**(NOTE: WORK PRODUCT – NON-DISCOVERABLE)**

**DISPOSITION RECOMMENDATION**

**DATE:** Approved by County Attorney Johnson on October 16, 2026

**FROM:** Brenda Sund, Assistant Criminal Division Chief

**RE:** Potential Defendant: Rayzjon Shawntell Walker
Potential Offense: Criminal Sexual Conduct
Date of Offense: April 2025 - October 2025
ICR No.: 25283258
County Attorney File No.: CA-2026-01387
"609.11, Subd. 10 (case involving firearms?)" – No

The State is unable to issue a criminal complaint in this matter because the current and available Minnesota law does not criminalize the Potential Defendant's conduct.

## FACTS

On December 24, 2025, the Anoka County Sheriff's Office received a criminal sexual conduct complaint concerning seventeen-year-old Child A, who resided in Fridley, Anoka County, Minnesota.

According to the report, during the 2024-2025 school year at Fridley Vista High School, Paraprofessional Rayzjon Shawntell Walker (DOB 07-16-05) had engaged in numerous acts of criminal sexual conduct against student Child A. Fridley Vista High is a Level 4 alternative learning school which focuses on behavioral support for students with Individual Education Plans [IEP].

On December 31, 2025, Child A participated in an interview with an Anoka County Sheriff's Office Detective. Child A said that Walker was not officially assigned to her classroom but that he spent a lot of time there. Child A explained that inappropriate behavior by Walker began shortly after she turned seventeen in February of 2025. He would talk to her about the size of his penis and later asked if she wanted to see it. He then asked her to add him to her Snapchat account and sent her images of his penis. Walker proceeded to send Child A multiple nude images of himself, as well as videos of himself masturbating. Child A said she felt pressured to reciprocate.

In April of 2025, Walker began engaging in sexual activity with Child A, through June of 2025. He began asking her to perform sexual acts in the classroom. Walker would become upset if Child A refused. Child A recalled that one time after she refused, he ignored her for a week, and she felt pressured to comply. Child A described how Walker asked her to perform oral sex on him and to allow him to touch her sexually. Child A

performed oral sex on Walker behind a bookshelf ***in a classroom at the school's*** "old" building.

On at least one occasion while ***in the hallway of the school***, Walker exposed his erect penis to her and told her to look. He would also expose himself to her in the classroom.

Child A said she also performed oral sex on Walker while in his vehicle, which she described as a White Dodge Durango SUV with three rows, black leather interior and a touchscreen. Child A explained that on April 23, 2025, she performed oral sex on Walker twice in the same night and that Walker also put his penis inside of her vagina. Child A said Walker had texted her the night before that he needed to "make a round to Crystal." She sent him her address, and he picked her up near her home around 8:00-8:30 PM and drove to Valley Place Park. Walker gave her marijuana before any sexual contact occurred. It ended when Walker ejaculated into a condom and then wrapped the condom in a napkin and threw it out of the window.

Child A said there was one incident in the "new" building when Walker touched her vaginal area with his fingers, over and under the clothing. This incident occurred in October of 2025.

Child A said Walker repeatedly told her not to tell anyone about their relationship. She said Walker put his penis in her vagina one time while they were in his car and two times ***in a classroom*** in the old building. She performed oral sex on Walker approximately twenty times, ***mostly in a classroom*** and one time in the hallway. He would also rub her vaginal area under the table when other students were present.

The investigation revealed that Walker was the registered owner of a White 2018 Dodge Durango, with three-row seating, leather seats and an infotainment system. Law enforcement also spoke to supervisors at the Fridley Vista Education Center and learned that Walker was employed as a paraprofessional, working alongside licensed teachers to support students. Part of his job responsibilities were to provide one-on-one assistance and reinforce instruction. As part of his job, Walker was allowed to remove students from their classroom and bring them to a more private setting, such as a sensory room.

The school had an old building which was where the Vista program began, but in October of 2025, they moved to a new building to accommodate growing enrollment. The new building is located at Fridley High School. Law enforcement photo-documented the classrooms described during the investigation, which included areas with cabinets that could provide concealment.

Law enforcement verified Walker's Snapchat account and collected those records pursuant to warrant. A chat message dated April 25, 2025, at 8:17 PM was sent to Walker providing Child A's home address. The message was sent from an account associated with Child A. Videos from Walker's account included marijuana use and Walker engaged in masturbation.

