

MIAMI-DADE COUNTY COMMISSION ON ETHICS & PUBLIC TRUST



MEMORANDUM

TO: Miami-Dade County Commission on Ethics and Public Trust

FROM: Loressa M. Felix, General Counsel

RE: C 26-24-06 (*In re*: Darvin Williams)

DATE: June 30, 2026

Recommendation:

This complaint is **Not Legally Sufficient** and should be **Dismissed** pursuant to Article LXXVIII, Section 2-1074 and Rule 4.2(a), COE Rules of Procedure.

Legal sufficiency exists where there is an allegation of a violation of an ordinance within the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission, purportedly committed by an individual within the authority of the Ethics Commission, based substantially on the personal knowledge of the Complainant and filed with the Ethics Commission within three years of the alleged violation.

Background:

On June 6, 2026, Carolina Matamoros, Constituent Aide for the City of North Miami Beach, filed a sworn complaint against Respondent, Darvin Williams, City Manager for the City of North Miami Beach, alleging that Respondent had violated Section 2-11.1 of the Conflict of Interest and Code of Ethics Ordinance (County Ethics Code) and Section 2-11.1.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code, entitled Ethical Campaign Practices Ordinance (ECPO).

In the documents accompanying the complaint, Complainant indicated that since January 2025, she has worked remotely part-time as a Constituent Aide for the Mayor of North Miami Beach. In February 2026, she met with Respondent regarding her position for the City of North Miami Beach and her employment with another municipality. Complainant indicated that Respondent confirmed in writing that her remote work arrangement would continue until further notice.

Complainant provided information regarding an email exchange between herself and Commissioner Fortuna Smuckler regarding the Mayor's attendance to the Miami-Dade County League of Cities gala. Subsequently, Respondent directed Complainant to copy him on all correspondence.

with a City Charter officer's performance is not a matter within the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission).

Moreover, this complaint does not allege a violation of Section (g) of the County Ethics Code or other ordinances within the jurisdiction of this Commission. Section (g) of the County Ethics Code prohibits County employees and officials from using their official positions to secure a special benefit for themselves or others. *See* Miami-Dade County Code at Sec. 2-11.1(g).

Additionally, Section 3.1.1 of the North Miami Beach Code states that the City Manager is "responsible for the appointing, hiring, promoting, supervising, disciplining and removing of all City employees, except the City Attorney, the City Clerk, and all employees of the Office of the City Attorney."

Respondent's alleged conduct regarding Complainant's work arrangement, work schedule, and work requirements fit squarely within his duties as the North Miami Beach City Manager. There are no allegations within the complaint to demonstrate that Mr. Williams was seeking a special benefit outside his role as a city manager.

The Ethics Commission has no authority to determine if Respondent's actions were appropriate under Section 3.1.1 of the North Miami Beach Code. *See* C 23-15-03 (the allegation that a City Commissioner exploited her position by conveying her desire to terminate the Complainant to the City Manager failed to demonstrate that Respondent was seeking a special benefit outside her role as a commissioner because the Opa-Locka Charter allows a commissioner to become involved in personnel matters through the City Manager and the Ethics Commission has no authority to determine if Respondent's actions were proper or appropriate); *see also* C 20-22 (allegation that city Mayor exploited his position by trying to incite board members of a city board to remove their chairman in order to gain a positive position for an impending city contract lacked any indicia of an exploitative act; there is no evidence alleged in the complaint suggesting that the Mayor used his official position to secure any personal benefit in the city contract).

Lastly, the complaint suggests a possible violation of Section 2-11.1.1 of the Miami-Dade County Code, entitled Ethical Campaign Practices Ordinance (ECPO). Section 2-11.1.1 (A) of the ECPO "shall extend to . . . (iv) candidates, and their respective campaign staffs, for any municipal elective office within Miami-Dade County . . ." This ordinance covers the actions of candidates and their respective campaign staff with respect to campaign related activities. There are no facts provided which implicate any provision of this ordinance.

Conclusion:

The factual allegations raised by the Complainant do not rise to a violation of the County Ethics Code, ECPO, or any ordinance within the jurisdiction of the Ethics Commission. Consequently, there is **No Legal Sufficiency** for an investigation to be conducted into this matter and the complaint should be **Dismissed**.