



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Alexandra Shepard
Inspector General

INVESTIGATION REPORT

TO: File, IG # 26-99384

SUBJECT: Investigation Into Official Misconduct by William Palmer,
President, San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board

DATE: September 11, 2026

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMARY OF PREDICATION

The Inspector General is mandated by the San Francisco Charter to conduct investigations regarding potential violations of laws or policies involving fraud, waste, or abuse.¹

The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) initiated this investigation upon request of Supervisor Stephen Sherrill of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to evaluate whether William Palmer (Palmer), President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, committed official misconduct, including by using the prestige of his office for private gain during a law enforcement encounter on December 9, 2025. During the investigation the OIG also independently developed information that Palmer may also have committed other instances of official misconduct during and following a second law enforcement encounter in July 2026.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

On December 9, 2025, San Francisco Sheriff's deputies conducted a traffic stop on Palmer's car because his registration was expired. Palmer immediately identified himself as "President William Monroe Palmer," and said that he was the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. During the traffic stop, Palmer repeated that he was President of the Oversight

¹ San Francisco Charter Section 3.105(j).

Board at least six times, implied that he had a relationship with the Sheriff, demanded to know why he was in handcuffs given that he was the President of the Oversight Board, threatened to retaliate against the deputies for the traffic stop, and then attempted to enlist a high-level San Francisco Department of Police Accountability employee to contact both the Sheriff and the deputies' supervisors. He repeatedly stated that he was investigating the Sheriff's Department and suggested that the traffic stop was in retaliation for his investigation.

On July 7, 2026, Palmer was detained by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) during an investigation involving a missing, at-risk adult, Jane Doe, who was believed to be with Palmer. Palmer identified himself to officers as the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Oversight Board and told officers they could verify his identity by looking on the Oversight Board website. He again mentioned his position on the Oversight Board at least six times during the encounter and also stated multiple times that he worked at City Hall and had taken an oath. He repeatedly requested that his handcuffs be removed as a professional courtesy due to his position on the Oversight Board.

A few hours after the encounter ended, Palmer emailed the Chief of Staff of the San Francisco District Attorney's Office from his city email. Palmer wrote that he was seeking "professional guidance" about the day's events, describing himself as Jane Doe's life coach. He signed the email as "President, Sheriff's Department Oversight Board."

Palmer did not tell any of the SFPD officers earlier in the day that he was Jane Doe's life coach.

Late that night, Palmer called a secure ward at Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center (ZSFG), told a nurse that he was President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, and insisted that he be allowed to speak to Jane Doe because he was conducting an investigation and needed to take her statement.

The next day, on July 8, Palmer went to the secure ward at ZSFG and spoke to a manager. He identified himself as the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Oversight Board and gave the manager his Oversight Board business card. He told the manager that he was Jane Doe's life coach and insisted that staff should let him into the ward, which was not open to the public, because he needed to be with her if she was in crisis.

On or about August 21, Palmer told the *San Francisco Chronicle* that he was acting in his official capacity as President of the Oversight Board when requested access to Jane Doe in the secure ward at ZSFG on July 8, suggesting that he was conducting an official investigation and wanted to observe sheriff's deputies at the hospital on behalf of the Oversight Board.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The OIG investigation substantiated that Palmer committed multiple instances of official misconduct by:

1. Using his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit and using the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage during a Sheriff's Department traffic stop on December 9, 2025 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.207(a)(1) and 3.218(a)(4));
2. Using his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit and using the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage during a San Francisco Police Department investigation on July 7, 2026 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.207(a)(1) and 3.218(a)(4));
3. Using the prestige of his office and city resources for private gain or advantage and using his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit when he communicated with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office on July 7, 2026 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.218(a)(3), 3.218(a)(4), and 3.207(a)(1));
4. Acting as an unauthorized city representative, using the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage, and using his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit when he communicated with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Staff on July 7, 2026 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.218(a)(6), 3.218(a)(4), and 3.207(a)(1));
5. Using his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit and using the prestige of his office and city resources for private gain or advantage when he communicated with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Staff on July 8, 2026 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.207(a)(1), 3.218(a)(4), and 3.218(a)(3)); and
6. Acting as an unauthorized city representative when communicating with the *San Francisco Chronicle* on or about August 21, 2026 (in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(6)).

