ATTACHMENT “A”

Termination Letter

14 pages

CITY OF TORRANCE

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER

Aram Chaparyan
City Manager

Danny E. Santana
Assistant City Manager
310/618-5880
DSantana@TorranceCA.Gov

September 22, 2022

Sent via USPS First Class Mail

Joshua Satterfield
Personal Address

Dear Officer Satterfield:

RE: LETTER OF FINDINGS

Upon the authority of the City Manager, I am the designated Administrative Conference Chair in this matter. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that I concur with the recommendation of the Police Chief that you should be terminated. **Your termination is effective September 22, 2022.**

I. AUTHORITIES UPON WHICH THE DISCIPLINE IS BASED

Your termination is based on your violation of the following rules, regulations, orders and/or policies, any of which, standing alone, or in combination, warrants your termination:

A. RULES THAT APPLY REGARDLESS OF DATE CONDUCT OCCURRED

1. Torrance Municipal Code, Chapter 4, Article 47, Section 14.47.1

A department head, with approval of the City Manager, for misconduct, incompetency, inefficiency, failure to perform duties or to observe the rules and regulations of his [or her] department or of the City: c) May discharge any such employee.

2. Law Enforcement Code of Ethics, Policy 104

I WILL keep my private life unsullied as an example to all…

I RECOGNIZE the badge of my office as a symbol of public faith, and I accept it as a public trust to be held so long as I am true to the ethics of the police service.

3. City of Torrance Anti-Harassment Policy

a. 34.10a- Protected Classifications

> …Harassment can consist of virtually any form or combination of verbal, physical, visual or hostile work environment conduct. It need not be explicit, nor even specifically directed at the victim…

b. 34.10d- Visual or Written Harassment

> The display or circulation of offensive or derogatory visual or written material related to race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age for individuals over 40 years of age, military and veteran status, and sexual orientation. This may include, but is not limited to, posters, cartoons, drawings, graffiti, reading materials, computer graphics or electronic media transmissions.

c. 134.05- Anti-Harassment Procedure

> All persons shall immediately report any evidence of discriminatory harassment or complaints regarding sexual harassment made to them or which they have directly observed, whether or not reported by the employee who is the object of the harassment to their supervisor, manager, or to the Human Resources Division…

d. 134.15- Employees' Responsibilities

> Report any conduct which fits the definition of discriminatory harassment to their immediate supervisor or appropriate authority figure.

B. FOR CONDUCT OCCURRING ON OR BEFORE APRIL 7, 2019

4. General Order 1.10 – Policing Philosophy

a. 1.10.3(B)- Service to the Community

The rules and regulations of the Department regarding police service in general, and public contact specifically, shall be as follows:

2. A police department employee shall maintain a professional attitude and demeanor that will not in any manner communicate any personal prejudices;

4. Members of the Department shall avoid behavior which would tend to bring about criticism of the Department. Conduct, whether on or off duty, shall be such as to merit the respect and confidence of the public.

5. General Order 2.01.1(A) – Employee Rules and Regulations

It is the duty of all employees to familiarize themselves with and abide by Department rules and regulations. Employees who fail to comply are subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination. Department employees shall:

4. Conduct themselves in a manner that does not create a conflict of interest with or is detrimental to the Department.

6. General Order 2.33 – Social Media

a. 2.33.1(D)- Prohibited Speech, Expression, and Conduct

To meet the Department's safety, performance, and public-trust needs, the following is prohibited unless the speech is otherwise protected…:

2. Speech or expression that, while not made pursuant to an official duty, is significantly linked to, or related to, the Torrance Police Department and tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation, or professionalism of the Torrance Police Department or its employees;

3. Speech or expression that could reasonably be foreseen as having a negative impact on the credibility of the employee as a witness. For example, posting statements or expressions to a website that glorify or endorse dishonesty, unlawful discrimination, or illegal behavior;

5. Speech or expression that is contrary to the Mission Statement or Core Values of the Torrance Police Department

C. FOR CONDUCT OCCURRING ON OR AFTER APRIL 9, 2019

7. Standards of Conduct (General Standards) Lexipol Policy 319.3

Members shall comply with lawful directives and orders from any department supervisor or person in a position of authority, absent a reasonable and bona fide justification.

