusion, and discrediting tactics.

While these coordinated actions follow me to virtually every business and coffee shop I visit, it is notable that this Starbucks is across from a Stonefire Grill that gives police officers a 50% off meal discount, and officers are regularly seen building relationships with Starbucks employees at this location. Based on their ongoing local presence, established ties, and my own past experiences at countless other locations, there is extremely strong reason to believe that police and affiliated community members immediately recognize me as someone they track and target as part of this larger network. The events that transpired here reflect not an isolated incident, but a single example of a much broader, organized stalking and exclusion effort: officers and their associates seized the opportunity, with support from local contacts, to continue the ongoing harassment, utilize disparaging and fabricated labels—including false mental health claims—and to take steps to exclude me from yet another public space.

Historical Patterns and Motive:

- Prior incidents include death threats and coordinated smears such as Officer Toro’s statement in 2013 (West Valley Division): “If you ever take a picture of a person I will exercise the law in my own way,” in Encino Starbucks, as well as intimidation campaigns designed to sabotage my work and social standing. - Whether the forum is a business, social event, or private life, similar campaigns of exclusion, provocation, and rumor-mongering have followed me, with diverse methods designed to harm my ability to earn a living, participate in the community, or simply exist in public. - Patterns of recognition, provocation, and group exclusion are rooted in long-running LAPD and community

connections—particularly involving individuals such as Paul Humphrey (a “friend” and LAPD affiliate since 1998) and Michael Patrick Huntley (both linked to Jason Perelman). These relationships have fueled escalation and surveillance for nearly 40 years on these re-occurring non rational themes.

- **Coffee Shop And Public Business Incident Dynamics (On This Occasion A Starbucks):**

- Upon arrival, **employees** immediately recognized and welcomed me, but soon began indirect provocation. The pattern is always the same: random employees who I don’t know, Civilians with the Police, and (sometimes) security companies collaborate to provoke, create the appearance of mental instability or misconduct, and support rotating accusations in official and community channels. This is a coordinated campaign of gaslighting, designed to document staged incidents and further exclusion.

- I was served my coffee in a ceramic cup intended for in-store use, which was a deliberate act, as similar situations have occurred almost daily in public places since the 2001 Michael Patrick Huntley threats referencing a “World of Paranoia.” I view this conduct as premeditated—intended to lend an illusion of normalcy while creating circumstances that could later be misconstrued as evidence for forgery or fraud, ultimately building a false paper trail in police databases under the accusation that I am “crazy,” based on empty, stigmatizing labels. This tactic has been repeated at other public businesses, where I notice that “word travels ahead” of my arrival through corrupt channels of police and community notification, both on the Internet and within police systems, as part of a larger campaign of ongoing fabrications. Importantly, there was no mention of any ban or prior exclusion at any point before the incident escalated. Just like all other incidences all the way down to 5 years old.

Psychological Provocation and Gaslighting Attempts:

- After being served coffee, Starbucks employees engaged in a deliberate, coordinated pattern of cryptic, repetitive, and group-based remarks, linking back to long histories of private dialogues and attempts by security or others to entrap me, including situations involving Rodie Morales and attempts by third parties to draw me into apparent wrongdoing (e.g., offers to hide police-confiscated marijuana or lures to places solely to generate rumors). This discussion was about a month ago, and information relayed to suppress my voice about the hinge in 2001 which changed my life and awareness of the crimes against me in mass groups- These tactics are classic “gaslighting,” characterized by attempts to frustrate, confuse, and induce emotional reactions—so that any normal response can be used against me in police reports or business records. Many employees/customers approach with scripting and repetition of indirect odd personal violating behaviors, matching community policing and group harassment patterns. - The goal is to manufacture the appearance of instability, volatility, or “problem customer” trying to escalate situations to use against me, instead of acceptance of my kindness, and status across extremely large public and private circles. This does not reflect my conduct, but rather a pattern to generate biased documentation for exclusion. - Such conduct can be proven through independent

surveillance, witness accounts, or forensic review of communications between staff, security, and police.

The Police Arrive

- Officer Dashanay Linton (Serial #43696) and Officer Glenna Espinosa (Serial #44710) arrived at Starbucks. Later on arrivals of Steve Norris (Serial #37704).
  Officer Linton immediately introduced herself to Starbucks employees as a "friend," reflecting ongoing and visible coordination between police and business staff.
- Officers and Starbucks staff interacted in a personal and familiar manner, distinct from professional, impartial law enforcement.
- I approached Officer Linton at her patrol car and asked a standard question about Officer Brittany Gutierrez as to how she was doing (from prior community meetings). Officer Linton replied, "I'm here for you."
- Without prior lawful warning or explanation, Officer Linton and her partner handcuffed and detained me at the scene.
- While I was handcuffed, Officer Linton produced paperwork referencing bans in three cities (none being West Hills). I state I never saw, signed, or was served this paperwork. The document had the appearance of something informal or unofficial—nothing like a proper legal notice or order.
- Officer Linton repeatedly and emphatically stated that I was "not allowed at any Starbucks worldwide." This statement is significant because I have experienced repeated harassment and exclusion at numerous businesses and public places across the United States. Officer Linton referenced a supposed letter from Starbucks supporting this claim; however, I was never shown such a letter, and it did not appear to be applicable to the specific location where the incident occurred. The manner and escalation of this interaction felt intended to intimidate or exclude me from all Starbucks locations, despite no due process or clear legal authority supporting this action.
- This version focuses on your direct observations, clarifies the lack of evidence shown to you, and explains why the conduct was concerning, while avoiding unsupported accusations.
- Officer Linton's conduct and immediate escalation were consistent with motives and methods seen in previous incidents with other officers, businesses, and group targeting. For example, Officer Toro (West Valley Division) in 2013 uttered an excessive, menacing threat ("If you ever take a picture of a person I will exercise the law in my own way") at Encino Starbucks, and was involved in a pattern of mobbing, provocation, and organized exclusion by police and community.

- I am not accusing private individuals out of retaliation or seeking personal retribution. Rather, by documenting this pattern of police escalation, overreach, intimidation, and coordinated exclusion, I am asking for an official investigation into officer conduct, department policy, and civil rights implications in which this was started at a very young age based on mental illness labeling and illegal police monitoring.

Reported Patterns of Stalking, Defamation, Group Abuse (Background for IA/Oversight)

- Officer Toro was reported to Internal Affairs for actions implicating the so-called "Photography Community Stalking" campaign. In this, I was introduced to Aubrey Fisher (linked to police associates) who, like Rodie Morales (LAPD-connected), repeatedly acted to escalate and "play victim," distorting benign interactions for group targeting.

