
Office for Civil Rights Discrimination Complaint Form: Submission #740751

1. Enter information about yourself

First Name:

Last Name:

Address:

City:

State:

Zip Code:

Best Time to Call You: Day

Primary Phone Number:

Alternative Phone Number: {Empty}

Your Email Address:

2. Who else can we call if we cannot reach you?

Contact's Name: {Empty}

Daytime Phone Number: {Empty}

Relationship to you: {Empty}

3. Who was discriminated against?

Yourself or Someone else Someone else?

If someone other than yourself please include:

Injured Person's Name: students that wish to remain anonymous

Daytime Phone Number: {Empty}

Evening Phone Number: {Empty}

Relationship to You

(eg. son or daughter) {Empty}

Injured Person's Address: {Empty}

City: {Empty}

State: {Empty}

Zip Code: {Empty}

4. What institution discriminated?

Institution Name: University of California, Los Angeles

Address: 617 Charles E Young Dr

City: Los Angeles

State: California

Zip Code: 90095

School or department involved: Law School, General Campus

5. Have you tried to resolve the complaint through the institution's grievance process, due process hearing, or with another agency?

Have you tried to resolve the complaint? Yes

Agency Name: Multiple venues (see complaint)

Date Filed

(MM/DD/YYYY): (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) - 00:00

If yes, what is the current status of the complaint? See complaint

6. Describe the discrimination

OCR enforces regulations that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin; sex; disability; and/or age.

(You may select more than one.)

On what basis were you discriminated against? race or color, national origin

In the space provided below please describe each discriminatory action separately. For each action, you need to provide the following information: DOE Complaint Incident Narrative

Part I. Incidents at the School of Law

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Incident

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) at around (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); a few UCLA Law students were walking down the main hallway at the law school. The hallways are generally busy at the law school during that time of day as many students were going to or coming from lunch.

At the same time, a rally entered the school and blanketed the law student organization bulletin boards with flyers. The bulletin boards are spaces for student-led organizations to post important notices about events and opportunities that concern their organizations. The school's policy is that leaders of each student organization are supposed to have full control over what is posted or removed from their bulletin boards.

The flyers that the rally covered student organization bulletin boards with were designed to look like missing persons flyers for Israeli hostages. However, these flyers did not serve the traditional purpose of

missing persons flyers; that is, identifying a missing person in the area. Covering the walls of a law school in the United States with these flyers served a political purpose: justifying the indiscriminate attacks and collective punishment of Palestinians in Gaza. Around the country, these flyers had already been used to harass and dox individuals in viral videos who disagreed with pro-war propaganda. There were widespread reports of pro-war people posting flyers, waiting for someone to take issue with the flyer, and then approaching them while recording to dox them for an online audience. (Alex Deluca, Who's Behind the Israeli Hostage Posters Popping Up Nationwide, Miami New Times, Oct. 23, 2023, <https://www.miaminewtimes.com/news/who-made-the-israeli-hostage-posters-popping-up-around-the-us-18073973>; Greg Grandin, Transformed into Mist: How to Read the Israeli "Kidnapped" Posters, The Intercept, Nov. 28, 2023, <https://theintercept.com/2023/11/28/kidnapped-posters-israel-latin-america/>.)

At around (b)(6); Students A and B, both (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) women, left their class and walked down the hallway. Student A and B approached one of the bulletin boards that had been blanketed with flyers to take a closer look. Students A and B were (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) so they had an interest in their bulletin boards. Several (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) had walked by the bulletin boards by this point and decided they did not want the flyers on their billboards, and many flyers were scattered on the ground.

There also was an unknown man from the rally in the hallway. He was not a student at the law school but had been at several events for (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). The unidentified man, who was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and refused to identify himself or say whether he was a student, demanded that Students A and B put the flyers back on the board. Students A and B handed him back the flyers, which he threw down on the floor. He then took his phone out and began recording the flyers on the ground claiming that Student A and B had done that indiscriminately. Students A and B left the man behind and stood in the hallway. The man quickly reapproached them, put his phone up to their faces, and ominously told them the videos were going on the internet.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Another student, Student X (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and emailed Deans (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). Dean (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) said to report to Title IX, connect with CARE, report via a form, or call the police. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) noted knowledge of only one prior report when Student X reported, but three other students reported talking to him before Student X told him about this.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) reached out to Student X to meet, saying he was in charge of investigations. After the meeting, (b)(6); shared resources for submitting concerns about violation of student conduct code, student legal services, and information for reporting crimes. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) held a follow-up meeting in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). During both meetings, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) claimed that no information about the investigation would be released or disclosed to any parties other than student(s) under investigation.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Incident

Student C is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female student who is also a student at UCLA Law. At (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) she was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) another student at the law school in Student C's class, approached her, seemingly unprompted. Student C had participated in protests as well, so it is possible that (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) recognized her from these. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) interrupted Student C's (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and began harassing her for a full thirty minutes. This discouraged Student C from (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) or other campus locations alone, especially in the evenings.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Incident 1

Between (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student D, a law student, was in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student D is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student who was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) in support of Palestinians and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) An older White man noticed her from outside the classroom. He began filming her through the window.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Incident 2

At (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student E joined a group of about (b)(6) fellow students for a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) protest. As part of the protest, the students walked through the hallways of the law school. A law student (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was there filming students without their consent. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) seemingly filmed all of the students at the protest, including Student E. While Student E walked by, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) taunted the crowd with statements like "take off your masks" and "do you even know what intifada means? Can someone tell me what intifada means?"

