

MGDPA Record Correction Request - PLPD ICR 26009995 Scope / Proper-Channels / Finality Statements

PLPD-PIS-RC-001 | fork-framed agency-facing packet

Date submitted	June 25, 2026
Correction determination deadline	July 25, 2026
Deadline basis	MGDPA correction determination deadline: 30 calendar days
Sender	
Recipient	Prior Lake Police Department Responsible Authority / Data Practices Compliance Official
Scope	PLPD-PIS-RC-001 fork-framed agency-facing packet

This cover page is an index aid. The formal request body follows on the next page and controls the specific scope, authorities invoked, and requested action.

MGDPA Record Correction Request - PLPD ICR 26009995 Investigation-Scope / Proper-Channels / Finality Statements

Prior Lake Police Department

Responsible Authority / Data Practices Compliance Official

4649 Dakota Street SE

Prior Lake, MN 55372

Dear Responsible Authority / Data Practices Compliance Official:

This is a formal written challenge under Minn. Stat. § 13.04, subd. 4, to the accuracy and completeness of maintained data about me and my minor child in, concerning, or derived from PLPD ICR 26009995. Please process this as a record-correction request, not as a new data-access request.

This request is independent of PLPD/City's pending data-access responses. It does not withdraw, narrow, replace, consolidate, pause, restart, or reset any pending Chapter 13 data request, response clock, production obligation, or verification process. It also does not seek immediate production of additional private data. The requested action is correction, supplementation, qualification, or a written determination that the challenged data are accurate and complete.

This request also does not challenge PLPD/City's ability to use reasonable measures to verify identity or authority before releasing private data under Minn. R. 1205.0400. The issue here is narrower: if PLPD maintains broad statements that the matter was investigated, that the incidents used "proper channels," or that "any and all investigative work" was completed "given information available," those statements need to identify their maintained factual basis or be corrected/qualified so they are not materially misleading.

To keep this request disciplined, I am not relying on future PLPD production, the full school-production universe, or speculation about records I have not seen. Any point that turns on undisclosed PLPD-maintained records is framed as a fork: if PLPD maintains a source basis for the broad statement, identify the category-level basis or supplement the record; if PLPD does not maintain that basis, correct, qualify, or append my statement of disagreement. I reserve, rather than assert here, any broader correction theory that depends solely on records not yet produced.

Authority Invoked

Minn. Stat. § 13.04, subd. 4 permits an individual to contest the accuracy or completeness of public or private data about that individual. Within 30 days after receiving the challenge, the responsible authority must either correct the data or notify the individual that the authority believes the data are correct. If the disputed data are disclosed while the matter is unresolved, the disclosure must include the individual's statement of disagreement. Appeal rights are governed by Minn. Stat. § 13.04, subd. 4 and Minn. R. 1205.1600.

Challenged Maintained Data

The challenged data are PLPD-maintained statements, summaries, emails, supplemental reports, disposition notes, closure records, routing notes, public/internal descriptions, or other derived records that state or imply any of the following:

- 26 1. PLPD investigated "the incident" or "the two incidents" in a way that resolved the separate
adult failure-to-report, reporting-interference, MDE school-facility routing, and
parent-notification issues submitted in the complaint packet.
- 27 2. The relevant incidents were reported through "proper channels" in a way that resolves
Chapter 260E, MDE school-facility, or parent-notification concerns, rather than only stating
that PLPD received reports concerning underlying peer incidents.
- 28 3. PLPD completed "any and all investigative work" and would conduct no additional follow-up
"given information available," without identifying what information was available, what
information was declined, and whether my offered written source evidence or witness
clarification was requested, accepted, reviewed, or rejected.
- 29 4. PLPD had a sufficient factual basis to rule out parent-notification defects while later treating
my parent/source relationship as unverified for related private-data access.
- 31 The following is a conditional fork only, not a production-dependent assertion: if PLPD relies
on prior PLPD incident files as part of the review basis, those files must be considered
consistently with available parent/source cues in those files, including prior PLPD-maintained
records identifying my child as the victim and later referring to an email from [REDACTED]
father."

