STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

(POSAAB) MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025

10:04 A.M.

MEETING HELD

AT THE OFFICES OF

COMMISSION ON POST

860 STILLWATER ROAD, SUITE 100

WEST SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Stenographically Reported By:
Connie J. Parchman,
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #6137

A P P E A R A N C E S

POSAAB MEMBERS PRESENT

JOYCE DUDLEY
Governor Appointee
Attorney
(Chairperson)

NICOLE CLAVO, Psy.D.
Governor Appointee
Public Member

REGINA HATCHER-CRAWFORD
Governor Appointee
Public Member

JACK GLASER
Governor Appointee
Public Member

CEPHUS JOHNSON
Governor Appointee
Public Member

CHARLES LARA
Governor Appointee
Management Rank Peace Officer

MARGARET PENA
Speaker of Assembly Appointee
Public Member

---o0o---

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
ADVISORY BOARD LEGAL COUNSEL

CHRISTOPHER BEATTY
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

POST STAFF

ANNEMARIE DEL MUGNAIO
Assistant Executive Director
Peace Officer Standards
Accountability Division
Executive Office

WILLIAM DARDEN
Chief Counsel
Legal Affairs Bureau

ROBERT GUYTON
Bureau Chief
Professional Conduct Northern Bureau

SARAH WALLACE
Bureau Chief
Intake and Disposition Bureau

CHELSEA WIJAYA
Analyst
Intake and Disposition Bureau

ROBERT BRINGOLF
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

BRYANT HENLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

WILLIAM IMBODEN
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

SIMONE RENTERIA
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

CHANDLER KNAPP
Staff Services Manager
Executive Office

---o0o---

A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D

ALSO PRESENT

LUKE BAXTER WALDEN
Peace Officer, POST ID A95-T18

MARLON MARRACHE

--o0o--

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
I. CALL TO ORDER	6
II. ROLL CALL OF POSAAB MEMBERS	6
III. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA	8
IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPTS	10
V. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR & NEW BUSINESS	
A) Report on Outcome of Case Review from the March 05-06, 2025 Commission Meeting	11
VI. NEW BUSINESS	
a) Report on Data for Serious Misconduct Reporting, Investigtions and Disciplinary Action Outcomes	12
VII. NEW CASES - REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION	
1. POST2305110 - Brian Kawamoto (POST ID: C34-D38) Last employing Agency: Torrance Police Department	77
2. POST2305111 - Christopher Allen-Young (POST ID: C46-H76) Last employing Agency: Torrance Police Department	94
3. POST2306324 - Luke Baxter Walden (POST ID: A95-T18) Last employing Agency: Los Angeles Police Department	105
VIII. CLOSED SESSION	
(Transcripts prepared and bound under separate cover)	153
X. ADJOURNMENT	158
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	159
ERRATA SHEET	160

---o0o---

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2025 10:04 A.M.

West Sacramento, California

---o0o---

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Good morning, everyone.

Great to see all of you.

Today is Wednesday, July 16th, and the time is 10:04.

Thank you all for attending the Peace Officer Standard Accountability Advisory Board hearing.

Please note that this hearing is being live streamed, recorded and transcribed.

Thank you so much to the transcriber.

Further, please note that the microphones are auto on/off. When you begin speaking, they will go live. With this, you will need to watch your crosstalk. That too will go live.

We will now call the roll of Board Members.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning, Members of the Board.

Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Member Crawford.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Member Doyle.

(No response.)

MR. KNAPP: Member Dudley.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Member Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Member Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Member Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Here.
MR. KNAPP: And Member Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Thank you.
Madam Chair, seven of nine.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. A quorum has been established.
And thank you, Mr. Knapp, for all the work you did to get us all here today. Very much appreciated.
I would now like to introduce Board Counsel. To my left, Christopher Beatty.
And POST Assistant Executive Director, Annemarie Del Mugnaio. I do this every time. I have so much respect for our Assistant Director and I never can get the name just perfect. But, Del Mugnaio?
MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Del Mugnaio.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: What?
MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Del Mugnaio.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Del Mugnaio.

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: There you go.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Del Mugnaio.

This time is set aside for members of the public who wish to comment on items not on the agenda, but those within the Board's jurisdiction.

Public comment on matters on the agenda will be heard after each item is presented. Public comment on specific peace officer revocation cases to be heard today will be heard at the time of the hearing of each of the matters.

Please be advised that the Board cannot take action on items not on the agenda and may discuss those matters only to the extent necessary to determine whether any matter should be made an agenda item at a future meeting, to respond briefly to statements or questions posed, to request clarification or to refer the items to staff.

Please remember that this meeting is being transcribed, so I may politely interrupt and ask you to repeat or speak slowly and clearly so your comment can be correctly captured in the transcript.

As the Board Chair, I may ask members of the public to limit their remarks to no more than three minutes, pursuant to existing Board policy.

I may conclude the public comment period if multiple speakers are voicing repetitive or similar statements, and the 15-minute public comment period has expired.

You will be given five minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly enforced, so please ensure that you complete your thoughts within the allotted time.

Before I open public comment on matters not on the agenda, please note that if you wish to comment on disciplinary matters scheduled to be heard today or tomorrow by the Board, you must wait until the matter is called to offer public comment.

If you have a specific complaint about an officer that is not on today's agenda, you should file a complaint with POST or with the officer's employing agency. Staff will assist you in this regard.

I would like to remind individuals making comments to not discuss pending complaints or pending disciplinary actions that may later come before the Board for recommendation.

If the Board takes action on your complaint, you will have an opportunity to address the Board at that time.

Following these rules is necessary to comply with

the law and to avoid compromising the Board's mission.

Now, is there anyone present in the audience or appearing remotely who would like to address the Board during public comment?

Let's start with people present first. Anyone present?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none, let me inquire, is there anybody remotely?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Moving on.

Let's go to the approval of the minutes.

Is there anyone present or appearing remotely or by phone who would like to address the Board regarding the approval of the January 16th, 2025, transcripts?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none. Are there any questions or comments from the Board regarding the minutes?

Seeing none.

If the Board concurs, the appropriate action would be a motion to approve the meeting transcript from the January 16, 2025, meeting.

Is there a motion?

MEMBER CLAVO: I make a motion to approve the

Pena.