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Incident 3

Students F, G, and H were in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) at (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) They were also part of (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) protest. Students F and G were both (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and Student H was a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) less than one week after the schoolwide email reminding students about the policy against filming on campus without the consent of others, walked up to Students F, G, and H and began filming them without their consent. She made a point to take individual photos of each of their faces anytime they adjusted their masks, so that she could capture more of their facial features.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Incident 4

Students I, J, and K were in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) at (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) The protest had ended several minutes earlier. Two of these students were (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and

one was a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) woman. They were sitting with one other student (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). There was nothing to indicate they had been at the protest.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) approached them. Her phone was pressed to her chest. This method of pressing her phone to her chest hid the phone from Students I, J, and K at first so that they did not notice it. The phone's camera was facing Students I, J, and K.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) closely followed (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). While (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) hovered over the table with her camera trained on Students I, J, and K, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) began trying to interrogate them. First, she asked the students if they had gone to the protest. The students got up and expressed their desire to leave, saying, "We're going to go." (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) attempted to stop them saying, "No, I want to talk to you about protest, and if you support what is happening." The students ignored this question. This is when they noticed (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) phone pressed against her chest. The way she was holding her phone concealed what was on her phone screen, but her camera was pointed at the students. This stood out as a highly irregular way for someone to carry a cell phone without some sort of ulterior motive. Given that (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) had already made a show of filming pro-Palestinian students and the nature of the interaction, the students thought her camera may be on and filming them. They asked (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) "Are you filming us?" (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) insisted that they were not. The students walked away.

Dean (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) were notified by Student X of (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) filming and attempting to dox at least 7 law students without their consent in three separate instances.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) shared emails from Chancellor Block and President Drake, suggested making EDI violation reports or sending the Dean of UCLA an email about violation of conduct. No further action was taken to hold (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) accountable.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Incident 5

Student M is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) who was at the pro-Palestine protest on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). After the protest, she was sitting in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) with two other (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) students who were at the protest with her. A girl who appeared to be an (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student approached them. She began filming Student M and the other two (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) students while harassing them with targeted racist questions.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Incident

Later that day, Student K (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) law student with (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was followed home by an unidentified person. The unidentified person followed Student K all the way to Student K's residence, then began verbally harassing Student K. This experience inflicted traumatic psychological harm on Student K. Due to his (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student K felt too insecure reporting this to the administration, particularly given some of the messaging the administration has put out implying that the Palestinian genocide is an appropriate response for the 10/7/23 attack.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A);
(b)(7)(C)

Incident with Student L

Former Student L is a male (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student affiliated with the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) program at the law school. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) He joined the pro-Palestine protest on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student L is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) man. During the protest, Student L encountered a counter-protestor. The counter-protestor was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) man. The counter-protestor started screaming at the crowd, " Hamas would kill you all!" When he noticed Student L, he changed his tune to, " Hamas would kill you all, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)!" He then continued with shouting things like " Hamas rapes women! Hamas murders babies!" The counter protestor then began shoving Student L and shouting things of this nature directly at him. Student L is now worried that the person that followed him could give his personal information to other radical pro-Israel parties who may wish him harm. He now feels unsafe in his own home. He feels this had a chilling effect on the future pro-Palestine of Student L and other pro-Palestine students on campus. If UCLA's inaction to protect students means they still fear this as a possibility, UCLA is sanctioning a hostile environment that chills their students' political expression. Due to his (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student L felt too insecure reporting this to the administration, particularly given some of the messaging the administration has put out implying that the Palestinian genocide is an appropriate response for the 10/7/23 attack.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A);
(b)(7)(C)

Incident 1

Between (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Students O, P, and Q were gathered in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) along with over (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) other law school students for a Free Palestine protest. Student O was a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and all three were students at the law school. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) another student at the law school, started recording individual protestors in the crowd, including Students O, P, and Q. This was about (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) weeks after the very public filming incident with the student organization bulletin boards and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) week after multiple filming incidents occurred without any repercussions during the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) protest.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A);
(b)(7)(C)

Incidents with (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

From (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Law Student Group A ("Group A") gathered in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the Free Palestine protest and then marched to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on UCLA's campus. At (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Group A met up with the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) chapter of Students for Justice in Palestine at UCLA.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A);
(b)(7)(C)

is an (b)(6); (b)(7)(C) student at the law school and a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

He is a part of a group message thread shared between/open to all (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) students. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) made statements on this text thread that were dehumanizing and expressed racial animus against Palestinian students. As students gathered in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the protest, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) walked around the edge of the crowd recording students. He followed the protest as they marched to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) filming them the entire way. At (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) he kept his distance but was still surveilling the crowd.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Incident 3

