Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

POST makes the following information available to the public pursuant to California Penal Code §13510.85(c) which establishes that POST shall publish the names of any peace officer whose certification has been suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation.

CASE NO.: POST2315501

SUBJECT OFFICER: Jasmine Marie Flanagan **POST ID:** C66-G27

EMPLOYING AGENCY: San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT: CPC §13510.8(b)(1) / 11 CCR §1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.

CASE SUMMARY:

On July 27, 2023, the San Bernadino County Sheriff's Department (SBCSD) submitted a report of potential serious misconduct to POST against Deputy Jasmine Marie Flanagan, hereafter "Respondent," alleging, that Respondent was dishonest during an administrative interrogation into her alleged misconduct. The events related to dishonesty in this report were actionable pursuant to Penal Code (PC) section 13510.8(g)(1)(A). Following POST's investigation and review, POST found, by clear and convincing evidence, that reasonable grounds existed for consideration of revocation pursuant to PC 13510.8. A summary of the investigative findings of the Division are as follows:

On July 10, 2023, SBCSD Respondent was involved in an on-duty at-fault vehicle collision during the pursuit of a stolen semitruck. During the pursuit, the Respondent rear-ended an on-duty Ontario Police Department (OPD) Sergeant who was also involved in the pursuit of the stolen vehicle, resulting in damage to both vehicles and injury to the OPD Sergeant.

Once the pursuit was relinquished to an allied agency, the Respondent was questioned about the collision and damage sustained to her patrol vehicle. Although she claimed no knowledge of the collision, the Respondent stated to multiple supervisors the damage to her patrol vehicle existed prior to her accessing the vehicle that day. During her administrative interrogation, the Respondent was dishonest, disavowed her statements to supervisors, and claimed she had not been properly trained.

On April 10, 2024, the Respondent resigned from SBCSD prior to the completion of the internal investigation.

ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

1. **The Respondent's misconduct violated CPC §13510.8(b)(1) and Title 11 CCR §1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.**

   CPC §13510.8(b)(1) and 11 CCR §1205(a)(1) defines dishonesty as "*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.*"

   The Respondent was involved in a rear-end collision wherein the patrol vehicle she was operating struck another vehicle with such force as to cause the driver's side push bumper to deflect back and dent the hood. The force of the impact also resulted in the sheet metal of the left front bumper to separate from vehicle body at the left front headlight assembly. As a result of the collision, the driver struck by the Respondent complained of back pain.

   During SBCSD's collision investigation, the Respondent was dishonest with a supervisor and collision investigator and claimed the damage sustained to the patrol vehicle was pre-existing. Digital evidence obtained showed the Respondent's patrol vehicle did not have pre-existing damage at the start of the Respondent's shift but returned after the pursuit with the described collision damage. During the Respondent's administrative interrogation, she was dishonest with investigators and denied she told supervisors that the patrol vehicle damage was pre-existing and alleged that she had not completed a patrol vehicle pre-shift inspection.

OUTCOME/IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST PEACE OFFICER CERTIFICATION:

The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division determined that reasonable grounds existed to seek revocation of the Respondent's certifications in this case. A notice of intent to revoke was served on January 17, 2025. The Respondent did not file a request for review within the 30-day response period, pursuant to CPC §13510.85(a)(2), thus resulting in default revocation of the Respondent's certification with no further proceedings. On March 7, 2025, the default order was issued and served to the Respondent. The Respondent, Jasmine Marie Flanagan's (POST2315501) (POST ID: C66-G27), peace officer certification was revoked on March 7, 2025.