

Gonzalez Series

Demand for Resignation

Subject: Demand for the Resignation of Mayor Cynthia Gonzalez

Dear Mayor Gonzalez and Members of the Cudahy City Council,

I am writing to formally demand the resignation of Cynthia Gonzalez from her position as Mayor of Cudahy. The statements and actions surrounding the controversy involving her public comments concerning local gangs and immigration enforcement have raised serious concerns about public safety, community leadership, and the responsibility of elected officials.

How dare she? Ms. Gonzalez has stooped to a whole new level of low. A woman serving in public office, inciting territorial gang warfare against the American people. Where is she really from? Not from America, we know that is for sure.

Healthy community citizens don't commit terrorist attacks, traffic drugs or people, hoist foreign flags, or light vehicles/property on fire and then stand there with a sign. And they certainly don't incite gang violence against the community. That's the whole thing. The vehicle didn't belong to them, and they destroyed it anyway. This is the entitlement being shown. They stole it. Then they placed the American community in danger. They are destroying what isn't theirs to destroy.

Our towns don't belong to hostile foreigners. If you are placing Americans in danger, the community is not yours to be in or to destroy. The community doesn't belong to you. It belongs to the American people who support the American people and care about each other's safety. End of story. End of mayoral term.

America belongs to Americans. Not hostile foreigners. Not hostile mayors. Stop gas-lighting, stop blame-shifting. We heard all that we needed to hear. Where is the accountability?

I am particularly concerned about the public comments in which Ms. Gonzalez referenced 18th Street and Florence and addressed gang members to get territorial, take over the streets, and fight police enforcement. Her comments resulted in public criticism and calls for her resignation, including from the Los Angeles Police Protective League. Many news agencies reported on these events and her controversial statements. The public was very clear that they wanted Ms. Gonzalez to resign. They want her out. What happened? Why is she still in office? What other corruption has she caused since her term began? She needs to get out or be forced out of public office. She doesn't belong there; she is posing a danger to the American people.

An elected official has a responsibility to promote safety, first and foremost, for the community they represent. When statements are made by a public official, such as calling on violent street gangs to take over a territory or harm law enforcement, they should no longer be serving the public. This much should be clear. They should be forced out of office immediately. They are not serving the public; they have become an enemy of the public. Yes,

calling on gangs to harm our communities, military, and public servants does make you an enemy. No, this is not “satirical”; it’s the real thing. Grown-ups don’t break the law. Mayors don’t incite territorial gang wars against the American people.

For these reasons, I respectfully demand that Cynthia Gonzalez resign as Mayor of Cudahy. I also request that the City Council publicly address these concerns and explain what steps they have already taken to ensure that she leaves office immediately for committing acts of gang warfare, treason, and for inciting violence against the American people. I believe this woman should be investigated for any criminal conduct that may have occurred in connection with inciting gang violence against the American people and our military. Thank you.

City Council Case

The case I am asking the City Council to address is based on several connected concerns involving public safety, the responsibilities of elected officials, and the potential harms that can result when organized street gangs are invoked in an already volatile political conflict. Ms. Gonzalez, while serving as an elected municipal official, publicly referenced the 18th Street and Florence gangs and used territorial language about protecting “our turf” and “our people” in connection with federal immigration enforcement. The comments occurred during a period when Los Angeles was already experiencing significant unrest and violence against law enforcement, and the Los Angeles Police Protective League subsequently called for her resignation and said prosecution should be considered. The federal Department of Homeland Security also publicly condemned the remarks and expressed concern about their potential effect on the safety of federal officers.

At the national level, the FBI reported 90,178 assaults against law-enforcement officers in 2025, representing 13.8 assaults per 100 officers and the highest officer-assault rate reported during the previous ten years. During the 2025 Los Angeles immigration protests, law-enforcement officers were also subjected to documented assaults and dangerous conduct, including projectiles and fireworks directed toward officers, and hundreds of arrests were made in connection with the protests. These statistics demonstrate the serious public-safety environment in which her statements were made and the potential consequences that should be considered when an elected official publicly invokes organized street gangs in connection with a conflict involving law enforcement.

The emotional toll and cultural dissonance are also significant because elected officials are expected to keep the public safe and operate through lawful government institutions, while gang organizations operate through territorial control, intimidation, and violence. Bringing those forms of language into a governmental conflict raises legitimate questions about responsibility, public safety, and institutional trust. The City of Cudahy subsequently stated that Ms. Gonzalez’s comments represented her personal views and not the official position of the city, which makes it reasonable to ask what accountability process followed, whether the statements were investigated by any appropriate authority, what complaints or legal reviews were considered, and why she continues to serve as mayor. The central issue is whether her

conduct, the surrounding circumstances, the documented risks to law enforcement, and the public responsibilities of an elected official were adequately addressed.

Civil Rights Complaint & Understandings

I am submitting this complaint to request federal review of publicly documented conduct by Cynthia Gonzalez, the Mayor of Cudahy, California, and to ask whether her conduct raises any issues within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division.