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) is another student at the law school. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female student (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) also filmed the large group of student protesters in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) during the gathering. She also approached several students, attempting to film their faces. She harassed several students, telling them she would report them to the school and post the videos online. During the protest, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) specifically picked one (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female student, Student R, out of the crowd and followed her as the student tried to escape while covering her face. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) tried to shove her phone in the student's face, and consequently filmed the student. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) harassed Student R with a barrage of invective. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) told Student R that she would report her for protesting on campus and disrupting student life, and that she was sending all of the videos of her to the Dean. Other eyewitnesses also heard these threats. These eyewitnesses also informed Student R that (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) had called the police on the protest. Student R assumed it was UCPD since they were the ones who arrived on the law school campus shortly after the protest began. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) shared these videos online in an attempt to dox protesters. Student R filed a report of harassment with the UCLA Title IX Office and was offered a no-contact directive but did not choose to follow through with it because that course of action would inform (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) that Student R had made the report, and she worried that would escalate the situation further. The only other solutions offered to Student R were mental health resources. No apparent action was taken to hold (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) accountable for her threats or to protect the other students she targeted.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Incident with Student D at (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Student D is a student at the law school. On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) they were (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) near the university (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). They were wearing a sweatshirt that said (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). An unidentified woman stopped Student S and told them they were disgusting for wearing the sweatshirt. Student S said they believed support for a genocide was disgusting, and the woman said all Palestinians were terrorists and by extension, Student S was a terrorist.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

The Womxn of Color Collective ("WOCC") at UCLA hosts an annual networking and community-building gala. This year, they invited the UCLA Law Women to collaborate with them. As with previous Galentines Gala events that WOCC had hosted and invited Law Women to collaborate on, there was supposed to be 1 WOCC scholarship winner and speech, 1 WOCC speaker, 1 Law Women scholarship winner and speech, and 1 speaker of Law Women's choosing. There were also supposed to be 2 emcees and 1 person in charge of announcing the silent auction split between the organizations. UCLA Law Women (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) began interfering with planning efforts (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) months into preparation and a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) before the date of the gala. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) demanded to the WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student E, that the organization change their scholar application prompt to not ask students about hardship or harassment they had experienced. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was informed that this was a WOCC board decision, not her decision. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) next insisted that the WOCC should not permit the scholarship

winners to speak at the gala. She was again told this was a WOCC board decision, and winners were encouraged to speak. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) then complained about WOCC's (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) who is a female (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). Again, she was told by the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student E, that the WOCC speaker was elected by the WOCC Board.

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) then went behind the WOCC's back to complain to the Dean (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). She complained to Dean (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) about the "potential damage" that women of color speaking, particularly (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) women speaking, at the gala could do to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) professional reputation. She also asserted that one of the speakers that WOCC had elected to speak at the event, a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) should not be allowed to speak. Dean (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) attempted to call the WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) into a private meeting to mediate the dispute, despite all involved parties' full awareness that this was a democratic WOCC organizational decision.

After this, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) tried to take over all the organizer speaking roles at the Gala. They insisted that only (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) be allowed to emcee the event. The WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student X, said this would be fine so long as WOCC members could provide the opening address about the history of the Galentine's Gala. Then, one day before the gala, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) reached out to the WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the first time, demanding that the WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X submit everything she planned on saying to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) before the event. The WOCC (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X told (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) that she had not yet drafted anything (and indeed, she drafted speaking notes during the first hour of the event, during which there were no speeches and dinner was served.). Later that day, two Law Women board members informed WOCC members that (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) had decided not to let their own scholarship winner (this was a different student than student T) speak at the event after finding out that she was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C).

Meanwhile, the WOCC board encouraged all their speakers to speak during the Gala on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) including Student D. Student D is a female (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student at the law school who (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student D was supposed to speak at (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) but because the Law Women speaker, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) went over her speaking time (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C), Student T's award and short speech were pushed to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). After Student X called Student D to the stage, Student D spoke for a few minutes about (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). During this time, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) began heckling her (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). He is (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) did not purchase a Gala ticket, but accompanied (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) unregistered. While Student D gave her speech, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) started heckling her, shouting, (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) " (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) did this until Student D left the stage. No (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) security members stepped in.

At the end of the event, around (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student D was approached by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) who herself talked about controversial topics, including (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) cornered Student D and chastised her for speaking about (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) saying that topics like that are not appropriate at events such as this. The stated purpose of the event, according to the hosts, was to build and foster community among diverse femme and nonbinary legal students, professionals, and professors, in times of hardship.

Since (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student R has coordinated with (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

to use

their boards in the main hallway of the law school building to post flyers. Some of these flyers inform readers about Israel's violations of international law, some cover a ruling by the International Court of Justice on a case filed by South Africa regarding application of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in the Gaza Strip, some provide links for direct action/donation/calling Congress, and others depict the brutality of the genocide and Palestinian martyrs. Student R has spent over \$200 of her printing funds provided by the school to constantly re-print flyers as they have been taken down without the organizations' or her consent. This is explicitly against the rules concerning these boards as made clear by emails sent out to the student body by the Dean of Student Affairs. Student R has reached out to the Dean of Student Affairs in numerous occasions to try and resolve the issue as it is an infringement of their First Amendment rights and also violates the Student Code of Conduct; however, the Dean has not provided any help other than it is out of his hands since SBA must be the one to coordinate more punitive measures for aggressors. Student R has spent money, time and energy to reprint and repost these flyers while also endangering herself for exposure to doxxing. On one occasion, when she was putting up flyers depicting martyrs, another student whose name is unknown but is a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) male (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year law student, called her "disgusting" for putting up the flyers. She has also heard about discussions from other students who have coined her a "radical" who is the Pro-Palestinian flyer-poster.

