

INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

PEACE OFFICER NAME: Richard Adams

POST ID NUMBER: C56-Q43

EMPLOYING AGENCY: California Highway Patrol

POST CASE NUMBER: POST2403212

WRITTEN BY: LEC Raymond Bechler, PCNB

DATE: 1/6/2026

Contents

I. Executive Summary and Findings 3

II. Investigative Methodology 4

III. Respondent's Background 4

A. Respondent's Peace Officer Certificates and Employment 4

B. Respondent's Service Record 5

IV. Factual Background 5

V. Analysis and Findings 10

A. Does the Respondent's alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) – Acts That Violate the Law – Specifically, CA Penal Code Section 243(e)(1)? 10

B. Does the alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty? 13

VI. Supporting Evidence 17

VII. Conclusion 17

I. Executive Summary and Findings

On February 25, 2024, California Highway Patrol (CHP) Officer Richard Adams (referred to as the Respondent) and his live-in girlfriend, (referred to as the Victim) were staying at the Hampton Inn Hotel in Poway, Ca. At approximately 4:00pm, the Victim called 911 after she and the Respondent got into an argument and his behavior was scary. The Victim waited in the parking lot for the police to respond.

San Diego County Sheriff Deputies arrived and contacted the Victim who explained the Respondent was an off-duty CHP Officer and was inside the hotel. The Victim told the deputies she and the Respondent were verbally arguing, and he did not get physical with her. The Victim added she wanted to drive back to their residence in Yucca Valley by herself and the Respondent wasn't letting her leave without him.

While talking to the deputies, the Victim informed them about several incidents of physical violence by the Respondent over the past two years.

One of the allegations of prior physical violence reported by the Victim was captured on their front door home camera system. This video was shown to the deputies by the Victim and depicted the Respondent dragging the Victim outside the front door of their residence, forcibly pushing her to the ground, causing the Victim to land on her head and upper torso. The video further showed the Respondent using two hands to get control of the Victim's right leg as he dragged her out of the front door while the Victim frantically yelled, "Richard, stop. stop." The Victim said this incident occurred on July 13, 2023.

The Victim further reported to the San Diego Sheriff Deputies three other domestic violence incidents which occurred in June 2022, May 2023, and February 2024 where she endured violence from the Respondent.

After speaking to the Victim, the San Diego Sheriff Deputies elected not to contact the Respondent for a statement, as all of the reported incidents of violence occurred in San Bernardino County. The deputies ensured the Victim safely drove away from the hotel parking lot without further incident with the Respondent.

Each of the prior incidents reported by the Victim were investigated both criminally and administratively. Ultimately, the San Bernardino County District Attorney's Office (SBCDAO) filed and pursued prosecution of the Respondent for one misdemeanor domestic violence charge involving the incident captured on video that occurred on July 13, 2023. The SBCDAO did not file on any of the other reported domestic violence incidents reported by the victim.

The criminal case against the Respondent was ultimately dismissed on February 4, 2025, by SBCDAO.

In the administrative investigation and subsequent findings against the Respondent, the CHP (Agency) sustained one allegation of committing domestic battery upon the Victim which involved the incident captured on video. All other reported domestic violence incidents were not sustained by the Agency. The Agency further sustained a finding against the Respondent for being dishonest when asked about the domestic violence incident captured on video.

Following POST's investigation and review, POST found, by clear and convincing evidence, that reasonable grounds existed for consideration of revocation pursuant to Penal Code § 13510.8. The findings in the POST Investigative Summary and Findings report are as follows.

II. Investigative Methodology

This report summarizes the findings related to allegations of serious misconduct. This investigation was conducted in accordance with the regulations and policies of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST). The investigation included a review of the Agency's administrative investigation which included interviews of witnesses and the Respondent.

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

This report is necessarily summary in nature and does not include every fact or issue that might be found in the underlying investigation and attachments. It does, however, contain reference to that evidence that 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:

Dates	Rank	Agency
06/26/2017 to 11/06/2024	Police Officer	California Highway Patrol

Respondent is assigned POST ID C56-Q43. He received the following peace officer certificate from POST:

Certificate Type	Certificate Number	Date Issued
Basic	195169	06/08/2019

B. Respondent's Service Record

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

California Penal Code section 13510.8(c)(5) provides that the Commission "shall consider the peace officer's prior conduct and service record, and any 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 Agency submitted the following Performance Appraisals for the Respondent:

- Rating period from 01/05/23 to 01/04/2024 - "Proficient" in all Critical Tasks
- Rating period from 01/05/22 to 01/04/2023 - "Proficient" in all Critical Tasks

Note – CHP rates employees as "Excellent", "Proficient", or "Deficient."

