BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 2305109
JOSHUA G. SATTERFIELD	OAH No. 2025101113
Basic Certificate No. 180699	**DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER**
Respondent.	[Gov. Code, §11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On June 25, 2025, Complainant Manuel Alvarez, Jr., in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, filed Accusation No. 2305109 against Joshua G. Satterfield (Respondent) before the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (Commission). (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)

2. On July 14, 2015, the Commission issued Basic Certificate No. 180699 to Respondent.

3. On May 3, 2023, Complainant ordered the immediate temporary suspension of Respondent's Certification under Penal Code section 13510.8, subdivision (d), because Complainant determined that the temporary suspension was in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the public based upon Respondent's discharge from the Torrance Police Department (TPD) for serious misconduct.

4. On July 1, 2025, Respondent was served by certified and first-class mail copies of the Accusation No. 2305109, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense (two blank copies), Request for Discovery, and Discovery Statutes (Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1215, is required to be reported and maintained with the Commission. Additionally, a courtesy copy was sent via certified and first-class mail to Respondent's counsel, Tom Yu, Esq., 10803 Foothill Blvd., Suite 112, Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730.

5. On July 3, 2025, Respondent signed and returned a Notice of Defense, requesting a hearing in this matter.

6. On November 7, 2025, a Notice of Hearing was served by certified and first-class mail at Respondent's address of record and Respondent's counsel. The Notice of Hearing informed Respondent that an administrative hearing in this matter was scheduled for May 4, 2026 through May 7, 2026.

7. On April 29, 2026, Respondent's counsel withdrew from representation, provided an e-mail address for Respondent, and indicated that Respondent was accepting electronic service via e-mail for all pleadings, notices, and communications.

8. On May 3, 2026, Respondent, through special appearance of his former counsel, filed a motion to continue the hearing on the grounds that his counsel had withdrawn from representation on April 29, 2026 and he required additional time to retain counsel and prepare for the hearing.

9. On May 6, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge issued an Order Granting Continuance; Notice of New Videoconference Hearing Dates, which were served via e-mail on Respondent and Respondent's former counsel. The hearing was continued to September 4, 2026 through September 10, 2026, excluding the weekend and holiday.

10. On May 19, 2026, a Notice of Continued Hearing; Motions Hearing was served via e-mail at Respondent's e-mail address and by certified and first-class mail at Respondent's address of record. The Notice of Continued Hearing; Motions Hearing informed him that an

administrative hearing in this matter was continued to September 4, 2026 through September 10, 2026, excluding the weekend and holiday.

11. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

12. The matter was called for hearing at the date, time and location set forth in the Notice of Continued Hearing; Motions Hearing. The assigned Administrative Law Judge found that the service of the Notice of Continued Hearing; Motions Hearing on Respondent was proper. There was no appearance by or on behalf of Respondent. A default was declared and on motion of counsel for Complainant, the matter was remanded to the Commission under Government Code section 11520.

13. Government Code section 11506, subdivision (c) states, in pertinent part:

> (c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense . . . and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation . . . not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense . . . shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing.

14. Government Code section 11520, subdivision (a) states, in pertinent part:

> (a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense . . . or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent . . . .

15. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Commission finds Respondent is in default. The Commission will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this matter, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 2305109, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent Joshua G. Satterfield has subjected his Basic Certificate No. 180699 to discipline.

2. The agency has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

3. The Commission is authorized to revoke Respondent's Basic Certificate based

upon the following violations alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this case: Respondent engaged in serious misconduct, to wit demonstrating bias in violation of Penal Code section 13510.8, subdivision (b)(5), and California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1205, subsection (a)(5), in that between approximately August 23, 2018 and approximately April 30, 2019, Respondent engaged in acts that through repetitive words, action, or other conduct, Respondent showed prejudice, intolerance, contempt, or hatred towards a protected class of persons which would lead a reasonable person to conclude that Respondent has not fairly and impartially performed, or will not fairly and impartially perform, his law enforcement duties. Respondent's repetitive words, actions, or other conduct violated TPD policies and were inconsistent with his obligation to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Basic Certificate No. 180699, issued to Respondent Joshua G. Satterfield, is revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on 09/14/2026.

