Police Civilian Review Panel

Meeting Agenda

Location:	Teams
Date:	December 4, 2025
Time:	7:00 pm
Website:	www.fairfaxcounty.gov/policecivilianreviewpanel/

Agenda details:

I. Call to Order

II. Agenda Items

a. Roll Call

b. Approval of Meeting Agenda

c. Approval of November 6, 2025 Draft Meeting Summary

III. New Business

IV. Adjournment

Panel Meeting Schedule:

- January 8, 2025, at 7:00 p.m., 12000 Government Center Parkway Fairfax, VA 22035. Rm 4/5

Panel's Purpose:
The nine-member Police Civilian Review Panel's mission is to enhance police legitimacy and to build and maintain trust between the citizens of Fairfax County, the Board of Supervisors and the Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) by reviewing certain FCPD investigations to ensure the accuracy, completeness, thoroughness, objectivity and impartiality of the investigation. It is appointed by, and reports directly to, the Board of Supervisors. The Panel is governed both by the bylaws approved by the Board of Supervisors and a code of ethics adopted by the Panel.

Police Civilian Review Panel

November 6, 2025

Fairfax County Government Center, Conference Room 8

12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, VA 22035

Meeting Summary

Panel Members Present:

Bryon Garner, Chair

David Adams, Vice Chair

Cheri Belkowitz

Todd Cranford

Jasmine Cruz (absent)

Fazia Deen

Dirck Hargraves

Jackie Patillo

James Yang

Others Present:

Craig Miles, Office of the Police Civilian Review Panel Liaison

Rachelle Ramirez, Office of the Independent Police Auditor

Richard Schott, Office of the Independent Police Auditor

Kenneth Bynum, Panel Counsel

Madison Gibbs, Panel Counsel

Captain Christopher Cosgriff, Fairfax County Police Department Internal Affairs Bureau

Call to Order and Roll Call: Chair Garner called the Police Civilian Review Panel's (Panel) business meeting to order at 7:05 p.m., and the Panel Liaison took attendance.

Approval of Meeting Agenda: Chair Garner gave everyone a moment to review the agenda for the meeting. Vice Chair Adams made a motion to approve the agenda, and Panel Member Hargraves seconded the motion. The Panel voted, and the motion unanimously carried.

Approval of October 2, 2025 Draft Meeting Summary: Chair Garner gave Panel Members time to review the October 2, 2025 draft meeting summary. Panel Member Yang made a motion for the approval of the draft summary. Panel Member Hargraves seconded the motion. The motion to approve the October 2, 2025 draft meeting summary carried, with no objections and Panel Member Belkowitz abstaining.

Subcommittee Report for CRP-24-20R:

Vice Chair Adams, who was the Chair of the subcommittee, greeted the members of the public who were present. He then described the Panel subcommittee process and explained the Panel's procedures and authority. He said pursuant to the Bylaws, a subcommittee of the Panel conducts a review of a complaint to determine if the complaint meets the minimum criteria for review by the full Panel. Vice Chair Adams said on October 16, 2025, a subcommittee of the Panel met to discuss the matter pursuant to Panel Bylaws. The

complainant was not present at the subcommittee meeting but was present at the Panel meeting and would be given 15 minutes to address the Panel. Vice Chair Adams read the allegations made by the complainant and reviewed the facts of the case. The complainant alleged:

1. The officer made threats, used threatening, accusatory, and intimidating language
2. The officer influenced school officials to obtain criminal charges against the complainant's child

Vice Chair Adams provided a detailed summary of the incident that prompted the complainant to file the complaint, without naming the complainant or the involved officers. Vice Chair Adams said that all the School Resource Officer's (SRO) interactions with the complainant, complainant's child, and school staff were captured on the SRO's body-worn camera. He added that review of the footage supported the accuracy of the account of the events and confirms that all actions were in accordance with policy, training, and the MOU [memorandum of understanding] between the Fairfax County Police Department and the Fairfax County Public Schools.

Vice Chair Adams explained the subcommittee was charged with determining whether the complainant alleged abuse of authority or serious misconduct and whether the evidence contained in the investigative file would lead a reasonable Panel to conclude there was significant evidence to support the allegations. Vice Chair Adams then read the allegations again. He said the subcommittee did not believe there was significant evidence to support the first allegation. After reading the second allegation, he said they [the subcommittee] also did not find significant evidence for that allegation. Vice Chair Adams said the complainant alleges serious misconduct or abuse of authority, but the evidence could not lead a reasonable Panel to conclude there was significant evidence to support the allegations. In addition, he said there was no reason to believe there was information missing from the investigative report, therefore the subcommittee did not recommend the full Panel take up the full complaint.

