CHICO POLICE DEPARTMENT

1460 HUMBOLDT RD CHICO, CA 95928 530-897-4900

FELONY REPORT

Case 23-006447

OFFENSES

F/M	A/C	Offenses (A/C - Attempt/Completed)
F	C	273.5(A) PC Inflict corporal injury on spouse/cohabitant/datng relatnshp - Aggravated
M	C	273A(B) PC Child abuse w/o gbl/dth - Family offenses, non-violent
M	C	653M(A) PC Annoying telephone call:obscene/threatening - Intimidation

Date Occurred	Time Occurred	Incident #
06/15/23-09/26/23	Unknown	2309260172

Date Reported	Time Reported
09/26/2023	1112

Related Cases

Date Printed	Time Printed	Printed By
10/31/2024	14:50:59	P02915

Latitude	Longitude
[redacted]	[redacted]

Location	Beat	Area	Disposition	Dispo Date
[redacted]		INCAMP		

Location Type	Location of Entry	Method of Entry	Point of Entry	Alarm System	Means of Attack (Robbery)

Victim and RP	Drivers License	Cell Phone	Email
[redacted]			

Residence Address	Notified of Victim Rights	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
[redacted]						

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes
		[redacted]			

Assistance Rendered/Victim Disposition	Transporting Agency	Means of Attack (Assaults)
Refused Aid		

Description of Injuries	Other Information
Apparent Minor Injury	

Name	Drivers License	Cell Phone	Email

Residence Address	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes

Suspect	Action Taken	Charges
[redacted]		273.5(A) PC, 273A(B) PC, 653M(A) PC

Residence Address	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
[redacted]					

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes
				[redacted]	

Identifying Features	Cell Phone	Drivers License	Arrest Number
	[redacted]		

Aliases	CII
	[redacted]

VEHICLES

Status	Vehicle Make and Model	License/State	VIN	Val Damgd

OFFICERS

Prepared By	Date	Assisted By	Approved By	Date
P04095 - Williams, Michael S	09/26/2023		P04095 - Williams, Michael S	09/27/2023

Routed To	Date	Routed To	Date	Notes
DA - Dist. Attny.	01/23/2024			
DA - Dist. Attny.	01/26/2024			

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

Victim [redacted]	Drivers License	Cell Phone	Email			
Residence Address	Notified of Victim Rights	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
[redacted]						
Business Name and Address		Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes
			[redacted]			
Assistance Rendered/Victim Disposition Refused Aid		Transporting Agency	Means of Attack (Assaults)			
Description of Injuries Apparent Minor Injury		Other Information				

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

On 9/26/202, at approximately 1100 hours, I responded to [redacted] regarding threats from her ex-boyfriend, [redacted] wanted advise on how to handle the threats and threatening text messages. With the information at hand, I responded to the address and met with [redacted] in the parking lot of the apartment complex. The following is a summarized version of her statement and is not verbatim or sequential order. For complete details please refer to the body worn camera.

Statement of [redacted]

[redacted] just recently broke up with her boyfriend of three years, [redacted] has a two year old daughter, [redacted] has two other children [redacted] with two separate fathers. [redacted] currently does not live with [redacted] and she believes that [redacted] is living somewhere in [redacted] is trying to get sole physical and legal custody of [redacted] because she feels that [redacted] is an unsuited father. [redacted] is an alcoholic and has mental health issues. She feels that [redacted] is not getting the appropriate help to be a successful parent. [redacted] to be a part of [redacted] life but wants the visitation to be productive instead of unproductive and volatile.

The relationship [redacted] has had with [redacted] has taken a turn for the worst. Over the last several days, [redacted] has been receiving numerous text messages from [redacted] that she felt was harassing and unnecessary. The text messages were the two "talking shit" and calling each other names. At one point, [redacted] to watch her back and was using derogatory names during a text thread. [redacted] did not take the threats seriously and she felt that [redacted] was drunk and angry.

According to [redacted] as she was texting back and forth with [redacted] about their relationship, she received a random phone call from [redacted] (Caller Identification). She received about seven phone call during a 5 minute period this morning at approximately 0755 hours. She has no idea who [redacted] is or why she is calling her phone. She thinks that [redacted] is friends with [redacted] is using [redacted] phone to contact her.

[redacted] continued by telling me that [redacted] has been violent in the past with her. She has never reported the incident until today. On June 11th, 2023 at approximately 1000 hours, [redacted] was at her apartment to visit their daughter. [redacted] was drinking and was acting erratic. [redacted] wanted to talk to [redacted] about their relationship and how he wanted to make their relationship work. [redacted] hat the relationship was over and that she did not want to date him anymore. [redacted] tried to walk away from him because the argument was heated. As she tried to walk out the front door of the apartment, [redacted] grabbed [redacted] by the waist and pulled her back inside. [redacted] was holding [redacted] at the time. [redacted] then threatened to call the police and pulled out her phone.

[redacted] told [redacted] to stop; however, he refused and was still hostile and argumentative with her. As she tried calling the police, [redacted] grabbed the phone out of her hand and threw the phone at her face - causing an injury to the left side of her chin and cheek. After the incident, [redacted] eft the apartment and later sent her a text apologizing. The text stated:

[redacted] 6/11/23 at 1725 hours:

"It got out of hand when you forced my phone out of my hands. You never learn to keep your hands to yourself. Nothing I did justified you entraping me and hitting me. I said I was done with you truth hurts."
[redacted] 6/11/2023
"I understand and I'm sorry I didn't mean to even touch you."

For details of the text conversation please refer to copies of the text messages [redacted] sent. They were logged into evidence in the X-Drive.

[redacted] continued by saying that in December 2022, he spanked [redacted] so hard that it caused bruising and swelling to her buttocks. [redacted] claimed that [redacted] was at the apartment visiting her daughter and as he was playing with her, [redacted] threw a phone at [redacted] striking him in the face. [redacted] allegedly got upset and yelled at [redacted] and began spanking her over her diaper. [redacted] claimed that [redacted] hit [redacted] so hard over the diaper, it left a hand print on her right buttocks. [redacted] did not witness the incident because she was downstairs while they were upstairs. [redacted] just heard [redacted] crying and [redacted] yelling. After the spanking [redacted] left the apartment. [redacted] took photos of the injuries and sent me a copy.

