

# Exhaustive Opposition Research Report: The Pamela Price 2026 Comeback Campaign

## Executive Summary and Strategic Overview

The following intelligence dossier provides an exhaustive, no-limits opposition research analysis of former Alameda County District Attorney Pamela Price, specifically tailored to dismantle her recently announced 2026 comeback campaign. Elected in 2022 on a platform of progressive criminal justice reform, Price made history as the first Black woman to serve as the county's chief prosecutor. However, her tenure devolved into an unprecedented administrative and ethical catastrophe, culminating in her removal from office in November 2024. Voters recalled her by a historic and humiliating margin of 62.9% to 37.1%. Despite this resounding, bipartisan repudiation by one of the most progressive electorates in the United States, Price announced her candidacy for the June 2026 primary against incumbent District Attorney Ursula Jones Dickson in December 2025.

Price's 2026 electoral strategy relies on a blatant attempt to rewrite local history by leaning heavily into national partisan divisions. She is actively attempting to position herself as a bulwark against federal immigration enforcement and the Trump administration, calculating that the electorate will overlook her disastrous local record if she can successfully inflame national political grievances. This dossier is designed to ensure that such a pivot fails.

Divided into ten comprehensive operational vectors, this report meticulously catalogs Price's vulnerabilities across biographical contradictions, campaign finance architecture, prosecutorial mismanagement, highly damaging judicial rebukes, systemic nepotism, and multiple active ethical and legal crises. By synthesizing quantitative electoral data, primary source legal filings, leaked internal memoranda, and internal staff communications, this document constructs a definitive, heavily sourced roadmap for dismantling her 2026 electoral strategy. The objective is to provide opposing campaigns with the narrative framing, debate landmines, and empirical data necessary to force Price to defend her local administrative failures, thereby neutralizing her attempts to campaign on national political abstractions.

## Part 1: Biographical and Professional Vulnerabilities

Pamela Price's political narrative is deeply anchored in her personal history and her decades of experience as a civil rights and employment attorney. Throughout her public life, she has frequently highlighted her background as a survivor of the Ohio juvenile justice and foster care systems, as well as her status as a survivor of domestic violence. This narrative of personal resilience was meticulously crafted to insulate her from criticism regarding her prosecutorial leniency, allowing her to claim a unique, empathetic understanding of both the marginalized accused and the victims of interpersonal abuse. However, her biographical framing presents severe, fatal contradictions when juxtaposed against her actual administrative record as District Attorney.

Before ascending to public office, Price operated her own Oakland-based law firm beginning in

1991, where she specialized in employment litigation. She built her professional reputation by representing victims of retaliation, wrongful termination, and workplace discrimination based on race, sex, and disability. Most notably, she served as the lead attorney for Abner Morgan in the landmark United States Supreme Court case *National Railroad Passenger Corp. (Amtrak) v. Morgan*. The case dealt heavily with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the application of the "continuing violations" doctrine regarding workplace discrimination and hostile work environments.

In this case, Morgan, a Black electrician, alleged a multi-year pattern of racial harassment, unfair punishment, and unequal pay at the hands of Amtrak. The Supreme Court delivered a nuanced ruling, authored by Justice Clarence Thomas, holding that while discrete discriminatory acts occurring outside the 300-day statutory filing window were time-barred, they could still be legally considered as part of a broader, systemic hostile work environment claim.

The primary vulnerability to exploit here is the staggering, undeniable hypocrisy between her private-sector expertise and her public-sector administration. An attorney who built a lucrative, high-profile career litigating against hostile work environments, workplace retaliation, and wrongful termination is now the central defendant in multiple high-profile lawsuits alleging the exact same workplace abuses within her own executive office. Opposing campaigns can and must leverage her intricate knowledge of employment law to argue that her alleged retaliatory actions against her own staff were not simple administrative oversights or rookie managerial mistakes. Because of her specific expertise in Title VII and hostile work environment precedents, any workplace abuses committed under her administration must be framed as calculated, knowing, and willful violations of the law.

Furthermore, Price's claims of being a domestic violence survivor collided disastrously with her policy outcomes. During her initial 2022 campaign, advocates and victims of domestic violence organized rallies in front of Oakland courthouses to protest reports that she intended to cease prosecuting misdemeanor domestic violence cases. This fear materialized into a horrific reality during her tenure. Her office developed a massive, unmanageable backlog of misdemeanor and domestic violence cases, resulting in over 1,000 cases being dismissed outright because her administration simply allowed the statute of limitations to expire. The narrative vulnerability here is acute and emotionally resonant: Price weaponized the rhetoric of domestic violence survivorship to gain political power, only to systematically deny justice to hundreds of actual domestic violence victims through sheer administrative incompetence and ideological apathy.

## **Part 2: Campaign Finance and Progressive PAC Funding Architecture**

Price's ascent to power was not a purely grassroots phenomenon; it was heavily subsidized by a sophisticated network of progressive political action committees and out-of-state donor networks. This financial architecture, which fundamentally contradicts her populist rhetoric, will undoubtedly be resurrected and retooled for her 2026 comeback bid. Understanding the mechanics of her funding and her disclosure liabilities is critical for constructing effective attack narratives.

Price is deeply embedded in the national network of "progressive prosecutors." During her previous campaigns, she benefited immensely from substantial independent expenditures and direct contributions linked to donor networks aligned with billionaire George Soros. Campaign finance records indicate that Soros-funded backers funneled at least \$190,116 into her political ecosystem through entities such as Fair and Just Prosecution, the Center for Empowered

Politics, and the California Justice & Public Safety PAC.

