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

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

CASE NO.: POST2316280 **SUBJECT OFFICER:** Khammouane Kevin Thakham

POST ID: A45-Q53 **EMPLOYING AGENCY:** Fresno Police Department

---

POST INVESTIGATOR: Robert Tripp

NOD DATE OF ISSUANCE: December 09, 2025

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT: PC 13510.8 (b)(1)/11 CCR 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty; PC 13510.8 (b)(6)/11 CCR 1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

On 08/10/2023 at 4:41 a.m., an anonymous male caller with a blocked number – which would be later identified as Fresno Police Department (FPD) Corporal Khammouane Kevin Thakham (hereinafter "Respondent") – contacted the FPD Communications Center to report an ongoing violent domestic disturbance. The caller said a female was screaming "help me!" and "stop!" and that he could hear banging and things being thrown around. The caller also said he observed frequent traffic through the apartment and described the victim's vehicle. The caller declined to provide his name. FPD officers responded to the address noted by the caller at 5:08 a.m., where they contacted a female (hereinafter "Victim 1") and her son (hereinafter "Victim 2") who resided at the reported location. The officers determined there was no disturbance.

On the following day at 10:08 p.m., the same caller again contacted the FPD Communications Center from a blocked number and reported another ongoing disturbance at the same address. The caller said he heard a "lot of screaming and yelling," including a female yelling "Stop! Stop! Stop!" The caller again refused to provide his name. FPD took the report and the call ended. At 10:26 p.m., the caller called back and reported he could now hear a male and female yelling and throwing things around, escalating the urgency of the situation. "It's bad," said the caller. The dispatcher told the caller he would update the report for the responding officers and the dispatcher subsequently escalated the priority designation for the call.

FPD officers responded to the address at 11:12 p.m., spoke with Victim 1 and Victim 2, canvassed other apartments for information, and determined there was no disturbance. Victim 1 and Victim 2, who were in the apartment on both occasions, told responding officers they believed the calls were made by Respondent to harass them. Respondent and Victim 1 had dated, but Victim 1 ended the relationship approximately one month prior to the incidents. Since then, Respondent had repeatedly called and texted the victim attempting to rekindle the relationship.

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

FPD opened an Internal Affairs (IA) investigation on 08/16/2023 and interviewed Respondent on 10/10/2023. Investigators played the three calls placed on 08/10-11/2023 and Respondent admitted that he was the anonymous caller. Respondent stated he placed the calls because Victim 1 had broken up with him without any explanation and would not speak with him. He hoped the police response would prompt Victim 1 to "seek out to me for my opinions or my advice." He stated he knew his calls would generate a police response and that none of the events he described in the call actually happened. He did not identify himself and blocked his number because he knew the call was not a legitimate call for service.

POST reviewed the FPD IA investigative report, Body Worn Camera (BWC) video of the 08/11/2023 incident response, recordings of the three calls, and a recording of Respondent's interview with IA investigators. POST also interviewed the Respondent. The clear and convincing evidence identified through this review establishes with high probability that Respondent engaged in dishonesty relating to the reporting of a crime by knowingly reporting a fabricated domestic violence incident, on multiple occasions, to the FPD. These facts constitute serious misconduct in violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(1) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(1) – Dishonesty.

Respondent's actions also violated California Penal Code Section 148.3(a), in that he made a report to a government agency "that an 'emergency' exists, knowing that the report is false." Although the violation is only a misdemeanor, and although no criminal charges were filed, his illegal acts were particularly egregious because they were repeated and because he used his knowledge of the police response process to coerce a vulnerable member of the public. In addressing the urgent call for service placed by Respondent, the responding officers unwittingly participated in Respondent's scheme to compel Victim 1 to contact him, an act akin to domestic violence and harassment. Respondent's actions were inconsistent with his obligation to uphold the law and respect the rights of members of the public, constituting serious misconduct in violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.

ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

1. **The alleged misconduct violated Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(1) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(1) – Dishonesty.**

Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(1) and Commission Regulation 1205 (a)(1) define as 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

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

data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct."