[redacted] said that [redacted] was not home and was at day care. I was unable to get a disclosure from her about the incident. [redacted] did not provide any further in her statement.

End of Statement.

On 9/26/2023, I spoke with [redacted] over the phone. The following is a summarized version of his statement. His statement is not verbatim or in sequential order. The statement is just a summary and for complete details please refer to my BWC.

Statement of [redacted]

[redacted] dated for approximately three years and have one child in common. [redacted] used to live with [redacted] and periodically stayed with her at [redacted] was apologetic and sent the text messages out of frustration. He does not wish any harm toward [redacted] even though he feels that she is manipulating the situation. [redacted] sent the annoying messages after he was drinking and knew it was a bad idea.

[redacted] indicated that he does not remember the domestic violence incident that [redacted] was referring to in which she was struck in the face with a phone. [redacted] only remembers minor details and claimed that he would not touch or hurt [redacted] especially if [redacted] was in her arms. He denied pulling [redacted] back into the apartment nor does he remember hitting her and grabbing a phone out of her hands.

I asked [redacted] about the markings to [redacted] [redacted] immediately began crying and denied ever hitting [redacted] or doing anything to hurt her. [redacted] was adamant that he would never hit his daughter or cause any injury to her. [redacted] does not even recall the incident that [redacted] was referring to and claimed that [redacted] was lying. [redacted] did not provide any further in his statement.

End of Statement.

I collected the photos of the text messages and injury [redacted] sustained to her face. The photos were logged into evidence on the X-drive. I conducted an in-house records check and I did not see any previous reported domestic violence incidents between [redacted] It should also be noted that [redacted] did not want any domestic violence resource information and has worked with victim assistance in the past and in seeking a restraining order.

Disposition:

Forward a copy of this report to the Butte County District Attorney's Office for review. Forward a copy of this report to Butte County Child Services Department.

Prepared By:		Date:	Approved By:		Date:
P04095	WILLIAMS, MICHAEL S	09/27/2023	P04095	WILLIAMS, MICHAEL S	09/27/2023
[X] *BODY CAMERA RECORDED*					

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

CHICO POLICE DEPARTMENT

CAD INCIDENT REPORT
2309260172

10/31/2024

Location	Cross Streets	City
[redacted]		

Incident Type	Call Taker	Dispatcher
THRT - VERBAL THREATS	P00227	P04095

Date	Priority	Primary Unit	Beat	Fire Zone	Area	Map	Source	Channel
09/26/2023	3	33S15	1	10208	1NCAMP		TELEPHONE CALL	

Caller Name	Caller Address	Caller Phone
[redacted]		[redacted]

Dispositions	Weapon	Alm Level	Case Number
Report Taken, No Report Taken			[redacted]

Vehicles	Associated Incidents

Incident Times

Received	11:06:57
Created	11:12:23
Dispatched	11:17:00
En Route	
On Scene	11:17:06
Closed	11:32:38
Revd-Closed	25:41

Special Circumstances

Persons	Sex	DOB	Race	DL
[redacted]				

Unit Times	Officers	Dispatched	Enroute	On Scene	Clear	Disp-On Scene	Enrt-On Scene	On Scene-Clear	Disp-Clear
33S15	P04095	11:17:00		11:17:06	11:32:38	00:06	N/A	15:32	15:38
33S15	P04095	11:53:09		11:53:17	12:18:52	00:08	N/A	25:35	25:43

Incident Comments

RP WANTING TO RPT HARASSMENT/THREATS MADE BY HER EX
EX IS NOW HAVING OTHER PEOPLE THREATEN HER AND SAY THEY ARE GOING TO 242 HER [redacted]
RP WAS ADVISED BY [redacted] (WHERE THE MALE LIVES) THAT WE WILL PROVIDE AN EPO AT ANY TIME

TIME	#	EVENT	BY
11:12:24	1	[redacted]	P00227
11:12:58	2	[redacted] WILL BE SERVING THE MALE WITH FAMILY COURT	P00227
	3	PAPERWORK TOMORROW	
11:13:29	4	[redacted] added to incident	P00227
11:13:29	5	[redacted]	P00227
11:13:29	6	Wanted Check: [redacted]	P00227
11:13:29	7	Missing Person[redacted]	P00227
11:13:29	8	APPS: [redacted]	P00227
11:14:16	9	RP ALSO MENTIONED PRIOR PHYSICAL DV INCIDENTS - UNK IF THOSE	P00227
	10	ARE REPORTED	
11:17:00	11	[redacted]	P04095
11:17:06	12	[redacted]	P04095
11:32:38	13	[redacted]	P03280
11:32:38	14	33S15 Closed - Disposition NR	P03280
11:52:56	15	Reopened	P03280
11:53:09	16	33S15 [redacted]	P03280
11:53:17	17	33S15 [redacted]	P03280
11:54:21	18	33S15 [redacted]	P03280
11:54:35	19	33S15 CD4.	P03280
12:18:52	20	33S15 10-8.	P02280
12:18:53	21	33S15 Closed - Disposition RX	P02280

CHICO POLICE DEPARTMENT

1460 HUMBOLDT RD CHICO, CA 95928 530-897-4900

INFORMATION REPORT

Case 24-002507

OFFENSES

F/M	A/C	Offenses (A/C - Attempt/Completed)
M	C	242 PC Battery on person - Simple

Date Occurred	Time Occurred	Incident #
04/15/2024	1203	2404150194

Date Reported	Time Reported
04/15/2024	1207

Related Cases

Date Printed	Time Printed	Printed By
10/31/2024	16:06:37	P02915

Latitude	Longitude
[redacted]	[redacted]

Location	Beat	Area	Disposition	Dispo Date
[redacted]	4	4HUMBO	Unfounded	

Location Type	Location of Entry	Method of Entry	Point of Entry	Alarm System	Means of Attack (Robbery)