Prior to joining the CHP, the Respondent was an active-duty Marine and upon joining CHP, continued in his military career by serving as a Reservist Marine.

The Respondent has no prior adverse actions reported to POST.

IV. Factual Background

The essence of this case stems from the Respondent's act of domestic violence reported by the Victim to San Diego County Sheriff's Department Deputies Danielle Powroznik and Nathan McKemy. Each of the alleged acts of violence occurred in a residence that Respondent and Victim shared in Yucca Valley, San Bernardino County. The Victim and also her two children from a prior relationship resided in the home along with Respondent. Therefore, the San Diego County Sheriff's Office (SDSO) was the

documenting agency and the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Office (SBSO) was the criminal investigating agency.

The Victim reported to SDSO deputies four incidents. The July 13, 2023 incident, which is described below, is the focus of the Division's Investigative Summary.

On **July 13, 2023**, after the Victim sent a text message to an ex-boyfriend, the Respondent picked her up and threw her on the ground, dragged her across the house by her ankles, and then threw her out of the front door of their residence. The Victim shared with the SDSO deputies doorbell camera footage she had saved of this event. The Victim described the video as evidence of the Respondent assaulting her in an incident of domestic violence. The footage shows the Respondent standing behind the Victim with his arms underneath hers on her torso. Respondent then forcibly propelled the Victim out of the front door, causing her to land violently on her head and upper torso of the front porch with her legs still inside the house. The Respondent then grabbed the Victim's right leg and dragged her completely out of the house. During the video, the Respondent can be heard yelling, "Are you fucking kidding me, dude?" The Victim can be heard yelling, "Richard stop! stop!" The Victim allowed the video to be captured on SDSO BWC footage but refused to submit it separately to the deputies for inclusion with their investigation.

Criminal Investigation

SBSO Detective Jose Perez was assigned to investigate. On February 28, 2024, Perez drove to the Victim's work and explained he was following up on what she had reported to the SDSO. The Victim did not feel comfortable speaking at work and said she would call Det. Perez the following day. Perez went back and forth with the Victim several times before connecting on March 21, 2024. Perez called the Victim and summarized the events of domestic violence she had reported to the SDSO deputies. The Victim said she and the Respondent were in an argument at the hotel and she wanted to drive alone back to their home in Yucca Valley.

The Victim told Det. Perez that SBSO deputies responded to their house on two occasions within the past two years. Perez asked the Victim to describe what happened during these two incidents, but the Victim said the events happened too long ago to describe proper details. Perez asked about the video the Victim provided. The Victim declined to elaborate saying, "The video that you're referring to, that's not what happened in that video." [SBSO Report 2324-00523 page 4].

The Victim told Det. Perez she felt uncomfortable talking about the past incidents and was not able to recall them. She further wanted Perez to close the cases so she could put past events behind her, wishing no longer to be part of the investigation.

On March 18, 2024, Detectives Perez, Ables and an unnamed Sergeant contacted the Respondent at his residence in Yucca Valley. The Respondent admitted law enforcement was called twice to his residence by the Victim. Both occurrences, the Respondent said, were only arguments and did not get physical. The Respondent denied the Victim's account of physically harming her. He stated he and the Victim were working through alcohol difficulties and receiving help through A.A. and rehab. [SBSO Report 2324-00523 Page 6]

Det. Perez informed the Respondent about a video he received by the SDSO depicting physical abuse. Perez asked the Respondent if he recalled events on the video, to which he said, "I don't." The Respondent, however, said their relationship was very passionate sexually. [SBSO Report 2324-00523 Page 6]

Det. Perez showed the video to the Respondent who said he couldn't recall if they were arguing or any other details. He acknowledged the subjects in the video looked like himself and the Victim and said, "it appears as if they were fighting." The Respondent described how he and the Victim "role play in a rough manner which could be misinterpreted." [SBSO Report 2324-00523 Page 6]