The ideological extremism attached to her funding sources has occasionally forced her allies into defensive postures. For example, the East Bay chapter of the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) was previously forced to issue a public apology to Price to split semantic hairs regarding her funding—apologizing for characterizing the Soros-linked money as "direct funding" to her campaign rather than "independent spending". The DSA also apologized for criticizing her receipt of funds from corporate law firms, revealing that her donor base was simultaneously reliant on elite corporate wealth and radical socialist endorsements. Regardless of the legal distinctions between direct contributions and independent expenditures, the financial reality remains that Price's political viability relies on out-of-county wealth dedicated to ideological experimentation rather than localized public safety.

During her December 2025 campaign announcement for the June 2026 primary, Price signaled that her team would establish digital fundraising infrastructure by the end of the year. In the same breath, she aggressively targeted the financial backing of her successor, appointed District Attorney Ursula Jones Dickson, claiming Dickson is funded by "billionaires" and "corporate polluters". This populist rhetoric is a preemptive defensive mechanism designed to mask her own reliance on billionaire-funded super PACs. Highlighting this financial double standard will be a critical mechanism for dismantling her populist facade.

PAC / Funding Entity	Financial Contribution / Support Type	Strategic Implication and Attack Narrative for 2026
<b>California Justice &amp; Public Safety PAC</b>	Independent Expenditures (\$190,116 total network)	Ties Price directly to the national progressive prosecutor movement, alienating moderate suburban voters who view her as a proxy for out-of-state ideological interests.
<b>Center for Empowered Politics</b>	Organizational and financial backing	Demonstrates her reliance on ideological think-tanks over local grassroots community safety organizations, reinforcing the narrative that she answers to activists, not victims.
<b>East Bay DSA</b>	Endorsement consideration and localized political defense	Links her to far-left economic and social policies, providing a vector for attacks on radicalism that will alienate moderate Democrats and independent voters in Alameda County.

Furthermore, the mechanics of California's rigorous financial disclosure laws present an ongoing vulnerability. As a candidate and former officeholder, Price is mandated to file Form 700 (Statement of Economic Interests) and Form 460 (Recipient Committee Campaign Statement) documents through the NetFile system. The Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) strictly regulates these disclosures, requiring the reporting of all investments, real property interests, business positions, and income sources. Property records maintained by the Alameda County Assessor's Office and the Clerk-Recorder are public and subject to cross-referencing with her FPPC filings. Any discrepancies between her reported assets, her Ida B. Wells Holding Company income, and her public property records should be aggressively scrutinized to identify

potential ethics violations or unreported conflicts of interest leading into the 2026 cycle.

## **Part 3: Prosecutorial Record, Policy Directives, and Data Analysis (2023–2024)**

When Pamela Price defeated Terry Wiley—the chosen successor of retiring, tough-on-crime District Attorney Nancy O'Malley—she promised a sweeping overhaul of the criminal justice system. Price campaigned on ending mass incarceration, halting the practice of charging youths as adults, and holding police accountable. However, her operational tenure was ultimately defined by sweeping, unilateral policy shifts that dismantled traditional prosecutorial leverage, resulting in severe administrative bottlenecks and a total collapse of core office functions. The defining moment of her administration occurred in late February 2023, barely two months into her term, when she issued a leaked internal memo that sent shockwaves through the Alameda County legal system. This memo outlined Special Directive 23-01, which mandated new, ultra-lenient sentencing guidelines. The directive established that probation or the lowest-level prison term would become the "presumptive offer" for nearly all crimes, barring extraordinary circumstances.

The policy effectively banned charging deputies from pursuing critical sentencing enhancements that add years to a prison sentence. Under Price's directive, enhancements for firearm allegations, bail violations, and gang activity were strictly prohibited from being pursued without high-level executive approval. Furthermore, the directive ordered prosecutors to drop "prior strikes" at the charging stage, entirely neutralizing California's Three Strikes law. Adding to the chaos, the directive was made retroactive, applying to all cases sentenced within the 120 days prior to the memo's implementation. Price's stated justification was that enhancements are applied disproportionately against minorities and individuals suffering from mental illness, and that eliminating them would reduce jail populations and allow the county to invest in root-cause interventions.

The second and third-order effects of this directive paralyzed the District Attorney's office. Under standard legal mechanics, prosecutors utilize enhancements as crucial leverage to secure plea deals and ensure efficient case processing. By unilaterally disarming her deputies at the charging stage, Price removed their primary negotiating tool. Defense attorneys had no incentive to advise their clients to plead guilty when the absolute worst-case scenario was already capped at the lowest possible term. This forced more cases toward trial preparation, completely overwhelming a system reliant on plea bargains.

The third-order effect was systemic bureaucratic failure. Price required that any deviation from the presumptive probation offer receive authorization from multiple supervisors, including herself. Because California law requires charging decisions for in-custody defendants to be made within 48 hours, this top-heavy, micromanaged approval process became immediately unworkable. Staff lacked the bandwidth to process these requests, resulting in critical deadlines being missed as requests for enhancement reviews went entirely unanswered.

This direct operational bottleneck culminated in a catastrophic scandal: the District Attorney's office allowed the statute of limitations to expire on over 1,000 misdemeanor cases. This was not a policy choice to divert low-level offenders; it was an administrative failure that essentially granted a blanket, retroactive amnesty to offenders—including domestic abusers—through sheer negligence.

