

Board of Ethics
Complaint No. 21-09
Confirmation of Email sent 12-01-2021

Re: Unethical Behavior - Police Commissioner

From: Board Of Ethics
To: malamaponomaui
BC:
Date: Wednesday - December 1, 2021 4:23 PM
Subject: Re: Unethical Behavior - Police Commissioner

Dear Malama Pono Maui.

Thank you for your email, consider this email an confirmation receipt and acknowledgement of your correspondence (with attachment) dated November 30, 2021. Your complaint has been assigned, Complaint No. 21-09, and has been forwarded to the Board of Ethics ("Board") Chair.

This matter will be taken up at the scheduled January 12, 2022 meeting at 12:30 PM, an agenda will be sent to you. You are not required to be present for the discussion/decision. You will be notified of the Board's decision shortly thereafter.

The Board requests the provision of contact information (a name and number).

Thank you,

Board of Ethics Staff.

>>> malamaponomaui <malamaponomaui@protonmail.com> 11/30/21 2:09 PM >>>

To: Maui County Board of Ethics

Maui County Code of Ethics

"Elected and appointed officers and employees shall demonstrate by their example the highest standards of ethical conduct to the end that the public may justifiably have trust and confidence in the integrity of government."

Mark Redeker, Maui Police Commissioner, possibly violated the Maui County Charter, Article 10, Code of Ethics provision regarding "The disclosure of confidential information."

Specifically, disclosing questions for Chief of Police Candidates to John Pelletier during a "secret" meeting in Las Vegas, which allowed Pelletier an unfair advantage and as a result influenced the Unanimous vote for Pelletier as Chief of Police.

This may also be in violation of Hawaii's Sunshine Laws.

Commissioner Redeker volunteered to be part of the four (4) person selection committee (Temporary Investigative Group) which not only selected the final candidates for Chief of Police but also formulated that questions to be asked for selection.

In comparing all the written responses by each of the final candidates, Pelletier submitted twenty-eight (28) pages detailing comprehensive answers to specific questions which far exceeded any of the other candidates.

Pelletier stated in his written response that he is the only candidate that has no history or issues with anyone in the Department, but he states in his first answer that he will break down real and perceived issues and nepotism. How would he know anything about nepotism in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker.

It should be noted that Commissioner Redeker's daughter-in-law works as a police officer for the MPD.

Pelletier stated in his second answer regarding employee concerns or suggestions that he would go to every section, bureau, division, and ask "What is working? Etc." and not done as "Lip Service". As mentioned, Commissioner Redeker's daughter-in-law who is a police officer, has an adversarial relationship with her supervisors and commanders which would validate why Pelletier would mention "Lip Service".

Pelletier stated in his third answer regarding sexual harassment that he would notify the Police Commission of the situation. The question regarding handling of the situation involving sexual harassment is inept because the Department and County already have established procedures in place to handle this situation. The notification of the Commission is not required, however, Commission Redeker has stated in the past that the Department keeps them in the dark on things.

It should be noted that Commission Redeker has served on the Commission in the past and that he has an **adversarial relationship with all three current MPD candidates (RAMOS, JAKUBCZAK, and FERREIRA) including former Chief Tivoli Faumu.** Commissioner Redeker was the only one who voted to terminate Chief Faumu after he had retired. The vote was 8-1.

Pelletier stated in his fourth answer regarding his top priorities that he would build trust and transparency internally. Again, how would he know anything about trust and transparency in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker. For Pelletier to state this without any inside information would contradict his statements in his other answers that MPD is good. As Pelletier states more than once, he will make MPD go from "good to Great!"

There are many more examples in Pelletier's written test answers to further confirm that he was given inside information. All you need to do is review and compare his response to the rest of the candidates as they all were supposed to have had the same amount of notice (time) to formulate and write down their answers. Copies of the candidate's written answers can be found online at civil beat.