33 **Active Correction Strikes**

35 **Strike 1 - June 17 Closure Language**

- 37 On June 17, 2026, Detective Steinhaus wrote that after reviewing the materials submitted
regarding "allegations of mandated reporter failures," PLPD determined there were "no
criminal violations to investigate," and that PLPD "was made aware of the incident, and it was
investigated." See Exhibit 2.
- 39 That language is inaccurate or incomplete if maintained or later used to mean that PLPD
investigated and ruled out the separate adult reporting, reporting-interference, MDE-routing,
school-facility maltreatment-process, or parent-notification issues. This challenge does not
require future production: the complaint itself was not limited to whether an underlying peer
incident reached PLPD. It expressly asked for review of possible failure to make or route a
required report, discouragement or prevention of a mandated report, and missing external
reporting/incident trail. See Exhibit 1.
- 41 Requested correction: either identify the maintained source categories and investigative steps
supporting the broader reading, or correct/qualify the record to state that PLPD declined to
conduct a criminal investigation based on the materials it reviewed and did not make a
documented merits determination on the separate adult reporting, reporting-interference,
MDE-routing, school-facility maltreatment-process, or parent-notification issues.

43 **Strike 2 - June 18 "Proper Channels" Language**

- 45 On June 18, 2026, Detective Steinhaus wrote that a supplemental report was completed and
that PLPD determined "the incidents were reported to us via the proper channels." See
Exhibit 3.
- 47 That statement is inaccurate or incomplete if maintained or later used to mean that Chapter
260E, MDE school-facility, child-protection, county-attorney, or parent-notification channels
were verified. If "proper channels" means only that the underlying peer incidents reached
PLPD, the record should say that. If PLPD meant broader Chapter 260E or MDE routing
channels, please identify the maintained source categories supporting that statement.

49 Requested correction: strike or qualify any maintained statement that implies PLPD verified non-PLPD reporting channels unless PLPD identifies the maintained factual basis for that broader statement.

51 **Strike 3 - June 24 Finality / "Information Available" Language**

53 On June 24, 2026, Chief Duggan wrote that PLPD had "completed any and all investigative work" and would not conduct "any additional follow up given information available." See Exhibit 4.

55 That statement is inaccurate or incomplete unless PLPD's maintained records identify what "information available" means and whether PLPD requested, accepted, reviewed, declined, or chose not to request the additional written source evidence and witness clarification I repeatedly offered. This is framed as a fork, not as a claim about undisclosed records: either PLPD maintains a documented source basis for the finality statement, or the finality statement should be qualified. Before the June 17 and June 24 finality statements, I requested written/email communication as an accommodation related to [REDACTED] and said I was willing to respond promptly to written questions. See Exhibit 1.

57 Requested correction: either identify the maintained source categories, contacts, agency checks, prosecutorial consultations, written questions, witness clarifications, and source records considered before finality was stated, or correct/qualify the record to state that PLPD made no further-investigation decision without requesting or reviewing my offered additional written source evidence or written witness clarification.

59 **Strike 4 - Parent/Source Predicate**

61 One matter submitted for review was the apparent absence of required parent notification in a school-facility maltreatment/reporting process. Evaluating that issue required a factual predicate about who the parent/source was and what parent contact channel existed.

63 PLPD received the complaint from my Gmail address, received my name, date of birth, address, phone number, and email address before assigning ICR 26009995, and later demanded photo identification plus proof of parentage before releasing related private data. See Exhibits 1 and 5.

65 Requested correction: if PLPD did not establish my parent/source relationship, correct or qualify any maintained implication that parent-notification compliance was investigated and ruled out. If PLPD did establish that relationship from the complaint, intake information, prior PLPD files, school records, district confirmation, or another maintained source category, please identify that category-level source basis and explain whether it was part of the investigative-review record.

67 **Conditional Fork - Prior PLPD File Cue**

69 This point is not an independent strike. It does not assert that PLPD relied on prior incident files; it preserves the consequence if PLPD uses those files as part of its source basis.

71 If PLPD relied on prior PLPD incident files as part of the ICR 26009995 review, those files themselves contain parent/source cues relevant to the scope and parent-notification theory. For example, PLPD ICR 24020491 identifies [REDACTED] as the victim, includes parent/guardian fields, notes that the case was sent for review of charges, and later states that PLPD received an email from [REDACTED] father" concerning [REDACTED] from the incident. See Exhibit 6.

73 Requested correction: if prior PLPD files were considered, identify at a category level whether those parent/source cues were considered. If prior PLPD files were not considered, correct or qualify any maintained statement implying a complete review of parent-notice or source-identity-dependent issues.