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

PREDICATION

On June 22, 2026, San Francisco Supervisor Stephen Sherrill requested that the Inspector General investigate whether William Palmer (Palmer), President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, engaged in conduct that may constitute official misconduct under Section 15.105 of the San Francisco Charter. He referred to reporting by the *San Francisco Chronicle* and other publications which included "allegations that he misused his official position for personal benefit and that he obtained city benefits for which he was not qualified."²

² [Sherrill Email 06222026 Redacted.pdf](#)

The OIG reviewed publicly available news articles and identified three areas of potential investigation for official misconduct:

1. Palmer's conduct during a traffic stop by the San Francisco Sheriff's Department on December 9, 2025;
2. Multiple allegations of violence by Palmer against women; and
3. Whether Palmer improperly secured the waiver of thousands of dollars in fines for traffic and parking infractions.

The OIG found sufficient predication to investigate the first allegation, Palmer's conduct during a Sheriff's Department traffic stop. The OIG declined to investigate the second set of allegations, despite the seriousness of the allegations, because 1) Palmer was not convicted of any of these crimes; and 2) the OIG is concerned that any such investigation and subsequent misconduct proceeding would interfere with potential ongoing criminal investigations, including by subjecting potential victims to questioning by Palmer in an Ethics Commission proceeding. The OIG declined to pursue the third set of allegations because the waiver application form did not require Palmer to make any affirmative representations.

During the investigation, the OIG learned that Palmer had also repeatedly invoked his title and position on the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board during an investigation by SFPD on July 7, 2026.

INVESTIGATIVE PROCESS

The OIG relied on the following to prepare this report:³

- Palmer's city emails (william.palmerii@sfgov.org)
- San Francisco Sheriff's Department body-worn camera (BWC) footage (December 9, 2025)
- SFPD BWC footage (July 7, 2026)
- ZSFG security camera footage (July 8, 2026)
- OIG interview of Registered Nurse, ZSFG ("ZSFG Nurse 1")
- SFPD recorded interview of Manager of Psychiatric Services, ZSFG ("ZSFG Manager 1")
- OIG interview of Chief of Staff, Department of Police Accountability
- San Francisco Charter Sections 4.104 (Boards and Commissions – Rules and Regulations) and 4.137 (Sheriff's Department Oversight)
- Michael Barba, *She says an S.F. official gave her drugs and coerced her into sex. He says he's her 'life coach'*, SAN FRANCISCO CHRONICLE (August 21, 2026), <https://www.sfchronicle.com/sf/article/william-palmer-san-francisco-sheriff-22395646.php>

³ The OIG offered Palmer the opportunity to sit for a voluntary interview prior to the submission of this report. Although Palmer responded to the OIG's emails, he has not agreed to be interviewed.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

William Palmer has been a member of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board since its beginning in 2022. Palmer's current four-year term as a member of the Oversight Board ends on March 1, 2027.⁴ He is currently serving a one-year term as President of the Oversight Board, which ends in September 2026.

As a member of a city board, Palmer certified to the San Francisco Ethics Commission that he took the city's required annual ethics training every year from 2022 to 2026. He submitted his most recent ethics training certification on May 15, 2026. Palmer also received, by email, Statements of Incompatible Activities which explicitly prohibited city officers such as Palmer from using their city title, business card, or email, or holding themselves out as a city representative without authorization, for any private gain or advantage.

December 9, 2025: San Francisco Sheriff's Department Traffic Stop

On December 9, 2025, San Francisco Sheriff's Department deputies conducted a traffic stop on Palmer because his car's registration was expired.⁵ The traffic stop lasted for approximately 51 minutes. The OIG reviewed Sheriff's Department body-worn camera footage from the stop and observed that Palmer referenced his Sheriff's Department Oversight Board title and position at least six times during the stop and also referenced his relationship with San Francisco Sheriff Paul Miyamoto multiple times.

The first statement Palmer made after a deputy approached his car was, "My name is President William Monroe Palmer and I'm the President of the Sheriff Department Oversight Board, and we just did a tour last night in the County and talked to the Sheriff with all his assistants, so, how may I help you sir?"⁶

Palmer initially refused to provide his driver's license. He then showed the deputy his driver's license but refused to give it to him, saying "I told you what it is, you can go check it, here's my license, William Monroe Palmer [sound redacted], Sheriff, he knows me very well, you can see me every first Friday at City Hall. I'm the President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. What else do you

⁴ See <https://sfgov.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=6234408&GUID=145450F9-5C4B-4905-B889-2682C516289B> (San Francisco Board of Supervisors motion appointing Palmer to term ending March 1, 2027.)