Administrative Investigation

On June 20, 2024, the Respondent was interviewed by CHP Internal Affairs Investigators Scott Mason and Joel Holly (Investigators). Investigators asked the Respondent if he was aware of an incident captured on July 13, 2023, by a video camera system on the front door of his house involving him and the Victim. Respondent replied, "Yes." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 166] (*Note- this comment is in direct contradiction to what he told Det. Perez)*

Investigators had the Respondent read portions of Det. Perez's report which summarized the interview and interaction he had with the Respondent. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 167-169]

After reading the report, Investigators asked the Respondent if the statement was true and accurate and whether he wanted to clarify anything. The Respondent replied, *"The statement, yes."* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 169]

The Respondent added*, "I was kind of bum-rushed on this one [referring to the way in which the three SBSO Detectives initially approached him at his home]. And he [Perez] shows me the video, and then I'm watching it, and it looks like us. It looks like a fight, but I can't remember, or I don't remember, at that time, any of the events leading up to it…[the Victim] never showed me the video. She just said she had a video. And I didn't know really what she was talking about with the video thing, so after he [Perez] showed me that, I started thinking more and more about it. I was like, oh okay. So… we're into*

some, I guess, weird or alternative lifestyle type stuff where we roleplay. And part of the role playing we were doing at that point, during that time frame, was like a landlord/tenant type thing. So, …we didn't have the kids for a month…So we started playing around with the idea, like, hey we'll do a roleplay, kind of landlord/tenant type situation, and this is my house and you're my tenant and how you are going to pay the rent? So, this is awkward to talk about with, like, totally people that I don't know…so, we'd both been drinking, and then we were -- hey, let's play the – play our little game or whatever,…and so, she would repay me with sex. And that just our, that was captured on that Arlo [front door video camera]." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 171-173]

IA Investigators showed the Respondent the body worn camera footage from San Diego Deputy McKemy's BWC which recorded a video from the Victim's phone. The Respondent was asked to describe what was on the video. Respondent stated, *"Like I said to Deputy Perez, it looks like people fighting…Somebody getting thrown out of a door."* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 182]. When pressed to confirm whether he was in the video, the Respondent acknowledged that both he and the Victim were in the video and that the video was taken from the front porch of Respondent's home. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 182].

Investigators reminded the Respondent of the statement he gave to Det. Perez about role playing. Investigators asked the Respondent if he liked using the term role playing to describe the incident and he said, *"Yeah…That was the landlord/tenant thing where she didn't pay her rent, so I'm throwing you out of the house. Like, that - we'd both been -- we both agreed to that, so that's why this is so just…"* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 183]

Investigators asked the Respondent: how did the role playing scene end? The Respondent said, *"It ended with me shutting the door, and then opening the door, letting her back in, and then she proceeded to pay the rent in a sexual way, I guess you could say."* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 185]

Investigators asked the Respondent if he ever went beyond the other one's comfort level when role playing and how would he know whether he had ever gone beyond the other's comfort level. The Respondent replied that neither Respondent nor the Victim had gone beyond the other one's comfort level, but said they use a pre-determined safe word when it does. The Respondent said the Victim "probably" used a safe word in the past. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 186]

Investigators showed the "role playing" video tape again to the Respondent. While watching the video, Investigators paused it when Det. Perez asked the Respondent if he knew whether the Victim had a video and he said, "I don't." Investigators asked if the statement made to Det. Perez was accurate, because Respondent mentioned earlier that he knew the Victim had a video taken from the house. The Respondent said*, "Well,*

like I said, they [SBSO Detectives] contacted me the day of. He's talking about a video. I am trying to wrap my head around what video he's talking about, and then I realize, okay, that's probably the video, and then he shows me the video… So I was kind of caught off guard…if you think about it, I got …the small guy [Perez] asking me questions. I have this older lady sitting here, and then I have a Sergeant on this side of me, like, staring down. I mean, I'm nervous." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 213-214]

Investigators also asked the Respondent why, when Det Perez asked about what was happening in the video, Respondent spontaneously stated, "I don't know if we were arguing that night." The Respondent told Investigators, "[b]ecause again, …I'm looking at it, like, I don't know…looks like two objects wrestling…The one I saw this morning is a lot clearer. But it was not very clear as to what the image was at the time." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 216]