8. Standards of Conduct (General Standards) Lexipol Policy 319.4

Members shall conduct themselves, whether on- or off-duty, in accordance with the United States and California Constitutions and all applicable laws, ordinances and rules enacted or established pursuant to legal authority. Members shall familiarize themselves with policies and procedures and are responsible for compliance with each. Members should seek clarification and guidance from supervisors in the event of any perceived ambiguity or uncertainty.

9. Standards of Conduct (Causes for Discipline) Policy 319.5.1(a) – Laws, Rules and Orders

(a) Violation of, or ordering or instructing a subordinate to violate any policy, procedure, rule, order, directive, requirement or failure to follow instructions contained in department or City manuals.

10. Standards of Conduct (Performance) Lexipol Policy 319.5.7(i) – Actions that Discredit Torrance Police Department

Any act on or off duty that brings discredit to this department.

11. Standards of Conduct (Conduct) Lexipol Policy 319.5.8

(f) Discourteous, disrespectful, or discriminatory treatment of any member of the public or any member of this department or the City.

(g) Use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on-duty or in uniform.

(m) Any other on- or off-duty conduct which any member knows or reasonably should know is unbecoming a member of this department, is contrary to good order, efficiency, or morale, or tends to reflect unfavorably upon this department or its members.

12. Employee Speech, Expression, and Social Networking Lexipol Policy 1021.4 -- (Prohibited Speech, Expression and Conduct)

(b) Speech or expression that, while not made pursuant to an official duty, is significantly linked to, or related to, the Torrance Police Department and tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation or professionalism of the Torrance Police Department or its employees.

(c) Speech or expression that could reasonably be foreseen as having a negative impact on the credibility of the employee as a witness. For example, posting statements or expressions to a website that glorify or endorse dishonesty, unlawful discrimination or illegal behavior.

(e) Speech or expression that is contrary to the canons of the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics as adopted by the Torrance Police Department.

II. FACTS SUPPORTING THE CHARGES

I base my decision on the facts and circumstances that were established by the administrative investigation, and summarized here:

Between February and March 2020, detectives from the Torrance Police Department (TPD) conducted an investigation into a vandalism report filed by an individual whose vehicle was vandalized in the process of being impounded. Detectives determined that two TPD officers – Cody Weldin and Christopher Tomsic - were suspects for the vandalism. On March 3, 2020, the investigation was reassigned to Crimes against Persons Sergeant J. Masalcas who was assisted by Special Investigations Unit Sergeant J. Taylor. During Sergeant Masalcas' investigation, he obtained a search warrant for the contents of the personal cellphones of Weldin and Tomsic. Upon the successful extraction of information from the phones, Sergeants Masalcas and Taylor found evidence implicating both officers in the vandalism incident. Detectives submitted the completed criminal investigation to the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office and requested the filing of criminal charges on both officers.

On or about August 16, 2021, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office ("LADA") notified TPD that concerning electronic messages were discovered on the officers' cellphones. Allegedly, multiple TPD officers exchanged these concerning electronic messages. The LADA's analysis revealed approximately 390 messages containing or referencing discriminatory topics, including but not limited to anti-Semitic, racist, homophobic, and transphobic remarks. The LADA identified you as one of the officers involved in the exchange of these messages. TPD subsequently opened an administrative investigation into the LADA's concerns.

The data revealed that during the period from approximately May 2018 through September 2019, while both on and off duty, you sent or interacted with (for example, by 'liking', commenting upon, or otherwise reacting to) multiple text messages that contained biased, discriminatory, racially/ethnically insensitive, and otherwise inappropriate text messages to other members of TPD.

The texts were as follows: [1]

[1] This does not represent an exhaustive list of the text messages that you exchanged or that are inappropriate on multiple levels. This is however a list of messages that were most clearly inappropriate and in which you actively participated.