- In one instance, Aubrey Fisher followed me to a Starbucks and "played victim" after a benign interaction—misrepresenting events to mass groups, manipulating context, and reinforcing group harassment narratives. - Similar tactics—character assassination, racial or bigoted hostility, coordinated group judgment and reversing everything they've done to me and my life to cover it up—have occurred at countless Starbucks and public locations: not as responses to facts, but as continued escalation, rumor-spreading, and defamation enabled by certain officers or their associates. - This has not only led to my exclusion from Starbucks and mostly by attacks, not by verbal statements which is how things start in 2004 at Topanga And Ventura Starbucks with Employee Garrett with the other employees and customers. "It's your transgression" eluding that their crimes against me are because of some imaginary crime of mine they fabricated as justifications to get away with their hate crimes, but also to widespread discrimination and harassment at many other public and private venues, compounding the exclusion and hostility. - I submit these facts as a *good-faith request* for Internal Affairs, LAPD oversight, or any impartial entity to investigate repeated and ongoing conduct by officers and community partners. My request is not personal; I seek transparency, fairness, and an end to coordinated, discriminatory exclusion.

Key Procedural and Pattern Misconduct Points

- I was never given a prior verbal warning or a lawful opportunity to leave before officers detained or arrested me. This pattern has repeated at various locations, including coffee shops and other public places. I have experienced ongoing defamation and provocations by individuals, seemingly intended to provoke a reaction from me. These actions appear to be an attempt to create false or misleading reports and paperwork in my name, portraying me as unstable. This harassment is not confined to a single location, making it impossible for me to simply walk away or avoid it.

- Based on my experiences, I am concerned that these reports or documents may be inaccurate or misleading, with the involvement of police officers communicating with community members. While I do not have direct evidence of fraud or forgery, the consistent pattern of provocations and subsequent documentation about my behavior raises serious

concerns. I respectfully request a thorough investigation into whether any improper coordination or creation of false paperwork has occurred.

- Multiple audio recordings reflect Officer Linton's (and others') intent to escalate exclusion with unsupported, fabricated "worldwide" bans—a pattern repeated at various businesses over decades with changing labels like "public nuisance," "schizophrenia," "criminal," and others.
- During this incident, I observed Starbucks staff and LAPD officers, including while I was in Officer Norris's patrol vehicle, engaging in behavior such as laughing, snickering, and making provocative statements and questions—while being recorded on bodycam and DVR, or in the station. These actions appeared designed to elicit or capture negative reactions from me on camera. This conduct seems to be part of a broader, long-standing pattern aimed at provoking me, rather than addressing any genuine safety concerns. Their behavior suggested they were not actually fearful of me but instead were attempting to portray me negatively or elicit responses that could be used to mischaracterize my behavior.
- Circumstantial evidence suggests Officer Steve Norris was positioned off to the side of the Starbucks building or another officer, in apparent anticipation of the event – supporting a narrative of premeditated, orchestrated police and staff misconduct.
- The officers' line of questioning was strategically crafted to agitate and create a record of supposed instability, rather than to neutrally resolve or de-escalate the situation. This constitutes police misconduct and abuse of authority.

Detailed Event Log with Penal Code and Legal Analysis

A) Initial Contact: False Order, Fabricated Authority, and Threatening Conduct

- **Officer Linton approached and confronted me without any prior warning, notice, or opportunity to comply—immediately asserting that I "can't be here," and referencing a so-called "order" or trespass document.** This paperwork was unsigned, not for the Woodland Hills location, and was never served on me.

- *PC § 602(n) (Trespass–Requires actual notice and opportunity to comply before enforcement);* - *14th Amendment Due Process (Being deprived of liberty with no notice or hearing).*

- **Officer Linton went beyond a location-specific trespass and escalated, telling me I was not allowed "at any Starbucks worldwide."** She claimed this without any legal authority or paperwork reflecting such a global ban. She presented herself not just as an enforcer but as the authority, delivering what amounted to a blanket lifetime exclusion and threatening police action if I ever showed up in any Starbucks again, anywhere.

- *PC § 118.1 (False statement by a public officer; misrepresenting the scope and legal validity of a ban);* - *PC § 182 (Conspiracy);* - *PC § 236 (False imprisonment if any detention resulted from the false claim);* - *Civil Rights: Threatening or excluding someone for reasons not supported by law is also a due process/deprivation of rights violation (42 USC § 1983).*

- **Linton's repeated "worldwide" statements, especially when combined with her tone ("You will be arrested if you return—anywhere, at any time, by any Starbucks"), went far beyond any lawful or routine ban.** The context—me surrounded by officers, already subject to years of community provocation/harassment, and hearing that I could be arrested anywhere, even outside this incident—was intended to maximize psychological distress and fear.

- *PC § 422 (Criminal Threats):* This statute prohibits not just threats of physical violence, but any credible threat of unlawful action intended to place a person in sustained fear for their safety or liberty. Here, the threat is not limited to the immediate property or incident, but is extended in an open-ended, intimidating manner—effectively telling me that I was targeted for relentless policing and exclusion, regardless of location or cause. This is consistent with the kind of psychological intimidation or "terror campaign" that has been unleashed on me since a young age, that can constitute a criminal threat under this law. - *PC § 118.1 (Also applies to fabricating the scope of the law and to statements made in the course of police duty that are not true).* - *Intent to threaten or intimidate is demonstrated by the expansion of the ban, the lack of due process, and the manner in which these statements were delivered—especially following a pattern of such threats designed to remove me from society and cause persistent fear.* - *Retaliatory exclusion or intimidation for protected characteristics or lawful conduct also implicates the Bane Act (California Civil Code § 52.1).*

clearly acting in close association and cooperation with Starbucks employees —conveying the coordinated/preexisting relationship without overstating:

No clear notice, explanation, or chance to dispute or comply was provided. Officer Linton's actions were not designed to keep the peace, but rather to provoke and intimidate, acting in clear coordination and association with Starbucks employees. Her relationship with Starbucks staff appeared professional but aligned in purpose, as they worked together to create a pretext for further criminalization—actions which violated both the letter and spirit of California law and constitutional protections.

These events occur at almost every business I go to, especially ones built to relax and stay at for large periods of time.

Summary of Law Violated in Section A:

- *PC § 602(n):* Requires clear notice and opportunity to leave for trespass enforcement.
- *PC § 118.1:* Bars police from making false official statements or misrepresenting the law.

- *PC § 182:* Conspiracy to provoke, exclude, and cover up coordinated police/community setup.
- *PC § 236:* False imprisonment can result from any unlawful detention based on fabricated claims.
- *PC § 422:* Criminal Threats includes broad, intimidating threats of false arrest and relentless targeting meant to instill fear, not just threats of physical violence.
- *14th Amendment/Due Process & Civil Rights/Bane Act:* Excluding, intimidating, or targeting me with baseless threats or official action is a violation of basic civil and constitutional rights.

B) Detention/Handcuffing Outside Store (Without Legal Cause)

- I am immediately detained and handcuffed in the parking lot (not inside), with no prior request to leave; parole/probation is invoked only to escalate, not because of actual threat.

- *PC § 236 (False imprisonment); 4th Amendment (unlawful detention); 42 USC § 1983 (Abuse of Authority); PC § 646.9 (Harassment/Intimidation)*

- Officers' speech and written threats (e.g., “you’re not allowed at any Starbucks”) constitute psychological coercion and group intimidation tactics.

