STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

(POSAAB) MEETING

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2024

9:02 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:
Kathryn S. Swank
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #13061
Registered Professional Reporter

A P P E A R A N C E S

POSAAB MEMBERS PRESENT

ROBERT DOYLE
Governor Appointee
Former Command Rank Peace Officer
(Vice Chairperson)

NICOLE CLAVO, Psy.D.
Governor Appointee
Public Member

REGINA HATCHER-CRAWFORD
Governor Appointee
Public Member

ROBERT DOYLE
Governor Appointee
Former Command Rank Peace Officer

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---

POST COMMISSION 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 COMMISSION STAFF

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

CHRISTOPHER BECKER
Assistant Chief Counsel
Legal Affairs 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

CHANDLER KNAPP
Staff Services Manager
Executive Office

MARK NAGEL
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Southern Bureau

KEVIN SHERBURNE
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Central Bureau

CARRIE WOOLLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

---oOo---

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

---o0o---

ALSO PRESENT

KASEY A. CASTILLO
Counsel for
Officer David Hubbard
(Via videoconference)

CESAR DIAZ
Peace Officer
POST ID C68-U20

SAKU ETHIR
Counsel for
Officer Ivan Sarabia-Medina
(Via videoconference)

DILLON FUSTON
Peace Officer
POST ID C71-S10

BRADLEY M. FIELDS
Counsel for
Officer Dillon Fuston
(Via videoconference)

BEATRICE JOHNSON

DANIEL SANCHEZ

IVAN SARABIA-MEDINA
Peace Officer
POST ID C12-A96
(Via videoconference)

---o0o---

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS		PAGE
I.	CALL TO ORDER	7
II.	ROLL CALL OF POSAAB MEMBERS	7
III.	PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA	9
IV.	ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMENTS	11
V.	NEW BUSINESS	
	1. Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (POSAD) Update	11
	2. Report on Outcome of Case Review from the March 07, 2024 Commission Meeting	21
	3. Election of Vice Chair	24
VI.	APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES AND TRANSCRIPT	
	1. Approval of Meeting Minutes from the December 13, 2023 Meeting	29
	2. Approval of Meeting Transcript from the December 14, 2023 Meeting	29
VII.	NEW CASES - REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION	
	1. POST2311496 - Cesar Hazel Diaz (POST ID: C68-U20) Last employing Agency: Los Angeles School District Police Department	35
	2. POST2300809 - Dillon Fuston (POST ID: C71-S10) Last employing Agency: San Diego Police Department	45
	3. POST2300204 - David Wesley Hubbard (POST ID: C15-B77) Last employing agency: Kern County District Attorney's Office	82

I N D E X C O N T I N U E D

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
4. POST2322012 - Ivan D. Sarabia-Medina (POST ID: C12-A96) Last employing Agency: Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	108
VIII. CLOSED SESSION	
(Transcripts prepared and bound under separate cover)	
IX. FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES	131
May 15-16, 2024 - POST, West Sacramento July 24-25, 2024 - POST, West Sacramento	
X. ADJOURNMENT	134
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	135
ERRATA SHEET	136

---o0o---

Thursday, March 21, 2024, 9:02 a.m.

West Sacramento, California

---o0o---

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Good morning. Welcome everyone. This is our second hearing of the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board.

Today before we get into the first order of business, I'm just going to make a quick announcement about the proceedings today. As many of you know, on the Board, Ms. Dudley, our Chair, will not be joining us today. Sadly, she would have been here if she could. But due to some unforeseen circumstances, she will not be joining us today.

So I will go ahead and facilitate at least the first half of the meeting until we get to our cases that are before the Board today. And then we will probably have our vice chair, as long as that person feels comfortable, facilitate the remainder of the meeting.

Does that sound fair to the board members?

(No response.)

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Okay. Great. All right. I'm going to go ahead and ask Chandler to call the roll this morning.

MR. KNAPP: Okay. Good morning, members of the Board.

Board Member Buchen.
(No response.)
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Clavo.
MEMBER CLAVO: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Crawford.
MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Doyle.
VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Dudley.
(No response.)
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Here.
MR. KNAPP: And Board Member Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Here.
MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Okay. Thank you.
We have a quorum.
I want to thank those of you who are in attendance today. We want to take a couple of notes to kind of explain to you that this meeting or hearing is being webcast. It is also being recorded and transcribed.
The microphones are on auto on and off, so you do

not have to touch them before you speak. As soon as you begin speaking, they will go live. When you are not speaking, they will not be live.

