



family family family

Request for Law-Enforcement Review - Possible Mandated-Reporter Failure / HOMS Maltreatment Report

10 messages

Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov>
To: family family

Wed, Jun 17, 2026 at 2:18 PM

Good afternoon sir,

After reviewing the materials you sent regarding allegations of mandated reporter failures by Hidden Oaks Middle School, the Prior Lake Police Department has determined that there are no criminal violations to investigate. The Prior Lake Police Department was made aware of the incident, and it was investigated. If you have concerns of possible policy violations on how the incident was reported by the school, I suggest you contact the Minnesota Department of Education and/or the Scott County Attorney's Office.

Thank you.



Cody Steinhaus
Detective
City of Prior Lake | 4649 Dakota Street SE | Prior Lake, MN 55372
Main: 952.440.3555 - Direct: 952.447.9879

This information is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby noticed that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is strictly prohibited.

family family family
To: csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov

Wed, Jun 17, 2026 at 11:35 PM

Detective Steinhaus,

Thank you for the update and for reviewing the materials.

I was surprised to receive a final no-criminal-violation disposition without any written follow-up questions, particularly because I had expressly requested written/email communication as an accommodation and stated that I was willing to respond promptly to written questions.

I was also surprised that the review could be completed so quickly. It has taken me the better part of a year to identify this pattern from heavily redacted, incomplete, and parent-facing records. I understand law enforcement may have tools I do not have, including the ability to consult with the county attorney and obtain underlying source records through subpoena or other lawful process, so it is possible Prior Lake Police was able to see a clearer record than I can.

I am assuming from that process that Prior Lake Police had enough evidence from the materials reviewed to conclude that witness clarification from me was unnecessary before determining that no criminal reporting or reporting-interference violations existed.

I am also concerned that your email refers to "the incident" having been made known to the department and investigated. My referral was not only about the underlying student-on-student assault. It was about later adult reporting, routing, and

Gross: fuzzy scope
The closure says no criminal violations, but the reviewed thing is only described as "the incident."

Remember this for later
He sends the family to MDE and the County without saying which questions PLPD actually answered.

Gross: clearer record
The family had to wade through mostly redacted records to figure this out. PLPD had access to the actual material and still did not bother to say what it reviewed.

possible reporting-interference issues after District actors were notified of potential child maltreatment concerns.

For the citations below, I am referring to the 2024 archived Minnesota Statutes Chapter 260E provisions that appear to govern the 2024 conduct. I understand that some cited provisions describe predicate reporting, school-facility investigation, notice, or data-access duties rather than criminal penalties by themselves. I am asking whether Prior Lake Police reviewed those duties as part of the criminal reporting-failure and reporting-interference analysis, especially under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.08(a) and 260E.08(e).

For clarity, can you please confirm in writing whether Prior Lake Police reviewed and determined that:

1. After family verbally notified District staff of safety concerns on or about October 30, 2024, and after District-produced notes reflected that on November 1, 2024 Mom came to school for family trombone, shared that the family had learned about a family assault, declined to provide additional details verbally, and said Dad would email, the District staff who received or routed that information had no report, report-intake, no-report, or routing obligation under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), and sec. 260E.08(a), including the potential maltreatment predicates in sec. 260E.03, subds. 12, 15(a)(2)-(3), 16, 17, 20, and 23(a).
2. After family notified Scott Peterson and John Dahl in writing on November 1, 2024 at 11:57 a.m. that family had been struck in the head with a chair multiple times, had suffered a concussion, and had disclosed ongoing family assault at school by a peer, the absence of any located maltreatment report, report-intake record, no-report determination, MDE routing, or cross-agency referral presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), sec. 260E.08(a), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, or sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(b), including the potential maltreatment predicates in sec. 260E.03, subds. 12, 15(a)(2)-(3), 16, 17, 20, and 23(a).
3. After family November 4, 2024 follow-up notified Scott Peterson, John Dahl, Dr. Michael Thomas, and the PLSAS School Board that there had been no response to the November 1 written notice and that family remained out of school because the District had not identified safety steps, the absence of any located report, intake, no-report determination, MDE routing, or school-facility maltreatment trail presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), sec. 260E.08(a), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, or sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(b).
4. After the PLSAS School Board auto-response confirmed receipt by all Board directors on November 4, 2024 and indicated that follow-up could be routed to the appropriate administrator, the Board/District handling of that routed child-safety notice did not violate Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, did not intentionally prevent or attempt to prevent mandated reporting under sec. 260E.08(e), and did not leave any report-routing issue under sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), or sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(b).
5. After District staff were notified on November 1 and November 4, 2024 that a student allegedly struck family in the head with a chair, repeated the attack about five minutes later, and caused a concussion while the class was under teacher/staff supervision, the absence of a located maltreatment report, MDE report/routing record, no-report determination, or school-facility neglect investigation trail for the supervising teacher/staff presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.03, subds. 12, 15(a)(2)-(3), 16, and 17; sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1); sec. 260E.08(a); sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d); sec. 260E.28, subds. 1, 3, 4, and 5; sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(b); or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
6. Joe Kuboushek / Emily Herman's November 20, 2024 explanation that no incident report existed from the November 1 trombone-pickup conversation, and that no verbal report was shared because family preferred written communication, presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), or sec. 260E.08(a), even though District-produced notes separately reflected that the same November 1 interaction included verbal notice that the family had learned about a family assault.
7. Treating the November 1, 2024 family-assault notice as not reportable or not yet actionable because the parent declined to provide additional verbal detail and indicated that a written complaint would follow did not reflect a policy, practice, act, or omission discouraging, delaying, preventing, or attempting to prevent a mandated report, and therefore presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e), in addition to the mandatory-reporting exposure under sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.09(a), and sec. 260E.08(a).
8. After family formally complained on January 7-8, 2025 that District staff failed to comply with mandated-reporting obligations, and Dr. Michael Thomas acknowledged the request for investigation into "failure of mandated reporters," the District's decision to process the matter internally under Policy 103 without a located MDE report, law-enforcement or child-protection intake trail, MDE school-facility screening record, or no-report/no-referral determination presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.