Other students also complained to Student Affairs about this both in email and in person. Student Affairs took no action until (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) when it shared an email that stated, "Students should not move or take down flyers on another organization's board." This was the only action taken by the Student Affairs office. After being solicited for feedback on what would be helpful by administrators, Student X suggested perhaps having someone from the office work in the hall to keep an eye on the boards, or to post a camera directed solely at the boards, but both these ideas were shot down. Student X was told that would be impractical and that filming is not allowed in the hallways. This turned out not to be true, as the hallways became a filming location for purposes unknown to students numerous weeks during the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) semester.

Attacks on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Board Room

Student organizations with need for storage have access to board rooms. Typically, the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) board room is available to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) members. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) has never had an issue with the room getting locked before, and prior members and leaders do not recall any incidents of the room being locked. Beginning in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) room kept getting locked by an unknown party. This is incredibly unusual among student organizations. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) leadership has never had keys. Since then, Student X, who is an (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female student, reported (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) lockings and repeatedly asked for the room to be unlocked and for a key, which (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) stated all student Chairs, Presidents, and Editors in Chief in charge of board rooms should have. Student X reported this to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). These requests were continually delayed, resulting in at least (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) documented lockings of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) boardroom by outside parties. Student X was not given a key to the room until (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). For many students facing harassment and discrimination on campus, the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was the only available safe space, but it

was rendered inaccessible for the majority of the academic year due to the lockings.

Solicitation of Recommendations and Rejection of All Proposed Suggestions

Student X, who is (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female student, and other students of Middle Eastern and North African descent including Egyptians and Palestinians, were approached by administrators, including (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) between (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) with invitations to provide suggestions on what would be helpful for students given the rampant harassment and discrimination taking place. Student X has email copies of those interactions with the aforementioned administrators attached. After carefully thinking about the issue for over a month and consulting with leaders of multiple student groups, Student X and other students prepared a list of interventions. This list included the following asks:

Reinstate the former student and student group conduct code/eliminate modifications preventing students from gathering or protesting at the law school.

Stop fueling Islamophobia/anti-Palestinian sentiment in official law school communications.

Be explicit about the consequences of filming peers, harassment, and doxxing with entire law student body

Provide a library conference room for safe studying and a MLSA board room for safe space on campus to MENA, Muslim, and allied students so that we face less harassment.

Stop broadcasting that calling the police is an appropriate response to protest or harassment.

Student X presented this list to both (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) shot down every suggestion. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) said she would run these by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) further stated that such announcements about consequences would not be possible for reasons he did not explain. Student X then scheduled a direct meeting with (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) told Student X that he did not believe that this list was made with leaders of other student organizations, and he would not consider the contents of the recommendations unless Student X assembled all other student leaders for a meeting with him. Student X countered that this would place undue burden on themselves and they would be happy to instead gather signatures. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) rejected this and insisted Student X take on the administrative burden of coordinating further meetings on the topic. Student X brought this up to other student leaders. Because the administration had failed to be receptive to their solicited feedback thus far, the student leaders decided that further engagement would be a waste of their time.

The Promise Institute for Human Rights' Broken Promise

Following October 7, 2023, many students and alumni have reached out to the Promise Institute asking it to host events on the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories, apartheid, and practices of genocide and ethnic cleansing. All such requests were ignored. Students wrote a seven-point list of requests for

the Promise Institute to promote a less hostile environment and met with the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

to discuss these points. This included the following asks:

Publicly issue statements of support for (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) as he faced doxxing and harassment on all public facing platforms.

Publicly issue statements acknowledging the full scope of human rights abuse committed by Israel on all public facing platforms.

Publicly issue statements celebrating South Africa's success in pushing for justice on all public facing platforms.

End collaborations on Human Rights with Israeli Institutes, academia, and study abroad programs that do not condemn treatment of Palestinians. ???????

These were also ignored. Students believe that (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) may have received instructions from the law school deans or possibly the Chancellor not to discuss Palestinian rights.

Promise Institute Event on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Following a ruling by the International Court of Justice in favor of South Africa's case for Palestine, students, led by the Promise Student Advisory Board, which had been advocating for more discussion on the issue since October, wrote a letter and gathered over 100 signatures and submitted it to the Promise Institute's core board of 16 people. The letter was dismissed by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). Students responded again, this time with an eight-page research letter. The Promise Institute then began hosting events with a heavy Zionist bias, featuring a disproportionate amount of Israeli and Zionist speakers.

This included an invitation to Amos N. Guiora to come speak at the law school on a panel with another Israeli, another Zionist, one (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and one member of the U.S. State Department. Guiora was part of the Israeli military from 1986 to 2004, holding senior command positions. Students were shocked when this event was publicized at the last minute and complained that this would further legitimate the hostility Palestinians and allies were already facing. The Promise Institute ignored this and went on with the event. Given previous work by the institute on genocide, human rights abuse, Third World approaches to International Law, and Critical Race Studies, this stunned the majority of the students in the program, as well as alumni and donors. The Promise Institute's mission statement is to empower students with enriching teaching and experiential opportunities in human rights law, engages with diverse frameworks and disciplines to generate new thinking on human rights, and advocates for change in coalition with academics, practitioners, and activists. The Promise Institute has also traditionally been extremely responsive to human rights abuses, armed conflicts, and possible genocides in the past. Most nations (138 nations) now recognize Palestine as a state and Israel's actions as rogue violations of international law. The ICJ released provisional measures for Israel to prevent genocide in Gaza. The Promise Institute maintains an office in the Hague and has study abroad programs in Geneva, the centers of international humanitarian and human rights law. Given these facts, the human rights community within the law school feels that Promise broke its

promise to speak out against human rights abuse, educate aspiring human rights scholars, and promote the international rule of law.