Investigators talked about Respondent's statement to Det. Perez that the video "was just us hanging out is what it looks like." The Investigators then asked Respondent "what's shown in this video, is that a normal hanging out?" The Respondent said, "So, again, it was us just hanging out. … I'm trying to understand how I'm going to explain to three strangers [referring to the three SBSO deputies] that we're into some weird stuff, weird sexual things…I don't feel comfortable telling them all the ins and outs." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 223-224]

Investigators again reviewed the video with the Respondent, specifically the Victim describing what occurred prior to what was captured on the front door camera on July 13, 2023. In Deputy Powroznik's BWC video, the Victim explains what happened that was captured on their front door video system as, "I texted an ex-boyfriend, and so [Respondent] picked me up and threw me on the ground and dragged me across the house by my ankles. Picked me up and threw me on the ground again and did it in front of (inaudible)." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 252]. Investigators asked the Respondent if the Victim texted an ex-boyfriend, and whether Respondent picked her up and threw her on the ground or dragged her across the house and he replied, "No." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 253]

Investigators asked the Respondent if the Victim's reaction (crying) while showing the SDSO deputies the video of what occurred at their front door was consistent with what Respondent would expect from the Victim, when showing a video of a consensual encounter. The Respondent said, "I think, in this video, she is intoxicated. I think she knows that this is going to be detrimental to our lives and to my life, in particular. And she knew that when she gives that narrative of what it looks like, that that's the end for me…" [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 254-255]

V. Analysis and Findings

The Present Allegations of Serious Misconduct

The CHP initiated an administrative investigation on April 15, 2024. Following a thorough investigation, the CHP sustained charges and then issued a Notice of Adverse Action against the Respondent for inexcusable neglect of duty, dishonesty, engaging in activities incompatible or inconsistent with official duties, and for failure of good behavior which is of such a nature that it caused discredit to the CHP.

The Respondent was terminated on November 6, 2024.

The Respondent filed an appeal from his dismissal with the State Personnel Board (SPB). The SPB held a hearing on April 1-2, 2025, with Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Douglas Purdy presiding. ALJ Purdy issued a Proposed Decision, concluding that Respondent engaged in an inexcusable neglect of duty, dishonesty, activities incompatible or inconsistent with Respondent's official duties, and other failure of good behavior. ALJ Purdy concluded that dismissal was a "just and proper penalty for [Respondent's] conduct." Some of ALJ Purdy's reasons for reaching this conclusion are discussed in greater detail below.

On June 9, 2025, the SPB carefully considered the Proposed Decision to uphold termination rendered by ALJ Purdy. The Board adopted the Proposed Decision, which supported the Respondent's termination. The Respondent then submitted a petition for a rehearing, which was denied by the SPB at its September 15, 2025 Board Meeting.

The CHP reported the Respondent's conduct to POST on April 19, 2024.

A. Does the Respondent's alleged conduct violate POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) – Acts That Violate the Law – Specifically, CA Penal Code Section 243(e)(1)?

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

CA Penal Code section 242 defines a battery as "any willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another." CA Penal Code section 243(e)(1) describes the criminal penalties that apply when an individual commits a battery against a current or

former spouse, cohabitant, fiancé, a parent of the defendant's child, or someone with whom the defendant has or had a dating relationship.

The Division concludes that there is clear and convincing evidence to prove the Respondent violated California Penal Code sections 242 and 243(e)(1) by dragging the Victim around by her legs and hands, and forcibly pushing the Victim to the ground of the front door patio area of Respondent's residence, as reported by the Victim and corroborated by video evidence. The Respondent's claim that the incident captured on video was a consensual role playing landlord/tenant scenario is not credible.

This Division reached its conclusion by considering the following evidence:

- The Victim's emotional demeanor while reporting the domestic violence incident from July 13, 2023, as she allowed the SDSO deputies to watch the video.

- The Victim, although reluctant to cooperate and provide details, never disclosed to deputies or detectives that the captured DV incident was role playing as a landlord/tenant scenario.

- In the Victim's letter she drafted and sent to "WHOM IT MAY CONCERN" on April 23, 2024, the Victim requested that the authorities drop the case so she can move forward in life. The Victim did not include anything in her letter about the video incident being role playing. [Victim Letter, dated April 23, 2024]

- The Victim kept a copy of the video for a reason. It is very likely that the reason she kept a copy of the video was to later show the video as proof that physical violence had been occurring in their relationship and at the hands of the Respondent.