75 **Reserved / Withdrawn for This Request**

77 To preserve the strength and narrowness of this correction request, I am not asking PLPD to make, correct, or defend any broader statement based solely on:

- 79 1. Future PLPD/City data productions not yet received.
- 80 2. The full Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools production universe.
- 81 3. The full Gmail parent-school communication universe.
- 82 4. Any claim that PLPD/City's identity or parentage verification demand is unlawful.
- 83 5. Any accusation about motive, bad faith, or intentional delay.

85 Those points are reserved. They are not needed for the active correction strikes above.

87 **Requested Maintained Correction / Qualification**

89 Please correct, supplement, or append the following qualification to each challenged record or derived record that maintains the broader statements above:

91 > PLPD accepted [REDACTED] written complaint packet, assigned ICR 26009995, reviewed identified materials concerning reported incidents, and declined to conduct a criminal investigation. Unless PLPD separately identifies maintained source categories showing otherwise, PLPD's disposition should not be read as a documented merits determination that all adult failure-to-report, reporting-interference, MDE school-facility routing, child-protection/county-attorney routing, or parent-notification issues were investigated and ruled out. The reporting parent/source requested written-only communication as an accommodation, offered to answer written questions and provide additional source records, and PLPD issued the no-further-investigation disposition without documenting any written witness questions or review of the offered additional source records.

93 If PLPD believes the challenged data are already accurate and complete, please provide the written determination required by Minn. Stat. § 13.04, subd. 4, including the factual basis for that conclusion and applicable appeal rights.

95 **Statement of Disagreement Pending Resolution**

97 Pending correction or written determination, please attach or include this statement with any disclosure of the disputed data:

99 > I dispute any PLPD-maintained statement or summary implying that PLPD fully investigated and ruled out every adult failure-to-report, reporting-interference, MDE school-facility routing, and parent-notification matter submitted in ICR 26009995. The maintained email record shows that PLPD received my written complaint packet, assigned ICR 26009995, received my written-only [REDACTED] accommodation request and offer to answer written questions, issued a no-criminal-investigation disposition without documented written questions to me, described "proper channels" without identifying whether that meant Chapter 260E/MDE/parent-notification channels or only PLPD receipt of underlying peer reports, later stated that all investigative work was complete "given information available," and separately required proof of parentage for related private-data access.

101 **Prior Recipients / Propagation**

103 If PLPD corrects or supplements the challenged data, please attempt to notify past recipients
of the inaccurate or incomplete data, including internal PLPD/City recipients and any external
recipients reflected in maintained records. Known or likely recipient categories include PLPD
command staff, PLPD records staff, City data-practices personnel, the Scott County
Attorney's Office, the Minnesota Department of Education, and any person or agency to
whom PLPD disclosed or summarized the June 17, June 18, or June 24 disposition/finality
statements.

105 Please preserve the original disputed records, the correction trail, the final corrected or
qualified version, and any written determination generated in response to this request.

107 Respectfully,

108

109

[REDACTED]

Evidence Index - PLPD ICR 26009995 Scope Correction

Narrow source support for correction/qualification request PLPD-PIS-RC-001.

Index page 1 of 3

Exhibit	Bates link	Bookmark label	Source	Why relevant
EX-001	PISRC-0004	EX-001 - Intake / ICR / written-only accommodation	Gmail native render page cut, June 6-11, 2026	Shows PLPD received the attached complaint packet, requested and received identity/contact data, assigned ICR 26009995, [REDACTED] he case for review, and received the written-only [REDACTED] accommodation request plus offer to answer writ [REDACTED] stions.
EX-002	PISRC-0007	EX-002 - June 17 no-criminal-violation / incident investigated statement	Gmail native render page cut, June 17, 2026	Contains the first closure language: no criminal violations to investigate; PLPD was made a incident and it was investigated. Also shows [REDACTED] he same-thread objection that no written questions w [REDACTED] d despite the accommodation/offer.

Visible Bates page numbers are clickable links to the first page of each exhibit.

PISRC-0001

Evidence Index - PLPD ICR 26009995 Scope Correction

Narrow source support for correction/qualification request PLPD-PIS-RC-001.