Prosecutorial Strategy	Nancy O'Malley Era (Pre-2023 Baseline)	Pamela Price Era (2023-2024)	Systemic Impact
<b>Sentencing Enhancements</b>	Routinely applied to violent offenses to maximize plea leverage.	Banned presumptively; required multi-tier executive approval.	Removed prosecutorial leverage, eliminated incentives for plea deals, and severely capped sentences for violent offenders.
<b>Misdemeanor Processing</b>	Standard processing within statutory limits.	Over 1,000 cases dismissed due to expired statute of limitations.	Denied justice to victims of domestic violence and property crime due to massive bureaucratic bottlenecks.
<b>Three Strikes Law</b>	Utilized for repeat violent offenders to ensure long-term public safety.	"Prior strikes" dropped at the charging stage.	Allowed prolific, repeat violent offenders to receive sentences indistinguishable from first-time offenders.

## Part 4: Controversial Cases and the Alienation of Victims

Price's strict adherence to ideological leniency, regardless of the severity of the crime, manifested in several high-profile case failures that horrified the public, alienated victims' families, and ultimately generated the unstoppable momentum for her recall. Her administration routinely prioritized the rehabilitation narratives of violent offenders over the trauma and grief of victims, creating a profound empathy deficit that defined her public image.

The death of toddler Jasper Wu became the emotional epicenter of the recall movement against Price. Jasper Wu was killed by a stray bullet while sleeping in his car seat during a rolling gang shootout on an Oakland freeway. The previous administration under Nancy O'Malley had charged the two suspects with special circumstances that carried a potential sentence of life without parole (LWOP). Upon taking office, Price intervened in the case and removed the special circumstance enhancements.

The situation devolved into a catastrophic public relations crisis when an internal email leaked in which Price floated the concept of "non-carceral forms of accountability" for the child's killers—meaning she was exploring avenues where the perpetrators of a freeway shootout that killed a toddler would serve no prison time at all. When the Wu family and the broader Asian-American community protested this extreme leniency, Price refused to meet with them directly. Instead of displaying empathy, her office issued a deeply defensive public statement claiming it was impossible for the District Attorney to meet with every victim. The visual of a District Attorney refusing to face the grieving mother of a murdered toddler while actively maneuvering to help the killers avoid maximum prison time permanently shattered Price's public standing.

This pattern of prioritizing offenders over victims was repeated in the case of Delonzo Logwood. Logwood was accused of three separate murders committed in 2008, including a murder-for-hire, a carjacking homicide, and the targeted killing of a witness to a shooting. Price's

office shocked the legal community by brokering a plea deal for a mere 15 years in prison, pleading the triple-homicide charges down to a single count of voluntary manslaughter. In March 2023, Alameda County Superior Court Judge Mark McCannon took the extraordinary step of publicly rejecting the plea deal from the bench. Citing the staggering loss of three lives, Judge McCannon stated to a packed courtroom, "I can't accept a plea to voluntary manslaughter for 15 years... I am not here to do what is popular, but what I believe is right and supported by the law". Rather than accept the judicial rebuke and prepare for trial, Price escalated the conflict, launching a vindictive public campaign to disqualify Judge McCannon from hearing any criminal cases prosecuted by her office. Logwood eventually pled no contest to manslaughter, facing 12 years, with his attorney explicitly stating the plea was taken purely to avoid the political fallout surrounding Price. Meanwhile, Price barred her own lead prosecutor on the case, Stacie Pettigrew, from even attending the sentencing hearing.

The alienation of victims continued in the case of Blake Mohs, a 26-year-old loss prevention officer at a Pleasanton Home Depot who was shot and killed by Benicia Knapps during an attempted shoplifting incident. Mohs's mother, Lorie Mohs, became one of Price's most vocal and effective critics, stating plainly that the District Attorney "doesn't do anything for victims except revictimize them". After a protracted, exhausting battle with Price's office to secure appropriate charges against the killers, Lorie Mohs successfully pushed for a plea deal (resulting in 19 years to life for the shooter) specifically because it could not be appealed, stating she just wanted closure for her family. The family publicly lamented Price's total lack of communication, highlighting a systemic empathy deficit within the administration toward the survivors of violent crime.

Perhaps the most egregious example of Price overriding her own staff to grant leniency to a serial killer occurred in the case of Dijon Holifield. Holifield was charged with four separate murders committed over a terrifying six-week span in Oakland in 2008. This crime spree included an ambush involving five shooters and 92 rounds of ammunition, a carjacking attempt, and a contract killing for which the perpetrators were paid at least \$10,000. The prosecution's case was incredibly robust, built on DNA evidence, ballistics, and the sworn testimony of 26 individuals, including a key witness the judge deemed credible.

Despite this overwhelming evidence, Price forced through a plea deal that would see Holifield released in a matter of months. This deal triggered the immediate resignation of lead prosecutor Stacie Pettigrew. Pettigrew publicly condemned Price, stating, "she gave them the deal of a lifetime and he'll be out next year," leaving the mothers of the victims "shattered and confused". The Holifield case perfectly exemplifies Price's willingness to sabotage slam-dunk murder convictions to deliver leniency to prolific, hyper-violent serial offenders, regardless of the cost to public safety.

## **Part 5: Office Mismanagement, Systemic Nepotism, and the Antwon Cloird Scandal**

In a glaring violation of standard ethical governance and public trust, Price utilized her executive position to financially enrich her romantic partner, Antwon Cloird. This scandal perfectly encapsulates the administration's total disregard for transparency, public integrity, and basic conflict-of-interest protocols.

Shortly after taking office, Price hired her boyfriend, Antwon Cloird, as a "senior program specialist" at a lucrative base salary of \$115,502 per year. This massive taxpayer-funded salary placed him just below the maximum allowable pay scale for the position. Cloird was stationed at

an East Oakland branch of the District Attorney's office, ostensibly focusing on the "re-entry" of incarcerated individuals into society. However, he was given unprecedented and highly inappropriate authority to identify candidates for early release. Former Assistant District Attorney Erin Loback noted the profound unorthodoxy of Cloird—a civilian with a severe ethical cloud over his past and a direct romantic link to the DA—presenting lists of prison inmates he personally wanted to see released back onto the streets.

