



**CLAY COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE**  
***SHERIFF MICHELLE COOK***

P.O. BOX 548  
(904) 264-6512 or (352) 473-7211  
FAX (904) 284-0710  
GREEN COVE SPRINGS, FLORIDA 32043-0548

---

**Subject:** Internal Affairs Summation AI #2022-011  
**Date:** **October 13, 2022**  
**To:** Sheriff Michelle Cook via Chain of Command  
**From:** Undersheriff Ron Lendvay/Sgt. Keith Smith  
  
**Reference:** S.O.P. 5300.01- Equal Employer Opportunities  
G.O. 2000.08 Supervisor Responsibilities  
G.O. 1000.02 Code of Conduct

---

**Principle:** Chief Tina Chatmon #6157

**Complainant:** Joanna Bramlitt #7182

<b>Witnesses:</b>	Director J. Bucci #6317	Sgt. Cody Whiddon #6576
	Lt. Christopher Coldiron #6162	Lt. Chad Ricks #6419
	CFO Vicki Adams #8468	Sgt. T. Jones #6486
	Assistant Chief Stacy Wase #6769	Heather Bailey #7737
	Shelby Kelley #8085	Brenda Lombardo #6114
	Diane Pickering #5027	Sarah Padgett #8610
	Kim Long #8567	Jon Kinney #8209
	Director W. McKinney #6229	Director Ricardo Wright #6326

---

**Synopsis**

On 08/05/2022, Medical Compliance Coordinator Joanna Bramlitt submitted a memorandum to Director Joe Bucci (Director of Detention) stating she felt she was subject to discrimination in career advancement opportunities by Chief Tina Chatmon. Joanna Bramlitt provided documentation to include job postings, she felt she was qualified for, but had been declined the opportunity to pursue, based on the perceived actions of Chief Tina Chatmon.

## **Details of Investigation**

On 08/10/22, Undersheriff R. Lendvay made contact with Sgt. K. Smith of Internal Affairs and stated he had received a memorandum through the chain of command from member Joanna Bramlitt in reference to her concerns of discrimination pertaining to internal job transfers. Joanna Bramlitt submitted a letter stating she had been told that a command staff member may have knowledge of her being discriminated against due to either personal or professional grievances by Chief Tina Chatmon. After speaking with Undersheriff Lendvay, it was determined an Administrative Inquiry would be initiated. AI#2022-011 was opened and entered into the IAPRO Complaint Module. Due to this complaint involving a member of command staff, it was determined, Undersheriff Lendvay would lead this investigation and Sgt. K. Smith would assist.

Unless otherwise noted, all of the following notifications, interviews, meetings, etc., conducted during the course of the investigation were recorded in audio format. All of the audio recordings were copied and attached to the complaint within the IAPRO system. Additionally, all of the pertinent sworn testimony is documented in this report via summary format. To obtain complete details, review the audio recordings in their entirety.

### **Witness #1 Notification and Interview: Director J. Bucci #6317**

On 08/11/2022, at 1330 hours Undersheriff Ron Lendvay and Sgt. Keith Smith interviewed Director Joe Bucci at the Clay County Sheriff's Office located in Green Cove Springs, Florida. The interview was conducted in the conference room in the Sheriff's executive suite. Director Bucci was advised of the administrative investigation process and he subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Director Bucci said that on 08/04/22, at approximately 1400 hours, Detention Medical Compliance Coordinator Joanna R. Bramlitt came to see him and told him she believed Chief of Human Resources Tina Chatmon was purposely holding her back from career advancement opportunities. J. Bramlitt told Bucci that she believed it all started when she was first promoted within the Medical Services Section at the jail and was then informed she had to re-apply for the job. J. Bramlitt believed Chatmon was responsible for the decision, although she did ultimately get the promotion. Bramlitt offered another example to Director Bucci of applying for a position as a budget analyst within the CCSO. J. Bramlitt believed she met all of the qualifications for the job and had relevant experience; however, she received a quick reply back that she would not be moving forward with processing for consideration for the position. Bramlitt told Bucci she later planned to apply for an open position as a Compliance Coordinator within the Accreditation Section. In her opinion, she not only met all of the qualifications for the job, but she had prior experience within the unit that would make her a strong candidate. When the job was officially posted, J. Bramlitt noticed a new

qualification that had not been present in prior internal job postings. This one prohibited applicants who had been disciplined within the past year. This would disqualify her as she was subject to agency discipline in November of 2021. Bramlitt researched policy and found no such requirement and believed Chatmon was intentionally impeding her career development.

To support this claim, J. Bramlitt told Bucci that a staff member confirmed her suspicions when J. Bramlitt was informed about a conversation the staff member witnessed in Chatmon's office. The staff member said that Chatmon had stated the disciplinary requirement had been added to the Compliance Coordinator job posting to specifically prohibit Bramlitt from being eligible to apply for the job. Bramlitt told Bucci she believed the matter between her and Chatmon was personal and there was a family relation by marriage between the two of them. J. Bramlitt added that Chatmon had also discussed private matters from J. Bramlitt's personal life with coworkers. Bramlitt told Bucci that she desired a fulfilling career with the CCSO but she believed Chatmon was holding her back. She made it clear to Bucci that she was bringing a formal complaint to him for follow up.

On 08/05/22, Director Bucci called Bramlitt to follow up with her on her complaint. He intended to ask her to put it in writing and she advised that she was already working on it. Bucci asked Bramlitt who the staff member was who had reportedly heard the statements by Chatmon and J. Bramlitt told him it was Assistant Chief of Professional Standards Stacy Wase. Director Bucci collected the written complaint from Bramlitt and brought it to the attention of Undersheriff Lendvay at the end of the day on Friday 08/05/22. Director Bucci reviewed the documentation and found it to be consistent with what she told him with additional details included.

Director J. Bucci did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Complainant Interview: Joanna Bramlitt #7182**

On 08/11/2022, at 0900 hours Undersheriff Ron Lendvay and Sgt. Keith Smith interviewed the complainant, Joanna Bramlitt, at the Clay County Sheriff's Office located in Green Cove Springs, Florida. The interview was conducted in the conference room in the Sheriff's executive suite. J. Bramlitt was advised of the administrative investigation process then subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

J. Bramlitt was advised Undersheriff Lendvay had received the memo she had submitted through her chain of command and this was the reason for meeting with her. J. Bramlitt stated she believed she was subject to potential personal discrimination by Chief of Human Resources Tina Chatmon. J. Bramlitt advised she had first brought her concerns forward to her immediate supervisor M. Pittenger and Chief of Detention Administration Chris Suefloh, and they referred her to Director Bucci. He then spoke with J. Bramlitt and collected her written complaint. Bramlitt confirmed Director Bucci had a full accounting of her complaint and that neither her supervisor nor Suefloh were provided with any additional details. Bramlitt provided her complaint in a memo format with four specific grievances. The interview was structured to follow the format of her memo to make sure everything was covered.

J. Bramlitt reported her first issue with Chatmon arose when she was first promoted to Medical Compliance Supervisor in early 2021. Bramlitt stated former RN Manager Melinda Dangerfield was reorganizing the medical section in the jail and created three supervisory positions. Two positions were for nurse supervisors and the third was her position with responsibilities for the administrative and billing compliance portion of the operation. Bramlitt was told by Dangerfield and Director of Detention Chris Coldiron that Chatmon disagreed with the process of her promotion and that she would have to apply for the job once it was posted. Bramlitt said this happened after she had been doing the job for a month or two. Bramlitt stated that neither of the Nurse Supervisors had to reapply for their positions. Although she believed this was inequitable, she applied for the job and was promoted again when no other candidates applied for this position.

Bramlitt's second example she took issue with was her application for an internal posting for a CCSO Budget Analysts position in early 2022. She reviewed the essential job functions and qualifications on the posting and thought she was a good fit for a job that had a listed salary that would bring a significant annual pay raise. The posting lists a Bachelor's Degree and 3 years of relevant experience as requirements. Bramlitt said she has a B.S. Degree in Homeland Security and Public Safety from Vincennes University along with the completion of a nine-month certificate program in Health Information Technology that deals with medical billing. As far as relevant work experience for the position, Bramlitt said she has worked for the CCSO since 2012. More specifically, she handled Risk Management in 2014 or 2015 and worked in CCSO Finance. She then took on medical billing for Detention. In that role she has worked with Finance on medical billing, approving invoices for medical claims, maintaining blanket orders for medical vendors, reviewing medical bills for compliance with agreements with medical providers, tracking detention medical budget expenses and comparing ledgers with CCSO Finance. She says she has good relationships with the Finance Team.

J. Bramlitt believed she met the job qualifications, had the right skill set and had good relationships with the finance team. She thought she would be a good fit for the job so she applied. After applying, she received an acknowledgement that her application was received on 03/24/22 at 1:25pm. One hour and thirty eight minutes later, at 3:03pm on 03/24/22, she got an email back notifying her that she would not be moving forward to be considered for the position. The email read in part, "Your qualifications have been carefully reviewed by our hiring team. Unfortunately, at this time, we are pursuing candidates with skills and experience more closely matched to the position we have open." Bramlitt did not feel that her qualifications and experience could have been fairly and completely reviewed due to the rapid response. She believed the application she submitted accurately reflected her education and relevant experience. Bramlitt said she could have accepted the reply after she got a chance to interview for the job but she was not able to get that opportunity.

