

INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

PEACE OFFICER NAME: Robert Sasek

POST ID NUMBER: C81-Z88

EMPLOYING AGENCY: Oroville Police Department

POST CASE NUMBER: POST2318309

WRITTEN BY: Scott Baland – Law Enforcement Consultant II

DATE: 4/16/2025

Contents

I. Executive Summary 1

II. Background Information 2

a. Identity of Respondent 2

b. Respondent's Service Record, Relevant Training, and Prior Complaints and Discipline 2

c. Prior Employment History 3

d. Peace Officer Certification 3

e. The Present Allegations of Serious Misconduct 4

III. Investigative Methodology 6

IV. Factual Summary 7

V. Analysis and Findings 14

a. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(2) and California Regulation 1205(a)(2) – Abuse of Power? 14

VI. Supporting Evidence and Documentation 20

VII. Findings 21

I. Executive Summary

On September 1, 2022, “Complainant,” was arrested by Oroville Police Department Officer Robert Sasek, herein after “Respondent,” at the Dollar General in Oroville for trespassing. Respondent later noted in his citation he believed the Complainant was also possibly under the influence of a central nervous system stimulant at the time of the arrest. This was the second time the Complainant had been arrested that day; the first arrest was made by the Butte County Sheriff’s Office for trespassing on private property.

The Complainant was transported to the Butte County Jail by Respondent for booking; however, the Butte County Jail nursing staff denied her booking and required Respondent to obtain medical clearance for the Complainant prior to booking due to her elevated blood pressure. Respondent transported the Complainant to Oroville Medical Center but did not seek or obtain the requested medical clearance. Instead, he cited and released her and told her to seek medical treatment on her own. Shortly after releasing the Complainant, Respondent was called back to the hospital because the Complainant was causing a disturbance.

Upon his arrival, Respondent took custody of the Complainant, handcuffed her, and placed her in the rear of his patrol vehicle to transport her towards the Chico area pursuant to her request. Respondent never activated his body-worn camera, and he turned off his work cell phone. After traveling approximately 15.5 miles, Respondent exited the freeway on Neal Road, drove for approximately one mile, then pulled over and had the Complainant exit the patrol vehicle. Respondent left the Complainant in a dark, desolate location without any access to services in an unpopulated area. The Complainant was not wearing shoes, had an altered mental state, did not have a cell phone, or a purse. After Respondent left the scene, the Complainant sustained substantial injuries which ultimately required hospitalization when she was located the next day.

Respondent's actions demonstrated an abuse of his peace officer powers.

With the completion of POST's investigation and review, reasonable grounds exist to submit this case to the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board and the POST Commission for consideration of suspension or revocation pursuant to Penal Code 13510.8.

II. Background Information

a. Identity of Respondent

At the time of the events at issue, Respondent was employed as an Officer with the Oroville Police Department.

This position is a peace officer position as defined under California Penal Code §830.1(a) and is required to be certified pursuant to California Penal Code §13510.1(a).

b. Respondent's Service Record, Relevant Training, and Prior Complaints and Discipline

Respondent began his employment with the Oroville Police Department on April 28, 2021, as a full-time Officer. Prior to his employment with the Oroville Police Department, Respondent completed the Basic Academy that included specific training in Learning Domain 3, *Principled Policing in the Community*, which taught curriculum on community policing, problem-solving, and the peace officer's role in the community. Additionally, Respondent received specific training during Learning Domain 31, *Custody*, with focused curriculum on peace officer's responsibilities in custodial situations; crimes involving treatment of prisoners, specifically, inhumane or oppressive treatment of the public and

violation of a prisoner's civil rights; and care and handling of prisoners in a local detention facility.

The Oroville Police Department has policies regarding Standards of Conduct (Policy 340). Every employee is trained and has knowledge of these policies during their field training program. These policies are reviewed periodically in briefings, departmental training days, and performance evaluations.