⁵ The registration expired approximately 18 months earlier.

⁶ The OIG determined that the prior afternoon, Palmer was one of approximately 20 people who visited a women's facility at one of the county jails, which are run by the Sheriff's Department. The tour was led by the Sheriff's Department and included representatives from the Department of Police Accountability, the Human Rights Commission, the Office of Transgender Initiatives, the Commission on the Status of Women and Department on the Status of Women, the Mayor's Office for Victims' Rights, the office of Supervisor Connie Chan, and the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. The tour was organized by the Department on the Status of Women and led by the Sheriff's Department and was connected to an investigation by the Department of Police Accountability into recent incidents at the jail. See https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/SHF_Memo_01212026_Updated.pdf.

need to know?" After Palmer repeatedly refused to give his driver's license to the deputy or to step out of his car, deputies ultimately removed Palmer from the car and detained him in handcuffs.⁷

Palmer made the following additional statements during the stop:

- "I'm the Sheriff Department Oversight Board President. I've seen things erased. I seen reports not filed. That's why we're investigating the May incident where you strip searched women with cameras on."
- "I cooperated. Why am I in handcuffs? I'm the President of the Sheriff Department Oversight Board. Why am I in handcuffs? You really think that this isn't going to happen? You really think this is going to be swept under the rug and nothing's going to happen? When I just left the building yesterday in an investigation of deputy abuse? You think nothing's going to happen behind this? That's crazy."
- "I can't wait to talk to Sheriff Miyamoto. You can say you're just doing your job, but it is a coincidence that I've never been pulled over by the Sheriffs until I came back yesterday from a tour of the jail where we're investigating abuse by the deputies."
- "I've been on the board of the Sheriff's Oversight since its conception and that's what, four, five years? I've never been pulled over by sheriffs before. Isn't that a coincidence, that those tags have been expired for over three years, two years, and this is the first time I get pulled over for it?"⁸

Later in the encounter, Palmer left a voicemail for the Chief of Staff of the Department of Police Accountability (DPA).⁹ The voicemail could be clearly heard on the BWC of the deputy who was standing next to him: "I just got pulled over by a bunch of deputies and they're claiming that I didn't provide a driver's license which I showed 'em. It's funny that this came off the day yesterday of touring the jail and so if you can call [unintelligible] supervisors of these people I would really appreciate it." He then provided the names of the deputies. He continued: "They had me in handcuffs. They're towing my car after they see I just got it out of impound that the DMV and SFMTA gave me permission to get it out to get it registered so I'd appreciate it if you'd handle that for me." When the DPA employee called him back, Palmer spoke to him on speakerphone and also held the phone up so that deputies could hear. He told the DPA employee, "I want the Sheriff to know about this," and provided the DPA employee with the names of all the deputies who were present.

⁷ Palmer was ultimately cited for the expired registration and failure to provide his license and proof of insurance, and his car was towed.

⁸ Palmer had recently received two SFMTA citations, in September 2025 and November 2025, for parking his car with an expired registration on the street near his home. The November 2025 citation resulted in his car being towed.

⁹ The DPA has a memorandum of understanding with the Sheriff's Department to conduct investigations into potential Sheriff's Department misconduct. https://media.api.sf.gov/documents/DPA_Sheriff_MOU_-_05.02.2019_Old_Final_Signed.pdf.

July 7, 2026: San Francisco Police Department Investigation of Missing Person

On July 7, 2026, Palmer was detained by SFPD officers who were looking for a missing, at-risk adult, Jane Doe. Jane Doe was reported to be with Palmer. Officers then located Jane Doe with Palmer in the Tenderloin and detained Palmer for investigation.

The OIG reviewed the SFPD body-worn camera footage from the incident. Palmer was detained for approximately 37 minutes, and during those 37 minutes told police officers that he was President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board at least six times.

Three of those instances took place within the first two minutes of the encounter. After asking why he was being detained and handcuffed, Palmer told officers, "I am the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. I work in City Hall." When an officer asked for his identification, he refused and said, "My name is William Palmer. I just told you. I am the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board." When an officer again asked for identifying information, he repeated: "I just told you who I am. You can look on the website, President William Palmer of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. That's identification."