J. Bramlitt's third example that concerned her is a specific qualification on new job postings that went up after March 2022, when she was denied the opportunity to interview for the Budget Analyst position. J. Bramlitt stated an internal job posting for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator came out in June of 2022. She thought she would be a good fit for this position since she had spent a year working within this job classification earlier in her career. When she reviewed the job requirements a

new one appeared that reads; "Candidates with disciplinary action within 365 days are ineligible". Bramlitt provided examples of other job postings where this requirement was not present to include; 08/20/21 HR Support Coordinator, 01/19/22 Inventory Specialist and 01/19/22 Fleet Maintenance Manager.

J. Bramlitt said she began to suspect a connection between not being afforded an opportunity to interview for the Budget Analyst position and this new disqualifier for another position she believed she was qualified for. J. Bramlitt was subject to agency discipline in November of 2021 and was therefore ineligible to apply for this position. She explained she had actually held the position of Accreditation Compliance Coordinator from roughly October of 2018 through October of 2019. J. Bramlitt said she worked for Chatmon and built files for FCAC, FMJS, CFA and TAC accreditation cycles. She went to that job from Detention Medical after being recruited by Chief Chatmon. After J. Bramlitt had been in this position for a year, Detention Medical went through a lot of turnover and there was nobody left who knew how to do many of the tasks she had done in the past. Chief Inman (Previous Detention Admin Chief) asked J. Bramlitt for her assistance and tension developed between Chatmon and Inman. Bramlitt was ultimately told she had to decide where she wanted to work and Bramlitt said she went back to help Detention because there was nobody there who could do the job while there were other Compliance Coordinators in Accreditation. J. Bramlitt believes she let Chief Chatmon down by going back to Detention and said Chatmon may have been upset with her.

J. Bramlitt said she stewed on not being able to advance her career with either of these job openings because she really had no other recourse. J. Bramlitt said she does not want to leave and likes her job at the CCSO, but she is a single mom with two kids who would like to be able to advance in her career. She added that both she and Chatmon's daughter married into the same family so they are related by marriage. They used to see each other at family functions and she did not report any outside issues between the two of them.

J. Bramlitt's fourth area of concern emerged on 08/25/22. Assistant Chief of Professional Standards Stacy Wase had a personal conversation with Lt. Chris Coldiron after hours that was relayed to J. Bramlitt. Bramlitt was told Asst. Chief Wase confided in Coldiron that she was having issues with Chatmon and Coldiron shared Bramlitt's discriminatory concerns. Wase allegedly told Coldiron that Chatmon did not want Bramlitt to apply for the Compliance Coordinator position, within her chain of command, and was actively working to keep that from happening. J. Bramlitt believed Wase had personal knowledge of this and may have heard this first hand from Chatmon. According to Bramlitt, it also came out during the conversation that Chatmon had been speaking to coworkers about a private family matter concerning Bramlitt's daughter. J. Bramlitt stated Chatmon would have knowledge of this matter due to the shared family ties. Coldiron encouraged Bramlitt to speak with Wase, but J. Bramlitt advised she was never able to make contact with Asst. Chief Wase. J. Bramlitt stated Coldiron had informed her, Asst. Chief Wase would share the details of her knowledge if she were ever asked.

J. Bramlitt was unsure why Chatmon would personally discriminate against her. Her only possible explanation was her past transfer out of Accreditation, which was detailed earlier, or a few personal

matters such as her divorce or relationship with Coldiron. J. Bramlitt said she carefully weighed bringing her complaint forward, but felt she had to because Chatmon is, in her opinion, using her position and authority to keep her from growing in her career and slandering her by sharing personal family information with coworkers.

Joanna Bramlitt did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Principal Notification: Chief Tina Chatmon #6157**

On 08/12/2022, Sgt. Smith met with Chief Tina Chatmon in her at office at the Clay County Sheriff's Office located in Green Cove Springs, Florida. Chief Chatmon was presented with the following documents: Member Notification of Internal Affairs Investigation Form, Administrative Rights, Notification of Florida Police Bill of Rights, Garrity Warning, and Perjury Warning. Subsequent to her review of the above listed forms, she signed them confirming her understanding and the receipt of her administrative rights. I then explained the administrative investigation process and concluded the notification.

### **Witness #2 Notification and Interview: Lt. Chris Coldiron #6162**

On 08/15/22 at 0900 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Lt. Chris Coldiron in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Lt. Coldiron was advised of the administrative investigation process and then subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Lt. Coldiron stated he had an issue with his timesheet several weeks ago, so he reached out to Assistant Chief of Professional Standards Stacy Wase due to his timesheet being listed under her. Coldiron took issue with his timesheet being held within Professional Standards while he is assigned to Patrol and he believed the decision was personal. (It should be noted Lt. Coldiron had been reassigned due to an ongoing Internal Investigation)

During this conversation with Asst. Chief Wase, Lt. Coldiron mentioned J. Bramlitt's situation and he told Wase that he believed J. Bramlitt was being treated unfairly. As examples, he told Wase about Bramlitt being quickly denied the opportunity to interview for the Budget Analyst position along with other jobs she could no longer qualify for due to the 365 day discipline requirement, such as the Compliance Coordinator position. In reply, Wase told Coldiron the 365 day disciplinary requirement had been put in place to specifically keep J. Bramlitt from being able to apply for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator position. Lt. Coldiron took her statement to mean that she had been present for a conversation where this was discussed. Lt. Coldiron stated Wase did not mention any other employees who may have been discriminated against for open positions.

Lt. Coldiron was asked why there would be animosity between himself and Professional Standards. Lt. Coldiron stated he was not shy about his criticism of the way the jail had been run before he got there as the Director of Detention and he knows some of that got back to Director Wright who was the former Director of Detention and is now responsible for Business and Administration. He also said he butted heads with Wright on a number of occasions when they were both directors. Coldiron added Director Wright always handled their differences professionally.

As for Bramlitt, Coldiron could not specifically say why Chatmon or Wright would bear a grudge against her. He thought animosity was more likely directed at him because of his issues over the past year but surmised it could have different professional or personal roots between Bramlitt and Chatmon. Coldiron did provide one example of a time when Chatmon got upset with Bramlitt while J. Bramlitt was working for Chatmon as an Accreditation Compliance Coordinator. Bramlitt was pursuing becoming a Florida Model Jail Standards (FMJS) Medical Inspector during the time J. Bramlitt worked for Chatmon. Bramlitt directly emailed Steve Casey (Florida Sheriff's Association Executive Director) about qualifications for the position, without going through Chatmon, and Coldiron reported Chatmon was upset about that.

Lt. Coldiron did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness #3 Notification and Interview: CFO Vicki Adams #8468**

On 08/15/22 at 0940 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Chief Financial Officer Vicki Adams in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. CFO Adams was advised of the administrative investigation process then subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

CFO Adams was questioned about the Budget Analyst position that J. Bramlitt had applied for on 03/24/22, and then received a quick declination via email. Adams confirmed the position had been posted and further stated the position still has not been filled. She did not know J. Bramlitt, or recall her applying for the position, nor did Adams believe she played any role in the screening of Bramlitt's application. Adams explained the original screening of applicants takes place in HR outside of the purview of the CCSO managers who are hiring for open positions in their areas of responsibility. She believed their initial screening process included the education and experience qualifications, and decisions on whether or not to move applicants forward in the hiring process rests with Human Resources. Adams expressed frustration with the CCSO hiring process and noted that it differs from her career experiences. She believes we need to look at it to make sure we are attracting qualified candidates from the outside and making our internal candidates feel valued.

CFO Adams did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

## **Complainant Interview #2: Joanna Bramlitt #7182**

On 08/15/22 at 1000 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay re-interviewed Medical Compliance Coordinator Joanna Bramlitt in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. J. Bramlitt was reminded she was still under oath.

The purpose of this second interview was to confirm the statements made by Coldiron concerning Chatmon being upset with Bramlitt for directly emailing Steve Casey of the FSA. Bramlitt confirmed the event and further detailed the circumstances. J. Bramlitt stated that during the time she was working for Chatmon as an Accreditation Compliance Coordinator, she became interested in becoming an FMJS Medical Inspector. She was encouraged to seek the position by peers from other agencies. To further her ability to do this, she went to Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) School and was certified as an EMT. This was all done with the knowledge and support of Chatmon. A letter sent out from Steve Casey appeared to have some conflicts with the published requirements for being an FJMS Medical Inspector. Specifically it was unclear if an inspector needed to have worked for three years as an EMT to be eligible. To clear up the issue, Bramlitt emailed Casey. She got a reply from Isaiah Dennard of the FSA who also contacted Chatmon. Chatmon was upset with Bramlitt for going outside her chain of command on the issue and expressed her displeasure to Coldiron at that time. Bramlitt said that Chatmon was well known within accreditation circles and wanted to be involved in anything accreditation related.

