

From: Christi Grab [REDACTED]
Subject: Part 2: Why I believe the human trafficking prevention seminar hosted by Ms. Blakespear on July 16, 2026 was not credible
Date: July 21, 2026 at 10:29 AM
To: Senator.Blakespear@senate.ca.gov, [REDACTED] Kutlow, Diana [REDACTED]
Cc: audra.eyeofthestorm [REDACTED] Dra J. Morgan [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Nam, John [REDACTED] Cervinka, Lynne [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Braverman, Sheila [REDACTED]
SanDiegoDA@sandiegoda.gov, [REDACTED] GetHope@ospsandiegocounty.gov,
socialpolicyinstitute@sdsu.edu, [REDACTED]
Bcc: [REDACTED]



Dear Ms. Kutlow:

Thank you for taking the time to come outside to speak with me on Thursday night after the seminar on preventing human trafficking was concluded. You had asked me to send an email addressing my specific concerns with Ms. Blakespear, and why I did not find the symposium on preventing human trafficking to be credible. I sent the email regarding Ms. Blakespear on Friday, July 17. This email addresses why I did not find the seminar to be credible.

I. The biggest and most obvious red flag was the fact that they didn't allow questions at the end. Clearly, the panel created a carefully contrived narrative, and they obviously knew that narrative was fragile. I believe that the panelists didn't want to risk having their narrative shattered by addressing questions that fell outside the purview of the controlled narrative and/or the questioning of the controlled narrative. If you truly wanted to engage the community and find solutions, you would have allowed an open discussion. The failure to allow audience engagement made it appear that the purpose of the seminar was a desperate attempt to justify the excessive amounts of tax money that has been spent on the various programs, despite the poor results.

In my previous email, I stated that I believed that R&TC 18537 qualifies as the State of California itself running a labor trafficking ring. Now I'll get into why I believe that the State of California is also running a sex trafficking ring, and why I believe that Ms. Blakespear is helping to ensure the ring has a steady supply of victims.

II. I'll start with some background. About a decade ago, I was defrauded by a California State government agency. I contacted the CA Department of Justice and asked them to prosecute. The DOJ explained to me that they represent State of California agencies, not the constituents. In other words, the DOJ protects the government from the people, not the people from the government. They explained that there was no state agency that would prosecute a crime committed by a fellow state agency. They told me that my only remedy was to file a civil suit against the agency and the DOJ would be the defense counsel in that lawsuit.

This means that the DOJ's job is to protect the State of CA's labor trafficking ring that was discussed in the previous email, as well as to protect the child sex trafficking ring that is discussed in this email. While I have not questioned the District Attorney's office directly, based on my discussion with the DOJ, it is my understanding that the District Attorney has the same duty to protect the state agencies instead of the constituents.

III. Here are a few articles highlighting the connection between government agencies and child trafficking, particularly sex trafficking:

- A HHS whistleblower testified to congress that she viewed first-hand a "sophisticated network" of [child migrant smuggling](#) into forced labor and other forms of slavery. "...we were not offering children the American dream, but instead putting them in modern-day slavery with wicked overlords.": <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/whistleblower-tells-congress-that-govt-delivering->

[migrant-children-human-traffickers](#). In the seminar, Ms. Saylor said not to bother calling the National Trafficking hotline – which is run by HHS – because you won’t get a response. She recommended calling a private agency instead.

- Here is a short 2-minute clip explaining that the federal government gives states a lot of money for each child that the state removes from their family home and places into the foster system: <https://x.com/StaciBryant133/status/1718658710581526786>. This incentivizes the State of California to steal children from homes to increase the state’s revenue totals.
- National Foster Youth Institute estimates up to 60 percent of child sex trafficking victims are or have been in foster care. California does not have any laws mandating that child welfare agencies screen children who might have been sex trafficked. In Texas, state officials shut down a state-licensed foster care facility for girls who had been sex trafficking victims — after a court found evidence that the staff themselves were trafficking the children. <https://19thnews.org/2023/11/foster-care-sex-trafficking-state-investigation/>.
- 3-minute news clip of about a Texas CPS employee trying to coerce a child who was in the foster system to become a prostitute: <https://rumble.com/v1g3zul-a-child-protective-services-employee-tells-a-14-year-old-girl-to-become-a-p.html>. The employee was fired as a result of the video, but... would anyone have taken the girl’s allegations seriously if she didn’t utilize the video to publicly humiliate the agency? I doubt it.
- This site doesn’t appear to have been updated since 2024, but this site tracked child abuse allegations nationwide. Here is the California page: https://cas.news/search?.state=CA&sort=date_desc. As you can see, the majority of the allegations are against people who work in conjunction with California agencies, such as the Department of Children and Family Services and the foster care system.
- Georgia State Senator Nancy Schaefer wrote an article about how Georgia CPS was trafficking children. She tragically passed away not long afterwards: https://www.parentalrights.org/child_protective_services.