Panel Member Hargraves gave further information about the school staff's decision to file charges as it related to the second allegation. Panel Member Yang explained that the subcommittee reviewed the file and the school staff said they came to their own decision to place charges. Panel Member Hargraves explained why there may have been a disconnect with the SRO and the complainant during their telephone call.

Vice Chair Adams said that the complainant would have 15 minutes to explain why they requested a Panel review and reminded the complainant that the meeting was public and recorded. He also asked that the complainant not use the officer's name.

The complainant introduced herself and identified herself and her child by name. She explained she comes from an educational background and provided an explanation of some of her experience. She said she did not submit the complaint lightly or out of emotion but did so based on an unprofessional and inappropriate manner in which the SRO engaged with her during a phone call. The complainant apologized for not attending the subcommittee meeting but said she had to be home to support her child, who has been on homebound instruction since the date of the incident. She said she respectfully disagreed with the subcommittee but said she was at a disadvantage because she had not had access to the body-worn camera footage or the report, which she requested.

She said there was harassment and discrimination based on a disability, and the SRO acted in a rude and threatening manner. She said the SRO was informed about a prior crisis her child had at an elementary school that involved the Fairfax County Police Department. The complainant then provided the details of the prior incident and said the incident left a significant and lasting impression on her child and her family. The complainant said that this was shared with the SRO prior to the child starting at the school. The

complainant said the SRO was called to the first incident on that date and the SRO's presence escalated the situation. The complainant said she explained to the school the medical follow-up that would occur when she left the school with her son on that day, so she believed the SRO's phone call was unwarranted and inappropriate. She said she told the SRO that she informed the school of her next steps and would not be providing additional information to the SRO. She believed, at that point, the appropriate action would have been for the SRO to end the call.

The complainant said the SRO continued the conversation and the tone became accusatory, threatening, and intimidating. The complainant read Virginia State Code 18.2-427. The complainant asked if there was intent to harass and did the SRO intend to harm? She told him she was not going to disclose information. She said that there was nothing in the code that required her to provide the SRO with her next steps. The complainant also said the conversational language used by the SRO caused reasonable fear. She added that as soon as she got off the phone, she instructed her child to lock himself in the bedroom and called her husband at work because she thought Social Services was coming to remove their son. The complainant said she strongly believes there was coercion and intimidation.

The complainant explained the incident that happened outside [that resulted in school staff having criminal charges brought against her child]. She said that a child was charged with assault despite no medical attention being sought, no workers' compensation claim being filed, and no one [staff] asking to leave school early. The complainant said the charges were inappropriate and believed they were based on the timing and her interaction with the SRO. There were conversations about filing assault charges with the SRO. The complainant asked how often assault charges are filed with assistance from an SRO. The complainant stated that if this met the standard for assault in the program her child was in, charges would be filed on a daily basis. The complainant said that the SRO's actions were misconduct and abuse of authority. She asked that the complaint be reconsidered with full transparency.

The complainant said they were required to engage the Juvenile Court and were able to participate in the diversion process but were told that if her child was charged again, her child would enter the juvenile system and have a record. The complainant said her child was discriminated against. The complainant said that homebound schooling causes isolation and stress, which lead to her child having a complete mental health crisis. The complainant said her family's fears come from the SRO's phone call and filing of charges against her son.

Vice Chair Adams said he would entertain questions from the Panel. Panel Member Belkowitz stated that she recused herself from the case. Vice Chair Adams read the allegations again and stated the subcommittee did not feel either charge merited a full Panel review. Chair Garner called for a motion to accept the subcommittee's recommendation. Panel Member Deen moved to accept the subcommittee's recommendation. Panel Member Belkowitz asked about Robert's Rules and whether you can vote against your own motion. Counsel Bynum asked what the question was. Panel Member Belkowitz repeated her question. Counsel Bynum said a non-subcommittee member needed to make the motion, and Chair Garner said that had happened. Counsel Bynum asked for clarification of Panel Member Belkowitz's question, and Panel Member Belkowitz repeated the question, which was whether someone who makes a motion can vote against that motion. The Panel Liaison and Counsel Bynum said they thought that was permissible.