J. Bramlitt did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

## **Witness #4 Notification and Interview: Asst. Chief Stacy Wase #6769**

On 08/15/22 at 1400 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff R. Lendvay interviewed Assistant Chief Stacy Wase in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Assistant Chief Wase was advised of the administrative investigation process then subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Wase was advised of the purpose of the interview and was asked if she recalled a specific conversation with Lt. Coldiron. Asst. Chief Wase stated Lt. Coldiron asked her directly if J. Bramlitt was being purposely discriminated against as it pertained to job transfers. Wase told Lt. Coldiron she would not lie and confirmed she believed J. Bramlitt was being intentionally held back. Wase was asked why she thought this and Wase advised it because Wase had heard it first hand from Chatmon. Wase said Chatmon's actions tipped her moral compass and she did not feel good about it.



Wase was asked to describe how this happened. Wase advised Chief Chatmon just had a conversation with Accreditation Manager Sgt. Cody Whiddon. Whiddon informed Chatmon that Bramlitt planned to apply for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator position and would be the most qualified in the field for it due to her previous experience in that position. Chatmon then informed Wase the only way to get around selecting Bramlitt would be to put the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier in place on the posting to make her ineligible. Wase said Chatmon told her this because the Compliance Coordinator position falls under her command.

Wase said Chatmon put the job posting together with the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier and she was not involved with its creation. Wase disagreed with how this was being done and did not believe this was right or fair but said she; "Did not have a dog in the fight". Wase said that whatever Chatmon says goes and she just has to roll with it. Wase could not explain why Chatmon did not want Bramlitt in Accreditation. Wase advised she had no knowledge about Bramlitt's prior pursuit of the Budget Analyst position.

I asked Wase if she was aware of any other instances where employees did not get a fair shot at jobs they had posted for and she told me she was aware of other examples. Wase said there was bias involved in the recent selection of the Training Sergeant. Wase said that for an unknown reason Chatmon did not want a particular sergeant to get that job. Wase said his training resume was by far the strongest of the group and his chain of command was supportive of him. Wase said the scoring of the interviews was shaded toward Chatmon's preferred candidate. Wase said she knew this because she overheard a conversation in Chatmon's office between Chatmon and Director Wright on the topic. The sergeant was upset about the decision and told Wase later that the reason he was given for not being selected was that he did not elaborate enough on his degree during the interview.

Wase provided a third example as it pertained to the interviews for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator. The oral board included Sgt. Whiddon, Compliance Coordinator Heather Bailey and Sgt. Thalantha Jones. Whiddon had informed Wase that when Human Resources Specialist Danelle Hays left the room to get the first candidate, Chief Chatmon went into the room and coached the board on what to say and what questions to ask to favor Chief Chatmon's preferred candidate. Whiddon told Wase that he was not comfortable with the situation. In addition, Wase believed it was inappropriate to allow that same candidate to attend a quarterly staff inspection at the jail, prior to the interviews, when the other candidates who had applied were not offered the same opportunity. Wase was asked if she ever reported any of this to Director Wright. Wase said she could not due to the close relationship between Director Wright and Chief Chatmon. Wase said she could not speak with him without fearing retaliation from Chatmon. Wase stated that Wright typically backs Chief Chatmon on the decisions she makes so she does not believe she has any recourse.

Assistant Chief Wase did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

## **Witness #5 Notification and Interview: Sgt. Cody Whiddon #6576**

On 08/16/22 at 1400 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Sgt. Cody Whiddon (CCSO Accreditation Manager) in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Sgt. Whiddon was advised of the administrative investigation process then subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

The purpose of the interview was to determine if Sgt. Whiddon had overheard any discussion about placing the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier on the job posting for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator to specifically keep J. Bramlitt from being eligible to apply. Sgt. Whiddon stated that he had not personally heard such a statement. Sgt. Whiddon did say he was part of a discussion with Chatmon where that opening was discussed before it was posted. Whiddon said he was in Chatmon's office discussing a few topics on a quiet Friday when the job opening came up. J. Bramlitt's name was mentioned as being interested in applying and Whiddon said that Bramlitt had worked for him in the past, doing this job, and was effective at it. Whiddon said it appeared to him that Chatmon may have favored a different candidate but Chatmon did say that the best person for the job would get it regardless of who put in for it.

Whiddon was then asked about being on the selection panel for this same job opening. He confirmed that he served on that board and said there were two candidates. Whiddon also confirmed that when the HR representative left to get the first candidate for the interview that Chief Chatmon came into the third floor training room and sat down with them. Whiddon said that Chatmon told them how to elaborate on certain questions they were going to ask to highlight the responses of the candidates. Sgt. Whiddon felt that this was done in an effort to differentiate the particular candidate that Chatmon preferred. Whiddon said he did not react to the statements or alter his questions because he knew it had to be a fair process for each of the candidates.

Sgt. Whiddon said that he went to his superior, Asst. Chief Wase, following the selection panel session to share his opinion that the comments made to the selection panel were "unprofessional" and "did not seem right". Whiddon related that he had no other recourse with Chatmon because with her it is her way or the highway. Whiddon further stated that Chatmon's candidate was given more of a chance to succeed than the others in his opinion. In addition to comments to the board, Whiddon gave examples of the candidate being given opportunities to go on inspections with the Accreditation Team up until about a week before the interview. Whiddon said he informed Chatmon he did not think they should continue the practice and Chatmon eventually agreed and put a stop to it. Whiddon further stated that the candidate went to lunch with Chatmon and a small group before the candidates' interviews on the day of the oral board and he thought that was bad optics.

Whiddon said that the candidate favored by Chatmon was legitimately the best choice for the position based on the interviews that were conducted and he had no issue with selecting her for the job. Whiddon did say that Bramlitt has worked for him in the past. Whiddon said that although J. Bramlitt might not have always been easy to manage, she was a hard worker who always got the job done and knew how to build accreditation files. Whiddon said that if Bramlitt was part of the interview

process the results might have been different. Whiddon added that if the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier was put in place to make her ineligible to apply for the job that is not right.

Whiddon was asked about the work atmosphere. Whiddon relayed that it was difficult to discuss because he considered Chatmon and Director Wright to be mentors who gave him an opportunity to succeed and make it to the accreditation manager position that he loves. Whiddon said he has worked for Chatmon for the past four years but her demeanor and treatment of him and those around her has changed in the past year. Whiddon said Chatmon has always been a "tough nosed" supervisor but that he never had a problem working for her until the past year. Whiddon detailed multiple issues regarding management practices and the chain of command that made it difficult personally and professionally to do his job. He describes the work environment as chaotic and described Chatmon's current style as that of a tyrant.

Sgt. Cody Whiddon did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #6 Notification and Interview: Jon Kinney #8209**

On 08/16/22 at 1515 hours, Sgt. Smith and U/S Lendvay interviewed Background Investigator John Kinney in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Jon Kinney was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony. Kinney was interviewed to see if he had heard any first hand conversations regarding Bramlitt and her interest or application for any internal job postings. He said that he had not heard any such conversations. Jon Kinney was asked if he was aware of any other employees who may have been treated unfairly as it pertains to internal job placement within the CCSO, and Kinney relayed a conversation that he had with Chatmon. He said she told him in roughly October of 2021, at a conference, that she had a plan for the Accreditation Unit. That plan included Shelby Kelley taking his place in Accreditation because he "would not be around much longer". Jon Kinney was asked what he felt Chatmon meant by that and I asked him if he was planning on leaving or taking another position. Kinney stated he loves accreditation, had no plans to leave at that time and considered the statement to be a "shot across the bow" that he would not be welcome in Accreditation much longer. Following that conversation Kinney said Chatmon encouraged him to take the Sergeant's exam, and then ultimately the background investigator's position that he now holds, to encourage him to leave Accreditation.

Kinney went on to say that, Chatmon's plan that he was told about for Accreditation also did not include Whiddon, who he considers an outstanding leader and supervisor. Kinney was critical of Chatmon's treatment of Whiddon and said he was surprised Sgt. Whiddon had not filed a formal complaint. Kinney said Whiddon worked harder than anyone he knows to make Chatmon, and his Unit successful, and she had turned on him. He said Chatmon is "hammering people" right now and said the work atmosphere was difficult. Kinney was critical of her leadership style and approach and said she treats her people very poorly. Kinney said that Chatmon did not recognize Whiddon for his

recent award from the state and he thinks she may resent him for his success in the Accreditation realm. Kinney believed Whiddon's transfer to Supply was an effort to disengage him from Accreditation.