When Respondent was hired by the Oroville Police Department, he took an oath expressing commitment and intent to respect constitutional rights in discharging the duties of a law enforcement officer. Respondent was given the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics which he affirmed, in part, that he would serve the community, safeguard lives and property, and respect the constitutional rights of all. Respondent successfully completed Oroville Police Department's field training program. This training program included showing sufficient knowledge of the laws in the State of California, Oroville Police Department policy, including but not limited to the aforementioned Policy 340, Policy 306 – *Handcuffing and Restraints*, and Policy 449 – *Portable Audio/Video Recorder* (i.e., Body-worn camera) and all other Oroville Police Department's procedures.

Respondent did not have any prior discipline that would be considered relevant to this case.

c. Prior Employment History

Respondent does not have any additional law enforcement appointments in California.

d. Peace Officer Certification

Respondent is assigned POST ID C81-Z88. He received the following peace officer certificate from POST:

- Basic – December 13, 2022 (#208597)

e. The Present Allegations of Serious Misconduct

1. Filing of Complaint with the Oroville Police Department

   On October 3, 2022, a government claim was filed on behalf of the Complainant, by her attorney, Robert Chalfant, against Respondent and the Oroville Police Department. As a result of the claim, the City of Oroville hired an outside entity, Employers Investigative Services (EIS), to conduct an administrative investigation into the allegations against Respondent and the Oroville Police Department. The investigation began on October 5, 2022. On October 6, 2022, Respondent was placed on administrative leave, pending the outcome of the investigation.

   As a result of this incident, the Complainant also filed a federal civil lawsuit, through her attorney, with the United States District Court - Eastern District, for a violation of her civil and constitutional rights against the City of Oroville. The City of Oroville ultimately settled with the Complainant for $3 million dollars.

2. Agency Determinations on Complaint, Discipline, and Any Appeals

   As a result of the administrative investigation conducted by EIS, the following findings were “sustained” against Respondent on September 13, 2023:

   a. Oroville Police Department Policy Manual 340.4 General Standards 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.
   b. Oroville Police Department Policy Manual 340.5.2 Ethics, Subsection (g) – Any other failure to abide by the standards of ethical conduct.

c. Oroville Police Department Policy Manual 340.5.8 Performance Subsection (i) – Any act on or off duty that brings discredit to this Department.
d. Oroville Police Department Policy Manual 340.5.9 Conduct Subsection (f) – Discourteous, disrespectful or discriminatory treatment of any member of the public or any member of the Department or City.
e. Oroville Police Department Policy Manual 340.5.9 Conduct Subsection (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.
f. City of Oroville Personnel Rules & Regulations Section 11.3 subsection K. Misconduct
g. City of Oroville Personnel Rules & Regulations Section 11.3 subsection T. Violation of department or city rules.
h. City of Oroville Personnel Rules & Regulations Section 11.3 subsection V. Other failure of good behavior either during or outside of duty hours which is such that it causes discredit to the city or his/her employment.
i. City of Oroville Memorandum of Understand with the Oroville Police Officers Association 30.4 Cause for Disciplinary Action, subsection C. Disclosure of confidential information.
j. City of Oroville Memorandum of Understand with the Oroville Police Officers Association 30.4 Cause for Disciplinary Action, subsection F. Discriminatory, discourteous or unbecoming behavior.
k. Oroville Memorandum of Understand with the Oroville Police Officers Association 30.4 Cause for Disciplinary Action, subsection I. Misconduct, i.e., any behavior that beings harm or discredit to the city.

As a result of the sustained findings against Respondent, Oroville Police Department imposed a 30-day suspension, without pay, and a subsequent 90-day Performance Improvement Plan. Respondent did not appeal his discipline.

During the course of his performance improvement plan, Respondent disclosed and criticized the City of Oroville's tentative settlement of the Complainant's lawsuit prior to its final approval. The City of Oroville and the Oroville Police Department had EIS conduct a separate investigation and it was determined that Respondent had engaged in unprofessional conduct, violated his Performance Improvement Plan, and violated various Oroville Police Department policies when he released information about the tentative settlement agreement while the details were confidential prior to its final approval. The City of Oroville and the Oroville Police Department terminated Respondent's employment as a result of the sustained findings of this investigation. Respondent has appealed that termination, and his appeal is ongoing.

3. Date of Receipt By POST

POST received the Agency Misconduct report from Oroville Police Department on September 25, 2023.