- *PC § 422 (Threats); PC § 182 (Conspiracy); Civil Rights*

C) "No Trespass" + "Worldwide" Claim is Impossible

- Linton insists a non-existent “worldwide trespass” is in effect, misleading deliberately about the law/case, using it to justify detention.

- *PC § 118.1 (False report/statement); PC § 182 (Conspiracy to Overreach); PC § 236 (False imprisonment); PC § 148.5 (False crime report if relayed to dispatch); Due Process*

G) Served Coffee—Entrapment Dynamic

- Staff and officers act as if provocation and entrapment is normal; I am knowingly welcomed and served, with no ban or warning. Then police are called to escalate a future incident.

- *PC § 602(n) (No valid trespass without due process); PC § 182 (Conspiracy); Abuse of Authority*

H) Probation Search and Small Talk

- Search conducted under color of law with intent to intimidate, not for officer safety or risk management.

- *4th Amendment (unlawful search); PC § 636 (Exceeding detention authority)*

I) Unsigned/Unserved Trespass Order; Coercive Signature, Attempted Theft of Identification, and Questionable Search

- After detaining me, Officer Linton presented a trespass order that had never been served to or signed by me previously, and which did not legally apply to the Starbucks location at issue.
- Officer Norris asked if I am left- or right-handed. After I stated I am right-handed, Officer Linton intentionally uncuffed only my left hand and instructed me to sign the document.
- During this process, Officer Linton took possession of my driver's license, and **explicitly asked, "Can I keep it?"**—even though there was no reason, legal basis, or authority to retain my state-issued identification. This act constitutes a theft of my identification under color of law, raising serious questions about intent and possible future misuse.
- Additionally, while I was still handcuffed, Officer Linton asked, **"Can I reach deeper in your pocket?"**—despite there being no legal grounds, warrant, probable cause, or articulated suspicion for such an intrusive and personal search. This request, made without justification, strongly suggested an intent to intimidate, to fish for evidence, or to further compromise my security and rights.
- These actions—manipulating my signature, attempting to retain my license, and seeking to perform an unwarranted deeper personal search—were not done for legitimate officer safety or investigative reasons. Instead, they appear to be part of a pattern of intimidation, evidence manipulation, and abuse of authority.

- *PC § 470 (Forgery, if signature is obtained under duress or manipulated for police records);* - *PC § 118.1 (False official statement/justification for paperwork or search);* - *PC § 182 (Conspiracy to fabricate or manipulate records/evidence or coordinate with others for wrongful goals);* - *PC § 484 (Theft, if license was taken/withheld);* - *4th Amendment (Unreasonable search and seizure—search and detainment without probable cause or warrant);* - *14th Amendment Due Process.*

J) Employee Recognition & Fabrication (Police-Employee-Customer Coordination)

- **Starbucks staff claim to "remember" me by name as a basis for banning or escalating police involvement, despite not actually knowing me—or only recognizing me after**
- **Yet, they couldn't simply ask me to leave, instead of to resort to people to provoke me in a mass gaslighting network to try to get reactions while they laugh and smirk like Norris and Linton driving me to the station asking questions. Showing they are not afraid, they are amused following the pattern of most I encounter.**
- Police treat these claims at face value as justification for action, even when it is clear that staff and, at times, customers have been *coached or influenced* by the officers on how to provoke reactions and document them. - This coordinated effort is not based on any misconduct or behavioral issue on my part at the location, but arises from a pattern of

intentional provocation designed to *gaslight*, create the false appearance of mental instability, and build a record for banning from business to business to escalate or arrests.

- **Police officers are directly coordinating with Starbucks employees—and, in some cases, customers—sharing information and tactical instructions on how to recognize, provoke, document, and escalate perceived incidents for the official record.**

- This goes beyond mere law enforcement response and constitutes group fraud, as statements and complaints are actively manufactured or exaggerated via joint action, rather than documented as honest, specific complaints regarding real events. - *PC § 470 (Forgery):* If Starbucks staff or officers create or submit false incident reports, notes, or supporting documents to make the ban or arrest legitimate when it is not, this becomes criminal forgery. - *PC § 118.1 (False statement in police report):* Officers knowingly submit or rely on statements that staff or others provide as a result of coordinated fabrication. - *PC § 182 (Conspiracy):* Participation by multiple parties—officers, employees, and potentially customers—in a scheme to provoke, falsely accuse, and document to support charges or bans, constitutes criminal conspiracy. - *Civil Rights—Defamation/Disability Labeling:* The coordinated effort, especially when intended to portray me as "crazy" or mentally unstable, is a form of repeated defamation and may constitute disability discrimination. - *PC § 528.5 (Online defamation, potentially):* If these defamatory or fraudulent claims are then spread or documented online (on social media, in "banned" databases, or other postings), this becomes federally actionable as online defamation of Character.

- **Summary:**

The ban letter that was shown to me and adverse actions are not legitimate responses to my conduct, but the end result of a calculated, nonstop 25 year or longer coordinated campaign between officers, public places, and civilians to provoke, document, and criminalize me—using fraud, forgery, and defamation as their tools with the Police.

K) Citation/Misdemeanor/"Judge Decides"/Private Person's Arrest (PPA) Conspiracy

• Officers, recognizing they lacked legitimate grounds for arrest or citation under trespass law, began to actively discuss, recommend, and coach Starbucks employees on the use of a Private Person's Arrest (PPA) strategy for future interactions. This entails encouraging Starbucks employees to call the police and claim a "citizen's arrest" whenever I enter a location, regardless of whether I have received proper notice, done anything wrong, or been disruptive while they provoke to try to get reactions. The officers then wash their hands of responsibility, telling both me and Starbucks staff that any legal ambiguity or false charge is "for the judge to decide."
- This calculated approach is not isolated—it demonstrates a **systematic, conspiratorial coordination between officers and Starbucks management/staff on how to create a continuous paper trail of accusations** (whether provoking into reactions or fabricated). This not only increases my legal exposure but functions as a powerful tool for ongoing defamation and exclusion.
- This method is designed to set me up and frame me as a troublemaker or criminal without any

legitimate evidence, and is ultimately part of a larger conspiracy to remove me from public spaces which has been going on all the way down to a young age—using official police authority to empower private actors as their agents.
- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy–coordinated plan to set up, defame, and criminalize); PC § 148.5 (False crime report if Starbucks files or is coached to exaggerate/fabricate events); PC § 602 (No lawful trespass if proper notice and opportunity refused); PC § 118.1 (False or misleading statements/statements made by officers encouraging or enabling false accusations); Civil Rights and Abuse of Authority (42 USC § 1983; Bane Act; retaliation); Defamation (propagation of pretext to third parties).*

Summary:
LAPD and public entities work hand-in-hand, not just to enforce the law, but to design a playbook for how to create, escalate, and institutionalize false accusations with the intention to "paper" me out of public life started at a very young age—covering this up by framing it all as the normal exercise of trespass law, but in reality, conspiring to defame and eradicate me from society.

