

INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

PEACE OFFICER NAME: Khammouane Kevin Thakham

POST ID NUMBER: A45-Q53

EMPLOYING AGENCY: Fresno Police Department

POST CASE NUMBER: POST2316280

WRITTEN BY: LEC Robert Tripp

DATE: 12/29/2025

Contents

I. Executive Summary and Findings 3

II. Investigative Methodology 3

III. Respondent's Background 4

A. Respondent's Peace Officer Certificates and Employment 4

B. Respondent's Service Record 4

IV. Factual Background 5

V. Analysis and Findings 10

A. Does the alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty? 10

B. Does the alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law? 11

VI. Supporting Evidence 13

I. Executive Summary and Findings

On August 10, 2023 at 4:41 a.m., an anonymous male caller with a blocked number – who would be later identified as Fresno Police Department (FPD) Corporal Khammouane Kevin Thakham (hereinafter "Respondent") – contacted the FPD Communications Center non-emergency line to report an ongoing violent domestic disturbance. FPD officers responded to the address provided by the caller and made contact with a female resident (hereinafter "Victim 1") and her son (hereinafter "Victim 2"). The officers determined there was no disturbance.

On the following day at 10:08 p.m., the same caller again contacted the FPD Communications Center non-emergency line from a blocked number and reported another ongoing violent disturbance at the same address. At 10:26 p.m., the caller called back and reported he could now hear a male and female yelling and throwing things around, escalating the urgency of the situation. FPD officers responded, spoke with Victim 1 and Victim 2, canvassed other apartments for information, and determined there was no disturbance. Victim 1 and Victim 2 told responding officers they believed the calls were made by Respondent to harass them.

FPD opened an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation on August 16, 2023 and interviewed Respondent on October 10, 2023. Respondent admitted he was the anonymous caller, stating he placed the calls because Victim 1 had moved out of his residence without explanation and would not speak with him. He hoped the police response would prompt Victim 1 to "seek out to me for my opinions or my advice." Respondent confirmed none of the events he described in the call actually happened and stated he did not identify himself and blocked his number because he knew the call was not a legitimate call for service. The administrative investigation resulted in Respondent receiving a 160-hour suspension and demotion.

POST reviewed the FPD IA investigative report, Body Worn Camera (BWC) videos of the August 11, 2023 incident response, recordings of the three calls, and a recording of Respondent's interview with IA investigators. POST also interviewed the Respondent. This review confirmed that Respondent intentionally made a false report regarding an emergency which Respondent knew did not exist. In so doing, Respondent was dishonest and Respondent was in violation of California Penal Code Section 148.3(a).

II. Investigative Methodology

This report summarizes the findings related to allegations of serious misconduct. This investigation was conducted in accordance with the regulations and policies of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). The investigation included a review of the FPD administrative investigation which included an interview of the subject officer. The investigation also included a review of the FPD response to the incidents on August 10 and 11, 2023, which documented contacts with the two victims.

POST analyzed the information obtained in this investigation using the clear and convincing evidence standard. For purposes of this report, clear and convincing evidence means "evidence of a charge is clear and convincing so long as there is a 'high probability' that the charge is true. The evidence need not establish a fact beyond a reasonable doubt."

This report is necessarily summary in nature and does not include every fact or issue that might be found in the underlying investigation and attachments. It does, however, contain reference to evidence that establishes the requisite facts and proves the serious misconduct charged by the clear and convincing evidence standard.

III. Respondent's Background

A. Respondent's Peace Officer Certificates and Employment

The table below sets forth Respondent's employment history:

Dates	Rank	Agency
08/16/1994 – 11/03/1996	Reserve Officer Level II	Fresno Police Department
11/04/1996 – Present	Police Officer	Fresno Police Department

Respondent is assigned POST ID A45-Q53. He received the following peace officer certificates from POST:

Certificate Type	*Certificate Number*	*Date Issued*
Basic	92819	09/11/1998
Intermediate	87364	09/12/2006
Advanced	74701	09/12/2006

B. Respondent's Service Record

When evaluating whether suspension or revocation is appropriate, California Penal Code section 13510.8(c)(5) and California Regulation section 1213(a)(5) provide that the Commission must consider Respondent's prior conduct, discipline and service record. The relevance and weight the Commission may choose to assign to a peace officer's prior conduct and service record will depend on the facts in each case.