5/29/2018	In a WhatsApp group chat of which you were a member, "*The Boys*"[2], several officers discussed a recent wrestling challenge that Officer Young lost. The discussion progressed into a discussion of Officer Chavez and Officer Young wrestling naked in Crisco oil next time. You commented, "I love it when you talk dirty." Officer Williams then messaged a video of two men without shirts on appearing to be involved in a sexual act, accompanied by the message, "Cody [Weldin], this is a non butthurt zone. Additionally, you must prove proficiency with your rifle. That includes putting it back together without the ranges [sic] help." Officer Chavez then messaged the group an image containing two photos. The first photo depicted two males that appeared to be soldiers holding hands. The second photo depicted two seemingly Muslim older males kissing. The caption to the images read "72 Shades of Gray". Officer Williams responded, "War on terror? Naw dog it was the war on gays."
8/18/2018	Officer Chandler messaged "*The Boys*" an image of a soccer/football field that included cheerleaders, officials, and a subject holding a flag, with the caption, "Dempsey…you could have been a professional flag thrower man". Dempsey replied, "Now I work with a professional fag thrower." You responded, "Lol."
12/13/2018 **(on-duty)**	Officer Chavez sent a photo from the social media account of a T Flats[3] rapper that contained an image of an assault rifle sitting upright on a table with a target underneath. After some discussion, you messaged the group, "You happen to notice the rounds put through that target on the table? I'm confident he won't be hitting any of us with that unzeroed Eotech…kinda reminds me of Chandler's targets…by evidence of [redacted IP1]." Officer Chandler responded, "I'm a deadeye shot biotch. Who's [redacted IP1]?" You replied, "That nigglet you failed to kill. Grandma said you needed to be a better shot."
4/30/2019	Officer Nelson shared a Black Lives Matter Instagram post to The Boys group chat. The post read, "TORRANCE, CA POLICE SHOT AND KILLED [redacted IP2] WITHIN 15 SECONDS. Just released bodycam footage shows police murder [redacted IP2]…" You responded, "Aww." "His little son will grow up without a father now. Oh way [sic] that's standard for any African American family to be absent a father. He'll be fine." Officer Williams responded, "Job security."

[2] Current members of "The Boys" list at this period in time included Officers Tomsic, Dempsey, Nelson, Gonzales, Williams, Weldin (owner of list), Wallace, Chavez, Kawamoto, Alonso, Satterfield, Young, Concannon, Chandler and Santaella.

[3] Torrance Tortilla Flats, or T Flats, is a prominent Hispanic Torrance street gang.

8/31/2019-9/1/2019 (late-night conversation continued to next day)	Officer Chavez texted you, Officers Gonzalez, Tomsic, Williams, Fermano and McKewen a video of an apparent crossdresser in a very short skirt standing in a dooryway. It then cuts to Tom Hanks as "Bubba Gump" on his boat waiving and then back to the crossdresser. The crossdresser starts to dance in place and causes something under the skirt to sway back and forth left to right, causing the skirt to noticeably move as a result. While the video does not show what is under the skirt, it is implied to be a penis. The video then cuts back to the Tom Hanks clip and he uncomfortably backs away.

Investigators interviewed you on April 25 and June 29, 2022. You claimed you did not believe you had ever sent any messages to your coworkers that contained discriminatory content, including discriminatory content based upon sexual orientation. You further claimed you did not believe you had ever received any racially inappropriate messages from the TPD employees you were questioned about. You stated generally that this was a group of coworkers who were not being racist, homophobic, or otherwise inappropriate, but that it was all just "humor". However, you admitted that your personal cell phone number throughout the time you worked for TPD was [Phone Number Redacted], the same number that is associated with the discriminatory text messages above. You also admitted you were the sole user of that phone. You admitted that you regularly used your personal cell phone to send and receive text messages, including using the application 'WhatsApp', with TPD co-workers for both official and un-official matters. You also admitted to exchanging messages with Officers Chavez, Dempsey, Fermano, Gonzalez, McKewen, Tomsic, Williams, and Young. You further admitted that you did know that [IP1] was a suspect in an officer involved shooting with Officer Chandler.

On April 25, 2022 you received a verbal and written admonishment of your rights by both investigator Ben Stauffer and Sergeant Ryan Galassi. Your counsel, Mr. Tom Yu, registered an ongoing objection against the use of the cellular phone data obtained from the the cell phones of Officers Tomsic and Weldin. Your counsel also advised you not to answer any questions based upon information retrieved in the cellular phone data downloads from Tomsic and Weldin. Sergeant Kyle then entered the interview room and provided additional admonitions regarding potential insubordination consequences for refusing to answer any further questions. You still refused to answer any such questions.