Chair Garner stated there needed to be a second so they could discuss. Counsel Gibbs started to make a reference to the Bylaws and Panel Member Hargraves said he found the answer via a Google search, and the maker of a motion can vote against that motion. Panel Counsel discussed the issue, and Counsel Gibbs referenced the Bylaws, Article VI, Section D, Subsection 3, d, "The full Panel will consider the recommendation from the Subcommittee and vote to determine whether it accepts a Review Request." She asked if that could presuppose whether a discussion could be held before the vote. The Panel Liaison

explained that the subcommittee recommendation and Panel vote are separate. Counsel Gibbs asked if there was a vote to discuss and a vote to accept. Counsel Gibbs again asked if the Panel could have a discussion before the vote. Chair Garner explained that to get to the discussion, someone needed to second the motion that was currently on the table. Panel Member Hargraves attempted to make the motion again, and Panel Member Cranford and Counsel Gibbs stated the motion should come from the subcommittee. Panel Member Hargraves seconded the motion.

Chair Garner stated that the motion had been properly moved and seconded and opened the matter for discussion. Panel Member Deen asked about the CRT [Crisis Response Team]. Vice Chair Adams explained that they are trained to handle and diffuse situations to protect those involved. Panel Member Yang stated they are school staff, and Vice Chair Adams explained the SRO was not involved in the incident outside door 13. Panel Counsel asked about "the previous incident," and Vice Chair Adams explained it was not about the previous incident at another school that had nothing to do with this SRO. Chair Garner asked Vice Chair Adams to confirm the date of the incident. Panel Member Hargraves explained the incidents were separate. Panel Member Yang explained the incident that occurred on body-worn camera and also explained the separate incident involving the CRT. Panel Member Cranford asked if the subcommittee had any concerns about the conduct of the investigation by FCPD. Panel Member Hargraves said one of the other allegations was the SRO used the SIS (Student Information System) to get the complainant's contact information. Panel Member Yang and Vice Chair Adams said the use of that system was within policy of an MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] between the Fairfax County Police Department and Fairfax County Public Schools.

Counsel Bynum asked the Chair if the juvenile matter was ultimately dismissed. Vice Chair Adams said he did not know the disposition of the matter, and Counsel Bynum asked if it was diverted. The Panel Liaison explained to Counsel Bynum that the Panel would not have access to that information, and Counsel Panel said he knew that.

Chair Garner asked if there was any more discussion and called for the vote to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee. The motion carried with all Panel members voting in favor of the motion, other than Panel Member Belkowitz, who abstained based on her recusal.

Panel Member Cranford thanked the complainant for coming and stated that there are limited parameters for the Panel to review matters.

<u>Subcommittee Report for CRP-24-23R:</u>
Panel Member Belkowitz, who was the Chair of the subcommittee, stated she would delete the introduction that Vice Chair Adams gave at the beginning of his presentation of his subcommittee's report. Panel Member Belkowitz stated that the subcommittee met that evening prior to the Panel meeting. Panel Member Belkowitz stated the complainant spoke to the subcommittee and was currently present. Panel Member Belkowitz then read the allegations made by the complainant. The complainant alleged:

1. There was no investigation conducted.
2. FCPD ignored the initial report from three responding officers (who were best positioned to note what happened) and let the mom go "cop shopping."

Panel Member Belkowitz stated that the complainant had now dropped the second allegation, which happened during the subcommittee meeting. Panel Member Belkowitz provided a detailed summary of the incident that prompted the complainant to file the complaint. During the summary, Counsel Bynum interrupted and asked Panel Member Belkowitz to repeat a statement she made. Panel Member Belkowitz clarified that the complainant was alleging that the detective did not investigate the case properly. During

the summary, Panel Member Belkowitz asked if she needed to discuss the criminal case. Counsel Bynum said if it was part of the file, [it should be summarized]. Panel Member Belkowitz provided a summary of the proceedings of the criminal case.

Panel Member Belkowitz said there was only one allegation to consider, and that allegation was that the investigation conducted was incomplete. Panel Member Belkowitz said the subcommittee was not unanimous in their conclusion. Panel Member Belkowitz said the subcommittee vote was 2-1 that the allegation made by the complainant did not meet the threshold of serious misconduct or abuse of authority, and therefore, the Panel did not have the authority to review the complaint. Panel Member Belkowitz asked if there were any facts the subcommittee wanted to add. Panel Member Hargraves said the subcommittee was grappling with General Order 501 and read a section of the General Order, and Panel Member Belkowitz added that the detective did not speak to the complainant or another minor who was present during the incident. Panel Member Cranford said he had nothing to add.

Chair Garner gave the complainant 15 minutes to speak.