Jon Kinney did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #7 Notification and Interview: Lt. Chad Ricks #6419**

On 08/17/22 at 0915 hours, Sgt. Smith and U/S Lendvay interviewed Training Unit Commander Lt. Chad Ricks in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Lt. Ricks was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Lt. Ricks confirmed that he was on the interview panel and participated in questioning the candidates who were interviewed for the Training Sergeant position. Lt. Ricks said Chatmon never said anything to him in reference to shading his scoring of his interviews toward a preferred candidate. Ricks said the scoring was fair and consistent across the board. Ricks further added that the candidate who was selected came highly recommended and scored out the best in the interviews. Ricks reported no concerns about his chain of command and said he functions with a lot of autonomy running the Training Unit outside of 10-19.

Lt. Chad Ricks did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #8 Notification and Interview: Compliance Coordinator Heather Bailey #7737**

On 08/17/22 at 0940 hours, Sgt. Smith and U/S Lendvay interviewed Compliance Coordinator Heather Bailey in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Heather Bailey was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Bailey confirmed that she was on the interview panel for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator position and confirmed that Chief Chatmon sat down to speak with the panel in the third floor training room prior to the candidate interviews. Chatmon discussed the wording of the questions with them to make sure the candidates understood what was being asked of them. Bailey said that in truth she believed there was a Chatmon favored candidate. Bailey could not think of a specific conversation where this was discussed but there were times where she heard coaching of that candidate ahead of the interview because the preferred candidate was close to their Unit. Bailey said she had never heard the interview questions being discussed or shared with the candidate.

Bailey had heard that J. Bramlitt was interested in the job and said she knew she was qualified because she had replaced Bramlitt when Bramlitt had left to go back to Detention Medical. Bailey was surprised she did not see her interviewing for the job but thought Bramlitt had changed her mind about applying. Bailey never heard any firsthand conversations regarding Bramlitt applying for the job. She said that Shelby Kelley performed the best on the oral board and got the job. Bailey did not have much to say about her work environment and said she stays busy with her work.

Heather Bailey did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #9 Notification and Interview: Sgt. Thalantha Jones #6486**

On 08/17/22 at 1015 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Courthouse Bailiff Unit Sgt. Thalantha Jones in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Sgt. Thalantha Jones was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Sgt. Jones confirmed that she was on the interview panel for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator position with Sgt. Whiddon and Bailey. Sgt. Jones recalled Chatmon coming in to speak with the board before the candidates were seated but could not recall the specifics of what chief Chatmon said. Sgt. Jones said she does quite a few oral boards and evaluates each candidate on their own merits and forms her own opinion. Sgt. Jones was not left with the impression from what was said that there was a preferred candidate. Sgt. Jones said both candidates did well with their interviews and the best interviewee got the job. Sgt. Jones said she took the time to visit the other candidate to give her feedback and let her know that she had done well.

Sgt. Jones did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #10 Notification and Interview: Shelby Kelley #8085**

On 08/17/22 at 1035 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Accreditation Unit Compliance Coordinator Shelby Kelley in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Shelby Kelley was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Shelby Kelley advised she had not heard any conversations about J. Bramlitt as it pertained to job openings. Kelley said she does sometimes hear conversations from Chatmon's office due to the proximity of her desk outside of her office. S. Kelley heard bits and pieces of a conversation from outside the office relating to Chatmon placing the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier on the posting for Compliance Coordinator but said she never heard any reference of that being directed at Bramlitt. Kelley reported receiving no advanced confidential information prior to her being interviewed for her current position. S. Kelley did recall hearing discussions about the interview panel questions from coming from inside Chatmon's office one time and felt it would be improper to hear that conversation so she left the area. Kelley said she honestly felt that she had an advantage in the interview process because of her proximity to the Accreditation Unit and familiarity with the team and their work. She said she sought out opportunities to work with them to learn more about the job. Kelley was told that there was nothing wrong with seeking direct knowledge about a job she was interested in within the CCSO.

As it pertains to her work environment, Kelley described it as walking on eggshells. She said every day is different due to Chatmon's demeanor and you never know which Chatmon you will be getting for the day. Kelley reported seeing her be especially tough on Wase and Communications Compliance Coordinator Diane Pickering. Chatmon was described as harsh with employees within the work environment. S. Kelley stated Chief Chatmon makes it obvious to those around her through her attitude when she is upset or frustrated. Kelley said Chatmon makes demands of and gives assignments to line level employees without their supervisors knowing it, which creates confusion within their units. S. Kelley advised it was difficult for her to have this conversation and share this information.

Shelby Kelley did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Principal Notification/ Receipt of Evidence: Chief Tina Chatmon**

On 0824/2022, Sgt. K. Smith met with Chief Chatmon in her office located in 10-19. Chief Chatmon was presented with the following documents (Initially presented on 08/12/2022): Member Notification of Internal Affairs Investigation Form, Administrative Rights, Notification of Florida Police Bill of Rights, Garrity Warning, and Perjury Warning. Chief Chatmon was provided an updated Member Notification

of Internal Affairs Investigation Form amending the allegations. The allegations were amended to reflect the following;

G.O. 2000.08-Supervisor Responsibilities  
G.O. 1000.01-Code of Conduct

Subsequent to her confirmation of understanding, Chief Chatmon was set up in her office with a laptop, which contained a copy of all audio-recorded witness interviews, and a copy of a memorandum submitted by J. Bramlitt. I informed Chief Chatmon after she reviewed all of the information contained on the CCSO laptop, we would set a future date to conduct the principal interview.

It should be noted Chief Chatmon had legal representative Derrell Chatmon present with her while reviewing the above-mentioned evidence.

Chief Chatmon advised she would be prepared to conduct her principal interview on 08/29/2022.

### **Principal Interview: Chief Tina Chatmon**

On 08/29/22 at 0915 hours, U/S Lendvay interviewed Chief of Human Resources (HR) Tina Chatmon in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Also present were Sgt. Smith (Internal Affairs), Derrell Chatmon (Legal Representative for Chief Chatmon) and Jeff Davenport (CCSO Legal Advisor). Chief Chatmon was sworn in and subsequently provided the following sworn statement.

The first topics covered were the four major points outlined in the complaint memo submitted by Joanna Bramlitt. Bramlitt contended her unfair treatment began in early 2021 when Bramlitt was first promoted to Medical Compliance Supervisor. Bramlitt believes Chatmon disagreed with the way Bramlitt was promoted and required her to submit an application and resume' as part of an open job posting to keep Bramlitt's position. Bramlitt said the RN supervisor who was also promoted in the same manner at that time was not required to go through the same process to keep her job. Chatmon said she learned of Bramlitt's promotion when she saw a memo announcing the promotion. Chatmon was fairly new in Human Resources at the time but knew that policy at the time dictated a fifteen day period of announcement for open positions. Chatmon discussed the situation with her supervisor, Director Wright, and showed him the memo and the policy. Chatmon said she was advised to follow the policy. Chatmon reported being unaware of the Registered Nurse promotion(s).

Chatmon was asked about Bramlitt applying for an open "Budget Analyst" position in March of 2022. Bramlitt contends that she met the minimum education and experience requirements by having a bachelor's degree and more than three years of relevant work experience within the CCSO. Bramlitt received an email a short time later later stating in part that; "Your qualifications have been carefully reviewed by our hiring team. Unfortunately, at this time, we are pursuing candidates with skills and experience more closely matched to the position we have open." Bramlitt took exception and did not believe a thorough review could have been conducted during such a short time period.

Chatmon was asked to explain the process for internal applicants applying for open positions. Chatmon stated it was similar to external candidates and they begin by filling out an application in "NEOGOV" which is HR software for the public sector. Automatic disqualifiers are put in place using qualifications and input received from the hiring authority within the agency that has the job opening. For this job posting a "Bachelor's Degree from an accredited college or university" was a requirement. However, Chatmon added that in discussions with CFO Adams, CFO Adams stated she wanted the degree to be within the disciplines of Finance and Accounting based on the pedigree of the applications that were being received. That disqualifier was noted and added to the back end screening but the job posting had not been updated. Chatmon stated HR staff should have done this but Chatmon referred to this as a reason she does not like long-term open job postings. Chatmon explained long-term job postings do not allow for updates and edits.

Specifically as it pertained to Bramlitt's application, Chatmon brought screen shots from NEOGOV that showed how the application was processed. The screen shots showed that Bramlitt's application was declined at initial screening because her degree was not based in either Finance or Accounting. Screen shots further show that at 1503hrs on 03/24/22, HR Specialist Melissa Phoenix processed the application and declined it based on the disqualifier noted above. Chatmon further stated that she was never aware that Bramlitt applied for the position until this complaint was received.

Chatmon was asked about Bramlitt's assertion that she believed a new 365 day disciplinary action disqualifier clause was put into place to keep her from being eligible to apply for the "Accreditation Compliance Coordinator" position that was posted in June of 2022. Chatmon agreed that no such disqualifier was in place on the earlier job posting examples provided by Bramlitt. Chatmon said the addition of the 365 disciplinary action disqualifier came about following a discussion she had with Director Wright and Director McKinney. Chatmon stated it was in April of 2022 that McKinney had an open posting for a detective eligibility list, and he asked about the lack of a 365 day disciplinary disqualifier on the posting. Wright and McKinney discussed that it used to be common practice to have that in place. Chatmon said she advised them the applicants should get advance notice of that requirement on the job posting. Chatmon said a day or two later Wright told her to add it to future internal job postings. Chatmon stated that she prepared the job posting for the Compliance Coordinator's position with that in mind. Chatmon said it took HR a little time to update their template and practices moving forward. Chatmon provided the following examples of job postings that all had the 365 day disciplinary action disqualifier in place since that time; Senior Staff Assistant 06/09/22, Community Affairs Sergeant 06/23/22, Administrative Supply Specialist 07/13/22, Bailiff 07/22/22 and Crime Analyst 08/12/22.