You will need to watch the cross-talk because if you lean over and talk to your partner, that will be caught on recording and webcast, so just be advised.

I also want to thank those in attendance today for joining us. When you are asked to come forward for public comment, you may introduce yourself and your association. You do not have to. So that is voluntary. I want to make sure that's clear today.

I would like to introduce some of the folks here at the table today. To my left, I would like to introduce Chris Beatty. He's our board counsel.

I'm assistant director -- Assistant Executive Director Annemarie Del Mugnaio of the Peace Officer Standards and Accountability Division.

To my right is Chandler Knapp. He works in EXO.

Thank you.

Okay. We're going to see if there's any public comment before the Board today. This is the time that is set aside for public members of the public who wish to comment on items that are not on the agenda but those within the Board's jurisdiction.

Public comment on matters on the agenda will be

I also want to add that I am off duty, just in case somebody decides to trigger an Internal Affairs investigation against me.

(Laughter.)

MR. SANCHEZ: Again, there are very few officers out there that will speak out. I think there are officers that can provide inside information into the behavior of these organizations. I don't believe that some of these organizations are capable of investigating themselves, especially when it involves investigations like these types of investigations.

Again, there was a plot to get Mr. Hubbard out of the Sheriff's Office to save his career. And there is a lot more people involved into the manner in which this investigation was conducted and the outcome of it.

And thank you again.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Thank you for your comments.

The next case is Ivan Sarabia-Medina, POST2322012, POST ID C12-A96.

At this time, I will call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Robert Bringolf, Professional Conduct LA Bureau, and Bryant Henley, attorney, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on this case.

MR. BRINGOLF: Thank you, Vice Chair.

Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Robert Bringolf, and I'm one of the Law Enforcement Consultants assigned to the Los Angeles County Professional Conduct Bureau.

We operate in the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division. And you have all met Bryant Henley sitting next to me, an attorney with our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I'm here to present case 2322012 involving Los Angeles Sheriff Department Sergeant Ivan Sarabia-Medina. I may refer to him as Sergeant Sarabia during this.

Sergeant Sarabia started his law enforcement career as a deputy sheriff with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department in 2007. He was promoted to the rank of sergeant in 2016. He has had no other law enforcement appointments in the state of California.

In August of 2022, a retired Los Angeles sheriff's sergeant contacted the Internal Affairs Bureau after watching several of Sergeant Sarabia's videos on the social media platform TikTok. Internal Affairs investigators watched the videos and believed Sergeant Sarabia was in violation of several LASD policies, as it appeared Sergeant Sarabia was filming TikTok videos for his personal TikTok account while he was on duty as a sergeant.

An Internal Affairs investigation into Sergeant Sarabia's on-duty filming of TikTok videos led to two separate Internal Affairs interrogations in which Sergeant Sarabia was asked in no equivocal terms whether he was filming the TikTok videos on duty.

Sergeant Sarabia stated he had never filmed any of his TikTok videos while on duty.

The Division reviewed several videos from Sergeant Sarabia's personal TikTok account. We reviewed the Internal Affairs investigation interrogation transcripts. And upon review of the videos and transcripts, it was clear that Sergeant Sarabia was repeatedly dishonest with Internal Affairs investigators. That dishonesty was clearly intended to cover up his misconduct, and the motivation to cover up that misconduct was plainly evident.

At several points in the TikTok videos, Sergeant Sarabia's watch was visible while he was filming. In those instances his watch showed the time the video was recorded had fallen within the hours of his scheduled work shift, which was 2100 to 0500, or 9:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. Same time frame.

In another video, Sergeant Sarabia films himself in a police car in full LASD uniform and states he has a couple hours left in his shift.

A further aggravating factor in this case is Sergeant Sarabia's status as a supervisor, one who would routinely act as the Watch Commander for the Walnut Station in the absence of a lieutenant.

Sergeant Sarabia's lack of integrity caused directly into question the accuracy and objectivity of his written reports, his testimony, and his workplace evaluations of subordinates.

Sergeant Sarabia was terminated from the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department for dishonesty related to this case.

The facts I just relayed support the Division's findings that Ivan Sarabia-Medina was involved in serious misconduct, specifically dishonesty relating to the investigation of misconduct of a peace officer.