L) Coercive Threats Over Compliance

- Direct threat: "If you get a little crazy, we're definitely going to take you," as a means to pressure me into cooperation for a process manufactured against me.

- *PC § 236 (Coercion); PC § 646.9 (Harassment/Intimidation); Civil Rights (Bane Act)*

M) Fabricated Restraining Order Reference

- Officer falsely mentions a possible restraining order against Starbucks, as further intimidation without factual/legal basis.

- *PC § 118.1 (False officer statement); PC § 182; Civil Rights (Defamation, Intimidation)*

N) Classic Conspiracy Setup (Served, Then Targeted)

- Staff knowingly serve me, then call police–an act of set-up anticipating future escalation as a systematic, ongoing pattern. This dynamic occurs at nearly every Starbucks/public business, under alleged LAPD coordination. It started in 2004 at the Starbucks in Topanga and Ventura. Where amongst their attacks and nonstop provokings, emerged a Starbuck's Employee Garretts statements. "It's your transgrations" Showing motive, intent, qualifying to attacks insinuating that I had committed a crime, and they were allowed to take the law in their own hands. Coordinating attacks in enormous groups of public businesses and places.

- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy–business/staff/police coordination); Defamation; Civil Rights (§ 51.7, Bane Act, Discrimination)*

O) Officer Station Dialogue: Paperwork Invalidity, Collusion, and Jurisdiction Overreach

• Officers Norris and Linton, in candid conversation, **acknowledge the paperwork against me is old, unsigned, and not for the West Hills location—yet nevertheless proceed to use it as a pretext to threaten me with citation and escalate the situation stating that "Well, it's in the San Fernando Valley".** Both officers admit off the record that this paperwork would "never stick in court," highlighting their awareness that they have no legitimate basis for their actions. And coming to the location under false pretenses.
- *PC § 470 (Forgery–knowingly submitting or relying on invalid paperwork); PC § 118.1 (False official statement for police records or justifying arrest/citation without lawful basis); PC § 182 (Conspiracy–to fabricate legal justification and criminalize me in concert with Starbucks staff); Civil Rights (Abuse of Authority, Bane Act § 52.1).*

• The officers **specifically conspire with Starbucks employees** on how to handle future encounters and paperwork, and how to process citations or trespass warnings—even though no Starbucks staff had asked me to leave or warned me before police arrived.
- This is critical: **They and Starbucks are not reacting to actual disruption, but plotting together how to set up possible future criminal charges, using invalid, recycled paperwork as a tool of exclusion and intimidation—even when they know there is no legal justification.**
- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy), and all related statutes above.*

• Officer Norris tries to artificially expand the coverage of older paperwork by **telling me that while the documents do not mention West Hills, "West Hills is the San Fernando Valley"—stretching the paperwork's geographic scope beyond any legal limit in an illogical, self-serving manner.** This is a clear and deliberate misrepresentation of legal authority and jurisdiction.
- This "San Fernando Valley" logic is invented on the spot, with no support from law or the content of the paperwork, and is a key example of officers knowingly making up new "law" as they go to justify pre-determined outcomes.
- *PC § 118.1 (False/misleading official statement); PC § 182 (Conspiracy to overreach); Civil Rights.*

• I was never asked to leave by Starbucks staff, never given a real opportunity to comply or depart, and never actually "served" a trespass notice in the proper, legal sense. Instead, officers and staff fabricated the entire basis for a trespass charge in a self-reinforcing cycle, using intimidation and collusion rather than due process.
- **They attempted to arrest (or threaten arrest) without fulfilling even the most basic legal requirement: a verbal or written notice and a refusal to leave. Their entire strategy—from Starbucks staff provocation to officer citation—was about creating the appearance of legitimacy, when in truth no lawful trespass event ever occurred.**
- *PC § 602(n) (Requires notice and refusal, which didn't happen here); All above statutes.*

• Throughout, officers and Starbucks staff **ignore and mock my ongoing complaints and documentation of harassment, vandalism, threats, attempts on my life, attacks with K-9 dogs, and "setup" attempts by community groups, especially public businesses, or locations within Topanga Division's territory**—making clear their intent is not to enforce the law, but to dismiss,

discredit, and label me as “crazy” or “obsessive” as a means to cover up misconduct and justify ongoing exclusion.

Officer Norris specifically states I am crazy from the defamation which is the start of the forest fire enabling the stalking grouping trying to provoke into reactions to call the police.

- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy); Defamation/Labeling; Civil Rights/Retaliatory Targeting; Bane Act § 52.1.*

P) Deliberate Smearing/Exclusion

- Officers label me “crazy” and orchestrate ban strategies, showing intent to cut off public access, not based on threat but based on group rumor, provocation, and hearsay. This is done to escalate violence and attacks against me with pre-meditation.

- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy); Civil Code § 51.7 (Violence/intimidation based on protected status); PC § 646.9 (Stalking/Harassment); Civil Rights Pattern*

Q) Coercion for Signature, Warning, and Threat of Arrest

- I am forced to (or manipulated into) signing a trespass warning for west hills with a threatened “automatic arrest” and suggested at any Starbucks Location Worldwide from Officer Linton, and then any location in San Fernando Valley by Officer Norris in the future making up their own rules, despite lack of due process; signature manipulated to be done with wrong hand, Driver’s license “theft,” and ongoing verbal threat. Just like in 2013 Officer Toro’s death threats and mass mobbing groups, “If you ever take a picture of a person I will exercise the law in my own way” Destroying any possibility of a Photography hobby or career with mass groups.

- *PC § 118.1; PC § 236 (False imprisonment/coercion); PC § 422 (Criminal threats if intending to intimidate); PC § 602(n); Civil Rights*

PPA & Police-Employee Collusion (applies to events throughout A–R):

- Repeated officer-employee interactions show a relationship where police encourage staff and community members to call in Private Person’s Arrests (PPA), knowingly gaming the system to create cumulative records, further exclusion, set-ups, and a paper trail of Worldwide defamation as cover ups.
- And refusal to allow me to build a paper trail of crimes against me.

- *PC § 182 (Conspiracy); PC § 118.1 (Institutional cover-up); Civil Rights (§ 52.1 Bane Act, Defamation, Retaliatory targeting)*

Wider Pattern (Public Places/Coffee Shops):

- Evidence in this single event matches a widespread tactic other public places, as community policing and staff are primed to provoke, escalate, and make “crazy” labels

stick—demonstrating motive, pretext, and discrimination. This is a situation I've been dealing with daily for 25 years since the Death Threats from my friend in 2001 who I knew since 14, and business partner. Michael Patrick Huntley. Upon finding out with the privacy violations he threats were. "I've given you enough rope to hang yourself with", "Have a good life now", "You had better live a careful life", "we are using the judicial system against you", and speech about defaming my name in the context of solving problems in sarcastic movie quotes. "If we have a problem, we tell Wally, he tells the town, no more problem" While he with Rodie Morales, and LAPD were told to befriend me, take me to strip clubs trying to make it look like I was doing something to people and defame my character to the largest circles possible. And trying to plant an LAPD confiscated trash bag of marijuana in my house asking me if I wanted it.