Chatmon was asked about Bramlitt's belief that the 365 day disqualifier was put in place to keep her from being eligible for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator job based on information relayed to Lt. Chris Coldiron by A/C Stacy Wase. Coldiron had shared information with Bramlitt that Wase bolstered Bramlitt's suspicions that she was intentionally disqualified from eligibility for the position. (Coldiron repeated this under oath during this investigation). Whiddon was interviewed and said he had a conversation with Chatmon about Bramlitt's interest in the position and her strength as a candidate due to her previous experience and record of accomplishment in the job. Wase reported she was part of a conversation with Chatmon immediately after the discussion with Whiddon where



Chatmon told Wase that the only way to get around selecting Bramlitt would be to put the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier in place.

Chatmon confirmed the above noted conversation with Whiddon took place. Chatmon said she agreed with him that Bramlitt was a well-qualified candidate for the position based on her prior experience. Chatmon noted that Whiddon said in his interview that she said Bramlitt would be treated fairly and the best candidate for the job would be selected. Chatmon insisted that was her position at the time and she believes her discussion with Whiddon makes that clear. However, Chatmon denies having the conversation with Wase about using the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier to prevent Bramlitt from being eligible to apply for the position. Chatmon said that conversation never happened and she does not know why Wase would say that. Chatmon said the statements made by Wase disheartened her.

Chatmon was asked about the last noted area of concern for Bramlitt, which was that she had shared personal information about Bramlitt's family with employees at work to discredit her. Chatmon confirmed that she and Bramlitt had been related through marriage and shared family ties. However, she denied discussing Bramlitt or her family members with anyone at work.

Chatmon was asked about potential professional or personal issues she might have with Bramlitt. Bramlitt said Chatmon might have felt let down by her when she left Accreditation to go back to Detention Medical. Bramlitt noted an email Chatmon took issue with that she sent Steve Casey (FSA) about an FMJS Medical Inspector's position and pondered whether Chatmon might have a personal issue with her related to family matters. Chatmon said she had no personal or professional issues with Bramlitt and further stated that she would be welcome under her command at any time. Chatmon said Bramlitt has a reputation for doing a good job wherever she goes and she would still go to her today on compliance matters related to detention medical. As to the email that was referenced, Chatmon said she had already contacted Isaiah Dennard at the FSA on behalf of both Bramlitt and Melinda Dangerfield to see if they were eligible for FMJS Medical Inspector Positions. The ruling was that Dangerfield was eligible based on her being a practicing RN at the jail but Bramlitt was not because she was not acting in the capacity of an EMT at the jail, even though Bramlitt had her certification. Chatmon said this information was communicated to both of them. Bramlitt then emailed Steve Casey, which potentially upset Dennard because he felt she was going over his head. Dennard noted it to Chatmon who passed it on to Coldiron to convey to Bramlitt since she was back in Detention Medical at that time.

During the interview with Wase, it was alleged that Chatmon may have had a preferred candidate in the interview process for the recently filled Training Sergeant's position, and that scoring during the interviews may have been slanted toward that candidate. Chatmon said that she did not have a preferred candidate in the process and denied having a conversation with Director Wright or anyone about shading scoring toward any particular candidate. Chatmon said she met with her training team before the spot was filled and talked about strengths and weaknesses within the unit. Chatmon advised her team all agreed an organized strong administrative sergeant was needed, who could bring a skill set in computer software programs and policy building. They agreed the team already had a sufficient cadre of tactical experts. The questions were crafted to identify the candidate with the

best set of administrative skills. Chatmon provided copies of the scoring sheets from the interviews that were completed by Wright, Chatmon & Ricks. The scoring from the panel was consistent with the outcome of the interviews and the ranking of the candidates.

Chatmon was questioned about allegations that she had a preferred candidate for the Compliance Coordinator position and the possibility that this candidate was provided with an unfair advantage in the interview process. The advantage was alleged to have included opportunities to attend staff inspections with the accreditation team, coaching on her interview, and a personal discussion Chatmon had with the hiring panel members before interviews. Chatmon said that she did not have a preferred candidate going in to the process. Chatmon referred back to a conversation with Jon Kinney when Kinney took the Background Investigator's position. Chatmon said she joked with him that he could not leave until he found a replacement and he suggested Shelby Kelley. Chatmon also thought Kelley might be a good fit. Chatmon said Kelley showed interest and self-initiated contact with the unit to learn more about the position. Chatmon encouraged her interest from an employee growth standpoint to see if Kelley liked the job.

Chatmon said she did assist Kelley by coaching her for her interview but not with any specific information about the job that would provide an unfair advantage. Chatmon reported talking to Kelley about confidence during interviews and general interviewing tips. Chatmon said she was honest with Kelley and told her that there was a chance that she might not finish on top on the candidate interviews for the job. Chatmon confirmed having a discussion with the interview board before the interviews. Chatmon said she spoke to them about the importance of taking good notes and scoring the candidates on what they actually say during the interview and not what they know about the candidates. Chatmon said it was not her intention to influence the board toward selecting any candidate. Chatmon said she wished that Whiddon had come to her with any concerns about what she said so she could have clarified her comments with him. It had been noted in earlier interviews that there was a small group who went to lunch the day of the interviews that included Kelley, Chatmon, McKinney and possibly Wright. Chatmon said there was no inside information shared at lunch that day.

Chatmon was asked about a statement made by Deputy John Kinney. Kinney mentioned a conversation with Chatmon at a conference about the future of the Accreditation Unit where neither he nor Sgt. Whiddon were noted as being a part of it. Kinney also said it was clear to him that Chatmon wanted him to move out of Accreditation. Chatmon said she did have a conversation with Kinney comparable to his statement. However, she said it was a follow up conversation to a discussion about succession planning for the Accreditation Unit. Chatmon said she relies on Kinney for his advice as a long time accreditation manager. Chatmon said they did discuss Shelby Kelley and Heather Bailey as potential pieces of a succession plan. Chatmon referred to Whiddon leaving only because she believed he would be taking the lieutenant's exam and would promote out. Chatmon also believed Kinney would be retiring at some point due to his length of service and that was why he was not specifically included in the discussion. Chatmon said she thinks a lot of Kinney and has no idea how that conversation could have been misconstrued. Chatmon believed the misconception could have been easily fixed had he just come to her with his concerns.

Chatmon was asked how she would describe morale within her division. Chatmon said she would have thought it was great until she heard the interview recordings for this investigation where clear morale issues surfaced. Chatmon stated she was in the process of trying to “soften her edges” as it pertained to delivering messages to her subordinates. Chatmon described Accreditation as her core group and said she was not aware that there were issues. Chatmon said she had recently taken a personal trip with several of her employees and that she and her husband took Whiddon and his wife to dinner to celebrate his recent award. Chatmon emphasized that she felt blindsided and had no idea that any of them had an issue with her. Chatmon said she saw promise in Wase and had poured everything into her over the past five years to mentor her. Chatmon said she was actually the first to nominate Whiddon for his award and had done so in November of 2021. Chatmon did not tell him of the nomination at that time in case he was not selected.

Chatmon then detailed a number of decision making and performance issues she was having with Wase. Chatmon said Wase does fine when assigned a singular project but struggled when she is multi-tasked. As to decision making, Chatmon noted Wase allowing a part time evidence clerk to use an agency vehicle while a personal vehicle was being repaired, contrary to agency policy. In addition, she talked about Wase approving storage of a new CCSO Polaris watercraft on employee personal property for the initial twenty five hour break in period. Another example was an attempt by Wase to revise Property and Evidence room policy for PPE compliance without including the sergeant of the unit. As to performance issues she noted Wase; not updating her chain of command on matters of concern (bi-weekly update failures), not meeting deadlines (year-end purchase orders), not following through on assignments (Enforce One project), not completing assignments (appliance orders for 500 Building) and telling Chatmon things had been completed when they were not (chair order for Records). There were further examples that are not included in this summation for the purposes of brevity.

Chatmon further described Wase as having no sense of urgency to get tasks accomplished and being non-responsive to emails and phone calls. Chatmon said she was frustrated with having to take over assignments from Wase to get them done. Chatmon said she could not provide Wase with further leniency. Chatmon also pointed out an audit Wase had recently done over Property and Evidence as a member of her Accreditation Team. Chatmon said this was improper and a potential conflict of interest because Wase heads both units. Chatmon said she also got complaints on Wase from another staff member she was looking at and had started documenting this and other information into a package for Director Wright when this investigation materialized.

