

Grievance Response Form

Before submitting this form, please make sure to review the [Grievance Policy](#).

Grievance Number

256

Neighborhood Council Responding

Mar Vista

Authorized Representative

Elliot Hanna

Email

mvcc.director.hanna@gmail.com

Grievant responded to

Selena Inouye

Board Member

Yes

Number of Grievances previously filed by this Grievant this calendar year

0

Last three years

0

After receiving a certified Grievance from the Department, a Neighborhood Council must, at its next regular or special meeting, but not more than 60 calendar days from the communication from the Department, take one of the following actions:

Grievance Review by Neighborhood Council

N/A - Grievant is a Board Member

What specific bylaw, rule, regulation, code, policy or directive is relevant to and supports the response to the grievance?

- Article V, Section 8 of the Bylaws of the Mar Vista Community Council, "Censure," dated 7/1/2020
- Division 22, Chapter 28, Section 22.818 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code

What is the nature of the response to the grievance?

This grievance focuses on events that transpired at the September 8, 2020 meeting of the Mar Vista Community Council Board of Directors wherein a censure motion, offered by Ms. Selena Inouye and three other members, was considered. Specifically, Ms. Inouye alleges that The Mar Vista Community Council Board of Directors:

- (a) "did not engage in a good-faith determination" regarding adjudication of the subject censure," and
- (b) "did not place said Board member on notice of misconduct and provide the Board member with an opportunity to correct the misconduct."

Ms. Inouye further alleges that the Mar Vista Community Council violated Article V, Section 8 and Article XIV, Section 1 of its Bylaws in addition to "The Board of Neighborhood Commissioners Neighborhood Council Board Member Code of Conduct Policy."

Article V, Section 8 of the Bylaws is the "Censure" process. Despite Ms. Inouye's allegations to the contrary, the procedures in this section were meticulously followed. Several days before the meeting, I discussed the matter with Messrs. Antelin and Cupen-Ames - both from D.O.N.E. and both of whom were in attendance - where we all agreed as to the process to be followed: The censure motion was agendized as required, proper written notice was given to the member subject to censure, and said member was given a reasonable opportunity to be heard. In addition, Board members had ample opportunity to be heard as did members of the public. The board then voted and the motion was rejected by a vote of

five ayes, eight noes, and one abstention.

Article XIV, Section 1 of the Bylaws is the "Code-of-Conduct" policy. The Code-of-Conduct violations Ms. Inouye is alleging occurred at the July 14, 2020 meeting. As specified in Division 22, Chapter 28, Section 22.818 of the Los Angeles Administrative Code, "[a] Grievance must be filed within 30 days from the date of the event giving rise to the Grievance." This alleged code-of-conduct violation was the subject of the censure motion in the first place. This is simply a clumsy attempt to re-litigate that which was already decided. Regardless, the events surrounding this allegation fall outside that 30-day window and are, therefore, irrelevant.

Finally, with regard to Ms. Inouye's allegation of violations of "The Board of Neighborhood Commissioners Neighborhood Council Board Member Code of Conduct Policy," This policy is incorporated by reference into Article XIV, Section 1 of the Bylaws. For that reason, this allegation is redundant and has no merit for the same reasons stated in the preceding paragraph.

In light of the 30-day window, and the fact that this grievance was filed on October 8, 2020, this grievance can be about one thing and one thing only: the handling of the censure motion at the September 8, 2020 meeting. It is not about the events that transpired at the July 14, 2020 meeting. As the grievant, the burden is on Ms. Inouye to produce evidence to prove that any of the Bylaws, policies, or procedures she cited was violated at that September 8, 2020 meeting. No such evidence was cited and she has clearly failed to meet her burden.

Witness statements have been submitted directly to Mr. Lorenzo Briceno.

What remedy is suggested?

Due to Ms. Inouye's failure to substantiate even one single allegation, this grievance is without merit and must be dismissed.

Supporting Documents

To SUBMIT, please click "Save" on top right corner.