Gross law hook

Chapter 260E / Minn. Stat. 260E.08: reporting-failure and prevention hooks. This ties duties to concrete notice facts, not vague policy complaints.

Gross law hook

Minn. Stat. 260E.06 / 260E.09: mandated-report and report-intake duties. Written notice of assault and abuse should create a report or routing trail.

Gross law hook

Minn. Stat. 260E.14 / 260E.28 / 260E.29 / 260E.30: routing, investigation, and parent-notice responsibilities. Where is that trail?

Statute reminder

The definition cites are doing one job: show the facts fit the maltreatment categories that trigger the reporting machinery.

9. Emily Herman's HOMS Maltreatment Report / Policy 103 investigation, transmitted with Dr. Thomas's January 24, 2025 response, lawfully satisfied the Chapter 260E school-facility investigation framework for the failure-of-mandated-reporters complaint, including any review of the teacher/staff response to the chair assault and family assault disclosures, under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, and sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5, and did not present any reporting-interference issue under sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e).
10. Dr. Thomas's January 24, 2025 presentation of the internal District investigation as the completed disposition of a maltreatment-reporting / failure-to-report complaint, despite the produced record not showing MDE routing, MDE screening, MDE investigative data collection, a school-facility maltreatment determination, or a no-report/no-referral rationale, presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
11. Presenting the January 24, 2025 HOMS Maltreatment Report as completed "results" or a completed parent-facing disposition, when approximately 89.99% of the findings/conclusion footprint was redacted, the page 2 conclusion body was 100% redacted, and only about 30 visible result words remained excluding headings, satisfied any applicable Chapter 260E school-facility investigation and notice obligations under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, and sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5, and did not function as reporting interference under sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e).
12. The combined January 24, March 13, May 9, May 27, June 4, and June 16 District posture - including redaction, denial, non-identification, and non-production of information necessary for a parent to determine which mandated reporters were assessed, what facts were found, whether a maltreatment report or no-report determination existed, whether MDE handled the school-facility maltreatment issue, and whether any staff failure was sustained, corrected, or rejected - did not constitute an illegal attempt to block the parent from establishing, documenting, or reporting a mandated-reporting failure, and presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
13. After Dr. Michael Thomas was notified of the failure-of-mandated-reporters complaint on January 7-8, 2025, acknowledged it on January 8, 2025, and then issued the January 24, 2025 response stating that the District reviewed the complaints under Policy 103 and complied with relevant policies, the absence of any located external report, MDE routing, staff correction, staff training, discipline, corrective/protective-action record, or no-action rationale presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) or (e), sec. 260E.09(a), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
14. After the District and School Board were later placed on written notice through the June 4, 2026 HOMS Maltreatment / Policy 414 correction and access-history request pair, and again through the June 16, 2026 HOMS Maltreatment redaction-results addendum, that the maintained HOMS Maltreatment Report / Policy 414 record did not show MDE review or the ordinary Chapter 260E school-facility reporting trail, the District's continued non-correction, non-routing, or non-identification of that trail presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
15. No District employee, administrator, Board actor, or entity intentionally prevented or attempted to prevent a mandated reporter from reporting under Chapter 260E by using an internal complaint process, Policy 103 framing, "the underlying incident was already investigated" framing, student-discipline framing, redacted-completed-results framing, or no-external-record/no-MDE-routing posture between November 2024 and June 2026, and therefore no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e) existed to investigate.
16. Prior Lake Police's June 17, 2026 no-criminal-violation disposition in ICR 26009995 did not rely on the premise that a prior investigation of the underlying student-on-student assault, a school-discipline outcome for the student actor, or a county charging decision on the assault charge would satisfy or eliminate separate adult mandated-reporting, school-facility routing, or reporting-interference obligations under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) and (e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.29, subd. 1(a)-(b), or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
17. Failing to preserve, produce, or account for family family original November 1, 2024 Title IX / complaint email to Scott Peterson and John Dahl, which contained written notice of the chair assault, alleged ongoing family assault at school, and school-staff neglect concerns, did not constitute concealment of source notice, suppression of a maltreatment-reporting predicate, or unlawful reporting interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1), sec. 260E.08(a) or (e), sec. 260E.09(a), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(k)-(l), and 5.
18. Failing to preserve, produce, or identify the email-systems audit, Google Admin / Vault / Gmail log-search export, quarantine object, routing record, search parameter record, raw log row, or Technology-source record that Joe Kuboushek / Emily Herman represented on November 20, 2024 confirmed the November 1 / November 4

Gross law hook

Minn. Stat. 260E.14 / 260E.28 / 260E.29 / 260E.30: school-facility routing, investigation, and notice path. Internal handling is being measured against that path.