Many, many families have made almost identical allegations to those listed above against agencies in San Diego. These allegations have been ignored by all the local oversight authorities, including Summer Stephan — which is to be expected since we’ve already established that Ms. Stephan’s job is to protect the agencies, not the children. Ms. Stephan is tasked with eliminating the competition so only the State of CA’s ring can flourish.

IV. The California legislature has passed a series of laws that make it easy for Child Protective Services to take children from parental homes and put them into foster homes, group homes, etc, where they can be easily trafficked. In my opinion, the legislature has passed this series of laws specifically to ensure there is always a steady stream of children in the State of California child trafficking ring.

For example, **Ms. Blakespear voted for AB- 665:**

https://calmatters.digitaldemocracy.org/bills/ca_202320240ab665. Prior to AB-665, a child aged 12 or older could request to be removed if (s)he was either in danger of serious harm to themselves or others, or was a victim of incest or child abuse. Thanks to AB-665, now if a child objects to parental involvement and the professional agrees — after hearing only from the child -- the parent is not contacted. The parent is not afforded the opportunity to provide his or her position, inform the shelter of the child’s mental health or medical issues, or defend against any misrepresentations made by the child. Once the county takes control of the child following the detention hearing, the child must be placed in an AFDC-FC-eligible facility. The current AFDC-FC rate for short-term residential therapeutic programs is [\\$17,616 per month](#) in state and

federal money. **AB-665 permits children to self-admit into residential facilities, which sets up their removal from their parents. And the facilities — which are often run by state agencies — are financially incentivized to ensure the removal happens.**

V. The California legislature has also passed a series of laws that make it harder for parents to maintain proper oversight of their children. This makes it easy for sex traffickers to entrap children and sell them without parents knowing — again, ensuring a steady supply of children for the State of CA's child trafficking ring.

For example, the HIPAA laws were expanded so that parents cannot access medical records of children over 12 without the child's consent. So if a child sustained genital/rectal damage or contracted an STD as a result of being trafficked, the information will be kept secret from the parent. If the parents knew about the harm, they would be able to figure out that their child had been entrapped in a sex trafficking operation and save the child. By keeping parents in the dark, the legislature has essentially given free rein to the traffickers.

Here is a second example: **Ms. Blakespear voted for AB-1955**, which was determined by the courts to be an unconstitutional violation of parents rights to know what schools were doing to their children, physically, psychologically and emotionally. At the seminar, **Ms. Franco spoke extensively about how important it was to have open communication with your child in order to prevent them from running into the arms of a trafficker — and yet Ms. Blakespear voted to ensure that parents were denied the opportunity to communicate with their child regarding the biggest facet of the child's life.** The job of legislators is to uphold the constitution, and I believe that Ms. Blakespear should be prosecuted for voting for a bill that had to be voided because it violated constitutional rights. This segues into my next point:

VI. The California legislature has also passed a series of laws that make it easy for children to be groomed and/or sexually assaulted — again, ensuring a steady supply of children for the State of CA's child trafficking ring.

- An important aspect of **AB-1955** that didn't get much attention was that the bill specifically protected people who were sexually grooming children in schools. The bill prohibited schools "to disclose any information related to a pupils sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression (including parents)... **The bill would prohibit** employees or contractors of school districts, county offices of education, charter schools, or the state special schools, or members of the governing boards or bodies of those educational entities, from retaliating or **taking adverse action against an employee on the basis that the employee supported a pupil** in the exercise of specified rights, work activities, or **providing certain instruction**, as provided." **Ms. Blakespear voted to ensure that child groomers were allowed to groom unfettered.**
- **Ms. Blakespear voted for California Assembly Bill 727**, which requires that the Trevor Project's phone number be printed on student ID cards. The Trevor Project is a grooming line. Children call this line and are paired with an adult who offers them guidance on being LGBTQ+. **Remember, the + stands for pedophilia**, and these children are taken through all the emotional bonding steps that Ms. Saylor and Ms. Urada described in order **to coerce them into sex** with their mentor — and often eventually evolves into full blown sex trafficking. **As part of the grooming process, children are encouraged to remove themselves from their parent's homes by utilizing the guidelines set forth in AB-665. The predators make money off children two ways: 1. from state and federal funds for being in the foster system and 2. From selling the children for sex.**
- **Ms. Blakespear voted in favor of SB-145**, which altered the sex offender registry law. While I do not see a problem with an 18-year old having sex with a 17 or maybe even a 16 year old, I believe

this bill to be predatory because it made the age gap between child and adult too wide and the age of the child too young, leaving very young, very naive children vulnerable to adult predators. **Under no circumstances is it ever acceptable for a 24-year old to have sex with 14-year old, yet Ms. Blakespear voted to allow that.** How many 24 year olds are “mentors” on the Trevor Project line, specifically seeking 14-year olds because the perpetrator knows they won’t have to register as a sex offender if caught?