Chatmon was told that multiple employees described their working environment with terms such as “walking on egg shells” every day and not being sure “which Chief Chatmon” they would get each day. Chatmon was told the periods varied but most of her subordinates described this change as occurring over the last six to 12 months. Chatmon was asked about this and her relationship with her subordinates. Chatmon said she was never told of any of this and she was disappointed to hear the thoughts of her subordinates. Chatmon did not have an explanation for what may have changed within the past twelve months to give her subordinates that impression and she said she was not consciously aware of what she could have done to make them feel that way. Chatmon did describe herself as focused on getting her mission accomplished and surmised that her accreditation

employees may have seen a shift in her due to her responsibilities increasing with her new position. Chatmon regretted that her team witnessed her frustration with Wase. Chatmon said she was trying to get her job done during the week and was doing elements of Wase's job at home on Saturday and Sunday. Chatmon said she did not want to see Wase, another woman, fail at her job.

Chatmon was asked how she managed her employees and how she would describe her management style. Chatmon replied that she could not speak to her employees' impressions but only for her intentions. Chatmon said she strives to be firm, fair and consistent. Chatmon said she has responsibility for high liability areas within the CCSO that are crucial to the agency. Chatmon believed that sometimes her urgency, and the necessity of getting things accomplished in this environment, could be misconstrued. Chatmon prefers letting people do their jobs without getting into their business but unfortunately has had to dig in due to complaints within her area on Wase.

When asked, Chatmon said she believes she works with her subordinates in a cooperative and supportive manner. When asked if she believed she was running her command efficiently and effectively, she replied that it does not appear to her that the group reporting to Wase was running efficiently and effectively. Chatmon believed the other sections are running fine. It was pointed out that multiple employees reported fearing retribution for speaking about the allegations contained in this investigation. Chatmon had no explanation for why they would feel that way. Chatmon said she hopes to be afforded an opportunity to sit down with each one of her subordinates to discuss their impressions of her and determine how she can make changes.

Chatmon was asked about her relationship with Director Wright that was described by Wase and supported to some degree by others who had been interviewed. Chatmon said she had worked for him for most of the past seventeen years. Chatmon describes their relationship as professional and not personal. Chatmon said they have a friendship at work but nothing outside of the office. Chatmon said Wright listens to her and allows her to vent when she is frustrated. Chatmon said she does hear it from Wright when others have issues with her and go to him. Chatmon said that if he hears her say something harsh to someone he will point that out to her and she has gone back to apologize later. Chatmon said there is no reason why Wase could not have gone to Wright with any concerns about her. Chatmon further stated that Wase had no right and no basis to allude in her interview that there was anything more than a professional relationship between her and Director Wright.

As the interview closed, Chatmon was provided with an opportunity to share any additional thoughts and comments related to the investigation. Chatmon said it disappoints her that after advocating for her subordinates for years that some believe she does not have their best interest at heart. Chatmon added that she wants to get back to the place where they all were as a group before this started. Chatmon said at the end of the day her responsibility is to get her job done which includes meeting expectations and deadlines.

Chief Chatmon did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

**\*\*All items submitted as evidence by Chief Chatmon were turned over to Sgt. K. Smith and were uploaded as part of this case file.**

Discussion after Chief Chatmon's interview led to the conclusion that further interviews would need to be conducted. Undersheriff Lendvay advised Sgt. K. Smith to schedule the below listed interviews.

#### **Witness #11 Notification and Interview: Sarah Padgett #8610**

On 08/31/22 at 1335 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Graphics/Multimedia Coordinator Sarah Padgett in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Sarah Padgett was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Sarah Padgett now works for the Sheriff out of the PIO office but has previously worked in both HR and upstairs directly for Chief Chatmon. Padgett said morale in HR was fine and she described it as a normal work environment. Padgett believes Chatmon works cooperatively and supportively with HR. Padgett further stated she believes HR is running efficiently and effectively and pointed to the twenty new hires for September as an example of that. She said that if there are issues, Chatmon asks her people to come to her with them. Padgett said that people who work with Chatmon need to be able to work fast and that in her experience those who complain cannot keep up. Padgett said she could tell there was recent tension between Chatmon and Wase but said she did not know the origin of it. Padgett characterized her relationship with Chatmon as both professional and personal as she has spent time with her both at and away from work.

Sarah Padgett did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #12 Notification and Interview: Brenda Lombardo #6114**

On 08/31/22 at 1405 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Records Manager Brenda Lombardo in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Brenda Lombardo was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Lombardo said morale was not very high within records, in her opinion, because they do not feel as included in the main group as the other units. Lombardo says Wase does a good job and tries to be inclusive but they do feel left out at times. Lombardo finds her chain of command to be "somewhat" supportive. She went on to say that, she knows her job well and seldom has to seek guidance. When she does, Chatmon is quick to interject before she can fully explain all sides of an issue. Lombardo said Wase listens to her, but Chatmon does not and tends to quickly mandate solutions that may not always be the best option. She was asked about her work relationship with Chatmon and she said she believes she is treated fairly but is not within Chatmon's group of favorites. Lombardo did describe Chatmon as a micro-manager. When I asked about Chatmon's interactions with employees she said if Chatmon feels like she can intimidate someone she will. She used former HR employee Windy Hunter as an example and said Hunter told her she left the CCSO because of the way she was treated by Chatmon. Lombardo had not witnessed the interaction herself and did not have knowledge of other similar situations.

Brenda Lombardo did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #13 Notification and Interview: Diane Pickering #5027**

On 08/31/22 at 1440 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Communications Compliance Coordinator Diane Pickering in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Diane Pickering was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Pickering said her work environment was not good and had been that way for some time. Pickering said she is not recognized for any of her accomplishments and gave the Power DMS implementation as an example. Pickering feels supported by Whiddon and Wase in her chain of command but not Chatmon. She described the work environment as non-inclusive and gave examples of events both at and away from work that she was not invited to. She does not feel that the work environment on her floor is professional. Pickering said the favoritism has taken away her love for her job, and the agency. She did not report Chatmon mistreating anyone else and says that other employees apologize to her for her treatment as an outcast. Pickering does believe Accreditation is running effectively and efficiently as evidenced by the agency being continually re-accredited without conditions.

Diane Pickering did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #14 Notification and Interview: Kim Long #8567**

On 08/31/22 at 1520 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Human Resources Manager Kim Long in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Kim Long was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Long said she never heard Chatmon discuss Bramlitt. Long confirmed that Phoenix disqualified Bramlitt's application for the Compliance Coordinator job and said that pre-screening applications for job requirement compliance was Phoenix's responsibility. Long was asked about the job posting originally showing a requirement for a B.A. degree from an accredited university without any specificity beyond that. She said that was true but the job posting was later updated to include a Finance or Accounting related B.A. degree requirement based on feedback from CFO Adams. Following her interview, Long returned and brought me an audit trail report for the Budget Analyst position in NEOGOV that showed the posting being updated to the specific degree requirement, as requested by CFO Adams, to be a degree in Finance or Accounting.

Long described the work environment in HR as great and said morale was good among the employees there. She said they communicate well, work cooperatively and are well supported. She described her relationship with Chatmon as professional. Long believes HR is being run efficiently and effectively but said there is always room for improvement. She said they get support from Chatmon and Long has never seen Chatmon act unprofessionally with anyone.

Kim Long did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

#### **Witness #15 Notification and Interview: Director Wayne McKinney #6229**

On 09/12/22 at 0920 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay interviewed Investigations and Special Operations Department Director Wayne McKinney in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Director McKinney was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Director McKinney was brought in to be questioned about two topics that came up in Chatmon's interview. The first concerned the impetus of the 365 disciplinary disqualifier that has appeared on recent job postings as pointed out by Ms. Bramlitt. McKinney confirmed what Chatmon testified to concerning how the disciplinary disqualifier began appearing on recent job postings. McKinney said this came up earlier this year during a series of meetings concerning the formation of a new detective's eligibility list. McKinney said there was a short series of meetings between himself, Chief Cotchaleovitch, Chief Chatmon and Director Wright. He said the process was changing and they were considering allowing deputies with certain specialized career experience to transfer directly into specialty detective units rather than having to go through the General Investigations Unit. As changes were being discussed, it was noted that there was no current disqualifier in the process for those who had received discipline within the past year. A decision was made that a specific standard should be in place and they decided that future postings should contain a 365 disciplinary disqualifier. By the

time the decision was made the detective eligibility for transfer memo had already been posted. However, it was decided that the disqualifier should be in place moving forward on agency job postings for internal movement.

McKinney was then asked about a lunch that Shelby Kelley had with Chief Chatmon on the day she was interviewed for the Compliance Coordinator's position. He confirmed the lunch occurred and said he was actually the one who invited Kelley to lunch. McKinney said he could tell she was nervous about the interview and just wanted to help settle her nerves. She had worked for him in the past and he thought she was a good employee. As they were leaving for lunch, they ran into Wright and Chatmon who both joined them. McKinney said no information about the interview panel or anything else that would have given her an unfair advantage was relayed during that lunch.