MEMBER PENA: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Pena, aye.

That's seven in favor. Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

Let's move on to the next case.

This is -- thank you, both. I know that was a difficult case to report on. Very much appreciate your professionalism.

POST2306324, Luke Baxter Walden POST A95-T18.

At this time, I will now call upon law enforcement consultant William Imboden, Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau and Simone Renteria, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau to provide a report on case POST2306324, Luke Baxter Walden, who at the time of the events at issue in this case was employed by the Los Angeles Police Department.

Thank you.

MR. IMBODEN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, Members of the Board.

My name's William Imboden, I'm one of the law enforcement consultants assigned to the Professional Conduct Bureau for Southern California in the Peace Officer Standards and Accountability Division.

With me today is Simone Renteria, an attorney with

our Legal Affairs Bureau.

And I'm here today to present case POST2306324 involving Luke Baxter Walden with the Los Angeles Police Department.

It's the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that the respondent, Luke Walden, committed an act of serious misconduct as set forth in Penal Code Section 13510.8 on March 17th, 2021.

Specifically, the Division has determined that respondent committed the following acts of serious misconduct.

Dishonesty, relating to the reporting, investigation or prosecution of a crime or relating to the reporting of or investigation of misconduct by a peace officer, or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, false statements, intentionally filing false reports, tampering with falsifying, destroying or concealing evidence, perjury, and tampering with data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct.

And 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.

In this presentation I will present a brief outline of the Division's findings of the investigation in this matter.

Respondent began his career with the Los Angeles Police Department on July 6, 1998; on October 7th, 2012, was promoted to the rank of detective; on June 15th, 2014, was promoted to the rank of supervisor.

On June 5th, 2022, respondent was demoted back to the rank of detective.

Respondent holds the following POST certifications: Basic, intermediate, advanced and supervisory.

During respondent's 24-year career, he has received 155 citizen and department commendations. His service records do not show any prior discipline or complaints for similar allegations.

On April 22nd, 2021, US Customs and Border Patrol -- Border Protection intercepted a suspicious package from China at the Los Angeles International Airport mail facility.

The package, which was labeled, quote, fuel filter, and addressed to respondent at his home address, actually contained an illegal firearm silencer.

The label also contained graphics in Chinese which,

when translated, stated, quote, "spiral 1/2 to 28 single core automobile fuel filter, parentheses, six-inch half to 28 black spiral P0171289910," close parentheses.

Half inch to 28 and 5/8 to 24, as will be mentioned throughout this presentation, refers to the thread size and count. For example half-inch diameter shaft with 28 threads per inch.

Upon learning respondent was a current LAPD officer, the investigation was turned over to the LAPD Internal Affairs Bureau.

Once the seized item was booked into evidence at LAPD, criminalist Fadil Biraimah of the Forensic Science Division examined it and its components. Next slide.

His report described the item as having the following characteristics:

Quote, "it has the general appearance of a silencer. The components are all consistent with machined aluminum with a dark, smooth surface finish.

"There is an internally threaded collar at one end and an unthreaded opening at the other.

"The internal inspection revealed a well-made, single piece monocore baffle with an open channel from end to end.

"The monocore baffle divides the tube into eight chambers which are open to the central channel.

"The first area is larger and is consistent with an entrance chamber. The threaded collar is consistent with a muzzle attachment point.

"These features are conspicuous suppressor silencer design elements that substantiate the classification as a silencer," end quote.

He concluded his report by stating, the assembly as received, was a firearm silencer as defined in California Penal Code Section 17210, which states: A silencer is any device or attachment designed to silence, diminish or muffle the report of a firearm or any parts intended for their assembly or fabrication.

A search through the California Department of Justice revealed respondent had 54 registered firearms, many of which were compatible with the half-inch, 28-thread barrel size.

LAPD conducted an audit of Respondent's internet search history on department computers between January 1, 2020, and April 28, 2021.

Using search words including, quote, silencer, fuel filter, solvent trap, China, threaded barrel and others.

The audit revealed that during that time frame, respondent conducted 21 internet searches and searched numerous websites that advertised the sale of threaded barrels for weapons registered to him as well as

additional weapons not registered to him.

The audit also revealed that respondent searched websites that are advertised -- that advertised the sale of, quote, fuel filters. The search focused on filters that had an inner thread size of half -- 1/2 to 28 converting to an outer thread side of 5/8 to 24.

The 1/2 to 28 thread size would apply to many of the weapons registered to respondent.

LAPD's IA consulted their acting general automotive supervisor who reviewed the websites that respondent visited that advertised the sale of fuel filters and inspected the item that Customs and Border Protection seized.

Next slide.

It was his opinion, based on the dimensions of the items respondent researched, that none of them were consistent with any fuel filter for a vehicle and that the items seized could not be used as a fuel filler because it had no internal filtration component.

Inline automobile fuel filters work by trapping dirt, rust and other debris as fuel flows through them preventing these contaminants from reaching the engine's fuel system.

The fuel -- sorry, the filter contains a pleated paper element or other filter medium that captures

particles and contaminants as the fuel passes through.

Modern fuel filters are designed to trap all particles larger than 30 microns or .03 millimeters.

Next slide.

The Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms issued law enforcement bulletins on April -- in April of 2017 and October of 2019. These bulletins advised that devices that are specifically manufactured as firearm silencers were being marked online as inline fuel filters despite having no filtering medium.

One such product is marketed as a quote, "Napa 4003," end quote, inline fuel filter.

When LAPD served a search warrant on the Respondent's PayPal account, the search revealed that on March 17th, 2021, at 8:28 A.M. a transaction was completed for $45.96 for the purchase of a quote, "Napa 4003 WIX24003 1/2 to 28, 5/8 to 24 fuel filter, aluminum solvent trap, half inch to 28 XH," end quote.

The recipient of the payment was Xu Shi Qi International Limited in Hong Kong, China.

Respondent was arrested by LAPD on November 14th, 2022, and booked into the LA County Jail.

On November 16th, 2022, the LA County District Attorney Office filed one count of Penal Code Section 664 and 33410, attempted possession of a silencer, a

felony.

On March 9th, 2023, Respondent was held to answer for the felony at a preliminary hearing. And on September 29th, 2023, as a result of a plea bargain, Respondent pled no contest to one count of attempt to possess an assault weapon, a misdemeanor.

