

City of Calhoun, Georgia
Calhoun Police Department
226 S Wall St, Calhoun, GA 30701

Confidential Administrative Investigation Report

June 2026

Prepared for:
City of Calhoun City Council

PRIVILEGED & CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

SECTION I – SCOPE OF INVESTIGATION

This administrative investigation was initiated in response to three separate accusations of alleged misconduct lodged against Calhoun Police Department Chief James "Tony" Pyle. Given the seniority of the subject employee and the nature of the accusations, an independent investigation was deemed necessary to avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest within the Calhoun Police Department or City chain of command.

The professional standard for conducting a police internal investigation is to investigate matters that are specifically and narrowly limited to the performance of duty or fitness for duty by the subject employee. Accordingly, this investigation is confined to those allegations that directly concern the job performance and compliance with city and department policies by Chief James "Tony" Pyle.

While many concerns and contentions about the state of Calhoun Police Department under the command of Chief James "Tony" Pyle were brought up in shared documents, communications by City officials, and interviews with personnel, only three primary allegations were focused upon for disposition in this investigation due to the culpability for the other concerns involving misunderstandings of process or widespread management deficiencies by multiple members of the department.

The three primary allegations against Chief James "Tony" Pyle are:

1. In September 2021 Chief Pyle engaged in inappropriate personal relations with a former City of Calhoun female employee on a secluded roadway in Floyd County, Georgia, while operating a City of Calhoun vehicle.
2. Chief Pyle abruptly and improperly disbanded the Calhoun Police Department Reserve Officer Program, not for legitimate operational reasons, but specifically to remove a particular Reserve Officer, for personal retaliatory purposes, against whom he lacked legal or valid administrative cause for individual separation.
3. Chief Pyle intentionally delayed or attempted to suppress a separate administrative investigation concerning alleged sexual harassment between a male police lieutenant and a female police officer, purportedly due to a personal friendship with the accused lieutenant.

SECTION II – WITNESS LIST

Listed alphabetically, not in chronological interview order.

Officer [REDACTED], Calhoun Police Department
Officer Xavier Bray, Floyd County Police Department
Lt.Col. Ken Carson, Calhoun Police Department
Sgt. [REDACTED] Calhoun Police Department
Maj. Randy Gallman, Calhoun Police Department
Ms. Sharon Jolley, Calhoun Police Department
Director Brooke Land, City of Calhoun Human Resources
Capt. Christy Nicholson, Calhoun Police Department
Sgt. [REDACTED] Calhoun Police Department
Chief James “Tony” Pyle, Calhoun Police Department
Director Suzanne Roberts, City of Rome Downtown Development Authority
City Administrator Paul Worley, City of Calhoun

SECTION III – INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY BY PRIMARY WITNESS INTERVIEWS

1. Chief James "Tony" Pyle

Calhoun Police Department

10 McDaniel Station Road, Calhoun, GA 30701

Chief James "Tony" Pyle (hereafter referred to as Chief Pyle) submitted to a compelled employee interview as part of this administrative investigation. This interview took place on Monday, June 15, 2026, at 1:47pm in the conference room at Calhoun City Hall 226 S. Wall Street, Calhoun, GA 30701.

Chief Pyle was accompanied by his legal counsel, Mitch Skandalakis, who brought a junior attorney and paralegal from his firm. After a lengthy objection of the cause for the interview and protest of the City of Calhoun's actions against Chief Pyle by Mr. Skandalakis (Reference #, Chief Pyle was provided with a Garrity Warning form which he reviewed alongside his counsel and signed. He was advised of the nature of the three allegations and was asked a series of questions narrowly focused on each of the allegations enumerated in the scope of this investigation.

Response to Allegations

The following narrative summarizes Chief Pyle's detailed account of the events underlying Allegation #1 provided during the interview:

Chief Pyle stated that on or about Thursday, September 15, 2022, a female City employee, identified as the former Calhoun Downtown Development Authority Director, Suzanne Roberts, contacted him and asked whether he had access to a city van or truck for a supply run in preparation for the upcoming Barbecue, Boogie, and Blues festival. Chief Pyle stated that the department head who customarily handled such errands, identified as "Shane," was unavailable, and that he agreed to assist. Chief Pyle stated that he and Suzanne traveled to Sam's Club in Rome, Georgia, where they purchased water and unsalted saltine crackers needed for the festival. He expressed approximately 75% certainty that Sam's Club in Rome was the correct destination for the errand.

Floyd County 911 dispatch records list the date of this event as Wednesday, September 22, 2021.

Chief Pyle stated that Suzanne paid for the groceries with her city-issued "P card". Financial records for this purchase were requested from the City of Calhoun but were never produced. Therefore, validity of the purchase and location could not be determined with physical evidence.

Chief Pyle stated that while returning to Calhoun from Rome, he received a telephone call from an unknown female (Chief Pyle was never able to recall her name) who identified herself as a cousin of a former confidential informant with whom Pyle had worked during his tenure on the drug task force, prior to assuming the role of Chief. The caller stated she was on foot in Shannon, Georgia, was frightened following an altercation with a drug dealer, and requested assistance. Chief Pyle stated he informed the caller that he had someone with him but agreed to look for her. He stated he advised Suzanne of the situation and that Suzanne consented to picking the woman up.

At the direction of Paul Worley, Suzanne Roberts was questioned about this event after her resignation from Calhoun by City Clerk, Sharon Nelson. When asked about the confidential informant, Suzanne stated that there was no one else in the vehicle with she and Chief Pyle. Later that same day Suzanne contacted Paul Worley and recanted this statement saying that she lied to Sharon because Chief Pyle told her never to tell anyone about the confidential informant. Suzanne told the investigator in their brief interview that there was a third person (confidential informant) in the vehicle with she and Chief Pyle.