For purpose of the Division's analysis, as you have heard, "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.

I'm happy to answer any questions.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Board members?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Mr. Henley, did you want to make some comments?

MR. HENLEY: No, thank you, Vice Chair. Not at this time.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: At this time, does the subject officer or counsel wish to make a comment?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Is there anyone in the public who would like to make a comment on this case?

(No response.)

MEMBER GLASER: One question. I'm sorry. Is there any indication that at any point along the way the sergeant was given any indication that he shouldn't be posting images on social media during -- that were taped during his shift?

MR. BRINGOLF: Yeah. There's a policy against it. There is a few policies. Those are mentioned in the back of that record that I provided.

It was pretty well understood. And, in fact, there was one statement -- I'm happy to read -- that was in that ISF that I think might shed a little bit of light.

Let me just pull it up. It is towards the end of -- page 23 of the investigative summary and recommendation that I drafted.

He says -- to the Internal Affairs investigators, Sergeant Sarabia says, "I always made it my goal to -- every time I record something to make sure that I'm, you

know, before my start time or after my end time. I have always made it a goal to, you know, make sure that it's off duty because it is pretty obvious that if you are on duty, you know, you are doing any social media, that might get you in trouble."

And that was a direct quote from him taken out of the transcript.

So it seemed relatively clear that that was not --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: We'll be right with you.

Mr. Lara?

MEMBER LARA: Just real quick.

Also, you prompted a memory. So some of the videos, they show him covering up what is referred to by the agency as their intellectual property. Covering up of the badges, the star, the rank insignia. So to my mind, that would show some of the requisite knowledge that, hey, this is probably not per policy.

MR. BRINGOLF: That's correct.

At some point in time, he was approached by a supervisor. I don't recall the rank of that supervisor. I believe somebody at a command level, who had indicated, "Look, you cannot be showing intellectual property." That's one of the issues that we are having. So to remediate that, he put the stickers, I believe

they are called, on the TikTok app; he put these digital stickers over the intellectual property.

That being said, the assertion was that none of it was happening on duty. And so the places in which we found repeated acts of dishonesty as they relate into the investigation into misconduct was the repeated assertions that he did not do any of this while on duty.

And that was just clearly not the case.

Ma'am?

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Pena.

MEMBER PENA: What was the time frame between when he started posting on TikTok and when he was talked to by his superiors about not doing that?

MR. BRINGOLF: I'm not sure. That's a great question. I'm not sure when they all started. The record that I was provided was it contains several TikTok videos. There may have been more that existed at one point in time. When I started looking at this investigation and when the Division started reviewing this investigation, his personal TikTok that these videos had previously existed on had been taken down.

He does have another personal TikTok account online now, but they do not include these videos. They are separate types of videos.

So I wasn't able to necessarily identify how long

he had been doing it until he had been spoken to. Yeah. And then how long he continued to do it afterward.

The issue at hand in this case just showing the dishonesty was not necessarily that he hadn't had an opportunity to take them down, or that he was trying to comply by covering up the intellectual property. The main issue that we were -- the Division is addressing in the dishonesty is the fact that he is saying he didn't do any of this while he was done duty.

And that's -- we have proven to a clear and convincing standard that that's not the case. To include times in which he even tells people on the TikTok video, "I'm on duty." Right? "I have a couple hours left on my shift." Or he explains what time it is. His watch showing the time frame that it was recorded fell within his work hours.

And another assertion that he said he never came to work on one of his days off to film the TikTok video. So if he was there, he had to have been on a workday. And if it fell within the hours of his work shift, he had to have been on duty.

So that's the issue, the dishonesty that we are addressing. And that was clearly provable.

MEMBER PENA: What if all of the TikTok videos were done in his patrol car, etc., but not on work time?

MR. BRINGOLF: Well, if they were done that way, he wouldn't be lying, but they weren't. So he -- I mean, had he done them in his patrol car -- excuse me -- if he's in his patrol car, and he's wearing full uniform, and he's in public, the assumption is that he's on duty when he's doing these things.

The fact of the matter is, in his Internal Affairs investigation, he was asked in no unspecific terms if he did these things when he was on duty. And he said he did not. He never did. It's not something he did. He never filmed any of his videos on duty.