III. 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 POST. The investigation included a review of the administrative investigation conducted by EIS on behalf of Oroville Police Department, which included interviews of three witnesses, the complainant, and the subject officer (Respondent), and a review of: body worn camera and other video surveillance footage, audio recordings, photographic evidence, Respondent's criminal report against the Complainant, associated Butte County Sheriff's Office reports related to the Complainant, and follow-up interviews of the three witnesses and Respondent by POST. All relevant documentation associated with the

administrative investigation was reviewed independently by POST. The Complainant did not submit to an interview to EIS and did not provide a medical release; however, she did initially give a statement to Butte County Sheriff's Office personnel which was captured on their body-worn cameras and documented in their reports. The Complainant did submit to an interview with POST for this investigation.

Information obtained was analyzed 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 that evidence that I believe establishes the requisite facts, and proves the serious misconduct charged by clear and convincing evidence.

IV. Factual Summary

On September 1, 2022, at approximately 2111 hours, the Complainant was arrested by Respondent for a violation of California Penal Code §602(k) – *Trespassing*, at the Dollar General in Oroville. Respondent had to remove the Complainant from underneath shopping carts to complete the arrest. At the time of her arrest, the Complainant did not have shoes on.[1][2][3]

Respondent transported the Complainant to the Butte County Jail from the Dollar General starting at 2121 hours. He completed the transport at 2124 hours. The distance traveled was 0.3 miles. This starting and ending mileage was provided by Respondent to Oroville Police Department Dispatch and shows his understanding of

[1] Oroville Police Department Arrest Report #22-2954
[2] Oroville Police Department Computer Aided Dispatch Log #2209010130
[3] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 15, lines 15-18

Oroville Police Department policy regarding information required when providing transportation. During this arrest, Respondent stated the Complainant did not have any apparent injuries.[4] While at the Butte County Jail, the Complainant was not cleared for booking by the jail medical staff due to her elevated blood pressure. In his arrest report, Respondent stated the Complainant was, in his opinion, "under the influence of a central nervous system stimulant." Sergeant Ali Khan, the on-duty supervisor who personally observed the Complainant, felt she was either under the influence of narcotics or experiencing a mental health issue.[5] Butte County Jail then made an appointment at the Oroville Medical Center for the Complainant to be seen and medically cleared for booking.

Respondent transported the Complainant to the Oroville Medical Center at 2143 hours and advised his beginning mileage was the same as his ending mileage, due to the close proximity of the hospital to the jail. This again showed Respondent's knowledge of the policy to provide starting and ending times and mileage. According to his statement in his administrative interview,[6] Respondent acknowledged the Complainant was refused booking because of a medical problem and she needed to go to the hospital, but he stated that he did not take the Complainant into the hospital to get medically cleared because he did not think she was "647f", which refers to California Penal Code §647(f) – *Public Intoxication*. This directly contradicts Respondent's arrest report regarding the Complainant being under the influence of a central nervous system stimulant. Respondent stated he pointed to the hospital entrance and told the Complainant to "seek medical treatment because you have high blood pressure and that's why the jail's not taking you." Instead, of seeking medical clearance, at 2149 hours, Respondent cited and released the Complainant while in the hospital parking lot

[4] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 5, lines 21-32
[5] POST Interview of Sergeant Ali Khan, dated 1/8/2025
[6] Sasek 1st Administrative Interview, dated 10/19/2022

and at 2201 hours, Respondent advised dispatch "X-ray released and advised to seek medical treatment."[7]

The Complainant was later observed by hospital Security Guard 1. Security Guard 1 was a recently retired Oroville Police Department officer who had served in law enforcement for 21 years and specialized in narcotics and was certified as an expert in narcotics by Butte County Superior Court. In Security Guard 1's opinion, at the time the Complainant was cited and released by Respondent at the hospital, she was "definitely" under the influence of methamphetamine. EIS and POST both interviewed Security Guard 1 regarding his observations of Respondent and the Complainant.[8][9]