Chief Pyle stated he located the unknown female near a small market on Old Shannon Highway and allowed her to enter the rear of the vehicle. Chief Pyle stated that as they drove back towards Calhoun the unknown female became hysterical inside the vehicle, causing him to nearly cross the center line. He stated that in response to the driving dangers, he turned off the main road onto what he described as an old, disused section of roadway near Shannon — formerly the primary roadway prior to the construction of Georgia Highway 53 — in order to calm the woman. Chief Pyle stated the vehicle was parked in a location visible from and facing the roadway. He stated emphatically that he had no intent to conceal his presence.

Floyd County 911 dispatch records indicate that the location was Calhoun Road at New Calhoun Highway.

Chief Pyle stated that while the vehicle was parked at that location, a Floyd County police officer, Officer Xavier Bray, approached. He stated the Bray's first words to him were to the effect of "y'all get your clothes on," to which Chief Pyle stated he replied that he was fully clothed — specifically noting he was wearing shoes, pants, a shirt, and a ball cap. Chief Pyle stated that Suzanne had changed into a sports bra at Sam's Club by removing her t-shirt, and that camera footage from the Floyd County officer had confirmed she appeared to be wearing a sports bra and either black or blue shorts at the time of the encounter. Chief Pyle stated the officer conducted a records check of

he and Suzanne and spoke with him briefly through the vehicle window before directing them to leave.

Floyd County 911 dispatch records indicate that Officer Bray ran a vehicle license plate, two operator license numbers, and a VIN.

When interviewed about the encounter, Officer Bray stated that as he approached the van he could see through the front windshield. He described his observations to be the female on top of the male going up and down. Bray said the man and woman did not initially see him upon his approach and that he had to knock on the driver's side window to get their attention and to stop their act.

In review of officer Bray's body camera video, the people in the van cannot be seen through the front windshield or driver's side window due to window glare and tint. Officer Bray verbally engages with the occupants of the vehicle once he is next to the partially opened driver's side window knocking and stating, "You know a bedroom is better than this, right? Go ahead and put your clothes on." This supports Bray's statement that the occupants did not notice him upon his approach to the vehicle. Before requesting the occupants' identification, you can hear a woman's voice groan in response to the encounter with police. Officer Bray then tells the occupants to "Go ahead and put your clothes on for me." as he walks to the back of the van. Once Bray returns to the front driver's side window, it is difficult to clearly see the female occupant in the front passenger seat due to camera angle, lens flare from the sunlight, and contrast of the captured video. However, there is a section of the body camera video (approximately at the 1m37s mark) in which you can see the female occupant leaning over the center console reaching into the back seat area. During this movement the female is dark-haired, wearing a light-colored bra, and a light-colored lower body garment of an unknown type. Chief Pyle is clearly seen and heard on the video in the driver's seat as he speaks with Officer Bray. He appears with a shirt and a baseball cap on. Once all records checks of the occupants and vehicle return, the encounter ends with Officer Bray instructing the occupants to "find somewhere else next time" and Chief Pyle asking Bray if he was "looking for a job".

Chief Pyle also stated that the unknown female, the alleged confidential informant, had been seated in the third-row rear of the van and had, at some point during the officer's approach, concealed herself entirely beneath a folding seat, apparently to avoid being observed. Chief Pyle stated the officer never detected the presence of this third occupant.

Officer Bray stated in his interview that he did not see a third person in the van claiming the van windows were tinted dark and the male and female occupants did not mention a third occupant during the encounter.

Chief Pyle stated that following the encounter, he drove back to Calhoun, dropped Suzanne off at CrossFit, and then transported the unknown female to the old police department. He stated the woman inquired about immigration-related matters, specifically asking whether he could assist with a U-Visa (legal documentation requesting a stay of deportation or Visa limitations for criminal prosecution-valued victims or witnesses) process in connection with obtaining dual citizenship for her children, who had been born in Mexico. Chief Pyle stated he informed her that such matters required an attorney, that he was not in a position to assist with the paperwork she described, and that his department's involvement would only be relevant if she had been the victim of a physical assault within Calhoun's jurisdiction. He stated he subsequently transported her to a Dollar Store in Resaca at her request, at which point the encounter concluded.

There are unsubstantiated claims by City of Calhoun officials that Chief Pyle had originally stated that he drove the confidential informant to her home.

Chief Pyle stated that sometime later, which he was unable to specify whether it was approximately six months or approximately a year and a half, the same female contacted him again and voluntarily provided drug-related information, stating she wanted nothing in return and had "started her process." Chief Pyle stated he forwarded the information to his narcotics unit commander, Donald Colburn, who later reported that the information had contributed to the seizure of approximately 4.5 pounds of methamphetamine. Chief Pyle stated he believed, though was not certain, that the matter may have been prosecuted federally through the FBI Safe Streets Task Force.

In a department-wide email Chief Pyle made a statement on the event. This same statement was also provided by Pyle to Gordon Gazette according to documents provided to the investigator by City officials. Chief Pyle says in the statement that he conducted an interview of the informant upon their return to the police department (inferring that said interview resulted in a criminal investigation and subsequent drug arrest). The information the informant provided led to "an arrest of a large-scale dealer. (several pounds of drugs were seized as well)".

A broad request was made to the City of Calhoun, and through it the Floyd County District Attorney's Office, for relevant case-related documents. While there is a similar case as that claimed by Chief Pyle, the case was not handled by Calhoun PD, but instead Floyd County PD officers assigned to a DEA taskforce. No official Calhoun PD records or reports could be produced to the investigator to substantiate these claims. Commander Colburn was on leave during the investigation and was not available for interview.