In June 2025, while serving as an elected Cudahy official, Ms. Gonzalez publicly referenced the 18th Street and Florence gangs in connection with federal immigration enforcement and used territorial language concerning protecting “our turf” and “our people.” These statements occurred during a period of significant unrest in Los Angeles involving immigration enforcement and confrontations between protesters and law-enforcement personnel.

I am concerned about the potential public-safety implications of an elected government official publicly invoking organized street gangs in connection with a conflict involving government authorities and law enforcement. The Los Angeles Police Protective League publicly called for Ms. Gonzalez’s resignation and raised the possibility of prosecution if her conduct violated the law. The Department of Homeland Security also publicly criticized the statements.

There is also a law-enforcement safety concern. The FBI reported 90,178 assaults against law-enforcement officers in 2025, representing 13.8 assaults per 100 officers and the highest officer-assault rate reported during the previous ten years. The 2025 Los Angeles immigration protests also involved documented assaults and dangerous conduct toward law-enforcement personnel.

It is clear that Ms. Gonzalez is inciting violence and gang warfare against Americans and our honorable military members. The emotional toll that civil conflicts like hers have caused our military community is immeasurable. I am requesting that the Department of Justice review the documented statements, their context, the public response, and any available evidence to determine whether any federal civil-rights or other federal law may have been implicated.

I am also requesting that the appropriate federal authority determine whether this matter belongs with the Civil Rights Division, the FBI, another Department of Justice component, or another federal, state, or local agency.

I can provide the publicly reported statements, news reports, dates, statements from law-enforcement organizations and government agencies, and other documentation supporting this report.

Thank you for reviewing this complaint and determining whether the matter falls within federal jurisdiction.

Possible Actions

- Public support of FBI probe.

- 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
- Claim against injury.
- Request official investigation (FBI currently investigating).
- Recall/Removal Proceedings.
- **Public-records and administrative action, records request, pending investigations, policies.**

Los Angeles County Superior Court

- **Personal injury/damages:** Los Angeles County Superior Court.
- **Civil-rights claim against a government official:** potentially **U.S. District Court for the Central District of California**, depending on the specific federal claim.
- **Claim against the City of Cudahy:** special California governmental-claim rules can apply before a lawsuit for damages against a public entity. California Government Code § 945.4 generally requires a claim to have been presented and acted upon/rejected before certain suits against a public entity can be filed.
- **Small monetary claim:** California small-claims procedures may be available depending on the amount and type of claim. Los Angeles Superior Court provides separate procedures for small claims.

Protections

- **Protection from government misconduct:** The Constitution protects people against certain actions by government officials—for example, unlawful searches, discriminatory government action, deprivation of due process, and excessive force.
- **Protection of federal officers:** Federal law separately protects federal officers from assault, **threats, obstruction, and interference with their official duties**. That is a **criminal-law** protection, rather than a general individual constitutional right to police protection.
- **Protection from discrimination:** Federal civil-rights laws prohibit certain **discriminatory** conduct based on protected characteristics.
- **Government-created danger:** In limited circumstances, courts have recognized constitutional claims where government conduct itself creates or substantially increases a person's danger.
- **Public safety generally:** The government has extensive statutory duties and police powers to maintain public safety, but the Supreme Court has generally held that the Due Process Clause does not create a constitutional entitlement to government protection from violence committed by private individuals.

- **You have rights against the government:** The Constitution and federal civil-rights laws protect people from certain unlawful government actions.
- **The government has laws and institutions intended to protect the public:** Police, prosecutors, courts, and federal agencies enforce criminal laws that protect people from assault, **threats**, trafficking, property crimes, and other harms.
- **Those protections don't mean the government is legally responsible for preventing every private act of violence:** The Supreme Court has generally held that the Constitution itself doesn't impose a general duty on government to protect every individual from harm by another private person.
- **Government officials can still potentially violate the law through their own conduct:** For example, if an official **unlawfully discriminates**, uses excessive force, **violates someone's constitutional rights**, or in a legally recognized **circumstance creates a danger**, different legal protections can apply.
- **Federal officers have specific statutory protections:** Federal law separately criminalizes assaulting, resisting, or **interfering** with certain federal officers while they are performing their duties.

"I am concerned that the conduct by Ms. Gonzalez may have undermined the lawful protection of citizens and law-enforcement personnel and may warrant review under applicable **federal law**. I am requesting that the appropriate federal authorities determine whether any protected rights were violated or whether any federal laws concerning interference with law enforcement, threats, violence, or civil rights were implicated."

"I am also concerned about California and local-government policies that restrict cooperation with federal immigration-enforcement authorities. I request review of whether any particular state or local action goes beyond permissible regulation of state and local resources and instead unlawfully interferes with federal officers performing their federally authorized duties, and whether such interference has affected federally protected rights or public safety. I ask the appropriate federal authority to determine whether federal preemption, supremacy, civil-rights, or federal law-enforcement protections are implicated."

Maine's LD 1971, ACLU, MIRC

Practical Options

1. Challenge the law legislatively.

Contact your state representative and senator and ask for repeal, amendment, or a bill restoring specific forms of cooperation between Maine law enforcement and federal immigration authorities.