In the Rules of the Maui County Board of Ethics, Subchapter 6 Complaints, subsection 04-101-62 Complaint initiated by the board. (a) Upon receipt of information not under oath, or obtained at the initiative of the board indication a possible violation of the code of ethics, the board may verify such facts as

Complaint No. 21-09

Submitted via Board of Ethics Email on
11/30/2021

RECEIVED

By Maui Board of Ethics at 11:27 am, Dec 01, 2021

Unethical Behavior - Police Commissioner

From: malamaponomaui <malamaponomaui@protonmail.com>
To: "boardofethics@mauicounty.gov" <boardofethics@mauicounty.gov>
 "mayors.office@co.maui.hi.us" <mayors.office@co.maui.hi.us>, "alice.lee@mauicounty.us" <alice.lee@mauicounty.us>, "keanu.rawlins@mauicounty.us" <keanu.rawlins@mauicounty.us>, "tasha.kama@mauicounty.us" <tasha.kama@mauicounty.us>, "gabe.johnson@mauicounty.us" <gabe.johnson@mauicounty.us>, "kelly.king@mauicounty.us" <kelly.king@mauicounty.us>, "mike.molina@mauicounty.us" <mike.molina@mauicounty.us>, "tamara.paltin@mauicounty.us" <tamara.paltin@mauicounty.us>, "shane.sinenci@mauicounty.us" <shane.sinenci@mauicounty.us>,
CC: "yukilei.sugimura@mauicounty.us" <yukilei.sugimura@mauicounty.us>, "chelseadavis@hawaiinewsnow.com" <chelseadavis@hawaiinewsnow.com>, "dean.rickard@mpd.net" <dean.rickard@mpd.net>, "wade.maeda@mpd.net" <wade.maeda@mpd.net>, "john.jakubczak@mpd.net" <john.jakubczak@mpd.net>, "victor.ramos@mpd.net" <victor.ramos@mpd.net>, "everett.ferreira@mpd.net" <everett.ferreira@mpd.net>, "ricky.uedoi@mpd.net" <ricky.uedoi@mpd.net>, "reid.pursley@mpd.net" <reid.pursley@mpd.net>, "clyde.holokai@mpd.net" <clyde.holokai@mpd.net>, "news@civilbeat.org" <news@civilbeat.org>, "citydesk@mauinews.com" <citydesk@mauinews.com>, "mlutu@shopohawaii.org" <mlutu@shopohawaii.org>
Date: Tuesday - November 30, 2021 2:09 PM
Subject: Unethical Behavior - Police Commissioner
Attachments: TEXT.htm; unethical advantage.pdf; unethical advantage.pdf; Mime.822

To: Maui County Board of Ethics

Maui County Code of Ethics

"Elected and appointed officers and employees shall demonstrate by their example the highest standards of ethical conduct to the end that the public may justifiably have trust and confidence in the integrity of government."

Mark Redeker, Maui Police Commissioner, possibly violated the Maui County Charter, Article 10, Code of Ethics provision regarding;

"The disclosure of confidential information."

Specifically, disclosing questions for Chief of Police Candidates to John Pelletier during a "secret" meeting in Las Vegas, which allowed Pelletier an unfair advantage and as a result influenced the Unanimous vote for Pelletier as Chief of Police.

This may also be in violation of Hawaii's Sunshine Laws.

Commissioner Redeker volunteered to be part of the four (4) person selection committee (Temporary Investigative Group) which not only selected the final candidates for Chief of Police but also formulated that questions to be asked for selection.

In comparing all the written responses by each of the final candidates, Pelletier submitted twenty-eight (28) pages detailing comprehensive answers to specific questions which far exceeded any of the other candidates.

Pelletier stated in his written response that he is the only candidate that has no history or issues with anyone in the Department, but hestates in his first answer that he will break down real and perceived issues and nepotism. How would he know anything about nepotism in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker.

It should be noted that Commissioner Redeker's daughter-in-law works as a police officer for the MPD.

Pelletier stated in his second answer regarding employee concerns or suggestions that he would go to every section, bureau, division, and ask "What is working? Etc." and not done as "Lip Service". As mentioned, Commissioner Redeker's daughter-in-law who is a police officer, has an adversarial relationship with her supervisors and commanders which would validate why Pelletier would mention "Lip Service".

Pelletier stated in his third answer regarding sexual harassment that he would notify the Police Commission of the situation. The question regarding handling of the situation involving sexual harassment is inept because the Department and County already have established procedures in place to handle this situation. The notification of the Commission is not required, however, Commission Redeker has stated in the past that the Department keeps them in the dark on things.

It should be noted that Commission Redeker has served on the Commission in the past and that he has an **adversarial relationship with all three current MPD candidates (RAMOS, JAKUBCZAK, and FERREIRA) including former Chief Tivoli Faamu**. Commissioner Redeker was the only one who voted to terminate Chief Faamu after he had retired. The vote was 8-1.