Respondent has worked for the Fresno Police Department for more than 30 years, first as a reserve officer and then, from 1996 forward, as a police officer. He has more than

19 years of service on SWAT, with experience responding to life-threatening emergencies. Following his graduation from the Peace Officer Basic Course in 1995, he received 14 hours of POST credit for attending four domestic violence training courses, including a two-hour “Domestic Violence Update” course conducted on April 27, 2022. This course included topics such as "Behaviors Batterers Use to Instill Fear and Control Over their Partner" and "Stalking."

Respondent had no previous misconduct complaints on file with POST and had no disciplinary history in the five years prior to this incident. On January 15, 2025, Respondent received a Letter of Reprimand for failing to activate his Body Worn Camera (BWC) while driving Code 3 during an emergency response in which Respondent collided with another vehicle.

IV. Factual Background

Emergency Calls

On August 10, 2023 at 4:41 a.m., an anonymous male caller using a blocked number – later identified as the Respondent – contacted the FPD Communications Center non-emergency line to report a violent domestic disturbance. The caller provided the address and apartment number where the disturbance was taking place and described what appeared to be an unfolding assault requiring an urgent response:

> *I don’t want to get involved, but, uh, this female is screaming “Help me! Help me!” and there’s a lot of banging noise going on. And I know there’s a lot of – been a lot of traffic in and out. There should be a – a – a [Victim 1’s vehicle] parked in front of it. These people just moved in and there’s a lot of traffic, and now I hear screaming and yelling. A female yelling “Help me! Stop! Help me! Stop!”*[1]

The call lasted for 5 minutes and 51 seconds. As the call progressed, the caller indicated the situation remained dire. The caller stated, “Now she’s screaming again, ‘Help me!’”[2] The caller declined to provide his name or telephone number, expressing concern about “shady characters going to come back to me.”[3]

FPD dispatch designated the call as “Priority 0,” the highest priority call for service reserved for “emergencies with immediate need such as threat to life or crime in

[1] FPD Transcript of First Emergency Call, p. 1.
[2] FPD Transcript of First Emergency Call, p. 1.
[3] FPD Transcript of First Emergency Call, p. 2.

progress."[4] Eleven officers responded. At 4:55 a.m., officers made contact with the occupants of the apartment, Victim 1 and Victim 2, who had been asleep. Officers determined there was no disturbance. Officers asked Victim 2 if he knew who might have called the police. Victim 2 indicated the ex-boyfriend of Victim 1 might have made the call, but did not identify the ex-boyfriend by name.[5]

On the following day, the same anonymous male caller again called the FPD Communications Center non-emergency line from a blocked number. This call was placed at 10:08 p.m. and lasted 1 minute and 40 seconds. The caller described a situation similar to that reported on the previous day: a female was yelling for help during what appeared to be a domestic disturbance. The caller said the female was yelling "Stop!" multiple times.[6] The caller did not wish to provide his name.

Approximately 15 minutes later, at 10:26 p.m., the anonymous caller called the FPD a second time that evening. In this call, which lasted 1 minute and 33 seconds, the caller indicated that a male was now also screaming along with the female, and that they were "just throwing things around," including glass.[7] In response to the second call, the FPD raised the priority of the response from Priority 2 to Priority 1, the highest priority designation not requiring an immediate response, and the first units arrived at the apartment within 30 minutes. Responding units were informed by dispatch of the call on the previous day and were given criminal history check results for Victim 2 performed during that call.[8]

FPD Response and Victim Impact

The interaction between the victims and FPD was recorded on the BWC video of the responding officers. When officers arrived, Victim 2 was reluctant to allow officers access to the apartment as this was the second time officers knocked on his door at an unusual hour without apparent cause. In fact, FPD officers were at the door for more than three minutes before Victim 1 and Victim 2 allowed them inside the apartment.[9]

Victim 2 was concerned FPD officers knew the Respondent, who had been dating Victim 1 before breaking up the previous month. Victim 2 told officers he believed Respondent had directed the police to check on Victim 1 and thought "maybe you guys

[4] Fresno Police Neighborhood Watch, "When to call 911, Non-Emergency Police Line or use the FresGo App," https://www.makefresnosafer.org/blog/when-to-call-911-non-emergency-police-line-or-use-the-fresgo-app/#:~:text=The%20Fresno%20Police%20Department%20receives%20over% 20950%2C000,scene%2C%20this%20may%20be%20a%20two%20priority.