Victim	Drivers License	Cell Phone	Email			
[redacted]						

Residence Address	Notified of Victim Rights	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
	No		[redacted]			

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes

Assistance Rendered/Victim Disposition	Transporting Agency	Means of Attack (Assaults)
Refused Aid		

Description of Injuries	Other Information
None	

Reporting Party	Drivers License	Cell Phone	Email			
[redacted]						

Residence Address	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
[redacted]					

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes
		[redacted]			

Suspect	Action Taken	Charges			
[redacted]					

Residence Address	Residence Phone	DOB	Age	Sex	Race
[redacted]					

Business Name and Address	Business Phone	Height	Wt	Hair	Eyes

Identifying Features	Cell Phone	Drivers License	Arrest Number

Aliases	CII

VEHICLES

Status	Vehicle Make and Model	License/State	VIN	Val Damgd

OFFICERS

Prepared By	Date	Assisted By	Approved By	Date
P03893 - Page, William	04/15/2024		P00677 - Saldano, Jordan	04/21/2024

Routed To	Date	Routed To	Date	Notes

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

On 4-15-2024 at approximately 1203 hours I responded to [redacted] Chico, Butte Co., California for a juvenile issue.

The reporting party, [redacted] stated her son, [redacted] had been body slammed while at a school function by another student and the other student had threatened to stab [redacted]

I contacted [redacted] at the school, who was waiting to speak to the assistant principal, [redacted] was in [redacted] with a written statement about the incident.

I accompanied all parties to [redacted] ffice and obtained a statement from [redacted] The following is a summary of [redacted] statement. [redacted] aid he was at the school dance on 4-12-24. While at the dance, another student, identified as [redacted] began to cause issues with [redacted] stated while he was rough housing with some friends in the dance, [redacted] "body slammed" him. [redacted] body slammed him while at the dance approximately twelve times. [redacted] also threatened to stab him at one point during the dance. [redacted] said he was constantly being bullied by [redacted] and tried to stay away from him. [redacted] was uninjured from the incident. [redacted] said he told multiple chaperons about the incident and nothing was done. [redacted] provided a written statement to [redacted]

[redacted] was provided a case number for the incident and was provided my contact information. [redacted] requested to speak to a school resource officer regarding the incident. [redacted]

I then spoke to [redacted] regarding the incident. [redacted] aid there was some surveillance of the incident, but stated it was not what was described by [redacted] [redacted] played the surveillance of the incident which shows multiple interactions throughout the dance between [redacted] The surveillance footage shows [redacted] push [redacted] to the ground once and shows the two arguing multiple times throughout the night. [redacted] never appears to be in fear of [redacted] nd appears to challenge [redacted] and approach him multiple times during the night.

[redacted] stated the school would contact [redacted] about the incident, and I informed [redacted] would be providing an information report to school resource officers. I obtained all of the involved subjects information from [redacted] and provided him with the case number as well.

REC.: Copy to SRO
Information Only

Prepared By:		Date:	Approved By:		Date:
P03893	PAGE, WILLIAM	04/20/2024	P00677	SALDANO, JORDAN	04/21/2024
[X] *BODY CAMERA RECORDED*					

CONTROLLED DOCUMENT - NOT FOR DUPLICATION RELEASED TO:

CITY OF CHICO MEMORANDUM

TO: Lt. Jeff Durkin

DATE: 01/16/2025

FROM: Sergeant Paul Ratto

FILE: IA# 24-0017

SUBJECT: Administrative Investigation Report

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

On 10/20/24 Sgt. Reid was notified by dispatch that a citizen, [redacted], wanted a phone call. [redacted] reported that the mother of his child, [redacted] was in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer. He reported the relationship began after the officer responded to a domestic dispute incident. Sgt. Reid drafted a memo to Lt. Love. Cpt. Pena authored a memo to Lt. Durkin to have the incident investigated by the Professional Standards Office. Sgt. Williams was determined to be the Officer involved in this case.

CITY OF CHICO ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY 1050

-Nepotism And Conflicting Relationships

City OF CHICO ADMINSTRATIVE POLICY 339
-Standards Of Conduct

On September 23, 2024 Sgt. Williams' attorney Julie Fox was notified of Sgt. Williams' Notice of Intended Discipline for termination as a result of Chico Police Internal Affairs Investigation 23-007. Sgt. Williams' attorney attended his Skelly Hearing where thereafter Sgt. Williams termination was confirmed by the Chief of Police. Sgt. Williams chose to not submit to any interviews citing his [redacted] communicated through his attorney Julia Fox.

DATE/TIME/LOCATION/INCIDENT

Date 09/26/2023,1100 hours[redacted]

INVOLVED PARTIES

Source of complaint: [redacted]
Involved Citizen[redacted]
Involved Officer: Sergeant Michael Williams
Assigned Investigator: Sergeant Paul Ratto.

Date of original complaint 10/20/2024.

BACKGROUND

On 10/20/24 Sgt. Reid was notified by dispatch that a citizen [redacted], wanted a phone call. [redacted] reported that the mother of his child, [redacted], was in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer. He reported the relationship began after the officer responded to a domestic dispute incident. An investigation revealed two Chico Police cases involving [redacted] handled by Sgt. Michael Williams [redacted] by Officer William Page. Further investigation showed Sgt. Williams electronic devices near [redacted] address on multiple occasions during his shift. [redacted] admitted to being in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer and communicating with him on a phone she had sent him messages regarding a criminal case.

INVESTIGATION

I conducted a CAD query for the cases involving [redacted]. I saw two Chico Police reports. An investigation revealed two Chico Police cases involving [redacted] handled by Sgt. Michael Williams and [redacted] handled by Officer William Page. I reviewed both cases and did not note any unprofessional or out of ordinary conduct on the written reports or by viewing the body camera.