On 08/10/2023 at 4:41 a.m., an anonymous male caller with a blocked number contacted the FPD Communications Center to report a domestic disturbance. The caller provided the address and apartment number where the disturbance was taking place and described a domestic violence situation requiring an urgent response:

> *I don't want to get involved, but, uh, this female is screaming "Help me! Help me!" and there's a lot of banging noise going on. And I know there's a lot of – been a lot of traffic in and out. There should be a – a – a white Tesla parked in front of it. These people just moved in and there's a lot of traffic, and now I hear screaming and yelling. A female yelling "Help me! Stop! Help me! Stop!"*

The call lasted for 5 minutes and 51 seconds. As the call progressed, the caller indicated the situation remained dire. The caller stated, "Now she's screaming again, 'Help me!'" The caller declined to provide his name or telephone number, which was blocked, expressing concern about "shady characters going to come back to me."

FPD dispatch designated the call as "Priority 0," the highest priority call for service reserved for "emergencies with immediate need such as threat to life or crime in progress." Officers arrived at the apartment at 4:55 a.m. and contacted the occupants of the apartment, Victim 1 and Victim 2, who had been asleep. Officers determined there was no disturbance. Officers asked Victim 2 if he knew who might have called the police. Victim 2 indicated the ex-boyfriend of Victim 1 might have made the call, but did not identify the ex-boyfriend by name.

On the following day, the same anonymous male caller again called the FPD Communications Center from a blocked number. This call was placed at 10:08 p.m. and lasted 1 minute and 40 seconds. The caller described a situation similar to that reported on the previous day: a female was yelling for help during what appeared to be a domestic disturbance. The caller said the female was yelling "Stop!" multiple times. The caller did not wish to provide his name.

Approximately 15 minutes later, at 10:26 p.m., the anonymous caller called the FPD a second time that evening. In this call, which lasted 1 minute and 33 seconds, the caller indicated that a male was now also screaming along with the female, and that they were "just throwing things around," including glass. In response to the second call, the FPD raised the priority of the response from Priority 2 to Priority 1, the highest priority designation not requiring an immediate response, and the first units arrived at the apartment within 30 minutes. Responding units were informed by dispatch of the call on the previous day and were provided record checks results for Victim 2 performed during that call.

The interaction between the victims and FPD was recorded on the BWC of the responding officers. When officers arrived, Victim 2 was reluctant to allow officers access to the apartment as this was the second time officers knocked on his door at an unusual hour without apparent

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

cause. After some discussion, Victim 2 admitted the officers into the apartment, but was concerned they knew the Respondent, who had been dating Victim 1 before breaking up the previous month. Victim 2 believed Respondent had directed the police to check on the victim and thought "maybe you guys were friends, and trying to harass us." He added, "Yeah, there's – that's why I asked for your ID and stuff because – just to make sure it is a real call and not him telling his friend to come here."

Victim 2 expressed concern about Respondent. Victim 2 stated, "He call, like he send message threatening us. He come, he knock, he said he's gonna call the police and much more." Victim 2 also shared an anecdote with the responding officers regarding a visit from Respondent in the previous month. Victim 2 said Respondent showed up and knocked on the door for approximately 30 minutes, until the neighbors came outside. While he knocked on the door, Respondent called Victim 2 about 20 times. Respondent told Victim 2 that if Victim 1 did not start dating him again, he would harass them. Victim 2 estimated that Respondent had called Victim 1 approximately 40 or 50 times.

Victim 1, who spoke very limited English, also believed Respondent was behind the calls for service and was harassing her. Victim 1 stated through a translator that she was very stressed out from the police response and from the repeated calls Respondent made directly to her over the past few days.

The officers contacted six other neighbors in the apartment building and confirmed there had been no disturbance. The officers completed their investigation sometime after midnight and cleared the scene.

Based on the allegations made by Victim 1 and Victim 2, and on a review of the anonymous calls by FPD personnel who believed the voice sounded like that of the Respondent, FPD initiated an internal affairs investigation on 08/16/2023.