- *PC § 182; Civil Rights (Disability Discrimination/Defamation/Targeting); § 51 (Unruh Act); PC § 646.9*

R) Defamation of Character, Officer Bias, and Deliberate Record Fabrication

- Throughout this incident (and as a pattern), officers—especially Norris—inject personal, defamatory, and biased commentary into both their statements and official police records.

- Examples: - Officer Norris says: - "He probably walked up to the counter with all his nonsense, he can't help himself." - "He likes to make it rain." - "He comes in, buys coffee, says, 'Oh, it's you, I want them arrested.'" - "They've trespassed him in the past," and not official police trespass, with no legal connection to the present event being used as leverage and justifications for groups to stalk me and random public places across the United States in Coordination acting as vigilantes who think they are police officers and think they know the laws when they don't. But empowered to by the police. These comments are based not on observed, factual misconduct but on standing personal bias, rumor, and the perpetuation of a paper trail that was itself created by earlier defamatory, retaliatory acts. Something in which Starbucks doesn't want to be sued over for Defamation of Character, which is escalating these mass stalking groups to silence. Because the group mobbing's began 10 years before the paper was handed to me at that location as setups with Employee Garrets Death Threats, While acting it out. "It's your Transgressions" with employees and customers—often originating with LAPD personnel themselves or their associates (dating back to 1998 and my so-called friend since 14, Paul Humphrey's employment with LAPD, and then Security Companies).

- This conduct constitutes:

- **Defamation of Character:** Officers and staff amplify unproven, unexamined, or false negative characterizations, damaging my reputation and feeding a recurring cycle of exclusion and targeting.
- **Bias in Law Enforcement:** Police approach calls and reports with pre-judged conclusions, not facts. Their perspective is shaped by earlier slanders—never by a fair review of evidence.
- **Falsified/Opinion-Based Police Records:** Officers write statements and reports ("he can't help himself," etc.) that reflect how they feel, not what is factually supported. Hearsay and rumor are entered into the record as justification for further bias, arrest, and escalation. - *PC § 118.1 (False

statement in police report); PC § 182 (Conspiracy, if deliberate pattern to exclude, escalate, or criminalize); PC § 148.5 (False crime report, if knowingly filed with non-facts); Civil Rights (Defamation, Retaliatory Targeting); PC § 528.5 (Online defamation, if posted or finalized online).*

- *This practice extends throughout my recent and past experiences:*

- Old, unproven, or fabricated claims of trespass or other "bad acts" while nonstop attampts to provoke reactions with mental illness labeling cover ups, at unrelated locations—sometimes dating back decades—are recycled to justify bans or criminalization almost anywhere, no matter what city or state. - The root cause of this pattern is a long-running campaign of defamation, hate, and community targeting, intertwined with LAPD associates and launched from biased judgments and hearsay. - When I attempt to report harassment, threats, or demand truthful documentation, officers refuse to take a police report, misrepresent that I can only do so at a specific "detainment area," and shut down any opportunity to truthfully defend myself or have a fair hearing. - This refusal and pattern of misconduct is **intentionally premeditated and designed to escalate hostility, deny me due process, and perpetuate the official narrative created by police/community bias.**

Summary:
Officer statements, official records, and repeated refusal to include my perspective demonstrate a persistent and systemic problem within law enforcement. This problem is characterized by continuing defamation, fabrication of records, and prejudicial treatment that has endured for years. These actions are not based on facts, but rather have been fueled by longstanding rumors and negative online campaigns—sometimes involving misuse of internet technologies to spread defamatory information. There are also indications that some of this activity may involve individuals in positions of public trust or government employment, using improper methods to disseminate or store data. This ongoing pattern has caused significant harm to my reputation and civil rights.

S) Premeditated, Template-Based Trespass Notice Issuance Under False Pretext (With Transcript Evidence)

In this incident, officers were not acting out of any genuine fear of departmental "defunding." Instead, they used this explanation as a cover to justify issuing a trespass order that they had already decided upon out of discrimination and falsifying reports, without regard to the actual circumstances or requirements of law. The transcript reveals that their plan to detain and trespass me was predetermined, with no good faith effort to follow legal process and cover up what was started against me. It demonstrates open premeditation, fraud, and the use of "template" strategies to target, exclude, and criminalize me at each new public location I visit.

Transcript Evidence of Pretext and Predetermination:
> *"Because they demand a PPA, you can't decline a PPA. You cannot decline a PPA. You have to take a PPA. Whether or not you physically arrest is another story… because if you decline it, they'll come back and say, 'I want to defund you, you didn't take my arrest.' You'd be like, no, I took your arrest."*

This “defunding” narrative, repeatedly referenced, was never about safety or justice but only to provide cover for an action they knew lacked legal grounds. As the officers themselves noted:
> *“I don’t know if we can just give you a ticket and let you be on your way, or if we’re going to actually have to take you… We’re going to see.”*
> *“I’m trying to just give you a ticket… If we can kick you out from here, we’ll try to get you out. Because you cannot come back.”*

The conversation further reveals knowledge that the paperwork did not support the alleged trespass or worldwide ban, but officers pressed forward regardless:
> *“So here is a trespass order that was given to you in 2023. Not by them, and I’ve never seen that. Apparently, you were trespassed with a random letter possibly by Sean Dinse. And a trespass generally expires after one year. I’m not sure, but this has your name on it, the date that they served it to you… Now you are not supposed to go to any Starbucks worldwide.”* - referring to something else
> *“Does it say that on there? I can’t read from this phone.”*
> *“That sounds like she does if she said, come on in and here’s some coffee. They don’t know you by face, they just know you by name. Well, I’ve never seen that.”*
> *“Well, either way, you shouldn’t be here.”*

Despite clear concerns among officers that:
> *“This paperwork is old, he brings up a good point saying, hey, it says Woodland Hills, he’s in West Hills, right, on their order. Their order is not signed by him, so it’s like, you could type that against anybody at any time. And the fact that they served him coffee, he came in as a customer and then they said arrest him.”*
They proceeded with the trespass order to fulfill a predetermined outcome rather than because of any new or verified alleged behavior.

“Template” for Systemic Exclusion and Threats:
The approach used here was openly described as a template for barring me from all future public spaces:
> *“You’re not allowed at any Starbucks worldwide. This is the template for what we’re gonna do at every place worldwide, right?”*

The officers made clear that the paperwork just needed to exist to justify an “automatic arrest” in the future, regardless of reality:
> *“Because now they’ll have this one filed with your signature, and when you come back, it’s an automatic arrest. There’s no ticket, there’s no let you go, it’s an automatic arrest.”*

Legal Violations:
This pattern—detaining me, presenting fabricated paperwork, and locking in a cycle of exclusion—reflects:

- **Premeditation** and intent to criminalize regardless of actual conduct.
- **Fraud and Forgery** by using or creating documentation inconsistent with reality.