And so there was nothing to support that other than his statement that he didn't do it on duty. He never provided any evidence that he did these things off duty. There's nothing there. We have seen him in a patrol car with his body-worn camera on, with his watch saying that it's within his work hours, in full uniform with his badge, in a police car.

At times in some of the videos, you hear a radio transmission that the Internal Affairs investigators were able to track down and determine happened during his work hours.

I mean, there's no -- had he done those things, it may not have been a violation necessarily of the sheriff's department's policy, but that is not what the

record is speaking to.

MEMBER PENA: Right. Right.

MR. BRINGOLF: Specifically -- and I don't want to presume that I understand the nuances of their policy in this -- in this case. Really, what we're dealing with is an allegation of dishonesty that was presented by the agency that he lied in the Internal Affairs investigations, and that was proven to a clear and convincing standard by the Division.

MEMBER PENA: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Any other questions?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: No? One moment. We understand there is a representative of Mr. Medina on the call or on video. If there is, please identify yourself, and go ahead.

MS. ETHIR: Good morning. I'm sorry -- good afternoon, everybody. My name is Saku Ethir. I am the attorney that works with PPOA, the sheriff's department union. And I am currently representing former Sergeant Ivan Sarabia-Medina.

I would like to just address -- I appreciate the questions that have already been presented by the Board or inquired of by the Board. I would like to provide everybody just some background with respect to the

events that involved the allegations involving my client's TikTok account.

To answer, I hope, some of the questions that were posed, then Sergeant Sarabia created the account in question, the TikTok account, in or around March of 2022. At the time, he was a sergeant. And this was a social media platform on TikTok that he was utilizing.

His intentions -- as the TikTok account garnered some traction and was creating a platform for him, his intentions were an attempt to bridge the gap between the community and law enforcement and the sheriff's department.

He began posting TikToks in and around March of 2022. At some point in time, the sheriff's department did become aware of the platform, and he was approached -- and this, I believe, was one of the questions. He was approached by a captain, but solely for the purpose of asking him to not put or place the department's intellectual property in his TikToks. He was asked to essentially cover that intellectual property.

At the time that he was approached, the evidence in the sheriff's department's own investigation, which is what the POST utilized in their investigation, he -- he then proceeded to ensure that videos -- to the best of

his ability, that the videos -- TikToks on his account were covering the intellectual property.

At no time, at that time, was he asked by a captain whether or not these TikToks were on duty or off duty or whether or not -- you know, the times that they were either video recorded or posted.

And he did, in fact, move forward. He covered the insignia or the intellectual property in the best fashion that he was aware of.

And at that time, he was never approached again with questions up until the interview with Internal Affairs about being on duty or off duty. He did continue after that initial inquiry to continue to post so long as he was covering the intellectual property.

We have information -- the information in the investigation established that after the TikTok account was created, the sheriff's department and specialized unit within the sheriff's department was, in fact, monitoring Sergeant Sarabia's TikTok account. And one of the reasons we believe that was occurring was because he shared a TikTok during the election process involving then Sheriff Villanueva, and he was the incumbent, and his opposition, which is the current Sheriff Luna. And he shared a TikTok in support of then Sheriff Villanueva.

And we have information that as a result of that, his TikToks were being recorded and were being tracked.

At one point in time, he was approached again by his supervision. And he was offered a three-day suspension for the displaying of department intellectual property.

Officer -- I'm sorry -- Sergeant Sarabia indicated at the time that he felt that that was excessive under the circumstance because when given direction to conceal any intellectual property, he took that under -- under advisement, and he immediately moved forward in doing that. And he felt that the three-day suspension was excessive. And so he asked that instead he be issued a written reprimand.

Following that, and very shortly after that, is when the department provided Sergeant Sarabia with the initial Notice of Administrative Investigation. That was on September 28 of 2022.

And then he was then subsequently provided another Amended Notice of Administrative Investigation by the sheriff's department on 11/11/2022.

And then he was placed on paid administrative leave on March 9th of 2023.

And then issued another Amended Notice of Investigation on May 11th of 2023.

And then finally interviewed for the first time on June 8th of 2023, almost eight months after he was initially notified that there would be an administrative investigation.

At the time of the initial interview, Sergeant Sarabia did his best to recall times and dates that he either recorded TikToks at the police department or the station and times and dates when he posted those TikToks.

What's important for the Board to keep in mind is Sergeant Sarabia did not learn about the specific TikToks he was going to be questioned about until he was in the midst of his interview. And at that time, he made it very clear that his practice with respect to recording TikToks at the station was to do it before he started his shift or after he completed his shift.