Palmer made the following additional statements to SFPD officers while he was detained:

- "I am being cordial, I am being respectful. I'm being professional. I took an oath at City Hall just like you probably have as well, right? You took an oath for your job? I took an oath for mine. I know how to be professional. Can you give me some professional courtesies?"
- Palmer repeatedly requested that officers show him "professional courtesies" by removing his handcuffs once they "identify me, that I work for the City, and all of those things."
- Palmer said to another officer, "excuse me ma'am you've got my ID right. And I'm the President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. Is there a reason I have to be in handcuffs? I'm not a flight risk, I'm not a danger to anyone, I took a oath, I took a oath to uphold..."
- Palmer offered to "help" with Jane Doe and officers declined, wanting to keep Palmer and Jane Doe separated. Palmer told them, "I understand that. As a professional, as a professional, I work in City Hall, I took an oath, I took an oath, and you can respect my oath for being the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Oversight Board."
- Palmer repeatedly threatened to sue the police officers, implying that the officers could lose their qualified immunity and be sued in their personal capacity.¹⁰

After Palmer demanded to see a supervisor, a sergeant came to the scene. Palmer immediately identified himself: "My name is William Palmer. I am the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. I did not attempt to run, I did not attempt to fight." He told the sergeant, "I've been sitting here for a very long time and I was asking these officers for some professional courtesies to loosen up the handcuffs. Why am I in handcuffs? I'm not going to run. I've taken an oath to the City and County of San Francisco, the City of San Francisco, to obey the laws

¹⁰ Qualified immunity is a form of immunity from certain kinds of lawsuits for government officials, including police officers.

and I'm asking for professional courtesy. Why am I in handcuffs?" He repeated twice more that he had taken an oath and said, "I'm a part of City Hall."

Palmer also insisted that he was represented by the Deputy City Attorney for the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board: "I have representation. I have representation at the Board. I have a City Attorney that can come down here right now and speak for me, and you're not allowing me to call my City Attorney, that represents me?"

For several minutes while he was still detained and handcuffed, Palmer questioned two of the police officers as if he was investigating in his official capacity. He repeatedly asked for details about one of the officer's training and experience, and at one point asked the officer, "Are you serious? Are you lying to me?" He implied that the officer would be in legal and professional trouble for lying to him: "Because if this goes to court this is like you've been under oath, bro. Like you should tell the truth. And if you're saying you forgot when you graduated the academy or how long you've been on the force that's going to look very bad on your official record, like you can't remember those things?" Palmer then asked the officer if his training officer, who was standing next to him, had lied to Palmer.

Officers ultimately released Palmer, who then stood across the street and watched Jane Doe. Officers noticed that Palmer was gesturing for Jane Doe to leave with him, asked him to stop, and then moved Jane Doe further away from him. Officers ultimately placed Jane Doe on a mental health hold and transported her to ZSFG.

Approximately three hours later, Palmer used his city email to contact the Chief of Staff for the San Francisco District Attorney's Office. The District Attorney's Office would likely be responsible for any criminal prosecution that might arise out of the investigation for which Palmer was detained earlier in the day.

The title of the email was "Professional Guidance." Palmer stated that he was "reaching out for professional guidance regarding a deeply concerning incident involving a young woman I have been supporting through trauma-informed mentorship and life coaching." He wrote that for the past week he had been assisting Jane Doe, "who was experiencing instability, street vulnerability, stripping, and abusive relationships." He shared his version of the day's events, including claiming that when he was confronted by somebody prior to being detained by the police, he had "calmly identified [himself] as her life coach and explained that observation, emotional safety, and trust-building were important parts of the support" he provided. He stated, "I would appreciate your professional guidance on how to proceed, especially where trauma-informed intervention, false trafficking allegations, police response, and the rights of vulnerable adult women intersect." He signed the email, "William Palmer, President of SF Sheriff's Department Oversight Board."

The OIG has reviewed the SFPD BWC from the incident earlier that day. At no point during his interactions with SFPD did Palmer tell any of the officers that he was Jane Doe's life coach.

After he sent the email, Palmer made two attempts to try to speak with Jane Doe, who was in a secure, non-public ward at ZSFG.

