Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

POST makes the following information available to the public pursuant to California Penal Code §13510.85(c) which establishes that POST shall publish the names of any peace officer whose certification has been suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation.

CASE NO.: POST2300069

SUBJECT OFFICER: Evelyn Denise Arraiga **POST ID:** C58-W32

EMPLOYING AGENCY: Riverside Police Department

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT: CPC §13510.8(b)(1) / 11 CCR §1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty and CPC §13510.8(b)(6) / 11 CCR §1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.

CASE SUMMARY:

In January 2023, the Riverside Police Department (RPD) submitted a serious misconduct complaint to POST against Officer Evelyn Denise Arraiga, hereafter "Respondent", alleging that Respondent committed criminal conduct and was dishonest during an administrative investigation. Following POST's investigation and review, POST found, by clear and convincing evidence, that reasonable grounds existed for consideration of revocation pursuant to CPC §13510.8. The findings in the POST Investigative Summary and Findings report are as follows:

On August 1, 2021, Respondent was arrested for domestic battery committed against her fiancée and for the assault of her mother. The Respondent was charged with violations of California Penal Code (CPC) §273.5(a) – Felony Domestic Violence and CPC §368(c) – Elder Abuse, a misdemeanor. The Respondent ultimately pled guilty to an amended charge of CPC §415(2), malicious disturbance.

Through RPD's subsequent internal investigation, a separate instance of domestic battery was discovered, which had occurred on March 17, 2021. As a result, the Respondent was charged with CPC §243(e)(1) – Battery on Spouse or Cohabitant, a misdemeanor. During the Respondent's administrative interrogation, she was dishonest with investigators and stated she had never struck or been violent toward her fiancée. On February 8, 2022, the Respondent was terminated from her position with RPD.

ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

1. **The alleged misconduct violated Penal Code §13510.8(b)(1) and Title 11 CCR §1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.**

CPC §13510.8 (b)(1) and 11 CCR §1205 (a)(1) defines dishonesty as "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."

During the Respondent's administrative interrogation, and prior to the Respondent's fiancée providing evidence to the contrary, the Respondent was dishonest with investigators and stated she had never hit or been violent toward her fiancée. Digital evidence and testimony later provided to investigators documented several instances of domestic battery perpetrated by the Respondent against her fiancée.

2. **The Respondent's misconduct violated Penal Code §13510.8(b)(6) and Title 11 CCR §1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.**

CPC §13510.8 (b)(6) and CCR §1205(a)(6) define "Acts the Violate the Law" as "*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*."

On March 16, 2022, the Respondent was charged with one misdemeanor count of CPC §243(e)(1), alleging that she committed battery on her fiancé on March 17, 2021. The Respondent was also charged with another misdemeanor count of CPC §243(e)(1), alleging that she committed battery on her fiancé on August 1, 2021. On February 20, 2024, the Respondent pled guilty to an amended charge of CPC §415(2), malicious disturbance.

OUTCOME/IMPOSITION OF DISCIPLINARY ACTION AGAINST PEACE OFFICER CERTIFICATION:

The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division determined that reasonable grounds existed to seek revocation of the Respondent's certifications in this case. A notice of intent to revoke was served on August 7, 2024. The Respondent did not file a request for review within the 30-day response period, pursuant to CPC §13510.85(a)(2), thus resulting in default revocation of the Respondent's certification with no further proceedings. On October 4, 2024, the default order was issued and served on the Respondent. The Respondent's (POST2300069) (POST ID: C58-W32) peace officer certification was revoked on October 4, 2024.