

SECTION 11.17.1: LINKS SUMMARY

CA DOJ RELATED

The exit email was referred to the California Department of Justice. This is the attempt to find out what happened to it — and what the Department's own tracking system says about who else has asked.

2026.09.05 — Email Thread re Public Records Act Request No. 26-2015

The full exchange with the Attorney General's Public Records Act Unit, two messages. The request, served August 25, had two parts: the Department's index of Public Records Act requests submitted by Paige St. John or the *Los Angeles Times*, and records concerning the DOJ's own referral, review, or investigation arising from the November 2021 exit email.

The response of September 2 answered the first part with a single row and then closed. It said nothing about the second.

Off-ramps — jump straight to the record:

- ▶ The Department's response, transmitted by Deputy Attorney General Kayla Dessel — September 2, 1:32 p.m. p. 1
 - ▶ The follow-up of September 5. p. 2
-

2026.09.02 — DOJ Response to PRA 26-2015 (*within the thread above*)

Worth reading on its own terms. The Department located **one** responsive record across the entire period from January 1, 2021 to the present: PRA-2023-02011, filed by Paige St. John on 23 August 2023 and completed thirteen days later. It withheld the request's subject and scope fields as deliberative under Government Code section 7922.000, citing *Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court*. It then wrote: "This concludes DOJ's response to your request."

The referral component — the part asking what the DOJ did with the allegations after they were referred — is not addressed anywhere in it.

2026.09.05 — Cotton to CA DOJ, PRA 26-2015 Follow-Up Letter

Two pages, and deliberately narrow. It does not ask the Department to describe any investigation, and it accepts that investigatory records may be exempt. It asks only for the disposition the statute requires: the subject and scope fields or the express provision under which they are withheld, and a statement whether records responsive to the referral component exist — with the express provision for any that are withheld.

It also offers the Department two ways to close the matter: a written statement that no responsive records exist, or a statement that its September 2 response already disposed of the referral component.

Off-ramps — jump straight to the record:

- ▶ Item 1 — why a request's subject line is the requester's own words, not the Department's analysis of anything. p. 001
- ▶ Item 2 — the referral records, and the two things Government Code sections 7922.540 and 7922.525 require of a denial. p. 002
- ▶ The three things that would fully resolve it — including the option of saying the matter is already closed. p. 002