Index page 2 of 3

Exhibit	Bates link	Bookmark label	Source	Why relevant
EX-003	PISRC-0008	EX-003 - June 18 supplemental report / proper channels	Gmail native render page cut, June 18, 2026	Contains the supplemental report description and the phrase that the incidents were reported to PLPD via proper channels.
EX-004	PISRC-0009	EX-004 - June 24 any/all investigative work finality	Gmail native render page cut, June 24, 2026	Contains Chief Duggan's finality language and [REDACTED] same-thread preservation that PLPD issued the disp without contacting him or accepting/responding to offered source evidence.

Visible Bates page numbers are clickable links to the first page of each exhibit.

PISRC-0002

Evidence Index - PLPD ICR 26009995 Scope Correction

Narrow source support for correction/qualification request PLPD-PIS-RC-001.

Index page 3 of 3

Exhibit	Bates link	Bookmark label	Source	Why relevant
EX-005	PISRC-0012	EX-005 - Parentage verification demand	Gmail native render page cut, June 24, 2026	Shows PLPD/City required photo identification and proof of parentage before releasing related private data, sharpening the parent/source predicate fork.
EX-006	PISRC-0013	EX-006 - Prior PLPD file parent/source cues	PLPD ICR 24020491 two-page cut from maintained police report	Shows PLPD-maintained prior-file cues: victim/parent fields, review-of-charges status, a [REDACTED] report note that PLPD [REDACTED] m [REDACTED] father concerning [REDACTED] T [REDACTED] D-native corroborati [REDACTED] ere part of the review.

Visible Bates page numbers are clickable links to the first page of each exhibit.



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

6 messages

To: Police@priorlakemn.gov

Sat, Jun 6, 2026 at 12:38 AM

Prior Lake Police Department,

Please accept the attached packet for law-enforcement intake and investigation/referral review.

The packet concerns a documented sequence involving Prior Lake-Savage Area Schools, Hidden Oaks Middle School, a District-labeled maltreatment-report complaint, and possible violation of Minnesota mandated-reporting obligations, including failure to make or route a required report, discouragement or prevention of a mandated report, or the absence of the ordinary report/incident trail that should exist if required reporting occurred.

I am not asking your agency to accept my charging conclusion. I am asking for intake, routing, and review because the attached evidence appears to show that the District:

- received a complaint that District staff failed to comply with mandated-reporting obligations;
- created and used an internal investigatory/review path that does not show external disclosure, MDE routing, law-enforcement intake, or child-protection intake;
- processed the failure-to-report complaint through that closed internal review even though District Policy 414 and District training identify external routing for school-employee maltreatment concerns; and
- reached a result showing no final discipline, training, or corrective action for the staff involved while, in the represented record universe, still not showing MDE routing, law-enforcement or child-protection intake, a no-report/no-referral decision, or ordinary incident documentation for the second staff member identified in the packet.

For ease of review, the cover memo contains the chronology. The key evidence map is: EX-002 for the District's no-incident-report/no-verbal-report explanation; EX-003 through EX-007 for the District's mandated-reporting, Policy 414, MDE-routing, and failure-to-report record; EX-008 for the live record fork; and EX-009 for the Nov. 1 written complaint, Nov. 4 Board/Superintendent-copied escalation and School Board auto-response, and Nov. 15 iPad-thread response sequence.

The packet includes a June 4, 2026 record-correction/access request pair as Exhibit 008. I am not submitting that exhibit as a records-law claim for the Police Department to decide. I included it because it identifies the live records fork created by the District's maintained HOMS / Policy 414 narrative: later production, a no-records statement, a lawful withholding basis, or continued non-response may confirm, refute, or sharpen whether a mandated-reporting trail exists.

If Prior Lake Police is the correct intake agency, please confirm receipt and advise whether a police report or case number will be opened. If another law-enforcement agency, child-protection authority, or prosecutorial office is the correct intake point, please identify the proper routing and whether you will forward the packet or need me to submit it separately.

Attachment:

- criminal_referral_packet_FINAL.pdf (CMR-REF-001) - 23 pages

Thank you,

 criminal_referral_packet_FINAL.pdf
792K

Sat, Jun 6, 2026 at 10:15 PM

To: [REDACTED]

FYI

[Quoted text hidden]

 **criminal_referral_packet_FINAL.pdf**
792K

Police Dept <police@priorlakemn.gov>

Tue, Jun 9, 2026 at 2:43 PM

To: [REDACTED]

Good afternoon,

Our police records department has received your email and attachment. I would like to obtain more information from you. Can I please get your full name, date of birth, address, and a phone number?

