Kevin Perelman
26500 Agoura Rd., STE 102
Calabasas, CA 91302
312-259-3686
Kevin@KevinPerelman.com

August 7, 2026

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)
Enforcement / Complaint Unit
P.O. Box 980550
West Sacramento, CA 95798-0550

Re: Supplemental Complaint – July 21, 2026 Security-Related Assault

To BSIS Enforcement:

Enclosed is a supplemental complaint regarding a physical assault that occurred on **July 21, 2026**, near Ventura Boulevard and Woodley Avenue in Encino, California.

Please review this complaint together with my previously submitted BSIS complaint concerning **CitiGuard Security, the guard known as "Mansour," and related security incidents**. I am submitting the prior complaint and supporting materials again because I consider the July 21 incident to be part of the continuing pattern described in those earlier submissions.

The enclosed materials include details of the July 21 assault, photographs of the resulting injuries, and background concerning prior security-related incidents relevant to this complaint.

I respectfully request that BSIS associate this submission with my prior complaint, identify the security company and personnel involved at the Encino location, preserve relevant records, and investigate the matter within its jurisdiction.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Kevin Perelman



Enclosures:
Supplemental Complaint

Prior BSIS Complaint
Supporting Documentation

Supplemental Complaint – July 21, 2026 Physical Assault Following Previously Reported Security-Related Conduct, CitiGuard Security Threats, Boyd & Associates Assault , and Continuing Security / Business / Community Escalation

Photographs Of Incident

Patient: KEVIN PERELMAN, Sex: M
Date of Service: 07/21/2026 (Log# 5894483)
Date of Birth: 02/19/1972 (54 years)
Patient ID: 222057



American Urgent Care Center
18840 Ventura Blvd Ste 110
Tarzana, CA 91356-3301
818-600-8343 F: 818-600-8359

Patient Clinical Summary

Log# 5894483 (Room# Exam 4)

You were seen at American Urgent Care Center (TARZANA) on Tuesday, July 21, 2026.

Your Diagnoses for today's visit are:

- 1. Laceration with foreign body of scalp, initial encounter
- 2. Assault by other bodily force, initial encounter

You have been Prescribed the following medications. Please take as instructed.

Medication Orders:

- Prescribed: cephalexin 500 mg capsule; Take 1 Capsule (oral) 3 times per day for 7 days; Total Qty: 21 (twenty-one) Capsule; 0 refill(s); Substitutions allowed; Earliest Fill Date: 07/21/2026

  ePrescribed at 11:44 AM on 07/21/2026 by Robert Newman, MD

  Prescription sent to CVS/pharmacy #9670 (P: 818-996-1000 F: 818-342-9032) 18441 Ventura Blvd, Tarzana, CA, 91356

Recommendations/Plan:

- Please return to the clinic in 3 day(s) if not better. Call or return to this clinic sooner if your condition worsens or if you have any concerns.

Patient: KEVIN PERELMAN, Sex: M
Date of Service: 07/21/2026 (Log# 5894483)
Date of Birth: 02/19/1972 (54 years)
Patient ID: 222057



American Urgent Care Center
18840 Ventura Blvd Ste 110
Tarzana, CA 91356-3301
818-600-8343 F: 818-600-8359

Patient Clinical Summary

Your Vital Signs recorded during this visit were:

- 10:48 AM (07/21/2026)
  Temperature: 98.7 °F, **Pulse: 103 BPM**, **BP: 143/101**, O2 Saturation: 95%, O2 Delivery: RA
  First entered 07/21/2026 10:48 by Newman, Robert

Procedures performed during visit:

- Wound Repair - Scalp/Axilla/Arm/Leg

  Ordered 07/21/2026 11:43 by Newman, Robert
  NOT COMPLETED

Thank you for allowing us to serve you today.

Please call this clinic at 818-600-8343 if your condition changes, or you have any concerns.

Visit discharged at 7/21/2026 11:44:41 AM by Robert Newman, MD

This chart is not signed, so the information on this visit summary may be incomplete.

Patient: KEVIN PERELMAN, Sex: M
Date of Service: 07/31/2026 (Log# 5916912)
Date of Birth: 02/19/1972 (54 years)
Patient ID: 222057



American Urgent Care Center
18840 Ventura Blvd Ste 110
Tarzana, CA 91356-3301
818-600-8343 F: 818-600-8359

Patient Clinical Summary

Log# 5916912 (Room# EXAM 6)

You were seen at American Urgent Care Center (TARZANA) on Friday, July 31, 2026.

Your Diagnosis for today's visit is:

- 1. Encounter for removal of sutures

Recommendations/Plan:

- Please return to the clinic in 3 day(s) if not better. Call or return to this clinic sooner if your condition worsens or if you have any concerns.

Patient: KEVIN PERELMAN, Sex: M
Date of Service: 07/31/2026 (Log# 5916912)
Date of Birth: 02/19/1972 (54 years)
Patient ID: 222057



American Urgent Care Center
18840 Ventura Blvd Ste 110
Tarzana, CA 91356-3301
818-600-8343 F: 818-600-8359

Patient Clinical Summary

Your Vital Signs recorded during this visit were:

- 02:35 PM (07/31/2026)
  Temperature: 98.3 °F, Pulse: 73 BPM, **BP: 141/99**, O2 Saturation: 99%, O2 Delivery: RA
  First entered 07/31/2026 14:35 by Purisima, Russell

Procedures performed during visit:

- Suture Removal

  Ordered 07/31/2026 15:08 by Newman, Robert
  NOT COMPLETED

Thank you for allowing us to serve you today.

Please call this clinic at 818-600-8343 if your condition changes, or you have any concerns.

Visit discharged at 7/31/2026 3:08:25 PM by Robert Newman, MD

This chart is not signed, so the information on this visit summary may be incomplete.










STEAKHOUSE
TEA LEAF
16101
RESTAURANT
PARKING
california
L3 460




CALIFORNI


CALIFORNIA BANK & TRUST
16101
CALIFORNIA PIZZA KITCHEN
LARSEN'S STEAKHOUSE
FOR LEASING INQUIRIES
CALL (805)724-5725
GYMBOREE
PILATES PLUS
SOAK NAILS
REVIVAL SALON
PARKING
Ventura Blvd
Sepulveda Blvd
Palace
MandarinArts


E83



Recent Photos And Location Boyds And Associates Truck Close By 7/29/2026

GPS
34°09'36.1"N 118°30'35.3"W


Placemark
Click on the map to drop the placemark
Location
34°09'36.28"N 118°30'35.09"W
Advanced measurements
Ground elevation
249.47 m
3D


BOYD &
ASSOCIATES
Means Total Security
SECURITY SYSTEMS
INSTALLATION • MONITORING
800-381-BOYD
www.boydsecurity.com


BOYD &
ASSOCIATES
Means Total Security
800-381-BOYD
www.boydsecurity.com
BOYD &
ASSOCIATES
Means Total Security
SECURITY SYSTEMS
INSTALLATION
MONITORING
www.boydsecurity.com


24
HOUR
SERVICE
RAM
California
73237T3
dmv.ca.gov

3 to 4 Black People Showed up at the same time in this area.
Others walking Ventura Blvd with Security Shirts

A Mother's Haven

Stated there is a security office on the 3rd Floor
Don't know if that is true

Encino Emergency Dentist

Where I was sigging working on legal paperwork

Location I was assualted

Guard Approached Telling me to leave

Lasting Impressions Dental Spa | Dentist in...

Guard walk path

Ventura Blvd & Woodley Ave

Perpetrater

Different Black Person with Security Hat After

Man With Mask Who Came Around the Corner Assaulting
Don't think it was same person
can't be sure

16042

Supplemental Complaint – July 21, 2026 Physical Assault Following Previously Reported Security-Related Conduct, CitiGuard Security Threats, Boyd & Associates Assault , and Continuing Security / Business / Community Escalation

Letter To Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)

Kevin Perelman
26500 Agoura Rd., STE 102
Calabasas, CA 91302
312-259-3686
Kevin@KevinPerelman.com

August 2026

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)
Enforcement / Complaint Unit
P.O. Box 980550
West Sacramento, CA 95798-0550

Subject: Supplemental Complaint – July 21, 2026 Physical Assault Following Previously Reported Security-Related Conduct, CitiGuard Security Threats, Boyd & Associates Assault, and Continuing Security / Business / Community Escalation

To BSIS Enforcement:

I am submitting this complaint as a **supplement to my previously submitted BSIS complaint concerning CitiGuard Security with other Security Companies, the security guard known to me as "Mansour," and other security-related incidents and companies**. I respectfully request that this complaint be reviewed together with my earlier submission and supporting documentation because the events described below are not isolated.

In my view, the July 21, 2026 assault represents another escalation in a continuing pattern involving private security personnel, community participants, public businesses, and law-enforcement-related encounters that I have documented over many years. My earlier BSIS complaint already described reactive security activity tied to my movements with community members and the Police, public-street positioning, confrontational contact, escalating accusations, community reporting, threats, and conduct that appeared inconsistent with ordinary neutral security functions.

That earlier complaint also documented Security Guard Mansour's statement to me, **"You're going to jail,"** after accusing me of scratching his vehicle as I walked past the car to the townhouse entrance, while positioned near the pedestrian gate I use at my residence. I explained in that complaint that the statement was significant because it occurred against a history of prior incidents in which accusations, provocations, community reports, and security or police contacts escalated into law-enforcement involvement.

The July 21, 2026 incident represents a more serious stage of that rotating progression. What had previously involved monitoring, confrontation, threats, provocation, exclusion, and attempts to create adverse reports escalated into a **physical assault causing documented injuries**.

This complaint should therefore be read as the **next event in the same continuing record**, not as a stand-alone disagreement between me and an individual security guard.

A recurring feature of the broader history is the use of changing character and mental-health labels to explain away or justify the conduct directed toward me. I have repeatedly reported being described to others as "crazy," mentally ill, criminal, dangerous, or unstable, including through people I knew long before the later security incidents. I have specifically identified Paul Humphrey — a friend beginning when I was approximately fourteen who later had LAPD and private-security associations — as part of the history from which these narratives and later security-related events developed. I include this context because the labels change, while the recurring pattern of monitoring, provocation, exclusion, security involvement, and escalation has continued.

My position in submitting this supplement is therefore not that the July 21 assault began with a closed Coffee Bean. It is that the assault is another event within the much longer sequence already described in my prior submissions, including the 2001 Michael Patrick Huntley threats and statements such as "World of Paranoia," "We are using the judicial system against you," "I've given you enough rope to hang yourself with," and "You had better live a careful life."

---

1. Broader Context and Escalation After I Began Documenting the Conduct

Beginning around **2008**, after I increasingly began documenting the nonstop incidents I was experiencing, reporting them to police, preserving recordings, preparing complaints and legal materials, and placing information online when I believed local authorities were not adequately addressing my reports, the confrontations I experienced became increasingly aggressive.