[5] IA Investigation Memo 2023-0056, p.p. 18-19; FPD Event Log 2308100278.

[6] FPD Transcript of Second Emergency Call, p. 1.

[7] FPD Transcript of Third Emergency Call, p. 1.

[8] FPD Event Log 2308111305; Final Order of Discipline, p. 2.

[9] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V (Excerpt 2253-1), 22:52:52-22:56:13.

were friends, and trying to harass us."[10] Victim 2 expressed further concern about harassment from the Respondent. Victim 2 stated, "He call, like he send message threatening us. He come, he knock, he said he's gonna call the police and much more."[11]

Victims 1 and 2 provided FPD with additional justification for their suspicions that the Respondent was responsible for the calls for service. Regarding the call on the previous morning, Victim 2 stated Victim 1 attended a party on the prior evening and saw the Respondent at the same party. Victim 1 avoided Respondent and left the party around 1:00 in the morning. Approximately four hours later, the police came to their apartment, and one hour after they left, the Respondent called either Victim 1 or Victim 2. (Victim 2 stated, "he called," but did not specify whom.) Victim 2 regarded the timing of these events as more than coincidental and suspected the Respondent was responsible.[12]

Both victims also reported the Respondent had attempted to contact Victim 1 the evening before the current call for service. Victim 1 (using Victim 2 as a translator) told officers the Respondent had called her on the previous day and asked her to go out drinking with him. Victim 1 declined. Victim 1 stated four or five friends of the Respondent then called at the behest of the Respondent, also encouraging her to go out and spend time with the Respondent.[13] Again, based on the proximity of these interactions with the appearance of the FPD, both victims concluded Respondent was responsible for the present call for service as well.

Victim 2 provided additional examples of what he characterized as the Respondent's harassing behavior. Victim 2 stated the Respondent showed up at his apartment in the previous month and knocked on the door for approximately 30 minutes, until the neighbors came outside. While he was knocking, Respondent called Victim 2 approximately 20 times. When the FPD Officer asked Victim 2 why the Respondent was knocking and calling, Victim 2 stated:

> *Victim 2: Because, he already told us that if we don't go back – if she doesn't date him again, he's gonna do that…that's what I think.*
>
> *FPD Officer: That he's gonna do what?*

[10] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V (Excerpt 2253-2), 22:59:47-22:59:53.
[11] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296 (Excerpt 2254-1), 22:58:32-22:58:42.
[12] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296 (Excerpt 2254-3), 23:12:40-23:14:32.
[13] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2356 X60AA493V, 23:58:16 – 23:59:10 (Excerpt 2356-1); Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V (Excerpt 2253-3), 23:12:25 – 23:13:46.

Victim 2: He's gonna, um, harass my mom back, like stalking, harassment, you know what I mean? Like, like uh, doesn't leave her alone, like harassment, [u/i] calling, stalking.[14]

Victim 2 also showed responding officers a text message he received from Respondent on August 5, 2023, in which Respondent wrote, "Please I want you guys to come back to my life. I'll give you my house and everything I have. I'll do whatever it takes to take care of your mom and you guys. I'll sign all the paperwork to prove my commitment. I love your mom a lot. Im [*sic*] sorry for everything but please come back!!"[15] While describing the situation to the FPD officer, Victim 2's body language and tone of voice reflected discomfort: he moved from speaking to the officers in a relaxed tone with his arms crossed to gesticulating with both hands; his facial expression changed; and his voice changed in pitch and emphasis. Victim 2 stated "we don't even know why he want to give anything to us. I don't even know why, I just don't know why."[16]

Victim 1 stated through a telephone contact who was translating that she was very stressed out from the entire situation.[17]

The officers contacted six other neighbors in the apartment building and confirmed there had been no disturbance. The officers completed their investigation sometime after midnight and cleared the scene.[18]