Gross law hook

Minn. Stat. 260E.29 / 260E.30 / 260E.35: notice/results/data framework. Redacted parent-facing results are the opposite of a useful notice trail.

Gross law hook

Minn. Stat. 260E.08(e): intentional prevention/interference theory. Redaction and nonproduction can block proof of reporting failure.

Statute reminder

The repeated cites all point back to the same question: was there an actual report, screen, investigation, notice, or no-report rationale?

complaint-email intake path did not constitute concealment of the source-record basis for the District's first-receipt / nonreceipt account, suppression of a maltreatment-reporting predicate, or unlawful reporting interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(k)-(l), and 5.

19. Treating family June 1, 2025 request for complete email logs, Oct. 30-forward family-as-data-subject communications, original Title IX complaint email content, and the quarantine audit as already answered or not clearly a new data request - while the produced log artifact identified to date is family with 312 event rows, only 10 unique message IDs, a February 13-March 5, 2025 UTC message-start window, and a February 13-March 13, 2025 event window - did not constitute concealment of the November 1 / November 4 complaint-intake path, suppression of a maltreatment-reporting predicate, or unlawful reporting interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2 and 3(k)-(l).
20. Robert Cothorn's May 26, 2026 posture that the email-log / complaint-content / quarantine-audit lane had been handled, without producing or identifying the original November 1 complaint email, the audit-source records for the November 1 / November 4 intake path, or complete log/quarantine/routing records for the represented Oct. 30-forward universe, did not constitute a materially false or misleading source-record posture designed to block a parent, mandated reporter, MDE reviewer, or law-enforcement reviewer from establishing a maltreatment-reporting failure, and did not violate Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2 and 3(k)-(l).

Separately, as to the District's handling of the underlying incident and the records later used to dispose of the Chapter 260E-adjacent complaints, please also confirm whether Prior Lake Police reviewed and determined that:

1. Creating, maintaining, or relying on Incident Detail ID 73528 / the "Physical Agression/Contact" incident record after the November 2024 chair assault, and then using that record in December 2024 and January 2025 District response/investigation lanes in a manner that could be read to obscure actor/victim roles or reduce the incident to two hits despite District-held source notes and later District correspondence reflecting that the incident was not a clean two-hit premise, did not constitute falsification, concealment, obstruction, or an attempt to suppress a maltreatment report, no-report determination, neglect review, or school-facility maltreatment referral under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.03, subds. 12, 15(a)(2)-(3), 16, and 17; sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©; sec. 260E.08(a) and (e); sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d); sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5; or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
2. Providing the parent with SO Data Request File 4 / the investigative interview file in a redacted or garbled form that left visible Emily Herman asking how many times family reported being hit, left visible fragments including "two times," the incident "happened twice," and "six times in the head," but did not disclose the staff/interview-source identity, role, or answer context needed to test which mandated reporter or staff witness supplied the count, what count was supplied, when that person knew it, whether that person reported it, and why a lower-count version was accepted, did not constitute concealment of material strike-count evidence, suppression of staff-witness / mandated-reporter identity, suppression of a maltreatment report or staff-neglect / weapons-policy theory, or unlawful reporting interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) and (e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
3. After the District had notice between November 2024 and March 2025 that family ized abuse / family allegedly occurred at least partly in class or in a classroom with a teacher present, and after District-produced records included a "touched her in class" source-note fragment, maintaining or providing a produced investigation universe that did not visibly show targeted inquiry into the implicated class periods, teachers, adult supervision, staff-witness knowledge, staff reporting, or school-facility maltreatment / failure-to-report implications did not constitute concealment of staff-neglect evidence, suppression of a maltreatment report, failure to make a maltreatment report, or unlawful reporting interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.03, subds. 12, 15(a)(2)-(3), 16, 17, 20, and 23(a); sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©; sec. 260E.08(a) and (e); sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d); or sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5.
4. Treating the November 2024 chair/stool incident later referred for prosecution / charged as second-degree assault as a lesser school altercation, and not applying the District's weapons / dangerous-instrument policy framework in a way that would have generated police-notification, DIRS, dangerous-weapon, or external-review records, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, staff-neglect theory, or external-review route, and presented no violation of Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) and (e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, or sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.
5. Continuing between December 2024 and January 2025 to rely on the two-hit / ambiguous incident-record framing without attaching an annotation, correction, or statement of disagreement, despite Dr. Thomas's January 8, 2025 statement that family three-plus-two account would be considered/reflected and despite later District reliance on the incident-record universe in both the HOMS Maltreatment Report and HOMS Investigation Process report, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report or materially affect whether the District's internal process could

Gross law hook

Missing audit and source-record trails matter because they preserve or erase the notice path.

Gross law hook

The incident-record framing is being tied to concealment, reporting, and routing duties.

Gross law hook

Hidden source identity makes it impossible to test who knew what, when, and whether they reported.

satisfy the Chapter 260E / MDE school-facility maltreatment investigation framework under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, and sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6.