- The video itself shows the Respondent's visible anger reflected in his facial expression and by physically pushing, grabbing and dragging the Victim while she was on the ground pleading for the Respondent to stop. The video also presents audible evidence of anger in Respondent's voice, as he curses during the incident.

- The video corroborates what the Victim reported to the San Diego County Deputies.

- There is no corroborating evidence to support the Respondent's claim of role playing.

As noted earlier in section V, above, the Respondent appealed his termination and had an SPB hearing on April 1-2, 2025. Administrative Law Judge Douglas Purdy presided. In his Proposed Decision, which was later adopted in full by the SPB, Judge Prudy cited Evidence Code 780 in determining credibility. That law provides that the trier of fact may consider any matter that has any tendency in reason to prove or disprove the truthfulness of testimony, including witness demeanor, character of testimony, extent of witnesses ability to perceive, recollect or communicate any matter about which she or he testifies.

Judge Purdy's decision provided in part as follows, "[t]he video footage from the doorbell camera was not consistent with consensual role-playing. [Respondent] lifted [the Victim] and tossed her onto the front porch, where she landed on her back. That action clearly could have resulted in serious injury to [the Victim], which makes it unlikely that she willingly consented to it. [Respondent's] demeanor in the footage appeared angry and aggressive. [The Victim] appeared to be frightened and screamed at [Respondent] several times to stop. [Respondent's] testimony therefore was not consistent with the video footage." [Board Resolution and Order/Proposed Decision, case 24-1576, pages 14 and 15].

When interviewed by the Division, the Respondent continued to maintain that the doorbell video footage was nothing more than consensual role playing. In assessing the Respondent's credibility, the Division finds it implausible to believe the footage is consensual role playing after watching the video numerous times. The Division's reasoning is based on the tone of voice and visible demeanor of the Respondent who sounds and appears angry, and that of the Victim who sounds frightened and seems to be protecting herself as she repeatedly tells the Respondent to stop.

Therefore, the Division finds the Respondent is not credible regarding his explanation as to what occurred on the doorbell video.

The Division also finds that the clear and convincing evidence substantiated that Respondent's conduct amounted to acts that violate the law as described in Commission Regulation 1205(a)(6), in that on July 13, 2023, the Respondent physically harmed the Victim by forcibly throwing her to the ground outside their residence and further dragging her on the ground by her ankles. This conduct was inconsistent with the Respondent's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public. The Division finds the Respondent's act of violence upon the Victim not only violated CHP's internal policies, but also CA Penal Code sections 242 and 243(e)(1), which confirms the Respondent's unlawful conduct. In addition to violating the CHP's policies with regards to off-duty conduct, clear and convincing evidence exists that Respondent violated California Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(6) – Acts That Violate the Law.

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

CCR 1205(a)(1) Dishonesty is defined in part as, "relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or the relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by a peace officer…"

SBSO Detective Jose Perez was assigned to conduct a criminal investigation concerning the Victim's allegations of domestic violence. Det. Perez informed the Respondent about a video he received from the SDSO depicting physical abuse. Perez asked the Respondent if he recalled the events on the video, to which Respondent said, "I don't." The Respondent, however, also volunteered that their relationship was very passionate sexually. [SBSO Report 2324-00523 Page 6]

Det. Perez showed the video to the Respondent who said he couldn't recall if they were arguing or any other details. He acknowledged the subjects in the video looked like he and the Victim and said, "it appears as if they were fighting." The Respondent described how he and the Victim "role play in a rough manner which could be misinterpreted." [SBSO Report 2324-00523 Page 6]

On June 20, 2024, the Respondent was interviewed by CHP Internal Affairs Investigators Scott Mason and Joel Holly (Investigators). Investigators asked the Respondent if he was aware of an incident captured on July 13, 2023, by a video camera system on the front door of his house involving him and the Victim. Respondent replied, "Yes." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 166] This comment is in direct contradiction to what he told Det. Perez.