Respondent Interviews

On October 10, 2023, FPD IA investigators interviewed Respondent and played recordings of the anonymous calls placed to the FPD Communications Center on August 10, 2023 and August 11, 2023. Respondent admitted he placed the calls. He stated Victim 1 broke off their relationship very suddenly without telling him why. When he saw her at social functions, she pretended everything was fine and that they were still in a relationship, but when he tried to call her, she refused to take his calls. The situation upset the Respondent. He said, "All I want to do is talk to her" and discuss their relationship.[19]

Respondent stated he had placed the calls to the Communications Center to elicit or provoke communication from Victim 1. He said, "that was my thought process, get her response and maybe again, seek out some, seek out to me for my opinions or my advice." He confirmed he hoped the victim would reach out to him to ask for help if the

[14] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA493V (Excerpt 2254-2), 23:07:28-23:08:05.
[15] Text Image 6477.
[16] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296 (Excerpt 2254-4), 23:15:28-22:16:08.
[17] Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V (Excerpt 2253-4), 23:13:46-23:14:25.
[18] FPD Event Log 2308111305.
[19] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 4.

police came to her apartment. Respondent understood the call he made would generate a police response. He confirmed none of the events he described in his call to the FPD had actually happened.[20]

Respondent stated that he did not identify himself during the calls because he knew people could call the police anonymously and he knew the calls were not legitimate. Respondent confirmed he blocked his phone number when he made the calls to hide his identity. Respondent also confirmed he knew his call would generate an emergency response, and that it was a crime to make a false report of an emergency.[21]

Respondent confirmed this account in an interview with POST conducted on November 6, 2025. Respondent stated he knowingly placed the calls to the FPD Communications Center to initiate a police response which he hoped would prompt Victim 1 to contact him; the situation he reported in the calls did not happen; and he knew placing such calls was wrong, which is why he deliberately blocked his caller-ID number to conceal his identity before placing the calls.[22]

Administrative Investigation and Discipline

Based on a review of the calls for service on August 10, 2023 and August 11, 2023, FPD opened an IA investigation on August 16, 2023. That investigation, completed on October 11, 2023, sustained two allegations against Respondent. First, in violation of FPD policy 341.2.5(aa), *Violating Any Misdemeanor Statute*, the IA investigative report noted "Thakham agreed that he was in violation of Penal Code 148.3(a) by falsely reporting an emergency" and sustained the allegation that he violated a misdemeanor statute. Second, in violation of FPD policy 341.2.5(ac), *Unbecoming Conduct On-Duty Or Off-Duty*, the investigation report noted "Thakham's decision to abuse emergency services for personal gain reflected poorly on the Department" and sustained the allegation that Thakham engaged in conduct unbecoming an officer.[23]

By letter dated November 13, 2023, Respondent was proposed for termination for violating the two aforementioned policies, as well as for violating Fresno Municipal Code Section 3-286(a), *Malfeasance, Misconduct, Incompetence, Inefficiency, or Failure to Perform Duties of the Position or Observe Established Rules and Regulations*; Fresno Municipal Code Section 3-286(b), *Malfeasance and Misconduct*; and Fresno Police Department Policy 341.1.2, *Integrity*.[24] On March 28, 2024, following a *Skelly* hearing conducted earlier that year, FPD imposed a 160 hour suspension and demoted Respondent from his Corporal assignment. FPD also imposed a Last Chance

[20] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript, p.p. 5, 8.
[21] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript, p.p. 5-6, 8.
[22] POST Thakham Interview Transcript, p.p. 9-10, 12, 15.
[23] IA Investigation Memo 2023-0056, p.p. 28-29.
[24] Final Order of Discipline, Attachment 1.

Agreement on Respondent which was effective for the duration of his employment. [25] Respondent signed the agreement and did not appeal this decision.

FPD notified POST of the serious misconduct allegation pertaining to these incidents on August 16, 2023. FPD provided the completed IA investigation memo to POST on February 6, 2025.

V. Analysis and Findings

A. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and POST Regulation 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty?