6. Providing the January 24, 2025 parent-facing HOMS Investigation Process report as the District's explanation for why the chair/stool incident did not require a Policy 501 weapons disposition, despite the report being approximately 76.68% redacted by estimated word capacity and not visibly disclosing a usable weapons-policy rationale, legal-consult scope, substantive finding, or conclusion, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, suppression of a reporting-failure complaint, or interference with the parent's ability to establish a staff-neglect / failure-to-report theory under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) and (e), sec. 260E.14, subd. 1(d), sec. 260E.28, subds. 4-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
7. Refusing the family's December 2024 request for CornerHouse or another neutral, trauma-informed interviewer on privacy / District-process grounds, then maintaining later Title IX, HOMS, redaction, or legal-consult records that used the child's private data through District-aligned legal, contractor, consultant, or review channels without producing a clear FERPA school-official, legitimate-educational-interest, direct-control, or redisclosure-limit mapping, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report or interference with the parent's ability to establish a mandated-reporting / staff-neglect failure under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1(a)(1) and ©, sec. 260E.08(a) and (e), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
8. In the same March 13, 2025 response package that transmitted the Title IX dismissal, Emily Herman's denial of the March 3 key-evidence / unredacted-file access requests by stating that "Demands for unredacted files" were denied, that all responsive data had been provided, and that redactions were made under student-data and personnel-data statutes - while using the attached written determination / dismissal posture as the functional reason no further active-evidence access would be provided - did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, suppression of staff-neglect / weapons-policy / failure-to-report proof, or unlawful interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
9. Emily Herman's March 13, 2025 Title IX dismissal based on noncooperation / inability to identify respondent(s), after the March 3 key-evidence notice placed chair-assault, teacher-nondiscipline, and HOMS records into the active Title IX evidence lane and the March 5 receipt confirmation anticipated a March 13 response, while the visible report showed no child interview, omitted the family's denied neutral / trauma-informed interview request, and the produced record universe did not show months of intervening investigative activity, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report or reporting-failure proof under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
10. The District's May 9, 2025 denial of the family's Title IX appeal as untimely, even though the identified March 13 dismissal notice / summary did not visibly provide the appeal deadline, procedure, permissible bases, appeal decision-maker, or operative policy/regulation later relied upon, and even though appeal review would have created or enabled external review of the incident-handling record, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, suppression of reporting-failure proof, or unlawful interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e).
11. Emily Herman's May 9, 2025 statement that the District had no obligation to respond to the May 6, 2025 Title IX complaint / correction / access submission targeting the Title IX summary and process defects, rather than treating it as a maintained-record correction, appeal, or reporting-failure / process-integrity challenge, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, suppression of reporting-failure proof, or unlawful interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
12. Emily Herman's May 27, 2025 denial of the May 6, 2025 source-backed HOMS Investigation Process / weapons-investigation correction request by stating that the challenged data were correct, complete, not inaccurate, and not misleading, despite the District's produced universe not visibly showing an investigation record sufficient to support the weapons-policy rationale or reconcile the two-hit / multi-hit source conflict, did not constitute suppression of a maltreatment report, suppression of staff-neglect proof, or unlawful interference under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), sec. 260E.28, subds. 3-5, sec. 260E.30, subds. 1 and 5-6, or sec. 260E.35, subds. 2, 3(g)-(l), and 5.
13. The combined incident-handling and source-record path from November 2024 through May/June 2026 - including the lost/not-produced November 1 complaint email, missing audit/source records for the November 1 / November 4 intake path, partial 30-day / 10-message-ID [family] artifact, incident-record wording, strike-count reduction, redacted or garbled File 4 count-source answers, absence of visible targeted investigation into the classroom/teacher-present [family] abuse allegation, weapons-policy / DIRS non-routing, redacted HOMS process report, denied neutral-interviewer request, March 13 unredacted-file denial, use of the Title IX dismissal / written-determination posture as an access-denial rationale, appeal-denial posture, May 9 no-obligation posture, and May

Gross law hook

This asks whether a heavily redacted explanation really satisfies a legal review duty.

Gross law hook

The neutral-interview issue is framed as access to reliable evidence, not just parent preference.

Gross law hook

Denials and redactions are being tied to whether reporting-failure proof was suppressed.

27 correction-denial posture - did not intentionally prevent or attempt to prevent any mandated reporter, parent, MDE reviewer, law-enforcement reviewer, or other reviewer from identifying, documenting, reporting, or externally reviewing a possible school-staff maltreatment, neglect, weapons-policy, or failure-to-report issue under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, or sec. 260E.08(e).

14. Even if any one, two, or several of the above items might have an innocent or noncriminal explanation when viewed in isolation, the cumulative convergence from November 2024 through June 2026 of missing source notice, missing audit/log basis, partial log production, internal-only routing, redacted findings, hidden staff/witness identity, reduced incident framing, nonuse of external review routes, and access/correction denials did not itself constitute circumstantial evidence of a possible effort to suppress, conceal, or prevent a maltreatment report or reporting-failure proof, and Prior Lake Police reviewed and ruled out that aggregate pattern under Minn. Stat. sec. 260E.06, subd. 1©, sec. 260E.08(e), or any other obstruction, concealment, or reporting-interference theory.

If the answer is yes, please confirm that these theories were reviewed and ruled out as noncriminal in ICR 26009995. If any item above was not reviewed, please identify which items were not reviewed and whether Prior Lake Police will review them, forward them to the Scott County Attorney, or direct me to submit them elsewhere.