Price was able to execute this hire by exploiting a long-standing loophole in Alameda County government rules, which technically lacked a formal nepotism policy—an omission that civil grand juries had pilloried for years. When confronted by the media and good government groups, Price refused to apologize or acknowledge the blatant conflict of interest. Instead, she attempted to deflect blame by accusing her critics of racism and claiming her predecessor, Nancy O'Malley, had also hired relatives.

The nepotism alone was a severe political liability, but Cloird's specific background rendered him wildly inappropriate for a role within any law enforcement agency. In 2015, while acting as a politically connected nonprofit executive in the city of Richmond, Cloird drew the intense attention of the FBI amid highly credible allegations that he was actively extorting local business owners. Richmond's mayor, city manager, and police chief all suspected Cloird of shaking down businesses for "fees" ranging from \$5,000 to \$20,000.

The specific allegations were staggering for a man who would later review prison sentences. Cloird allegedly demanded \$5,000 to "expedite" city permits for the Golden Gate Meat Company, and executed a \$20,000 shakedown of a Peruvian restaurant owner to facilitate a conditional use permit for a liquor license. A sworn affidavit filed by an attorney claiming to be an FBI informant explicitly quoted Cloird declaring to business owners, "you gotta pay to play" in Richmond. Although Cloird was never formally indicted by federal prosecutors, the existence of a federal extortion probe into his business practices makes his installation into the District Attorney's inner circle a profound, unmitigated liability. Price's public defense of Cloird as a "symbol of hope" who "overcame adversity" reads as a tone-deaf, insulting justification for taxpayer-funded cronyism.

## **Part 6: The Staff Exodus and the Installation of Unqualified Loyalists**

Price's combative leadership style, ideological mandates, and retaliatory culture resulted in a catastrophic brain drain within the Alameda County District Attorney's Office. Dozens of highly experienced trial attorneys, senior inspectors, and prosecutors resigned in disgust or were forced out, crippling the institutional knowledge required to effectively prosecute complex criminal enterprises.

The exodus of veteran prosecutors was highly public and deeply damaging. Charly Weissenbach, a respected trial attorney with a decade of experience, submitted a searing resignation letter that was leaked to the media. She wrote, "I no longer feel capable of fulfilling my legal and ethical duties as a prosecutor under this administration". Similarly, Assistant District Attorney Jill Nerone resigned, publicly stating she could not "adequately and ethically protect the rights of victims" under Price's leadership. As previously noted, Stacie Pettigrew resigned over the indefensible Dijon Holifield plea deal. These resignations were not isolated incidents; they represented a systemic collapse of morale and ethical confidence within the office's core felony trial teams.

To replace this lost institutional knowledge, Price attempted to backfill critical executive roles

with unqualified political loyalists, further degrading the office's operational capacity and creating a fertile environment for legal errors. The most egregious example of this was the purge of the office's Chief Inspector, identified in lawsuits as Chew, and his replacement with Marcus (Eric) Lewis.

Chew was a highly decorated Asian American veteran who had served the county for 22 years and managed a vital unit of over 60 sworn peace officers. He was abruptly fired by Price and replaced by Lewis. According to court filings, Lewis had not even been Livescan fingerprinted, had not been subject to a background investigation, and had not passed standard POST medical or psychological exams when he was given the job.

More alarmingly, Lewis had previously been forced into retirement from the Oakland Police Department in 2021 following a severe misconduct investigation. An outside investigator had formally found Lewis to be untruthful during his testimony—an offense that involves dishonesty and can lead directly to police decertification in the state of California, permanently blocking an officer from law enforcement work. The visual of Price firing a highly experienced, unblemished veteran to install an unqualified loyalist with a documented history of police misconduct perfectly encapsulated the profound mismanagement driving her personnel decisions.

## **Part 7: Legal Red Flags, Extortion Allegations, and Retaliatory Prosecutions**

Price's tenure was characterized by a terrifying willingness to weaponize the District Attorney's prosecutorial powers against her political critics and internal whistleblowers, resulting in severe legal liabilities and State Bar ethics complaints that will haunt her 2026 campaign.

In what is arguably the most explosive and legally perilous scandal of her career, Price stands accused of attempting to extort a political critic for campaign cash. Mario Juarez, an East Bay political figure who had previously created a website ([badpam.com](http://badpam.com)) attacking Price during her 2022 run, alleged that in January 2024, Price offered to "help" him with an old, dormant legal issue in exchange for "love and support". This support was explicitly defined as a \$25,000 cash donation to her political campaign to fight the looming recall effort.

Witnesses at the funeral of Oakland Police Officer Tuan Le, including Juarez's business partner Cecilia Mendez, reported overhearing Price state that her relationship with Juarez should improve and that she specifically "needed \$25,000.00 for a political campaign". When Juarez bravely refused the shakedown, Price allegedly threatened that he would be hearing from her office very soon and that "it won't be pretty". Exactly two weeks later, Price and her second-in-command, Otis Bruce Jr., revived a dead 2022 check fraud case against Juarez. They actively removed a prosecutor who had previously found insufficient evidence to proceed, and hit Juarez with a felony charge. Juarez's defense attorney filed a motion for dismissal citing "vindictive prosecution" and "outrageous government conduct," and a formal, devastating complaint was filed with the State Bar alleging severe ethical violations and criminal extortion by Price.