Investigators had the Respondent read portions of Det. Perez's report which summarized the interview and interaction Det. Perez had with the Respondent. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 167-169]

After reading the report, Investigators asked the Respondent if the statement, as summarized by Det. Perez, was true and accurate and if he wanted to clarify. The Respondent replied, *"Yes."* When asked by Investigators if there was anything Respondent wanted to clarify or change from the statement, Respondent added*, "I was kind of bum-rushed on this one [referring to the way in which the three SBSO Detectives initially approached him at his home]. And he [Perez] shows me the video, and then I'm watching it, and it looks like us. It looks like a fight, but I can't remember, or I don't remember, at that time, any of the events leading up to it.… [the Victim] never showed me the video. She just said she had a video…I started thinking more and more about it. I was like, oh okay. So… we're into some, I guess, weird or alternative lifestyle type stuff where we role play. And part of the role playing we were doing at that point, during that*

time frame, was like a landlord/tenant type thing. So, …we didn't have the kids for a month…So we started playing around with the idea, like, hey we'll do a role play, kind of landlord/tenant type situation, and this is my house and you're my tenant and how you are going to pay the rent? So, this is awkward to talk about with, like, totally people that I don't know…so, we'd both been drinking, and then we were -- hey, let's play the – play our little game or whatever,…and so, she would repay me with sex. And that just our, that was captured on that Arlo [front door video camera]." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 169-173]

IA Investigators showed the Respondent the body worn camera footage from San Diego Deputy McKemy's BWC which recorded the video from the Victim's phone. The Respondent was asked to describe what's on the video. He responds, *"Like I said to Deputy Perez, it looks like people fighting…[s]omebody getting thrown out of a door."* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 182]. The Respondent further added it was he and the Victim in the video and the video was from the front door of their home. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 182].

Investigators reminded the Respondent of the statement he gave to Det. Perez about role playing. Investigators asked the Respondent if he liked using the term role playing to describe the incident and he said, *"Yeah…that was the landlord/tenant thing where she didn't pay her rent, so I'm throwing you out of the house. Like, we'd both been, we both agreed to that, so that's why this is so just…"* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 183]

Investigators asked the Respondent how the role playing scene ended. The Respondent said, *"It ended with me shutting the door, and then opening the door, letting her back in, and then she proceeded to pay the rent in a sexual way, I guess you could say."* [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 185]

Investigators asked the Respondent if he ever went beyond the other one's comfort level when role playing and how would he know if he ever went beyond the other's comfort level. The Respondent replied that they have not gone beyond the comfort level of each other, but said they use a pre-determined safe word when it does. The Respondent said the Victim "probably" used a safe word in the past. [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 185-186]

Investigators showed the "role playing" video tape again to the Respondent. While watching the video, Investigators paused it when Det. Perez asked the Respondent if he knew whether the Victim had a video and he said, "I don't." Investigators asked if the statement made to Det. Perez was accurate, because Respondent mentioned earlier that he knew the Victim had a video taken from the house.. The Respondent said*, "Well, like I said, they [SBSO Detectives] contacted me the day of. He's talking about a video. I am trying to wrap my head around what video he's talking about, and then I realize,*

okay, that's probably the video, and then he shows me the video…… So I was kind of caught off guard…if you think about it, I got the small guy [Perez] asking me questions. I have this older lady sitting here, and then I have a Sergeant on this side of me, like, staring down. I mean, I'm nervous." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 213-214]

Investigators also asked the Respondent why, when Det Perez asked about what was happening in the video, Respondent spontaneously stated, "I don't know if we were arguing that night." The Respondent told Investigators, "[b]ecause again, that was the first time I saw it, I'm looking at it, like, I don't know…looks like two objects wrestling…The one I saw this morning is a lot clearer. But it was not very clear as to what the image was at the time." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 215-216]

Investigators talked about Respondent's statement to Det. Perez that the video "was just us hanging out is what it looks like." The Investigators then asked Respondent, "what's shown in this video, is that a normal hanging out?" The Respondent said, "So, again, it was us just hanging out. … I'm trying to understand how I'm going to explain to three strangers [referring to the three SBSO deputies] that we're into some weird stuff, weird sexual things…I don't feel comfortable telling them all the ins and outs." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 223-224]

