

INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

PEACE OFFICER NAME: Matt Lawrence White

POST ID NUMBER: A68-U16

EMPLOYING AGENCY: Sacramento County Sheriff's Department

POST CASE NUMBER: POST2507337

WRITTEN BY: Rick Collins

DATE: 2/19/2026

Contents

I. Executive Summary and Findings 3

II. Investigative Methodology 6

III. Respondent's Background 7

A. Respondent's Peace Officer Certificates and Employment 7

B. Respondent's Service Record 7

IV. Factual Background 8

V. Analysis and Findings 10

A. Does the alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) and Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6)? 10

VI. Supporting Evidence 11

I. Executive Summary and Findings

2024 Incident

On August 4, 2024, Sacramento County Sheriff's Office Deputy Matt White (hereinafter "Respondent") was pulled over by a Folsom Police Officer based on suspicion of driving under the influence, in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a). According to the police report written by Officer Eathan Vavak **(Attachment D)**, he observed a vehicle driven by Respondent driving north on Folsom Auburn Rd. just four minutes after midnight. Officer Vavak saw the vehicle swerve back and forth within its lane, while the driver drove at inconsistent speeds ranging from 40-55 mph. Additionally, the driver applied the brakes irregularly as the vehicle approached a red traffic light.

Officer Vavak stopped the vehicle and when he spoke with Respondent, Officer Vavak immediately smelled the odor of alcohol coming from inside the car and noted Respondent's speech was slurred. Based on driving observations, coupled with the smell of alcohol and Respondent's slurred speech, Officer Vavak conducted a series of field sobriety tests and a preliminary alcohol screening ("PAS"). The PAS results showed his blood alcohol content was 0.116% for test 1 and test 2. After observing Respondent's driving mechanics, the objective signs of his intoxication and his performance on the field sobriety tests, Officer Vavak opined that Respondent was under the influence of alcohol and was unable to safely operate a motor vehicle. Respondent was subsequently arrested for violating Vehicle Code sections 23152(a) (driving under influence) and 23152(b) (blood alcohol content of .08% or greater). At the Folsom Police Department, Respondent submitted to a breath test via the Drager Alcotest 9510 to determine his BAC. The results showed his BAC was .11%. In the body worn camera video of this incident (**Attachment-G)**, Respondent appeared to be cooperative and respectful during the encounter with Officer Vavak. Respondent was later booked at the Sacramento County Main Jail.

On June 11, 2025, Respondent pled no contest to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b). (**Attachment-J)** He was sentenced to four years' probation, four days in custody, fines, and was mandated to complete an 18-month second time offender DUI program. Respondent was employed by Sacramento County as a Deputy Sheriff when the arrest occurred in 2024. Following an Internal Affairs investigation, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department suspended him without pay for 160 hours. He was also reassigned to a non-driving position in the jail facilities for the duration of any restriction on his driver's license or the duration of his criminal probation, whichever is greater. (**Attachment -M)**

2016 Incident

Respondent had a prior DUI in 2016. Sacramento County Superior Court documents associated with the above-mentioned criminal case reveal Respondent was arrested for a violation of California Vehicle Code section 23152(b) [blood alcohol content of .08% or greater] on or about April 16, 2016. **(Attachment-N)** His blood alcohol level for the 2016 incident was .12%. Respondent was employed by Sacramento County as a Deputy Sheriff when the arrest occurred in 2016.

According to the arrest report, California Highway Patrol Officer Fuhrman received a call from dispatch on April 16, 2016, at approximately 2:13 a.m. The call reported an off-duty Stockton police officer was following a driver who he suspected of driving under the influence. (**Attachment-C)** Officer Fuhrman located the suspected DUI driver on State Route 99 near Florin Rd. The following was taken directly from Officer Fuhrman's arrest report to describe his observations:

"I observed the s/v (suspect vehicle) weaving from right to left in its lane. The right-side tires touched the broken painted white lines and raised pavement markers as the s/v weaved to the right, and the left side tires touched the broken painted white lines and raised pavement markers as the s/v weaved to the left. I moved from the #2 lane into the #3 lane behind the s/v, and I positioned the CHP unit closer behind the s/v to begin an enforcement stop. I activated the CHP unit's forward red lights and wig-wag lights. I advised the s/v over the CHP unit's public address system (P/A) to take the next exit on the right. The s/v began yielding to the right shoulder. I continued to advise the s/v to take the exit at 47th Avenue. The s/v continued on northbound SR-99 and eventually exited at 47th Avenue. As the s/v exited at 47th, I instructed the s/v to turn right onto 44th Street. The s/v turned right onto 44th Street. I advised the s/v to turn right into the parking lot. The s/v complied with instructions and pulled into the parking lot on the southwest corner of 47th Avenue and 44th Street."