Case # 23-006447:

On 09/26/23 at 11:17 AM, Sgt. Williams was dispatched to [redacted] for a harassment call reported by [redacted] reported her ex boyfriend, [redacted], was threating her and getting other people to threaten her via text message. Sgt. Williams met with [redacted] in the parking lot of her apartment complex. Sgt. Williams contacted [redacted] and took her report. During the contact, [redacted] disclosed to Sgt. Williams that she was battered by her ex boyfriend and that he physically abused their child in common. Sgt. Williams took a domestic battery report and child abuse report from [redacted]. Sgt. Williams asked [redacted] to send him screen shots of the text messages sent by her ex-boyfriend. Sgt. Williams told [redacted] she could use the number he called her from at the initiation of his contact with her. I did not see any conduct by Sgt. Williams during this contact that was unprofessional. I also did not see any overt flirtation by either Sgt. Williams or [redacted] during this call for service. This case did initiate phone communication between Sgt. Williams and [redacted] that I will reference later in this report.

Interview with [redacted]:

I phoned [redacted] on October 31,2024, at 4:30 PM. The following is a summary of my interview [redacted] (For exact details refer to audio recording).

I identified myself to [redacted] as Sgt. Paul Ratto with the Professional Standards Office at Chico PD. I told [redacted] that a complaint came into the Chico Police Department. I told

[redacted] that part of my job was to investigate allegations of misconduct by our officers. I told [redacted] that her name was brought up as having a sexual relationship with one of our officers that may have stemmed from an on duty contact. I told [redacted] I was calling to find out if there was any truth to this.

[redacted] stated that this report was probably made by her daughter's father [redacted] I told [redacted] that I would not disclose who reported the matter. [redacted] stated that she had mentioned to him that she was dating a cop[redacted] stated her child's father was over at her house threatening not to leave so she told him she was dating a cop. She told him that if he didn't want to leave, she would contact help that way. I asked [redacted] if this was just a vague, untrue statement she told ex-boyfriend just to get him to leave[redacted] stated it wasn't untrue. [redacted] stated she met the officer by her calling the Chico Police Department and then time going by from the initial call and then she reached out to the officer after hours. [redacted] stated she called the officer when he wasn't on duty and started initiating conversation.

I asked [redacted] what the officer's name was? [redacted] asked if there was a reason I was asking because it was on the officer's personal hours it shouldn't really matter. I told [redacted] that was what I was investigating if this occurred on personal hours or while the officer was on duty. I told [redacted] that it would be a policy violation for us. I told [redacted] it was my job to investigate if it occurred, if it occurred was it consensual, and was it on duty. [redacted] stated it was consensual, and it was off duty[redacted] stated a couple times she stayed out of school to hang out with the officer off duty. I asked [redacted] if any relationship she had with a Chico Police Officer was while the officer was on or off duty. [redacted] stated it was not on duty. I asked [redacted] why she didn't want to tell me the name of the officer? [redacted] stated, because she thought it was nobody's business[redacted] stated if she wasn't in school and the officer wasn't on duty she didn't believe his name was a necessary piece of information.

[redacted] stated she knew who called the police regarding this and it was over a control issue[redacted] stated it was not necessary for her to entertain this investigation any further if she already stated it was all off duty. I told [redacted] I understood she did not want to speak with me but I had a few questions.

I asked [redacted] if any sexual relationship she had with a Chico Police Officer was consensual? [redacted] stated it was, yes, and I'm the one that initiated it. I asked her if any of our offices used any type of coercion or his position of power to engage in a sexual relationship with her? [redacted] stated, "No, absolutely not, I wish he would have used his handcuffs once or twice, but no, no he didn't". I asked [redacted] if any of this conduct occurred in a Chico Police vehicle or while the officer was in uniform. [redacted] stated no. [redacted] stated she had no association with this officer anymore. [redacted] stated she was sure I knew who it was without her giving me his name. I told [redacted] I did not know who the Chico PD officer in question was. [redacted] stated her child's father did not know who the officer was either so that would make sense.

I asked [redacted] if she could tell me when the relationship started and ended [redacted] stated she was bad with dates and times. [redacted] said she couldn't tell me when it started but said it had been a couple months since she had spoken to the officer. [redacted] stated she was in a relationship with a new person. I asked [redacted] if she would tell me how many times she was engaged in relations with the officer. [redacted] stated, no, it was not anybody's business. I asked [redacted] if there was any other information she thought I needed to know. [redacted] stated no. I asked [redacted] when she messaged the officer was it his personal phone or his work phone? [redacted] stated she did not know. [redacted] stated it was the same phone she sent the officer pictures to from a case. She stated she just messaged that number a week later.

I left [redacted] my contact information should she decide she wanted to share any other information regarding this case.

I concluded my interview with [redacted]

Investigation of Officer Page:

Case # 24-0017
This case was a battery at [redacted]. I watched Officer Page's body worn camera of this incident. Officer Page responded to the school and spoke with one of the juveniles' parents who was [redacted] reported her son [redacted] had been body slammed by another student. Officer Page was professional with [redacted] and provided her with his card with the case number and his contact information. I did not see anything out of the normal funtions of police work during this contact.

I had Chico Police Crime Analyst James Bennett check Officer Page's mobile computer terminal GPS near the address of [redacted]. from April 2023 to December of 2023. This was the address of [redacted]. There were zero occurrences of Officer Page mobile computer being in that area during this time. Mr. Bennett did note that Officer Page GPS in his vehicle would was only reporting sporadically.

On November 7th, I served Officer Page with a notice that he was subject of an administrative investigation regarding policy violation of Nepotism and Conflicting Relationships. Officer Page agreed to interview the following day.

Interview of Officer Page:

On November 8th, 2024 at 0939 hours, I interview Officer Page at the Chico Police Department in the Professional Standard's Officer. Officer Page chose not to have a representative of his choice present during the interview. I read Officer Page the Interview Administrative Interview Admonition verbatim from the form. I provided Officer

Page his right per AB301 to which he said he understood. I read Officer Page his rights per Miranda. I asked him if he understood his rights. He stated, "Yes". I asked Officer Page having these rights in mind if he wished to speak with me. He stated, "No". I then read Officer Page his Lybarger Warning, ordering him to answer my questions. The following is a summary of my interview with Officer Page: For exact details refer to audio recording.