The felony was only dismissed as part of the plea agreement.

Despite Respondent's misdemeanor plea resulting in the dismissal of the felony charge, clear and convincing evidence exists to show that Respondent committed the act of purchasing an illegal firearm silencer in violation of California Penal Code Section 33410, a felony.

This conduct occurred despite his extensive firearms training through POST, in-service training, and on-the-job exposure to firearms crimes, both generally and as a part of Los Angeles PD's gun unit.

Although the investigation was turned over to local law enforcement for prosecution, Respondent also violated federal law under Section 27 CFR 447.21 and 27 CFR 447.52, as well as the National Firearms Act USC Title 26, Section 5844.

Respondent is an experienced peace officer with almost 27 years with the -- in the LAPD and his position

as an LAPD officer, Respondent was not only charged generally with getting illegal guns off the street, but had been part of the LAPD's gun and narcotics division gun unit for approximately three years.

By illegally purchasing a silencer from China, Respondent was, in effect, committing the same type of crime that he was sworn to prevent.

During the administrative investigation into the alleged serious misconduct of acts that violate the law, Respondent was dishonest when he stated several times to the IA investigators that he did not try to purchase a firearm silencer.

Respondent stated he ordered a fuel filter a, quote, "Universal fuel filter for a 1985 Toyota Celica, which never arrived." He could not recall the vendor or when he ordered the filter. He later ordered another fuel filter through Amazon.com which he did receive. In looking at them in comparison, they look nothing alike.

Respondent denied ordering or attempting to obtain a firearm silencer despite the ceased item being addressed to him at his home address and despite the use of his PayPal account to purchase it.

The item is the exact same brand and size as was located in LAPD's internet audit of the Respondent's internet searches for firearm silencers and was

determined to fit many of the firearms Respondent owned.

Next slide.

Additionally, the exact name, type and size of the item are listed on ATF training documents to help law enforcement recognize illegal firearm silencers.

Next slide.

Respondent stated he only had a cursory knowledge of silencers, but was not an expert. He admitted he knew they were illegal to possess and he did not dispute the results of the internet search audit, but said those searches were for work-related purposes only.

However, he could not provide specific cases or reports that required searches he conducted. And his internet searches ceased two days prior to the items being purchased using Respondent's personal PayPal account.

Next slide.

LAPD sustained the allegation of attempting to possess a firearm silencer and referred the Respondent to a Board of Rights with a recommendation for termination from employment.

At the Board of Rights Respondent continued to deny that he tried to buy a firearm silencer and repeated that he attempted to buy a fuel filter for his 1985 Toyota Celica.

However, the item seized would not only not fit a 1985 Toyota Celica, it would be useless as a fuel filter because it has no filtering properties.

At the Board of Rights hearing, LAPD criminalist Biraimah stated that, quote, Napa 4003, end quote, is a code word for suppressers known to firearm buyers.

After examining the seized item, he determined it was a firearm suppresser compatible with a number of firearms.

After examining the list of firearms possessed by Respondent, Mr. Biraimah found a number of them could be used with a silencer if modified with a threaded barrel.

Respondent's supervisor, LAPD Lieutenant Eric Bixler testified at the Board of Rights hearing that one of Respondent's job responsibilities was to identify suppressors and that the Respondent would have been aware of the seized item's purpose as a suppressor.

At the conclusion of the Board of Rights hearing, the Board unanimously agreed that Respondent was guilty of the allegation that he attempted to obtain a firearm silencer.

The facts I've just recited support the Division's finding that Respondent was involved in serious misconduct, specifically dishonesty and acts that

violate the law.

For purposes of the Division's analysis, clear and convincing evidence means evidence of a charge is clear and convincing so long as there's a high probability that the charge is true.

The evidence need not establish a fact beyond a reasonable doubt.

The Division recommends that Respondent's POST certification be suspended or revoked. And the Division's recommendation is based on the following:

Clear and convincing evidence exists to show Respondent purposefully committed a felony after conducting research for weeks in advance and then purchasing an item that was clearly intended to be used as a firearm silencer.

This is in direct conflict with Respondent's general duty to uphold the law. And is, in fact, the exact type of crime Respondent was charged with preventing as part of the specialty unit he was assigned to.

His blatant dismissal of the law alone is egregious enough to warrant revocation of Respondent's peace officer certification, but in addition to violating the laws he was sworn to uphold, Respondent lied repeatedly to IA, and at his Board of Rights, when he was

confronted with his behavior, in an obvious attempt to keep his job through consistent denial, despite the evidence of his guilt.

Respondent has broken the public trust through his actions and his words and cannot be entrusted to truthfully, honestly, and ethically uphold the law or to respect the rights of the members of the public.

With that, I'm happy to have answer any questions the Board may have.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Does the Board have any questions or comments?

Yes.

MEMBER PENA: There was an earlier slide that showed a -- an authentic filter; right? A real one; right?

MR. IMBODEN: Correct.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Any other comments?

(No Response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Questions?

(No Response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: At this time, does the subject officer and/or their counsel wish to make public comment?

If so, you will each be given five minutes to speak

and the time limits will be strictly enforced. So please ensure that you complete your comments within the allotted time.

While commenting, keep in mind that the Board will only consider the facts as presented by the Division today and will not consider any additional facts or defense at this time.

The sole question before the Board today is the following:

If the facts offered by the Division today are, in fact, proven at a later hearing, do those facts demonstrate a high probability that a serious misconduct as defined by Penal Code Section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205 occurred?

Is there anyone from the public who would like to address the Board at this time?

Looking to the audience?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anyone on the phone?

MR. KNAPP: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Please.

MARLON MARRACHE: Hi, yeah, my name is Marlon, M-A-R-L-O-N, last name Marrache, M-A-R-R-A-C-H-E, representing my classmate, Luke Walden. Just wanted to add a couple of facts, if you will, about this

particular matter.

We want to talk about the dishonesty allegation.

In the presentation by Mr. Imboden that he said that March 17th, 2021, that the department considered dishonesty, that's not the case.

As a matter of fact, throughout this whole process, the allegation of dishonesty is what we consider a false statement or a misleading statement around truthfulness, et cetera, was never, ever discussed.