The arrest report states that Officer Fuhrman spoke to the off-duty officer, who reported that Respondent nearly collided into the center median at one point, and almost hit a big-rig as he weaved all over the road. The big-rig honked at Respondent and Respondent continued weaving in and out of its lane.

The arrest report states Officer Fuhrman spoke to the solo male driver at the open driver's side window. He explained the reason for the stop and asked the driver for his driver's license. The male, who later verbally identified himself as Respondent, told the officer he did not have his driver's license with him; however, he did let the officer know he (Respondent) was a Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff. While talking to the driver, Officer Fuhrman noticed the strong odor of an alcoholic beverage coming from inside the vehicle. He also noted Respondent's eyes were red and watery and his speech was

slurred. When he asked Respondent if he had any alcohol during the evening, he told the officer he had one shot and two beers. He subsequently instructed Respondent to get out of his vehicle and walk to the side of the CHP unit.

While at the side of the CHP unit, Officer Fuhrman continued to smell alcohol coming from Respondent's breath and/person. Respondent was unsteady on his feet, and had slurred speech, coupled with red and watery eyes. When asked to rate his level of intoxication, using a scale from 0-10, with 10 being the most drunk he's ever been, Respondent told Officer Fuhrman he felt like he was at a "6" on the scale. When asked if he should have been driving, Respondent said, "No." Officer Fuhrman opined that Respondent had been driving under the influence of alcohol. He based his opinion on his observation of Respondent's driving mechanics, the objective signs of intoxication, and his poor performance during the field sobriety tests.

Respondent was subsequently arrested for a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a). Respondent was taken to the Sacramento County Main Jail where he completed two breath tests to measure for alcohol. Both tests registered .12% BAC. He pled no contest to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(b) on July 25, 2016. At the time of this first DUI arrest, Respondent was employed by Sacramento County as a Deputy Sheriff. He was sentenced to three years informal probation and ordered to perform 48 hours of service on the Sheriff's Work Project.

During his Internal Affairs interview, Respondent told the investigators he had two beers and three or four shots of Jim Beam within an hour and forty-five-minute timeframe before he left the bar in Stockton. When asked if he had taken any steps to correct his behavior, he had the following response:

"Um, yes I have. Um, the, ah, irony of it all is, I've …I've been well aware for the last couple of years that, ah, alcohol has been a little bit of a problem in my life and, ah, in September I was introduced to Alcoholics Anonymous and I've attended there and I've been off again, on again, and then, ah, I was 45 days sober prior to this arrest and had not touched alcohol and ah, ah, and since this arrest I've gone right back, I have a sponsor and back to the program and, ah, I met with my, ah, Lieutenant and, ah, at the Airport. I expressed my disappointment in myself and, ah, I'm taking it from there and of course I have abstained from alcohol since."

Following the Internal Affairs Investigation, he was suspended without pay for 160 hours, 80 of which were held in abeyance for one year. (**Attachment-N)** Additionally, he was transferred to a non-driving assignment for the duration of any restriction on his driver's license or the duration of his criminal probation, whichever is greater.

General Discussion

Based upon the above events that occurred in 2016 and 2024, coupled with the subsequent criminal convictions for each act, Respondent's actions meet the definition 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, 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. Respondent violated the above-mentioned criminal statute when he drove vehicles in 2016 and 2024 in violation of the California Vehicle Code restrictions for driving under the influence of alcohol. Respondent was convicted twice for driving under the influence within ten years, although the incidents were eight years apart.

According to the evidence presented in the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs investigation and my investigation, reasonable grounds exist for the suspension and/or revocation of Respondent's peace officer certifications pursuant to California Penal Code Section 13510.85(a)(1), as set forth in more detail in the attached Executive Review/Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division Recommendation (**Attachment 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 Sacramento County Sheriff's Department's Internal Affairs investigations, which included two interviews of the subject officer. (**Attachments E and F**). Additionally, I reviewed body worn camera footage, police reports, and court documents. Based on my review of the entire administrative investigations, the written investigative report(s), and my own independent investigation, the administrative findings were supported by reasonable grounds.

I analyzed the information I 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 that evidence that I believe establishes the requisite facts and proves the serious misconduct charged by clear and convincing evidence.