On the chance that any of these avenues were not fully reviewed, each point above is supported by written source records, District-produced records, preserved emails, or formal District response records. I would be happy to provide the specific source documents, excerpts, or packet references for any item if that would assist Prior Lake Police's review.

I am not asking Prior Lake Police to resolve FERPA, MGDPA, school-record correction, or education-policy issues. I am asking for written confirmation of the scope of the criminal/no-criminal-violation determination because the disposition email did not identify which Chapter 260E reporting and reporting-interference theories were evaluated.

Thank you,

family family

On Wed, 17 Jun 2026 19:18:17 +0000, Cody Steinhaus csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov wrote:

Good afternoon sir,

After reviewing the materials you sent regarding allegations of mandated reporter failures by Hidden Oaks Middle School, the Prior Lake Police Department has determined that there are no criminal violations to investigate. The Prior Lake Police Department was made aware of the incident, and it was investigated. If you have concerns of possible policy violations on how the incident was reported by the school, I suggest you contact the Minnesota Department of Education and/or the Scott County Attorney's Office.

Thank you.

Cody Steinhaus

[Quoted text hidden]

Gross law hook

This is the cumulative-pattern theory: many small omissions can add up to interference.

Evidence offered

We are offering them the evidence they need. Remember this for later.

Simple ask

We are just asking them to say what they did.

To: family family family

Good afternoon, sir,

A supplemental report was completed detailing that after reviewing the two incidents reported to the Prior Lake Police Department, no criminal investigation will be conducted for "Possible Mandated-Reporter Failure". The Prior Lake Police Department determined that the incidents were reported to us via the proper channels.

If you are concerned with the school's management of these incidents, I would direct you to the Minnesota Department of Education.

Thank you.



Cody Steinhaus

Detective

City of Prior Lake | 4649 Dakota Street SE | Prior Lake, MN 55372

Main: 952.440.3555 - Direct: 952.447.9879

This information is intended only for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is privileged, confidential, and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby noticed that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this information is strictly prohibited.

PLPD thread release copy

Gross: 16h 25m later

From the 11:35 PM email to this 4:00 PM response. If the workday started at 9 AM, that is about 7 work hours.

Really?

34 items in about 7 work hours?

Becomes important later

Again, PLPD directs the family to another agency without identifying the actual review scope.

From: family family family
Sent: Wednesday, June 17, 2026 11:38 PM
To: Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@PriorLakeMN.gov>
Subject: Re: Request for Law-Enforcement Review - Possible Mandated-Reporter Failure / HOMS Maltreatment Report

SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender. Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether you know the sender. For more information please contact Helpdesk@PriorLakeMN.gov.
[Quoted text hidden]

family family family Thu, Jun 18, 2026 at 6:15 PM
To: csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov

Detective Steinhaus,

Thank you for the update. I appreciate you taking the time to review this and respond.

I also apologize for the persistence. I know this is not a simple or ordinary email thread, and I am not trying to make your job harder. I am trying to be explicit because our prior experience with PLPD and PLSAS left us concerned about how school-context information can enter a police file.

Specifically, in the earlier assault matter, a supplemental report was created more than four months after the November 2024 investigation contact. That supplemental report memorialized that the school would issue school discipline to the accused student. From the materials available to us, that school-discipline fact had no apparent bearing on whether the assault charge was supported, but it had obvious bearing on the school’s later liability/defense narrative. I am not saying that proves misconduct by PLPD. I am saying it left us with a bad taste and taught us that, in this matter, it is better to be very clear about what was reviewed, what was decided, and what agency record exists.

Your message says the incidents were reported to PLPD through the proper channels. I take that to mean that PLPD concluded a school official or school resource properly reported the relevant incidents, including the mandated-reporting concern. If I am misunderstanding that, please correct me.

What surprises me is that District-produced records show verbal family -assault notice on November 1, 2024, but the District later gave us the opposite framing. In SO Data Request File 4, the District-produced notes state that Mom came to Hidden Oaks to get family trombone and that “Mom shared they learned about a family assault.” The same note then says Mom did not want to share anything further verbally and that her husband would send an email. That is evidence of verbal family -assault notice. It is not the same thing as no verbal report.

Then, in a November 20, 2024 message signed by Joseph Kuboushek and Emily Herman, the District stated that there was no incident report from the November 1 conversation; that, based on internal interviews, family preferred to communicate in writing and no verbal report was shared with Scott Peterson; and that the initial communication received on the family abuse allegations was not received until November 15, when screenshots of the quarantined email chain were forwarded.

So if a school official or school resource actually made a proper-channel maltreatment report within 24 hours of the November 1 verbal notice, I am extremely surprised. I wish the District had simply said that. It would have saved us a great deal of time and would have changed the nature of our request.

Can you help me identify the agency I should contact to request access to the report, intake record, screening record, or screened-out report? My assumption is that a school-facility maltreatment report would have gone to the Minnesota Department of Education, but I do not want to assume incorrectly. If the relevant report was made only to PLPD, or to another agency, please let me know that as well.

I am not asking you to disclose private student, juvenile, or personnel data by email. I am asking for the record-routing information: what kind of report PLPD understood had been made, to which agency or agencies, and how I should request the report, intake record, screening record, screened-out report, or the PLPD supplemental report referenced in your email.