There is conjecture from Pyle during the interview as to what police unit handled the case which was derived from the confidential informant's information. Chief Pyle is uncertain whether Calhoun Police Department is a part of the FBI Safe Streets Task Force or not (which would require a chief's approval in an MOA) or if the case was federally prosecuted.

In other documents from City of Calhoun officials, Chief Pyle provides the name of a judge, Tim Lankford, as being involved in the matter. Extensive searches online, of public records, the American Bar Association, and State Bar of Georgia revealed no such judge or person by this name.

With respect to prior proceedings about this allegation, Chief Pyle stated that an earlier investigation into the incident conducted by City Administrator Paul Worley had concluded with Chief Pyle signing a written reprimand. He stated he was told by Worley at that time that the matter was closed and would not be placed in his personnel file. Chief Pyle stated he was surprised and felt blindsided when the investigation was subsequently reopened, which he indicated Worley attributed in part to the dashcam video having been released to the public and a citizen coming forward. Chief Pyle stated he was thereafter placed on paid administrative leave following a special-called City Council meeting, after which Worley conveyed to him that the Council had initially sought to take more severe action but had been persuaded to proceed otherwise by the City Attorney on due process grounds.

Part of this statement is supported by a memo dated March 17, 2026, sent by Paul Worley to Chief Pyle reference "Citizen complaint against Chief Pyle". In the memo Paul writes that the "memorandum serves as a formal reprimand regarding the procedural concerns identified..." In closing, Paul states "...we may revisit this matter." A memo from Paul Worley to Brooke Land dated December 10, 2025, revealed the citizen lodging the complaint of improper conduct by Chief Pyle (Allegation #1) was [REDACTED]. This investigation was requested on April 13, 2026, and Chief Pyle was placed on administrative leave around this time.

Chief Pyle additionally stated that in February he had filed a complaint against Floyd County Officer Brey, after learning the officer had been discussing the incident in a subjective manner, publicly at a restaurant in the presence of other officers and state troopers. Chief Pyle stated his intent in filing the complaint was solely to have the officer cautioned regarding public discussion of police matters and not to seek formal discipline. He stated he ultimately withdrew the complaint out of concern that it could result in the officer's termination. Chief Pyle confirmed through discussions with the Floyd County IA investigator that the officer had not been formally disciplined as a result of the complaint.

An open records request was filed with Floyd County Police Department by the investigator for documents and videos pertaining to this incident and the complaint investigation lodged by Chief Pyle. Documents were provided but added little value to the investigation in excess to the body camera footage and Officer Bray's interview. It was determined that dash camera footage was

either not captured by Officer Bray's vehicle or not retained by the department since it was not a part of the request returns.

The following narrative summarizes Chief Pyle's detailed account of the events underlying Allegation #2 provided during the interview:

Chief Pyle was questioned regarding the discontinuation of the Calhoun Police Department Reserve (aka Part-time) Officer Program. An existing memo or email authored by Chief Pyle announcing the program's dissolution was mentioned. Chief Pyle acknowledged he did not specifically recall sending the memo but accepted that he had done based on the investigator's representation.

Chief Pyle stated that the matter first came to his attention when City Administrator Paul Worley contacted Chief Pyle's administrative assistant, Sharon Jolley, to inquire why a particular officer was submitting pay claims that no one could verify. Jolley reported to Chief Pyle that she advised Worley she had no knowledge of the individual performing any work. Chief Pyle further stated that Jolley relayed to him that the HR Director, Brook Land, had separately contacted Jolley regarding a different part-time officer who had not worked in over a year but remained on the city/department's active rosters.

Chief Pyle identified the officer whose pay submissions had prompted City Administrator Worley's inquiry as [REDACTED]. He stated that [REDACTED] had purportedly claimed he was performing grant-related tasks from home. Chief Pyle stated he had no means by which to verify [REDACTED]'s reported hours and characterized that accountability gap as unacceptable from a public trust standpoint.

Chief Pyle described what he framed as the core operational problem underlying his decision: reserve officers, whose function was to serve as a force multiplier for full-time patrol staff, were consistently unavailable when called upon. He stated that when supervisors attempted to fill patrol vacancies by contacting reserve officers, the officers repeatedly could not be reached or declined to work. He noted one female reserve officer who participated in parade details but stated the general pattern among the group was one of non-participation in patrol functions. He additionally noted that some reserve officers had never completed their Field Training Officer program yet remained sworn peace officers.

These statements were substantiated through interviews with Paul Worley, Sharron Jolley, Lieutenant Colonel Carson, and Major Gallman.

Chief Pyle stated directly and without qualification that the decision to dissolve the Reserve Officer Program was a business decision, and that [REDACTED]'s complaint to the City had no bearing on that decision. He stated that prior to taking any action, he consulted with both City

Administrator Worley and the City Attorney. He stated that Worley indicated his agreement with the decision. He stated the City Attorney expressed support as well, advising that if reserve officers were not working, discontinuation was the appropriate course of action, and noting that a nearby jurisdiction with a similarly disproportionate ratio of part-time to full-time officers had drawn scrutiny from POST (Georgia Peace Officers Standards and Training).

Chief Pyle stated that upon dissolving the program, he personally spoke with each reserve officer individually and offered every one of them a full-time position with the department, noting that three full-time vacancies existed at that time. He stated that none of the reserve officers accepted the offer. He further stated that he informed them the program could be reevaluated in the future and that he would contact them again if it were reinstated.

Chief Pyle acknowledged uncertainty regarding the precise timeline of these events, stating he believed the conversations with Worley and HR occurred sometime in 2026, but noted that his extended period of administrative leave had affected his sense of time.

At the close of questioning on this topic, Chief Pyle briefly indicated he wished to add something further pertaining to a statement made by Paul Worley, but elected not to do so, stating only that he probably should not say it. No additional information on that point was offered.