Respondent was then called by Security Guard 1 on his cell phone because the Complainant was causing a disturbance.[10] Respondent was then dispatched back to Oroville Medical Center at 2211 hours.[11] Respondent, Oroville Police Department Sergeant Khan, and Oroville Police Officer Isaac Hererra all responded to Oroville Medical Center. Security Guard 1 advised that upon Respondent's and Sergeant Khan's arrival; the Complainant was positioned underneath an MRI trailer. Officer Sasek took the Complainant into custody, put her in handcuffs, and transferred her into the rear seat of his caged, patrol vehicle. Respondent stated he never activated his body-worn camera for this call[12]; even though Oroville Police Department policy regarding the use of body-worn camera required the use of the camera for the investigation.[13] Security Guard 1 never saw the handcuffs taken off the Complainant. Sergeant Khan stated Officer Sasek would've been the one who handcuffed the Complainant.[5] In his follow-up

[7] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 13, lines 21-51 and Oroville Police Department CAD Log
[8] EIS Supplemental Investigation Interview w/Security Guard 1, dated 10/6/2023
[9] POST Follow-up Interview with Security Guard 1, dated 1/8/2025
[10] Sasek's Call Log for 9/1/2022
[11] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 2, lines 47-51
[12] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 5, lines 6-8 and page 10, lines 34-45
[13] Oroville Police Department Policy 449

interview with POST, Respondent did not recall ever handcuffing the Complainant during this second call for service at the hospital.[14]

After securing the Complainant, Respondent, Sergeant Khan, and Officer Hererra, discussed what actions to take. Ultimately, the officers decided, with Sergeant Khan's approval, to transport the Complainant to Chico, where she resides.[15] Officer Hererra, stated while speaking with everyone, he made a "joke" to drop the Complainant off at Neal Road instead of taking her all the way to Chico.[16] Specifically, Officer Herrera stated he said, "Drop that bitch off on Neal Road!"[17]

During the conversation about what to do with the Complainant, Officer Hererra stated the Respondent seemed frustrated with both the Complainant and having to transport her to Chico. Respondent confirmed his frustration with being unavailable to support his fellow officers because of the Chico transport during his interview with POST.[14] Officer Herrera stated at the time of this comment/joke, both the Respondent and Sergeant Khan were leaning on the driver's side door/window when the comment/joke was made; the Respondent smirked and Sergeant Khan shrugged his shoulders in acknowledgment of Officer Hererra's comment/joke.[18] When asked, Officer Herrera stated the Respondent and Sergeant Khan "definitely" heard the comment/joke and would be lying if they said they didn't.

Respondent then exited the Oroville Medical Center with the Complainant in the rear of his caged vehicle. Respondent advised dispatch that he was "enroute" to an unknown location in Chico with the Complainant at 2218 hours and provided his beginning mileage.[10] At this time, Respondent stated he turned off his work cell phone to reboot RIMS. Respondent explained he "reset" his cell phone and RIMS because he had been

[14] POST Follow-up Interview with Robert Sasek, dated 2/5/2025
[15] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 3. Lines 12-14 and page 5, lines 1-4
[16] Transcript of Hererra Interview, pages 4-6
[17] POST Follow-up interview with Isaac Herrera, dated 1/8/2025
[18] POST Follow-up interview #2 with Isaac Herrera, dated 1/21/2025

having problems and never turned it back on during this incident.[19] He also chose to not activate his body-worn camera, in conflict with Oroville Police Department policy. There was no record of Respondent advising dispatch of experiencing any type of issues with RIMS. Furthermore, Sergeant Khan stated that Respondent never advised him at any point during the shift that he was having or had issues with his RIMS or radio.[5] Respondent still had the patrol vehicle radio system and his personal cell phone available to him for any communication needs.