In my experience, the conduct progressed from:

- repeated monitoring and following;
- civilians notified to instigate at public places if they see me;
- provocations and confrontational encounters;
- defamatory labeling;

- attempts to exclude me from businesses and public locations;
- security-company involvement;
- threats of police involvement and arrest;
- physical confrontations; and
- increasingly violent attacks.

My prior submissions describe what I contend is a broader pattern involving private security personnel, public businesses, community participants, and law-enforcement contacts acting in ways that reinforce one another. The issue is not limited to one company or one shopping center. I have experienced related incidents at coffee shops, restaurants, residential communities, public streets, social locations, and other ordinary businesses.

In many of these situations, normal public activity—drinking coffee, eating, walking, sitting outdoors, driving, going to the gym, taking photographs, attending social events, or simply remaining in a as a customer—has been treated as suspicious, provocative, or a basis for escalating security or police contact.

That broader context is relevant because the July 21 incident began while I was doing exactly what I had intentionally tried to do to avoid conflict: I drove away from my own neighborhood, selected an unfamiliar location late at night where virtually nobody was present, sat quietly, ate food, and worked on legal materials concerning related events.

---

2. Location and Circumstances Before the July 21, 2026 Assault

On the evening of **July 20, 2026**, at approximately **11:30 p.m.**, I purchased food and drove to the Encino area.

I intentionally selected a location where I did not normally spend time and where I had not previously used the outdoor seating area. I did this because I wanted a quiet place where I could eat and work without interaction with other people.

I stopped at the shopping center located near **Ventura Boulevard and Woodley Avenue**, approximately:

34°09'25.98"N, 118°29'00.76"W

A Coffee Bean location in the shopping center was closed, but there were outdoor Coffee Bean tables and chairs in the exterior shopping-center seating area.

The businesses were closed or largely inactive. The immediate area was extremely quiet. There were no customers sitting around me and very few, if any, people visibly present nearby.

I sat at one of the outdoor Coffee Bean tables and began eating while working on legal materials concerning related incidents that I have been documenting.

Those materials were not limited to private security alone. They concern a broader series of events involving security companies, community harassment, public businesses, law-enforcement contacts, prior arrests, prior assaults, and attempts to mischaracterize or reverse incidents involving me.

---

3. Security Individual Repeatedly Walking Public Sidewalks Around Multiple Properties

During the approximately twenty minutes that I remained seated, I observed an individual wearing dark clothing that appeared to identify him as security.

I observed him walk past approximately **two or three times**.

What immediately stood out was that he did not appear to be simply patrolling one shopping center.

He appeared to be walking along **public sidewalks on Ventura Boulevard and circulating around blocks containing multiple commercial buildings and properties**.

Security guards ordinarily have a defined assignment, property, or patrol area. This individual appeared to be moving repeatedly between multiple properties and public sidewalks rather than remaining visibly assigned to one specific location.

I later observed other individuals wearing similar dark security-style shirts in the Ventura Boulevard area. Some appeared to be associated with particular properties, although the assignment of the first individual remained unclear.

When the first individual eventually approached me, I observed what appeared to be a label, patch, or marking containing the word **“Shadow,”** or something similar.

At the time, I did not know whether “Shadow” was:

- the individual’s name;
- the name of his employer;
- the name of a security company;

- or another identifying designation.

I was later told that there may be a security company operating in the area called **Shadow Security**, or something similar, but I have not independently confirmed the exact company name.

I request that BSIS identify the security company or companies working that area during the relevant shift.

---

4. Delayed Security Contact and Sudden Appearance of Additional People

The first security individual had passed through the area multiple times before approaching me.

He could have contacted me on his first pass.

Instead, approximately twenty minutes elapsed before he approached.

That timing became important because, by the time he finally contacted me, **additional individuals began appearing in the surrounding area**.

The environment changed within a very short period from an almost completely empty, quiet late-night shopping center into a small area containing approximately three or four additional people.

Based on what I could observe under dark nighttime conditions:

- the first individual appeared to wear a security shirt;
- a second individual later appeared wearing a somewhat different security-marked shirt;
- the person who physically assaulted me wore dark clothing and a mask or bandana over his face;
- at least one or possibly two additional individuals appeared or approached the immediate area during the same short period.

The individuals I observed appeared to be **Black men**. I include that fact as an identifying observation relevant to surveillance footage, witness identification, and investigative reconstruction. I do not rely on race alone as proof of motive.

The simultaneous appearance of several people within minutes is significant because there had been virtually nobody present during the preceding period.

---

5. Initial Security Contact – Immediate Compliance

The first security individual approached the table and told me words to the effect:

“You can’t be here. We’re closed.”

I did not argue with him.

I did not refuse.

I immediately complied.

I gathered my belongings, stood up, and began walking away from the Coffee Bean seating area.

As I was leaving, I asked him whether he actually worked at that property.

I asked because I had watched him repeatedly walking public sidewalks and circulating around multiple buildings rather than visibly remaining assigned to the shopping center.

After instructing me to leave, the security individual also **walked off the property and returned toward the public sidewalk**.

That increased my concern regarding his actual assignment.

If he was the assigned security guard for the property, it was unclear why he had spent the preceding period walking around multiple surrounding properties, waited approximately twenty minutes before approaching me, ordered me from the shopping center, and then immediately walked off the property himself.

Regardless, I continued leaving.

---

6. Masked Individual Waiting Along My Route After I Left the Property

I walked completely away from the outdoor seating area and toward the public sidewalk.

Within **minutes** of the security contact, while I was already leaving and walking away from the shopping center, another man came around a corner toward me.

This second individual was wearing **dark clothing** and had a **mask or bandana covering his face**.

Because it was dark and the attack happened extremely quickly, I cannot reliably state whether he was wearing a security uniform.

He appeared to be positioned along the route I would naturally take after leaving the property.

The fact that the assault began only after I had complied and moved off the shopping-center property is particularly significant. The first security individual did not confront me physically at the Coffee Bean seating area. I was directed to leave, I complied, and the masked attack occurred only after I had moved onto the public sidewalk.

I believe the timing and location were strategic. One possible reason for waiting until I had left the property was to move the physical assault away from the shopping center's principal surveillance cameras or into an area with reduced or incomplete camera coverage. I cannot establish the camera coverage from my observations that night, but the sequence warrants a camera-by-camera reconstruction rather than treating the location of the attack as accidental.

I therefore request preservation and review not only of surveillance footage itself, but also the locations and fields of view of every relevant camera covering the Coffee Bean seating area, my route off the property, the corner from which the masked individual emerged, the public sidewalk where the assault occurred, and the area where the photographed individual wearing the "SECURITY" hat later stood. Investigators should determine whether the assault occurred at or near a surveillance blind spot and whether any of the involved individuals positioned themselves in relation to camera coverage.

As he moved along my right side and slightly behind me, I heard or sensed what appeared to be a hand or punch passing close to my head.

As I began turning toward him, another punch struck me in the head.

I fell to the ground.

---

7. Physical Assault – Approximately Fifteen to Twenty Punches or Kicks

Once I was on the ground, the individual continued striking and kicking me.

I cannot provide an exact count because the assault happened rapidly and I spent approximately ninety percent of the time on the ground protecting my head.

I estimate approximately **fifteen to twenty punches and/or kicks**.

The initial blows were directed toward my head.

After I was on the ground and protecting my head, many of the remaining blows appeared to strike:

- my shoulders;
- the sides of my body;
- my upper torso;
- my arms;
- and other exposed areas.

The assailant then walked away.

The fact that the person had already concealed his face before coming around the corner is important. This was not an argument that spontaneously escalated between two strangers.

I had never spoken with him.

I had not confronted him.

I had already complied with the first security individual and left the property.

The masked individual appeared **after** I had walked away and attacked without any preceding interaction.

---

8. Individual Wearing a “SECURITY” Hat Present Immediately After the Assault

Immediately after the masked assailant stopped striking me and I was able to get back to my feet, I looked toward the shopping-center property and observed another Black man standing there.

This individual was not dressed in a conventional security uniform. Photographs taken at the scene show him wearing ordinary dark street clothing: a plain dark short-sleeved shirt, dark pants, casual shoes with light-colored soles, and what appears to be a necklace or chain. The security-related item I observed was a hat marked “SECURITY.” He did not appear to be wearing a uniform shirt, visible badge, duty belt, shoulder patches, radio, or other conventional security equipment.

His appearance and behavior were materially different from the first security individual, whose clothing contained what appeared to be a “Shadow” marking and who had approached me minutes earlier at the Coffee Bean seating area and instructed me to leave.

The timing is significant. Within minutes, the sequence was:

1. The first security individual, who had been repeatedly circulating along Ventura Boulevard and around multiple properties, approached me and told me that I could not remain at the closed shopping-center seating area.

2. I immediately complied, gathered my belongings, stood up, and walked off the property.

3. The first security individual also walked off the property toward the public sidewalk.

4. After I had left the property and was walking away on the public sidewalk, a man in dark clothing with a mask or bandana covering his face came around the corner toward me and attacked without any preceding interaction.

5. He struck me in the head, knocked me to the ground, and continued punching and kicking me while I protected my head and body.

6. Immediately after the assault, I observed the man photographed at the scene standing on the shopping-center property wearing ordinary street clothing and the hat marked "SECURITY."

Based on the extremely short timing, his clothing, his immediate presence after the attack, and the fact that he appeared to remain positioned on the property as though asserting a security or territorial role, I believe there is a serious possibility that the photographed man was the masked assailant after removing the bandana or face covering. I cannot establish that identification conclusively from my observations alone because the attack occurred rapidly, at night, while I was being struck and protecting my head. It is also possible that he was a separate participant who arrived during the assault or was already positioned nearby.

I approached this individual and asked words to the effect, "What is your role in this?" He responded that he had "heard some noise" and came outside.

That explanation did not fit the timing or his conduct as I observed it. When I got up immediately after the assault, he was already present and positioned on the property. He did not appear to be calling police, rendering assistance, pursuing the attacker, identifying witnesses, or otherwise responding as an uninvolved security person who had

unexpectedly discovered a violent assault. Instead, he remained standing on the property while events unfolded.

The photographs are important because they provide BSIS with a specific individual to identify. They also document that his clothing was ordinary streetwear apart from the “SECURITY” hat. This raises an additional question as to whether he was actually a licensed security guard assigned to the property, an employee or associate of the first security individual, or a private individual using security-identifying headwear.

His conduct after the assault also increased my concern that the individuals present were acting together. In my view, his immediate appearance, his security-marked hat, the first guard's contact minutes earlier, the masked attack after I complied and left, and the simultaneous appearance of other individuals are consistent with coordinated or conspiratorial conduct rather than a series of unrelated arrivals. I am reporting that conclusion as my assessment of the sequence and requesting that BSIS determine the individuals' identities, employment status, communications, and relationships.