Relatedly, can you please identify the supplemental report referenced in your email by report number, title, date, or whatever request language PLPD Records would need to locate it?

Gross: prior bias marker
Randomly remembering an inconsequential school-discipline fact after four months and filing a supplemental report about it seems... unlikely.

Source-backed contradiction
This raises a written District record that directly contradicts the no-problem finding.

Hard written evidence
This points to written evidence of verbal notice. That is the failure-to-report problem in plain language.

Gross: help me do your thing
The family is simply asking PLPD to help them contact the agency PLPD told them to contact.

Evidence offered
We are offering them the evidence they need. Remember this for later.

Basic records problem
We kind of need to know this to request information about it. Let us see if they provide it.

One additional clarification: your answer still leaves a large number of my prior scope-confirmation questions unaddressed. Can you please confirm whether each of the 34 items in my prior message was evaluated and found not to present a criminal issue? If any item was not evaluated, please identify which items were outside PLPD's review and whether I should direct those specific items to MDE, the Scott County Attorney's Office, or another agency.

Thank you again for your time.

family family

family family family

Fri, Jun 19, 2026 at 3:33 PM

To: csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov

Detective Steinhaus,

I am sorry to take more of your time again. I realize you probably have much better things to do than continue with a parent trying to make a school/police record make sense, and I appreciate the time you have already spent on this.

I am following up because, given our past experiences with issues involving PLPD and PLSAS, it is important to us that the record be clear and not misleading, especially when it comes to matters of which complaints have or have not been screened out. I do not want your messages later represented as a PLPD determination that every issue I raised was investigated if that is not what happened.

Can you please identify what specific "incident" you meant when you wrote that "the incident" was made known to PLPD and investigated? For example, did you mean the student-on-student assault, the family abuse allegations, the alleged failure by school personnel to report or route maltreatment concerns, the later record/access/redaction pattern, or something narrower?

I am also asking again for a scope answer. Please identify which of the items I raised PLPD actually investigated or evaluated for criminal/reporting-interference purposes, and which items PLPD did not evaluate and believes I should forward to MDE, the Scott County Attorney's Office, or another agency.

If PLPD is declining to answer that scope question, please say that expressly. I can work with a clear "we are not answering that question" more safely than with an ambiguous record that may later be read as PLPD having investigated and rejected all of the issues I identified.

I am not asking you to disclose private student, juvenile, or personnel data by email. I am asking only for the scope of PLPD's review and the proper routing path for anything PLPD did not review.

Thank you again,

family family

[Quoted text hidden]

family family family

Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 10:05 AM

To: Police@priorlakemn.gov

Cc: csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov, lduggan@priorlakemn.gov, penglin@priorlakemn.gov, jbisek@priorlakemn.gov, info@priorlakemn.gov

Good morning,

I am routing this to PLPD's general police intake/supervisory/records contacts because I need a clear scope/routing answer in order to follow Detective Steinhaus's direction that remaining school-reporting concerns be brought to MDE and/or the Scott County Attorney's Office.

Detective Steinhaus's June 17 and June 18 messages state that PLPD will not conduct a criminal investigation for possible mandated-reporter failure, that PLPD was made aware of "the incident," and that the two incidents were reported to PLPD through proper channels. I have asked for a narrow clarification of what PLPD actually screened or evaluated, what "the incident" refers to, and which issues PLPD did not review and believes should be sent elsewhere.

I am especially concerned because this is now the second time in this same PLSAS child-safety/reporting context that PLPD wording or supplemental reporting has created ambiguity that could be read as adopting or preserving the school-side framing without clearly identifying the independent law-enforcement scope or source basis.

PLPD thread release copy

Gross: all of them

"A large number" means all 34. It is grosser because a detective is trained to give exactly these non-answers.

No response after 21h 18m

The follow-up comes after the June 18 scope request sat unanswered overnight and into the next afternoon.

The clean question

What did PLPD review, what did it not review, and where should the rest go?

Easy out offered

Just say what you are doing and be done with it. That was the off-ramp.

No response after 66h 32m

By the Monday escalation, the Friday scope question had been unanswered for the entire weekend.

Gross.

This is another reminder that the same case already had a PLPD wording/bias problem.

That clarification matters because I cannot accurately bring serious child-safety and school-reporting concerns to another agency if PLPD’s record is ambiguous about whether those same concerns were already screened, or whether PLPD reviewed only the underlying student incidents and not the later adult reporting, routing, or reporting-interference issues.

I am not asking PLPD to disclose private student, juvenile, or personnel data by email. I am asking for non-private scope/routing clarification sufficient to prevent PLPD’s closure language from being misrepresented later.

Please provide one of the following:

- 1. Identify which of the issues I raised PLPD actually screened or evaluated for criminal/reporting-interference purposes;
- 2. Identify which issues PLPD did not screen or evaluate and where PLPD believes those issues should be routed; or
- 3. State expressly that PLPD is declining to provide a scope/routing clarification, so I can route the remaining child-safety concerns with that caveat.

This request concerns ICR 26009995 and the email thread titled Request for Law-Enforcement Review - Possible Mandated-Reporter Failure / HOMS Maltreatment Report.

[Quoted text hidden]

family family family

Wed, Jun 24, 2026 at 8:50 AM

To: Police@priorlakemn.gov
Cc: csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov, lduggan@priorlakemn.gov, penglin@priorlakemn.gov, jbisek@priorlakemn.gov, info@priorlakemn.gov

Good morning,

I am following up on my Monday morning email regarding ICR 26009995.