And we just wanted to point out that during this whole process, from the beginning, when there is an investigation of internal affairs initiated, all the way up to the levels of review, including the inspector general, please bear in mind that at no point did the Los Angeles Police Department in their process ever consider an allegation of dishonesty.

You're talking about a Captain I and a Captain III from the department in that division. You're talking about a commander and deputy chief from Internal Affairs; a commander and a deputy chief from the bureau as well.

And they all have to go to the tenth floor where the chief is and present these allegations.

And yes, it was directed to a Board of Rights, it was serious misconduct. But at no point was it ever

considered to have a dishonesty allegation.

In fact, what Mr. Imboden also forgot to mention is that there is a process with LAPD called a masked complaint, which means that the accused employee is unaware of the actual allegations or unaware that they're actually being investigated by Internal Affairs.

And so it wasn't until September 14th, 2021, when Luke Walden was actually aware of this particular matter, this particular alleged misconduct.

So I just really wanted to point that out to make sure that the Board understands what the process of the Los Angeles Police Department is.

And just a little bit of my background is I've been involved in discipline since 2008. I have put on over 30 Board of Rights when I worked Internal Affairs for over five years.

I actually teach a POST-certified course in Internal Affairs and I've been hired as a witness, expert, as it relates to IA matters alone.

So my expertise is -- my scope is very, very narrow. And just based on my experience -- not just because he's my classmate -- is the fact that this allegation should have never been framed in the first place. In fact, when I attended the SB 2 seminar, I was told that POBAR, Peace Officers Bill of Rights do not

apply.

And for the fact that the SB 2 panel, or Mr. Imboden, actually consider an allegation of dishonesty to frame, that would be considered a 3304 issue, which means it's beyond the statute of limitations.

So just wanted to that know.

And Luke is also present. And I'm going to hand the mike over to Luke to let you know what he's doing now and what he's been doing ever since his Board of Rights concluded.

Thank you.

LUKE WALDEN: Hello?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes.

LUKE WALDEN: Hello. Hello, this is Detective Walden.

Hey, so I have about -- I have over 27 years of service with the Los Angeles Police Department.

I've worked in multiple capacities within the department, undercover, buying narcotics, I've gone through multiple polygraphs.

When you go to a federal task force you're polygraphed. They do extensive background.

And based on the information provided in the rationale where I spoke to Mr. Imboden to kind of

understand what the whole process was, because I thought it was already done.

I had gone through the process, I made some decisions based on financial needs to not pursue fighting it all the way to the end, because it's either pay my mortgage and take care of my kids or be homeless. I made those decisions. And that's the reasons I did take the plea deal.

I know that we wrote an outline. We provided it to the Board.

I think it's a three-page document laying out all the discrepancies within the POST rationale.

When I spoke with Mr. Imboden regarding it, he advised me that he did not have all the information from the Los Angeles Police Department Internal Affairs.

When I asked how is a rationale written up without all the facts, being a detective of, I don't know, 15, 16 years, he couldn't give me an answer for that.

There's a lot of discrepancies in here. He talks about my training. As far as POST training that's all qualification. Has nothing to do with expertise, firearms expertise.

I was assigned to the gun unit. It was only for a year. The three years is incorrect.

Because after that year I went to the federal task

force. And I went through extensive background.

My sole purpose was to deal with apps, which is prohibited possessors, people who have mental illness and/or they have a criminal background.

And there were -- when I was there, we authored about 44 search warrants to deal with that. I never have nor attended any training regarding suppressors. I've never been trained on suppressors.

Currently the department has no training of suppressors or silencers.

When they provided the document regarding the ATF information, written by the ATF, I had never seen that, no one ever taught me that.

The other issues that were in there as far as training experience, yes, I was responsible for getting guns off the street.

That was part of the job that I did with the feds, because I did have experience with AR-15s, Glocks and 1911s and the ghost guns.

And I've testified as an expert.

There's issues with the firearms that they say that I own that will accept a suppressor. None of them were found during the preliminary hearing. And it was admitted to by the investigator to find threaded barrels, I didn't have threaded barrels. And during the

search of the computer, threaded barrels were not located.

I know Mr. Imboden talks about the search ending at a certain time. From what I understand, they had a scope of certain days that they chose to do.

I don't know that scope, but I think that's just a little bit reaching.

I haven't lied in the 27 years that I've been on the job. I haven't perjured myself. I have no complaints of lying and denying. I've currently been back to work about a year and a half.

I've currently filed probably over 100 cases.

I work with victims, suspects, interview them, I'm still working with -- still working as a police officer.

A Board of Rights deemed me, which is like yourself, civilians or sworn, that deemed me okay to return to work.

It didn't meet the egregious nature that is being told today.

So I hope that you guys take into consideration the write-up that was provided.

I understand that not everybody was privy to the Los Angeles Police Department's policies and procedures. And I understand that the Los Angeles Police Department doesn't always provide all the information when needed

because I work there.

So I understand how that works.

But I hope you that you take all this into consideration for your decision today.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Detective Walden, are you still there?

LUKE WALDEN: Yeah, I'm still here.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Good. This is Joyce Dudley, the Chair of this Board.

It was unclear to me whether the first person who spoke was an attorney or not. Or if he was just a colleague of yours?

LUKE WALDEN: He's acting as my attorney. He's not an attorney, but he has a law degree. He doesn't have a bar degree -- he's not bar -- he's my representation.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So I just want to be clear on this. He's representing you, but not as an -- but he is not someone who's been sworn in by the California Bar; is that correct?

LUKE WALDEN: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MARLON MARRACHE: That would be correct, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: That's fine. I understand.

And do you have an attorney representing you in

this matter?

LUKE WALDEN: No, I do not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Fine.

Is there anything else you wanted to say?

LUKE WALDEN: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Is there any questions from the Board?

MEMBER CLAVO: I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes. Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: The question I have, is, is it my understanding, did I mishear or did I hear correctly that you took a plea deal for the initial charges of purchasing a silencer?

LUKE WALDEN: No. The district attorney -- the district attorney offered a plea deal at the arraignment, which was like in January. And because he said based on the information provided by the Internal Affairs investigator, I guess there was a 13 seized -- 13 potential suppressors seized on that day when they went to go find it. And I was the only person charged.

No other people -- no other person in LA County. And it was because I was a police officer.

I was -- I believe I was targeted. It was not my intent in any way to purchase a suppressor.