The following narrative summarizes Chief Pyle's detailed account of the events underlying Allegation #3 provided during the interview:

Chief Pyle was questioned about his alleged interference or intentional prolongment of the internal affairs investigation into accusations of sexual harassment made by Officer [REDACTED] against [REDACTED]. Information was obtained through interviews and personnel discussions indicating that he had directed Major Gallman to pause the investigation for a week in December 2025. Chief Pyle stated he did not recall ordering any such pause.

Major Gallman and Captain Nicholson both mentioned in their interviews that Chief Pyle ordered a "pause" to the IA investigation for approximately one week in December 2025 before directing Major Gallman to reconvene the investigation. Both the Major and Captain were uncertain of the reason for this directive. Major Gallman stated although it delayed the investigation, the impact on his process was negligible.

Officer [REDACTED] expressed in her interview a general angst over the extensive timeframe of the investigation. She cited multiple communications with Major Gallman, Chief Pyle, and Brooke Land during the course of the matter to highlight the timeframe and delayed results. [REDACTED] was confused and assumed intentional interference, or at least indifference, by Chief Pyle and/or Major Gallman. She could not, however, provide evidence to support her assumptions.

When asked whether he had any social contact with [REDACTED] outside of the workplace, Chief Pyle stated he did not. He further stated that he had no relationship connections to [REDACTED] — no shared history, family ties, or personal friendship — noting that [REDACTED] family was not from the area and that [REDACTED] was originally from [REDACTED]. Chief Pyle stated he had never engaged with [REDACTED] in any friendly capacity, such as one-on-one lunches or other events. When asked whether he had shown favoritism to either party during the investigation, Chief Pyle stated he had not.

Chief Pyle confirmed that both Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had separately approached him during the course of the investigation with questions about its extensive timeframe. He stated that in both instances he directed each party to Major Gallman for answers, and that he informed them the delay was attributable to Major Gallman awaiting phone records from AT&T, which Chief Pyle characterized as providing records on their own timeline regardless of the urgency of any request.

This statement was substantiated by Major Gallman, who at the time of his interviews was still awaiting phone records requests from AT&T. The purpose of these records was to ascertain the number of calls made by [REDACTED]'s work phone to Officer [REDACTED] work phone and vice-versa. This investigative step, at face value, is common practice within administrative and criminal investigations.

Chief Pyle stated he had overseen fewer than five formal internal affairs investigations during his tenure as chief, explaining that most lower-level complaints were typically resolved at the patrol captain level. He stated the relative infrequency of formal IA processes was among the reasons he treated the complaint with particular seriousness — initiating the investigation on a Sunday and contacting Major Gallman at home that same day to instruct him to treat the matter as a priority upon his return to work. Chief Pyle further stated that he notified City Administrator Paul Worley of the investigation the following Monday morning, that he assumed Worley would in turn notify HR Director Brooke Land, and that Worley's response was to keep him updated.

With respect to the investigation's conclusion, Chief Pyle stated his knowledge was limited at the time he was placed on administrative leave. He indicated the investigation remained active at that juncture, though he noted that Major Gallman had verbally advised him that the investigative work on his end was substantially complete and had characterized the likely outcome as a "he said, she said" situation; meaning there was no definitive way to substantiate [REDACTED]'s allegations over [REDACTED] defense. Chief Pyle stated that Gallman had indicated he intended to deliver a final written report, but that his administrative leave intervened around that time.

When asked directly whether he had taken any active steps to thwart, delay, or impede the investigation, Chief Pyle stated unequivocally that he had not.

The finalized IA report was not provided to the investigator. Review of this report will support or refute Chief Pyle's statement. Major Gallman categorically denied any interference with the investigation by Chief Pyle (outside of the one week pause in December 2025).

Chief Pyle then voluntarily disclosed, without prompting, that [REDACTED] stepmother had cut his hair on occasion at her salon. He stated he raised this matter of his own accord so that the investigator would not construe it as a concealed connection. He stated he had visited her shop approximately three times over the course of several years, that she was not his regular barber, and that he had not known her identity the first time she cut his hair. Chief Pyle stated this incidental contact did not reflect any personal relationship he had with [REDACTED]

Chief Pyle stated that both Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] had conducted themselves professionally throughout their interactions with him during the investigation, and that neither had attempted to pressure or influence him regarding the investigation's outcome. He described the underlying sexual harassment allegation as a shocking development given his personal knowledge of both officers.

Chief Pyle offered no additional closing statements to his interview when given the opportunity to do so. The interview was concluded at 3:29pm.

2. Director Suzanne Roberts

City of Rome, Downtown Development Authority
601 Broad Street, Rome, GA 30161
706-236-4520

Director Suzanne Roberts (hereafter referred to as Suzanne) was interviewed via telephone for this administrative investigation. This interview took place on Wednesday, May 20, 2026, at 10:56am. As a witness relevant to Allegation #1, Suzanne was interviewed regarding the alleged inappropriate conduct involving herself and Chief Pyle while occupying a City of Calhoun vehicle on a secluded roadway in Floyd County, Georgia. At the outset of the interview, Suzanne was immediately contentious, advising that she had been instructed by her attorney not to discuss the incident. Despite efforts to disarm her reluctance by initially presenting less sensitive questions, Suzanne steered the interview toward an abrupt conclusion, citing that she had previously addressed this matter with Paul Worley. Prior to ending the interview, Suzanne provided one substantive response, stating that a third occupant was present in the vehicle with herself and Chief Pyle at the time of the incident.

At the direction of Paul Worley, and following her resignation from the City of Calhoun, Suzanne Roberts was questioned about this matter by City Clerk Sharon Nelson. During that inquiry, Suzanne stated that no other individual was present in the vehicle with herself and Chief Pyle. However, later that same day, Suzanne contacted Paul Worley and recanted her prior statement, acknowledging that she had been untruthful with Sharon Nelson. Suzanne explained that she had concealed the truth because Chief Pyle had explicitly instructed her never to disclose the presence of the confidential informant to anyone.