Pelletier stated in his fourth answer regarding his top priorities that he would build trust and transparency internally. Again, how would he know anything about trust and transparency in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker. For Pelletier to state this without any inside information would contradict his statements in his other answers that MPD is good. As Pelletier states more than once, he will make MPD go from "good to Great!"

There are many more examples in Pelletier's written test answers to further confirm that he was given inside information. All you need to do is review and compare his response to the rest of the candidates as they all were supposed to have had the same amount of notice (time) to formulate and write down their answers. Copies of the candidate's written answers can be found online at civil beat.

In the Rules of the Maui County Board of Ethics, Subchapter 6 Complaints, subsection 04-101-62 Complaint initiated by the board (a) Upon receipt of information not under oath, or obtained at the initiative of the board indicating a possible violation of the code of ethics, the board may verify such facts as may be verified through public documents or the assistance of County officers and employees, including the respondent.

During the month of August 2021, after the August 25, 2021 Police Commission meeting, Commissioner Redeker did travel to Las Vegas and did meet with then Las Vegas Metro Police Department Captain John Pelletier which is conduct that is questionable at best not to mention hints of being unethical.

It is very easy to verify that Commission Redeker travelled to Las Vegas during this time frame whether he disclosed this to Commission needs to be investigated.

An investigation needs to be conducted to determine whether this meeting occurred and statements from both Commissioner Redeker and Pelletier to explain why this was not revealed needs to be done separately to avoid any collusion by them.

As you would know, any meeting between a Commissioner and a candidate regardless of its intent is unethical during the selection period especially if the other candidates weren't given the same considerations.

This is a violation of the Maui County Code of Ethics which ultimately affected the outcome of the selection of the Chief of Police.

This kind of egregious act should not be tolerated. Maui County does not deserve a Police Commissioner or Police Chief that have integrity issues. Las Vegas may be known as the 9th Isle as Pelletier states on page two in his written response, however, never forget what its other nickname is "**Sin City!**"

The known corruption that happens in Las Vegas is slowing rearing its ugly head on Maui. The fact that Pelletier selected a retired Assistant Sheriff from their Department (Las Vegas Metro PD) claiming that the qualifications that "Pelletier" was requiring for his Deputy Chief which included experience in aerial (air support) and detention (prison) command is evidence of further corruption and unethical behavior. By asserting that those qualifications were necessary, Pelletier immediately excluded any local MPD candidates. This paved the way for Pelletier (the hiring authority) to have the HRS resident requirement waived. This is not coincidental. This is another example of unethical behavior. Not being familiar with local government procedures, Pelletier again must have had inside information regarding the waiving of the HRS resident requirement, abusing the system.

Kauai PD Chief Todd Raybuck did the same in selecting his Deputy Chief of Police when he appointed, retired Las Vegas Metro Assistant Patrol Bureau Commander, Stan Olsen, on August 16, 2020.

Pelletier's selectee, Charles Hank aka "Hank the Shank" as he was known by many who feared him in LVMPD, also has a questionable history of domestic abuse and failed marriages. A quick google search of his name produces nothing negative which gives credence to the rumors that surfaced in Las Vegas that Hank paid a service like [accountskiller.com](https://www.accountskiller.com) to "purge" his on-line fingerprint.

As Pelletier has stated in interviews and written statements that he wants to make things "Pono", an obvious pun making fun of our Culture. The Maui Police Commission will never admit that they were duped by one of their own and because if this they will not change their decision even though they have authority to do so.

This is a plea to the Board of Ethics to uphold your responsibility and to fully investigate this travesty and restore the Public Trust and Confidence in Government.

There is still time. Pelletier and Hank will be sworn in on Wednesday, December 15, 2021. Please "Do What is Right." PONO!

To: Maui County Board of Ethics

Maui County Code of Ethics

“Elected and appointed officers and employees shall demonstrate by their example the highest standards of ethical conduct to the end that the public may justifiably have trust and confidence in the integrity of government.”

Mark Redeker, Maui Police Commissioner, possibly violated the Maui County Charter, Article 10, Code of Ethics provision regarding;

“The disclosure of confidential information.”

Specifically, disclosing questions for Chief of Police Candidates to John Pelletier during a “secret” meeting in Las Vegas, which allowed Pelletier an unfair advantage and as a result influenced the Unanimous vote for Pelletier as Chief of Police.