Sometime between 9:30 and 10:15 that night, Palmer called ZSFG and spoke with ZSFG Nurse 1 in the secure ward. He identified himself as the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Oversight Board. He stated that he was conducting an investigation and needed to obtain a statement from Jane Doe. He insisted that he needed to speak with Jane Doe, and instructed ZSFG Nurse 1 to write down Palmer's telephone number, give the number to Jane Doe, and have Jane Doe call him. Before the call ended, Palmer referenced his title again.

The OIG interviewed ZSFG Nurse 1. He found Palmer's tone concerning and questioned why someone from city government would contact the hospital unit that late, rather than during normal business hours. He thought the call was suspicious and told SFPD detectives about it when they came to the hospital not long after the call.

The OIG also reviewed Palmer's city email and found no evidence that Palmer was conducting an investigation related to this personal matter.

Palmer also does not have the authority to investigate. San Francisco Charter Section 4.137, which outlines the powers and duties of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, does not give the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board the power to conduct investigations. At most, the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board has the power to "[c]onduct community outreach and receive community input regarding SFSD [San Francisco Sheriff Department] operations and jail conditions, by holding public meetings and soliciting input from persons incarcerated in the City and County."¹¹ The Charter also prohibits individual board members like Palmer from acting on their own without authorization from a quorum of the board in a public meeting.

The next day, on July 8, Palmer went in person to ZSFG. The OIG reviewed security camera footage from the hospital. A camera in the secure ward captured Palmer as he appeared at the reception window in the ward, which is open by appointment only. For approximately five minutes, as he waited, he leaned against the reception window so that he was facing the windows in the ward doors and periodically tried to look through the windows. ZSFG Manager 1 then came to the window and spoke with Palmer.

SFPD interviewed ZSFG Manager 1, who said that Palmer told her he wanted to see Jane Doe. He provided his business card, which identified him as the President of the San Francisco Sheriff's Oversight Board. He told ZSFG Manager 1 that he was Jane Doe's life coach, and that staff should let him in to see Jane Doe because she needed a life coach if she was in crisis. ZSFG Manager 1 would not tell Palmer whether Jane Doe was a patient in the ward, nor would ZSFG Manager 1 allow Palmer into the ward.

¹¹ San Francisco Charter Section 4.137(b)(4). Under the charter, investigations into potential Sheriff's Department misconduct are supposed to be conducted by the Office of the Sheriff's Inspector General. However, because the Inspector General position is currently vacant, any such investigations are conducted by the Department of Police Accountability pursuant to the MOU discussed earlier in this report.

On or about August 21, 2026: Statement to the *San Francisco Chronicle*

On August 21, 2026, the *San Francisco Chronicle* published an article regarding the events of July 7 and 8. In the article, Palmer is reported to have said that he went to the hospital and requested to see Jane Doe in his official capacity as Sheriff's Department Oversight Board President, was turned away, and left his business card. Palmer is quoted in the article as saying, "They said I couldn't come in under my professional title as president of the board that can observe the sheriffs that were in there in the process of doing some things that maybe I should have been able to see."

APPLICABLE LAW

San Francisco Charter Section 15.105(b) provides that the Board of Supervisors may suspend and remove a member of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board for official misconduct."

San Francisco Charter Section 15.105(e) defines "official misconduct" as "any wrongful behavior by a public officer in relation to the duties of his or her office, willful in its character, including any failure, refusal or neglect of an officer to perform any duty enjoined on him or her by law, or conduct that falls below the standard of decency, good faith and right action impliedly required of all public officers and including any violation of a specific conflict of interest or governmental ethics law."

San Francisco Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1) prohibits City elective officers and members of boards and commissions from using "his or her public position or office to seek or obtain anything of value for the private or professional benefit of himself or herself, his or her immediate family, or for an organization with which he or she is associated."

San Francisco Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(3), *Use of City Resources*, prohibits City officers and employees from engaging in "the use, other than minimal or incidental use, of the time, facilities, equipment, or supplies of the City for private gain or advantage."

San Francisco Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(4), *Use of Prestige of Office*, prohibits City officers and employees from engaging in "the use of any market (including without limitation a badge, uniform, or business card), prestige, or influence of the city officer or employee's position for private gain or advantage."