Investigators again reviewed the video with the Respondent, specifically the Victim describing to SDSO Deputies what occurred prior to what was captured on the front door camera on July 13, 2023. In Deputy Powroznik's BWC video, the Victim explains what happened that was captured on their front door video system as, "I texted an ex-boyfriend, and so he picked me up and threw me on the ground and dragged me across the house by my ankles. Picked me up and threw me on the ground again and did it in front of (inaudible)." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 252]. Investigators asked the Respondent if the Victim texted an ex-boyfriend, and whether Respondent picked her up and threw her on the ground or dragged her across the house and he replied, "No." [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Page 253]

Investigators asked the Respondent if the Victim's reaction (crying) when the Victim showed the video of what occurred at their front door to the SDSO deputies was consistent with how the Victim would present a consensual encounter. The Respondent said, "I think, in this video, she's intoxicated. I think that she knows that this is going to be detrimental to our lives and to my life, in particular. And she knew that when she gives that narrative of what it looks like, that that's the end for me…" [CHP IA – ADAMS Interview, Pages 254-255]

Appealing his termination, the Respondent had a State Personnel Board hearing on April 1-2, 2025. Administrative Law Judge Douglas Purdy presided. In his ruling, Judge Prudy cited Evidence Code 780 in determining credibility, which provides that the trier of fact may consider any matter that has any tendency in reason to prove or disprove the

truthfulness of testimony, including witness demeanor, character of testimony, extent of witnesses ability to perceive, recollect or communicate any matter about which she or he testifies.

Judge Purdy described his conclusion in part as follows, "[t]he video footage from the doorbell camera was not consistent with consensual role-playing. [Respondent] lifted [the Victim] and tossed her onto the front porch, where she landed on her back. That action clearly could have resulted in serious injury to [the Victim], which makes it unlikely that she willingly consented to it. [Respondent's] demeanor in the footage appeared angry and aggressive. [The Victim] appeared to be frightened and screamed at [Respondent] several times to stop. [Respondent's] testimony therefore was not consistent with the video footage." [Board Resolution and Order/Proposed Decision, case 24-1576, pages 14 and 15].

Judge Purdy further believed the Respondent was not credible. In his summary regarding the Government Code section 19572(f) charge of dishonesty, Judge Purdy ruled, "[Respondent] falsely told [SBSO] Deputy Perez that he did not know what the doorbell video footage depicted. He falsely told [CHP] Sergeant Mason that the July 13, 2023, incident was consensual role-playing and that his disputes with [the Victim] had never escalated into physical conflicts." [Board Resolution and Order/Proposed Decision, case 24-1576, page 20].

When the Division subsequently interviewed the Respondent, he continued to maintain that the doorbell video footage was nothing more than consensual role playing. In assessing the Respondent's credibility, the Division finds that Respondent is not credible. It is implausible that the footage depicts consensual role-playing, and this is clear after carefully examining the video. The Division's conclusion is based, in part, on the tone of voice of the Respondent who sounds and appears angry, and the actions of the Victim, who seems to be protecting herself and sounds frightened as she repeatedly tells the Respondent to stop. Therefore, the Division finds the Respondent's representations that the July 13, 2023 video depicts a consensual role playing encounter between Respondent and the Victim are not credible.

The Division finds that the clear and convincing evidence substantiated that Respondent's conduct amounted to dishonesty as described in Commission Regulation 1205(a)(1), in that the Respondent made dishonest statements, first to the SBSO investigators who were investigating a crime, and then later to CHP administrative investigators who were investigating the same events as part of an investigation into misconduct. The Division finds the Respondent's statements to the SBSO and CHP concerning the July 13, 2023 video established clear and convincing evidence he violated California Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.

VI. Supporting Evidence

Evidence	Attachment
Executive Review and Division Recommendation	A
Respondent's EDI Profile	B
San Diego County Sheriff's Report # 24107775	C
San Bernardino County Sheriff's Report # 232400513	D
CHP IA Case Summary P24-053	E
Victim Letter	F
Doorbell Video Footage	G
SPB- Board Resolution and Order/Proposed Decision Case # 24-1576	H
Respondent IA Interview – Transcript	I
Respondent Interview with POST LEC - Transcript	J

VII. Conclusion

As stated above, the clear and convincing evidence substantiated violations of California Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(6) and (b)(1) and POST Regulation 1205(a)(6) and (a)(1). 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 of Respondent's peace officer certificates pursuant to California Penal Code Section 13510.8.