III. Respondent's Background

A. Respondent's Peace Officer Certificates and Employment

The table below sets forth Respondent's employment history (**Attachment B- EDI Profile**):

Dates	Rank	Agency
06/04/2002 to 7/24/2003	Police Officer	Fortuna Police Department
09/05/2004 to present	Deputy Sheriff	Sacramento County Sheriff's Dept.

Respondent is assigned POST ID A68-U16. He received the following peace officer certificates from POST (**Attachment B – EDI Profile**):

Certificate Type	***Certificate Number***	***Date Issued***
Basic	121846	09/19/2005
Intermediate	95804	04/27/2009
Advanced	130055	02/13/2023

B. Respondent's Service Record

When evaluating whether suspension or revocation is appropriate, Penal Code section 13510.8(c)(5) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations section 1213(a)(5) provide that the Commission must consider Respondent's prior conduct, discipline and service record and any prior instances of misconduct, including any incidents occurring beyond the time limitation for investigation in evaluating whether to revoke certification for the incident under investigation. 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 had three complaints dating back to 2016, which included one for discourteous treatment which resulted in an exonerated finding. The other two were for conduct unbecoming an officer related to his 2016 and 2024 DUI arrests. According to Sacramento County Sheriff's administrative investigation report number 2016PSB-158 relating to the 2016 incident, Respondent received a 160-hour suspension, without pay

of which 80 hours were held in abeyance for one year. (**Attachment N – Proposed Discipline for the 2016 DUI**). He was also transferred to a non-driving assignment. Respectively, in conjunction with Sacramento County Sheriff's administrative investigation report number 2024PSB-0421, relating to the 2024 incident, Respondent received a 160-hour suspension, without pay, in addition to his reassignment to a non-driving assignment. (**Attachment M – Proposed Discipline for the 2024 DUI**).

IV. Factual Background

a. 2024 DUI Incident and Internal Affairs Investigation.

On August 4, 2024, Respondent was arrested by a Folsom Police Officer for violating California Vehicle Code sections 23152(a) [driving under the influence] and 23152(b) [blood alcohol content of .08% or greater]. (**Attachment D- 2024 Folsom Police Department DUI Arrest Report**). Respondent's BAC measured .11% by volume. On June 11, 2025, Respondent was convicted of California Vehicle Code 23152(b), driving under the influence with BAC of .08% or greater. (**Attachment J – 2024 Court Records**). Sergeant Yeates was assigned to conduct an administrative investigation into Respondent's arrest for DUI. The investigation was submitted to POST subsequent to its completion. During his administrative interview concerning the August 4, 2024, arrest, Deputy White told investigators he thought he was okay to drive the night of his arrest. (**Attachment F – Deputy White's Interview Transcript from the 2024 DUI Administrative Interview**).

He said he fell short and made a mistake by having his last drink before leaving the bar. He admitted there was no reason for him to be driving that night and that his actions were not in line with department policy or the department's vision, mission, and values. He said his actions brought discredit to the organization. Additionally, he told investigators he started attending Alcoholic Anonymous meetings again after his arrest in conjunction with completing [redacted] (**Attachment H – Notice of Completion** [redacted]. [redacted] Additionally, Respondent told investigators he has been sober since January 12, 2025, and continues his weekly therapy sessions with a counselor [redacted]

POST Professional Conduct Northern Bureau interviewed Respondent on December 18, 2025. (**Attachment O – Transcript of POST Interview with Deputy White**). The interview took place at POST Headquarters, specifically in training room C. Respondent's Attorney, Joseph Hoffman of Mastagni Holstedt was present for the interview in its entirety. POST and Joseph Hoffman recorded the interview. The following is a summary of the interview and not a verbatim response to every question that was asked. Respondent maintains he had not had a drink of alcohol since January 12, 2025. Since then, he has abstained from consuming alcohol.

His efforts to stay sober are supported by weekly meetings with the counselor he worked with during his [redacted] He wanted to get to the root of why he was drinking. Additionally, he attends Alcohol Anonymous meetings once a week. His efforts are also supported by meeting with a counselor from the mandated 18-month DUI completion program, which he anticipates completing in February 2027. During the aftermath of his second arrest, he met with fellow employees who offered support and guidance for him. Respondent does not maintain a log pertaining to when he meets with his therapy counselor(s).