During your second interview on June 29, 2022, you verbally confirmed your understanding of the admonishment of your rights from the first interview. You were again verbally admonished by Sergeant Kyle, but were initially willing to give a compelled statement as ordered again by Sergeant Kyle. Your counsel again objected to you reviewing any exhibits or answering any questions relating to the exhibits or their contents. You then refused to answer any questions based upon the cellular phone evidence. After your first refusal, Sergeant Kyle again read you the admonishment and ordered you to answer all questions or face a separate insubordination charge. You refused to answer the investigator's questions fourteen times. You further refused to even look at any of the exhibits or other evidence. You refused to comply three more times and were again admonished by Sergeant Kyle. In spite of these admonishments, you stated you would continue to refuse to participate in any evidence review for the remainder of the interview. The interview subsequently concluded.

III. ANALYSIS

In *Skelly v. State Personnel Board* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 194, the California Supreme Court stated that the "overriding consideration" when addressing whether a public employer has imposed an appropriate level of discipline is "the extent to which the employee's conduct resulted in, or if repeated, is likely to result in, 'harm to the public service.'" (*Id.* at 218.) "Other relevant factors include the circumstances surrounding the misconduct and the likelihood of its recurrence." (*Id.*) In your particular case, the principles set forth in *Skelly* amply support your proposed discipline. In fact, the period between May 2018 through September 2019 establishes an ongoing pattern of misconduct and policy violations.

A. YOU ENGAGED IN INEXCUSABLE MISCONDUCT

1. You Exchanged Discriminatory and Inappropriate Text Messages with TPD Coworkers

Your involvement in discriminatory text messaging with other TPD officers demonstrates an extreme lack of sound decision-making and unbecoming conduct that calls into question your fitness for duty as a police officer. You sent, received, and otherwise interacted with/responded to multiple blatantly discriminatory text messages from other members of TPD for over a year. You used racial slurs, as well as the "N" word in conversations with your colleagues, and engaged in homophobic and transphobic "jokes". The casual use of these terms between you and the other officers indicates that this type of conduct was not unusual between you. Particularly alarming, you made multiple jokes about Black individuals from real Torrance police officer –involved shootings. In one, you state the officer should have been a better shot so he could have killed the Black individual. In another you state the deceased's surviving son will be fine because it is the "norm" in Black communities to grow up without a father.

Such racist, homophobic, and inappropriate content has no place in this Department. Whether or not these messages were intended as "jokes" does not exempt them from the City's harassment policies. In fact, the policy clearly defines visual/ written harassment as " The display or circulation of offensive or derogatory visual or written material related to race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry…" among other protected classifications. The content contained within the text messages in question here clearly fall within these parameters. By engaging in these messages, you engaged in inappropriate speech and unprofessional conduct in violation of multiple City policies, including Policy Nos. 319.5.1(a), 319.5.7(i), 319.5.8(f),(g),(m), and 1021.4(b), and former General Orders 1.10.3(B), 2.01.1(A), and 2.33.1(D). This conduct also violated the City's Anti-Harassment Policy. Moreover, you should have reported any discriminatory messages you received by a fellow Officer as soon as you received it.

This Department relies on its officers to uphold the highest standards of conduct to maintain positive relationships and preserve the trust we have with the community we serve. You demonstrated bias here that erodes that trust and smears the reputation of this Department. This Department already experienced the damage to its reputation when the news media published what were then unverified accounts of these text messages starting in August 2021. Now that the investigation has substantiated at least some of the allegations, the breach in community trust is cemented.

2. Your Failure to Follow a Direct Order to Provide Answers During an Administrative Interview Constituted Insubordination

You were ordered by Sergeant Ryan Galassi and Sergeant James Kyle to answer the investigators questions. Yet, during your interview with Mr. Stauffer on April 25 and June 29, 2022, you refused to answer any questions related to the information retrieved in the cellular phone data downloads from Tomsic and Weldin, which were the very subject matter of your administrative interview. In fact, even after providing you with the potential consequences for failing to comply, you continued to refuse to answer approximately *seventeen more times* in spite of Sergeant Kyle's admonishments. You further stated you intended to continue refusing through the end of the interview, and accordingly the interview had to be concluded prematurely.