Part II. Incidents Involving the General Campus

Since October, there have also been numerous incidents beyond the law school in which students have been targeted for harassment and threats based on their Palestinian identity or perceived affiliation with Palestinian identity often while [REDACTED]. Students have raised some of these incidents directly with university officials, either through formal reports or in meetings. In other cases, university affiliates were direct witnesses to the events. Despite the university being aware of the hostile environment created by these incidents, it has not taken any effective action to protect or support students or to condemn these bad acts.

A [REDACTED]-year UCLA student who was [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was told by another student on campus that he was “supporting genocide” as a result of associating himself with [REDACTED]. The student who was targeted reported this incident to the Equality Harassment Program, as well as telling a professor about the incident, but no action was taken to address this discriminatory remark.

During an [REDACTED] Palestine rally on campus, counter protestors made crude identity-based remarks to a UCLA [REDACTED] student participating in the rally, including calling the student a [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]” Though university administrators closely monitored the protest, they took no action to support the student or condemn this harassment.

During a pro-Israel protest on campus, a participant of the protest pushed a [REDACTED]-year UCLA student who was [REDACTED] and called the student a “fucking bitch.”

On [REDACTED], a group of about [REDACTED] UCLA students attending a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] faced aggressive opposition to the event. At least [REDACTED] adult men came up to the students and screamed at the group, using aggressive and violent language about [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The men circled the group. A student ran away when a security guard appeared and situated himself between them and the men. As the student was attempting to leave, one of the men jumped in front of them, screaming at them an inch from their face. One student who wanted to report the incident to the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion was unable to do so because the reporting system was not clear. Another met with the university. Representatives of Students for Justice in Palestine publicized the incident and raised it in a meeting with UCLA student affairs. Beyond the guard’s initial intervention, the university took no meaningful action to address this

incident.

During a Students for Justice in Palestine rally on campus, a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) by a counter-protestor who opposed the rally.

In (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) men came up to a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year UCLA student, looked the student "in the eyes" and said, "(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)" repeatedly.

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student at UCLA has gotten dirty looks from students when (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on campus. On multiple occasions, students have filmed him. Because of the widespread tactic of doxxing (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and their supporters online and exposing them to threats and harassment, the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student believes that the students who filmed him have done so with the intent of exposing his identity. While (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on campus, people harassed him and instigated arguments.

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was one of two students (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) while standing with two other students at the UCLA campus. A car drove by, and an unidentified passenger (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year student who was by the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was verbally harassed and threatened by attendees of a pro-Israel rally, some of whom call the student a "terrorist."

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) with four other students on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Protestors from a pro-Israel rally that was taking place at the same time began giving the students the middle finger. A group of five pro-Israel protestors approached the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student's (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and began shouting at the students. The shouting included direct threats, such as "I'm going to find you," and later, a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) woman who appeared to be in her (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the remainder of the day. This (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was reported to university police. Due to the pro-Israel protestors' conduct, individuals on bikes who were wearing shirts emblazoned with "Public Safety" had to place themselves in between the students' table and the pro-Israel protestors who were threatening and harassing them. Despite reporting the incident, the student did not receive any follow up.

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C), a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) year (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student in the UCLA university housing found (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) outside the student's (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) The student resides in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) with (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) The student reported this hate incident to the resident director, to university police, to the Office of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, and the Office of Student Conduct. Despite there being surveillance cameras in the student's building, the student has received no follow up regarding any investigation or positive identification of the suspect.

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) female UCLA student was (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) during the evening of (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) while walking on UCLA's campus and while (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) This student has reported that she has been followed home by strangers in cars that verbally harass her and watch her while she enters her (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

An (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) UCLA student was verbally harassed and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) on campus by two students while

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was harassed for weeks by Zionists, simply for referring students to an (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C). Since then, the student has been doxxed and her private identity has been shared.

A (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was doxxed on (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the student's pro-Palestine advocacy. As a result, the student has received (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) for the purposes of harassment. For years, students have requested that the university take action to condemn (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and provide support to students targeted by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) but the university has failed to take action.

An (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) student was called a "terrorist" and other slurs on many occasions. The student was also (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) by individuals who expressed anti-Palestinian views rallies on the UCLA campus.

Part III. Included Email Threads

Thread 12 – Report (Email) by Student X entitled (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X emailed the following administrators: (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and the Office of the Dean of Students. In their email, Student X expressed grave concerns regarding the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) event, an annual formal gathering (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X highlighted major issues of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) noting (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Of particular note, Student X cited multiple statements by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) including a one-sided and Islamophobic statement (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) and statements made in support of Israel that completely ignore the ICJ charges of genocide and copious evidence of war crimes and crimes against humanity perpetrated by Israel against the Palestinian people.

Given (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) clear, unrelenting support of Israel and the IDF, Student X explained that they – along with many peers and friends – did not feel welcome or comfortable attending an event there. Student X made four demands (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Only one administrator replied to Student X's email. (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) did not offer any resolution – she simply wrote that she trusted that SBA is "listening to students." Student X clarified that many SBA members had voiced concerns with leadership regarding cultural sensitivity and economic

accessibility yet were ignored. There were no further replies by (b)(6); (b)(7)(A) or other administrators.

