

APPROVED FOURTH DISTRICT VICTIMS' RIGHTS COMMITTEE MEETING DECEMBER 1, 2025

Committee	Fourth District Victims' Rights Committee Meeting
Date Time Location	December 1, 2025 1:00-2:00 pm Virtual: https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/88233404467?pwd=QMqJbxmAOrHyyWB3WWObLBdONJPb2d.1
Members Present	Virtual Attendance: Sandi Johnson, Kevin Thurman, Tracy Bullock, Lesli Shields, Sheriff Mike Smith
Staff & Visitors	<u>Staff</u> : Katie Fox, Marlesse Jones <u>Visitors</u> : Jim Bradshaw, S.K., Sheriff Jared Rigby, Josh Probst, McKay King, Clara Hatcher
Agenda Item	Welcome & Introductions/Establish Quorum
Notes	Sandi Johnson welcomed the Committee. Sandi Johnson established that a quorum was present.
Agenda Item	Approve Minutes from 11.3.2025 Meeting
Notes	Sandi Johnson inquired if everyone had a chance to review the minutes from the previous meeting. Motion : Kevin Thurman made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 3, 2025 meeting. Lesli Shields seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
Agenda Item	Review of Complaints
Notes	<p>1. S.K. Complaint</p> <p>The committee discussed a complaint filed by S.K. involving the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office (WCSO) and the Wasatch County Attorney's Office (WCAO). The complaint stemmed from the investigation and screening process following the death of P.H.</p> <p>The Committee's review was narrowly focused based on a decision from a prior meeting. The scope was limited to alleged violations that occurred during the investigation and screening stages of the case, prior to the formal attachment of certain victim rights that are triggered by filed charges. The review centered on potential violations of Utah Code Title 77, Chapter 37, which outlines general rights for victims throughout the criminal justice process. The Committee had previously determined that rights under Title 77, Chapter 38 (which apply to specific court proceedings for filed charges) did not attach to P.H.'s victim representatives until an October 3rd court ruling that formally recognized P.H. as a victim in the filed Obstruction of Justice case.</p> <p>The Committee's focus was strictly on three potential violations by the WCSO and WCAO during the investigation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The right to be informed and assisted as to their role in the criminal justice process. 2. The right to clear explanations regarding relevant legal proceedings. 3. The right to be treated with dignity, respect, courtesy, and sensitivity. <p>S.K. and their attorney, Jim Bradshaw, detailed a series of events and interactions that they argued constituted a violation of the family's rights and left them feeling uninformed during a period of immense grief. The family's primary complaint was a feeling of being systematically excluded from the process. Communication with the WCSO, primarily with Lieutenant Frederickson and Detective Hayden Walker, ceased abruptly. The family was informed that Lt. Frederickson was placed on administrative leave and that Det. Walker could not speak to them as he might be a witness. Mr. Bradshaw emphasized that the decision not to file homicide charges was made without any prior consultation with the family. They were informed of the decision after the fact in a meeting with prosecutor McKay King on December 26th. The family felt they were not consulted or afforded the right to be heard regarding the</p>

defendant's release from custody on the Obstruction of Justice charge. S.K. articulated a deep-seated frustration with the lack of guidance through an unfamiliar and intimidating legal system. The family did not understand the meaning of specific hearings, the potential outcomes, or the overall sequence of events. S.K. articulated the emotional toll of the process and the feeling that the system lacked empathy for their loss. S.K. did state that their experience in the courtroom had improved since the filing of the complaint.

Representatives from both the Sheriff's and County Attorney's offices responded to the complaint, asserting that their actions were procedurally correct and that they made significant efforts to communicate with the family.

The Wasatch County Sheriff's Office was represented by Sheriff Jared Rigby. Sheriff Rigby stated that the WCSO remained available and willing to continue to communicate with the family. He clarified that the lead case agent, Detective Hayden Walker, was never placed on administrative leave, was not instructed to cease communication, and stayed available through the entire life of the case. The officer on leave was a supervising lieutenant, not the primary detective. The WCSO's position was that once the investigation was concluded and referred for prosecution, questions regarding the legal decision to file or decline charges were appropriately directed to the County Attorney's Office, which has the sole authority to make that decision.

The Wasatch County Attorney's Office was represented by McKay King. Mr. King affirmed that the decision on what charges to file is ultimately a legal one resting with the prosecutor. He stated his belief that this decision should be free of the emotional desires of the victims. Before making the decision, the WCAO consulted with detectives, the Sheriff, other attorneys in the office, and even attorneys from another jurisdiction. Mr. King detailed direct communication with the family to explain the charging decision. They held a meeting on December 26th and a follow-up meeting in January to explain in-depth why they did not believe they had sufficient evidence to prove a homicide charge. He acknowledged the family was not satisfied with the explanation but stated the office did its best to maintain a professional environment. Frequent contact was maintained through the office's victim advocate, who had exchanged over 250 text messages with the family and made an in-person visit in September. Mr. King noted that later requests for meetings were declined because they were perceived as efforts by members of the family to rehash things that had already been discussed and to pressure him to change a decision that was not going to be altered without new facts or legal arguments.

Motions: Sheriff Mike Smith made a motion to find that there was no violation of victims' rights by the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office. Kevin Thurman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Sandi Johnson motioned to find that there was no violation of victims' rights by the Wasatch County Attorney's Office. Lesli Shields seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Action Items: Sandi Johnson will draft formal letters to S.K., the Wasatch County Sheriff's Office and the Wasatch County Attorney's Office informing them of the committee's decisions. Sandi will include the recommendation of the committee that the WCAO consider involving victims in their discussions before final charging decisions are made. Katie Fox will send the letters.

2. M.B.

The Committee discussed moving this complaint to the next meeting due to time constraints.

Motion: Sandi Johnson made a motion to continue the discussion of this complaint to the next meeting. Lesli Shields second the motion. The motion passed unanimously,

Agenda Item	Public Comment
	Public comment was given during the discussion of the complaint.
Agenda Item	Schedule Next Meeting and Adjourn
Notes	<p>Lesli Shields made a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously. The committee adjourned.</p> <p>Next Meeting: January 5, 2026, 1:00 pm- 2:00 pm</p> <p>Zoom link: https://utah-gov.zoom.us/j/88233404467?pwd=QMqJbxmA0rHyyWB3WWObLBdONJPb2d.1</p>