Respondent stated while on the way to Chico, the Complainant's demeanor changed and she demanded to get out of the patrol vehicle. Respondent stated he took the next exit pursuant to Complainant's demands, which was Neal Road and drove about a quarter mile and let the Complainant out near the "worm food farm." Neal Road is the same location that Officer Hererra had just joked or made a comment about dropping the Complainant off at. Respondent stated the Complainant got out of the car and began cursing at him. Respondent decided it was easier for him to just leave the scene to keep things from escalating.[20] Respondent stated at the time he left her he just thought to himself "Bye!" Respondent further stated his thought process was that he "could probably re-arrest her but were just going to do this over and over again."[14]

Respondent again didn't activate his body-worn camera, in conflict with Oroville Police Department policy, because he stated he was already getting back into the patrol vehicle and felt it was safer to leave the scene.[21] Respondent left the Complainant on Neal Road, which was dark and desolate. Respondent admitted that he left the Complainant when she had no shoes, no cellular phone, no flashlight, and he did not offer to call someone for her or allow her to use his cellular phone to request assistance.[22] Respondent admitted he left the Complainant in a greater position of

[19] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 3, lines 16-19 and lines 43-52 and page 4, lines 2-27
[20] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 3, lines 21-41; page 6, lines 11-32; page 10, line 52; and page 11, lines 1-32
[21] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 11, lines 34-37
[22] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 15, lines 29-52

danger, and in contradiction to his Oath and the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics.[14] Additionally, Respondent stated the Complainant's behavior had abruptly changed for the worse on the drive and he later reported in his arrest report that the Complainant was, in his opinion, under the influence of a central nervous system stimulant. As such, when he left her on Neal Road, the Complainant was still under the influence of drugs and/or experiencing a mental health issue and had been experiencing high blood pressure which required medical attention. During his administrative interview, Respondent stated "I didn't deem her to be 5150 at that time. I thought she was of sound mind"[23] and that she had been making good decisions up until her demeanor changed and that he probably put her in a worse position than she was before.[14] Respondent did not provide his ending mileage or the location where he left the Complainant to dispatch over the radio because the radio wasn't working at that location. However, Respondent admitted he never tried to transmit anything over the radio.[14] Respondent stated he did not try to switch radio frequencies to possibly broadcast information to Chico Police Department dispatch, even though that was an option available to him.[14] Respondent had not turned his work cell phone or RIMS back on.[24] Respondent also didn't try to use his personal cell phone to call in the required information because he said he didn't think about it, although he admitted using his cell phone was his normal back-up communications option.[25] Respondent did not attempt to contact Sergeant Khan, via radio or on either of his cell phones, to advise him of the circumstances leading to dropping the Complainant off on Neal Road.[5]

Once Respondent was back in the Oroville area, he provided his ending mileage to dispatch. Since he didn't write down what the ending mileage was when he left the Complainant on Neal Road, Respondent instead provided dispatch with his mileage at the time he was back in the Oroville area. Respondent stated he advised Sergeant Khan that he dropped the Complainant off on Neal Road.[6] This advisement occurred

[23] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 15, lines 23-27
[24] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 7, lines 9-15
[25] Transcript of Sasek Interview, page 14, lines 14-28

while Respondent was at an unrelated call after he got back into Oroville. According to Sergeant Khan, he didn't specifically recall being told this information by Respondent. Sergeant Khan stated he felt that Neal Road was in the area of transient camps and that had he known the Complainant was left in a desolate area in the condition she was in, he would have had Respondent return to her and provide assistance.[26] Sergeant Khan stated that Respondent never told him any of the circumstances that led up Respondent leaving the Complainant on Neal Road until the civil lawsuit was filed.[5]

Respondent stated in a second administrative interview that he never heard Officer Herrera make the joke about Neal Road while at the hospital and the fact that he dropped the Complainant off at that exact location was "100% coincidence" and just "a very bad hand that was dealt in coincidence."[27] This was confirmed by Respondent in his follow-up interview with POST.

Security Guard 1 was asked about the Neal Road joke made by Officer Herrera and stated he never heard anything mentioned about Neal Road or the landfill. However, Security Guard 1 advised he was approximately 20 feet away from where this conversation took place. Sergeant Khan stated he didn't recall Officer Herrera making the comment/joke about dropping the Complainant off on Neal Road, although he didn't deny that Officer Herrera could've made the comment/joke, he just didn't recall hearing it.[5]

Respondent also stated that it was possible Officer Herrera made the joke/comment in his presence, but due to hearing problems he suffered from his time in the United States Army which resulted in him having to wear a hearing aid, he may not have heard it.[14] In contrast, Officer Herrera stated that if Respondent and/or Sergeant Khan stated they didn't hear the comment/joke, that they would definitely be lying because they each