The complainant referenced the speaking guide used to speak to the Panel and item number three, that asked if all witnesses were interviewed, and he said no. The complainant said that we are here talking about serious misconduct and serious misconduct that occurs when something is not done. The complainant stated the assumption was that his son and his son's mother were being honest, and the investigation should have been based on facts. The complainant said the investigation should have included a conversation with the complainant and the other minor who was present. The complainant said he feared volunteering for his middle son's football team because of a possible background check that would show he had a felony charge pending. The complainant also said he pulled his oldest son out of school to testify in court. The complainant said the Commonwealth Department of Social Services conducted a good investigation. The complainant said as expected, the mother filed a complaint against him for child abuse, and the disposition of the complaint was unfounded. The complainant then shared some portions of the report. The complainant raised serious credibility issues with his child by presenting evidence of the son's behavior at school. The Social Services report allegedly said the most concerning were discrepancies between the son's initial report to police and the report after he rejoined his mother. The report also allegedly says school records and emails from the son's teachers provided by the complainant indicate the son has behavioral concerns that can be difficult to manage, and this corroborates the complainant's account that the son was having an angry outburst and destroying property when the complainant made a momentary, reasonable contact to stop him that accidentally resulted in a minor mark. The complainant said the Social Services report said there was insufficient evidence to support a finding of physical abuse against the complainant.

The complainant said he did not understand how you could say you had a thorough investigation without the detective speaking to the person accused of a crime. The complainant said that is why this was serious misconduct, and he added that it had taken a lot of his money and a lot of his emotion. The complainant added that he "got perp walked" down his street in handcuffs.

Panel Member Belkowitz asked the complainant how old his other child was. The complainant said the other child was 16 years old at the time of the incident. Panel Member Deen asked if his children lived with him. Panel Member Hargraves asked the complainant about the FACT [Forensic Assessment and Consultation Team] report and clarity about when the complainant grabbed his child by the hoodie. The complainant clarified the difference in when he allegedly grabbed his child and when the child alleged he was grabbed. Panel Member Deen asked if the complainant grabbed his child by the hoodie. Vice Chair Adams asked Panel Member Belkowitz what the domestic violence professionals say they observed during the forensic examination. Panel Member Belkowitz provided a summary of the evidence observed during the examination to include red marks and petechiae. Panel Member Belkowitz added that she viewed body-

worn camera footage in which the child said the complainant grabbed the child by the neck and wrestled him to the ground, and the child demonstrated being grabbed on both sides of the neck. Panel Member Belkowitz said none of the officers questioned the child any further, and their interview of the child was insufficient. Panel Member Belkowitz said she did not see the FACT exam, but provided a summary of her notes, indicating the child had been choked. Vice Chair Adams asked if the forensic exam occurred on the same day of the incident, and Panel Member Hargraves said it did.

Chair Garner asked the Panel members who did not think there should be a full Panel review what their rationale was. Panel Member Cranford said his decision was based on whether this was gross misconduct. Panel Member Cranford said he had concerns about the thoroughness of the investigation [domestic violence investigation]. Panel Member Cranford said there was nothing that suggested to him there would have been a different outcome. Panel Member Hargraves said he appreciated the complainant's respectful interaction with the police, and he said what the complainant said has been consistent from his first interaction until now. Panel Member Hargraves said the detectives looked at a FACT examination with a litany of injuries consistent with being strangled, not pulled by a hoodie. Panel Member Hargraves said the initial officers made an initial decision and did not have probable cause. Panel Member Belkowitz stated the forensic interview at SAFESPOT occurred a few days later, and Panel Member Hargraves said the FACT exam occurred that day. Counsel Bynum asked when the petechiae was found and how much time after the incident it was found. Counsel Bynum then talked about how long it might take petechiae to manifest itself and said that might be an important fact for the Panel to consider later.

Chair Garner said that considering the Panel's mandate, two subcommittee members did not say the actions rose to the level of serious misconduct. Chair Garner asked if it rose to the level for a full Panel review or if the Panel should bring some questions to FCPD. Panel Member Cranford said that the issue would go to the full Panel. The Panel Liaison clarified, stating that if two Panel members voted for a full Panel review, there would be a full Panel review of the investigation. Panel Member Belkowitz told the complainant that the Panel could not help him with the amount of time and money for counsel he spent dealing with the matter. Panel Member Belkowitz told the complainant the full Panel review was comprehensive and reminded the complainant that the subcommittee spent a lot of time reviewing his case.