Price's vindictiveness extended to her own former staff. Amilcar "Butch" Ford, a veteran prosecutor who ran the felony trial team, was placed on administrative leave by Price. Ford resigned and wrote a blistering letter accusing Price of attempting to "hide your transgressions like a thief in the night". Ford subsequently took a job working for San Francisco District Attorney Brooke Jenkins. In an act of apparent retaliation designed to destroy Ford's career and get him disbarred, Price filed a misdemeanor criminal complaint against him, alleging he breached professional conduct rules by sharing information with a defense attorney while on

leave.

The prosecution was widely viewed by the legal community as a baseless, politically motivated retribution against a whistleblower. Superior Court Judge James Cramer eventually took the extraordinary step of recusing Price's entire office from the case, noting her "overarching comments" were entirely outside the realm of normal criminal proceedings. In September 2024, the California Attorney General's office, having taken over the case, comprehensively reviewed the evidence and abruptly dropped all charges against Ford, citing "insufficiency of the evidence and in the interest of justice". The Attorney General's dismissal served as a humiliating, state-level rebuke of Price's weaponized, corrupt prosecution tactics.

## **Part 8: Anti-Asian Discrimination Allegations and Whistleblower Lawsuits**

A critical, decisive factor in Price's 2024 recall was the total collapse of her relationship with Alameda County's large and politically engaged Asian-American community. This was not merely the result of policy disagreements over cases like the Jasper Wu shooting, but was fueled by direct, explosive allegations of systemic racial discrimination and anti-Asian bias originating from within her executive office.

Patti Lee, a highly respected veteran communications professional who served as Price's spokesperson, filed a devastating wrongful termination and discrimination lawsuit against the county. Lee alleged that she was abruptly fired for being Asian American and for refusing to participate in illegal conduct. Specifically, Lee acted as a whistleblower, accusing the DA's office—and specifically communications director Haaziq Madyun—of intentionally "withholding, hiding, deleting, or altering the production of public records" in order to evade California Public Records Act (CPRA) requests from journalists and watchdog groups.

Furthermore, the lawsuit exposed a virulently racist culture within Price's executive suite. Lee alleged a "clear anti-Asian sentiment," quoting Price directly as stating that her primary enemies were "the media and the Asians". Price also allegedly accused Lee of secretly collaborating with Asian American activists, specifically naming Carl Chan of Save Alameda for Everyone (the primary organization driving the recall effort). This explosive, racially charged quote provided undeniable proof to the Asian-American electorate that the District Attorney viewed their community not as constituents to be protected, but as a hostile political entity to be marginalized.

This animus was further demonstrated by tone-deaf, insulting political theater. In a desperate attempt to mend ties with the Asian community amidst the Jasper Wu fallout, Price planned a press conference at the Oakland Asian Cultural Center to announce that she had adopted a "Chinese name" during AAPI Heritage Month. Facing massive online ridicule and fierce criticism for what was widely perceived as offensive cultural appropriation, the press conference was humiliatingly canceled.

The allegations of anti-Asian bias in the Lee lawsuit were independently corroborated by the lawsuit filed by former Chief Inspector Chew. Chew alleged that Price was driven by an "overriding, and outspoken, desire to rapidly install African-American individuals in leadership positions, regardless of merit and qualifications". Chew was explicitly warned by a member of Price's own campaign team that Price "did not trust Asians" and that he would inevitably face issues with her. The systemic purge of Asian American professionals from her office, combined with documented racial slurs, permanently alienated a crucial voting bloc.

# Part 9: The 2024 Recall: Precinct Demographics and Strategic Failures

The November 2024 recall of Pamela Price was a historic repudiation of her administration, marking the very first time an Alameda County District Attorney was successfully recalled by the voters. The quantitative and demographic data from the election provides a clear, undeniable blueprint of the electorate's complete and total rejection of her progressive platform, proving that her policies are toxic even in deeply blue districts.

Price was initially elected in 2022 with 53.1% of the vote. Just two years later, she was ousted by a staggering margin, with 62.9% voting "Yes" on the recall and only 37.1% voting "No". The recall drew massive civic participation, with 296,893 total votes cast, making it the largest county-level district attorney recall in recent United States history by sheer volume (easily surpassing the 189,768 votes cast in the 2021 Sonoma County recall of Jill Ravitch).

Electoral Metric	2022 Election Data	2024 Recall Election Data	Strategic Shift and Analysis
<b>Total Vote Share</b>	53.1% (Victory)	37.1% (Defeat)	Represents a catastrophic 16-point collapse in baseline progressive support over just 24 months.
<b>Recall Margin</b>	N/A	62.9% to 37.1%	Demonstrates an insurmountable, bipartisan rejection of her tenure across all demographics.
<b>Comparative Metric</b>	N/A	Chesa Boudin Recall: 55.03%	Price's rejection (62.9%) was significantly more severe than Boudin's in neighboring San Francisco, indicating a deeper localized anger at her specific administrative failures.

The recall effort, initiated by the group *Save Alameda for Everyone*, successfully assembled a broad, unified coalition of Oakland and Piedmont residents, business owners, and crime victims' families. The decisive factor in the recall's success was the total mobilization of the Asian-American voting bloc, driven by the handling of the Jasper Wu case, the catastrophic cultural appropriation stunts, and the leakage of the "media and the Asians" quote. Price's desperate attempts to characterize the recall as a right-wing, Republican-funded conspiracy failed entirely to resonate. Alameda County is one of the most progressive, deeply Democratic enclaves in the country. The electorate correctly identified that the surge in violent crime, the organizational chaos within the DA's office, and the rampant nepotism were the result of severe administrative incompetence, not a partisan illusion. Her inability to hold her own progressive base demonstrates that her political brand is irredeemably damaged.