He admitted being in uniform at times. He admitted that sometimes he was at the station. But his best recollection at the time, as he conveyed it, was that his practice was to make every effort not to do this on duty.

And so the answers he provided in that interview almost nine months after, or eight months after, being advised of this investigation, and a year to a year and a half, in some instances, of when he posted these

TikToks, he did his best to provide answers that were truthful and concise to the best of his recollection.

He was then subsequently interviewed again on July 14th of 2023. Again, approximately nine months after the original notice. And, again, a year to a year and a half at that point or almost a year and a half since some of these TikToks had been actually posted. Not necessarily recorded.

And so the burden, as POST is aware, or the Board is aware, is clear and convincing evidence. No clear and convincing evidence has been introduced to establish that going into this interview, or in this interview, Sergeant Sarabia possessed the intent to deceive or be deceitful in his responses.

Remember, going into this interview, Sergeant Sarabia was aware that the department's level of discipline that they had intended to impose against him almost nine months prior was a three-day suspension without pay.

Lastly -- I know I'm running out of time or have run out.

Ultimately, Sergeant Sarabia, at the time of imposition of this discipline, had a 16-year career. Seven of those as a sergeant, with no notable prior discipline referenced by the department or even

referenced, more importantly, by the investigators in this case. And he had excellent prior evaluations. There were no issues of credibility, integrity, or honesty either as a deputy or as a sergeant.

So we believe, in this case, the criteria has not been met with the clear and convincing standard, not just that is required here, but also that is required in order to sustain allegations of dishonesty.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Board, any questions?

MEMBER JOHNSON: I have one.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I believe you stated that he stated that these TikTok videos were to bridge the gap between the police and the community.

Could you explain the video concerning the Taser when the young man was running, and he was Tased, and he kept flashing the Taser beam consistently?

MR. ETHIR: So I mean, I know specifically what you are referring to.

But what you have to remember, with respect to what is before the Board, here is an allegation of dishonesty. And so that -- that is the criteria here. That's what we are here to address are the allegations of dishonesty. There are no findings as I'm familiar with the Board that is -- involves the actual content of

the TikToks or the -- the content of the TikToks.

I will tell you that Sergeant Sarabia posted numerous, numerous TikToks well beyond those that he was questioned about.

However, I will tell you that he said in his interview and he described the purpose behind the account and why he was posting these TikToks, and oftentimes would describe reasons for uses of force and how and why sometimes these things would occur.

And so certainly I think -- and I know he is present on this call. He may be able to provide you with more clarity with respect to that, sir.

But I do know that he has expressed and expressed in his interview that his intentions at all times were not to disrespect or to present information that would be perceived or reviewed by someone as being disrespectful.

However, his intentions at all times, he expressed, were to provide information, context, experiences, that he felt would certainly bridge that gap.

But he is -- he is on this call, and if you would like him to provide you with more context as to his intentions behind any of his TikToks, including that one, I'm sure he would be willing to do that.

MR. BRINGOLF: Chair, if I could just add something

to that point.

I just want to bring attention to section 1209, which essentially says we can only address the issue of sufficiency of our findings during this hearing, right, and during the public comment period.

Our findings are a finding of dishonesty by the peace officer during the Internal Affairs investigation. As counsel for Sergeant Sarabia has indicated, there are no allegations about the content of those videos.

There's also an indication that his statements were only to help provide clarity. The Division has found that that's not the case. The Division has found that the dishonesty was clearly intended to cover up his misconduct.

And what we need to decide here today is whether our findings were sufficient in that matter, under 1209.

MEMBER CLAVO: I have a quick comment.

Adding to what Mr. Johnson's question was --

Board Member Clavo.

I think his question was relevant to the honesty/dishonesty because as community members sitting here on this board, I don't think anyone I know in the City of Sacramento, the County of Sacramento, would look at that video and see that it is bridging the gap of the community.

So if Mr. Diaz -- I'm sorry, Mr. Medina would like to explain and bring us on board on how that is bridging the gap -- the gap in a community who are facing issues with law enforcement currently in California, we would -- I am more than willing to listen.

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: Of course. Can you guys hear me okay?

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Yes.

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: Right. Again, thank you again for listening to my case here today.