Question: For the record state your name please:
Answer: William Page

Question: How are you currently employed?
Answer: I'm a Peace Officer for the City of Chico Police Department.

Question: On 04/15/23 how were you employed?
Answer: As a Police Officer with the City of Chico.

Question: Do you recall responding to [redacted] to the report of battery and speaking with a female, [redacted]?
Answer: I do.

Question: Do you recognize this person? (I showed Officer Page a still photo of [redacted] from the Body Worn Camera from his contact with her at [redacted]).
Answer: Yes, I do.

Question: Do you remember the call?
Answer: I do. It was a battery with her child.

Question: How do you know this person?
Answer: Other than from that call I do not know her.

Question: So you don't know her in any other capacity?
Answer: Nope.

Question: Did you know her prior to this call?
Answer: No, I did not.

Question: Have you contacted her after this call?
Answer: Nope.

Question: Do you have any sort of relationship with this person?
Answer: Nope

Question: Have you ever engaged in a sexual relationship with [redacted]?
Answer: Nope.

Question: Are you familiar with Chico Police Departments Policy 1050 which is nepotism and conflicting relationships policy?
Answer: Yes.

I read a portion of Chico Police Policy 1050: To avoid actual or perceived conflicts of interest members of this department shall refrain from developing or maintaining personal or financial relationships with victims, witnesses or individuals during the course of their employment or as a direct result of any official contact. I told Officer Page that was the policy and asked if he was familiar with it?

Answer: Yup.

Question: Your statement here today is that you were never in any sort of relationship with [redacted].
Answer: Correct, I've never been in any relationship with her.

Question: Did you ever notify your supervisor of a relationship with [redacted]
Answer: No.

I concluded my interview at 9:46 AM.

Electronic Evidence Investigation:

On 11/04/24 I had IT Specialist James Bennett conduct a query into Sgt. Williams' vehicle lap top GPS data. Mr. Bennett conducted a searched around the area [redacted] between the dates of April 15th, 2024 and December 31st, 2024. I had Mr. Bennett conduct the search for when Sgt. Willliams' computer was logging zero miles per hour. This would be an indication the vehicle was stopped or parked. Mr. Bennett found multiple instances of Sgt. Willaims vehicle computer stopped at [redacted] residence of [redacted].. Mr. Bennett provided me with a map (attached) plotting red circles where Sgt. Williams' vehicle was stopped. Mr. Bennett also provided me with a heat map with dark red indicating where Sgt. Williams' vehicle's computer was stopped. You can see the majority of the time Sgt. Williams' vehicle computer was stopped at [redacted]. it was parked in the northwest corner of the complex. This would be out of view from [redacted].

Mr. Bennett also provided me with time stamp data from Sgt. Williams' vehicle's computer near [redacted]. Mr. Bennett stated that the times were estimates and that the computer has to be parked, not moving for a period of time before it will register as not moving and provide data the vehicle was stopped. For an analysis of accuracy I compared Sgt. Williams' body worn camera footage of his initial call response to [redacted] residence on 09/26/23. Sgt. Williams arrived at [redacted]. 11:38 am and left her residence after taking a report at 12:18 pm. Sgt. Williams BWC footage was a total of 40 minutes at 38 seconds. Sgt. Williams' vehicle computer that was signed on by his credentials during the same day showed his computer stationary at [redacted]

[redacted] for 43 minutes. I believe the accuracy of the computer stationary data to be relatively accurate. The following dates Sgt. Williams' vehicle computer was stationary at [redacted].

09/26/23 stationary for 43 minutes (Original call for service).

10/12/23 stationary for 6 minutes

10/16/23 stationary for 14 minutes

10/25/23 stationary for 11 minutes

10/30/23 stationary for 7 minutes

11/02/23 stationary for 5 minutes

11/06/23 stationary for 12 minutes

I noted that there was no computer GPS data on 11/20/23 though I would discover Sgt. William's work at [redacted]. there for 63 minutes. Mr. Bennett checked Sgt. Williams' vehicle computer and discovered there was a four hour gap in GPS data on 11/20/23 from 12:23 pm to 4:30 pm. This gap in data is during the time Sgt. William's work phone was at [redacted].

Sgt. Williams' Cellebrite Extraction Work Phone Data.

I consulted with one of the Chico Police Department's Cellebrite experts to discuss Sgt. Williams' work phone data. I met with Sgt. Bailey and told him that this investigation was to be kept confidential. I had Sgt. Bailey conduct a query in Sgt. Williams' work phone. This phone is a City of Chico issued phone that was issued and then confiscated from Sgt. Williams during a previous administrative investigation. The phone had already been run through the Cellebrite extraction system. I had Sgt. Bailey analyze the data. The phones GPS history showed Sgt. Williams at [redacted]. multiple times after his initial call with [redacted]. The following are dates and times Sgt. Williams' work phone was in the area of [redacted]. after the initial call for service. This information was taken from Sgt. Williams phone and downloaded by Sgt. Bailey using the Cellebrite extraction system. The "unknown duration of time" is depicted because the cell phone only communicated with a cell tower one time during this time period. This may not be an accurate depiction of how much actual time was spent there. This data can be combined with the vehicle's computer data to get a better understanding of time spent at this location.

10/02/23 @ 10:31 am unknown duration of time.

10/12/23 @ 10: 24 am unknown duration of time.

10/16/23 @ 9:47 am unknown duration of time.

10/25/23 @ 10:47 am unknown duration of time.

10/30/23 @ 12:52 pm unknown duration of time.

11/06/23 @ 11:53 am unknown duration of time.

11/20/23 @ 2:06 pm until 3:11 pm (Phone pinged at location for 65 minutes).

11/21/23 @ 10:22 am unknown duration of time.

[redacted] cell phone number was [redacted]. I confirmed this when I conducted my phone interview with her.