McKinney was asked about the work environment on the third floor. He shares a hallway with Chatmon and many of her subordinates to include the Accreditation team. McKinney said he has not noted any openly demeaning behavior from Chatmon toward her subordinates. However, he said he has observed a sense of frustration on both sides. McKinney gave an example of talking about the supply needs for Narcotics with Wase and Whiddon one day. They were speaking with him before going to the Narcotics office to talk to them firsthand about equipment needs. As they began to leave, Chatmon walked up and abruptly asked Wase where she was going. McKinney said Chatmon appeared frustrated and told Wase she had things she needed her to do. He said he tried to tell a joke to lighten the mood and Chatmon went to her office while he believes Wase and Whiddon continued on to Narcotics. McKinney said Wase has shared frustration with him about working for Chatmon. She shared concerns of Chatmon being overbearing and managing her through a shared calendar that they have. McKinney also reported that he has never heard Chatmon or Wright discuss Bramlitt in any manner to include keeping her from pursuing job opportunities.

Director Wayne McKinney did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Complainant Re-Interview #3: Joanna Bramlitt**

On 09/12/22 at 0950hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay conducted a follow up interview with the complainant Joanna Bramlitt in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Joanna Bramlitt was reminded she was still under oath and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

The purpose of this re-interview was to learn specifics about Bramlitt's belief that Chatmon had been speaking to co-workers about personal family matters. Bramlitt confirmed that her two daughters have a relationship with Chatmon's daughter. Bramlitt could not provide any firsthand information about whom Chatmon had been speaking with about her family and said that Wase had provided this information to Coldiron which then made its way back to her. She said Wase relayed that Chatmon had



spoken about one of her daughter's preference for which parent she wanted to live with but could not provide any further specifics.

Joanna Bramlitt did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness Re-Interview Asst. Chief Stacy Wase #2**

On 09/12/22 at 1015 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay conducted a follow up interview with the witness Asst. Chief Stacy Wase in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. A/C Stacy Wase was reminded she was still under oath and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

The purpose of this re-interview was to establish whether Wase had firsthand knowledge of Chatmon speaking to coworkers about Bramlitt's family matters. Wase said that Chatmon would discuss marital and custody issues concerning Bramlitt with her and others such as Whiddon, Bailey and possibly Kelley at the office. She gave a specific example about one of Bramlitt's daughters struggling with where she wanted to live following her parent's divorce. Wase was asked if there was a business purpose for the discussion and she replied that there was not and it was just gossip. She said there were other discussions as well but should could not recall the specific details because the information did not pertain to her.

Asst. Chief Wase did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness Re-Interview Heather Bailey #2**

On 09/12/22 at 1025 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay conducted a follow up interview with witness Heather Bailey in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Heather Bailey was reminded she was still under oath and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Bailey said she knew there were family ties between Chatmon and Bramlitt. She said the conversation concerning one of Bramlitt's daughters struggling with where she wanted to live following her parent's divorce was familiar to her and she had been a party to it. However, she was not sure where she heard it or exactly who said this. Bailey said it could have come from Chatmon but she could not remember for sure.

Heather Bailey did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness Re-Interview Shelby Kelley #2**

On 09/12/22 at 1040 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay conducted a follow up interview with witness Shelby Kelley in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Shelby Kelley was reminded she was still under oath and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Kelley said she could not recall any conversations with Chatmon about Bramlitt or her family's personal affairs.

Shelby Kelley did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness Re-Interview Sgt. Cody Whiddon #2**

On 09/12/22 at 1100 hours, Sgt. Smith and Undersheriff Lendvay conducted a follow up interview with witness Sgt. Cody Whiddon in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Sgt. Cody Whiddon was reminded he was still under oath and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Whiddon said the conversation concerning one of Bramlitt's daughters struggling with where she wanted to live following her parent's divorce was familiar to him and he had been a party to it. Whiddon could not recall exactly when the conversation happened but estimated that it could have been last October. He could not say if the information came directly from Chatmon or not. Whiddon also said he could not recall any other conversations with Chatmon about Bramlitt.

Sgt. Cody Whiddon did not provide any additional pertinent information. The interview was subsequently concluded.

### **Witness #16 Notification and Interview: Director Ricardo Wright #6326**

On 09/23/22 at 0915 hours, Sgt. Smith and U/S Lendvay interviewed Director of Administration and Business, Ricardo Wright, in the conference room of the 10-19 executive suite. Director Wright was advised of the administrative investigation process and subsequently provided the following sworn testimony.

Director Wright confirmed the 365 day disciplinary disqualifier clause, as noted on recent internal job announcements, was put into place following his discussion with Director McKinney during the creation of a new eligibility list for detective transfers. Director Wright stated he asked Chatmon to include that clause moving forward on future job postings after that discussion. Wright said this had nothing to do with Bramlitt.

Wright stated the only time he ever heard Chatmon discuss Bramlitt was when they were discussing the few candidates who put in for the compliance coordinator's opening. Director Wright said Chatmon noted that she was qualified and had experience in the position. Wright said he never heard any discussion from Chatmon about keeping Bramlitt from being eligible for transfer to the Compliance Coordinator position or any other job opening. Director Wright also said he never heard Chatmon discuss any of Bramlitt's personal affairs or family matters. Wright was asked about the Training Sergeant's position that was recently filled and said he was never a party to any discussion about shaded scoring to favor a candidate. Director Wright confirmed that he went to lunch with Shelby Kelley, McKinney & Chatmon on the day of Kelly's Compliance Coordinator interview. Wright said the lunch did not include any conversation that would have given Kelley an unfair advantage in her interview or any inside information.

Wright said he has worked with Chatmon since roughly 2005 when they were both assigned to the courthouse. Wright was a supervisor at the time and had to intervene in some bias based behavior that targeted Chatmon at the time. Wright said he has worked to mentor her since then. Wright describes his relationship with her as friendly but professional just like it is with the rest of the Chiefs. Wright said their relationship does not extend outside of the office. Wright said that Chatmon has a different approach in dealing with people and noted she is task oriented. Wright said he has heard from other Directors about her interactions with them at times but said the disagreements related more to them being told we were moving in a different direction from past practice as she tries to move Human Resources forward.

Wright said the friction is typically about Chatmon's delivery of her messages and he has worked to mentor her on that. Wright said he allows her to vent when she gets frustrated and offers her suggested solutions to problems when needed. Wright said all recent feedback received about Chatmon has been positive and coworkers have noted positive changes. He has seen no indications in her over the past year that she is reverting to her more direct style and he said nobody who works for Chatmon has come to him with any complaints of harsh treatment, to include those in the Accreditation Unit.

Wright said he was aware that Chatmon was having performance issues with Wase. Wright said Chatmon was aware of some personal issues in Wase's life, so Chatmon was trying to allow her

some grace. Wright said Chatmon has grown frustrated with Wase's lack of focus and follow through. Wright said Wase is capable of carrying out single tasks but struggles when she is multi-tasked. Wright said she has not yet learned how to step up from being in the weeds herself to managing the completion of tasks through her subordinates.

Wright said tasks that are assigned to Wase linger and are not completed without repeated reminders. Wright said Chatmon has struggled with being fully tasked in her job while having to take on tasks from Wase. Wright said Chatmon has come to him for advice on handling the situation but he has not spoken to Wase himself about her performance. He is unaware of any personal issue between Chatmon and Wase or Chatmon and the Accreditation Team. Wright has seen no outward signs of change within Chatmon and said there is no yelling, slamming of doors or mistreatment of employees going on that he has observed. Wright stated he would not tolerate that. Wright stated he has frequent contact with the Accreditation Team about their work and he is puzzled as to why nobody has ever brought him a concern about Chatmon.

Wright said that Chatmon is performing well in her job. Wright believes that if Wase had an issue with Chatmon she should have brought it to him so he could have addressed it. He said that if he was unable to address her concerns she would have been advised to meet with the Undersheriff for resolution. Instead, he said it appears that she went to non-supervisory personnel to get her message out. Wright believes this is an example of poor leadership on Wase's part. He believes that if this issue had been brought to him, it would have been handled before it got to this point. Wright said that it is his responsibility to handle issues within his command but if problems are not brought to his attention, he cannot fix them.

## **Principal Notification/ Receipt of Evidence #2: Chief Tina Chatmon**

On 09/23/2022, Sgt. K. Smith met with Chief Chatmon in her office located at 10-19. Chief Chatmon was advised there were additional interviews conducted in reference to this investigation. Chief Chatmon advised she would like to review the additional audio recording on today's date if possible. Chief Chatmon advised she was available at 1400 hours.

On 09/23/2022 at 1400 hours, I made contact with Chief Chatmon at her office located at 10-19. Chief Chatmon was set up in her office with a laptop, which contained a copy of the additional audio-recorded witness interviews. I informed Chief Chatmon after she reviewed all of the information of the additional audio recordings contained on the CCSO laptop, we would set a future date to conduct the additional principal interview.