I truly am -- I provided information to Internal

Affairs with all the stuff I'm doing with my kids, building cars. I had photos.

At the Board of Rights, Jiz Bagian (phonetic), who was the administrative investigator, when they asked -- when counsel asked him that, he said we didn't do anything with that evidence.

That could have exonerated me, so I kind of feel like I got shortchanged by my own department in our -- our -- in our due process of, you know, doing what's right.

I think that I'm supposed to do investigation, I'm supposed to take all the facts, put it together and present it to a district attorney and they make the ultimate decision whether or not they're going to file the case.

It was almost kind of like: We're going to let this guy take the hit. And I -- you know, when you're going through this, it's very stressful. It's high anxiety. You're not getting paid, you're -- I was assigned home for two years. I'm not getting paid.

And I have to live off of whatever I saved to combat this. And I just didn't have the money to battle this.

And so they offered a plea deal which was a misdemeanor. And I took it for financial reasons in

hopes that it didn't violate POST, which it did -- based on -- researched it, so I could go back to work if the Board allows me.

And the Board did.

And so I went back to work.

Yes, I got demoted. Yes, I worked a bunch of special details. Yes, I have probably a little bit more knowledge than most. But I don't have the experience that they're talking about.

I read the rationale and I seen the write-up regarding the training that I've had and that's all my qualification.

It has nothing to do with firearms training in the sense of how they work, how to take them apart. That's all qualification.

So to use that is like bolstering a report to make it look more egregious than it truly is.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Detective Walden. One moment, please.

Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Just a follow-up on that, Ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes.

Okay. Hang on one second.

Detective Walden, Dr. Clavo has a follow-up question or statement. Just standby.

MEMBER CLAVO: So just for clarity purposes, for myself. My initial question was: Did you take a plea deal?

You said no. But in the end of your statement you said yes.

So is it yes you took a plea deal, or no you took a plea deal?

LUKE WALDEN: All right. I think your initial question was for the silencer and the answer was no.

I took a plea deal for a lesser charge based on what the district attorney's office offered.

MS. RENTERIA: And Madam Chair, if I may answer that question for Board Member Clavo?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: One moment, please.

Dr. Clavo, anything else?

MEMBER CLAVO: I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you. Yes.

MS. RENTERIA: Just to clarify, Mr. Walden was charged and arrested for a felony, which was attempted possession of a silencer. That was pled down. And so he pled no contest to a misdemeanor, which was attempted possession of an assault weapon.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes. I think Dr. Clavo understood that.

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. Any other questions or comments from the Board?

Yes, Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Thank you.

So, Mr. Walden, I just would like to get clarity.

Are you -- are you denying that you ordered that item?

And that you conducted the internet searches that are in the record relating to a suppressor with a threaded barrel?

LUKE WALDEN: Am I -- did I -- no, I ordered the part. It was for my car. It was -- based on the information that was provided on the internet, I thought it was for my car. Because I'm putting in a bigger engine. And I thought it would allow additional -- more fuel. The car originally comes with a four cylinder, 22R. I'm putting in a V-8 because I want to hotrod it with my kid. So I can do drifting and rally and stuff.

So the way it was presented on the internet, is that it was a high-flow fuel filter. That's what I thought and --

MEMBER GLASER: Would you --

LUKE WALDEN: If I can explain, sir, about the searches on the internet.

MEMBER GLASER: Uh-huh.

LUKE WALDEN: That's the next question?

MEMBER GLASER: Yes, please do.

LUKE WALDEN: Okay. So, assigned to the FBI gang task force. I provided some expertise when it came to us purchasing guns. We bought a lot of guns. We worked the MS task force, MS-13, so we were buying guns and a lot of them were attached to murders.

We did have external informants. And when I say that, I worked with informants since 2009. The informants -- these informants are federal informants.

When you work with the fed -- when you work with an informant that's assigned to you and you're an LAPD agent, LAPD, those -- there's documentation that is required. It's called an informant contact sheet and every time you talk to them, every time, they call you 20 times you got to fill out 20 pieces of paper.

They give you information, you write it down.

With the federal informants, they are not required that, because their informant information is captured by the feds, we don't have that documentation.

So what had happened was, in over -- over that time frame, from January to February -- because we -- we were in a lull waiting for the Assistant US Attorney to give us direction on several of the murder suspects from MS-13 how they were going to, what we were going to do,

when we were going to make the takedowns and arrests.

And so we were -- we had these informants that were providing information regarding guns sales, firearms sale and narcotics sales.

But it was ultimately up to the federal -- the FBI agents to make the determination whether or not they wanted to move forward on these cases.

The -- since these -- these guns with suppressors -- that's how the pictures came through and the information came through. So I started researching it because I didn't have the knowledge base. And the guys would say, well, you should know this. You had worked the gun unit.

Yeah, but I didn't have the training.

So I went on Google and I put in "silencer." I put in -- and then I tried to figure out how it would work or how it would work based on what you need to get the filing. Or at least make the arrest.

As you guys may or may not know, federal charges are different than state charges.

And a lot of times if it's going to go federal, they need specific -- it needs to be from -- the gun was manufactured in -- from state to state. So state -- interstate commerce.

And so that's -- that's why I did it. We had three

separate cases from two informants that provided information, they provided pictures. I didn't see captured those pictures they were on the FBI's -- the agents' cell phones.

I think my phone died.

Can you guys still hear me?

MEMBER GLASER: Yeah, we hear you.

LUKE WALDEN: Okay. So --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Dr. Glaser, do you need more information?

MEMBER GLASER: I'm going to follow up.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. I think Dr. Glaser has a follow-up question and that may address whatever else you wanted to add to this.

And I know that we have at least two more Board Members who want to be heard.

But go ahead, Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Yeah, I would just like more clarity. You are acknowledging that you ordered that item. And it's your claim that it's just coincidentally while you were trying to order a filter for a car, you -- the item that you ended up ordering happened to be a functioning suppressor for a firearm that would not function as a filter for a car?

LUKE WALDEN: Yeah, basically -- based on what I

was told, because I never received it. And over the course of a couple months, I didn't know I was under investigation.

So that was sometime in April, I believe, what I was told by the Internal Affairs.