[redacted] texted Sgt. Williams screen shots of text messages sent by her ex-boyfriend on 09/26/23. The text messages between [redacted] and Sgt. Williams appeared to be professional and about the domestic battery and the child abuse [redacted] was reporting. [redacted] did text: "Sorry I didn't catch your name". and Sgt. Williams responded "Mike Williams". This confirms the two of them did communicate after the call for service but the interaction appears to be professional in nature. There was a phone call made by [redacted] to Sgt. Williams later in the day as depicted below in the Cellebrite download of Sgt. Williams' cell phone:

[redacted]

There was only one phone call made by [redacted] to Sgt. Williams' work phone on 09/26/24 at 3:32 pm for a duration of 6 minutes. This phone call could be the phone call referenced by [redacted] during my interview of her of her reaching out to the officer when he was off duty.

Sgt. Williams was on the A-Day work schedule during this time. The A-Day work schedule is Monday through Thursday 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. I uploaded the shift schedule during the time period of this alleged relationship.

For the entirety of this investigation Sgt. Williams has not been at work and has been off on both administrative leave and [redacted].

11/12/204 I emailed a notice of Sgt. Williams Internal Affairs Investigation to his attorney at dcortez@rlslawyers.com.

11/18/2024 I sent Sgt. Williams certified mail notification of an Internal Affairs Investigation of the reporting to P.O.S.T per Senate Bill 2.

12/03/2024 I emailed Sgt. Williams attorney at jfox@rlslawyers.com a request for a voluntary interview.

12/03/2024 at 11:16 am I knocked on Sgt. Williams residence door in order to serve him with a voluntary request for an interview there was no answer at the door. After I left his residence, I received a text message from Sgt. Williams on my personal phone asking me to leave whatever I had for him under the doormat of his residence. I texted him back on my work phone that I would that per his request. I immediately deleted Sgt. Williams text from my personal phone. I wanted all communications with Sgt. Williams kept professional on city of Chico communication lines.

12/03/2024 at 1:26 pm I placed the voluntary request for interview under Sgt. Williams doormat [redacted]. per his texted request. A December 10th 2024 deadline was placed on the request. No communication from Sgt. Williams regarding this matter has been received.

I would prefer to interview Sgt. Williams regarding the allegations made in this case but due to his leave status and his non-responsiveness to a request for an interview, I have not been able to interview him regarding this case.

FACTS

On 09/26/23 Sgt. Williams responded to a harassment call at [redacted] During this time period Sgt. Williams was on A-Day shift which was 0700-1700 Monday – Thursday. Sgt. Williams met with a victim [redacted] who reported a domestic battery and child abuse case. Sgt. Williams took a criminal report and exchanged his work phone number with [redacted] to receive evidence from her. There was several text messages sent by [redacted] to Williams about her case. There was also a phone call from [redacted] to Sgt. Williams, work phone on 09/26/23 at 3:32 pm.

On 10/20/23, [redacted] ex-boyfriend, [redacted], called the Chico Police Department to report his child's mother [redacted] was engaged in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer [redacted] stated the officer met [redacted] during a call involving a domestic dispute.

During an interview [redacted] admitted to having a consensual sexual relationship with a Chico PD officer. [redacted] stated she contacted the officer on the same phone she messaged him pictures involving a case. I was able to confirm these communications on Sgt. Williams' work phone. [redacted] stated that she contacted the officer on his off time. This was proven to be false as evidence of the call being made on 09/26/23 @ 3:32 PM during Sgt. Williams' assigned shift.

I found GPS evidence of Sgt. Williams' work cell phone and his vehicle's computer being at [redacted]. on multiple occasions all during Sgt. Williams' assigned shifts.

On September 23, 2024 Sgt. Williams' attorney Julie Fox was notified of Sgt. Williams' Notice of Intended Discipline for termination as a result of Chico Police Internal Affairs Investigation 23-007. Sgt. Williams' attorney attended his Skelly Hearing where thereafter Sgt. Williams termination was confirmed by the Chief of Police. Sgt. Williams chose to not submit to any interviews citing his medical condition communicated through his attorney Julia Fox.

EVIDENCE

CITY OF CHICO ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY 1050
-Nepotism And Conflicting Relationships

[redacted] was contacted by Sgt. Williams during a call for service on 09/26/23 at [redacted]. During this call for service Sgt. Williams learned that [redacted] was victim of domestic battery and took a police report documenting the incident.

On 10/20/24 [redacted] called the Chico Police Department to complain a Chico Police Officer was in a sexual relationship with his ex-girlfriend [redacted] who was also the mother of his child. [redacted] stated that the officer met [redacted] during a custody / domestic dispute call for service.

On 10/31/24 I telephoned [redacted] to inquire about the allegations. [redacted] was not completely cooperative with the investigation but did admit to being in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police officer. [redacted] stated she contacted the officer using a phone number he provided to her on a call for service. Evidence of [redacted] calling Sgt. Williams on his work phone was located after the initial call for service.

I also found Sgt. Williams vehicle computer GPS data showing that a computer logged on using his credentials was at [redacted] residence of [redacted]. on multiple occasions as follows:

10/12/23 stationary for 6 minutes
10/16/23 stationary for 14 minutes
10/25/23 stationary for 11 minutes
10/30/23 stationary for 7 minutes
11/02/23 stationary for 5 minutes
11/06/23 stationary for 12 minutes

I also located Sgt. Williams work phone GPS data and discovered his work phone in the immediate area of [redacted]. at the following dates and times:
10/02/23 @ 10:31 am unknown duration of time.
10/12/23 @ 10: 24 am unknown duration of time.

10/16/23 @ 9:47 am unknown duration of time.
10/25/23 @ 10:47 am unknown duration of time.
10/30/23 @ 12:52 pm unknown duration of time.
11/06/23 @ 11:53 am unknown duration of time.
11/20/23 @ 2:06 pm until 3:11 pm (Phone pinged at location for 65 minutes)
11/21/23 @ 10:22 am unknown duration of time.