On 09/23/2022 at approximately 1600 hours, Chief Chatmon advised me she had concluded reviewing the additional audio recordings. Chief Chatmon advised me she did not want to schedule an additional Principal Interview.

Chief Chatmon did advise she had a transcript from her previous Principal Interview she wanted to provide and submit to become part of this case file. The transcript was collected and scanned as a permanent record of this case.

## **Conclusion**

Joanna Bramlitt presented written concerns for an “Employment Review” to Director Joe Bucci alleging “interference of employment opportunities and personal discrimination from the Chief of HR”. CCSO Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) policy encourages employees to report such complaints and notes that an employee may report their suspicions to any supervisor of their choosing. Neither Bramlitt’s memo of her concerns nor her interview alleged an EEO complaint where her treatment was based on race, color, sex, pregnancy status, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, parental status, age, disability or marital status. Instead, Bramlitt suspected the alleged discriminatory behavior was personal and based on work or family related conflicts. She further believed that Chatmon was using her authority and position to limit her promotional and lateral movement opportunities.

Interviews with employees under Chief Chatmon’s command about this original complaint gave rise to concerns about employee morale and treatment in some of the units she is responsible for.

This Investigation concluded the allegations made against Chief Tina Chatmon pertain to the alleged violations of the following Clay County Sheriff's Office directives.

### ***General Order 2000.08 (Supervisory Responsibilities)***

#### ***III. Duties and Responsibilities of Supervisors***

##### ***A. General***

*4. Supervisors will ensure that the authority within proportion to their rank or position will always be used in the best interest of the Clay County Sheriff's Office and will not be abused in any way.*

### ***General Order 1000.2 (Code of Conduct)***

### **III. Constraints on Behavior**

#### **G. Unbecoming, immoral or detrimental conduct**

##### **4. Examples of prohibited conduct include, but are not limited to:**

**g. Speaking disparagingly about any other member, or defacing or demeaning the nationality, creed, race, or sex of any person.**

### **General Order 2000.08 (Supervisor Responsibilities).**

## **II. Duties and Responsibilities of Supervisors**

### **B. Specific**

#### **1. Personnel Management**

**a. Supervisors are responsible for promoting and maintaining efficiency, discipline, and high morale among *all members under their supervision*.**

## **Disposition Recommendation**

**Allegation #1:** Chief Tina Chatmon used her authority and position to limit the promotional and lateral movement opportunities of member Joanna Bramlitt who is attempting to advance her career at the Clay County Sheriff's Office.

**Pertinent facts/evidence:** Bramlitt believed she was treated unfairly when she was asked to re-apply to a posting for a supervisory position she had been appointed to in the Detention Medical Section. She pointed out that an RN Nursing supervisor had been promoted at the same time and was not required to apply for her position. Through the course of interviews, it was determined; Chief Chatmon was unaware of the RN Nursing Supervisor's promotion but became aware of Bramlitt's promotion through a memo that made it to her desk. Policy required a posting period for internal vacancies at that time. Chatmon brought the promotion to the attention of Director Wright and he advised her to make sure CCSO policy was followed. This action was within CCSO policy and does not appear to be discriminatory.

**Pertinent facts/evidence:** Bramlitt applied for an open Budget Analyst position in March of 2022. She believed she met the minimum job requirements for an interview of having a B.A. degree and relevant work experience. She got an email from HR advising her she would not move forward for in the process of being interviewed for the position. Through the course of interviews, it was determined; at that time, CFO Vicki Adams had been meeting with HR staff about the applications that were being received and requested a change in the job degree requirements from a general B.A. degree to a B.A. in the disciplines of Finance or Accounting. This update was later made for CFO Adams, who was the hiring authority within CCSO, the next time the open posting was taken down and revised. Neither Adams nor Chatmon knew Bramlitt had tried to apply for the position and HR Specialist Melissa Phoenix disqualified the application in NEO GOV. Screening applications for prerequisite requirements was Phoenix's job and Bramlitt's disqualification for the position came about due to the request of Adams to require applicants to have a B.A. in the disciplines of Finance or Accounting. This action does not appear to be discriminatory.

**Pertinent facts/evidence:** Bramlitt believed the 365 day disciplinary action disqualifier on the job posting for the Accreditation Compliance Coordinator position was put in place by Chatmon to specifically deny her the opportunity to apply for the job. Bramlitt was subject to formal agency discipline in November of 2021. Statements made by A/C Stacy Wase to Lt. Chris Coldiron bolstered her suspicions. Through the course of interviews, it was determined; that there is a conflict between statements made by Chatmon and Wase. Wase said Chatmon told her this and Chatmon said the conversation never occurred. No other witnesses to this statement were found and this investigation is unable to reconcile the differences in testimony. However, other testimony did bring out that the origin of the 365 disciplinary action disqualifier for job postings actually came out during meetings about a posting for a new detective eligibility list in the spring of 2022. This meeting included Chatmon, Chief Cotchaleovitch, Director McKinney and Director Wright. McKinney testified that he brought up the fact that there used to be a disciplinary action disqualifier in previous postings that was no longer present and he discussed this with Director Wright. Following the meeting, Director Wright told Chatmon to add the disqualifier to future job postings. Chatmon testified she believed Bramlitt would be a strong candidate for the job and told Sgt. Whiddon that the best candidate for the job would get it. This statement was confirmed by Sgt. Whiddon who said Chatmon told him the best candidate, to include Bramlitt, would get the job. In addition, internal job postings since that time were reviewed and the 365 disciplinary disqualifier is present in all of them. The reinstatement of the 365 disciplinary disqualifier for internal job postings does not appear to be discriminatory and was not initiated by Chatmon.

Recommendation as to Allegation #1: **UNFOUNDED**

**Allegation #2:** Bramlitt believed that Chatmon had spoken disparagingly about private family matters involving her children with coworkers to slander her reputation.

**Pertinent facts/evidence:** Testimony revealed that Chatmon and Bramlitt share family ties through marriage, which facilitates access to private information. Wase testified that Chatmon would discuss Bramlitt's marital and children's issues around coworkers. She classified the comments as gossip without a business purpose. She further stated Bailey, Whiddon and possibly Kelley were present for some of these conversations. Kelley testified she never heard Chatmon discuss Bramlitt's personal matters. Bailey and Whiddon both said a conversation on the topic was familiar to them but they were unsure if it was initiated by Chatmon or someone else and could not provide further detail. Chatmon denied discussing Bramlitt or her family members with anyone at work.

Recommendation as to Allegation #2: **NOT SUSTAINED**

**Allegation #3:** As a CCSO Supervisor, Chatmon has not promoted and maintained high morale among **all** of the members under her supervision.

**Pertinent facts/evidence:** During the course of this investigation, it became necessary to interview various members under Chatmon's command to explore different aspects of Bramlitt's complaint. During some of these interviews, clear morale issues surfaced in some of the units under her command. The problem was not universal, as members of Human Resources reported good morale and feelings of support from Chatmon. The same could not be said for the Accreditation team who reported low morale due to their treatment by Chatmon. Multiple employees characterized the work environment as difficult and described Chatmon's management practices as a direct contributor to a chaotic work environment. Most said this all started happening within the past year. Employees discussed having to "walk on egg shells" because they did not know which Chief Chatmon they might get for the day. She was described as a leader who made it obvious to those around her when she was frustrated and unhappy. Her work style was described as "harsh" with people, and that of a "tyrant". One employee characterized her as "hammering people". Some of this was backed up, to a lesser extent, within other interviews as well. Chatmon conceded during her interview that there were clearly morale issues with some under her command after she listened to the interviews.

It should be noted that none of the detail above was sourced from A/C Wase who also took issue with her treatment by Chatmon. It is clear from Chatmon's interview and Wright's interview that there is frustration with Wase's work and Chatmon has been tracking what she believes are deficiencies with Wase's work products. There are clear issues between Chatmon and Wase, and for this reason, only the interviews with non-staff ranked employees are being factored into this conclusion. It is clear that high morale has not been maintained among all members under Chatmon's supervision.

Recommendation as to allegation #3: **SUSTAINED**



## **Prior Disciplinary Action**

Internal Affairs History: Chief Tina Chatmon

1. No Prior Discipline History

RMS Complaint History: Chief Tina Chatmon

1. No Prior Discipline History

## **Enclosures**

### **Internal Affairs Case File #2022-011:**

- Investigative Activity Summary
  - IAPRO Complaint report AI2022-011
  - Internal Affairs Documents (Digital Copies)
  - Evidence submitted by Principal
  - Case Related Documents
  - Witness Interview Recordings
  - Principle Interview Recordings
  - Summation
-

***“I the undersigned, do hereby swear, under penalty of perjury that, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, I have not knowingly or willfully deprived, or allowed another person to deprive, the subject of the investigation of any rights contained in ss. 112.532 and 112.533, Florida Statutes.”***

***“Pursuant to FSS 92.525, I declare that the foregoing document and the facts contained therein are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.”***

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Undersheriff Ronald Lendvay #8429**  
**Undersheriff-Clay County Sheriff's Office**

---