3. Officer Xavier Bray

Floyd County Police Department

5 Government Plaza, Rome, GA 30161

706-235-7766

Floyd County Police Officer Xavier Bray (hereafter referred to as Officer Bray) was interviewed via telephone for this administrative investigation. This interview took place on Friday, May 22, 2026, at 4:15pm.

As a witness with direct knowledge of the encounter involving Allegation #1, Officer Bray confirmed his willingness to participate and answer questions regarding the incident, which he recalled.

Officer Bray stated that while on patrol, he observed a vehicle parked on the side of a secluded roadway. He approached the vehicle to investigate its status, consistent with standard patrol practice. Upon approaching the vehicle, Officer Bray stated that he observed what appeared to be a female occupant positioned on top of a male occupant, moving in a manner he described as indicative of an active sexual encounter. He stated that the occupants had not noticed his approach and that he had to knock on the driver's side window to gain their attention.

This is contrary to Chief Pyle's statement in which he indicated that the confidential informant observed Officer Bray's approach and was afraid. Chief Pyle also stated that he instructed Suzanne to lean over the center console in such a way to obstruct Officer Bray's view of the confidential informant.

Officer Bray stated that the female occupant had no shirt on and was, to his recollection, fully unclothed from the waist up at the time he made contact. Regarding the male occupant, Officer Bray stated he was uncertain as to whether or how far the male's pants had been removed or lowered, though he noted the male did have a shirt on. Officer Bray further stated that after directing the occupants to put their clothes on, he walked to the rear of the vehicle to run the license plate and therefore did not personally observe the male occupant redress.

In review of officer Bray's body camera video, the people in the van cannot be seen through the front windshield or driver's side window due to window glare and tint.

Officer Bray stated that he did not observe a third person in the vehicle and was not aware of any statements made by the occupants regarding the presence of a third party. He noted that no movement or indication of a third occupant caught his attention during the encounter due to the dark tinting of the vehicle windows.

Regarding video documentation, Officer Bray confirmed that his body-worn camera captured the encounter. He also indicated his belief that a dashcam was operating at the time, though he acknowledged uncertainty given the passage of time, stating it was possible the dashcam had not been manually activated (activating his vehicle's emergency lights would have started the dash video recording automatically, but Bray did not activate them). Officer Bray acknowledged that his specific recollections of verbal statements made during the encounter were limited due to the time elapsed since the incident.

As mentioned before, an open records request was filed with Floyd County Police Department by the investigator for documents and videos pertaining to this incident. Documents were provided but added little value to the investigation in excess to the body camera footage and Officer Bray's interview. It was determined that dash camera footage was either not captured by Officer Bray's vehicle or not retained by the department since it was not a part of the request returns.

Officer Bray's response to questioning regarding the complaint filed against him by Chief Pyle was noted. When asked directly whether any individual had attempted to contact, pressure, or otherwise influence his account of the incident, whether to suppress, omit, or alter his testimony, Officer Bray stated that no such contact or effort had been made.

Despite the significant time elapsed between the incident and the date of this interview, Officer Bray demonstrated sufficient recall of the encounter to provide a coherent and consistent account of the events he witnessed. The nature of the incident, combined with the professional stature of the individuals involved, appears to have rendered the encounter sufficiently notable to remain within his recollection.

Officer Bray's interview ended with him indicating that he had nothing further to add beyond what was already said or what was captured on his body camera.

4. Major Randy Gallman

Calhoun Police Department

10 McDaniel Station Road, Calhoun, GA 30701

Major Randy Gallman was interviewed in person for this administrative investigation. Due to schedule interruption the interview was split into two parts. The two interviews took place on Wednesday, April 29, 2026, at 9:11am and Monday, May 4, 2026, at 11:09am, both held in the conference room at Calhoun City Hall 226 S. Wall Street, Calhoun, GA 30701.

As a witness relevant to Allegation #2, the alleged delay or suppression of the sexual harassment investigation involving the male police lieutenant and the female police officer, Major Gallman was interviewed regarding Chief Pyle's role and actions in that matter.

Gallman provided a general overview of his investigation and the processes employed throughout its course. He advised that the investigation was assigned to him by Chief Pyle on a Sunday in November 2025. Gallman stated that at no point during the course of his investigation did he perceive Chief Pyle to exhibit behavior indicative of an attempt to delay or suppress the investigation. Gallman did note, however, that during a week in December 2025, Chief Pyle directed him to pause the investigation before subsequently ordering him to resume. Gallman was unable to provide a reason for the weeklong pause, characterizing the directive as highly unusual, while maintaining that it had no adverse effect on the integrity of the investigation.

This 'pause' of the investigation is substantiated in the interview of Captain Nicholson. She was also not aware of the reason for this directive by Chief Pyle.

The subject of speculation regarding an alleged relationship between Chief Pyle and [REDACTED] was raised during the interview; however, Major Gallman dismissed the existence of any such relationship. Gallman acknowledged awareness of instances in which both Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] visited Chief Pyle's office during the course of the investigation but advised that he was not privy to the substance of those conversations. Gallman further stated that no direction or guidance from Chief Pyle resulted from those visits.

The visits to Chief Pyle's office by both employees were substantiated through the interview of Ms. Sharon Jolley.

Gallman advised that the primary cause of the delay was attributable to an outstanding external request for AT&T phone records, which represented crucial evidence in the investigation. This delay was characterized as outside of his control. Gallman expressed disappointment with the prolonged timeline, noting his desire to conclude the investigation in a prompt manner.

Nevertheless, he remained steadfast in his position that Chief Pyle made no attempts to delay or suppress the outcome of the investigation.