The photographed individual remained in the area during the subsequent response. He appeared to maintain a presence on the shopping-center property as though it were his assigned territory. After the police response concluded and I left the area, he also left. That timing should be compared against surveillance footage, security rosters, dispatch records, and any communications among the individuals present.

I specifically request that BSIS determine whether this photographed individual:

• was present before the assault;

• was the masked assailant and removed the bandana or face covering afterward;

• arrived during or immediately after the assault;

• witnessed the assault and failed to intervene or report it;

• communicated with the first security individual before or after the attack;

• communicated with the other individuals who appeared in the area at approximately the same time;

• was actually employed or registered as a security guard;

• was assigned to this property or another nearby property;

• was authorized to wear security-identifying clothing or headwear; and

• left the property after the police and I departed.

9. Sudden Presence of Multiple Individuals

At approximately the same time, several other people appeared in the immediate vicinity.

This was highly unusual because the area had been virtually empty during the preceding twenty minutes.

Within a very small timeframe and roughly within a one-hundred-foot area, there were suddenly:

- the first security individual;
- the masked attacker;
- the photographed individual wearing the “SECURITY” hat;
- and at least one or possibly two additional people.

I cannot state the exact role of every person present.

I also cannot state that every individual was a licensed security guard.

What I can state is that **several individuals appeared at approximately the same time immediately surrounding the security contact and assault**.

This timing should be reconstructed through surveillance footage, dispatch records, telephone records where legally available, post logs, and security-company staffing information.

---

10. Concern Regarding Reversal of Aggressor and Victim

The sequence also raised another concern based upon prior incidents documented in my earlier complaints.

Had I blocked the masked individual's punch, restrained him, or struck him back successfully, there were now several people nearby who could potentially have entered the confrontation.

The resulting event could then have been described as:

"Kevin attacked someone."

That type of reversal is a recurring concern in my prior documentation: a confrontation is initiated against me, my defensive reaction is isolated from what happened first, and the story is then presented as though I initiated the event.

In this case, the initial blows knocked me down quickly, and I spent most of the assault protecting myself rather than fighting back.

I include this because the July 21 incident should not later be reduced to a vague report of a fight between two people.

It was an attack after I had already complied with security and left.

---

11. Relationship to CitiGuard Security and Mansour's "You're Going to Jail" Threat

This incident should be reviewed alongside my earlier CitiGuard complaint.

The prior complaint describes a progression that includes:

- security personnel positioning themselves around my movements;
- public-street security activity;
- reactive monitoring;
- confrontation;
- community reporting;
- attempts to provoke reactions;
- accusations;
- threats of criminal consequences;
- and Mansour's statement that **"You're going to jail."**

The July 21 incident follows the same broader progression, except that the conduct escalated into actual physical violence.

The important sequence is:

1. Security personnel appear around my movements;
2. Contact is initiated;
3. I am directed to leave or placed under threat;
4. I comply;
5. Additional people appear;
6. The event escalates anyway;
7. Police or official reporting becomes relevant afterward.

That is why the July 21 incident belongs with the CitiGuard file.

---

12. Paul Humphrey – Security Employment, LAPD Association, and Longstanding Background

The larger security history also involves **Paul Humphrey**, a person I knew beginning approximately in **1986**, when I was around fourteen years old.

My previous submissions describe Humphrey as later having an association with LAPD and private security employment.

I have reported that, during most of the period in which I knew him, I later came to recognize a continuing pattern in which details of my personal life, personality, relationships, conduct, hobbies, and private activities were being mischaracterized and circulated in ways that portrayed me as criminal, mentally unstable, dangerous, or responsible for unidentified wrongdoing.

In my view, Humphrey was not simply an unrelated former friend. His later LAPD and security-company associations make his history directly relevant to the security-related pattern I have been documenting.

My prior agency submissions expressly identify Humphrey's LAPD/security involvement and request investigation of his role in the broader conduct I have reported.

---

13. Same Woodland Hills Security Location – Paul Humphrey, Starbucks Employee Garrett, and John Paul Naranjo

A particularly important location in this history is:

5422 Topanga Canyon Boulevard
Woodland Hills, California 91367

I have reported that **Paul Humphrey worked a security position at or associated with this same location around 1998**.

Around **2004**, at the Starbucks located there, an employee known to me as **Garrett** stated:

“It’s your transgressions.”

I interpreted that statement as indicating that the hostility, instigations, and repeated provocations directed toward me were being justified by some supposed wrongdoing attributed to me.

No specific crime was identified.

Instead, the accusation or explanation has repeatedly changed over the years:

- criminal;
- mentally ill;
- dangerous;
- unstable;
- public nuisance;
- obsessed;
- threatening;
- harassing;
- Asshole
- Weird
- Thinks Differently
- or some other rotating characterization.
- And a Imaginary Rap Sheet that goes down to a very young age of fabrications

The treatment has remained largely the same even as the explanation changes.

That is important because it demonstrates why I do not view the later security encounters as unrelated incidents.

---

14. April 6, 2013 – Boyd & Associates / John Paul Naranjo Assault at the Same Location

On **April 6, 2013**, I reported being physically assaulted by a Boyd & Associates security officer identified through his employee badge as:

John Paul Naranjo
Boyd & Associates
California Security Officer License #5966
Employee No. 10715

The assault occurred at the same Woodland Hills commercial property associated with the earlier Starbucks incidents with Garrets threats and ongoing group provocations, around 2004, “it’s you’re transgressions”.

My previous BSIS complaint already identifies Naranjo and requests review of his licensing, employer records, use-of-force documentation, and complaint history.

I reported that Naranjo repeatedly struck me, First, and including blows directed toward the back or side of my head nonstop.

The incident occurred while I was documenting substantially more than a single piece of defamatory Starbucks paperwork. I was attempting to document and obtain proof of what I had experienced as recurring instigation, provocation, exclusion, security encounters, physical attacks, and repeated messages that I was not welcome in ordinary public locations wherever I went. The paperwork was important because it was evidence of the accusations and narratives being circulated about me, but my larger purpose was to document the conduct, understand what was being alleged, defuse the recurring confrontations, and stop the escalating attacks.

In my view, Naranjo’s assault was part of that escalation and was intended to intimidate and silence me from documenting the provocations, attacks, exclusions, and defamatory narratives and from obtaining evidence concerning what was occurring. Possibly even to remove me from society so that there could never be any statements as to the mass crime spree against me that started at a very young age since Paul Humphrey and Micheal Patrick Huntley befriended me at 14 years old linking to Jason Perelman. I did not experience him as a guard merely performing an ordinary property-security function. The assault occurred in the middle of my effort to document and stop conduct that I contend was already being

reinforced through Starbucks, other businesses, community participants, security personnel, and law-enforcement contacts showing motive and pre-meditation.

Ironically this Starbucks anger seemed to start from me relaxing and writing a business plan to make money with some new ideas after my business partner, Michael Patrick Huntley, and other friend since 14 years old death threats while working with Paul Humphrey around 2004. Trying to make writing on paper a behavioral issue.

“I’ve given you enough rope to hang yourself with”

“Have a good life now”,

“We are using the Judicial System against you”

“You had better live a careful life”

“You are too out of control for California”

“It’s your behavior”,

And statements about defaming my name and trying to set me up to the largest circles.

My DOJ, FBI, ACLU, NAACP, and other oversight agencies submission also identifies this incident and states my position that Naranjo assaulted me after I photographed Starbucks paperwork containing defamatory claims and that Paul Humphrey had previously held security employment at that same location.

---

15. John Paul Naranjo’s Apparent Presence in the Encino Area

I have also repeatedly observed what I believe to be a vehicle or van associated with John Paul Naranjo in the Encino area close by to this location. Although I believe he might be linked in this conspiring security group.

I am **not identifying Naranjo as the July 21 masked attacker without verification**.

However, because of:

- his security employment;
- the earlier physical assault;
- Paul Humphrey’s prior security employment at the same property around 2001;
- Naranjo’s apparent presence in the Encino area which appears to possibly be where he lives **34°09'36.1"N 118°30'35.3"W**, but was working in woodland hills in 2013;

- and the new July 21 security-related assault in Encino;

I request that BSIS review Naranjo's:

- current and former security employers;
- guard-registration status;
- known assignments;
- company affiliations;
- employment locations;
- and any relationship to the security company operating at the July 21 shopping center.

---

16. Prior Threat Language – "No Relaxing for You Nigger" and Related Statements

My previous submissions document recurring threat language that forms part of the background against which these incidents occurred.

Those statements include:

"No relaxing for you nigger."

Which seems to be coming from LAPD, and growing HATE mobs with nonstop daily provocations, instigations, harassments, towards me from early childhood after kissing a black girl at sunny skies day camp. In which whatever they started they want to disappear by trying to remove the victim from society so there are no questions about the their starting point and illegal Police monitoring.

I regard this statement as a death threat and as part of racially hostile messaging directed toward me as a Jewish person. Especially with the Starbucks location at Topanga and Ventura fraudulently forging paperwork about me making racial slurs and masturbating in the bathroom. In which they don't want me around to sue over their defamation of character to worldwide circles. Once again, showing more pre-meditation and motive. As a matter of fact it appears each and every crime against me, they are reversing and giving out to the largest circles possible as cover ups.

Other documented statements include:

- **"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.”**
- **“We are using the judicial system against you.”**
- **“You had better accept what’s going on or it will get a lot worse for you.”**
- **“You’re a snitch—you’re dead.”**
- **Officer Toro of LAPD “If you ever take a picture of a person, I will exercise the law in my own way.”**
- and Mansour’s more recent **“You’re going to jail.”**

These statements appear throughout the broader history documented in my DOJ, LAPD, FBI, ACLU, NAACP, and BSIS submissions with other oversite agencies.

I am not claiming that the July 21 masked assailant personally spoke these statements during the assault.

I include them because the July 21 attack occurred in the context of this previously documented threat environment and continued exclusion from ordinary public activity.

---

17. Businesses Generally – Not Limited to Starbucks

The conduct I have reported is not limited to Starbucks.

My broader complaints document repeated confrontational or exclusionary encounters involving:

- coffee shops;
- restaurants;
- gyms;
- automotive businesses;
- retail businesses;
- hotels;
- residential properties;
- public gathering places;

- and other ordinary commercial locations.

The recurring pattern is that individuals working at or associated with businesses appear to already possess negative information or assumptions about me before any meaningful interaction occurs.

Normal behavior is then reinterpreted negatively while they lash out and instigate trying to get reactions with LAPD and the Psychology community as cover ups to their motive and activities.

Examples include:

- sitting quietly;
- drinking coffee;
- eating;
- taking photographs;
- working on a laptop;
- attending a social event;
- asking questions;
- exercising;
- walking;
- parking;
- trying to be warm and friendly, almost any dialogue showing normal human traits
- or simply being present.

In my experience, the explanation changes from business to business while the resulting conduct remains similar: confrontation, provocation, , exclusion, security involvement, police contact, or the creation of adverse records.