On July 01, 2026, Walker provided a voluntary statement to law enforcement. He said that his job as a Paraeducator at Vista was to guide and support students, including frequently managing their behavioral issues. Walker said that consequences of disruption at school included Paraeducators bringing the student to a sensory or break room. He confirmed that the Snapchat account reviewed by law enforcement belonged to him. When

asked to describe his relationship with Child A, Walker said Child A was attention-seeking and quickly attached herself to "boy energy." He admitted to exchanging Snapchat accounts with Child A, and admitted to sending images of his penis to Child A. He denied initiating sexual activity with Child A and claimed he was focused on his job. Walker denied twenty occasions of oral sex and claimed it was closer to "two or three," occurring ***in an unused classroom*** at the offsite location [old building]. Although initially denying sexual conduct in his vehicle, Walker later admitted that Child A had performed oral sex on him before he penetrated her vagina with his penis while inside his Dodge Durango. Walker claimed that sexual activity with Child A occurred for approximately one month until he determined it was inappropriate. He admitted telling Child A not to tell anyone because he did not want to lose his job.

## LEGAL ANALYSIS

### I. Criminal Sexual Conduct

Under current Minnesota law, there are two provisions of the Criminal Sexual Conduct statutes that most closely match this fact pattern. The first provision is under the legal theory of "Prohibited Occupational Relationship." It is a crime when an actor has a certain professional relationship with a victim and engages in sexual penetration or contact with that victim. For example, a psychotherapist or doctor cannot have sexual contact with their patient. The law under this provision prohibits ***licensed teachers*** from having sexual contact with secondary students. Unfortunately, an unlicensed paraprofessional is not listed as a prohibited occupation. Therefore, even though Walker was employed to assist with students in the school, he is not prohibited as a matter of law from engaging in sexual activity with a seventeen-year-old student under this subdivision.

The case was also reviewed under the theory that Walker was in a position of authority over Child A. Walker clearly falls under the definition of position of authority because he was charged with a duty of responsibility over Child A while working at the school. However, because Child A was seventeen at the time of the offense, to prosecute Walker for criminal sexual conduct while in a position of authority, Minnesota law also requires that Walker be more than 36 months older than Child A. In this case, he was only two years and seven months older than Child A.

It should be noted that Child A does not meet the definition of "mentally impaired," as defined by law, in order for the State to proceed under the theory that she could not consent. To meet this definition, the State would have to prove that Child A had impaired intelligence or that she suffered from a substantial psychiatric disorder such that she lacked judgement to "give a reasoned consent." No such evidence exists nor does the investigation support such a conclusion.

Therefore, under these specific facts, the crime of criminal sexual conduct cannot be charged.

### II. Other Crimes

The State also explored whether other crimes could be pursued against Walker. Specifically, the following offenses:

- Felony Solicitation of a Child to Engage in Sexual Conduct. This crime

cannot be charged because it requires that Child A be fifteen years old or younger.

- Felony Possession of Child Sexual Abuse Materials. This crime cannot be charged because no images of Child A were in Walker's possession or within his Snapchat account.

- Felony Dissemination of Private Sexual Images. This crime cannot be charged because there is no evidence he shared sexual images of Child A with others.

- Gross Misdemeanor Contributing to the Delinquency of a Minor. This crime cannot be charged because Walker did not contribute to the delinquency of Child A. Child A did not commit a crime.

- Gross Misdemeanor Contributing to the Need for Protective Services. This crime cannot be charged because Child A did not require protective services from the County as a result of Walker's actions.

- Gross Misdemeanor Neglect. This crime cannot be charged. Neglect requires proving that Child A was deprived of appropriate supervision. Although a strong argument can be made that the school deprived Child A of appropriate supervision to ensure that Walker did not sexually touch her, Walker himself did not deprive Child A of supervision and there is insufficient evidence that specific individuals at the school could have known or foreseen the inappropriate contacts by Walker.

- Gross Misdemeanor Endangerment. This crime cannot be charged. Endangerment requires an act likely to *substantially* harm the child's mental or emotional health. In this case, Child A had diagnoses of behavior disorder and ADHD prior to Walker's actions. The State reviewed the case to determine if Child A's diagnoses changed or if her behavior declined after the incidents described. There is no evidence that her mental health deteriorated or debilitated as a result of Walker's actions. This legal analysis is in no way meant to suggest that Child A was not harmed by Walker. Rather, it is to explain the legal burden and evidence required for the State to meet when alleging this specific charge.

The investigative file submitted to the State was thorough and well organized. The effort to hold Walker accountable does not go unnoticed. It is alarming to discover that this child is unprotected by the current law in Minnesota from acts that in our office's view should clearly be criminal. Walker was responsible for helping Child A navigate her daily challenges at school. Instead, he took advantage of his hired role to prey on a teenage girl.

The State strongly recommends that Walker be prohibited from working with children in the future and that the Minnesota Department of Education take strong action to ensure his permanent removal as an employee within any school setting.

At the direction of the County Attorney, our office is going to consult with the *Zero Abuse Project* about this case and the deficiencies and gaps in protection for students in schools and other institutions. This case highlights an area where Minnesota law is inadequate, and our office intends to work with other stakeholders to strengthen the law. If additional research reveals a viable theory of a case, we may re-evaluate and reconsider this matter if there is a good faith belief that our office can prove a criminal charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

cc: Victim Witness
Property Room Tech – ACSO Crime Lab