- **False Imprisonment and Deprivation of Rights** (PC § 236, PC § 118.1, PC § 182, PC § 470, 42 U.S.C. § 1983).

Issuing trespass warnings or citations to suit a pre-written script, and threatening, "You're not allowed at any Starbucks worldwide," is not just local overreach but part of an admitted, premeditated scheme for repeated exclusion and targeting—an ongoing criminal act in violation of my civil rights.

T) Norris's Personal Bias and Manipulating Linton with Disinformation, Overstepping the Law, and Escalation Toward Incarceration

During the encounter, Officer Norris made statements indicating personal bias and improper motives, relying on rumor and manufactured records instead of lawful process. The following transcript lines from the audio/body camera capture this pattern:
> "When you give this part back to Starbucks, they'll have all this current info. But they need to go to court and get a real restraining order on them."

Shortly after, Officer Linton seeks clarification about the legal process:
> Officer Linton says: "How long does this last?"

Officer Norris does not answer Linton's question about the duration of a valid trespass, instead diverting to commentary about restraining orders and paper handling. This omission, whether intentional or not, leaves the question unresolved and allows the improper use of outdated paperwork to persist while sending Officer Linton into a scenario where she has flagrant disregard for the law, and knowing right from wrong.
> Norris ignores Linton's question and continues: "But they need to go to court and get a real restraining order on them." He also states, "Who's to say they actually said it? This is something that was hyped up, maybe they tested it out, but next time we show them so they can at least have it."
> Officer Linton then says: "Oh, that's good."
Linton's approving comment is especially concerning, as it shows acceptance and even support for Norris's methods. She fails to grasp—or ignores—the reality that these actions bypass legal process and use expired or misapplied documentation. Despite not fully understanding the actual length or validity of trespass or restraining orders, she clearly agrees with efforts to escalate consequences against me using unlawful tactics.

This exchange is significant for several reasons:

- Linton's question reveals uncertainty or lack of training about lawful trespass procedure, and her approval despite this lack of knowledge.
- Norris's refusal to clarify, and deflection to broader process questions, enables continuing misuse of old documents and promotes ongoing exclusion based on invalid grounds.

Furthermore, Norris's repeated derogatory statements in front of Linton—such as calling me

“definitely crazy”—show personal animus and a pattern of relying on third-party hearsay over factual history or individual assessment:
> Norris (from the audio): “He’s definitely crazy.”
> Norris references old complaints:
> “They’ve trespassed him in the past.”
> “I think they did. Get him the finest and make a copy.”
> “Because I know you had a lot of issues at that store.”

Norris even advocates for “five-year restraining orders” for locations visited only a few times, in the absence of violence or credible cause, revealing an intent to use improper legal means for exclusion and harassment.

Importantly, this pattern of seeking restraining orders and escalating conflict is not about addressing real danger, but about manufacturing incidents and focusing on a single supposed victim or entity—often through provoked or fabricated encounters. The real, long-standing objective is to justify more aggressive or permanent state action (such as incarceration or forced commitment), a goal seemingly decided by authorities as far back as my childhood. Each orchestrated incident is one step closer to fulfilling this predetermined outcome, not as a matter of public safety, but to make me “disappear” based on fear, animosity, and discrimination.

Moreover, there is a demonstrable pattern of police and Starbucks staff working in tandem with customers to deliberately provoke and escalate reactions. These ‘setup operations’ are not about addressing actual wrongdoing, but about manufacturing incidents that can be used to justify higher-level legal action, such as a so-called ‘real’ restraining order. The process appears designed not only to document and exaggerate minor disputes but also to engineer scenarios in which an employee or customer can claim to be a victim in danger, shifting the legal dynamic to enable more aggressive charges or restrictions against me.

This is further evidenced by the practice of “store-hopping”: Norris and other officers attempt to use paperwork from one Starbucks location to justify exclusion at other, unrelated stores—sometimes in areas where I have never had any prior contact or official notice. When confronted with the lack of specific grounds in West Hills, Norris insists that “West Hills is the Valley” to apply bans and paperwork from entirely different regions, and openly threatens that any future visit to any Starbucks will result in enforcement, regardless of the actual facts. This not only points to a willingness to fabricate grounds for exclusion or arrest but also demonstrates an intentional effort to create a paper trail leading to fabricated ‘evidence’ of wrongdoing or danger, which can then be used to initiate restraining orders or more severe criminal charges.

These actions implicate numerous legal violations, including but not limited to:

- **PC § 602(n):** Requires actual notice and an opportunity to comply before enforcing trespass.
- **PC § 118.1:** False or misleading official statements/reports by a peace officer.

- **PC § 182:** Criminal conspiracy to commit or cover up unlawful acts.
- **PC § 470:** Forgery and use of false documents.
- **PC § 236:** False imprisonment/unlawful detention.
- **PC § 646.9:** Stalking and ongoing harassment.
- **PC § 422:** Criminal threats or intimidating conduct.
- **PC § 148.5:** False crime reports.
- **PC § 528.5:** False personation on the internet.
- **PC § 31:** Aiding and abetting an offense.
- **PC § 538d:** Impersonating a peace officer.
- **Civil Code § 52.1 (Bane Act):** Civil rights violations through threat, intimidation, or coercion.
- **Civil Code § 51.7 (Ralph Act):** Violence or intimidation based on protected status.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983:** Deprivation of civil rights under color of law.

Summary of Motive:
The recurring strategy of staff and officers working together to provoke, escalate, and manufacture grounds for exclusion—combined with the "business-hopping" use of paperwork and attempts to justify baseless restraining orders—reflects not only a disregard for lawful process, but a deeper intent to ultimately remove me from society and silence me. The underlying motivation suggests a longstanding desire to achieve my disappearance or incarceration, driven by fear, hostility, and institutional bias, rather than any valid safety concern.

Legal and Procedural Violations:

- **Improper use of expired or irrelevant trespass paperwork (not lawful notice under PC § 602(n)).**
- **Making/using false official statements or entries (PC § 118.1).**
- **Conspiracy with others to facilitate exclusion and harassment (PC § 182).**
- **Forgery or use of false/fabricated documentation to justify action (PC § 470).**
- **Suppression of my right to fair process and civil liberty (Bane Act, Civil Code § 52.1; 42 U.S.C. § 1983).**

Summary:
These excerpts clearly illustrate that Officer Norris's actions reflect a pattern of bias and procedural

misconduct, ignore established legal requirements, and may be aimed at maintaining or concealing a broader history of police misconduct against me and others, in part to avoid further scrutiny or accountability. Such conduct endangers civil liberties and highlights persistent problems within local law enforcement practice, meriting independent investigation.