My LAPD complaint expressly describes what I contend is repeated coordination among businesses, security personnel, community participants, and police contacts, including the use of public-business complaints and trespass mechanisms to create escalating records.

Coffee Bean itself also appears in the earlier history I have documented. Around 2008, when I told a Coffee Bean employee that I was writing a book about my life and the

events I had experienced, the employee responded, "Good luck with that." In the context of the threats, provocations, defamatory characterizations, and escalating conduct I was already documenting, I understood the statement as hostile with the daily instigations and as reflecting concern about my publicly documenting what had occurred and is still going on today. I include this history because the July 21, 2026 assault occurred at another Coffee Bean location while I was again writing—this time preparing legal materials concerning prior incidents and arrests that I contend were unlawful. Given the larger pattern documented in my prior submissions, I do not consider that context insignificant.

The July 21 shopping-center assault therefore should not be viewed simply as a private-property issue involving a closed Coffee Bean.

The broader issue is what occurred after I complied and left the property. Within minutes of complying with the security individual's instruction and walking away onto the public sidewalk, I was approached and physically attacked by a masked individual.

---

18. Concern That the Attack Was Intended to Avoid a Police Report

A significant emergency-care facility was located within a short walking distance of the scene.

Based on the location, timing, presence of security-related individuals, and the photographed individual wearing the "SECURITY" hat and his apparent failure to call police or emergency services, I believe there was an expectation that I might go directly for medical treatment instead of making an immediate police report.

Had I done so, there might have been:

- no contemporaneous police report from me;
- no immediate identification effort;
- no police questioning of security personnel;
- no immediate request for surveillance preservation;
- and no official record establishing the sequence between the security contact and the masked attack.

I called police immediately after I was able to get up.

That decision created a contemporaneous law-enforcement record rather than leaving the event documented only as a medical injury.

---

19. Police and Emergency Response

After the assault, I called 911.

Fire department or emergency medical personnel also responded first.

Los Angeles police officers responded after.

Medical personnel cleaned the blood from my face, treated the wound, and advised that the forehead injury would likely require stitches or staples.

Photographs taken immediately after the assault document:

- visible bleeding from the forehead;
- blood running down the left side of my face;
- injury to my arm;
- blood at or near the scene;
- and other physical evidence following the attack.

I later obtained medical treatment and received staples for the forehead injury.

The photographic evidence should be preserved as exhibits to this complaint.

For that reason, I request that the July 21 Coffee Bean location not be treated as an incidental detail. I request preservation and review of any incident records, security communications, trespass or customer-notice records, internal reports, or communications involving Coffee Bean, the shopping-center management, the security contractor, or neighboring businesses that identify me or contain criminal, behavioral, mental-health, exclusionary, or other characterizations about me. I also request review of whether any information concerning me was communicated to security before the first guard approached me that night.

The July 21 assault also occurred immediately outside a Coffee Bean seating area. I do not regard the business name alone as proof of a connection. However, the location is relevant because Starbucks, Coffee Bean, and other public businesses repeatedly appear in the history with threats and confessions of their guilt and involvement, that I have documented

concerning preexisting defamatory narratives, confrontational contacts, security involvement, exclusion, and escalation. The earlier Woodland Hills Starbucks history includes Garrett's approximately 2004 statement, "It's your transgressions," the same location where I have reported Paul Humphrey previously worked security and where Boyd & Associates officer John Paul Naranjo later assaulted me in 2013. These connected events alone show this starting point to be around 1986 when Michael Patrick Huntley, and Paul Humphrey latched on to me with strategic pre-meditated motive.

19A. Relevance of Coffee Bean / Starbucks and Other Public-Business Locations

20. Requested Preservation of Surveillance and Security Records

Because commercial surveillance systems frequently overwrite recordings within days or weeks, I respectfully request immediate preservation and review of all available records concerning the incident.

I request that BSIS identify and obtain, where within its authority:

1. Security company assigned to the shopping center;
2. Security company or personnel using the name **"Shadow"** or a similar designation;
3. Guard names and registration numbers;
4. Guard rosters for July 20–21, 2026;
5. Post orders;
6. Patrol routes;
7. Dispatch records;
8. Incident reports;
9. Supervisor reports;
10. Radio communications;
11. Body-camera recordings, if any;
12. Company-issued telephone or messaging where lawfully obtainable;
13. Surveillance footage from:

- the Coffee Bean exterior;
- parking areas;

- sidewalks;
- surrounding businesses;
- building entrances;
- and adjacent commercial properties;

the physical locations and fields of view of relevant surveillance cameras;

identification of any camera blind spots or gaps along the route from the Coffee Bean seating area to the public sidewalk and assault location;

footage sufficient to trace the first security individual, masked assailant, photographed "SECURITY" hat individual, and other persons before, during, and after the assault;

14. Any record documenting the first security contact;
15. Any record identifying the photographed individual wearing ordinary street clothing and a hat marked "SECURITY," including whether he was a licensed guard, employee, contractor, witness, or other person present at the property;
16. Any record identifying individuals working nearby or arriving during the incident.

---

21. Requested Review of Connections Among Security Personnel and Companies

I request that BSIS review whether there are employment, licensing, subcontracting, supervisory, or personnel connections among:

- CitiGuard Security;
- Mansour;
- Boyd & Associates;
- John Paul Naranjo;
- Paul Humphrey;
- any company using the name Shadow Security or similar;
- Allied Universal;
- Security Specialists;
- and other security vendors identified in my prior complaint.

I specifically request review of whether any individual:

- worked for more than one of these companies;
- supervised personnel across vendors;
- subcontracted between companies;
- worked at both Woodland Hills and Encino locations;
- communicated regarding me;
- or appears repeatedly in incident or dispatch records.

---

22. Notice of Other Agency Complaints and Investigative Requests

BSIS is not the only agency or organization to which I have reported the broader conduct.

Over time, complaints, evidence, or requests for investigation have been prepared for or submitted to organizations and agencies including:

- **United States Department of Justice;**
- **California Department of Justice / California Attorney General;**
- **Federal Bureau of Investigation;**
- **American Civil Liberties Union;**
- **NAACP;**
- law-enforcement oversight offices;
- and other appropriate agencies.

I include this information so that BSIS understands that this complaint forms part of a larger documented record and is not the only notice provided regarding the broader series of events.

My DOJ submission expressly requests review of what I contend is a continuing pattern involving law enforcement, community participants, private security, businesses, and related networks.

My LAPD/California Attorney General materials likewise describe public businesses, security companies, community participants, and officers as recurring components of the conduct being reported.

I request that BSIS preserve its file and, where appropriate, make referrals or coordinate with agencies possessing jurisdiction over conduct extending beyond private-security licensing.

---

23. Requested BSIS Action

I respectfully request that BSIS:

1. **Open a supplemental investigation** concerning the July 21, 2026 Encino assault;
2. **Associate this complaint with my prior CitiGuard / Mansour complaint** rather than treating it as an unrelated matter;
3. **Identify the security company and guards** assigned to the Ventura Boulevard / Woodley Avenue shopping center during the incident;
4. Determine whether the word **"Shadow"** observed on the first individual's clothing identifies a licensed security company or employee;
5. Obtain and review all relevant:
    - post orders;
    - guard rosters;
    - dispatch records;
    - incident reports;
    - use-of-force documentation;
    - supervisory records;
    - surveillance footage;
    - and communications;
6. Determine the identity and licensing status of the photographed individual wearing ordinary street clothing and a "SECURITY" hat who appeared immediately after the assault;
7. Determine whether any security personnel witnessed the assault and failed to intervene or report it;
8. Review the employment and licensing history of **John Paul Naranjo**, including current or recent assignments in the Encino area;

9. Review the security employment history of **Paul Humphrey** and any connection to the security vendors or locations described in these complaints;
10. Review whether any personnel, companies, subcontractors, or supervisors overlap between:

- CitiGuard;
- Boyd & Associates;
- Allied Universal;
- Security Specialists;
- the company using “Shadow” or a similar name;
- and other security vendors identified in my prior complaint;

11. Determine whether security personnel have been sharing or relying upon defamatory, criminal, mental-health, exclusionary, or “danger” narratives concerning me without legitimate factual basis;
12. Determine whether private security personnel are being used to monitor, provoke, confront, exclude, report, or create incidents involving me beyond legitimate security functions;
13. Determine whether the July 21 incident represents a violation of licensing rules, professional standards, post orders, use-of-force policies, or other laws governing private security operations;
14. Preserve all records related to this matter before routine deletion or overwrite.

---

24. Closing

The July 21, 2026 assault should not be reduced to a random altercation occurring outside a closed Coffee Bean.

I intentionally went to an unfamiliar location late at night to avoid interaction, sat alone in an empty outdoor seating area, complied immediately when told to leave, walked off the property, and was then attacked within minutes by a masked individual while additional black people some security-related persons appeared in the immediate area.

That sequence occurred against a previously documented history involving CitiGuard Security, Mansour’s “You’re going to jail” threat, earlier security confrontations, the 2013

Boyd & Associates assault involving John Paul Naranjo, Paul Humphrey's prior security and LAPD associations, the same Woodland Hills security location, recurring business-based exclusion, and the 2001 Michael Patrick Huntley threats, including "World of Paranoia" and "We are using the judicial system against you." I intentionally chose an unfamiliar, nearly empty location in an effort to avoid interaction, yet the same type of security, police and community related escalation occurred there. In my view, that is important evidence that the recurring problem I have reported is not confined to one neighborhood, one business, or one security company. And a motive to remove from society out of personal HATE.

I therefore request that BSIS review this incident **as the latest escalation in the continuing pattern already brought to its attention**, identify the personnel and companies involved, preserve all relevant evidence, and take appropriate enforcement or referral action.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am available to provide photographs, medical records, police information, prior complaints, video evidence, timestamps, and additional supporting documentation. I also have documentation concerning numerous additional incidents involving community members, private security personnel and security companies, public businesses, and other recurring events that I contend are connected to the pattern described in this complaint. The incidents identified here represent only a portion of the larger documented record, and additional incidents and supporting evidence can be provided as necessary for a complete investigation.

Sincerely,

Kevin Perelman



January 12, 2026
Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)

Enforcement / Complaint Unit

Subject: Complaint Regarding Private Security Guard Conduct – CitiGuard Security (“Mansour”) and others / Woodland Oaks HOA and local area (Los Angeles)

Kevin Perelman

26500 Agoura Rd, STE 102

Calabasas, CA 91302

312-259-3686

Kevin@KevinPerelman.com

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)

P.O. Box 980550

West Sacramento, CA 95798-0550

January 12, 2026

Bureau of Security and Investigative Services (BSIS)

Enforcement / Complaint Unit

Subject: Complaint Regarding Private Security Guard Conduct – CitiGuard Security ("Mansour") and others / Woodland Oaks HOA and local area (Los Angeles)

HOAORGANIZERS.COM and community

To BSIS Enforcement,

I am submitting a complaint regarding repeated conduct since 2019 or so, by private security assigned to my residential complex (21520 and 21620 Woodland Oaks, Ca 91367 — both addresses, same property), which is managed through the Woodland Oaks Homeowners Association (HOA) and professionally managed by a third-party property management company Woodland Oaks Organizers, www.hoaorganizers.com The guard is known to me as "Mansour" (spelling uncertain; possibly Mansour/Monsour) and is associated with CitiGuard Security with rotating employees and companies, with similar conduct.