Your conduct on these occasions was disobedient and insubordinate in violation of Department Policies 319.3 and 319.5.8(f) and (m).

B. YOUR MISCONDUCT WARRANTS TERMINATION OF YOUR EMPLOYMENT

Peace officers are held to the highest standards of conduct. (See, e.g., *Ackerman v. State Personnel Board* (1983) 145 Cal.App.3d 395, 440. Your conduct in this case causes irreparable harm to the public service and reveals that you are unfit to serve as a peace officer.

Torrance Police Department Policy 401.2 notes that it is the policy of this Department to serve the community equally, fairly, and objectively in both the enforcement of the law and provision of law enforcement services. Policy 401.3 strictly prohibits bias-based policing. These provisions are consistent with the growing number of laws being enacted by the California Legislature that also aim to curtail bias in peace officers. Notably, recently enacted Senate Bill 2 ("SB 2[4]") modifies the definition of "serious misconduct" to include at a minimum, "Demonstrating bias on the basis of any legally protected status, in violation of law or department policy, or in a manner inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to carry out their duties in a fair and unbiased manner".

Though you stated in your administrative interview that you are not racist or homophobic, based on the record of text messages you sent, received, and responded to, your assertion is unreliable at best, and dishonest at worst. As a result, I and the public can no longer rely on your fitness to serve in a bias-free manner. Rather, I now fear that there are discriminatory motivations behind all your actions, which could open the Department to liability, and moreover, subject innocent members of the public to unfair treatment due to your own personal prejudices. It is clear you do not know what lines not to cross and how to abide by workplace boundaries. You and certain other officers openly mocked Black victims of Torrance police officer- involved shootings, and insinuated a fellow officer should have had better aim so he could kill a Black individual he had shot.

[4] Penal Code Section 13510.8(a)(5).

It is self-evident that messaging like that which you participated in is inconsistent with peace officer employment. You also received training and policies covering this type of conduct. Notwithstanding the training and policies you received, you proceeded to engage in discriminatory messaging on numerous occasions for over a year, including using the "N word". Lesser disciplinary measures are inadequate under the circumstances.

SB 2 also supports my recommendation that termination is the necessary consequence under the circumstances. Under Penal Code section 13510.8(a)(2), "A peace officer may have their POST certification suspended or revoked if the person has been terminated for cause from employment as a peace officer for, or has while employed as a peace officer, otherwise engaged in, any serious misconduct as described in subdivision (b). Subdivision (b) subsection (8) includes as part of the definition of serious misconduct, "Failure to cooperate with an investigation into potential police misconduct…" By refusing to answer the investigator's questions during your administrative interview, in spite of being repeatedly admonished to do so, you failed to cooperate with an investigation constituting serious misconduct and warranting possible suspension or revocation of your POST certification under this statute.

Furthermore, the content of these messages damages your credibility as a witness and therefore your usefulness as an officer. An officer who lacks the ability to be a credible witness is unable to perform one of the essential functions of the job, i.e., to testify truthfully and competently in a court of law. Because the records of an officer's bias is potentially discoverable pursuant to a *Pitchess* motion under Evidence Code sections 1043-1045, and even potentially pursuant to a Public Records Act request under Penal Code section 832.7(b)(1)(D), it is reasonable to conclude that your conduct renders you ineffective as a prosecution witness.

In sum, you have breached the public's trust and I can no longer count on you to engage in professional conduct or to act in an unbiased-manner when carrying out your duties. You have demonstrated a willingness to engage in inappropriate, unprofessional, and offensive conduct despite admittedly knowing it was a violation of your training. For these reasons, I have lost all confidence in you and I concur that termination is the appropriate discipline for your misconduct.

IV. WORK HISTORY

You were hired by the City on February 22, 2016 as a Police Officer. Your last performance review indicates that your performance has been rated as "meet standards" to "above standards".