City OF CHICO ADMINSTRATIVE POLICY 339
-Standards Of Conduct

Taking into account all the information set forth above it appears Sgt. Williams may have engaged in a sexual relationship with a person he met at a call for service regarding a domestic violence incident. Sgt. Williams took the domestic violence report from [redacted] so he knew her victim status[redacted] confirms she was engaged in a consensual sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer. [redacted] did not use Michael Williams' name but stated it was same officer she sent pictures to involving a case. I confirmed [redacted] did text Sgt. Williams pictures from a Domestic Battery and Child abuse. By excluding Officer Page by my investigation it suggest Sgt. Williams as the involved officer. Given Sgt. Williams was on duty during multiple visits to [redacted] residence he may have engaged in sexual relations while on duty. This may constitute a violation of Chico Police Policy.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachments are kept as links in IA Pro.

Respectfully Submitted,

_____
Sergeant Paul Ratto
Professional Standards

CITY OF CHICO MEMORANDUM

TO: Captain O. Peña DATE: 7/7/25

FROM: Captain J. Struthers PCN: 24-0017

SUBJECT: Case Closure Post Separation (In Place of NOID)

It is my recommendation to take no further action on this matter.

CHARGES

Chico Police Department Policy 1050.2(d), Conflicting relationships

Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.6 (ab), Conduct unbecoming

Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.3 (m), Engaging in on-duty sexual relations

The reason for this action is:
With all disciplinary matters, I balance three concepts, punitive action, prevention, and rehabilitation. As outlined in this investigation, it is clear Sgt. Williams has not fully rehabilitated his behavior related to previous discipline. Although Sgt. Williams has been terminated because of conduct outlined in another investigation, it is imperative that this investigation be completed in its entirety. In this investigation, it is particularly troubling to note an apparent escalation of misconduct of a similar nature to previous discipline. Although there is no longer a need to determine an appropriate course for punitive action, prevention, or rehabilitation, it is still necessary to document the ongoing and escalating conduct of Sgt. Williams and point out that his termination has been the best prevention strategy the Department could deploy. Sgt. Williams no longer has the means to abuse his position as a police sergeant to exploit citizens, especially potentially vulnerable victims seeking the protection of police.

YOUR RIGHT TO RESPOND TO THIS NOTICE OF INTENT

Sgt. Williams has been terminated from employment with the City of Chico and therefore has no right to respond or appeal.

Respectfully,

J. Struthers C2/2735 Date: 7/7/25

J. Struthers
Captain C2

CITY OF CHICO MEMORANDUM

TO: Captain J. Struthers **DATE:** 7/1/2025

FROM: Cpt. O. Peña/ C3 3805 **FILE:** PCN: 24-0017

SUBJECT: Administrative Investigation – Transmittal **CONFIDENTIAL**

OVERVIEW

A citizen contacted the Chico Police Department informing us that his ex-girlfriend [redacted] was in a sexual relationship with a Chico Police Officer whom she met when the officer took a report from the woman.

Sgt. Mike Williams was determined to be the mentioned Officer and engaged in a dating and sexual relationship with a woman who he met while taking a domestic violence report. The woman was the victim of the domestic violence incident. After examining the conduct to determine if any of this happened on duty, PSU investigators uncovered a pattern of conduct that suggests that Williams engaged in the same conduct as that which was investigated in a separate misconduct investigation that involved sexual acts on duty (IA#23-0027).

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, it appears that WILIAMS began having sexual dating relationship with the victim of a domestic violence incident which he investigated. The preponderance of the evidence is that he carried out this relationship while he worked on-duty. It is not explicitly clear that he engaged in sexual acts while on duty, but the behavior is consistent with that previous conduct and meets the preponderance of the evidence.

ALLEGATIONS

The misconduct being investigated is potentially a violation of the following policies:

Chico Police Department Policy 1050.2(d) Conflicting relationships

Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.6 (ab)- Conduct unbecoming

Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.3 (m)- Engaging in on-duty sexual relations

ANALYSIS

1. **In dating [redacted] did Sgt. WILLIAMS develop or maintain a personal relationship with a victim, as a direct result of an official contact, in violation of Policy 1050.2(d)?**

To answer this question, one must first establish that WILLIAMS developed or maintained a personal relationship with [redacted] The policy specifically defines a personal relationship as:

Personal relationship - *Includes marriage, cohabitation, dating or any other intimate relationship beyond mere friendship.*

During her interview with Sgt. RATTO, [redacted] acknowledges that she had engaged in a romantic, sexual, relationship with a Chico Police Officer after meeting the Officer during a call for service. As RATTO has established in his investigation, WILLIAMS was the only officer who responded to a call for service and then had the exchanges via cell phone that [redacted] described. [redacted] acknowledged having a sexual relationship with that Officer (WILLIAMS) but refused to identify him as the contact occurred in what she described as his personal time. [redacted] described "dating a cop" and acknowledged that the dating relationship was consensual and that she never felt pressured because WILLIAMS was a police officer. Clearly this relationship was of a dating nature, sexual, and went beyond mere friendship; mere friendship is not prohibited.

It then must be established that WILLIAMS knew she was the victim or witness of the crime being reported. As RATTO points out, WILLIAMS investigated a domestic violence dispute where she alleged, she was the victim.

The second point to examine is whether this resulted because of official contact. In her interview [redacted] describes meeting the officer after he came to take a report; only WILLIAMS and Officer PAGE had contact with [redacted] during the timeline described. [redacted] would also acknowledge texting and calling the Officer regarding the call for service. WILLIAMS had this pattern on his work cell. Based on the evidence located on WILLIAMS work phone and its consistency with [redacted] account of her contact with the Officer; WILLIAMS met [redacted] during this official contact.

Based on this analysis, both prongs of the question were met and therefore I believe that WILLIAMS met [redacted] during an official contact, knew her to be the victim of a domestic violence incident and despite this, maintained a personal relationship with her. I find this conduct is in violation of Policy 1050.2(d) and the allegation is SUSTAINED.

2. **Was WILLIAMS conduct, in dating [redacted] conduct that he reasonably should know is unbecoming a member of the Department or which tends to reflect unfavorably upon the Department or its members, in violation of Policy 333.3.6(ab)?**

The previous question addressed whether the nature of the relationship was a policy violation; was the relationship a friendship or something more. This question looks to analyze whether engaging in the relationship with the victim is conduct that WILLIAMS should know is unbecoming of an officer or reflects unfavorably upon the Department.