This complaint is based on a persistent, near-daily pattern since approximately 2019 of targeted monitoring and reactive security activity at and around my residence, including irregular "patrol" behavior, repeated gate positioning tied to my movements, waiting for me to come home to be in my presence, entering the garage or on foot, escalating confrontations, and inappropriate threshold/doorway contact that appear inconsistent with legitimate residential security duties. In practice, the conduct often appears designed to provoke or elicit a reaction, then recast that reaction into "incident" allegations (including set-up / frame-job style narratives), followed by increased resident pre-meditated reporting and heightened risk of law-enforcement involvement. This pattern has involved recurring resident/community reporting dynamics and has created an ongoing hostile, unsafe environment amongst the community and done with community member in coordination with the security companies.

It is especially concerning in light of prior arrests arising from disputed or mischaracterized incidents linked to the same ongoing Police and Judicial situations(including 2013, 2017, and 2023), and the risk that private-security activity is being used to manufacture or justify

enforcement contact by portraying routine lawful behavior as suspicious, dangerous, or mentally unstable (including false “schizophrenia” labeling) and monitoring with the police. I request BSIS review the underlying post orders, incident reports, call logs, and communications sufficient to confirm or refute whether the guard/company is operating outside legitimate security functions.

This complaint also concerns a persistent pattern of targeted monitoring, confrontational escalation, unequal application of security services, and conduct inconsistent with neutral residential security duties.

Expanded Guard and Assignment Summary:

• Guard known as “Mansour” (spelling uncertain)

• Company: CitiGuard Security

• Assigned location: Woodland Oaks HOA

• Frequently positioned near Owensmouth pedestrian gate

• Often stationed in an unmarked vehicle with tinted windows on the public street adjacent to the complex

Most Recent Expanded January 19, 2026 Incident Clarification:

On January 19, 2026, the guard positioned himself directly adjacent to the Owensmouth pedestrian gate I routinely use. As I approached the outside gated entrance to the townhouse complex, he abruptly exited his vehicle, accused me of scratching his car, and repeatedly stated words to the effect of “You’re going to jail.” He appeared to be wearing or activating a body-worn police recording device on his chest.

Given my prior experience with escalatory accusations leading to repetitive, nonstop, law-enforcement involvement with the homeowners association and neighbors which is persistent over 26 years, this threat cannot reasonably be viewed as casual rhetoric. I request BSIS review:

• Incident reports from January 19, 2026, and any other instances which will be based on provocation

• Any body-camera footage

• Post orders governing confrontation and accusation

• Authorization and retention policy for recording devices

Neutrality Concern Clarification:

Residential security personnel are expected to provide neutral, even-handed safety services for all residents. Repeated reactive positioning tied specifically to my movements, combined with accusatory and confrontational engagement, raises concern regarding professional neutrality and possible deviation from authorized residential duties.

Unequal Application Clarification:

On multiple occasions, I contacted CitiGuard seeking assistance as a homeowner and long-term resident (26 years) and received no meaningful response, while complaints about me appear to receive prompt response. I request review of dispatch logs, call records, and incident reports to determine whether services were administered consistently.

Any attempts to define the situations against me with security from others resulted in retaliation, whether it be mental illness labeling, or provoking belittling behaviors to try to illicit reactions.

Common Area Access Clarification:

I have been told I am “not allowed” in certain common areas, despite paying HOA assessments and receiving no written restriction. I request review of any post orders or directives referencing alleged area restrictions involving me that would show discriminatory, territorial and unethical treatment with fabrications to get what they want.

Bias / Selective Enforcement Clarification:

For approximately seven years, the guard has observed repeated hostility toward me without intervention, later escalating into confrontational threats. This creates the appearance of selective enforcement rather than neutral property protection.

Additional context regarding scope (stated conservatively): I also have documentation indicating that more than one private-security company has been involved in similar patterns of contact over time, including earlier periods before 2019. I recognize BSIS’s jurisdiction is limited to licensing and professional conduct; I am providing this context because it may reflect repeat vendor use and potential coordination across licensees. I request BSIS review whether any other licensed security vendors have been utilized for similar monitoring/response patterns relating to me, and obtain any available records reflecting vendor changes, subcontracting, or shared reporting narratives.

Longer-term context: While this complaint focuses on the near-daily conduct at Woodland Oaks since approximately 2019, I have also documented similar patterns involving private-security personnel and rotating vendors in earlier years, and I can provide a structured index of those records upon request.

1) Guard / assignment information (as currently known)

Guard name: “Mansour” (spelling uncertain); additional CitiGuard personnel also appear involved at times and linked in coordination with other security guards, and security companies

Company: CitiGuard Security

West Hills: 22736 Vanowen St, Suite 300, West Hills, CA 91307

States on the door moved: Woodland Hills: 5550 Topanga Canyon Blvd, Suite 310, Woodland Hills, Ca 91367

Los Angeles: 801 S Hope St, Suite 1108, Los Angeles, CA 90017

Northridge: 9301 Corbin Ave, Ste 1800, Northridge, CA 91324

Assigned location: Woodland Oaks HOA / Woodland Oaks complex (Los Angeles)

21520 and 21620 Burbank – same complex

Woodland Hills, Ca 91367

Uniform/ID: He wears a security uniform; “SECURITY” marking is visible in video stills

Typical post behavior: Frequently positioned near complex gate areas (including the Owensmouth pedestrian gate) and, on many nights, stationed in an unmarked vehicle with tinted windows on the public street adjacent to the complex rather than operating from a visible on-property post.

2) Summary of repeated conduct

On many nights, the guard remains near the complex gates for extended periods, and the “patrol” behavior appears irregular and reactive rather than routine. Specifically:

Ongoing gate positioning pattern (Owensmouth pedestrian gate): The guard repeatedly positions his vehicle at or directly adjacent to the pedestrian gate I use (Owensmouth), creating a conspicuous and pressuring presence during my normal entry/exit.

01/19/2026 — Escalation at Owensmouth gate: yelling, threats, and apparent body-worn camera: On January 19, 2026, the CitiGuard security guard known to me as Mansour was positioned directly adjacent to the Owensmouth pedestrian gate I use to enter/exit on foot. As I approached the gate, he abruptly exited his vehicle and began yelling allegations to the effect of “you scratched my car” as I walked by his car to the gate to enter the gate and “you’re going to jail,” repeatedly escalating the encounter and making threatening statements. During this incident he appeared to be wearing a police-style body-worn camera (body cam). Normally he is not wearing a body cam, but on this night he choose to.

Request: I request BSIS obtain and review any incident report/call note/dispatch entry created for this event or all other events; any available body-cam footage or recordings retained by the guard/company; the Woodland Oaks post orders governing confrontations/accusations; and confirmation of whether the guard/company is authorized to use body-worn cameras at this site or is specifically there for me, including recording/retention policies. This was the only time he had a police body camera on.

Escalation into Confrontational, Provocative, and Threat-Based Conduct: The guard’s conduct has escalated over time from visible monitoring or routine patrol posture into direct confrontation, accusatory statements, and adversarial engagement. However, in the past, neighbors were told to be the aggressors to act as proxies for them. This has included yelling allegations at me in common areas, asserting wrongdoing without documented basis, indirect instigations in repetition, and adopting a posture that portrays me as the aggressor while positioning himself and the neighbors, as the victim.

Beyond overt accusations, interactions have increasingly included unsettling or provocative remarks delivered in a manner that appears designed to elicit a reaction rather than address a

legitimate security concern. These exchanges do not resemble neutral safety engagement; instead, they create a confrontational atmosphere and suggest preexisting narrative framing.

There have also been instances in which the guard appears to have knowledge of incidents affecting me or my vehicle—such as damage or interference—shortly after I return home, followed by attempts to initiate dialogue or confrontation. The timing of such interactions raises concern that monitoring may be reactive and targeted rather than neutral patrol activity.

Additionally, I have documented prior video-recorded law-enforcement encounters in which statements were made to the effect of “We are watching you, Perelman.”, “If you ever take a picture of a person, I will exercise the law in my own way” by LAPD, and Indirect Police threats that I do not leave my house. While I am not asserting improper coordination, the combination of such law-enforcement messaging and subsequent security guard confrontations—particularly threats such as “you’re going to jail”—creates a cumulative atmosphere of intimidation and heightened escalation risk. When private security personnel adopt accusatory, threat-based language in a context where prior enforcement escalation has occurred, it materially increases the likelihood of conflict and unjustified reporting or enforcement contact.

Residential security personnel are expected to de-escalate tension and provide neutral, even-handed protection to all residents. Engagement that appears designed to provoke, intimidate, or reinforce prior enforcement narratives is inconsistent with that professional role.

Why the **“you’re going to jail”** threat is especially concerning (pattern-based): The guard’s statement to the effect of “you’re going to jail” wearing a police body camera, is not a casual remark in context. And is based on previous pre-meditated behaviors of doing just this, out of discriminatory behaviors, and empty labeling or personal judgements In my prior experience, escalatory accusations of criminality have been followed by increased third-party reporting, heightened monitoring, and law-enforcement contact arising from disputed or mischaracterized events. For that reason, this type of threat raises concern that the guard’s conduct may be part of an escalation sequence that increases the likelihood of unjustified enforcement involvement. I request BSIS preserve and review any reports, call notes, and communications generated before and after 01/19/2026 that could explain the basis for any “criminal” framing or threatened enforcement action which starts approximately 26 years purchasing the property with the Home Owners Associations personal discriminatory bias towards me.

Apparent resident/community-driven reporting tied to my movements (day or night): When I leave or return to my residence—day or night—security positioning and monitoring near the gates, garage doors, frequently changes shortly afterward. The timing and repetition of these responses is consistent with resident/community reporting (i.e., third parties relaying my movements to security). I request review of resident call-in records, dispatch notes, and any reporting logs identifying what was reported, by whom (if recorded), and what specifically triggered each response.