## Part 10: 2026 Comeback Campaign: Attack Narratives and Debate Landmines

Despite suffering a humiliating 25-point electoral defeat, Price announced her candidacy for the June 2026 primary against incumbent District Attorney Ursula Jones Dickson in a surprise press conference in December 2025. Price's early campaign messaging reveals a desperate, highly calculated attempt to nationalize the local race, pivot entirely away from her catastrophic administrative record, and inflame partisan cultural grievances to distract the electorate. Price's primary strategic objective for 2026 is to avoid discussing the reality of Alameda County. During her campaign announcement, she repeatedly invoked Donald Trump as the primary "driving force" behind her return, positioning herself as a heroic protector of immigrant communities against federal agents and "Gestapo troops". She has explicitly threatened Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), stating she will aggressively challenge federal authorities who violate state law, warning them to "F around and find out". Additionally, she has attempted to co-opt international geopolitical issues, openly aligning herself with activists protesting the conflict in Gaza.

This transparent pivot must be aggressively countered at every turn. Opposing campaigns must relentlessly drag the narrative back to the local, blood-stained realities of Oakland and Alameda County. Debate landmines should be set to trigger whenever she mentions Trump or ICE, forcing her to answer for her local failures.

**Debate Landmine 1: The Competence Pivot** When Price attempts to pivot to protecting citizens from ICE or Trump, the immediate counter-narrative must be: *"A District Attorney cannot protect vulnerable populations from federal overreach if she cannot even successfully file the paperwork to prosecute local domestic abusers before the statute of limitations expires. You dismissed 1,000 cases not out of compassion, but out of sheer incompetence."*

**Debate Landmine 2: The Billionaire Hypocrisy** Price's attacks on her successor, Ursula Jones Dickson, rely heavily on accusing Dickson of being aligned with "billionaires," "rogue police who kill," and "insurance companies". This opens up a massive vector for counter-attack. Price's own 2022 campaign was heavily subsidized by out-of-state billionaire George Soros's political network to the tune of nearly \$200,000. The counter-attack must frame Price as a hypocrite who gladly accepts out-of-state billionaire dark money to fund her ideological experiments, while attacking local leaders for seeking funding to restore basic public safety.

**Debate Landmine 3: The "Rogue Police" Paradox** Furthermore, her claim to be fighting "rogue police" is deeply, laughably hypocritical given her unilateral decision to hire Marcus (Eric) Lewis as her own Chief Inspector. Price fired a 22-year veteran to install a man who was forced out of the Oakland Police Department for untruthfulness and misconduct. When she attacks "rogue police," the debate moderator or opponent must force her to explain why she put a disgraced, untruthful ex-cop in charge of 60 sworn officers in her own office.

**Debate Landmine 4: The Extortion Reality Check** Price's final rhetorical flourish during her announcement—"The Wakandans are not coming, y'all. We have got to be the change we want to see in Alameda County"—demonstrates a reliance on pop-culture sloganeering to mask a void of substantive policy and deep ethical rot. When she speaks of "change," the narrative must immediately pivot to the Mario Juarez scandal. An opponent must ask: *"Is the change you want to see extorting political critics for \$25,000 in campaign cash at a police officer's funeral?"*. Pamela Price's vulnerability profile is unparalleled for a returning candidate. She carries all the negative baggage of an incumbent without any of the power or platform of the office. Her

liabilities are not merely abstract ideological disagreements; they are deeply tangible, bloody failures of basic government competence, marred by ongoing federal FBI links (Clouid) and civil legal exposure (Lee, Chew, Juarez). By executing a disciplined, data-driven narrative that contrasts her national grandstanding with her localized administrative collapse, Price's 2026 comeback campaign can be neutralized decisively and permanently in the primary phase.

## Works cited

1. DA Pamela Price '82 describes making history — and change — in Alameda County, <https://www.law.berkeley.edu/article/alameda-county-first-black-da-pamela-price-describes-path-to-making-history-and-change/> 2. Endorsement: Yes, Alameda DA Pamela Price should be recalled - UC Davis School of Law, <https://law.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk10866/files/inline-files/sfchronicle.com-Endorsement%20Yes%20Alameda%20DA%20Pamela%20Price%20should%20be%20recalled.pdf> 3. Pamela Price recall, Alameda County, California (2023-2024) - Ballotpedia, [https://ballotpedia.org/Pamela\\_Price\\_recall,\\_Alameda\\_County,\\_California\\_\(2023-2024\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Pamela_Price_recall,_Alameda_County,_California_(2023-2024)) 4. Recalled DA Pamela Price says she'll reclaim her seat in 2026, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2025/12/05/courts/recalled-district-attorney-pamela-price-will-r-un-again/> 5. Alameda County District Attorney's Office - Wikipedia, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alameda\\_County\\_District\\_Attorney%27s\\_Office](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alameda_County_District_Attorney%27s_Office) 6. Pamela Y. Price District Attorney - Alameda County Budget, <https://budget.alamedacountyca.gov/Content/pdf/FY23-24/District%20Attorney%20%20FY%202023-24%20Early%20Budget%20Work%20Session%20Presentation.pdf> 7. Who Holds the Power? A Conversation with Alameda County District Attorney Pamela Price, <https://prisonerswithchildren.org/newspaper/who-holds-the-power-a-conversation-with-alameda-county-district-attorney-pamela-price/> 8. A Partial Legal Victory Against Continuing Discrimination: The New Supreme Court Ruling in *Amtrak v. Morgan* - Scholarship @ Hofstra Law, [https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1616&context=faculty\\_scholarship](https://scholarlycommons.law.hofstra.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1616&context=faculty_scholarship) 9. *National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan* | 536 U.S. 101 (2002) - Justia Supreme Court, <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/536/101/> 10. *National Railroad Passenger Corporation v. Morgan* - Oyez, <https://www.oyez.org/cases/2001/00-1614> 11. *NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION v. MORGAN*. - Law.Cornell.Edu, <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/536/101> 12. *Nat'l. Railroad Passenger Corp. v. Morgan* - Supreme Court, <https://www.supremecourt.gov/pdfs/transcripts/2001/00-1614.pdf> 13. Ex-spokesperson sues DA Pamela Price for wrongful termination, racial discrimination, <https://localnewsmatters.org/2024/06/17/ex-spokesperson-sues-da-pamela-price-for-wrongful-termination-racial-discrimination/> 14. DA Pamela Price hits her biggest critic with misdemeanor charge - The Berkeley Scanner, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/07/19/courts/da-pamela-price-butch-ford-misdemeanor-case/> 15. New lawsuit alleges anti-Asian discrimination by Pamela Price - The Berkeley Scanner, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/10/31/courts/new-lawsuit-alleges-anti-asian-discrimination-pamela-price/> 16. Domestic violence victims speak about district attorney candidate | KTVU FOX 2, <https://www.ktvu.com/news/domestic-violence-victims-speak-about-district-attorney-candidate> 17. Alameda County DA Price working to correct backlog of criminal cases - CBS News, <https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/alameda-county-da-price-working-to-correct-backlog/>