[26] Transcript of Sergeant Khan Interview, page 9, lines 28-51 and page 10, lines 1-5
[27] Transcript of Sasek Second Interview, page 2-4

provided a non-verbal response to the comment/joke and were less than one foot away from him when the comment/joke was made.[17] Respondent smirked at Officer Herrera when the comment/joke was made and Sergeant Khan shrugged his shoulders.[17]

The next morning, September 2, 2022, the Butte County Sheriff's Office responded to a call for service at Franklin Construction on Neal Road because an injured person been discovered. Witness #1 reported the Complainant was injured and appeared to "be on something" (CHP 9-1-1 Call from Witness #1). According to the Butte County Sheriff's Office report,[28] the Complainant stated she was struck by a passing vehicle on her right side. Butte County officers also recorded that the Complainant stated she was driven out to Neal Road by the peace officer who had arrested her and left her out there before being struck by a passing vehicle. Butte County Sheriff's Office did a search of the immediate area and didn't locate any evidence of a traffic collision occurring (blood, broken plastic, etc.). The California Highway Patrol was not requested to investigate a possible hit and run traffic collision. The Complainant's injuries were photographed by Butte County Sheriff's, and it was documented her injuries were consistent with rolling in brush, but it also notated she had "road rash" and significant bruising on her right side.

V. Analysis and Findings

a. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(2) and California Regulation 1205(a)(2) – Abuse of Power?

Abuse of power, including, but not limited to, intimidating witnesses, knowingly obtaining a false confession, and knowingly making a false arrest. 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 abuse of power was a knowing abuse of the power and authority of a public office.
Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations Regulation 1205(a)(2)

[28] Butte County Sheriff's Office Report #22-06096

Respondent purposely and willfully used his position and power as a peace officer to take control and care of the Complainant. Respondent then neglected his oath and duties as a peace officer when he abandoned the Complainant on Neal Road to ensure she had no ability to return to Oroville, or any nearby metropolitan area, limiting her ability to obtain any services or further law enforcement encounters with her.

Clear and convincing evidence shows Respondent abused his power as a peace officer when he knowingly abandoned the Complainant on an unlit, desolate back county road, with complete and utter disregard for her safety or wellbeing. On September 1, 2022, Respondent took custody of the Complainant on two separate occasions. On the second occasion, Respondent returned to Oroville Medical Center after he received a call for service from Security Guard 1 because the Complainant was causing a disturbance and trespassing. Respondent, for the second time that evening, had to take custody of the Complainant by removing her from underneath an item, this time the MRI trailer. He then took custody and control of the Complainant and placed her in the back seat of his caged patrol vehicle.[14] The rear doors of the patrol vehicle could not be opened from the inside. Respondent then obtained approval from Sergeant Khan to transport the Complainant back to Chico where she stated her home was. During his interview with POST, Respondent admitted he didn't want to obtain the medical clearance and book the Complainant for his initial arrest of her because it would've taken him "a long time," "maybe 2-3 hours" when he initially dropped her off at the hospital for her initial trespass at the Dollar General"[14] Additionally, Respondent stated he was "frustrated" with having to take the Complainant all the way to Chico because he was going to be unavailable to answer calls for 45 minutes to an hour.[14] During this discussion at Oroville Medical Center with Sergeant Khan and Officer Herrera, Respondent admitted and voiced his frustration with having to transport the Complainant to Chico.[14] It was during this meeting that Officer Herrera admitted that he stated "Just drop that bitch off on Neal Road" in response to Respondent's frustration.[18]