Rapid “on-cue” appearance during nighttime walks, drives, leaving my house (repeated pattern): On multiple occasions over the years which are consistent, when I go out for an evening walk—particularly on nights when the guard is not already visibly posted—he appears within minutes and positions near the gate/exit route I use in a manner that is conspicuous and intimidating (consistent with overt monitoring rather than routine patrol). This has occurred repeatedly and is not a single isolated event. On some occasions it has appeared other security companies like

Allied Universal, Security Specialists, and others have also coordinated at the same time. And on some occasion the local area neighbors in outdated old police cars, and similar looking vehicles, come out in hopes to instigate reactions or intimidate. Several videos of local area civilians posing as police officers in black and white non police cars, and even direct threats claiming I've committed a crime in jokingly stages civilians impersonating police officers in hopes to invoke responses that appear to be mental instability that get on video that seem to be coordinated with the security companies, I request review of any related call logs, dispatch notes, or incident reports documenting what prompted his arrival on those nights.

Provocative, non-security interactions: On occasions, the guard attempts to initiate conversation that appears provocative/instigating rather than security-related, and appears designed to draw me into conflict or create a narrative that I am the aggressor.

One of these ongoing situations, BB-gun incident video shown by guard; later similar vandalism directed at me (intimidation context): On one occasion, the guard showed me a video he claimed depicted individuals shooting at him with a BB gun. At a later time, my vehicle was shot with a BB gun (separate incident multiple locations; I am not asserting the same individuals were involved). The sequence is relevant because it suggests the guard may be collecting and introducing "incident narratives" during interactions with me in a way that escalates tension and could be used to imply suspicion or blame without evidence. I request review of any incident reports, call logs, security notes, or communications concerning (1) the guard's reported BB-gun incident and (2) any reports involving my vehicle, including dates, times, who reported, and the stated basis for any suspicion (3) Any calls that relate to complaints about me leaving my property.

Asian neighbor "I'm Telling Security" I'm guessing about 8 years ago with the neighboring complex in harmless friendly dialogue while screaming at me. Who seemed to always know when I was coming home and coming out walking her dogs on Owensmouth Street, the Warner Center Met, and Security Specialists, Incident and Escalation Pattern (Owensmouth Area): A resident in the Owensmouth area had repeated proximity contacts in the vicinity of my residence over a period of time. On one occasion, after a brief and initially friendly exchange on the public street, she abruptly began shouting words to the effect of, "I'm telling security," or similar. The statement was made loudly and, in a manner, clearly intended to trigger a response while pretending to be a victim.

They have a google blog stating I'm a violent paranoid schizophrenic, and if you see me call the police. Stating I am unstable. Showing discriminatory motive with fabricated psychological labeling.

Following that incident, I observed a noticeable increase in security presence and monitoring near the pedestrian gate and surrounding areas. The timing of this change in posture, immediately following the resident's public statement, raises concern that informal resident complaints—rather than documented security violations—are triggering reactive deployment decisions.

This incident is not isolated. In prior years, I experienced similar escalation patterns involving other private security companies operating in the area, including Security Specialists and Allied Universal with others. On multiple occasions while walking on public streets, I was confronted or followed by security personnel who suggested I was trespassing on the public street and

sidewalk, or not permitted in areas that were in fact public rights-of-way. In at least one instance, an Allied Universal/Security Specialists guard aggressively deploying mace spray in my eyes on Owensmouth street for trying to get fresh air and exercise. In other instances, security personnel contacted law enforcement when I was lawfully parked on a public street on the side of the road with car idling, briefly stopped to input GPS coordinates, or waiting in a vehicle—ordinary activities commonly performed by members of the public and in the same areas of others who do the same.

In those situations, law enforcement was called based on allegations that portrayed normal behavior as suspicious or threatening while overdramatizing a few minutes into hours of waiting around and on video. I later became aware that statements were circulating within the community labeling me as “violent” or “mentally unstable,” with suggestions that police should be called if I was observed. I am not asking BSIS to adjudicate the truth of those characterizations; rather, I am requesting review of whether private security personnel are relying on unverified resident narratives to justify confrontational or enforcement-oriented responses to lawful conduct.

When routine public behavior—such as walking on a public sidewalk, parking on a public street, getting exercise and fresh air or entering one’s own residential complex—is repeatedly treated as a security incident, it creates a pattern in which normal activity becomes the basis for confrontation and law-enforcement involvement. Residential security personnel are expected to distinguish between legitimate safety concerns and ordinary lawful conduct. Reactive deployment based primarily on resident statements, without objective verification of wrongdoing, risks contributing to unnecessary escalation. And at no point are security to act as the police, or monitor with the police in unconstitutional methods out of personal bias.

3) Documentation of Incidents and Reaction to Recording

In response to repeated confrontational and escalatory encounters, I have at times recorded interactions in order to preserve an accurate record of events. This has included video recording in the local areas when I reasonably believed an interaction might escalate or be mischaracterized.

My purpose in recording has been documentation and self-protection — to ensure that any allegations or reports are evaluated against objective evidence. However, I have observed that the act of recording itself appears to generate heightened hostility or escalation from security personnel, community members, and, at times, law enforcement. Even threats that I had better accept what’s going on or it will a lot worse for me. And multiple events with similar situations. On certain occasions, recording has been met with immediate adversarial posture, accusatory statements, mental illness labels as cover ups or increased efforts to portray the situation as a security incident.

The act of recording in public or common areas is lawful and is frequently used by residents to document interactions for clarity and accountability especially within the guidelines of self defense. A professional residential security response should remain neutral and focused on de-escalation regardless of whether a resident is documenting an encounter. The more information on video that is provided to the police, the more the escalation, especially the mental illness labeling.

I respectfully request that BSIS review whether any incident reports, dispatch notes, or communications reference my act of recording as justification and retaliation for escalation, and whether security personnel have treated documentation itself as suspicious or confrontational conduct rather than a lawful exercise of personal documentation in self-defense.

4) Context and concern regarding purpose of deployment

Woodland Oaks, and Woodland Hills in general, is generally a quiet residential community. The guard's routine practice of positioning in an unmarked, tinted-window vehicle on the public street adjacent to complex gates with LAPD and Community members—rather than operating from a visible on-property post—appears disproportionate to ordinary residential security needs and inconsistent with routine patrol.

In my experience, this deployment has become a source of disturbance rather than stability. The repeated, conspicuous stakeout posture near the gates with neighbors, community members, and other security companies, has contributed to turmoil and confrontation risk, and appears to generate more disruption than any security benefit it provides.

Based on the recurring timing and reactive nature of this monitoring, and prior incidents involving law-enforcement contact in past years, I am concerned this private-security activity may be used to provoke or manufacture a pretext for unjustified law-enforcement involvement. I cannot confirm law-enforcement coordination with direct proof; however, I request preservation and review of all logs and reports that would confirm or refute this concern, including any communications, call notes, or incident reports referencing me.

5) HOA-triggered responses / manufactured pretext concern

I understand the HOA and property manager have processes for residents to report concerns and contact management/security). Based on repeated incidents over time, I am concerned that the HOA's reporting process may be used with pre-meditation to trigger security responses tied to my normal presence and lawful activity, sometimes accompanied by shifting or inconsistent justifications (including claims on video implying I do not reside here or do not "belong" in certain areas of the complex).

Concern regarding HOA direction and scope of assignment (stated as a records issue): Based on the duration, targeting, and escalation of the security attention described above, I am concerned that HOA leadership (including the HOA president Steven Bear and/or board) may be directing or funding security services in a manner that goes beyond legitimate residential security needs and results in targeted monitoring or harassment of a specific resident (me). I am not asserting this as a proven fact; I request BSIS obtain and review the Woodland Oaks contract, post orders, scope of assignment, and any billing records/invoices/work orders or written instructions that reflect who requested the guard's presence, what tasks were authorized (including any gate "post" instructions), and what basis was documented for repeated responses involving me.

In particular, I request review of any written or electronic communications between HOA leadership/property management and CitiGuard that reference me by name or describe monitoring, "watching," or responding to my movements.

I request BSIS obtain and review all security call logs, dispatch notes, and incident reports reflecting the stated basis for responses involving me at my residence in Woodland Oaks, and determine whether CitiGuard personnel are acting outside legitimate security functions or engaging in harassment/targeted monitoring.

6) Community pre meditated false statements (reputation harm) tied to security responses

I have become aware of repeated statements being circulated in the community and at local public businesses that I am “crazy,” “violent,” “schizophrenic,” a criminal, a public nuisance, or that I “harass” people which appear to change over and over, over the years. I have also encountered claims implying that I “do not live” at my own residence, despite being a long-term resident/owner for 26 years which implies criminal motive to steal what I own.

I am concerned these false statements are being used to justify calls to security and increased monitoring, escalating the risk of confrontation. I request that BSIS obtain and review any security logs, incident reports, call notes, or communications that reference me, including the stated basis for responding and any claims made about my identity, residency, or alleged conduct.

7) Pattern of mischaracterizing normal, lawful activity as “suspicious” or “behavioral”

I have observed an ongoing pattern in which ordinary, lawful activities are treated as suspicious or framed as evidence of instability. Examples include taking an evening or nighttime walk, going to the gym, going to coffee shops, social gathers, sitting at a public park bench, briefly pulling to the side of the road for a few minutes, traveling to ordinary destinations, or leaving my residence at normal hours. These are routine behaviors, yet they repeatedly appear to trigger security attention with certain community members and LAPD, monitoring near the complex gates, and/or resident/community reports.

In addition, normal movement to public areas where others may already “know of me” through community rumor or prior claims has been treated as inherently suspicious, with individuals sometimes presenting themselves as victims of alleged conduct without a clear factual basis. I have also observed that normal expression—such as creating art, wearing humorous clothing, or making jokes, friendly statements to uplift the atmosphere and show warmth—is almost always mischaracterized as “dangerous” or “crazy,” no matter how friendly and kind, and that ordinary emotions or minor disagreements are similarly reframed as evidence of instability. This pattern raises concern that the purpose is not legitimate security, but to build a misleading narrative about my behavior and justify repeated contacts or interventions.

8) Interrogative Encounters in Public Settings Connected to Security Interactions

Following recent security-related discussions at my residence, I have experienced multiple unusual encounters in public settings, including one at a car event approximately 50 minutes from my home. At this gathering, I was approached by an individual I did not initially recognize, who was not part of the hotrod, social venue. He identified himself as my neighbor and began conversing with me. Although the conversation started with references to his own normal passenger car and a recent accident, it quickly shifted to a series of pointed questions focused solely on my living situation, recent security concerns, and neighborhood matters with groups of community members.

The interaction was distinctly one-sided; his approach felt much more like an interrogation than a casual conversation. He did not seem interested in anything that had happened to me or my perspective, nor did he bring a car to show to the crowd while telling me he knows all about cars, focusing only on eliciting information about issues that were already disturbing to me. Later, I recognized this individual's caravan parked in my local area, confirming he was indeed a neighbor, although I had not previously noticed him or his vehicle.

While I do not wish to speculate regarding motives or coordination, the timing and subject matter of his questioning were unusual—closely mirroring topics I had recently discussed with Security Guard Mansur in regards to me finding out what was going on in 2001 when my business partner had someone befriend me trying to get me to take a trashbag of Police confiscated marijuana regarding security-related matters at my residence. Encounters like this are concerning because when lines of questioning that echo prior security discussions follow me into unrelated social environments, and focus exclusively on allegations or security issues, it increases the risk that any response I make could later be misrepresented or lead to further enforcement or reporting actions.