It is not only a policy violation to engage in a romantic relationship with the victim of a crime, but also generally accepted principle in law enforcement that these types of relationships are out of bounds. Victims, particularly those of domestic violence incidents, are usually experiencing trauma and may be in a vulnerable state. Furthermore, they might need to testify in a judicial proceeding, engaging in a relationship with an officer may jeopardize the objectivity of the officer and/or the objectivity of the victim (as a witness).

It is important to differentiate between meeting someone while one is at work (at a coffee shop, the waitress who served you at a restaurant, or a passerby during a parade detail) and having an official contact that is the basis of the meeting (witness of a crime, victim of a crime, or suspect in a crime).

Engaging in a relationship with these latter folks, is not good practice for law enforcement officers and therefore generally seen as inappropriate within the profession. Thus, WILLIAMS' engaging in a relationship with a victim of a crime reflects negatively on the Department. Adding to the negative reflection on the Department, is the fact that WILLIAMS is a supervisor within our organization and should be an authority as to policy and should be setting the example in abiding by policy. The fact that a leader in the organization is the one violating policy by engaging in an inappropriate relationship further tarnishes the Department to external peers and internally causes damage to the supervisor/employee relationship.

Based on the totally of these factors, I find that WILLIAMS conduct reflects unfavorably on the Department and that as a supervisor, WILLIAMS should not only know this and demonstrate this, he would also be tasked with enforcing policy.

I therefore find that WILLIAMS' conduct is a violation of Policy 333.3.6(ab), and find the allegation SUSTAINED.

3. **Did WILLIAMS' conduct, in dating [redacted] extend to sex on duty in violation of policy 333.3.3(m)?**

This question is prompted by the fact that WILLIAMS engaged in very similar conduct as detailed in IA# 23-0027. In RATTO's interview of [redacted] she is adamant that all conduct was when WILLIAMS was off duty and that nothing happened while he was on duty. But RATTO did note discrepancies in [redacted] account of their actions. The concerning conduct here is the amount of time that WILLIAMS' patrol vehicle was found to have been in or about [redacted] residence.

As RATTO points out, there were multiple times that WILLIAMS' patrol vehicle was stationary at [redacted] apartment complex. The location data from his work cellphone shows that on at least one occasion he was there for just over an hour; of concern was the fact that his vehicle's GPS was not operational for over 4 hours during this time period (it is not possible to identify if this was a deliberate act or a mechanical issue). The coincidence is suspicious.

The amount of short stops at or about [redacted] residence, with the one extended time period, is consistent with the actions WILLIAMS took in the incidents investigated in IA#23-0027 where WILLIAMS was found to have engaged in sexual acts on duty.

It is important to note that this incident was reported late to our Professional Standards Unit, and the conduct investigated here, occurred during the same time frame as the other instances investigated in IA#23-0027. This relationship would have been later than some of those investigated and is indicative of a progression, from inappropriate relationships at work, to inappropriate conduct during duty hours, to now using the work contacts as a means of facilitating these relationships. This progression is a significant concern and highlights the potential for continued progression into further unacceptable and concerning conduct.

With [redacted] factual accounts discredited, with WILLIAMS' pattern of conduct (as detailed by his vehicle and cell phone GPS location data) being consistent with his actions in IA#23-0027, his previous sustained misconduct of on-duty sexual acts, his unwillingness to provide an interview, and the threshold for establishing a violation of policy being a preponderance of the evidence, I find that there is enough evidence that WILLIAMS engaged in sexual acts on duty consistent with IA#23-0027.

I find that the allegation that WILLIAMS violated policy 333.3.3(m) is SUSTAINED.

Mitigating Factor(s)

- N/A

Exacerbating Factor(s)

- As detailed in the answer to Analysis Question 3, this conduct details a progression in WILLIAMS conduct, a very concerning progression. His first misconduct investigation detailed in PCN 21-11, was of an inappropriate relationship (a romantic relationship) with a subordinate officer.
- This escalated to inappropriate sexual conduct while on duty, with women he met off duty. Some of these were individuals with significant negative Police contacts.
- In this instance there is strong evidence that there is similar on duty conduct, this time with a woman WILLIAMS met because of an official police contact. This begs the question, what type of conduct will this escalate into?
- Lastly, at the time this investigation was initiated and conducted WILLIAMS held a leadership role in the organization having the firs line supervisor rank of Sergeant.

FORMER DISCIPLINE

- WILLIAMS has been terminated pursuant to findings in IA #23-0027.

REVIEW OF PERSONNEL FILE

- N/A

COLLATERAL ASSIGNMENTS

- N/A

REPORTING/PUBLIC RELEASE

13510.8 PC (SB 2) - The allegations of misconduct detailed in this investigation, specifically the allegation of on-duty sexual acts, ***does*** rise to the definition of serious misconduct and exposes WILLIAMS to decertification. The allegation was reported to POST's POSAD, as required.

832.7 PC (SB 1421)- The allegation of on-duty sexual acts does meet the definition of sexual assault and as such requires the release of information pursuant to a public records request.

FINDINGS

1. Chico Police Department Policy 1050.2(d) Conflicting relationships

I find this allegation to be: **SUSTAINED**

Captain Struthers: I ☒ concur ☐ do not concur with this finding.

J Struthers C2/2735
Captain J. Struthers

2. Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.6 (ab)- Conduct unbecoming

I find this allegation to be: **SUSTAINED**

Captain Struthers: I ☒ concur ☐ do not concur with this finding.

J Struthers C2/2735
Captain J. Struthers

3. Chico Police Department Policy 333.3.3 (m)- Engaging in on-duty sexual relations

I find this allegation to be: **SUSTAINED**

Captain Struthers: I ☒ concur ☐ do not concur with this finding.

J. Struthers C2/2775
Captain J. Struthers

RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend this transmittal be forwarded to Captain Struthers for further action and review.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cpt. O. Peña C3/3805