SECTION IV – ADDITIONAL FINDINGS OF ACILLIARY ALLEGATIONS

It should be noted that these allegations were not directed solely toward Chief Pyle, but instead were attributed broadly across multiple levels of department leadership.

1. Allegations were raised concerning the inaccurate or fraudulent reporting of City of Calhoun Police Department traffic statistics to the State of Georgia Governor's Officer of highway Safety for the purpose of obtaining grant funds. Following an interview with Captain Nicholson, and drawing upon the investigator's direct knowledge and experience in reporting statistics for the same grant program, no wrongdoing or inaccuracies were identified with respect to the methodology employed by the Calhoun Police Department in its reporting process as described by senior staff.
2. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] raised concerns regarding the disparate treatment of certain staff members, including themselves, with respect to selections, placements, removals, and assignments involving specialized units. The instances described, if accurate, give rise to significant concern regarding the management philosophy and potential retaliatory practices of supervisory and command-level personnel within the Calhoun Police Department. Of particular note, one specifically identified action taken by leadership resulted in a reduction of salary without cause or the imposition of formal punitive action. Should this allegation prove accurate, such conduct may constitute a violation of applicable labor laws and warrants further scrutiny.
3. Numerous additional allegations were identified through documentation submitted by city officials and statements made during interviews. These allegations encompassed a broad range of concerns, including improper or unlawful policing practices, inappropriate conduct and gross misconduct by employees toward members of the public, monetized corruption, lack of accountability for personnel issues or corrective behavior, disregard of citizen complaints, potential criminal acts by current or former officers, favoritism, inconsistent adherence to and enforcement of department policy, and misuse of department equipment. A comprehensive listing of these matters is contained within the investigative document packet designated "Junk List." While these accusations are serious in nature, they were determined to be too broadly attributed to investigate with specificity, potentially founded in rumor, and in many instances, unlikely to be provable through available evidence or testimony. Accordingly, no investigative action was taken by this investigator with respect to these allegations.

SECTION V – ITEMIZED POLICY VIOLATIONS & CONSIDERATIONS

Based on the totality of the investigation, the following alleged policy violations and considerations are itemized for Chief James "Tony" Pyle:

Allegations Restated:

1. In September 2021 Chief Pyle engaged in inappropriate personal relations with a former City of Calhoun female employee on a secluded roadway in Floyd County, Georgia, while operating a City of Calhoun vehicle.
2. Chief Pyle abruptly and improperly disbanded the Calhoun Police Department Reserve Officer Program, not for legitimate operational reasons, but specifically to remove a particular Reserve Officer, for personal retaliatory purposes, against whom he lacked legal or valid administrative cause for individual separation.
3. Chief Pyle intentionally delayed or attempted to suppress a separate administrative investigation concerning alleged sexual harassment between a male police lieutenant and a female police officer, purportedly due to a personal friendship with the accused lieutenant.

Alleged Policy Violations:

Based upon the evidence and testimony gathered in the course of this investigation, the following policy violations are identified as potentially applicable to the conduct of Chief James "Tony" Pyle. These violations are organized by allegation and the governing policy provisions implicated by each. The identification of a potential violation herein does not constitute a finding that the violation has been proven; rather, these provisions are cited to inform the disposition analysis that follows and to ensure that the appropriate authority is aware of the policy framework applicable to the alleged conduct.

Allegation #1

Policy 2.15 — Rules of Conduct

Truthfulness

The evidence developed through this investigation establishes that Chief Pyle directed Suzanne Roberts to conceal the presence of the confidential informant from anyone who inquired, a directive she followed and subsequently acknowledged during her recantation to Paul Worley. This directive constitutes a knowing effort to withhold information material to an official inquiry, in direct contravention of the truthfulness provision of this policy, which prohibits the

intentional omission of pertinent information and expressly characterizes such omission as an untruthful act.

Issuance of Unlawful Orders

Related to the above, directing a subordinate or associated city employee to conceal the identity of a third occupant, particularly during a period of active administrative scrutiny, may constitute the issuance of an order that is unlawful or (at least) unethical in violation of this provision.

Conduct Unbecoming

The alleged inappropriate conduct involving Chief Pyle and Suzanne Roberts in a City of Calhoun vehicle on a secluded roadway in Floyd County, combined with the subsequent direction to conceal the presence of the confidential informant, reflects conduct that adversely affects public trust, respect, and confidence in Chief Pyle and the Calhoun Police Department. Such conduct falls within the definition of conduct unbecoming as established by this policy.

Policy 3.05 — Discipline and Accountability

Dishonesty and Encouraging Other Persons to Commit Inappropriate Acts

The instruction given to Suzanne Roberts to provide a false statement to City Clerk Sharon Nelson during an official inquiry implicates two independently enumerated grounds for discipline under Policy 3.05: dishonesty, and the encouragement of other persons to commit inappropriate acts. Both provisions are applicable to the conduct described.

Unacceptable Off-Duty Conduct

Should the alleged inappropriate personal conduct between Chief Pyle and Suzanne Roberts be substantiated, such conduct would constitute unacceptable off-duty or on-duty conduct as defined under Policy 3.05, which enumerates this as an independent basis for disciplinary action.

Failing to Cooperate with an Internal Affairs Investigation

By withholding information and providing responses that were inconsistent with the subsequently developed evidence during Paul Worley's prior inquiry into this matter, Chief Pyle may be subject to discipline under the provision of Policy 3.05 that expressly enumerates the failure to cooperate with and provide information in connection with an authorized internal affairs investigation as grounds for disciplinary action.