V. DISCIPLINARY RECORD

Discipline	Date Issued	Date of Incident & Sustained Violations
Written Reprimand	December 13, 2019	June 29, 2019 incident Violation of TPD Policy 800.6.4(g)-Radio Transmission (Leaving Assigned Beat) Violation of TPD Policy 800.6(c)-Radio Communications (Keeping dispatcher/police officer advised of status and location) Violation of Patrol Bureau Operations Manual Section III D-11 (Staying in assigned beat during shift)

Discipline	Date Issued	Date of Incident & Sustained Violations
30-Day suspension	January 22, 2019	April 10, 2018 incident Violation of TPD General Order 2.21.4(G)(1)- Neglect of duty Violation of TPD General Order 2.21.4(G)(2)- Violation of department policies, rules or regulations Violation of TPD General Order 2.21.4(G)(3)- Conduct which may be detrimental to the Department Violation of TPD General Order 2.17.4(E)- "On Call" status
30-Day suspension	January 22, 2019	August 20, 2018 incident Violation of TPD General Order 2.21.4(G)(2)- Violation of department policies, rules or regulations Violation of TPD General Order 2.21.4(G)(3)- Conduct which may be detrimental to the Department

VI. EMPLOYEE'S RESPONSE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE CHAIR ASSESSMENT

An in person administrative conference was held on this matter on August 24, 2022. You, your attorney, Tom Yu of the Law Offices of Pelayes and Yu, APC, Police Chief Jeremiah Hart, Lt. Charles Fisher, and Senior Human Resources Analyst Robert Weinmeister, were all in attendance. At the administrative conference, I offered both you and your attorney an opportunity to provide me with additional information to consider before making my decision. Your attorney stated that he would be presenting on your behalf.

While your attorney made various arguments, his comments focused primarily on the warrant that was associated with the origin of the text messages that he claimed were "…ill gotten evidence" and he alleged that the Police Chief and the Torrance Police Department violated the California Electronic Communications Privacy Act. However, my understanding is that all of the arguments raised by Mr. Yu were set forth in a Motion to Suppress which was recently denied in its entirety by the Court. A true and correct copy of the Judge's Memorandum of Decision is attached hereto as Attachment A and incorporated by reference herein. In summary, the Court found that Penal Code section 1546.4 does not require suppression of the evidence in this matter, that the search warrant at issue did not violate section 1546.1(d)(1), that the Department's pending administrative investigation does not violate section 1546.1(d)(2), and that the City did not violate Judge Carter's order by reviewing Petitioners' messages or providing the messages to the DA's office. The Court also ruled that Attorney Corey Glave was not entitled to the return of his attorney-client communications which were captured in the search warrant data.[5] Irrespective of Mr. Yu's arguments regarding the source of the text messages, the evidence demonstrates that you violated numerous Department policies, as outlined above and your misconduct cannot be excused. Any future appeals of the Motion to Suppress would not change my determinations regarding your misconduct contained within.

In response to the violation of the City's Anti-Harassment Policy (Policy 34), Mr. Yu contended that there was no victim and that no one was offended by the associated texts. Additionally, your attorney stated that "…everyone has a bias." As defined in Policy 34, the content of the cited text messages for which this discipline is recommended are clearly related to protected classifications (Section 34.10a), they represent visual and/or written harassment (Section34.10d) that was circulated amongst police officers that were not reported to a supervisor, manager or to the Human Resources Division (Section 134.05) or to their immediate supervisor or appropriate authority figure (Section 134.15). It is documented that you completed requisite Anti-Harassment Training and signed acknowledgment of both City and Department Policies. Biases that may or may not exist in the greater society are no excuse for the violation of these standards put into place to promote a hostile free work environment and unbiased approach to a police officer's interaction with the public you swore to serve and protect. However, my understanding is that all of the arguments raised by Mr. Yu were set forth in a Motion to Suppress which was recently denied in its entirety by the Court.

[5] It should be noted that the Administrative Conference Chair did not rely upon any attorney-client privileged communications in making the decision to terminate Satterfield's employment.