Respondent stated he never heard this statement from Officer Herrera.[14] While enroute to Chico, after traveling about 15.5 miles, Respondent stated the Complainant became agitated and aggressive in the back of the vehicle and demanded to be let out of the patrol vehicle as they reached Neal Road. Of note, Neal Road was the exact location previously suggested by Officer Herrera. Neal Road is located in rural Butte County, between Oroville and Chico. Instead of continuing to transport the Complainant to Chico, as he promised and as approved by his supervisor, Respondent exited the freeway onto Neal Road and drove up to a mile before pulling over. Respondent then opened the rear door of the patrol vehicle and had the Complainant exit the patrol vehicle. Respondent stated the Complainant got mad at him and began kicking rocks at him. This caused Respondent to get back in his patrol vehicle and leave the scene. Respondent left the Complainant in a desolate location, during hours of darkness, with no public services available.[29] The Complainant was not wearing shoes, did not have a cell phone, purse, or flashlight. Respondent did not offer to call anyone for the Complainant and did not offer to her to use his cell phone prior to leaving her at this location.[30] Respondent just left her in a place of potential harm. Subsequently, after Respondent abandoned her, the Complainant suffered severe injuries requiring her hospitalization after being located the following morning. The Complainant did not have these injuries when she was arrested by Respondent.[31]

Conversely, the Complainant stated in her interview with POST, that as Respondent started to travel down Neal Road, she asked where they were going, and he said something to the effect of “Just shut the fuck up!”[32] Additionally, the Complainant stated that Respondent pulled over on Neal Road, he opened the door, grabbed her arm, and pulled her out of the patrol vehicle. The Complainant stated she asked Respondent, where they were and what was going on, and he told her “you’re not my fucking

[29] Transcript of Sasek Interview pages 3, 15, and 16
[30] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 15
[31] Transcript of Sasek Interview page 5
[32] POST Interview of Complainant, 4/15/2025

problem anymore…deal with it!"[32] Respondent got back in the patrol vehicle and sped off, kicking up dirt and gravel as he sped away. Respondent abandoned the Complainant on a remote, unlit county road without any access to a phone or other services so that he would no longer need to interact with the Complainant for the remainder of his shift. He was admittedly frustrated with the Complainant and wanted to make sure she wasn't going to be a problem for him or anyone else in Oroville Police Department. Respondent failed to activate his body-worn camera, issue any radio report, or call-in information to document where he abandoned the Complainant, even though these options were available to him.

During his interview with POST, Respondent agreed that his actions could be construed by someone as leaving her on Neal Road as a means of ensuring she wouldn't be an issue for him or Oroville Police Department for the remainder of that shift.[14] Respondent stated when he left the Complainant on Neal Road, he thought to himself "Bye!" Respondent further stated he thought he could've rearrested the Complainant, "but then we're just going to do this over and over again."[14] Respondent countered that his intention wasn't to abandon her on Neal Road when he left Oroville and stated if he "wanted to dump her, there were places in Oroville that he could have done so."[14] However, any locations within Oroville city limits wouldn't have ensured the Complainant would be kept from causing any further issues in Oroville that may have required Respondent's or any other law enforcement's response or attention.

It is indisputable that Respondent acted with indifference to Complainant's safety and placed her in a position of greater harm when he transported her from the Oroville Medical Center where she could receive medical treatment for elevated blood pressure to ultimately abandon the Complainant on an un-lit county road with no services available. Respondent's failure to accurately track his mileage, utilize the patrol vehicle's radio system or either of his cellular phones to report the incident or the final location where he abandoned the Complainant demonstrates further indifference to her harm

because it eliminated any record of the alleged confrontation, as well as the Complainant's last known physical location. He also failed to inform his supervisor why he deviated from the authorized transportation to Chico or any of his interactions with the Complainant that led to her being left on Neal Road.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Respondent abused his power as a peace officer when he demonstrated a clear indifference to the Complainant's safety and wellbeing when he took custody of her and purposely did not get her the required medical clearance for booking. Respondent's own statements demonstrate this clear indifference to the Complainant's safety. When asked why he didn't follow through with the medical clearance and booking of the Complainant, Respondent stated it would've taken too long, "two to three hours" and he wanted to get back to answering calls.[14] It is also undisputed that the Complainant was suffering from an altered medical state either through the influence of narcotics or behavioral/mental health issues, as noted by statements from Respondent, Sergeant Khan, Officer Hererra, and Security Guard 1 who each independently observed the Complainant prior to and at the Oroville Medical Center. Additionally, in her interview with POST, the Complainant advised she had used methamphetamine on the date of this incident and continued to feel the effects of the narcotic throughout the date of this incident, including when she was left on Neal Road.[32] The Complainant stated she had been suffering from other medical conditions throughout the night relating to dehydration and high blood pressure. These medical conditions were compounded by being struck by a vehicle while on Neal Road. The collision caused the Complainant to sustain internal injuries which included a ruptured small intestine, internal bleeding, damage to her colon, and other external injuries.[32] The Complainant's medical issues continued into the following day when she was discovered at the construction site and dealing with the Butte County Sheriff's office personnel.