Thread 13 – Report (Email) by Student X entitled (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X emailed the following administrators: (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) In their email, Student X asked for clarification regarding scheduling meetings with administrators to discuss how to better support students at UCLA Law. Student X noted that after meeting with multiple administrators for 3 hours, none of their requests or complaints had been addressed, and they had been directed to come to future meetings with administrators. Given the apparent lack of momentum from meeting with officer members individually, Student X suggested scheduling a larger meeting where all parties could convene, and/or including letters from student groups. Student X also mentioned to Dean (b)(6); that they wanted his office to take action on doxxing, filming, and harassment of UCLA Law students by having his office announce the specific consequences of doxxing, filming, and harassment, including announcing the number of infractions incurred to the entire student body. Dean (b)(6); did not offer any resolution to the doxxing, filming, and harassment concerns; his office has not suggested alternatives to Student X's suggestion.

Thread 15 – Report (Email) by Student X entitled (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X emailed (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) to coordinate (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) participation in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) stated that a (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) could not perform due to a previously signed "performance agreement" and suggested that (b)(6); could instead be involved through helping with "event set-up/break down, participant check-in, food distribution," etc. Student X respectfully declined the offer for (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); to be involved with the community service aspects of (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) as Student X and (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); had been clear from the outset that they were interested in organizing (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) to perform.

Thread 18 – (Email) from (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

replied to the

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) letter to Promise sent by a coalition of students.

[Info re (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); letter sent in response]

Thread 19 – Report (Email) by Student X entitled (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C), Student X emailed (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) after meeting with her to memorialize (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

The law school has not responded to any of the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Thread 21 – Report (Email) by Student X entitled (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

On (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) Student X emailed (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

to follow up after a meeting with two additional suggestions: (1) to have one of the three events coordinated by Promise in the semester to take a Non-Anglocentric/Non-Westphalian approach to international law and human rights; and (2) to share more about what Promise is doing to protect (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) stated that Promise would consider Student X's suggestions. Promise has not taken any action on Student X's suggestions.

Do you have written information that you think will help us understand your complaint?

yes or no No

7. Your complaint must be filed within 180 days of the discriminatory action

The laws that we enforce require that complaints be filed with our office within 180 days of the alleged discriminatory event. If any of the alleged discriminatory actions took place more than 180 days before the postmark or receipt date of this complaint, you may request a waiver of the 180-day limit. When did the last act of discrimination occur?

When did the last act of discrimination occur?

Enter the date: 00:00

Are you requesting a waiver of the 180-day filing time limit for discrimination that occurred more than 180 days before the filing of this complaint?

Are you requesting a waiver of the 180-day filing time limit for discrimination that occurred more than 180 days before the filing of this complaint?

yes or no No

Reason for not filing complaint before 180 days: {Empty}

8. What would you like the institution to do as a result of your complaint?

What remedy are you seeking? Meet and confer with harmed students, discuss this with them, hold offending students accountable, greater institutional transparency

9. Option to Participate in OCR's Early Mediation Process

I am interested in participating in early mediation: No



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

REGION IX
CALIFORNIA

50 UNITED NATIONS PLAZA
MAILBOX 1200, ROOM 1545
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 942012

May 7, 2024

Sent via email only to chancellor@ucla.edu

Dr. Gene Block
Chancellor
University of California Los Angeles
Box 951405, 2147 Murphy Hall
Los Angeles, California 90095

Re: Case Number 09-24-2336 – University of California-Los Angeles

Dear Chancellor Block:

On April 26, 2024, the U.S. Department of Education (the Department), Office for Civil Rights (OCR) received a complaint against the University of California-Los Angeles (the University), including the School of Law (Law School). The complaint alleged that the University has failed to respond effectively to reported incidents of harassment of students by other students and third-parties based on national origin (including Palestinian, Arab, and/or Muslim shared ancestry) since October 2023. The complaint also alleged that the University has engaged in disparate treatment of students based on shared ancestry (including Palestinian, Arab, and/or Muslim shared ancestry). The alleged incidents at the Law School include inflammatory, pro-Israeli flyers being posted on Law School student organization bulletin boards while pro-Palestinian flyers were taken down in violation of the student conduct code; the unwanted filming, doxxing, and/or following of Palestinian and/or pro-Palestinian students both on campus or in areas near the Law School by other students and members of the public; and hosting a Law School event at a venue that is known to (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) The alleged incidents outside the Law School include the verbal and physical harassment of students based on their actual or perceived shared ancestry (including Palestinian, Arab, and/or Muslim shared ancestry), often while (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) doxxing; and offensive, violent, and/or threatening comments, such as “ Hamas would kill you all,” directed at pro-Palestinian protestors and comparing them to Hitler, Nazis, baby murderers, and terrorists.

OCR enforces Title VI, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d-2000d-7, and its implementing regulations at 34 C.F.R. Part 100, which prohibit discrimination on the bases of race, color, and national origin (including shared ancestry) in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance from the Department. The University is a recipient of federal financial assistance from the Department and must comply with Title VI and its implementing regulations.

OCR will investigate the following issues: (1) whether the University responded in a manner consistent with the requirements of Title VI to alleged harassment of students by other students and members of the public based on actual and/or perceived national origin (including Palestinian, Arab, and/or Muslim shared ancestry); and (2) whether the University violated Title

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

VI by engaging in disparate treatment of students based on their actual or perceived national origin (including Palestinian, Arab, and/or Muslim shared ancestry).