V) Suppression of Free Speech, Double Standard, and Retaliatory Hostility

Throughout my interactions with Officer Norris (and others), I have repeatedly asserted my innocence and exercised my constitutionally protected right to free speech by clarifying that the accusations and rumors against me are false and with criminal intent and motive. However, I have encountered a disturbing double standard: each time I explain that none of these claims are true, or ask simply to be left alone, I am met with anger or resentment from Officer Norris and others. Officer Norris has gone so far as to suggest that, by defending myself in a passive way and telling the truth about my innocence, I am somehow "destroying people's lives" or causing additional harm, regardless of the facts. This reaction is particularly troubling given that false accusations and defamatory narratives about me continue to spread unchecked through police channels, businesses, and community circles—potentially reaching vast audiences and doing lasting damage to my reputation and safety.

It is inconsistent and unjust that I am expected to remain silent in the face of ongoing defamation and exclusion, while those who perpetuate these falsehoods are allowed to circulate their claims without challenge. My attempts to set the record straight or peacefully request to be left alone have been met not with understanding or fairness, but with further retaliation and escalation. This suppression of my right to speak, paired with the unchecked spread of misinformation, highlights a serious and ongoing violation of my civil liberties under both state and federal law.

Pervasive Officer Violations:

- **False Imprisonment/Unlawful Detainment:** PC § 236
- **Trespass Notice Without Due Process:** PC § 602(n)
- **False Official Statement/Report:** PC § 118.1
- **Forgery/Document Falsification:** PC § 470
- **Conspiracy:** PC § 182
- **Criminal Threats/Intimidation:** PC § 422; PC § 646.9
- **Defamation/Retaliatory Group Conduct/Hate:** Civil Rights (Federal & CA, Unruh, Bane Act)

Based on the Audio Recordings

Officer Linton and Officer Norris: Possible Starbucks “Bait-and-Switch” Trespass Enforcement + Mental-Health Label Cover-Up Operations Targeting Those Deemed “Crazy”—Possible Judicial Kickbacks

There is clear evidence, based on the audio recordings of dialog between Officers Norris and Linton, of an organized, “bait-and-switch” trespass enforcement operation. These practices involve Starbucks staff and police using ambiguous or outdated “trespass” paperwork, together with a recurring “crazy” label, to discredit, escalate, and justify targeting of individuals—particularly those like myself, who may be marked by group rumor or suspicion.

The transcript makes plain that the officers, in coordination with Starbucks, are not focused on any individualized act of wrongdoing. Rather, the intent is to systemically exclude, harass, and criminalize, using a scripted template that may be applied at will to any target. The end goal is exclusion from public space, facilitated by forged or misused paperwork, denial of due process, and coordinated escalation to arrest—with the process easily repeatable city- and nationwide.

Transcript Excerpts:

- **Officer Norris says:** “And then that way let’s say you handed this (The Trespass) and you give this to Starbucks now.”

- _Note_: Describes the handoff—paper is physically put in Starbucks’ hands, ready to be used later; a “plant the trigger” step, so Starbucks can point to paperwork even if the next person did not receive lawful notice.

- **Officer Norris says:** “You go home.”

- _Note_: Once Starbucks holds the paper, the setup is maintained beyond any particular officer or employee; just the document’s existence is enough.

- **Officer Norris says:** “You come back.”

- _Note_: The trap closes when the victim unwittingly returns—enforcement is now automatic.

- **Officer Norris says:** “After you’re in the watch, the next person comes.”

- _Note_: Person B (the “next” victim) is now treated as if legally trespassed, bypassing any requirement for direct notice.

- **Officer Norris says:** “I want them arrested.”

- _Note_: The paperwork’s objective is “arrest,” not “warning,” regardless of facts.

- **Officer Norris says:** “There’s no argument.”

- _Note_: Dispute or challenge is deliberately foreclosed; paperwork is presented as infallible.

- **Officer Norris says:** “And that’ll just—this will stay in court.”

- _Note_: The paperwork becomes a lasting “exhibit,” a courtroom artifact designed to support baseless charges.

- **Officer Norris says:** “Because now you can keep it.”

- _Note_: Ensures Starbucks’ ongoing “proof,” able to be reused for retaliation or exclusion at will.

- **Officer Norris says:** “And then you’ll take that back with you to Starbucks.”

- _Note_: Reinforces Starbucks’ control over the paper for redeployment.

- **Officer Linton responds (with a notably approving and satisfied tone):** “Oh, that’s good.”

- _Note_: Linton’s approval—delivered with evident satisfaction—underscores the criminal intent and awareness of procedural misconduct. Rather than concern for legal protocol or justice, the tone reflected excitement at having established an off-the-books system to entrap and exclude, with full knowledge that such enforcement bypasses lawful standards.

Bait-and-switch Definition:
A Starbucks employee initiates a “trespass” narrative (often with ambiguous or outdated paperwork), and the police treat the next individual as trespassed, converting any confusion or lack of process into an “automatic arrest/no argument” outcome.

Core Indicators from the Recording:
Norris describes a workflow serving as a repeatable enforcement trap: paperwork goes to Starbucks, the person leaves and later returns, and arrest is now “automatic.” Instructions like “I want him arrested,” “there’s no argument,” and “this will stay in court” serve as operational guidance for turning disputed situations into immediate criminalization—even where the facts and law don’t support it.

Criminal, Civil, and Administrative Violations:

These audio excerpts and procedural admissions demonstrate the following legal violations:

- **California Penal Code § 602(n):** Requires actual notice and an opportunity to comply before enforcing trespass; the “bait-and-switch” template bypasses this requirement.
- **PC § 118.1:** Filing or knowingly relying on false or misleading official statements/paperwork by officers is a criminal act.

- **PC § 470:** Forgery—creating and using false documents as authority for exclusion/arrest.
- **PC § 236:** False imprisonment—detention/arrest made without lawful process or probable cause.
- **PC § 182:** Conspiracy—agreement between parties to commit unlawful acts, including coordinated targeting and exclusion using fabricated processes.
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Civil Rights Act):** Depriving individuals of due process, fair notice, and equal protection under the law by means of systemic criminalization and coordinated exclusion.
- **Bane Act, Civil Code § 52.1:** Interference with civil rights by threats, intimidation, or coercion, especially when coupled with official authority.

Summary:
This operation, openly described and enthusiastically approved by the officers involved, reflects deliberate, systemic abuse of law enforcement authority and due process for the purpose of targeted exclusion and persecution. The combination of manufactured paperwork, chain-of-custody handling, and approval of these tactics—clearly reflected in both the procedures described and the approving tone of Officer Linton—demonstrates ongoing criminal conspiracy, fraud, and deprivation of civil rights with the intent to harm, defame, and exclude selected individuals from public spaces.

"Crazy" label used as a cover and escalation lever:
Throughout the encounter(s), officers used character/mental-health labeling ("crazy," "schizophrenic," "unpredictable," etc.) not as a medical conclusion but as a **narrative shortcut** to:

1. justify detention/search/escalation despite weak or disputed grounds and cover ups based on their behavior with public locations and private citizens directed at me,
2. dismiss my objections to the paperwork scope/validity, and
3. pre-load the record with a credibility attack so that future contacts default to "he's unstable" rather than "the paperwork is flawed."

