



Dr. Tomislav Mihaljevic
CEO and President, Cleveland Clinic
Cleveland Clinic
9500 Euclid Ave
Cleveland, Ohio 44195

I am writing to formally express my deep disappointment and concern about the recent actions of the Cleveland Clinic Civilian Review Board in a case involving myself—and at least one identified victim—who were directly involved. I have learned that the Review Board conducted its evaluation without allowing me or the other affected individuals to participate, provide testimony, respond to allegations, or review the materials under consideration.

This exclusion is not only procedurally problematic but also threatens the Board's legitimacy and impartiality.

Civilian review processes nationwide, including those operated by police oversight commissions, hospital review boards, and university police oversight entities, regularly permit the participation of complainants, victims, witnesses, and named parties. This practice is regarded as a standard for ensuring fairness, transparency, and accountability.

In contrast, the Cleveland Clinic Civilian Review Board's decision to move forward without including the individuals named in its review indicates an inherent bias and raises serious due-process concerns. No credible oversight body should operate without hearing directly from those affected by an incident.

The Review Board, as structured by Cleveland Clinic, is not considered civilian-led in any significant or nationally recognized way. My understanding is that most—or all—of its members are Cleveland Clinic employees or selected through internal processes. This conflicts with the usual definition of "civilian oversight," which requires:

- independence from the institution being evaluated
- insulation from internal political influence, and
- decision-making authority independent of the organization under review.

When the same institution effectively supervises those responsible for oversight, it undermines the credibility of the entire system.

A civilian review board must meet basic transparency standards to gain the public's trust— especially when overseeing a private police force that exercises state-delegated powers, including detention, searches, use of force, and arrests.

Currently, there is:

- no publicly available record of Board membership, qualifications, or conflict-of-interest protections.
- No official meeting minutes, findings, or hearings have been published.
- No verifiable disciplinary records available.
- lacks a mechanism for public accountability and
- No evidence of following civilian oversight best practices used by independent municipal review boards.

Without transparency, trust cannot exist.

Regrettably, based on the available information, the Cleveland Clinic Civilian Review Board does **not** meet the nationally recognized standards of:

- independence,
- transparency,
- due process,
- community accountability, or
- verified and public oversight reporting.

This results in a process that is neither strong nor trustworthy in the public's eyes. For an institution like Cleveland Clinic, with its size, influence, and impact—especially one that runs a private police force—such issues create serious reputation and ethical concerns.

As a State Representative and a Black man representing one of Ohio's largest districts with low-income and predominantly minority residents, I have received numerous emails, calls, and personal accounts describing harassment, mistreatment, and questionable detainment practices involving Cleveland Clinic Police Officers.

These are not isolated incidents. They reveal a broader pattern of distrust that grows when oversight systems appear designed to protect the institution rather than the public.

Therefore, I am submitting the following request:

1. **A formal written explanation** of why the civilian review process excluded all involved parties.
2. **Suspending or reevaluating** the Civilian Review Board's recent findings related to my case until a proper, inclusive hearing is conducted.
3. **A public description** of the Board's membership, appointment process, and independence, safeguards, and conflict-of-interest policies.
4. **A commitment to restructuring the Board** to include:

- independently selected civilian members,
 - publicly available reporting requirements,
 - participation rights for complainants and affected parties, and
 - transparent review procedures aligned with national oversight standards.
5. **A meeting with Clinic leadership, the Board, and myself** to discuss systemic concerns and explore ways to establish legitimate civilian oversight that protects public safety and constitutional rights.

Furthermore, the Cleveland Clinic Police Department is recognized as an OPOTA-approved law enforcement agency, and the Cleveland Clinic's own job listings confirm that its sworn police officers must be fully OPOTA-certified peace officers **under** Ohio law. This demonstrates that, although hired by a private institution, these officers have the same core legal authority as municipal police officers, including the power to detain, arrest, search, seize, and use force under state law. However, unlike municipal departments, the Cleveland Clinic's police do **not** operate under any independent public oversight system, nor do they provide publicly accessible disciplinary records, complaint data, or reporting structures. Even more concerning, it appears that private security personnel who are not sworn officers may sometimes perform roles indistinguishable from those of OPOTA-certified peace officers, further obscuring authority and accountability. When an organization employs state-certified police with full arrest powers, it must also adhere to the same transparency, due-process protections, civilian review standards, and public records obligations expected of any Ohio law enforcement agency. Failing to meet these standards risks unchecked police authority and undermines the integrity of Ohio's entire peace officer certification system.

Cleveland Clinic is an internationally recognized institution known for excellence, integrity, and trust. The current structure and actions of its Civilian Review Board do not embody those core values. The communities I serve deserve a process that is credible, transparent, and accountable—one that does not exclude victims, conceal internal operations from oversight, or endorse questionable detainment policies without proper scrutiny.

I look forward to your prompt response and to working together on meaningful reforms that rebuild public trust and establish a national standard for responsible, community-focused institutional accountability.

YOURS IN SERVICE

Darnell T. Brewer

DARNELL T. BREWER
216-832-8369 / DarnellTBrewer@gmail.com