This may also be in violation of Hawaii’s Sunshine Laws.

Commissioner Redeker volunteered to be part of the four (4) person selection committee (Temporary Investigative Group) which not only selected the final candidates for Chief of Police but also formulated that questions to be asked for selection.

In comparing all the written responses by each of the final candidates, Pelletier submitted twenty-eight (28) pages detailing comprehensive answers to specific questions which far exceeded any of the other candidates.

Pelletier stated in his written response that he is the only candidate that has no history or issues with anyone in the Department, but he states in his first answer that he will break down real and perceived issues and nepotism. How would he know anything about nepotism in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker.

It should be noted that Commissioner Redeker’s daughter-in-law works as a police officer for the MPD.

Pelletier stated in his second answer regarding employee concerns or suggestions that he would go to every section, bureau, division, and ask “What is working? Etc.” and not done as “Lip Service”. As mentioned, Commissioner Redeker’s daughter-in-law who is a police officer, has an adversarial relationship with her supervisors and commanders which would validate why Pelletier would mention “Lip Service”.

Pelletier stated in his third answer regarding sexual harassment that he would notify the Police Commission of the situation. The question regarding handling of the situation involving sexual harassment is inept because the Department and County already have established procedures in place to handle this situation. The notification of the

Commission is not required, however, Commission Redeker has stated in the past that the Department keeps them in the dark on things.

It should be noted that Commission Redeker has served on the Commission in the past and that he has an **adversarial relationship with all three current MPD candidates (RAMOS, JAKUBCZAK, and FERREIRA) including former Chief Tivoli Faaumu.** Commissioner Redeker was the only one who voted to terminate Chief Faaumu after he had retired. The vote was 8-1.

Pelletier stated in his fourth answer regarding his top priorities that he would build trust and transparency internally. Again, how would he know anything about trust and transparency in MPD unless being told by Commissioner Redeker. For Pelletier to state this without any inside information would contradict his statements in his other answers that MPD is good. As Pelletier states more than once, he will make MPD go from “good to Great!”

There are many more examples in Pelletier’s written test answers to further confirm that he was given inside information. All you need to do is review and compare his response to the rest of the candidates as they all were supposed to have had the same amount of notice (time) to formulate and write down their answers. Copies of the candidate’s written answers can be found online at civil beat.

In the Rules of the Maui County Board of Ethics, Subchapter 6 Complaints, subsection 04-101-62 Complaint initiated by the board (a) Upon receipt of information not under oath, or obtained at the initiative of the board indication a possible violation of the code of ethics, the board may verify such facts as may be verified through public documents or the assistance of County officers and employees, including the respondent.

During the month of August 2021, after the August 25, 2021 Police Commission meeting, Commissioner Redeker did travel to Las Vegas and did meet with then Las Vegas Metro Police Department Captain John Pelletier which is conduct that is questionable at best not to mention hints of being unethical.

It is very easy to verify that Commission Redeker travelled to Las Vegas during this time frame whether he disclosed this to Commission needs to be investigated.

An investigation needs to be conducted to determine whether this meeting occurred and statements from both Commissioner Redeker and Pelletier to explain why this was not revealed needs to be done separately to avoid any collusion by them.

As you would know, any meeting between a Commissioner and a candidate regardless of its intent is unethical during the selection period especially if the other candidates weren’t given the same considerations.

This is a violation of the Maui County Code of Ethics which ultimately affected the outcome of the selection of the Chief of Police.

This kind of egregious act should not be tolerated. Maui County does not deserve a Police Commissioner or Police Chief that have integrity issues. Las Vegas may be known as the 9th Isle as Pelletier states on page two in his written response, however, never forget what its other nickname is **“Sin City!”**

The known corruption that happens in Las Vegas is slowly rearing its ugly head on Maui. The fact that Pelletier selected a retired Assistant Sheriff from their Department (Las Vegas Metro PD) claiming that the qualifications that “Pelletier” was requiring for his Deputy Chief which included experience in aerial (air support) and detention (prison) command is evidence of further corruption and unethical behavior. By asserting that those qualifications were necessary, Pelletier immediately excluded any local MPD candidates. This paved the way for Pelletier (the hiring authority) to have the HRS resident requirement waived. This is not coincidental. This is another example of unethical behavior. Not being familiar with local government procedures, Pelletier again must have had inside information regarding the waiving of the HRS resident requirement, abusing the system.