Policy 4.26 — Use of Agency Vehicles

Egregious Abuse / Improper Use of a City Vehicle

Policy 4.26 expressly prohibits employees from the egregious abuse of city vehicles for general, extensive personal use and requires that members operating marked departmental vehicles do so in a prudent manner so as not to bring discredit to themselves or the Department. The operation of a City of Calhoun vehicle (although unmarked) to a secluded roadway in Floyd County, outside the city's jurisdictional boundaries and in the absence of a clearly documented law enforcement function, raises a legitimate concern as to whether the vehicle was being used for personal rather than official purposes, in potential violation of this provision.

Transporting Other Persons

Policy 4.26 establishes that when an officer elects to transport a citizen or other individual in a city vehicle, all applicable protocols must be observed, including notification to 911, seatbelt compliance, searches, criminal and warrant checks, and proper documentation. No evidence was produced to establish that any of these required steps were taken in connection with the transport of the confidential informant. The failure to comply with any of these requirements may constitute an additional violation of this policy.

Allegation #2

City of Calhoun Personnel Policies – Layoffs

Required Written Notice to the Employee Timeframe

While the investigation did not substantiate the allegation that the Reserve Officer Program was disbanded for personal or retaliatory reasons, it was determined that the process by which the program was dissolved did not conform to the procedures prescribed by the City of Calhoun Personnel Policies governing layoffs. Specifically, Section D.5.d mandates that permanent status employees receive written notice from the Personnel Director at least 14 calendar days prior to the effective date of any layoff and that such employees receive first consideration for transfer to any available qualifying vacancy prior to separation. There is no evidence that these procedural requirements were followed. While the circumstances suggest this departure from policy was likely unintentional, Chief Pyle consulted with City Administrator Worley prior to acting and received no noted guidance on proper procedures, the procedural deficiency nonetheless existed and is identified for the appropriate authority's consideration.

Allegation #3

Policy 2.15 — Rules of Conduct

Disparate Treatment / Favoritism — Respecting the Rights of Others

Allegations that Chief Pyle afforded favorable treatment to ██████████ during the pendency of the sexual harassment investigation, to the detriment of Officer ██████████ complaint, implicate the provision of Policy 2.15 prohibiting favoritism and requiring that all employees maintain a strictly impartial attitude toward all parties. These allegations were not substantiated through the evidence gathered; however, they are noted as a potential violation should additional evidence emerge.

Directing a Pause in an Internal Affairs Investigation — Obedience to Rules

The weeklong pause in the sexual harassment investigation directed by Chief Pyle in December 2025 was confirmed by both Major Gallman and Captain Nicholson. The directive was characterized as highly unusual, but Chief Pyle was unable to recall issuing it. While no unequivocal evidence was developed to establish that the pause was issued for an improper purpose, and Major Gallman maintained it had no meaningful adverse effect on the

investigation's integrity, the directive is nonetheless identified as a potential violation of the provisions governing obedience to rules and the prohibition on conduct that could be construed as interference with an authorized investigation. Whether this directive constitutes a violation of policy is a determination appropriately left to city officials.

City of Calhoun Personnel Policies – Harassment

Confidential and Impartial Investigations

The visits by both Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to Chief Pyle's office during the course of the internal affairs investigation are particularly concerning in the context of this harassment policy analysis. The policy requires that harassment investigations be conducted in a confidential and impartial manner. Direct access by the subject of a harassment allegation to the Chief of Police during the pendency of an investigation, with no documented direction or outcome from those meetings, raises legitimate questions about whether the integrity and impartiality of the process was compromised, and whether Chief Pyle fulfilled his affirmative obligations under this policy.

SECTION VI – DISPOSITIONS

Allegation 1 – NOT SUSTAINED

Following a thorough review of all available evidence, witness testimony, body camera footage, and supporting documentation, this allegation is determined to be **Not Sustained**. While sufficient evidence exists to establish that the incident occurred, that Chief Pyle and Suzanne Roberts were together in a City of Calhoun vehicle on a secluded roadway in Floyd County on or about September 22, 2021, the evidence does not rise to the level required to definitively establish that inappropriate personal conduct took place between the two occupants.

The statements of the three principal witnesses are materially inconsistent and cannot be reconciled. Chief Pyle denied any inappropriate conduct and provided a detailed, though not fully corroborated, account of the circumstances that led to the vehicle being parked at that location.

Suzanne Roberts declined to be meaningfully interviewed, citing the advice of legal counsel, and provided only the singular confirmation that a third occupant was present in the vehicle. Floyd County Officer Xavier Bray stated that upon approach he observed what he believed to be the female occupant on top of the male occupant; however, a subsequent review of

Officer Bray's body camera footage revealed that the vehicle's window tint and glare prevented a clear view through the windshield, rendering his visual observations prior to making contact with the occupants inconclusive and unable to be corroborated by viewers of the video record.

The body camera footage does confirm several facts: that Chief Pyle appeared fully clothed in the driver's seat; that Officer Bray made statements consistent with having perceived a compromising situation prior to approaching the vehicle; that a female occupant, wearing what appeared to be a light-colored bra, was present in the front passenger area; and that the encounter concluded without formal action by Officer Bray, who directed the occupants to leave. The footage does not, however, definitively confirm or refute the nature of what occurred inside the vehicle prior to Officer Bray's arrival or a third occupant.

Additionally, the extensive timeframe between the occurrence of the incident and the initiation of this formal investigation placed significant limitations on the investigator's ability to gather, verify, and weigh the available evidence. The passage of time contributed to the loss, unavailability, or diminished reliability of records, memories, and witnesses that may have otherwise been material to a definitive finding.

Accordingly, while this investigator cannot conclude that the allegations are false, the conflicting accounts of the three witnesses most proximate to the incident, the limitations of the available physical evidence, and the temporal constraints of the investigation collectively preclude a definitive finding that the alleged conduct occurred. This allegation is therefore **Not Sustained**.

