IS THIS A POLICE CRIME FAMILY?

Editorial inquiry | Allegations and theories are not findings of misconduct.

1. I have reviewed public records and materials from the Glendale Police Foundation, IRS filings, and relevant news archives, including the SOLID (Saving Our Law Enforcement Family) donation report (see BPC_11-0015.pdf) and the Los Angeles Times article from January 14, 1997, titled “Solidarity for a Struggling Cop” by Molly Selvin.

2. Officer Jim Antenucci, the central figure in the SOLID donation drive, was publicly reported in the Los Angeles Times as being under severe personal financial distress in 1997. At that time, a direct donation drive was launched under his name while he was an active-duty officer.

3. The donation list reveals highly suspicious numerical patterns. Contributions are logged in clean, round-numbered denominations (e.g., $50, $100, $200, $500) with no natural variation. This creates the strong appearance that amounts were either:

    - retroactively adjusted to match backfilled donation entries, or
    - fabricated to simulate donor support.

4. In a possible conflict of interest, Jim Antenucci is listed as the primary contact and recipient for SOLID-related communications—raising red flags for improper personal receipt of public-sympathy funds.

5. As of recent years, a Glendale Police officer named Jeffrey Antenucci (suspected to be the same person or closely related) has received multiple awards for “proactive arrests” from the Glendale Police Foundation. These awards appear to be issued by a foundation that shares the same address as the Glendale Police Department (131 N. Isabel St., Glendale, CA), and may operate in a gray area of nonprofit/state crossover, violating:

    - California Government Code § 8314 (unlawful use of public resources),
    - IRS rules on nonprofit abuse and self-dealing (26 U.S.C. § 4941),
    - California Fair Political Practices rules on gifts, conflicts, and campaign laundering.

IS THIS A POLICE CRIME FAMILY?

6. Phone calls made to the Glendale Police Foundation yield highly suspicious behavior:

   - The line was answered with what sounded like an answering service or routing contractor, despite claiming to be “not an answering service.”
   - A beep in the background indicated potential recording of the caller’s voice.
   - The person answering could not verify the foundation’s establishment date or oversight.

7. The foundation’s website and press materials appear manufactured or unusually minimalistic—raising further concerns of misrepresentation or a “front” status to mask private or political interests.

8. The source report raises questions about awards, police associations and possible conflicts of interest. No kinship, improper influence, or misconduct by any family member is established by the accompanying source records.

9. A 1997 Los Angeles Times article (“Donors to Officer’s Family Range From Children to Corporations”) further documented that Jim Antenucci’s family received unusually structured donations shortly after his publicized hardship. Donation figures such as $1,000.00 or $5,000.00 were repeated in ways that seem non-organic. This raises questions of either coordinated back-numbering or donation laundering, especially as Jim’s public status and awards accelerated.

10. The implications are compounded by the pattern of recognition. Jim Antenucci was quickly elevated in profile. His family—potentially including Officer Jeffrey Antenucci—benefited from this social uplift. Over time, Jeffrey (if related) was granted awards by the same foundation that
ing as the police department.

11. Based on surname rarity, department placement, generational age separation, and the repetition of Antenucci in courtroom staff conversations (e.g., “one of three names that always comes up in problem cases”), there is reasonable cause to suspect a familial tie.

12. The potential connection between Jim and Jeffrey Antenucci (e.g., father and son) becomes materially relevant in light of my own allegations of unlawful arrest, sexual assault during detainment, and malicious legal targeting by a Glendale officer with the surname Antenucci.

13. If family relationships are shielding misconduct, or if financial donations are being channeled through law enforcement nonprofits to reinforce family or political influence, it would constitute a breach of multiple ethical and legal standards, potentially implicating:

    - Conflict of interest statutes,
    - IRS nonprofit compliance rules,
    - 18 U.S.C. § 1341 (fraud),
    - 18 U.S.C. § 241 (conspiracy against rights), and
    - RICO predicate elements under 18 U.S.C. § 1962.

14. Further, if nonprofit donations (especially SOLID donations or Foundation-based awards) were used to cover, obscure, or incentivize problematic conduct by certain officers, there may be federal jurisdiction under whistleblower statutes and federal contracting prohibitions.

15. Based on all of the above, I respectfully request that this declaration be treated as part of a larger pattern submission already in progress, and that appropriate authorities review the familial, nonprofit, financial, and misconduct issues raised herein for audit and investigation.