San Francisco Campaign & Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(6), *Acting as an Unauthorized City Representative*, prohibits city officers and employees from "hold[ing] themselves out as a representative of their departments, or as an agent acting on behalf of their departments, unless authorized to do so, including the use of City letterhead, title, e-mail, business card, or any other resource for any communication that may lead the recipient of the communication to think that the officer or employee is acting in an official capacity when the officer or employee is not."

FINDINGS:

Finding #1: Palmer Used His Public Position to Seek Something of Value for His Private Benefit and Used the Prestige of His Office for Private Gain or Advantage During a Sheriff's Department Traffic Stop on December 9, 2025

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Used his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit when he repeatedly cited his title and position on the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board and implied that there would be professional consequences for San Francisco Sheriff's deputies, in an attempt to improperly influence and intimidate deputies during the traffic stop in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1).
- Used the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage when he referred repeatedly to his title and position at the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board and implied that there would be professional consequences for San Francisco Sheriff's deputies, in an attempt to improperly influence and intimidate deputies during the traffic stop in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(4).

Finding #2: Palmer Used His Public Position to Seek Something of Value for His Private Benefit and Used the Prestige of His Office for Private Gain or Advantage During an SFPD Investigation on July 7, 2026

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Used his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit when he referred repeatedly to his title, his association with City Hall, and the oath he took for the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, and implied that there would be legal, professional, and personal consequences for the police officers for detaining him, in an attempt to improperly influence and intimidate officers who were investigating him, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1).
- Used the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage when he referred repeatedly to his title, his association with City Hall, and the oath he took for the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board, and implied that there would be legal, professional, and personal consequences for the police officers for detaining him, in an attempt to improperly influence and intimidate officers who were investigating him, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(4).

Finding #3: Palmer Used the Prestige of His Office and City Resources for Private Gain or Advantage and Used His Public Position to Seek Something of Value for His Private Benefit When He Communicated with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office on July 7, 2026

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Used the prestige of his office and City resources for private gain or advantage when he used his city email and his title to request "professional guidance" from the San Francisco District Attorney's Office in a purely personal matter, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Sections 3.218(a)(3) and (a)(4).
- Used his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit, when he used his city email and title to communicate with the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, seeking "professional guidance" from the District Attorney's Office in a purely personal matter, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1).

Palmer's email requesting "professional guidance" from the Chief of Staff of the District Attorney's Office had no legitimate purpose. Instead, it appeared to be an attempt to reframe the narrative of the day's events and to influence the District Attorney's Office's perception of Palmer and his culpability in an SFPD investigation.

Finding #4: Palmer Acted as an Unauthorized City Representative, Used the Prestige of His Office for Private Gain or Advantage, and Used His Public Position to Seek Something of Value for His Private Benefit When He Communicated with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Staff on July 7, 2026

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Acted as an unauthorized city representative when he spoke to ZSFG Nurse 1, identified himself by his title, and claimed that he was conducting an investigation and needed to take a statement from Jane Doe, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(6).
- Used the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage when he called ZSFG Nurse 1, referred to his title, and claimed that he was conducting an investigation and needed to take a statement from Jane Doe, in order to gain access to a potential witness against him in an SFPD investigation, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(4).
- Used his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit, when he called ZSFG Nurse 1, referred to his title, and claimed that he was conducting an investigation and needed to take a statement from Jane Doe, in order to gain access to a potential witness against him in an SFPD investigation, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1).

There is no evidence that any such investigation existed, nor does Palmer have the authority to conduct any such investigation, nor would it be appropriate for Palmer to investigate a personal matter in which he was involved. A reasonable conclusion is that Palmer was instead using his position on the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board to attempt to interfere with SFPD's investigation into Palmer's conduct with Jane Doe.

Finding #5: Palmer Used His Public Position to Seek Something of Value for His Private Benefit and Used the Prestige of His Office and City Resources for Private Gain or Advantage When He Communicated with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital Staff on July 8, 2026

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Used his public position to seek something of value for his private benefit when he advised ZSFG Manager 1 that he was President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board and provided his business card to try to gain access to Jane Doe, a patient in a secure ward and a potential witness against him in an SFPD investigation, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.207(a)(1).
- Used the prestige of his office for private gain or advantage when he advised ZSFG Manager 1 that he was President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board and provided his business card to try to gain access to Jane Doe, a patient in a secure ward and a potential witness against him in an SFPD investigation, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(4).
- Used City resources for private gain or advantage when he used his City business card to attempt to gain access to Jane Doe, a patient in a secure ward of ZSFG and a potential witness against him in an SFPD investigation, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(3).