A true and correct copy of the Judge's Memorandum of Decision is attached hereto as Attachment A and incorporated by reference herein. In summary, the Court found that Penal Code section 1546.4 does not require suppression of the evidence in this matter, that the search warrant at issue did not violate section 1546.1(d)(1), that the Department's pending administrative investigation does not violate section 1546.1(d)(2), and that the City did not violate Judge Carter's order by reviewing Petitioners' messages or providing the messages to the DA's office. The Court also ruled that Attorney Corey Glave was not entitled to the return of his attorney-client communications which were captured in the search warrant data.[6]

Finally, following the administrative conference your attorney also sent me an email with the following subject line: "SUPPLEMENTAL SKELLY RESPONSES FROM OFFICERS SATTERFIELD & [NAME PURPOSELY OMITTED]." The email listed a litany of alleged rule violations of the Department asserting that a "double standard that is currently being placed at the Torrance Police Department." To paraphrase, Mr. Yu alleged that the Torrance Police Department, via their social media accounts, posted a video that included a rap song and that the lyrics to that song contain numerous sexual insinuations and racist words that you and another Officer are being accused of using as part of your respective notices of intent to terminate your employment. Mr. Yu then went on to utilize all capital letters in his email to highlight some of the vulgar words allegedly associated with the song.

Mr. Yu's email further conceded *"that the post only contained the instrumental portion of this song"* (emphasis added) yet simultaneously insisted that it "is common knowledge that the lyrics contained in the song are sexually explicit, incite violence, and contain racist words." Moreover, he further insinuated that "posting the instrumentals was functionally equivalent to playing the Star Spangled Banner or the Halls of Montezuma . . ." and that "everyone knows the words." Mr. Yu's contention is equally tenuous as it is absurd. Most importantly, such posting, does not alleviate any responsibility you bear for sending, receiving and responding to discriminatory and homophobic messages.

VII. ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE CHAIR FINDING

Officer Satterfield, I am wholeheartedly disappointed as the Administrative Conference Chair in rendering this decision in a case involving a Torrance Police Department Police Officer sending, receiving and responding to discriminatory and inappropriate messaging. In your role as a police officer, the City and the public entrusted you to follow the regulations and policies of the Torrance Police Department, and the City of Torrance. All members of the public, no matter, their race, religion, creed or sexual orientation (among other protected classifications), rely on police officers for assistance in emergencies and life-threatening situations. Your engagement in the above-described behavior calls into questions your ability to deliver such services in an unbiased manner.

You betrayed the trust instilled in you as a Police Officer and displayed a blatant disregard of your duty to uphold values so paramount to law enforcement and basic human dignity. As a Police Officer, you swore to protect and serve not just select members of the Torrance community, but the entire community, all differences aside. Your conduct is unacceptable and unbecoming of a Police Officer. Therefore, I concur with the recommendation of the Police Chief that you be **terminated from employment as a Police Officer effective September 22, 2022.**

VIII. ATTACHMENT

Attachment A: *Anthony Chavez, et al. v. Torrance Police Department, Case No. BH014005* Memorandum of Decision

IX. APPEAL RIGHTS

You have the right to appeal this decision to the Civil Service Commission pursuant to Section 14.47.8 of the Torrance Municipal Code. A request to have this matter reviewed must be submitted to Ms. Brianne Cohen, Civil Services Manager, in writing within ten (10) days of the date of this letter.

You may submit your written response by email; U.S. first class mail, overnight mail, delivery courier or other personal delivery; or fax: CivilServiceCommission@TorranceCA.Gov; City of Torrance, Civil Service Commission, ATTN: Brianne Cohen, Civil Service Manager, 3231 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503; FAX (310) 618-2726.

Sincerely,

Danny E. Santana
Assistant City Manager
Administrative Conference Chair

cc: Jeremiah Hart, Police Chief
Hedieh Khajavi, Human Resources Manager
Brianne Cohen, Civil Services Manager
Tom Yu, Attorney for Employee
Human Resources Division – Personnel File

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)ss
CITY OF TORRANCE)

I am employed with the City of Torrance, California.

I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to the attached action. My business address is 3031 Torrance Boulevard, Torrance, California 90503.

On **September 22, 2022,** I deposited in the United States mail a letter and attachment regarding Administrative Conference Findings to:

Joshua Satterfield

by placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed, postage prepaid envelope,

first class mail, addressed as follows:

Personal Address
[redacted]

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and of the

United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 22nd day of September 2022 at Torrance, California.

Danny E. Santana
Administrative Conference Chair