Then I realized, hey, it never came, I figured the porch pirates stole my packages because I was working probably 12 to 15 hours a day, a week, because we were after -- we were working a lot of murder cases, so our hours were always crazy.

And then -- so I ordered another fuel filter -- because the other one didn't come.

So I said, well, at least with Amazon, I will get a receipt and I will get a -- I'll get confirmation. And also if it doesn't show up, you know, I can ask for an additional one. Which I should have done in the first place --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

LUKE WALDEN: And this could have all been avoided.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Detective Walden, thank you. I think you've -- you've answered --

LUKE WALDEN: Oh. Okay. Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: -- Dr. Glaser's question.

Now I know that next was Mr. -- Lieutenant Lara and then after that is Regina. Okay. Go ahead. Crawford.

MEMBER LARA: Charles would do just fine.

So normally speaking, my question is, say I go on to Amazon. And I'm going to order an item. I generally order online to the specific item that I need. Say if I -- it was for the Celica or the enhanced V-8, I would order the item to match the engine to which I -- I'm building out.

So how is it that by pure coincidence you end up with what is essentially a functioning silencer that's purely coincidentally, what you ordered online?

Can you explain that to me?

LUKE WALDEN: I was -- well, that's how it was presented. I ordered the part for my car. And it was a high-flow fuel filter. I never got it.

Then I went on Amazon and I did the same thing.

And, no, based on what you're saying, as a former mechanic, the -- because I worked on cars prior to becoming a law enforcement agent, police officer, I never -- these -- the fuel filter never came. So I ordered a second one.

And they're called universal fuel filters. I think it was in the slides. And that's the one I ordered.

And it's a high-flow universal fuel filter.

Based on all the research, there's -- in that -- in the ATF document, there's a ton of things in there

that -- I had no idea that could be used as a suppressor.

Which, I would assume that they're fuel filters based on what -- how they're sold. They're sold on Amazon. They're sold on eBay. They're sold on all these different websites, which is not illegal. And you're taking -- you're purchasing that.

So I didn't know that it was a suppressor. Otherwise, I would not have -- I would have avoided this whole situation.

MEMBER LARA: Okay. Presumably one buys a fuel filter to filter fuel.

Meaning there will be some medium by which particulate or contaminants will be extracted from said fuel.

So I'm not going to deny that it's high-flow, there's no baffling in this and there's an expression in Latin, caveat emptor, which means "buyer beware."

I imagine that with as much background as you have -- or purport to have in mechanics, that you would recognize that this item would not function as a fuel filter because it has no medium by which to filter fuel.

Can you explain that to me?

LUKE WALDEN: No. I believed it can because it showed -- I don't have the documentation, because I

didn't take pictures of it. I didn't know I was going to get in trouble for buying a fuel filter.

But it -- on the -- on the website, it showed filtration, it showed it hooked up to a car with a -- with a line going from the -- from the fuel line from the back, from the gas tank, up.

So based on the subject, I didn't look for the filament, which is the item that traps the debris, because it showed everything in the -- in the -- on the website.

And based on what I was understanding when they did the Board of Rights they tried to pull the link up from the website to use it in their investigation and they couldn't find it because it had been taken down.

MEMBER LARA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Detective Walden, were you being honest when you pled guilty or no contest to attempting to purchase an assault rifle? An assault weapon?

LUKE WALDEN: As far as honest how? Because that was the charge that they offered. So I wasn't trying to buy an assault weapon, but that's the charge that they gave me for the plea deal.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. That was the one they offered.

LUKE WALDEN: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And that was the one you pled guilty or no contest to.

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And when you did that, were you being honest?

LUKE WALDEN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Crawford.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: So reading your report, you sound like you were a car enthusiast. And --

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: And given your background and being a mechanic and an officer of the law, one of the things that kind of caught me, and it was an "aha" moment, was how many guns that you owned in the house.

So answer this question.

As LAPD, if you were to come into my home and I owned -- what was it 54 guns, and rifles. That wouldn't be a little bit alarming?

LUKE WALDEN: No, ma'am. I know that it -- in today's society based on -- that people are afraid of guns.

I was raised around guns. I fired my first firearm at five years old. My family was raised on a farm. So

for me guns is kind of like having a hammer.

The intention is not there to run around murdering people.

It -- I shoot competitively. I have for years. Under IDPA.

As far as the amount of guns, I worked -- when I did work the gun unit, we did have a lot of people who owned guns.

Now a lot of the guns I owned, they're worth thousands and thousands of dollars. So they're -- it's like an investment. And I buy them. I sell them.

Of the guns that I owned, half of them were not mine. And when I say that they weren't originally mine.

My brother died in '96 in a car accident. And some of them were his. And then some of them were my father's, so I inherited them either from my father or from my brother, who passed away.

So most of the -- a bulk of them, maybe two-thirds of them, were originally not mine.

But because of registration and following the law and all the -- Senate Bills, I uphold the law and basically registered them to me so that they would be in safekeeping, because I was working in law enforcement. There are locked up in safes so that no one has access to them. Not even my kids.

If I go recreational, we take safety and take the kids and go through the safety rules and go shooting as -- you know, at the local range.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Mr. Walden, you said something that was very interesting.

Being in law enforcement, you wanted to follow the law.

I work formerly for the Department of Defense. And knowingly, if I purchased something or had something in my house that could give pause or question to -- you didn't -- did you report that to your senior leadership?

LUKE WALDEN: Report what?

MEMBER CRAWFORD: That you were buying these items that --

LUKE WALDEN: No --

MEMBER CRAWFORD: You're an expert. You're an expert.

LUKE WALDEN: No, I'm not an expert in suppressors.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: You are not, okay.

LUKE WALDEN: I know that the POST has tried to frame it that way. But, no, I've never dealt with a suppressor. I've never seen one in real life.

Based on my -- as far as how they come apart, how they work, I've had no formal training.

When it comes to suppressors, I have -- based on

what I did, I would buy a fuel filter for my car. I never got it. I bought another one. And then all of a sudden I was under investigation.

If it had come and I found out that it was in this suppressor type form, I would have booked it into evidence and told them.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Detective Walden.

Anything else? Any other questions?

MEMBER CLAVO: I have two.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: The first one is for Mr. Imboden.