og-of-criminal-cases/ 18. Backlog of criminal cases in Alameda County leads to some passing statute of limitations, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aa2fXUID4Ws> 19. Pamela Price (California) - Ballotpedia, [https://ballotpedia.org/Pamela\\_Price\\_\(California\)](https://ballotpedia.org/Pamela_Price_(California)) 20. Statement on the Candidacy of Pamela Price - East Bay DSA, <https://www.eastbaydsa.org/archive/blog/statement-candidacy-pamela-price/> 21. Pamela Price - LELDF, <https://www.policedefense.org/pamela-price/> 22. 2023/2024 Form 700 Statement of Economic Interests - NetFile, [https://netfile.com/Filer/Content/SEI/docs/v2024/FPPC\\_RefPamphlet\\_2023-2024.pdf](https://netfile.com/Filer/Content/SEI/docs/v2024/FPPC_RefPamphlet_2023-2024.pdf) 23. Frequently Asked Questions: Form 700 Disclosure - FPPC, [https://www.fppc.ca.gov/siteassets/documents/legal\\_div/ip\\_meetings/2024/093024\\_700/form\\_700\\_faqs\\_2024.pdf](https://www.fppc.ca.gov/siteassets/documents/legal_div/ip_meetings/2024/093024_700/form_700_faqs_2024.pdf) 24. Form 700 - FPPC, [https://www.fppc.ca.gov/siteassets/documents/tad/form\\_700/2023-24/form\\_700\\_2023.pdf](https://www.fppc.ca.gov/siteassets/documents/tad/form_700/2023-24/form_700_2023.pdf) 25. Section VI - Statement of Economic Interest, Form 700 - Anaheim.net, <https://www.anaheim.net/DocumentCenter/View/32660/SECTION-VI---STATEMENT-OF-ECONOMIC-INTEREST-FORM-700> 26. CONCURRENT SPECIAL MEETING OF THE FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMISSION AND THE OPEN GOVERNMENT COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA September - The City of Berkeley, <https://berkeleyca.gov/sites/default/files/legislative-body-meeting-attachments/AGENDA%20PACKET%209.8.2022%20FCPC-OGC%20Special%20Meeting.pdf> 27. Alameda County, California Property Records | AlamedaRecords.us, <https://alamedarecords.us/property-records> 28. Assessor's Records, <https://www.acassessor.org/homeowners/assessors-records/> 29. 'Voters have decided it's time to try something different': Pamela Price's election signals reform in district attorney's office - Oakland North, <https://oaklandnorth.net/2022/12/06/oakland-pamela-price-alameda-county-district-attorney-reform/> 30. Leaked memo: DA Pamela Price to shorten prison sentences, lean ..., <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/03/02/courts/alameda-county-district-attorney-pamela-price-leaked-memo/> 31. In the news | DA Pamela Price to shorten prison sentences, favor probation according to leaked memo | Piedmont Exedra, <https://piedmontexedra.com/2023/03/in-the-news-da-pamela-price-to-shorten-prison-sentences-favor-probation-according-to-leaked-memo> 32. Office of the District Attorney Alameda County, <https://www.alcoda.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/SPECIAL-DIRECTIVE-23-01-FAQ.04142023.pdf> 33. Jasper Wu murder suspects now face less time, DA decides - The Berkeley Scanner, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/06/08/courts/jasper-wu-murder-suspects-face-less-time-pamela-price/> 34. He was charged with 4 murders. Pamela Price gave him a plea deal — now he'll be out in months : r/bayarea - Reddit, [https://www.reddit.com/r/bayarea/comments/1ge6dle/he\\_was\\_charged\\_with\\_4\\_murders\\_pamela\\_price\\_gave/](https://www.reddit.com/r/bayarea/comments/1ge6dle/he_was_charged_with_4_murders_pamela_price_gave/) 35. I-Team obtains Alameda Co. DA's controversial email about Jasper Wu case | EXCLUSIVE, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=poJquHsyeh8> 36. Fact vs. Fiction - Protect The Win, [https://www.protectthewin.org/fact\\_vs\\_fiction](https://www.protectthewin.org/fact_vs_fiction) 37. Jasper Wu: Slain toddler's family voices concerns on possible shorter sentences for murder suspects - YouTube, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=njhbn\\_VnJ1I](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=njhbn_VnJ1I) 38. DA Pamela Price takes aim at judge who rejected her plea deal - The Berkeley Scanner, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/04/08/courts/alameda-county-da-pamela-price-judge-mark-mccannon/> 39. Judge rejects 15-year plea deal in case alleging 3 murders - The Berkeley Scanner, <https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/03/23/courts/judge-rejects-15-year-plea-deal-logwood-alameda-county-pamela-price/> 40. 'You can't think an apology will make this all better': Judge throws out controversial plea deal for man accused of three Oakland killings Delonzo Logwood