- **Ms. Blakespear voted for SB 357**, which repeals California Penal Code Section 653.22, a law that criminalizes loitering for the intent to engage in sex work. This has left families/family oriented businesses with no legal recourse to stop a prostitute from hanging out in front of their home/business — and attracting unsavory characters to the home/business. But more importantly, the residents/businesses also can’t call the police so that the police can determine if the people prostituting themselves voluntarily or if they are being sex trafficked. Ms. Blakespear voted for a law **that made it harder for victims to be rescued.**
- During the seminar, **Ms. Blakespear bragged about voting for SB-1414** and falsely made it sound like all children were protected. The reality is that the final version of **the bill only protects some children in some circumstances.** This intentional deception was one of the reasons that I believe that this seminar was a carefully contrived narrative. If we were having an honest discussion, she would have discussed the holes in the bill, including:
 - 1. sex trafficking a child who is 16 or 17 year olds was decriminalized, so traffickers and “Johns” can still sell/buy 16 and 17 year olds without fear of felony prosecution.
 - 2. Buying a child who is 15 and under is only a felony if the “John” is a repeat offender, so there are still no protections in place for a child who is with a “John” who has never been caught before.
 - There are no punishments for a child selling/purchasing another child. So a 17-year old can traffic/buy an unlimited number of infants with no penalties whatsoever.

Ms. Blakespear indicated that she felt like SB-1414 was sufficient and did not indicate that she would push for new legislation to ensure that all children are protected.

In California children cannot legally consent to sex until they are 18, so by law, any child sold for sex is automatically deemed to be a child trafficking victim. Prostituting children is a violation of the 13th amendment, so voting for a bill in which only some children are protected is *Treason of Oath*. The argument when the legislators allowed the original bill to be gutted was that some protection is better than none, but sorry, that doesn’t fly when it comes to violating constitutional rights.

- And, while this bill isn’t about trafficking, I want to point out that **Ms. Blakespear has endangered women by voting for SB-132**, “The Transgender Respect, Agency, and Dignity Act.” This bill allows any biological male who still has a working penis and claims to identify as a woman to be housed in women’s prisons (prior to that, a biological male could be housed in a women’s prison if his penis had been removed/disabled). [Since this law passed, 30% of the men who transferred to CA women’s prisons have been registered sex offenders.](#) Unsurprisingly, **there has been a giant increase in rape in women’s prisons.**

The politicians she affiliates herself with is also telling. There have been many credible allegations made by HHS whistleblowers that Xavier Becerra himself was ensuring children were placed with traffickers by refusing to allow proper vetting before placing the children. He knowingly sent children to questionable people in questionable locations: <https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/press/ren/releases/new-hhs-data->

people in questionable locations. https://www.judicial.y.senate.gov/press/rep/releases/new_tms_data_confirms-biden-harris-admin-placed-tens-of-thousands-of-migrant-children-with-unvetted-sponsors-declined-recommended-home-studies and <https://www.clarksvilleonline.com/2021/05/23/marsha-blackburn-bill-hagerty-chuck-fleischmann-speak-out-against-joe-biden-administration-trafficking-migrant-children-to-tennessee/> and <https://x.com/WallStreetApes/status/2070539588137783574>. While the numbers vary, allegations are that Becerra “lost” somewhere between 85,000 and 300,000 vulnerable migrant children.

Xavier Becerra has endorsed Catherine Blakespear. Is Ms. Blakespear proud to be endorsed by this man?

There are many more examples that I could add to all of the above points, but **I believe I have provided enough information to demonstrate why I believe that Ms Blakespear is a fraud** for claiming that she is trying to prevent human trafficking. Her words mean nothing — only behavior matters. And her consistent behavior is to facilitate the exploitation of the vulnerable.

As discussed in the last email, Ms. Blakespear is knowingly committing the felony of being *a foreign agent posing as a government agent* by failing to take an oath to uphold the constitution for this legislative session. Her unwillingness to sign an oath is no surprise given that she has voted for many bills that violate the constitution, including AB-1518, SB-1414 and AB-1955. She has also consistently voted to help feed the state’s trafficking rings by making it harder for parents to protect their children and easier for children to be stolen by the state.

I would appreciate the opportunity to meet with you to discuss these matters further. I can be reached at  

Regards,

Christine Grab