Example of language repetition following a security interaction:

During an interaction with the CitiGuard security guard known to me as Mansur, he attempted to engage me in conversation. I referenced concerns about past misconduct and improper activity involving law enforcement in a situation they were trying to make me look like a drug dealer with my Gym Manager Rodie Morales, then disengaged and left. As I walked away, the guard addressed me using the nickname "bud" in a belittling or instigating manor. After that encounter, I documented repeated instances where unrelated individuals in nearby businesses addressed me with the same nickname ("bud") in a noticeably pointed and recurring manner over a short period of time.

Within this same period, the neighbor who followed me to the social event also called me "bud" multiple times in a similar context. The use of this distinctive nickname, especially when paired with a pointed and interrogatory style of questioning and apparent efforts to befriend me, raised concerns about potential attempts to provoke a reaction or create the appearance of instability while wanting to join me weekly to become a friend and pretending, he's just being humorous with private conversations he should have no knowledge of.

I respectfully request review of any security logs, incident reports, call notes, dispatch records, or communications that reference defaming mental health-related labels (including "Paranoia", "schizophrenia", "Anger") in connection with me, and the basis for any such references.

Additionally, on several occasions, I have observed that third-party contacts in public are accompanied by nonverbal behavior—such as prolonged hostile staring, smirking, or laughter—that is consistent with attempts to provoke. The recurrence of the same unusual nickname, or rotating trigger words by groups in repetition, and questioning based on privacy violations, across multiple unrelated locations within a short timeframe, warrants review of any security reports, call notes, communications, or resident-reporting processes that reference or repeat allegations or labels about me, including any information being generated and shared about my situation. Or trying to tease someone with mental illness mind games, while stating I suffer from mental illness while they claim they are just joking around.

9) Related documentation suggesting broader coordination

I recognize BSIS will focus on licensing and professional conduct. I am not asserting conclusions beyond my evidence. However, my documentation and evidence index reflect repeated security-related encounters over time and include references to more than one security company name appearing in my records. I request BSIS determine whether CitiGuard Security is coordinating with other licensees/subcontractors in a way that is inconsistent with lawful, routine security duties, and/or whether multiple vendors are being utilized to generate repeated responses based on vague or unsupported allegations about my identity, residency, or behavior.

10) Documented public labeling and escalation risk (mental-health claims and “call police” messaging)

I am submitting the following s because they are externally verifiable examples of mental-health labeling and “danger” narratives being circulated about me publicly, in a manner likely to increase resident reporting and escalated security/police contact absent verified misconduct. I am not asking BSIS to evaluate medical claims as they would come from an unofficial source; I am submitting these items to document that such labels (including “schizophrenia”) are being used in connection with security and Police escalation.

Google-hosted public post labeling me “violent” / “paranoid schizophrenic” and instructing others to call police from random citizens who have never met me or taken to time to get to know of me while obtaining the labels for outside parties (documented), with additional commenter referencing LAPD: I have preserved a screenshot of a public Google-hosted post attributed to an individual identified as “Yuka,” from the Warner Center Met complex which labels me using stigmatizing mental-health language (including “violent” / “paranoid schizophrenic”) and instructs others to call the police if they see me. The same Google-hosted page also includes participation by Paul Humphrey, a former friend I grew up with starting around the age 14, who has prior employment/association with the Los Angeles Police Department around 1998, and later on worked with Security companies who I found out had ulterior motives with his fraudulent and forged fabrications about mental illness from personal bias towards me. I am not asking BSIS to adjudicate law-enforcement conduct; I am submitting this because it is an externally verifiable example of the “schizophrenia/violence” narrative being circulated publicly by multiple individuals with clear pre-meditated intent to the largest circles possible.

08/29/2013 public post labeling me with “Paranoid Schizophrenia” and warning others not to approach (documented): I have preserved a screenshot of a public online post dated 08/29/2013 that identifies me by name and asserts that I have “Paranoid Schizophrenia,” on changing labels and criminal accusations, recommends others not approach or speak with me, and suggests I may “react violently.”

Request: I request review of whether any CitiGuard, Allied Universal, Security Specialists security logs, incident reports, call notes, dispatch records, or HOA/resident reporting processes reference or repeat criminal or mental-health labels (including “schizophrenia”) in connection with me, and the stated basis for any such claims.

11) Prior incident involving private security use-of-force (identified guard) – separate from Woodland Oaks

I am also providing a dated prior incident involving private security use-of-force and identification of the involved guard, so BSIS can evaluate licensing/registration status and any related employer incident documentation and complaint history.

04/06/2013 — reported physical assault by identified security officer (Boyd & Associates) at Gateway Plaza Woodland Hills, in Association with Starbucks falsified claims fear mongering and retaliation for speaking out: I reported being physically assaulted by a private security officer identified by the attached employee badge as John Paul Naranjo of Boyd & Associates (Security Officer; Calif. State Lic. #5966; Employee No. 10715). Police were called immediately by me. I request BSIS review this individual's licensing/registration status and any related employer incident documentation, including any use-of-force reporting, supervisor reports, and prior complaints. This was also met with LAPD threats "If you ever take a picture of a person, I will exercise the law in my own way" from a west valley police officer named Officer Toro linking Police Misconduct and Police Retaliation events to what they have been doing, going down to a very young age.

12) Representative documented incidents supported by video and stills

I can provide full clips upon request. Representative documented incidents include:

Doorway / threshold contact Video stills show a uniformed "SECURITY" employee Mansur at my door area, indicating prolonged presence at my threshold late at night. This is significant because I have documented incidents where security contact at my door is used to prolong interaction at the threshold and attempt to look into my residence.

Approach along exterior walkway carrying a box from fedex or ups delivering it personally (12/05/2020) and (7/2/2021): Video still shows mansur approaching along the exterior walkway carrying a box toward my unit area and placing it by my door while looking in my house windows, consistent with non-routine, targeted contact late at night

These incidents are examples of the type of conduct that, in my view, exceeds routine residential security functions and raises privacy and harassment concerns while trying to collect information to use to create false narrative.

13) Evidence available

I can provide:

Full video clips corresponding to the still images referenced above and a lot more;

A written incident log (dates/times/locations/what happened/evidence reference) on various situations;

The on-site property management notice and contact information which appears to be enabling random neighbors to call and play victim when they see me to try to make the monitoring look acceptable, and

A structured evidence index showing dated entries and categorized folders, with underlying files available upon request.

14) Requested action

I respectfully request that BSIS:

Identify the guard (“Mansour”) of CitiGuard, and other company security guards or agencies working with him and confirm his guard registration status, employer of record, and any related permit details or legitimacy or his behaviors;

Confirm the license status of CitiGuard Security (and any PPO/branch information, if applicable), and whether their practices at this site are consistent with licensed security operations.

Obtain and review the Woodland Oaks account post orders by Steve Bear or Anyone else at the Woodland Oaks HOA / scope of assignment (what the guard is authorized to do) and compare it to the documented conduct (street-side stakeout posture, reactive monitoring with LAPD, confrontational escalation, and threshold/doorway contact);

Obtain and review security logs, incident reports, dispatch notes, and communications concerning contacts or responses involving me at the house I own, Woodland Oaks and the Woodland Oaks HOA, including the stated “basis for suspicion” or alleged justification; and

Determine whether the described conduct constitutes unprofessional or illegal conduct or licensing violations, including inappropriate private-residence threshold contact and misuse of security duties for targeted monitoring/harassment while coordinating with the neighbors and residents in the same complex or local area.

Thank you for your attention. I am available to provide additional documentation and to identify exact gate locations and relevant dates/times from the attached log.

Sincerely,

Kevin Perelman




reolink
05/12/2020 23:06:08 SAT
Patio1


05/12/2020 23:06:08 SAT


Cyrusher
RD-100
Cyrusher
Cyrusher


05/12/2020 23:05:47 SAT


reolink
05/12/2020 23:05:15 SAT
ALL LIVES MATTER
Patio1


12/05/2020 23:05:33 SAT
SECURITY
dory


07/02/2021 22:33:54 SUN
reolink
Patio1

itiguard™

Our Office Has Moved!

Our New Address is:

5550 Topanga Canyon Blvd.
Suite 310
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

-- Allied Security --
-- Allied Univeral Security --
-- Allied Universal Security - Warner Center Met --
-- Boyds & Associates --
-- CitiGuard --
-- Gateway Plaza Security Guards --
-- Metro Complex Security Guard harassments and stalkings - Security Specialists --
-- Patrol Security Services Inc - New Woodland Oaks Security Company - Not sure Company --
-- Securitas AB --
-- TST Private Security --
gsdata
2_10_2019 - ACS Security Beverly Hills - Waits behind me shining lights
2_12_2019 - Security waiting for me at all coffee shops
6_30_2018 - Security at Starbucks_Rite Aid_Subway harassing me telling me I have to leave in 20 mins when talking to pec
8_12_2020 - Armed Security Guard in unmarked car waiting for me gateway plaze - goes into Jamba
10_9_2020 - about 5 security companies all working together to harass me with a grey eclipse copycat
10_22_2018 and 10_24_2018 - Security company parks his car in front of both my cars
10_25_2018 - Allied Universal Follows me to AMC Movies shining lights on my car as I get out
11_7_2018 - Coffeebean - Baja Fresh - Aliied Universal Security - Whistling, harassments
12_17_2018 Studio City Starbucks - Girl Tells me to not come back and has security guard try to thug me quiet
ADT Security 10_14 follow me to Studio City Starbucks - 10_15_2017
Allied Universal Security following me to Oxnard Venture locations
Andrews International - Lady who claimed I took a pic of her ass
Black Security Guard tearing up my cards and telling me to throw them on the ground
Golden West Security At the Canoga_Victory harassing me
Metro Security Company Sign
Private Select Security
Securitas AB
Security Guard Topanga lot - Card - try keep me quiet
Security Guards Thugging Granada Hills
VCS PRivate Security
Warner Center Ln Security Guard - Private Road