Panel Member Belkowitz made a motion that the full Panel review the investigation, and Panel Member Hargraves seconded the motion. Chair Garner opened the floor for discussion, and there was no discussion. The Panel voted and the motion carried with seven Panel members voting in favor of a full Panel review and one Panel member voting in opposition to a full Panel review.

Bylaws Amendment Discussion and Vote:

Chair Garner explained that there were proposed amendments to the Panel Bylaws that were discussed during the Friday Panel leadership meetings and opened the matter for discussion. Panel Member Cranford said he was fine with the recommended amendments but said Panel members with a year left would not be eligible to run for office. Panel Member Belkowitz said that there would be four years in office, with a three-year term. Panel Member Cranford asked if the term could be "no more than two years," rather than "two years." Counsel Bynum suggested that the Panel make recommendations and lay them on the table for a month and after some thought or circulation they debate and vote. The Panel Liaison explained the implications of not making the changes prior to the next election of Panel officers. Panel Member Cranford said that he was fine with not making the changes prior to the election of new officers [that would take place in January 2026 per the current Bylaws]. Panel Member Belkowitz asked Chair Garner when his term as a Panel member expired, and Chair Garner said 2029 if he is reappointed in 2026.

Panel Member Belkowitz made a motion to table the proposed Bylaws amendments until the December Panel meeting, and Panel Member Cranford seconded the motion. The Panel voted and the motion did not

carry, with three Panel members voting in favor of tabling the proposed amendments and five voting in opposition to tabling the proposed amendments.

Panel Member Hargraves made a motion to accept the proposed amendments to the Panel Bylaws, and Vice Chair Adams seconded the motion. Panel Member Hargraves said he was in favor with some changes, and Counsel Bynum said that the motion needed to be clarified. Counsel Gibbs said that Chair Garner did not finish the sentence for the record when calling for the motion and asked for clarification. Chair Garner said he was entertaining a motion to accept the proposed changes to the Bylaws. Panel Member Belkowitz asked if a super majority was needed to change the Bylaws. Panel Member Hargraves stated he was in favor of the motion. Panel Member Deen said she really liked what Panel Member Cranford said about making some changes and asked when that would be done. Counsel Bynum said the Panel would vote on the proposal "as is with all faults, so to speak."

The Panel voted and the motion carried with six Panel members voting in favor of the amendments and two Panel members voting in opposition to the amendments.

Panel Member Belkowitz asked how long it would take for the Board of Supervisors to approve the amended Bylaws. The Panel Liaison said the vote would occur during the December meeting. Panel Member Belkowitz said that it had taken months sometimes for the Board of Supervisors to vote on Bylaws changes.

2025 NACOLE Conference Report

Chair Garner said the NACOLE Conference was in Minneapolis, Minnesota and well attended. Chair Garner said the FCPD sent two representatives, and it was the first time they had done that. Chair Garner named the Panel members who attended the conference and said they connected with oversight bodies from Alexandria, Virginia and Arlington, Virginia. He added that the City of Alexandria representatives were interested in attending the training that the Panel holds in the future. Chair Garner reminded the Panel that building and maintaining trust was very important. Chair Garner said there was significant discussion of the use of AI [artificial intelligence] and data. Chair Garner also brought up the idea of looking at law enforcement policies to include the use of technology to make sure concerns from the community are being considered, and the Panel has a role in that.

Panel Member Patillo said it was an awesome conference and stated the Panel needed to look at a strategic plan moving forward. Panel Member Patillo said there should be at least three to five goals and an increase in outreach should be part of the strategic plan. Panel Member Yang said that community outreach, stakeholder engagement, and partnership with external entities were the keys to success. Panel Member Yang said that he talked to a lot of major cities and said the Panel must be really productive to be recognized. Panel Member Yang said the Panel has a lot of things to do to be more successful. Panel Member Hargraves asked if staff attended, and Chair Garner said that Richard Schott and Rachelle Ramirez attended. The Panel Liaison added that Panel Analyst Shaquishe Ferguson attended the conference. Independent Police Auditor Analyst Ramirez said the Prince George's County oversight body in Maryland said a positive outcome can be providing a complainant with due process and more access to information.

Panel Member Belkowitz said she wished the Panel had more opportunities for restorative justice, and it would be nice if the complainant could have a conversation with the police officer. Chair Garner said there were examples of mediation discussed that occurred in other jurisdictions.

New Business

Chair Garner told the Panel to give their shirt sizes to the Panel Liaison so polo shirts could be ordered to be worn at community events.

Adjournment

Chair Garner called for a motion to adjourn. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The Panel voted and the motion unanimously carried. The meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.