I understand that 48 hours is not a long period for a substantive response. At this point, I am asking for acknowledgment and either a scope clarification or an estimated date by which PLPD expects to provide one.

The narrow issue is whether PLPD’s June 17–18 disposition constituted:

- 1. A threshold screening based on PLPD’s existing files concerning the two underlying student-on-student incidents;
- 2. A review of the separate adult mandated-reporting and intentional reporting-interference theories identified in my submission; or
- 3. A decision not to investigate those theories further despite unresolved factual questions.

That distinction matters because the statement that the two underlying incidents reached PLPD “through the proper channels” does not, by itself, resolve whether suspected school-personnel or school-facility maltreatment was reported through the Chapter 260E process, whether the responsible agency received such a report, or whether anyone intentionally delayed, redirected, discouraged, prevented, or attempted to prevent such reporting.

The 34 points I identified were not presented as 34 unrelated policy complaints or 34 separate crimes. They were presented as circumstantial evidence bearing on knowledge, intent, means, and continuity concerning possible violations of Minn. Stat. § 260E.08(a) and (e).

Among the source-backed issues were:

- District-recorded verbal notice of a family assault on November 1;
- written notice sent later that day and again on November 4;
- the District’s admission that an email-systems audit located the messages in its environment;
- the absence of a presently identified Chapter 260E report, MDE-routing record, or documented no-report determination;
- the later internal disposition of the reporting-failure complaint under Policy 103 after Policy 414 was expressly reviewed;
- heavily redacted findings that do not permit identification of the actors, allegations, or reporting conclusions actually investigated; and
- the continuing nonproduction of the admitted email audit and its source records.

Those matters are not resolved merely by confirming that the underlying peer assaults reached PLPD. Nor, unless PLPD reviewed additional records or performed investigative steps not identified to me, does the approximately 24-hour response period—without contacting me or requesting the source records I offered—demonstrate that the aggregate

PLPD thread release copy

Gross: frozen in place

Their answer, as written, effectively blocks accurate routing because it does not say what was actually screened.

Easy out offered

They were given the simplest possible exit: say PLPD is declining scope clarification.

Waiting 46h 44m

This Wednesday follow-up came almost two days after the Monday escalation.

Spell it out cleaner?

I do not know how to spell it out any cleaner.

Evidence offered

We are offering them the evidence they need. Remember this for later.

adult-conduct theory was investigated and ruled out on its merits.

I am therefore requesting one of the following responses:

1. PLPD reviewed only its existing incident files concerning the underlying student incidents and did not evaluate the separate adult failure-to-report or reporting-interference theories;
2. PLPD evaluated those theories, in which case please identify at a non-private category level the records reviewed, persons or agencies contacted, MDE or cross-notification checks performed, and whether any prosecutorial consultation occurred; or

3. PLPD declines to provide scope clarification.

I am not requesting private student, juvenile, personnel, privileged, or active-investigative information. Category-level confirmation is sufficient.

For reference, a public redacted chronology and supporting source materials are available at <https://plsas.compliance-theater.org/plpd>. Full source records can also be provided directly upon request.

Because PLPD's disposition may be relied upon by MDE, the Scott County Attorney's Office, and other reviewers, I want to ensure that I describe the scope of PLPD's review accurately and do not attribute findings to the Department that it did not make. Absent clarification, I will need to route the remaining concerns with the caveat that PLPD issued a no-investigation disposition but did not identify whether the adult reporting and reporting-interference theories were evaluated.

Please acknowledge receipt and provide either the requested clarification or an estimated response date.

Thank you,

family family
[Quoted text hidden]

Liam Duggan <lduggan@priorlakemn.gov> Wed, Jun 24, 2026 at 12:59 PM
To: family family family Police Dept <police@priorlakemn.gov>
Cc: Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov>, Phillip Englin <penglin@priorlakemn.gov>, Jennifer Bisek <jbisek@priorlakemn.gov>, Daniel Olson <dolson@priorlakemn.gov>

Mr family

As per the email you received June 18 from Detective Steinhaus, the police department has completed any and all investigative work on the case you refer to and will not be conducting any additional follow up given information available. We also will not have any further response to your repeat inquiry other than any official data requests that will be filled accordingly.

If you would like to meet in person, please let me know of potential future dates and I would be happy to accommodate.

Should you choose not to meet and have any additional requests other than legal data request, please direct any and all correspondence in the matter to the Scott County Attorney's Office and/or the Minnesota Department of Education.

Respectfully,

Liam Duggan
Chief of Police

What they are really trying to do

A vague PLPD closure can be waved around later as if every adult-reporting issue was investigated.

Gross public push

A parent should not have to publish personal details and push this hard to have the police say what they did about an issue presenting probable cause of gross child neglect and failure to follow mandated reporter laws.

Gross: 50h 54m later

It took 50h 54m from Monday, and 4h 10m after the public-link email, to get this non-answer.

Chief of Police

This is not a records-clerk brush-off. The Chief of Police is closing the loop without saying what PLPD actually reviewed.

Data-request wall

The questions were polite and reasonable, and they still would not clearly state what they were doing.

Off-record trapdoor

Also: "If you would like to give me a chance to speak off-record and then add my version to the reported record later."