During his interaction with ZSFG Manager 1, Palmer said both that he was President of the Oversight Board and that he was Jane Doe's life coach. While both statements may be true, there was no reason for him to share his title with hospital staff other than to use his position's authority to bolster his request for access to Jane Doe in the secure ward. As previously noted, it is reasonable to conclude instead that Palmer cited his title as part of an attempt to interfere with the SFPD's investigation into his own conduct with Jane Doe.

Finding #6: Palmer Acted as an Unauthorized City Representative When Communicating with the *San Francisco Chronicle* On or About August 21, 2026

The OIG concludes that Palmer:

- Acted as an unauthorized city representative when he told the *San Francisco Chronicle* that he went to the ZSFG ward in his capacity as President of the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board to investigate the Sheriff's Department, in violation of San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.218(a)(6).

Palmer's statement that he went to the ward in his official capacity to "observe the sheriffs that were in there in the process of doing some things that maybe I should have been able to see" is not credible. Palmer clearly stated his real intent to ZSFG Manager 1: he wanted to talk to Jane Doe. Although the San Francisco Sheriff's Department "provides law enforcement patrol and security services" at ZSFG, the Sheriff's Department was not part of the criminal investigation conducted by San Francisco Police Department into Palmer's conduct on July 7. There is no indication that Jane Doe had any connection to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, other than her presence in a hospital which happened to be guarded by the Sheriff's Department.

In addition, Palmer did not have the authority to act on his own to come to ZSFG and observe sheriffs in a secure ward. The San Francisco Charter prohibits individual board members like Palmer from acting on their own without authorization from a quorum of the board in a public meeting.

Instead, as previously noted, it is reasonable to conclude that Palmer tried to use his position on the Sheriff's Department Oversight Board to attempt to interfere with the SFPD's investigation into his own conduct with Jane Doe.

Additional Finding: Palmer's Conduct was Willful

The OIG's understanding is that violations of these city ethics laws constitute official misconduct. Even if they do not, Palmer's conduct was willful.

Palmer certified annually that he received ethics training as a member of the Oversight Board, and he also received copies of the DPA and Oversight Board Statements of Incompatible Activities which explicitly prohibited him from using his title or city resources, or acting as an unauthorized city representative, for personal gain.

Despite this training, Palmer intentionally identified himself as President of the Sheriff's Oversight Board in all the personal encounters discussed in this report.

In the December 2025 encounter with Sheriff's deputies, Palmer was told that he stopped because his car registration was expired, a fact which Palmer admitted during the encounter. Nevertheless, Palmer repeatedly mentioned his title, his association with the Sheriff, and the work he was doing on the Sheriff's Oversight Board. He suggested multiple times that the stop was in retaliation for his role in a tour of a county jail the day before, although the record indicates that he was one of approximately 20 people, and that he did not organize or lead the tour. The record suggests instead that he was intentionally citing his status, position, and connections to try to avoid the consequences of the traffic stop.

Palmer's conduct in connection with the July 2026 incidents took place (1) after he was interviewed by the *San Francisco Chronicle* regarding his conduct during the December 2025 traffic stop, and (2) after Supervisor Stephen Sherrill publicly requested the OIG's assistance in determining whether Palmer committed official misconduct during the tstop, by using the prestige of his office for private gain. The letter from Supervisor Sherrill to the Inspector General was provided by email to Palmer and the other members of the Oversight Board on June 23, 2026. Given these facts, as well as his prior

training, Palmer was on notice by the July 2026 incidents that his use of his position and title for personal benefit may constitute official misconduct.

CONCLUSION

Each of the above findings establishes that Palmer violated specific governmental ethics laws and demonstrates conduct by Palmer that falls below the standard of decency, good faith, and right action impliedly required of all public officers.

As such, the OIG concludes that there are facts to support a determination that Palmer committed multiple instances of official misconduct during his interactions with the San Francisco Sheriff's Department on December 9, 2025; with the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco District Attorney's Office, and Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital staff on July 7, 2026; and with Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital staff on July 8, 2026.