Request for Comprehensive Investigation and Evidence Preservation

In light of all the incidents, patterns, and ongoing misconduct detailed above, **I formally request that a thorough, independent investigation be conducted, not just regarding this specific Starbucks event, but encompassing the broader, longstanding campaign of coordinated harassment, provocation, defamation, and unlawful policing and community policing against me with their own non law-oriented ideologies.** These actions include, but are not limited to, the conduct of officers, security companies, civilians, and business employees acting in concert with law enforcement—actions that date as far back as my friend Paul Humphrey's involvement

beginning in 1998 employed by LAPD and continuing through every connected incident up to the present.

Based on the evidence and ongoing patterns described, I formally request that Paul Humphrey (employed by LAPD and known to have been involved in activities targeting me since 1998) and Michael Patrick Huntley (known associate and participant in harassment and defamation campaigns against me) both be thoroughly investigated for their roles in the ongoing campaign of harassment, provocation, and defamation against me. The actions of Paul Humphrey and Michael Patrick Huntley—whether taken individually or as part of a broader group—constitute serious criminal violations, including but not limited to:

- **California Penal Code § 182:** Criminal conspiracy to commit acts of harassment, intimidation, and deprivation of civil rights;
- **Penal Code § 422:** Making criminal threats or engaging in conduct intended to cause sustained fear for my safety;
- **Penal Code § 646.9:** Stalking and ongoing harassment;
- **Penal Code § 118.1:** Fabrication and filing of false or misleading official statements or records;
- **Penal Code § 470:** Forgery and use of falsified documentation;
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 / Bane Act (Civil Code § 52.1):** Deprivation of civil rights under color of law, including coordinated retaliation, discrimination, and denial of due process.

Given the continuing nature of these actions, I respectfully request that Paul Humphrey, Michael Patrick Huntley, and any other individuals found to be acting in concert with them be held fully accountable and that appropriate legal action be pursued to address the harm and ongoing violation of my rights.

It is critical that:

- Every allegation of police misconduct, provocation, fabrication, conspiracy, Falsified Mental Illness Labeling and retaliatory arrest or exclusion outlined here be individually and systematically investigated;
- The investigation not be limited to a single incident, but rather include all connecting events, historical and current, that demonstrate a pattern of orchestrated and targeted abuse against me;
- All involved LAPD officers, Businesses involved in this nonstop harassment, community members, and any other relevant parties or entities be held to account for their roles in ongoing harassment, intimidation, stalking, and deprivation of my civil and constitutional rights.

I respectfully request that all involved LAPD officers, businesses, community members, and any other relevant parties or entities be held fully accountable for their roles in ongoing harassment, intimidation, and the deprivation of my civil and constitutional rights. This includes not only direct actors, but also those who assist, facilitate, or participate in these illegal activities.

Aiding and Abetting - Penal Code § 31:
Under California Penal Code § 31, a person who "aids and abets" a crime is anyone who, whether present or not at the commission of the offense, directly or indirectly counsels, aids, promotes, encourages, or instigates the commission of a crime. Anyone who assists, supports, or facilitates another in carrying out an unlawful act can be prosecuted and punished as a principal in the crime, even if they did not commit the act personally.

Impersonating a Police Officer - Penal Code § 538d:
California Penal Code § 538d makes it a crime to impersonate a peace officer. This includes wearing, using, or exhibiting any badge, uniform, identification, or insignia with the intent to fraudulently cause another to believe the individual is a law enforcement officer, for the purpose of facilitating any crime or unlawful activity.

Conspiracy & Assisting Illegal Police Operations - Penal Code § 182 and Related Sections:
Any person who conspires with, assists, or facilitates law enforcement officers or anyone else in carrying out illegal police operations—including harassment, defamation, or deprivation of rights—may be criminally liable for conspiracy under Penal Code § 182. This applies to civilians/third parties who knowingly participate, organize, or aid in the execution of any criminal scheme, regardless of their official status.

Summary of Related Violations:

- **PC § 31:** Aiding and abetting any felony or misdemeanor, including harassment, intimidation, stalking, or deprivation of rights.
- **PC § 538d:** Impersonating a police officer (or assisting someone in doing so) in furtherance of any unlawful activity.
- **PC § 182:** Conspiracy to commit a crime, including participation in ongoing campaigns of harassment or civil rights deprivation.
- **PC § 528.5:** False personation on the internet (if anyone assumes a fake identity online in connection with harassment/defamation).
- **42 U.S.C. § 1983 / Bane Act (Civil Code § 52.1):** Any person, business, or other entity that acts in concert with police or others to violate civil rights may also be held liable under civil rights statutes.

Request:
I respectfully ask that all persons or entities—including those who aid, abet, conspire, or impersonate law enforcement or assist in illegal operations—be investigated, and if appropriate, prosecuted or sanctioned for their part in the ongoing violation of my rights.

To ensure truth and accountability:

- I would appreciate the immediate preservation, and full review of all relevant evidence, showing the progression of provocation, setups, frame jobs, and businesses told to retaliate for me finding out what was going on in 2001. including but not limited to:
- With such death threats starting in 2001, to me as “No relaxing for you nigger”, “You had better live a careful life”, “World Of Paranoia”, “I’ve given you enough rope to hang yourself with”, “have a good life now”, “you had better accept what’s going on or it will get a lot worse for you”, “your too out of control for California”, “You’re a snitch your dead” countless other crimes, threats and statements by rotating criminal terror groups working conjunction. In which LAPD will not lift one finger to stop in these federal crimes against me.

- All police officer body camera footage, related to this incident and any connected events;

Steve Norris Serial #37704
Glenna Espinosa Serial #44710
Dashanay Linton Serial #43696

All officer linked to any other event investigated, especially Charles Sean Dinse’s Useage of his facebook account to fear monger the masses against me.

- All external and internal security camera footage (including in police vehicles, and at the police station to show the methods of police misconduct and coordination amongst communities, security companies, and these private businesses);
- Dispatch logs, audio recordings, institutional emails, and internal memos;

Retaliation Concern

I respectfully request that all oversight bodies, investigative agencies, and relevant parties be aware that under federal and California law, any form of retaliation, escalation of charges, or adverse action taken in response to my filing of this police misconduct complaint is strictly prohibited. This includes, but is not limited to, any effort to intensify enforcement, create new or enhanced charges,

If law enforcement or affiliated parties attempt to use any related events as grounds to take other adverse action after the submission of this complaint, I ask that such actions be independently and thoroughly reviewed for signs of retaliatory motive, fabrication, or discrimination.

Retaliatory use of criminal or probation mechanisms as punishment for exercising my legal rights is prohibited under the First Amendment (right to petition), 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (civil rights protections), and California's Bane Act (Civil Code § 52.1). I expressly reserve all these protections and request that explicit recognition and protection against retaliation be noted and ensured in this matter.

These matters do not merely concern the singular wrongful acts of any one officer or employee, but instead represent an entrenched pattern of abuse that, unless fully addressed, will continue to deprive me of my safety, dignity, and rights as a member of this community and society.

Kevin Perelman