I want to make sure I heard you. I think -- I believe it was you and not Mr. Walden that stated that the fuel filter that was ordered was listed under a name that is known by gun enthusiasts or individuals who are purchasing illegal silencers and is known to be listed under the name in which the fuel -- fuel filter was purchased; is that correct? Did I make sense?

MR. IMBODEN: That's correct. The code -- the term "Napa 4003" is known amongst the gun enthusiasts as a code word for "silencer."

MEMBER CLAVO: Mr. Walden, did I understand that you said you are currently working back as a police officer for the last year and a half?

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

MEMBER CLAVO: I lied. I have a third question.

So with that, you were doing research on silencers on a work computer prior -- two days prior, I believe, to receiving, or being arrested, or being notified that you had received silencers in the mail.

LUKE WALDEN: No. That's incorrect.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay.

MS. RENTERIA: Two days prior to him purchasing the item, the silencer, he had been researching the Napa 4003 inline fuel filters, as well as threaded barrels.

Mr. Walden claimed that he was doing that for work-related purposes, based on FBI informants, information that they had received.

So from POST's perspective it demonstrates knowledge of the item that he was purchasing, because he had spent so much time researching those items, by his own admission, and then bought the item he was in fact researching.

MEMBER CLAVO: Thank you. That was the clarity I was seeking. Appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And just so I'm clear on this, was he saying that he was researching filters? Or suppressors?

MS. RENTERIA: He said he was researching

suppressors, silencers, for an illegal firearm sales that they were investigating.

Those silencers were being marketed as Napa 4003 fuel filters or solvent traps.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Anything else?

Yes, Mr. Johnson?

MEMBER JOHNSON: For Mr. Walden.

LUKE WALDEN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: The question I have is, has others bought this particular so-called fuel filter that you was confused on and made complaints?

Or did you make a complaint that this particular suppressor would not work as a fuel filter?

LUKE WALDEN: As far as people buying it and using it, I don't know.

I know that based on what was told to me that there were 13 fuel filters recovered that they believe to be silencers. And I was the only one charged, as far as the District Attorney's Office.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: So there were others is what you're implying?

LUKE WALDEN: Yeah. And they -- based on what I was told by the -- because I had -- in our FBI unit, we had members of HSI and Homeland Security and they do all

the checks on what comes in and out of the searches.

They basically told me that, generally, they send a letter to the person and say, hey, you can't own this.

And they said that they have thousands of those things coming in.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Yes, Ms. Clavo. Pena.

MEMBER PENA: Mr. Walden, I have a few questions for you.

What type of car was it that you were seeking to buy a filter for?

LUKE WALDEN: A 1985 Celica GT hatchback.

MEMBER PENA: What kind again? I'm sorry.

LUKE WALDEN: It's all right. Okay. It's a 1985 Toyota Celica.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. Is it running?

LUKE WALDEN: Right now it's been disassembled. So I took all of the -- the fuel system out. And I'm currently taking the engine out so that I can put a larger or better running engine in. Because the engine in there is old and I need to put a new bigger -- bigger engine in.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. So that's -- that's the car that you were attempting to order a filter for?

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

MEMBER PENA: You said you subsequently ordered another filter when you didn't receive the first one; is that right?

LUKE WALDEN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: Did you install that filter?

LUKE WALDEN: No, because I was told I was under investigation. And then I was sent home. And I didn't have the money to work on the project.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. How soon after ordering the first filter that was intercepted by the Border Patrol, did you order the second filter?

LUKE WALDEN: I think April, so -- about four months. So the first one didn't come, which I assumed it got stolen.

And we were working the murder cases, so I was never home. I hadn't -- I was working seven days a week doing surveillance.

And so I realized, hey, that part never came. Because suspension pieces came, shocks came, brakes came, which was all being put together. And I realized that the fuel filter wasn't here. So I --

MEMBER PENA: Did you --

LUKE WALDEN: -- went on Amazon and ordered a new one.

MEMBER PENA: Did you know at that point that you

were under investigation?

LUKE WALDEN: No, ma'am. I wasn't told -- so I got a notice -- I ordered it in, I believe, August. I got an email from Internal Affairs, because it was masked, in September. Like middle of August is when it showed up. September I was told I was under investigation. I still wasn't told what for.

I had to get legal counsel.

Once I got legal counsel, it was like maybe the end of September, November, somewhere around there, where they told -- you know, IA told the -- my counsel. Then we set up an interview. And that was done over the phone I think in January.

I can't remember the exact dates.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes. Okay. So Mr. Johnson, then Mr. Lara.

MEMBER JOHNSON: On that first fuel filter that you never received, did you make a complaint to Amazon?

Or is there some documentation that you have that you never received the first item you ordered? If --

LUKE WALDEN: No. So the -- I never received it. I was working -- I was working 15 hour days for -- every day. So I never received it.

Once I realized it was there, to me it was like --

I thought it was 20 bucks. But guess it was 45 bucks. I didn't remember the price.

So I figured it had got stolen. I went looking for the website. I couldn't remember how to find it.

So I said I'm going to go on Amazon and order my -- that part and I'll just eat the 20 bucks. Which, I thought -- the whole time I thought it was 20 bucks.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: In the past when Amazon did not deliver items to you, did you complain and seek to get your money back?

LUKE WALDEN: In the past, I've had front bumpers for 300 bucks and I haven't gotten it. So sometimes I complain, sometimes I figure someone steals it. Sometimes there's no recourse if you don't do it within a certain time period.

This company, the website --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Lara.

MEMBER LARA: Mr. Johnson asked the first question I was going to ask, which was have you requested a refund or filed a complaint?

But out of curiosity, why didn't you order the same filter you had previously ordered?

LUKE WALDEN: Why didn't I order the same -- it was a universal fuel filter. That's what I ordered on the first one. It never came.

The second one, I ordered a universal fuel filter and that came.

That's how it was -- that's how it was sold on the internet. It was a universal, high-flow fuel filter.

I ordered the first one, never came.

I went looking for the same thing on the Amazon, that one, they had a different versions and I wanted a more compact one so it wouldn't get swiped off the bottom of the car. And so I found the other one, which is the one that I purchased.

It's very similar in dimensions, as far as length, I believe.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I think I lost track.

When you got the second one, did you install it?

LUKE WALDEN: No. That was asked before.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Why didn't you install it?