had faced potential sentence of up to life,  
<https://www.opoa.org/you-cant-think-an-apology-will-make-this-all-better-judge-throws-out-contr>  
oversial-plea-deal-for-man-accused-of-three-oakland-killings-delonzo-logwood-had-faced-potent  
ial-sentence-of-up-to-life 41. Oakland man, charged with killing 3, pleas no contest to voluntary  
manslaughter,  
<https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/oakland-man-charged-with-killing-3-pleas-no-cont>  
est-to-voluntary-manslaughter/ 42. Mother of slain Pleasanton store guard continues fight for  
justice despite plea deal,  
<https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/mother-of-slain-pleasanton-store-employee-contin>  
ues-fight-for-justice-despite-plea-deal/ 43. Slain Home Depot security guard's family upset with  
DA Pamela Price's handling of case,  
<https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/slain-home-depot-security-guards-family-upset-wit>  
h-da-pamela-prices-handling-of-case/ 44. Parents of Home Depot employee killed by shoplifter  
upset by DA Price's decision to seek lesser char - YouTube,  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kgjR2aNkLSI> 45. Parents of Home Depot employee killed by  
shoplifter upset by DA Price's decision to seek lesser char - CBS News,  
<https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/video/parents-of-home-depot-employee-killed-by-shoplif>  
ter-upset-by-da-prices-decision-to-seek-lesser-char/ 46. He was charged with 4 murders.  
Pamela Price gave him a deal - The Berkeley Scanner,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/10/28/courts/pamela-price-plea-deal-dijon-holifield/> 47.  
TBS Today, Oct. 28 - The Berkeley Scanner,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/10/28/newsletters/tbs-today-oct-28-2024/> 48. Alameda  
DA's office hired Pamela Price's boyfriend, raising nepotism concerns,  
<https://www.opoa.org/alameda-das-office-hired-pamela-prices-boyfriend-raising-nepotism-conce>  
rns 49. OPOA News - Oakland Police Officer's Association, <https://www.opoa.org/news> 50.  
Docs raise questions about the hiring of DA's boyfriend - The Mercury News - PageSuite,  
[https://edition.pagesuite.com/tribune/article\\_popover.aspx?guid=47afd9b5-ab2b-4f38-a6d0-eeb](https://edition.pagesuite.com/tribune/article_popover.aspx?guid=47afd9b5-ab2b-4f38-a6d0-eeb)  
026350a25 51. Alameda County DA's office sees resignations over ethical qualms - The  
Berkeley Scanner,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/03/22/courts/alameda-county-district-attorney-pamela-pr>  
ice-prosecutors-resigns-ethical-reasons/ 52. Alameda County prosecutor resigns in protest over  
new DA's policies | KTVU FOX 2,  
<https://www.ktvu.com/news/alameda-county-prosecutor-resigns-says-cannot-protect-victims-righ>  
ts-under-price 53. Pamela Price's first month as Alameda County's new DA - The Berkeley  
Scanner,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2023/02/08/courts/pamela-price-alameda-county-district-attor>  
ney-first-month/ 54. Police Use of Force and Misconduct in California,  
<https://www.ppic.org/publication/police-use-of-force-and-misconduct-in-california/> 55. Another  
top deputy of DA Price committed misconduct at his last job, investigation found,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/09/17/courts/eric-lewis-misconduct-oakland-police-alam>  
eda-county-da-pamela-price/ 56. Oakland Police Department 2021 Annual Report,  
<https://www.oaklandca.gov/files/assets/city/v/1/police-commission/police/documents/opd-data/o>  
pd-annual-reports-and-strategic-plan/opd2021\_annualreport\_041522\_final\_signed.pdf 57. DA  
Pamela Price accused of \$25,000 extortion attempt,  
<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/10/12/courts/pamela-price-accused-extortion-attempt-m>  
ario-juarez/ 58. Pamela Price charging key figure in Brooke Jenkins' office with crime - SFGATE,  
<https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/pamela-price-charges-attorney-in-sf-da-office-18206959>  
.php 59. AG's office drops Butch Ford case 'in the interest of justice' - The Berkeley Scanner,

<https://www.berkeleyscanner.com/2024/09/11/courts/butch-ford-case-dropped-pamela-price/> 60. Lawsuit alleges anti-Asian sentiment and record tampering - Northwest Asian Weekly, <https://nwasianweekly.com/2024/06/lawsuit-alleges-anti-asian-sentiment-and-record-tampering/>  
61. Former spokesperson sues DA Price for wrongful termination, discrimination - CBS News, <https://www.cbsnews.com/sanfrancisco/news/former-spokesperson-sues-da-price-for-wrongful-termination-discrimination/> 62. DA Pamela Price sued by former spokesperson | KTVU FOX 2, <https://www.ktvu.com/news/pamela-price-lawsuit-filed-spokesperson> 63. Oakland DA Recall Effort Reflects Double Standards - Filter, <https://filtermag.org/oakland-da-pamela-price-recall/amp/>