

**From:** "Lehman, Stacy" <StacyLehman@fdle.state.fl.us>  
**To:** VolusiaExposed.Com <VolusiaExposed@cfl.rr.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Ofc. Gittner - Volusia Beach Patrol Complaint  
**Date:** Mon, 5 Mar 2012 15:53:51 -0500

Chapter 943.1395 (6)(a), Florida Statutes, states, in part, that the Criminal Justice Standards and Training Commission (Commission) may investigate verifiable complaints. In order to verify the complaint, we require the name and address of the complainant. Volusia Exposed published an FDLE case as an example of an anonymous complaint resulting in an investigation. It should be noted that the anonymous complaint was made to the FDLE Office of Executive Investigations, not the Commission. The Office of Executive Investigations is not under the direction of the Commission, therefore, is not governed by 943.1395(6)(b), and follows their own practices and procedures.

Upon receipt of the name and address of the complainant, we will proceed with a review of the complaint against the Volusia County Beach Patrol.

Thanks,  
Stacy

**From:** VolusiaExposed.Com <VolusiaExposed@cfl.rr.com>  
**To:** "Lehman, Stacy" <StacyLehman@fdle.state.fl.us>  
**Bcc:**  
**Subject:** RE: Ofc. Gittner - Volusia Beach Patrol Complaint  
**Date:** Mon, 05 Mar 2012 22:41:27 -0500

Mr. Lehman:

Interesting comments / position --- we respond as follows:

Since our concerns involve possible criminal violations by the subject LE agency / administration - your office (CJSTC) might seriously consider forwarding our concerns to the FDLE Office of Executive Investigations. We highly suspect that you have a duty to do so.

Second, according to the below media article, your office (the CJSTC) only became aware of the alleged misconduct of Levy County Sheriff Deputy Charles Johnson via an anonymous letter. Records appear to indicate that the CJSTC DID opened an administrative complaint/review regarding the allegations of the anonymous letter. That alleged practice of insisting on the complainant's name and address - was it employed in the Johnson matter? Surely as per F.S. 943.1395(6)(a), CJSTC would have insisted on the complainant's name and address to insure

that there was a **verifiable** complaint.

Maybe VX should make a public record request for the Deputy Johnson case file, to insure that the complainant's name and address were secured (as per alleged CJSTC "practice" and CJSTC understanding of F.S. 943.1395(6)(a)).

<http://cops.htcreative.com/Narrative/Details/237797>

VX

[volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com](mailto:volusiaexposed@cfl.rr.com)