2. Document specific public-safety consequences.

This is much stronger than simply arguing that the policy is bad. If you know of a specific situation where the policy prevented Maine police from assisting federal officers, delayed a response, endangered an officer, or interfered with another legitimate law-enforcement operation, document the **date, agency, policy involved, what happened, and resulting harm**.

3. **Request government records.**

Maine's Freedom of Access Act can be used to request records concerning implementation of LD 1971—such as agency directives, communications, training materials, and documented incidents involving federal/state cooperation. This could help determine whether the policy is actually producing the effects you are concerned about.

4. **Ask for a legal review.**

If you believe a particular provision actually conflicts with federal law or unlawfully interferes with federal officers, you can ask an attorney to evaluate a **federal preemption/supremacy** challenge. You would need to identify the particular provision and the particular federal authority it allegedly conflicts with.

5. **Report an actual rights violation separately.**

If a particular person was actually denied a constitutional right or subjected to unlawful government conduct, that is potentially a civil-rights matter. It should be based on the specific incident rather than the existence of LD 1971 itself.

6. **Use the courts if there is a concrete injury.**

A person or organization with appropriate standing may be able to challenge a government action in court. A generalized disagreement with the policy normally isn't enough; there needs to be a legally recognized basis for the lawsuit.

Maine Contacts

- Maine Legislature: <https://legislature.maine.gov/>
- Find Your Maine State Representative:
<https://www.legislature.maine.gov/house/house/MemberProfiles/ContactYourLegislator>
- Find Your Maine State Senator:
<https://www.legislature.maine.gov/senate-home-page/find-your-state-senator>
- Maine Attorney General: <https://www.maine.gov/ag/>
- Maine Freedom of Access Act (FOAA): <https://www.maine.gov/foaa/>
- DOJ Civil Rights Division: <https://civilrights.justice.gov/>
- DOJ Civil Rights Complaint Portal: <https://civilrights.justice.gov/report/>
- U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Maine: <https://www.justice.gov/usao-me>

- FBI Tips: <https://tips.fbi.gov/>
- Maine Governor: <https://www.maine.gov/governor/mills/>

Maine Chinese-Linked Organized Crime / Illegal Marijuana Concerns

We are not dealing with “Mother Mary” out in her vegetable garden; we are dealing with organized criminals, foreign mafia, gangs and cartels who are very territorial and who may pose a risk of warfare-level harms against our local and historic communities. Furthermore, harmful pesticides were found in many of the products these organized criminals were selling. Pesticides that, when inhaled, are fatal. Any action against our law enforcement to keep them from protecting and safeguarding the public must be challenged like any other form of *war* against the USA and our military.

These actions are not being taken for no reason. We are in the middle of mass crimefare, fraud, trafficking, and territorial wars. These decisions are not up to radical foreign activists, and far from it. Modern warfarists remain committed to smuggling, trafficking, and supporting gang and cartel territorial warfare against the American people. We don’t need territorial war; we need safety, peace, and stability restored once again to the American people, so that they can go about their days normally, pledge allegiance, and honor America as they once did before they were viciously attacked, blameshifted and labelled as their **assailants** are by modern fourth-generation warfarists.

Request for Review of Campaigns and Policies Affecting ICE Operations in Maine

Dear Representative/Senator,

I am writing to ask for legislative review of the current “ICE-out” campaigns, policies, and efforts in Maine that seek to limit cooperation between Maine law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. We are not dealing with isolated or insignificant public-safety issues; Maine has documented investigations involving organized criminal networks, illegal marijuana operations, drug trafficking, and transnational criminal connections. The U.S. Attorney’s Office has specifically stated that alleged organized criminal enterprises with ties to China have been involved in illicit marijuana operations in Maine and that these investigations require strong federal, state, and local cooperation. I am concerned that any effort to prevent law enforcement from working together could make it more difficult to address trafficking, organized crime, dangerous criminal activity, and threats to our communities and law-enforcement personnel.

I am particularly concerned about campaigns or policies that could create barriers to federal officers carrying out their federally authorized duties. Maine’s LD 1971 was enacted on January 11, 2026, and places restrictions on certain state and local assistance with federal

immigration enforcement, although the law expressly preserves some cooperation involving criminal investigations, joint task forces, terrorism, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and other criminal-law matters. I believe these distinctions need to be clearly understood and carefully reviewed. Any action that interferes with lawful law-enforcement operations, reduces officer safety, or prevents agencies from communicating and coordinating when serious criminal activity is involved should receive serious legislative attention.

I am asking you to support public safety, lawful cooperation between law-enforcement agencies, and the ability of federal, state, county, and municipal officers to protect Maine communities without unnecessary political interference. We do not need territorial conflict, trafficking, organized crime, or instability; we need safety, peace, and stability restored so that Maine residents can go about their daily lives normally and feel protected in their own communities. Please consider whether LD 1971 or related policies should be reviewed, amended, or repealed where they unnecessarily restrict legitimate law-enforcement cooperation, and please let me know what legislative actions, hearings, records, or other processes are available to Maine residents who want these concerns formally considered.

Thank you.