Thank you,

Jacinta Heinzmann

Records Specialist | Prior Lake Police Department | Office 952-440-3555

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Saturday, June 6, 2026 12:39 AM

To: Police Dept <police@PriorlakeMN.gov>

Subject: 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]

[REDACTED]

Tue, Jun 9, 2026 at 5:25 PM

To: police@priorlakemn.gov

Good afternoon Ms. Heinzmann,

Thank you for confirming receipt of the email and attachment. Please use the following information for intake:

Full name: [REDACTED]
Date of birth: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED] Prior Lake, MN 55372
Phone number: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

Please let me know if the department needs anything else from me to open or route the matter for review.

[Quoted text hidden]

Police Dept <police@priorlakemn.gov>

Wed, Jun 10, 2026 at 10:28 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Good morning,

Thank you for your information. Your ICR number for this report is 26009995. I have forwarded this case for review and most likely an officer will be reaching out to contact you by phone. Typically, when an officer calls it will come from a private or blocked number. Although normally we ask people not to answer those calls, please do answer the call, if possible, as it will most likely be coming from our agency.

Thank you!

Jacinta Heinzmann

Records Specialist | Prior Lake Police Department | Office 952-440-3555

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, June 9, 2026 5:26 PM

To: Police Dept <police@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]

To: police@priorlakemn.gov

Thu, Jun 11, 2026 at 6:48 PM

Good afternoon Ms. Heinzmann,

Thank you for the update and for providing ICR number 26009995.

If an investigator needs additional information from me, I am willing to cooperate, but I do not want to discuss this matter by telephone, especially from an undisclosed or blocked number.

I would prefer that any questions be sent to me in writing by email, or that the investigator first email me identifying themselves, their role, and the best direct contact information. Written communication is the best format for me to review questions carefully and provide clear, accurate, record-based responses.

In addition, because of [REDACTED] related to the underlying events and the subsequent handling of these matters, real-time phone communication about this subject can unnecessarily escalate [REDACTED] and interfere with my ability to respond as clearly and accurately as I can in writing. To the extent needed, please treat this as a request that communications about this matter be handled in writing as an accommodation.

I am willing to respond promptly to written questions.

Thank you,

[REDACTED]
[Quoted text hidden]



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

10 messages

Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov>

Wed, Jun 17, 2026 at 2:18 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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.

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

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,

>

> [REDACTED]

>

> 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

>

> Detective

>

> [City

>

> of Prior Lake](<http://www.priorlakemn.gov/>) | 4649 Dakota Street SE | Prior Lake, MN 55372

[Quoted text hidden]

Cody Steinhaus <csteinhaus@priorlakemn.gov>

Thu, Jun 18, 2026 at 4:00 PM

To: [REDACTED]

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.

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,

[Redacted]
[Quoted text hidden]

Liam Duggan <lduggan@priorlakemn.gov>

Wed, Jun 24, 2026 at 12:59 PM

To: [Redacted] 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 [Redacted]

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

Get Outlook for iOS

From: [REDACTED]**Sent:****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]

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 [REDACTED]
 - the alleged failure of a different classroom teacher to protect or supervise during reported repeated peer [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] 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.

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,



[Quoted text hidden]

 **Data Request Form.pdf**
764K

Tue, Jun 23, 2026 at 2:14 PM

To: police@priorlakemn.gov
Cc: Info@priorlakemn.gov

Jennifer,

Attached is the City form for the PLPD Baker / Peterson supplemental-report records request.

The form is provided as supplemental intake information only. It does not withdraw, narrow, replace, or reset the original written request lawfully submitted under Minnesota Statutes Chapter 13 on June 22, 2026. The June 22, 2026 written request remains the operative request. Please confirm that PLPD/City continues to treat the original receipt date as the operative date for response-timing and processing purposes.

Please produce responsive data electronically by email or secure download. If PLPD/City contends that any item is not maintained, withheld, redacted, or denied, please provide the applicable written classification, statutory basis, and certification required for denial of access.

The request seeks public data and/or private data accessible to me as data subject and parent of the minor data subject. If PLPD/City needs specific identity verification to process any private-data portion, please identify the verification requested.