Respondent's indifference to the safety of the Complainant ultimately placed her in a location where she sustained severe injuries. Respondent's actions were inconsistent

with his obligation to protect the public. He demonstrated a clear disrespect for the Complainant and frustration at performing his duties as a peace officer. Notably, Respondent does not refute any of his actions. His only justification for abandoning the Complainant on Neal Road is that her demeanor changed and she demanded to be let out of the vehicle and since he deemed this to be a courtesy transport, he let her out because he felt she had been making good decisions, even though, she was demonstrating mental health and/or narcotics-related issues throughout the day. The Complainant's statements clearly contradict this defense from Respondent. Furthermore, Respondent admitted that he placed her in a worse position from when he first took her into his care and custody and probably should have handled the incident differently.[14] When you take into account the statements from Officer Herrera, the Complainant, and Respondent, as well as the fact that Respondent purposely did not activate his body-worn camera and did not utilize his radio or cell phones, it becomes apparent and highly probable that Respondent willfully and deliberately took the Complainant to Neal Road in an effort to dump her there to insure she would not be an issue for him or Oroville Police Department for the remainder of the night.

The actions of Respondent during this incident clearly showed his intentions were to use his position of power and trust to intimidate the Complainant by discarding her in a location which made it virtually impossible for her to return to Oroville or seek any other services or assistance. Furthermore, the Complainant stated she never was told where Respondent was taking her, she never requested to go anywhere specific, and when he placed her into the patrol vehicle, she assumed that because he was a peace officer, he was either taking her to jail, to the hospital, to her home in Chico, or to a place of safety. Instead, he left her "in an even worse situation than I was already in."[32] The Complainant stated at the end of her interview that "regardless of what kind of situation I was in, if I was on drugs or not, I'm still a human being and I should be treated like a human being and my life is valuable."[32] Respondent's actions during this incident were a direct cause of the injuries sustained by the Complainant, which ultimately led to

multiple surgeries, the loss of a portion of her small intestines and colon, and the amputation of two of her toes.

VI. Supporting Evidence and Documentation

- Attachment A – Civilian complaint, dated 10/3/2022.
- Attachment B – Butte County Sheriff's Office Report #22-06096
- Attachment C – Oroville Police Department Report #22-2954
- Attachment D – Transcript of Sasek Interview
- Attachment E – Transcript of Second Sasek Interview
- Attachment F – Transcript of Khan Interview
- Attachment G – Transcript of Hererra Interview
- Attachment H – Transcript of Security Guard 1 Interview
- Attachment I – Sasek Call Logs
- Attachment J – Oroville Police Department CAD Log 2209010130
- Attachment K – Transcript of POST Interview of Sergeant Khan
- Attachment L – Transcript of POST Interview of Isaac Herrera
- Attachment M – Transcript of POST Interview #2 of Isaac Herrera
- Attachment N – Transcript of POST Interview of Security Guard 1
- Attachment O - Transcript of POST Interview of Robert Sasek
- Attachment P - Transcript of POST Interview of Complainant

VII. Findings

The evidence meets the clear and convincing standard to support the allegation(s) of serious misconduct as defined in Title 11 of the California Code of Regulations, regulation 1205(a)(2), Abuse of Power; and Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(2). A peace officer's inherent duty is to serve and protect the public by upholding the law. Peace officers are prohibited from placing members of the public into greater risk or intimidating or removing their ability to obtain public services. Reasonable grounds exist to submit this case to the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board and the POST Commission for consideration for revocation of Respondent's POST Certificates. The Division recommends that Robert Sasek's POST certification be **revoked.**