Please understand that opening these issues for investigation under Title VI does not mean that OCR has made a decision about the merits. During the investigation, OCR is neutral; OCR will collect and analyze the relevant evidence from the complainant, the recipient, and other sources, as appropriate. OCR will ensure that its investigation is legally sufficient as required by OCR's Case Processing Manual (CPM) (July 18, 2022). You may find additional information in OCR's Complaint Processing Procedures. Individuals who file complaints with OCR may have the right to file a private suit in federal court whether or not OCR finds a violation.

OCR may close this case prior to making formal findings of compliance or non-compliance, provided that the circumstances or information gathered establishes an administrative or other basis for resolution in accordance with the CPM. For example, under Section 201(b) of OCR's CPM, if both parties are interested and OCR determines that the individual allegations are appropriate for mediation, the parties may voluntarily resolve these complaint allegations through mediation that OCR will facilitate. Note that in such a case, OCR does not monitor or enforce the agreement reached between the parties.

When appropriate, a complaint may be resolved before the conclusion of an investigation after the recipient expresses an interest to OCR to resolve the complaint. In such cases, OCR obtains a resolution agreement signed by the recipient. This agreement must be aligned with the complaint allegations or the information obtained during the investigation, and it must be consistent with applicable regulations.

To reach an efficient and timely resolution of this matter, OCR is providing an opportunity for the University to present its response to the complaint allegations and to submit supporting documentation. **Within 15 days of the date of this letter**, please provide to OCR the information listed in the attached data request. The regulation implementing Title VI, at 34 C.F.R. §§ 100.6(b) and (c), requires that a recipient of federal financial assistance make available to OCR information that may be necessary for it to determine whether a recipient is in compliance with the regulations it enforces. Pursuant to 34 C.F.R. § 100.6(c) and 34 C.F.R. § 99.31(a)(3)(iii), of the regulation implementing the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, OCR may review personally identifiable records without regard to considerations of privacy or confidentiality. OCR will take all proper precautions to protect the identity of any individuals named in the documents.

Please be advised that the University must not harass, coerce, intimidate, discriminate, or otherwise retaliate against an individual because that individual asserts a right or privilege under a law enforced by OCR or files a complaint, testifies, assists, or participates in a proceeding under a law enforced by OCR. If this happens, the individual may file a retaliation complaint against the University with OCR.

Under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), it may be necessary to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. If OCR receives such a request, it will seek to protect, to the extent provided by law, personally identifiable information that, if released, could

reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

If you have any questions, please contact OCR attorney Jenny Moon at Jenny.Moon@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

(b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C)

Naghmeh Ordikhani
Team Leader

Attachment

Data Request

OCR Case Number 09-24-2336
University of California-Los Angeles

OCR requests that this information reach our office within **15 days from the date of the attached letter, which is May 22, 2024**. If any of the required items are available to the public on the Internet, you may provide the website address. While OCR prefers electronic submissions, you may send documents by any of the following means:

SharePoint: OCR may create an external sharing site through a browser-based portal in which the requested documents and information may be uploaded. Please contact Jenny Moon to receive online portal information to upload data.

Email: jenny.moon@ed.gov

Fax: (415) 486-5570

Mail: U.S. Department of Education
Office for Civil Rights
San Francisco Office
50 UN Plaza, Mail Box 1200, Room 1545
San Francisco, CA 94102

Please do **not** provide the information via an electronic cloud format such as Google Docs. Because email is not reliably secure, please do not email any document that contains personally identifiable or private information without first encrypting this information. You may upload this information using the SharePoint option described above.

Please do not include Social Security numbers in your responses. If any responsive documents or data contain Social Security numbers, please redact them before sending OCR the information.

Preservation of requested and relevant data and documents: OCR may request supplemental data and documents that are relevant to the allegation under investigation. To ensure that OCR can assess the University's compliance with the statutory and regulatory obligations at issue in this investigation, please ensure that University employees preserve the data and documents requested below for the time frame specified in these requests and going forward until OCR closes this case. Please also ensure that University employees preserve other data and documents that are relevant to the allegation(s) under investigation until OCR closes this case. The regulation implementing Title VI, at 34 C.F.R. §§ 100.6(b) and (c), requires that a recipient of federal financial assistance make available to OCR information that may be pertinent to reach a compliance determination.

RESPONSE DUE: May 22, 2024

Please provide the following information for academic year 2023-2024, unless otherwise indicated, or indicate in writing if any of the requested items do not exist. **If the University has already provided any of the information in response to a request made in another OCR investigation, please state what information has been provided, the relevant OCR case number, and the date of submission:**