Kauai PD Chief Todd Raybuck did the same in selecting his Deputy Chief of Police when he appointed, retired Las Vegas Metro Assistant Patrol Bureau Commander, Stan Olsen, on August 16, 2020.

Pelletier’s selectee, Charles Hank aka “Hank the Shank” as he was known by many who feared him in LVMPD, also has a questionable history of domestic abuse and failed marriages. A quick google search of his name produces nothing negative which gives credence to the rumors that surfaced in Las Vegas that Hank paid a service like [accountskiller.com](https://www.accountskiller.com) to “purge” his on-line fingerprint.

As Pelletier has stated in interviews and written statements that he wants to make things “Pono”, an obvious pun making fun of our Culture. The Maui Police Commission will never admit that they were duped by one of their own and because if this they will not change their decision even though they have authority to do so.

This is a plea to the Board of Ethics to uphold your responsibility and to fully investigate this travesty and restore the Public Trust and Confidence in Government.

There is still time. Pelletier and Hank will be sworn in on Wednesday, December 15, 2021. Please “Do What is Right.”..... PONO!

cc: Mayor’s Office, Maui Police Commission, Maui County Council, Maui Police Department Chiefs Office, Maui Police Department Internal Affairs, SHOPO, Maui News, Hawaii News Now

may be verified through public documents or the assistance of County officers and employees, including the respondent.

During the month of August 2021, after the August 25, 2021 Police Commission meeting, Commissioner Redeker did travel to Las Vegas and did meet with then Las Vegas Metro Police Department Captain John Pelletier which is conduct that is questionable at best not to mention hints of being unethical.

It is very easy to verify that Commission Redeker travelled to Las Vegas during this time frame whether he disclosed this to Commission needs to be investigated.

An investigation needs to be conducted to determine whether this meeting occurred and statements from both Commissioner Redeker and Pelletier to explain why this was not revealed needs to be done separately to avoid any collusion by them.

As you would know, any meeting between a Commissioner and a candidate regardless of its intent is unethical during the selection period especially if the other candidates weren't given the same considerations.

This is a violation of the Maui County Code of Ethics which ultimately affected the outcome of the selection of the Chief of Police.

This kind of egregious act should not be tolerated. Maui County does not deserve a Police Commissioner or Police Chief that have integrity issues. Las Vegas may be known as the 9th Isle as Pelletier states on page two in his written response, however, never forget what its other nickname is "**Sin City!**"

The known corruption that happens in Las Vegas is slowing rearing its ugly head on Maui. The fact that Pelletier selected a retired Assistant Sheriff from their Department (Las Vegas Metro PD) claiming that the qualifications that "Pelletier" was requiring for his Deputy Chief which included experience in aerial (air support) and detention (prison) command is evidence of further corruption and unethical behavior. By asserting that those qualifications were necessary, Pelletier immediately excluded any local MPD candidates. This paved the way for Pelletier (the hiring authority) to have the HRS resident requirement waived. This is not coincidental. This is another example of unethical behavior. Not being familiar with local government procedures, Pelletier again must have had inside information regarding the waiving of the HRS resident requirement, abusing the system.

Kauai PD Chief Todd Raybuck did the same in selecting his Deputy Chief of Police when he appointed, retired Las Vegas Metro Assistant Patrol Bureau Commander, Stan Olsen, on August 16, 2020.

Pelletier's selectee, Charles Hank aka "Hank the Shank" as he was known by many who feared him in LVMPD, also has a questionable history of domestic abuse and failed marriages. A quick google search of his name produces nothing negative which gives credence to the rumors that surfaced in Las Vegas that Hank paid a service like accountskiller.com to "purge" his on-line fingerprint.

As Pelletier has stated in interviews and written statements that he wants to make things "Pono", an obvious pun making fun of our Culture. The Maui Police Commission will never admit that they were duped by one of their own and because if this they will not change their decision even though they have authority to do so.

This is a plea to the Board of Ethics to uphold your responsibility and to fully investigate this travesty and restore the Public Trust and Confidence in Government.

There is still time. Pelletier and Hank will be sworn in on Wednesday, December 15, 2021. Please "Do What is Right."..... PONO!

cc: Mayor's Office, Maui Police Commission, Maui County Council, Maui Police Department Chiefs Office, Maui Police Department Internal Affairs, SHOPO, Maui News, Hawaii News Now