At the time of his arrest in August 2024, Respondent's driver's license status was valid, without restrictions. At that time, he was working the North Patrol Sector as a field training officer. He is currently assigned to the Rio Consumnes Correctional Facility. Although his driver's license status is currently restricted, he has the ability to drive a county vehicle if the current administration were to sign a form acknowledging the Respondent is required to use an ignition interlock device (IID) in his personal vehicle. If the administration signed the form, Respondent could drive a county vehicle if it became necessary.

b. 2016 DUI Incident and Internal Affairs Investigation

On April 16, 2016, California Highway Patrol Officer Fuhrman arrested Respondent for violating California Vehicle Code sections 23152(a) and 23152(b), DUI. (**Attachment C - 2016 California Highway Patrol DUI Arrest Report**). Respondent's BAC measured .12% by volume. On July 16, 2016, Respondent pled no contest to a misdemeanor violation of Vehicle Code section 23152(a). (**Attachment I – 2016 Court Records**). He was sentenced to three years informal probation and 48 hours of Sheriff's Work Project. At the time of his 2016 arrest, Respondent was employed as a Deputy Sheriff (**Attachment B – EDI Profile**). The Sacramento County Sheriff's Department initiated an administrative investigation into Respondent's arrest by the California Highway Patrol on April 18, 2016. Sergeant Marcus Gregory conducted an administrative investigation. That investigation was submitted to POST subsequent to its completion.

During his administrative interview, Respondent told the investigators he was aware that alcohol was a little bit of a problem in his life. (**Attachment E – Deputy White's Interview Transcript from the 2016 DUI Administrative Interview**). He said he was introduced to Alcoholics Anonymous in September of 2015 where he attended meetings off and on. He continued by saying he had been sober for 45 days before his arrest in April 2016. Since that arrest, he went back to AA, found a sponsor, and abstained from alcohol since the arrest. He also expressed the feeling of embarrassment he had for himself.

V. Analysis and Findings

According to the Sacramento County Sheriff's Administrative Investigation report, the agency received the complaint against Respondent on August 7, 2024. The agency sustained findings against Respondent for violating SCDSA MOU 18.5(p) -any failure of good behavior either during or outside of duty hours, which is of such nature that it causes discredit to the county or his/her employment. Respondent did not file an appeal after receiving disciplinary sanctions. POST received the agency misconduct report and the completed administrative investigation on August 22, 2025.

A. Does the alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) –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? If so, did the Respondent's actions constitute a violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(6)?

The clear and convincing evidence established that Respondent violated POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) and California Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) when he was arrested and pled guilty to driving under the influence in 2016 and 2024. On both occasions, Respondent was employed by Sacramento County as a Deputy Sheriff. Court documents related to both criminal cases articulate the criminal sentences Respondent received as a result of his conduct. Impaired driving is illegal because of the dangers it places on the drivers themselves and the general public as a whole.

Under Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) and POST Regulation 1205(a)(6), acts that violate the law constitute serious misconduct when they 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." Impaired driving and repeated acts of impaired driving are acts that violated the law that are both sufficiently egregious and also sufficiently repeated as to be inconsistent with Respondent's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public. As an officer who is charged with enforcing California law, including the Vehicle Code, Respondent's actions in driving impaired on two occasions establish he engaged in serious misconduct.

The clear and convincing evidence substantiated that Respondent violated California Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) when:

- He drove a vehicle on April 16, 2016, with his blood alcohol content at .12% by volume.

- He pled no contest to violating California Vehicle Code section 23152(b) on July 25, 2016.
- He drove a vehicle on August 4, 2024, with his blood content at .11% by volume.
- He was convicted on June 11, 2025, for violating California Vehicle Code section 23152(b).
- He knew in 2024 that he had already been convicted of DUI in 2016. As a peace officer, Respondent is charged with upholding the law and his repeated criminal offenses are inconsistent with that obligation.

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 California Penal Code section 13510.8.

VI. Supporting Evidence

Evidence	**Attachment**
Executive Review and Division Recommendation	A
Respondent's EDI Profile	B
2016 California Highway Patrol DUI Arrest Report	C
2024 Folsom Police Department DUI Arrest Report	D
Deputy White's Interview Transcript from the 2016 DUI Administrative Interview	E
Deputy Whites' Interview Transcript from the 2024 DUI Administrative Interview	F
Body Worn Camera Footage from Folsom Police Department	G

Evidence	Attachment
Notice of Completion [redacted]	H
2016 Court Documents and Details Related to Sentencing	I
2024 DUI Waiver and Plea	J
Informal Probation Order for 2024 DUI Conviction	K
Sacramento County Superior Court Minute Order	L
Proposed Discipline for the 2024 DUI Arrest/Administrative Investigation	M
Proposed Discipline for the 2016 DUI Arrest/Administrative Investigation	N
Transcript of POST Interview with Deputy White	O