On 10/10/2023, IA investigators interviewed Respondent and played recordings of the anonymous calls placed to the FPD Communications Center on 08/10/2023 and 08/11/2023. Respondent admitted that he placed the calls. He stated Victim 1 broke off their relationship very suddenly without telling him why. When he saw her at social functions, she pretended everything was fine and that they were still in a relationship, but when he tried to call her, she refused to take his calls. The situation made Respondent upset. He said, "All I want to do is talk to her" and discuss their relationship.

Respondent stated he had placed the calls to the Communications Center to provoke a response from Victim 1. He said, "that was my thought process, get her response and maybe again, seek out some, seek out to me for my opinions or my advice." He confirmed he hoped the victim would reach out to him to ask for help if the police came to her apartment. Respondent

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

understood the call he made would generate a police response. He confirmed none of the events he described in his call to the FPD had actually happened.

Respondent stated that he did not identify himself during the calls because he knew people could call the police anonymously and he knew the calls were not legitimate. Respondent confirmed he blocked his phone number when he made the call to hide his identity.

Respondent confirmed this account in an interview with POST conducted on 11/06/2025. Respondent stated he knowingly placed the calls to the FPD Communications Center to initiate a police response which he hoped would prompt Victim 1 to contact him; the situation he reported in the calls did not happen; and he knew placing such calls was wrong, which is why he deliberately dialed "67" before placing the calls to conceal his identity.

The clear and convincing evidence – including the incident reports, recordings of the three calls, BWC video which captured victim statements, Respondent's IA interview, and Respondent's POST interview – establishes with high probability that Respondent was dishonest when he made a false report to the FPD Communications Center. He intentionally made that false report to provoke a police response, thereby manipulating a former romantic partner into contacting him. Respondent did so knowing any police response had the potential to create a dangerous situation for both the victim and the responding officers. The Respondent's actions were done deliberately, involved substantive falsehoods, and consisted of false reports related to the reporting of a criminal matter. These actions constituted serious misconduct as defined in Penal Code §13510.8(b)(1) and Title 11, CCR 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.

2. The alleged misconduct violated Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.

Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Commission Regulation 1205 (a)(6) define as serious misconduct "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 his IA interview, Respondent stated he had been a sworn officer for approximately 27 years and was knowledgeable about patrol functions, investigations, and tactical responses. He acknowledged that part of his duties were to teach recruits how to respond to calls for service. Respondent identified an in-progress call in which there is an imminent threat to life or great body injury as a 0 or 1 priority, or an "emergency situation."

Based on the details he provided to the Call Taker, Respondent believed there would be an "*emergency response*" to the location. While he agreed that there was a possibility that the call could lead to either the apartment residents or officers being injured, he explained that he had not considered this when he made the calls.

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

He stated in his IA interview that he was aware it was a crime to make a false report of an emergency and believed he violated a misdemeanor statute. He qualified this response in his POST interview by stating he was not aware of the legal implications of his actions when he placed the calls but learned so after the fact. Respondent's knowledge of the specific California Penal Code violation(s) notwithstanding, it is noted Respondent stated he knew the calls were "improper" and that he deliberately concealed his identity when he placed the calls.

California Penal Code Section 148.3(a) states that any individual making a report "to any city, county, city and county, or state department, district, agency, division, commission, or board, that an 'emergency' exists, knowing that the report is false." California Penal Code Section 148.3(c) defines "emergency" as any condition that results in, or could result in, the response of a public official in an authorized emergency vehicle. The clear and convincing evidence affirms with high probability that Respondent knew his report was false and that he knew the situation he described would be considered an emergency, i.e., a Priority Zero call. It was also clear that the call would result in a response by police to Victim 1's residence. The clear and convincing evidence also demonstrates the Respondent knew what he was doing was wrong, as evidenced by his statements made during his IA and POST interviews and by the deliberate actions he took to conceal his identity, i.e., declining to provide his name and dialing "67" before placing the calls to block his caller ID number.