LUKE WALDEN: Oh, because I had taken the whole car apart. I took the whole fuel system. I had to put a bigger -- I was putting in larger fuel pump to put the fuel through the fuel filter. So I bought all the fuel --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm sorry. I don't know much about cars. So just if you could give me a simple answer to this.

LUKE WALDEN: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You purchased a filter --

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: -- that didn't come.

LUKE WALDEN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And then you purchased a filter that had the same name that did come. And --

LUKE WALDEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm asking if you attempted to install the second filter with the same name as the one that didn't come?

LUKE WALDEN: I attempted to install it? No, I did not, because that's when I was made aware -- like maybe a couple months later. Because we were still working a lot, I just didn't have the time to work on the project.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

LUKE WALDEN: So I was ordering the entire fuel system.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else?

MEMBER CLAVO: One more question.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Go ahead, Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: I'm not going to say one more. I might have several.

So it was my understanding that the initial fuel filter was purchased through PayPal. I believe one of

my fellow members here asked about filing a complaint.

I know with PayPal, because I'm a internet shopper, I have disputed many things that I've received or did not receive.

So did you -- and PayPal's pretty good about giving you your money back when you don't receive an item or it's the wrong item or you don't get it in time.

Did you -- and they usually have the purchaser's information listed there where you can send an email, because they ask you to send an email to the seller first.

LUKE WALDEN: Right. Right.

MEMBER CLAVO: Prior to them taking action.

Did you do any of those things?

LUKE WALDEN: No, because the website was down when I went to go look for the thing. So it wasn't -- it didn't work anymore, the link.

MEMBER CLAVO: The PayPal website was down or the --

LUKE WALDEN: No, no --

MEMBER CLAVO: Or the seller's website?

LUKE WALDEN: Seller's.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. I'm going to ask this question again. Maybe I didn't say it clear.

So when you go on to PayPal, if you have a PayPal

account and you log into your PayPal account it has all the purchases you bought through PayPal or through the original websites.

LUKE WALDEN: Right.

MEMBER CLAVO: And so when you go on there, and you hit the item that you purchased, you're able to say whether or not you received it, if you have an issue, whether it didn't come timely, whether it's the wrong thing.

And then you can dispute that purchase through PayPal. And PayPal's pretty good at crediting you your money back to your account.

So did you do any of those things?

LUKE WALDEN: No.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

MEMBER CLAVO: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Any other Board Member?

Okay. Thank you, Detective Walden. You can hang --

MS. RENTERIA: I'm sorry, ma'am, if I may, just for the record, clarify two things or respond to two items from Mr. Marrache?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Do you need Detective Walden on the phone for that?

MS. RENTERIA: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Anything else, Detective Walden?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you, Detective Walden.

Please go ahead.

MS. RENTERIA: I just wanted to respond to two statements that were made by Mr. Marrache, Mr. Walden's representative.

With regard to POST jurisdiction he had made a comment that the LAPD had not pursued a dishonesty charge and so therefore he questioned POST's ability to also do that.

I just wanted to clarify that POST, the Board and the Commission, are not bound by the decisions of the law enforcement agencies.

So therefore, LAPD's decision not to pursue a dishonesty charge has no bearing on whether or not POST can do so.

And then secondarily, he also seemed to, in the same vein, also make a statement that because the -- our claim of the dishonest conduct occurred before January 1st, 2022, that it was beyond POST's ability to hear that.

However, dishonesty is one of the categories of misconduct that POST can consider prior to January 1st, 2022. I just wanted to clarify that for the record.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. Those are helpful clarifications.

Okay. At this time, does the Board wish to adjourn into closed session for deliberations on this case?

Or is the Board ready to take a vote or recommendation of the case?

MEMBER CLAVO: We'll go into deliberation, I think.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So here we go.

(Time noted: 1:49 P.M.)

---o0o---

(Closed session was held:
1:55 P.M. to 2:07 P.M.)

---o0o---

(Time noted: 2:11 P.M.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Are we all set?

We will now reconvene in the regular session to take a vote on the Board's recommendation in the matter of case POST2306324, Luke Baxter Walden, who at the time of the events at issue in this case was employed with the Los Angeles Police Department.

What comments does the Board have on this matter?

Okay. I have a few comments.

In listening to my fellow Board Members, it seemed critical to all of us that someone who has a badge and has authority and has the authority to arrest, has the authority to use potential great bodily injury, it's so important that that person be honest.

And what seemed very important to all of you was that law enforcement officials throughout California and our country be honest.

And that was what I heard over and over again from this Board.

Does anybody want to dispute that? Or add to that?

MEMBER CRAWFORD: I would like to add that just as you said, as law officials, we, as a people, expect for you to be there to protect and serve. And when we come across -- or the public comes or the community comes across an officer who seems dishonest, overzealous, it's a recipe, sometimes, for disaster.

And so I would like to make a motion if it's okay with my Board Members.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Please.

MEMBER GLASER: May I just add one more comment. So just to sort of close this circle here, in this particular case, I think it -- Mr. Walden's arguments just strained credulity, that he would have -- had been

researching suppressors and then within a few days order one. And that he had intended to order something else entirely. That just -- the probability of that occurring by chance is so vanishingly small that it -- that it seems like it can't be true.

And hence, there -- him having denied that raises an honesty issue, which is, as we say, so important to law enforcement.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. Anybody else want to make a comment?

MEMBER JOHNSON: I think --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes. Johnson.

In regards to that honesty, we definitely made it clear to ourselves, the Board that is, that though LA, Department of Police, didn't charge him or see any dishonesty, that wasn't the issue with us. It was the fact that he was dishonest.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else before a motion is made?

Okay. You wanted to make a motion?

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Regina Crawford. And I would like to make a motion to decertify Mr. Walden.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there a second?

MEMBER LARA: I second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. We need roll call, please.
MR. KNAPP: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you.
Clavo.
MEMBER CLAVO: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Clavo, aye.
Crawford.
MEMBER CRAWFORD: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Crawford, aye.
Dudley.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Dudley, aye.
Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Glaser, aye.
Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Johnson, aye.
Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Lara, aye.
Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Pena, aye.
That's seven ayes, motion passes.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing proceedings were reported, to the best of my ability, in shorthand by me, Connie J. Parchman, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings nor in any way interested in the outcome of said proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 30th day of July 2025.



Connie J. Parchman, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 6137