Penal code section 13510.8(b)(1) defines the serious misconduct of dishonesty as follows: *Dishonesty relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, a peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, false statements, intentionally filing false reports, tampering with, falsifying, destroying, or concealing evidence, perjury, and tampering with data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct.*

POST Regulation 1205(a)(1) defines the serious misconduct of dishonesty as follows: *Dishonesty relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, a peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, false statements, intentionally filing false reports, tampering with, falsifying, destroying, or concealing evidence, perjury, and tampering with data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct. For purposes of this subsection, in considering whether a suspension or revocation of certification is proper, the Commission will consider the extent to which the dishonesty related to a material or significant fact in the context of the statement or omission alleged to be dishonest, and will also consider whether the dishonesty appears to have been done willfully or intentionally, with the intent to deceive.*

That the Respondent placed the three anonymous calls is not in dispute. The Respondent's voice was captured in recordings of the calls made by the FPD; the victims suspected Respondent was the caller, based on other communications with the Respondent; and – most definitively – the Respondent admitted he was the anonymous caller during interviews with FPD IA investigators and with POST.

That the reports made by the Respondent in the three calls were false is also not in dispute. When FPD responded on the morning of August 10, 2023 to the location provided by the Respondent, they determined the residents at this location, Victim 1 and

[25] Final Order of Discipline, covering memo and p.p. 1-4.

Victim 2, had been sleeping and no disturbance had occurred.[26] When FPD responded on the evening of August 11, 2023, they again made contact with Victim 1 and Victim 2 as well as with other neighbors in the apartment complex, and again determined no disturbance had taken place.[27] Respondent subsequently admitted he was at his home when he placed the calls, had no knowledge of a domestic disturbance, and nothing he described in the calls was accurate. [28]

The inaccuracies in the three calls were not the result of accident or chance, but rather were deliberate falsehoods constructed by the Respondent for a self-serving purpose: to compel a former domestic partner into communicating with him and, he hoped, resume the relationship. The Respondent admitted this to FPD IA investigators and to POST. He stated he placed the calls to generate a police response that would be so problematic for Victim 1 that she would reach out to him and seek his help. As he stated to POST, Respondent intended for Victim 1 to "reach out and ask…for [Respondent's] advice and…hopefully…come back."[29]

The clear and convincing evidence establishes with high probability that the Respondent made false statements related to the reporting of a crime. This dishonesty was not incidental, but rather consisted of material and significant facts. Indeed, the entire substance of the three aforementioned telephone reports of a violent disturbance was fabricated. The dishonesty was also intentional, unfolding over the course of approximately 41 hours as part of a plan to deceive the FPD into an emergency response, thereby manipulating a former domestic partner into resuming a relationship with the Respondent. The Respondent made these false statements despite his knowledge that any emergency response entails a potential risk for responding officers and the public.[30] In light of these circumstances, the Respondent violated Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(1), Dishonesty.

B. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) and POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law?

Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) defines the serious misconduct of Acts that Violate the Law as follows: *Acts that violate the law and are sufficiently egregious or repeated as to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public, as determined by the commission.*

[26] FPD Event Log 2308100278.
[27] FPD Incident Report 2308111305.
[28] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript p. 5 and 7; POST Thakham Interview Transcript p. 9 and 11.
[29] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 5; POST Thakham Interview Transcript p. 10.
[30] FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 6; POST Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 19.

POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) defines the serious misconduct of Acts that Violate the Law as follows: *Acts that violate the law and are sufficiently egregious or repeated as to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public, as determined by the Commission.*

As established above by clear and convincing evidence, the Respondent was responsible for making multiple false reports to the FPD regarding an ongoing domestic disturbance. During the calls, Respondent emphasized the urgent nature of a situation involving what he presented to the dispatcher as an ongoing violent assault. In the call placed on August 10, 2023, the caller stated "this female is screaming 'Help me! Help me!' and there's a lot of banging noise going on….now I hear screaming and yelling. A female yelling "Help me! Stop! Help me! Stop!"[31] In the first call placed on the following evening, the caller reiterated a woman was "screaming and yelling…saying something like 'stop.'"[32] The Respondent called FPD dispatch back approximately 15 minutes after the first call to emphasize the urgency. Now he claimed he could hear "things thrown around, like glass….It's bad."[33]