It should be noted, however, that irrespective of the disposition of this primary allegation, the evidence developed in the course of this investigation does establish that Chief Pyle directed

Suzanne Roberts to conceal the presence of the confidential informant from anyone who inquired, a directive she followed until subsequently recanting. This conduct — independent of the underlying allegation — raises substantiated concerns under Policy 2.15 (Truthfulness, Issuance of Unlawful Orders) and Policy 3.05 (Dishonesty, Encouraging Other Persons to Commit Inappropriate Acts), and is referred to the appropriate authority for further consideration.

Allegation 2 – UNFOUNDED

Following a thorough review of all available evidence, witness interviews, and supporting documentation, this allegation is determined to be **Unfounded**. The evidence does not support the conclusion that Chief Pyle disbanded the Reserve Officer Program for personal or retaliatory purposes directed at any individual reserve officer.

The investigation revealed a documented operational basis for the program's dissolution. Chief Pyle stated directly and without qualification that the decision was a business decision, and this characterization was substantiated through the interviews of City Administrator Paul Worley, Administrative Assistant Sharon Jolley, Lieutenant Colonel Carson, and Major Gallman. Each corroborated the underlying operational concerns that informed the decision, including the chronic unavailability of reserve officers for patrol assignments, unverifiable pay submissions, and the presence of sworn officers who had never completed their Field Training Officer program.

The decision was not made unilaterally. Chief Pyle consulted with both City Administrator Worley and the City Attorney prior to acting, both of whom indicated their agreement or support. Furthermore, evidence suggested that the Reserve Officer Program had been a subject of scrutiny for a period of years prior to its dissolution, lending additional support to the conclusion that this was a legitimate operational determination rather than a pretextual one.

While the allegation that [REDACTED]'s complaint to the City served as the true motivation for the program's elimination could not be entirely discounted given the proximity of events, there was insufficient evidence to establish that this was the operative cause. Chief Pyle explicitly denied that [REDACTED]'s complaint influenced his decision, and no witness testimony or documentation was produced to affirmatively contradict that denial. This allegation is therefore **Unfounded**.

It is noted, however, that in executing the dissolution of the Reserve Officer Program, Chief Pyle did not adhere to the procedures prescribed by the City of Calhoun Personnel Policies governing layoffs, specifically the requirements of Section Five, D.5, including the mandatory 14-day advance written notice to permanent status employees and the formal recommendation process through the Personnel Director. The evidence suggests this procedural departure was unintentional, as Chief Pyle had consulted with City Administrator Worley prior to acting and received no

guidance on the proper procedural requirements. The responsibility to ensure compliance with applicable personnel procedures rests not only with the department head but with the City Administrator and HR Director, neither of whom directed Chief Pyle toward proper layoff procedures at the time. This procedural deficiency is noted for the record and referred to the appropriate city authority for any action deemed warranted.

Allegation 3 – UNFOUNDED

Following a thorough review of all available evidence, witness interviews, and supporting documentation, this allegation is determined to be **Unfounded**. The evidence does not establish that Chief Pyle intentionally delayed, suppressed, or otherwise attempted to influence the outcome of the internal affairs investigation into the sexual harassment allegations involving [REDACTED] against Officer [REDACTED].

To the contrary, the evidence reflects that Chief Pyle treated the matter with appropriate seriousness from its inception initiating the investigation on a Sunday, contacting Major Gallman at home that same day to designate the matter as priority, and notifying City Administrator Worley the following morning.

Major Gallman, the assigned investigator, stated unequivocally that he never perceived Chief Pyle to exhibit any behavior indicative of an attempt to delay or suppress the investigation, and he categorically denied any interference by Chief Pyle throughout its course. Gallman identified the primary cause of the investigation's extended duration as an outstanding external request for AT&T phone records, a delay entirely outside of Chief Pyle's control, and consistent with common delays encountered in administrative and criminal investigations of this nature.

The allegation of a personal friendship between Chief Pyle and [REDACTED] was not substantiated. Chief Pyle denied any social relationship with [REDACTED] outside the workplace, and no witness testimony or documentation was produced to contradict this denial. Chief Pyle voluntarily disclosed, without prompting, that [REDACTED] stepmother had cut his hair on three occasions at her salon over the course of several years, a disclosure made proactively and in a spirit of transparency, which the investigator found to be inconsistent with the behavior of an individual seeking to conceal a material relationship.

The weeklong pause in the investigation directed by Chief Pyle in December 2025 was acknowledged and cannot be disregarded. Both Major Gallman and Captain Nicholson confirmed the pause, and neither was provided a reason for the directive. Chief Pyle stated he had no recollection of ordering a pause. While the pause was characterized as highly unusual, Major Gallman maintained it had no meaningful adverse effect on the integrity or progress of the investigation. In the absence of any evidence establishing the purpose or intent behind the

directive, and given Major Gallman's own assessment of its impact, the pause alone is insufficient to support a finding of intentional interference.

Officer [REDACTED] concerns regarding the length of the investigation were noted and taken seriously. However, her characterization of the delay as intentional interference was acknowledged by her own admission to be an assumption unsupported by direct evidence.

The visits of both Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to Chief Pyle's office during the pendency of the investigation, while potentially inconsistent with the spirit of the City of Calhoun Personnel Policies' requirements for confidential and impartial harassment investigations, were not shown to have resulted in any direction, communication, or influence upon the investigation's course. Whether those visits constituted a violation of the confidentiality and impartiality requirements of the City's harassment policy is a question appropriately left to city officials and the appropriate authority for further review and determination.

As no unequivocal evidence was produced to establish that Chief Pyle acted with intent to sway, delay, or suppress the outcome of the investigation, this allegation is therefore **Unfounded**.

*****END OF INVESTIGATIVE REPORT*****