- 1_11_2020 - Monsur Bullshit working with neighbors
- 2_7_2021 - Monsur bings package from front gate
- 4_27_2022 - CityGuard Following me watching me to harass
- 5_2_2022 - Mansur - Waiting in car for me to sit on steps then leavesafter HOA Threat Letter
- 5_6_2021 - mansur waoting for me with neighbors wants me to take his picture
- 5_6_2022 - Lauren waiting where security guard does stalking me
- 5_7_2022 - HOA and neighbor interactions
- 5_7_2022 - Lauren working with Warner Center Met - Black Hate Groups - Security - Possible Police - Starbucks - showing
- 5_8_2022 - Coming home from Beach Drive - Bar - Police Talking to Mansur from City Guard and linked events with Strang
- 5_8_2022 - Lauren Taking off Florida Plates in Guilt - Showing something to hide
- 5_9_2022 - Documenting to STALKINGS between LAPD - HOA - Neighbors - Lauren - and Citiguard paid off to stalk me
- 5_9_2022 - The Link Between LAPD - Lauren - My Neighbors - Jennifer Pilchick Perelman - Citiguard - Political Kill Agenda
- 5_16_2021 - Mansor waits for me to come home trying to intimidate - also dynamics of how Gangstalking works
- 5_26_Guard hovers over me follows me as I go to get grub hub delivery working with them
- 5_27_2020 - Guard follows me into guarage as I park
- 5_28_2020 - Person puts dogshit and fuck you note on car - BTI Security Witness
- 5_30_2020 - 2 walks and the prograsson of security with mass groups
- 6_19_2020 - West Hills El Pollo Loco and CVS hires Citiguard to work on me for going to el pollo loco with mass stalking
- 6_22_2020 - Felipe working with black girl in equinox
- 6_23_2020 - Felipe and black girl gone - person waiting lights on where walked last night and another black girl honk 2s
- 6_30_2020 - El Pollo Loco Lot almost back to normal - no security guard
- 7_1_2020 - Black Security Guard back with same groups of people because I went to el pollo loco the night before
- 7_10_2022 - Old Man who defaces my car - Followed me out - Working with Mansur from City Guard Ramping up HOA St
- 7_11_2022 - Mansur Follows me out trying to passive aggressively intimidate me as I go out to take a walk
- 7_12_2022 - CityGuard Mansur in his black Civic Plate - 8AIC912 - with groups of other black Civics
- 7_12_2022 - Mansur with Paid Off Stalking Company Cityguard Waiting for me to come home to peep in my car - as Perso
- 7_29_Getting Angrier and dafacing my car even more as it stays in the same spot - As city Guard tries to intimidate me
- 7_31_2022 - More car vandalisms - City Guard - Old Man working with HOA - Follows me out with mass group attacks - c
- 8_13_2020 - African empoyee harassing me - Tony
- 8_15_2020 - Mansfer or something stalking me with Metro Security and large groups
- 10_10_2020 - Guard Follows me from rec room while watching me on sec cameras to try to get reaction
- 10_12_2020 - 911 - come out - cars lights on at me - cars 2s - Monsur approach me - video of ppl cops called on
- 11_4_2023 - Citiguard stops coming by until I start normalizing my life in anger with the neighbors
- 11_30_2020 - Monsur trying to mke me look schizo asking me if Im working
- 12_2_2020 - monsur Paramedics
- 12_5_2020 Monsur Provokings then Wants to Deliver Package to door
- 12_6_2020 - Monsur waiting for me to come home after debre or someone throws something at my car
- 12_13_2020 - Monsur working with met people to try to make me look crazy set me up proke me
- Dont know date - 1st convo at door by eclipse asks me if I live there
- Felipe Maximus Perez
- Phone Harassments from Felipe
- www.mysecurityguards.com
  - Felipe Maximus Perez.txt
  - Info.txt

HOA Organizers, Inc.
20847 Sherman Way, Penthouse
Winnetka, CA 91306
(818) 778-3331 Office
(818) 778-3332 Fax

HOA ORGANIZERS

This property is professionally managed by HOA Organizers, Inc. The current Community Manager for all questions and issues relating to the property is:

Shauna Gatlin, CMCA
(818)778-3331
Cell or Text to: (818)235-1340
shauna@hoaorganizers.com

For all after-hours emergency matters please call (833)446-2674.

Please do not call members of the association's Board of Directors.






S COFFEE





CALIF. STATE LIC.
#5966

BOYD &
ASSOCIATES

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE

SECURITY OFFICER

POSITION OR TITLE

NARANJO, JOHN PAUL	5'10"	160lb	BRN	BRN
FULL EMPLOYEE NAME	HT	WT	HAIR	EYES

10715

EMPLOYEE NO.



We're There, When You Can't Be.

Residential & commercial patrol services provide an effective deterrent for criminals, verify false alarms and provide fast response for emergencies.

LEARN MORE GET A QUOTE

Request A Free Quote Today

Name * E-Mail * Phone * Get In Touch

HOME SECURITY

As a family operated business, we take our responsibility for securing your home very seriously. Boyd Security provides a range of services, systems and teams that create a security solution that's reliable, responsive and commanding.

Learn More >

HOME AUTOMATION

Upgrade your life with our home automation solutions. From setting schedules for thermostats and lighting to sending automated text alerts for events that matter to you, the possibility for a simpler life from Boyd & Associates is endless.

Learn More >

BUSINESS SECURITY

With a level of protection that few firms can match, our advanced systems, reliable services, and highly qualified team work together to give you the confidence you need to focus on day-to-day business and its future.

Learn More >

Quality Service for Over 50 Years!

Since 1967 Boyd & Associates has built a strong reputation for being one of the best full-service security and **alarm companies in Southern California**. It is through our tireless pursuit of perfection and our unwavering commitment to the latest technologies that we have been able to exceed the expectations of industry leaders and homeowners throughout **Los Angeles County**, **Ventura County**, **Orange County** and **Riverside County**.

- Total Security
- Personalized Service
- Locations Throughout Southern California

Get Started Today

""Your technicians were very professional and there was no mess from the installation of our new system. I would gladly recommend Boyd & Associates."

Kathy I.
Northridge, CA

Big Enough To Get The Job Done, Small Enough To Care.

Boyd & Associates is a premier full-service security firm with more than 600 associates serving homeowners, businesses, and gated communities throughout Southern California. And while the company has changed since 1967, it continues to stay true to its roots of striving for excellence for its customers and setting the standard for service within the security industry.

Ventura County | Corporate Headquarters
2191 E Thompson Blvd
Ventura, CA 93001
(805) 650-3267
(805) 643-4438

Orange County
3151 Airway Ave, Suite K 105
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(714) 641-2940
(949) 650-6560

Call Today! (800) 381-BOYD (2693)

Refer Friends & Family and Receive 3 Months of Free Monitoring!

© 2020 Boyd & Associates | Privacy Policy |
powered by ALARM.COM

Paul Humphrey friend since 14 years old stalking me right out of A.E. Wright Middle School, with Michael Patrick Huntley linking to Jason Perelman. Paul Humphrey worked for LAPD in 1998, then Security Companies fear mongering the masses out of HATE. Everything after this with Security Companies, LAPD, and the masses is FEAR MONGERED HATE, daily provocations, and COVER UP with Mental Illness Labeling. Their is no actual Mental Illness. Just you accept us STALKING you to remove you from society with the Perelman Family, and LAPD. Everything is reversing the situation and supression of the TRUTH out of HATE

This message has been deleted.

(unknown)

Most Important - and blatantly OBVIOUS admission of GUILT. Showing motive to Silence and Eradicate. Defamation of Character Globally with his Co-Worker Lead Officer Charles Sean Dinse of Topanga Division

8/29/13

Hello All,
Let me introduce myself, my name is Paul Humphrey and I am on this man's list, number three to be exact. The man's name is Kevin Michael Perelman. I went through middle school and high school and stayed friends with him until about 12 years ago. He was my best friend up until that time. He snapped and began to believe everyone in the world was out to get him including me, at this time I had been friends with him for over 15 years. He was like a brother to me. I have not seen him or spoken to him over 12 years. He is suffering from a severe case of **Paranoid Schizophrenia**. He is not only blaming me for ruining his life, but my other friends that are all on his list, the top six to be exact. I have spoken with several psychologists and psychiatrists and have shown them his web sites and they concur he is suffering from Paranoid Schizophrenia and not to approach him, do not talk to him, because he may react violently. I would like to work with this group, so he can receive the proper medical care he needs.

I can be reached at this e-mail address: xcr375...@hotmail.com

His web sites are:

http://kevinperelmantarget.wordpress.com/

Google

Search for messages

Groups

POST REPLY

20 of 99+ **(99+)**

My groups
Home
Starred

Favorites

Click on a group's star icon to add it to your favorites

Recently viewed

fa.freebsd.scsi
Brekel Kinect
Softimage Mailing…
alt.true-crime
Met Google Groups

Recently posted to

Met Google Groups

Privacy - Terms of Service

Met Google Groups ›

Be cautious of this man living next to us. <picture attached>

81 posts by 31 authors

U.S. based Federal Defamation with LAPD - Defamation of Character - and Federal Crimes against me based on Mental Illness labeling and Cover ups

Previous Page 1 Next

Yuka 6/22/13

I finally gave in and picked up one of those white business cards with Kevin Perelman Project written on it which is often scattered all over warner center. Apparently this man lives in the condo's next to the Met (on Burbank Blvd between Owensmouth and Juliana Pl) and just from glancing through this site, he appears to have a mental illness (which he denies in extensive detail of each incident where people are out to get him) Pictures of people, cars, business, surveillance video's etc. are all posted here.

Please don't waste your time reading this and just be careful when you are out walking the area. I will not post his website but will post his picture. I am not saying that he is dangerous or he has done anything wrong, but just take extra caution and you should not have any problems.

I won't post the website shows it's a one sided argument out of hate concealing the proof of their activities



Showing bias, and censorship - Refusal To Stop what they are doing with the Security companies and Police, suppress the proof of what they are doing on the website, Such Threats from them "You had better accept what's going on or it will get a lot worse for you"

Seven or more punches to the back of the head, and first punch was his - LAPD Cover Ups with Motive and Criminal Intent

SJW 6/28/13

I think we need to be proactive rather than reactive. I've included the link to our local police station. On the home page, there is a link for 'report a crime'. If you select this, there is then the option to report anonymously (if you so wish).

http://www.lapdonline.org/topanga_community_police_station

We shouldn't wait for matters to escalate.

He has gone from throwing business cards all over the place to dog food? What is next? When you're dealing with someone who is delusional, they have completely different reasoning capabilities.

On Saturday, June 22, 2013 10:36:24 PM UTC-7, Yuka wrote:
- show quoted text -

Lauren 6/28/13

I agree! we should definitely be proactive rather than reactive. This guy is CRAZY! If he is beating up the security at starbucks, who knows what else he is capable of!

JennyK 6/29/13

> Teri, did you report this to the HOA? They should put notices out cautioning people.

-Jenny

Yuka 6/29/13

Reversing the Argument on Everything They've Done and Are doing for 26 years. I was attacked by security for buying a coffee based on Racial Bigotry and Lies About Masturbating in their bathroom with Coffee Bean Fabricating Identical Unprovable Arguments

I get proof of their daily provocations and put it on the website for everyone to see. Especially the direct death threats and physical Attacks

In order to COVER UP their ongoing crimes against me, they blast the Defamation of Character WORLDWIDE with LAPD out of HATE instead of leaving the target and victim alone with the daily provocations while they laugh and snicker