A violation of California Penal Code Section 148.3(a) is a misdemeanor charge. Here, no criminal charges were filed against Respondent. Those facts notwithstanding, Respondent's illegal acts were egregious because they were repeated and because he used his knowledge of the police response process to coerce a vulnerable member of the public. In addressing the urgent call for service placed by Respondent, the responding officers unwittingly participated in Respondent's scheme to compel Victim 1 to contact him and ultimately resume a relationship which she clearly indicated she did not want to do. As Respondent acknowledged in his POST interview, his actions were "a category of domestic violence or domestic harassment," and that Respondent would have conducted an investigation if he received a call for service involving a fact pattern similar to this incident.

The clear and convincing evidence – consisting of the Respondent's knowledge of police practices, California law, and his own statements – demonstrate with high probability that the Respondent knowingly and deliberately committed acts that violate the law and were sufficiently egregious or repeated as to be inconsistent with his obligation to uphold the law and respect the rights of members of the public, constituting serious misconduct in violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law.

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

Title 11, California Code of Regulations 1213(a) requires the Commission to consider various factors when considering whether to take action against a peace officer's certification, including the following:

- The nature and severity of the act or omission.
- The circumstances surrounding the conduct and the extent to which the act or omission caused any actual or potential harm to or impact upon the victim, the public, other peace officers, the employing agency, or the law enforcement profession.
- The extent to which the act or omission was done intentionally, willfully, or maliciously.

The Respondent's acts were severe. The Respondent knew his false reports would compel armed officers to make contact with the victim, and the BWC video from the response on 08/11/2023 depicted FPD's necessarily intrusive and persistent – but professional – response, given their understanding of the situation. Indeed, the severity of the act was the Respondent's intent: he desired the police contact to be so disturbing as to drive Victim 1 to reach out to him; and on 08/11/2023, he called the FPD a second time that evening to emphasize the urgency of the incident and escalate the severity.

The Respondent's actions caused actual or potential harm to the victim, to the public and other police officers, and the employing agency. FPD officers had reason to believe they were responding to a potentially violent situation. Victim 1 and Victim 2 did not know the circumstances behind the response, which came on the first day when they were both asleep. The potential for a use of force situation in those uncertain circumstances was not negligible, and represented a potential threat for both the victims and the responding officers. In the response on 08/11/2023, FPD officers also contacted six neighbors late at night, another series of interactions entailing potential risk and great disruption. Additionally, the BWC video documented Victim 2's concerns that responding officers were present at the behest of Respondent, a reflection of how Respondent's acts eroded trust in the Department.

The Respondent's actions were intentional, willful, and malicious. Respondent stated to POST that he was not thinking rationally when he made the calls, but he nevertheless devised a plan to report a fabricated emergency, executed that plan, waited more than 24 hours to determine if the plan succeeded in compelling Victim 1 to reach out to him, and then placed two additional calls to further coerce his intended victim.

It is noted Respondent had no disciplinary history on file with the FPD in the five years prior to the allegations addressed by this report, but he was the subject of a domestic violence Temporary Restraining Order issued in December 2013, which was lifted in January 2014. The Respondent stated to POST the TRO was not made permanent and was lifted because the date/time stamps on the digital photographs presented as evidence were inconsistent with the domestic violence narrative. The Respondent stated his firearm and badge were taken while he was subject to the

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

TRO, but he received no discipline. FPD had no records of discipline for the Respondent for this incident.

In mitigation of Respondent's actions, he was forthright during the IA investigation and POST interview. He did not minimize his actions or evade responsibility and expressed remorse for his actions. FPD's internal investigation sustained multiple policy violations against Respondent, including violating Penal Code Section 148.3(a), and he was suspended for 160 hours, demoted from Corporal to Police Officer, and given a last-chance agreement which remains in effect for the duration of his FPD employment.

FINDINGS

The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division has determined by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(1) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty, and as defined in Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations 1205(a)(6) – Acts that Violate the Law. For purposes of this report, clear and convincing evidence means "evidence of a charge is clear and convincing so long as there is a 'high probability' that the charge is true. The evidence need not establish a fact beyond a reasonable doubt."

Based on its investigation and the consideration of factors enumerated in Title 11, California Code of Regulations 1213(a), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division has determined that reasonable grounds exist to seek suspension or revocation of Respondent's certifications, in accordance with Penal Code Section 13510.85.