1. Provide a narrative response to the issues OCR is investigating and a copy of any documents or data relied upon in the narrative or supporting the facts stated in the narrative.
2. Indicate if the issues raised in OCR Case Number 09-24-2336 are pending elsewhere. If so, please provide a copy of the complaint filed and indicate its status. If it is not possible to provide a copy of the complaint, please state the allegations raised in the other complaint and the forum in which the complaint was filed (e.g., another federal, state, or local civil rights enforcement agency, through the University's internal grievance procedures, or in state or federal court).
3. Copies of the Law School's policies and procedures, and/or a description of the Law School's practices governing the investigation of complaints or incidents of harassment of and other discrimination against students on the basis of national origin, including shared ancestry. Provide a detailed description of the complaint process, including each level of the process, the length of the process, and the types of records maintained. Also provide the name(s) and job title(s) of Law School employees responsible for handling complaints of discrimination, including harassment, on the basis of national origin, including shared ancestry, at each level of the process.
4. Explain how the Law School informs its students and employees of the policies and procedures set forth in Item 3 above. Submit copies of all materials disseminated or links to the Law School's and/or University's website. Also provide the name(s) and job title(s) of the individuals responsible for implementing the policies and procedures.
5. Copies of the Law School's policies and procedures, and/or a description of the Law School's practices, governing:
 - a. disciplinary or corrective actions that may be taken to address harassment of and other discrimination against students on the basis of national origin, including shared ancestry; and
 - b. the provision of supports and remedies to students, employees, and other individuals found to have been discriminated against/harassed on the basis of national origin, including shared ancestry.
6. Copies and/or descriptions of all formal and informal oral and written reports and complaints of harassment and other discrimination based on national origin, including shared ancestry (e.g., Palestinian, Arab, Muslim, and/or Jewish shared ancestry). For each report/complaint/incident, please provide:
 - a. the name(s) and job title(s) of the person(s) to whom the report/complaint was made, and the date the report/complaint was made;

- b. the name and relation to the University of the person making the report/complaint (e.g., student, faculty members, parent/guardian, counsel, member of the public);
 - c. a detailed description of the report/complaint, including the name(s) of the alleged target(s) of discrimination/harassment and the alleged discriminators/harassers if not evident from the copy of the report/complaint;
 - d. a detailed description of the grievance procedures or other complaint processing procedures employed to resolve the report/complaint;
 - e. the length of the investigation and complaint resolution process;
 - f. the name, national origin, and/or ancestry of each student, employee, or other individual involved in the alleged incident(s) of discrimination/harassment;
 - g. the name(s) and relation to the University of any individual(s) who witnessed the alleged incident(s), including any University students, employees, or others;
 - h. the name(s) and relationship to the University of any witnesses interviewed by the University;
 - i. the name(s) and job title(s) of the individual(s) involved in the response to, investigation of, and resolution of the report/complaint;
 - j. all actions the University has taken in response to the report/complaint/concerns raised, including corrective action taken, disciplinary sanctions imposed, supportive services and remedies offered and/or provided to individuals (e.g., counseling, safety measures); and/or University-wide remedies;
 - k. the final outcome of any investigation of the report/complaint, including copies of any incident/investigative reports, final determination, and any appeals;
 - l. if the University did not investigate any particular report/complaint, the reason(s) for not investigating, and the name(s) and job title(s) of the person(s) who made the decision;
 - m. any notice of the investigative findings provided to the complainant and/or other notice regarding the report/complaint, including notice of any outcomes on appeal; and
 - n. the complete case file for the report/complaint identified, including internal emails or other correspondence, internal and external memoranda, incident/investigative reports, video and audio recordings, witness statements, logs, forms, interview notes, notes regarding remedies provided, hearing transcripts, meeting minutes, and notes generated.
7. State whether the Law School conducts focus groups, other meetings, or trainings, and/or holds informational sessions with students and/or staff regarding students' rights under Title VI, how to report possible violations of Title VI, and/or the University's obligation to respond to Title VI complaints. If so, provide the dates of such events, a description of the attendees, and any materials presented and/or distributed.
 8. A detailed description of any training regarding discrimination, including harassment, based on national origin, including shared ancestry, that the Law School provided to its staff responsible for responding to such complaints. For each such training provide the date(s) it was delivered, a description of the training, a list of the names and job titles of the individuals who attended the training, and copies of any materials distributed at the training.
 9. A copy of University policies and practices governing the posting of flyers or other information (including but not limited to on student organization bulletin boards at the Law School), the nonconsensual filming of students, and "*doxxing*" or the act of publicly

providing personally identifiable information about an individual or organization in the Law School and/or the University community, including the consequences for violating such policies and practices. Please include a copy of all complaints received regarding flyers being torn down or removed at the University, the “doxxing” of University students, unwanted/nonconsensual filming of students, including at protests, and detail the University’s response to each complaint with supporting documentation.

10. Information on the Womxn of Color Collective’s annual gala, including who is responsible for organizing it and how speakers are chosen. Please include copies of all complaints received by the University and/or the Law School alleging disparate treatment for Palestinian or Palestinian affiliated speakers.
11. A copy of all documents or a description of the Law School’s efforts to work with various student groups, including student groups based on shared ancestry, to address harassment and discrimination at the Law School.
12. Information about the Promise Institute Event in (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); including a list of speakers, who organized the event, where the event was held, who was in attendance, etc. Please include copies of all complaints received by the University and/or the Law School that the event promoted or presented anti-Palestinian viewpoints.
13. A copy of all complaints received by the University and/or the Law School, and the University and/or the Law School’s response to the complaints, regarding the (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(6); (b)(7)(A); (b)(7)(C) was held due to its alleged affiliation with or support for Israel.
14. A narrative description, with copies of any supporting documents, regarding the University’s response to the recently publicized events involving the encampments, protests, and violence.
15. The name, job title, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address of the University’s designated contact person for this complaint.
16. Any other information the University believes will assist OCR in this investigation.