Routing made harder

That would be easier if PLPD could just say what it actually looked at, or heck, would even give the case numbers to reference.

Get Outlook for iOS

From: family family family
Sent: Wednesday, June 24, 2026 7:50 AM
To: Police Dept <police@PriorLakeMN.gov>
Cc: Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@PriorLakeMN.gov>; Liam Duggan <lduggan@PriorLakeMN.gov>; Phillip Englin <penglin@PriorLakeMN.gov>; Jennifer Bisek <jbisek@PriorLakeMN.gov>; Information City Web Page <Info@PriorLakeMN.gov>
Subject: Re: Request for Law-Enforcement Review - Possible Mandated-Reporter Failure / HOMS Maltreatment Report

SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender. Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether you know the sender. For more information please contact Helpdesk@PriorLakeMN.gov.

[Quoted text hidden]

family family family Wed, Jun 24, 2026 at 7:32 PM
To: Liam Duggan <lduggan@priorlakemn.gov>
Cc: Police Dept <police@priorlakemn.gov>, Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov>, Phillip Englin <penglin@priorlakemn.gov>, Jennifer Bisek <jbisek@priorlakemn.gov>, Daniel Olson <dolson@priorlakemn.gov>

Thank you for responding and for clarifying PLPD’s position regarding my requests for written identification of the scope of its review.

I understand PLPD to be stating that it has completed “any and all investigative work” it intends to perform, will conduct no additional follow-up, and will not identify in writing whether the separate adult mandated-reporting and reporting-interference issues were included within that work.

I understand why PLPD may prefer not to try to reconcile that scope in writing. I would find it difficult to explain as well, particularly given the progression from “the incident” was investigated, to “the two incidents” were reported through proper channels, to all work now being complete “given information available”—despite PLPD issuing that disposition without contacting me and without accepting or responding to my repeated offers to provide additional written, source-backed evidence.

Thank you also to you and PLPD Records for the additional requirement that I provide photo identification and proof of parentage before my pending data requests will be processed. I appreciate the degree of care PLPD is taking to verify that the person communicating from the same email address that appears throughout the complaint, follow-up communications, and records PLPD says it reviewed is indeed the parent requesting records concerning himself and his minor child.

I will comply through an appropriately secure method. My compliance does not withdraw, narrow, replace, or reset the original requests or their June 19 and June 22 receipt dates.

Given PLPD’s categorical statement that all investigative work is complete, I must also understand PLPD to be asserting that the work it performed was sufficient to evaluate, or consciously decline to evaluate:

- the alleged failure of a classroom teacher to observe or intervene during two chair-strike episodes separated by approximately five minutes and resulting in a concussion;
 - the alleged failure of a different classroom teacher to protect or supervise during reported repeated peer family assaults or family occurring in class;
 - whether District staff who later received verbal and written notice complied with their individual Chapter 260E reporting duties;
 - whether anyone intentionally prevented or attempted to prevent a mandated report; and
- whether a qualifying school-facility maltreatment report was transmitted to MDE, including any required police-to-MDE handoff.

I appreciate what I am sure the pending records will show was a detailed and appropriately sourced review of those distinct questions before PLPD reached its no-criminal-investigation disposition without contacting the reporting witness, requesting the additional source evidence offered, or identifying any investigative step taken beyond review of “information available.”

What remains particularly strange is that, after all of this asserted investigative work, I still do not know whether MDE ever received a qualifying maltreatment report, whether MDE investigated one, or what school-staff or facility conduct was actually placed within the statutory review process.

No scope answer

The issue is not private data. It is the refusal to identify whether adult reporting issues were included.

Given information available

How many times (2) did we offer additional written evidence again? How many times did they accept it? (0)

I recognize that Chapter 260E generally protects the identity of an alleged offender. I am not asking PLPD to disclose private personnel information. But under Minn. Stat. § 260E.29, subd. 1(a), MDE was required to inform the parent within ten days after receiving a school-facility maltreatment report whether it would investigate. If an MDE investigation had been completed, Minn. Stat. § 260E.30, subd. 5, required written notice summarizing the nature of the alleged maltreatment, the investigator, the findings, whether maltreatment was found, and the corrective or protective measures taken.

I received neither form of notice.

That leaves a finite unresolved set of possibilities: no qualifying school-facility maltreatment report reached MDE; MDE received one but the required notice did not occur; or responsive reporting and notice records exist but have not yet been identified. PLPD's statement that the underlying peer incidents reached police through "proper channels" does not establish which of those possibilities is true.

Because PLPD has declined to identify its review scope, I will not represent to MDE, the Scott County Attorney's Office, or other reviewers that PLPD investigated and rejected every adult-conduct theory I submitted. I will instead describe the record as follows:

PLPD issued a no-further-investigation disposition based on information available to it, relied in part on the fact that two underlying peer incidents reached PLPD, and declined to identify whether it evaluated the separate adult failure-to-report, intentional-reporting-interference, MDE-routing, and staff-supervision allegations.

No further substantive response is necessary unless that description is inaccurate. I will await the responses to the pending data requests and route the unresolved matters accordingly.

Respectfully,

family family

[Quoted text hidden]

Missing notice problem

This separates peer incidents reaching police from the unresolved school-facility reporting trail.

Summary

No further investigation, available-info reliance, and no identified scope for adult reporting issues.