To answer your question on that specific video, there's a caption that I put on top of the video. And that caption says "50,000 volts. Please fight us in court, not on the streets." And that's the message that I want to get out there. Like, do not fight police officers on the street. If you don't agree with what he is doing or saying at the time, do not fight them. Just fight us in court.

I do agree that maybe the Taser was a mistake looking back. But that is the caption that I put on the video because that's the message that I wanted to get across to my viewers.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: I have a question.

Is it your position that none of the TikTok postings that were investigated were conducted on duty?

And my second question was: Is there some monetary reward or compensation for doing this?

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: Of course.

So as to your -- I see you are asking about whether or not there's a monetary compensation on the videos. The videos that I post are monetized. So basically they do pay per view or per -- I believe per thousand views or 10,000 views. I really don't know the algorithm behind the TikTok algorithm, but they do pay a certain amount of money, which is not much. I believe a video that went viral, I got like $1.25. So this is not, you know, life-changing money.

But to answer your question, yes, they do pay per view or per thousand views, I believe.

And what was your first question, sir?

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: My first question was: Is it your position that none of the postings that were done -- that were investigated were done on duty?

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: So at the time, I believe that all the postings that were done were not done on duty, which is why I stated to Internal Affairs that that was my belief, and that's why I answered.

Obviously, I didn't have the luxury that the department has to listen to radio traffic or to look at different -- to slow down the videos and look at

specific times.

So, obviously, some of those videos did fall within the time that I was on duty. And, of course, you know, knowing that now, I of course -- you know, I would have -- had I known, I would have disclosed that.

But at that time, I did not know that, and that's why I provided my statement to Internal Affairs.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Thank you.

Any other questions?

MEMBER GLASER: Yeah. I would like to follow up on that point.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Mr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Mr. Sarabia, thank you for answering our questions.

On that point, it appears from what we have seen that there were more than a few videos posted where the evidence is quite clear that you were on duty. And so I would just like to reinforce Mr. Doyle's question, which is: Is it still your contention that you didn't realize, at the time of the IA interview, that you had been on duty for some of these?

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: Now, so I recorded the majority of my videos before my shift and after my shift. That's the message I was trying to get across to the Internal Affairs investigators. However, they

weren't videos that I recorded on duty. A lot of those videos were never posted. Those videos were just for myself and for family members.

However, it turns out that maybe some of these videos were ultimately posted at some point. And that's why it shows that I was on duty.

I did record some videos on duty, as I said. But those videos, as far as I know, were never posted. And that was my idea when I went into my interview Internal Affairs, and that's why I provided those statements.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Any questions?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. SARABIA-MEDINA: You are welcome, sir.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: At this time, we will adjourn the meeting and go into closed session.

(Time noted: 2:57 p.m.)

---o0o---

(Closed session was held from 3:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.)

---o0o---

(Time noted: 3:32 p.m.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: We're back on the record again, in the matter of Case POST2322012, Ivan

Sarabia-Medina, who at the time of events in this case was employed by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department.

Comments on -- did the Board have any comments?

(No response.)

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Would a board member care to make a motion?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Johnson. Motion: Decertification.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Okay. We have a motion to decertify.

Is there a second?

MEMBER GLASER: Second.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Second is Mr. Glaser.

Please take the roll.

MR. KNAPP: Okay. Board Member Buchen.

(No response.)

MR. KATAPODIS: Board Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Abstain.

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Doyle.

VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Yes.

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Dudley.

(No response.)

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Lara.
MR. ELLSWORTH: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: And Board Member Pena.
MEMBER PENA: No.
MR. KNAPP: Five yeses; one abstention; and one no.
VICE CHAIRPERSON DOYLE: Motion passes.
Okay. Is there any other business?
MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Sure.
So as this concludes our case proceedings for today, I just want to point your attention to future meeting dates before we adjourn.
As I mentioned earlier in an administrative report this morning, we have a hearing scheduled for May 15th and 16th to be held here in West Sacramento.
At this point, we're going to kind of hold that date, but keep you advised whether or not we have any appeals to hear -- to hear cases on that date.
We will, however, have cases for the July 24th, 25th hearing here in West Sacramento.
And I also would like for you folks to put some additional dates on your calendar so that we can plan

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KATHRYN S. SWANK, 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, Kathryn S. Swank, a 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 10th day of April 2024.

Kathryn S Swank

KATHRYN S. SWANK, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13061