Respectfully,

[Quoted text hidden]

 **2026-06-23-plpd-baker-peterson-city-data-request-form-draft.pdf**
831K

Police Dept <police@priorlakemn.gov>

Wed, Jun 24, 2026 at 10:07 AM

To: [Redacted]

Good morning,

Thank you for returning the data request forms. The information you are requesting does contain private data about yourself and a minor data subject. In order to release this information, we will need the following:

- Copy of your photo identification
- Proof of parentage for the minor data subject

Once returned, we will use this information for both data requests.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Also, is there a good phone number to reach you at for questions regarding the specifics of your requests?

[Quoted text hidden]



PRIOR LAKE POLICE DEPARTMENT

INCIDENT REPORT

4649 Dakota Street SE
Prior Lake, MN 55372
Phone: (952) 440-3555

ICR# 24020491	AGENCY ORI# MN0700900	JUVENILE: Juvenile Involved
Reported: 11-05-2024 0843 First Assigned: 0845 First Arrived: 0855 Last Cleared: 1134 Committed Start: 10-28-2024 Committed End: Title: Assault AGGRAVATED-ASSAULT How Received: Telephone Short Description: Case sent for Review of Charges Summary: Assault. Report of a student being hit with a chair by another student on 10-28-24. Report to be completed 11-7-24. TB60 Location(s) HIDDEN OAKS MIDDLE SCHOOL Address: 15855 FISH POINT RD SE City: PRIOR LAKE State: MN Zip: Country:		
Officer Assigned: Johnson, Beau Badge No: BJ48 Primary: No Officer Assigned: Baker, TJ Badge No: TB60 Primary: Yes		
Involvement: Parent/Guardian Name: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] Age: 47 Sex: F Race: W Height: [REDACTED] Weight: 165 Address: (Residence) [REDACTED] NE City: PRIOR LAKE State: MN Zip: 55372 Country: Phone: (Cell) [REDACTED] Eye Color: BRO Hair Color: RED		
Involvement: Victim Name: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] Age: 12 Sex: F Race: W Height: 0 Weight: 0 Address: (Residence) [REDACTED] NE City: Prior Lake State: MN Zip: 55372 Country:		
Involvement: Suspect Name: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] Age: 11 Sex: F Race: W Height: 0 Weight: 0 Address: (Residence) [REDACTED] City: [REDACTED] State: [REDACTED] Zip: [REDACTED] Country: US		
Involvement: Parent/Guardian Name: [REDACTED] DOB: [REDACTED] Age: 44 Sex: F Race: W Height: 0 Weight: 0 Address: (Residence) [REDACTED] City: [REDACTED] State: MN Zip: [REDACTED] Country: Phone: (Cell) [REDACTED] Eye Color: GRN		

I spoke with [REDACTED] in my office. She told me the following in summary.

- She was working in a group with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in their first hour class
- She said [REDACTED] was making [REDACTED] noises
- She could not describe the noise [REDACTED] was making
- She said they asked her to stop multiple times
- She said [REDACTED] picked up a stool and hit [REDACTED] on the back of the head
- She described it as a baseball bat swinging motion
- She said [REDACTED] said it hurt and grabbed the back of her head
- She only saw [REDACTED] hit [REDACTED] once
- The teacher did not see or hear what happened

The statement was audio recorded and later uploaded to evidence.com see her statement for further information.

I called [REDACTED] mother, [REDACTED] she asked to be present when I spoke with [REDACTED]. She met me at my office along with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] told me the following in summary.

- He was working in a group with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]
- He said they finished their work and were just sitting at their table messing around
- He said [REDACTED] picked up a stool and swung it in a baseball bat swinging motion and hit [REDACTED] in the back of the head
- He said [REDACTED] kind of laughed about it and it seemed like [REDACTED] was messing around
- He did not think [REDACTED] was trying to hurt [REDACTED]
- He said a couple minutes later [REDACTED] swung the stool again and hit [REDACTED] again in the same area
- He said it seemed like [REDACTED] hit [REDACTED] harder the second time but [REDACTED] still kind of laughed it off
- He said the teacher did not see or hear what happened
- He said [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are friends and get along

The statement was audio recorded and later uploaded into evidence.com see his statement for further information.

On 11-06-24, I received an email from [REDACTED] father indicating she was told to go back into the [REDACTED] room by her [REDACTED] care [REDACTED] due to ongoing [REDACTED] from the incident.

Please forward to the Scott County Attorney's Office for review of the following charge

- 2nd degree assault (F) - 609.222.1

TB60 11-07-24