When he placed the three calls, Respondent had nearly 29 years of experience with the FPD, including approximately 19 years on the SWAT team where he gained extensive experience handling police emergencies. Respondent confirmed in his POST interview that he was familiar with Fresno emergency call prioritization, with "zero" calls representing the most urgent situations and higher number designations representing decreasingly urgent situations.[34] In discussing his anonymous reports, Respondent told POST he believed that FPD dispatch would designate the situation as a zero priority, prompting an emergency response from FPD officers.[35]

California Penal Code Section 148.3(a) states that any individual making a report "to any city, county, city and county, or state department, district, agency, division, commission, or board, that an 'emergency' exists, knowing that the report is false, is guilty of a misdemeanor…" California Penal Code Section 148.3(c) defines "emergency" as any condition that results in, or could result in, the response of a public official in an authorized emergency vehicle. The clear and convincing evidence affirms the Respondent knew he was calling a city department; that he knew his report was false; and that he knew the situation he described would be considered an emergency, resulting in a response by police to the victims' residence.

[31] FPD First Call Transcript, p. 1.
[32] FPD Second Call Transcript, p. 1.
[33] FPD Third Call Transcript, p. 1.
[34] POST Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 12.
[35] POST Thakham Interview Transcript, pp. 15-16.

In his interview with POST, the Respondent stated he did not know the legality of his actions at the time he placed the calls. These false reports were clear violations of law, however. The Respondent took deliberate actions to conceal his identity by blocking his caller ID when he placed the calls and by declining to give his name to the FPD dispatcher, and he stated he did so because he knew his actions were improper.[36]

A violation of California Penal Code Section 148.3(a) is a misdemeanor charge. Although criminal charges were not filed against the Respondent, his illegal acts were egregious because they were repeated and because he used his knowledge of the police response process to coerce a vulnerable member of the public. In addressing the urgent call for service placed by Respondent, the responding officers unwittingly participated in Respondent's scheme to compel Victim 1 to contact him and ultimately resume a relationship. While they were doing this, the officers were not available to assist the public with genuine calls for service. Moreover, as Respondent acknowledged in his POST interview, his actions were "a category of domestic violence or domestic harassment," and that Respondent would have conducted an investigation if he received a call for service involving a fact pattern similar to this incident.

The clear and convincing evidence – consisting of the Respondent's knowledge of police practices, California law, and his own statements – demonstrates with high probability that the Respondent committed acts that violate the law and were sufficiently egregious or repeated as to be inconsistent with his obligation to uphold the law and respect the rights of members of the public when he made false emergency reports three times in 41 hours, constituting serious misconduct in violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.

VI. Supporting Evidence

Evidence	**Attachment**
Executive Review and Division Recommendation	A
Respondent's EDI Profile	B
IA Investigation Memo 2023-0056 Excerpts	C
Final Order of Discipline	D
First Emergency Call	E
FPD First Emergency Call Transcript	F
Second Emergency Call	G

[36] POST Thakham Interview Transcript, p. 12.

Evidence	Attachment
FPD Second Emergency Call Transcript	H
Third Emergency Call	I
FPD Third Emergency Call Transcript	J
FPD Incident Report 2308111305	K
FPD Event Log 2308100278	L
FPD Event Log 2308111305	M
FPD IA Thakham Interview Transcript Excepts	N
POST Thakham Interview Transcript Excerpts	O
FPD Domestic Violence Training Outline	P
Text Image 6477	Q
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V, Excerpt 2253-1	R
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V, Excerpt 2253-2	S
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V, Excerpt 2253-3	T
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2253 X60AA493V, Excerpt 2253-4	U
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296, Excerpt 2254-1	V
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296, Excerpt 2254-2	W
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296, Excerpt 2254-3	X
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2254 X60AA2296, Excerpt 2254-4	Y
Axon Body 3 Video 2023-08-11 2356 X60AA493V, Excerpt 2356-1	Z
Fresno Police Neighborhood Watch, “When to Call 911”	AA

VII. Findings

Based on POST’s investigation reasonable grounds exist to submit this case to the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board and the POST Commission for consideration of revocation or suspension pursuant to Penal Code 13510.8.