It is so ORDERED 09/14/2026

MANUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Attachment:
Exhibit A: Accusation

68711811
LA2025301505

Exhibit A

Accusation

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
THOMAS L. RINALDI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
CLAUDIA MOREHEAD
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 205340
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6482
Facsimile: (916) 731-2117
E-mail: Claudia.Morehead@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. 2305109
JOSHUA G. SATTERFIELD	**ACCUSATION**
Basic Certificate No. 180699,	
Respondent.	

Complainant alleges:

PARTIES

1. Manuel Alvarez, Jr. (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (Commission).

2. On July 14, 2015, the Commission issued Basic Certificate Number 180699 (Certification) to Joshua G. Satterfield (Respondent). That Certification was in full force and effect at all relevant times to the charges brought herein.

3. On May 3, 2023, Complainant ordered the immediate temporary suspension of Respondent's Certification under Penal Code section 13510.8, subdivision (d), because Complainant determined that the temporary suspension was in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the public based upon Respondent's discharge from the Torrance Police Department (TPD) for serious misconduct.

JURISDICTION

4. This Accusation is brought before the Commission under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Penal Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

5. Code section 830 states:

> Any person who comes within the provisions of this chapter and who otherwise meets all standards imposed by law on a peace officer is a peace officer, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person other than those designated in this chapter is a peace officer. The restriction of peace officer functions of any public officer or employee shall not affect his or her status for purposes of retirement.

6. Code section 830.1, subdivision (a), states that ". . . a police officer, employed in that capacity and appointed by the chief of police or chief, director, or chief executive of a public safety agency, of a city. . . is a peace officer. . . ."

7. Code section 13510.1 states:

> (a) The commission shall establish a certification program for peace officers described in Section 830.1, 830.2 with the exception of those described in subdivision (d) of that section, 830.3, 830.32, or 830.33, or any other peace officer employed by an agency that participates in the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) program. A certificate or proof of eligibility issued pursuant to this section shall be considered the property of the commission.
>
> (b) Basic, intermediate, advanced, supervisory, management, and executive certificates shall be established for the purpose of fostering professionalization, education, and experience necessary to adequately accomplish the general police service duties performed by peace officer members of city police departments, county sheriffs' departments, districts, university and state university and college departments, or by the California Highway Patrol.
>
> . . .
>
> (e) The commission shall assign each person who applies for or receives certification a unique identifier that shall be used to track certification status from application for certification through that person's career as a peace officer.
>
> (f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the commission shall have the authority to suspend, revoke, or cancel any certification pursuant to this chapter. This authority extends to any certificate or proof of eligibility issued by the commission including, without limitation, any certificate or proof of eligibility that is invalid, inactive, expired, or canceled.
>
> . . .
>
> (i) As used in this chapter, 'certification' means any and all valid and unexpired certificates issued pursuant to subdivision (b), including basic, intermediate, advanced, supervisory, management, and executive certificates or any

proof of eligibility issued by the commission pursuant to this section.

8. Code section 13510.85 states:

(a)(1) When, upon the completion of a serious misconduct investigation conducted pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 13510.8, the division finds reasonable grounds for the denial, revocation, or suspension of a peace officer's certification, it shall take the appropriate steps to promptly notify the peace officer involved, in writing, of its determination and reasons therefore, and shall provide the peace officer with a detailed explanation of the decertification procedure and the peace officer's rights to contest and appeal.

(2) Upon notification, the peace officer may, within 30 days, file a request for a review of the determination by the board and commission. If the peace officer does not file a request for review within 30 days, the peace officer's certification shall be suspended or revoked, consistent with the division's determination, without further proceedings. If the peace officer files a timely review, the board shall schedule the case for hearing.

(3) The board shall meet as required to conduct public hearings, but no fewer than four times per year.

(4) At each public hearing, the board shall review the findings of investigations presented by the division pursuant to paragraph (1) and shall make a recommendation on what action should be taken on the certification of the peace officer involved. The board shall only recommend revocation if the factual basis for revocation is established by clear and convincing evidence. If the board determines that the facts and circumstances revealed by the investigation warrant a sanction other than revocation, it may recommend that a peace officer's certification be suspended for a period of time. The board shall issue a written decision explaining its reasons for decertification or suspension.

(5) The commission shall review all recommendations made by the board. The commission's decision to adopt a recommendation by the board to seek revocation shall require a two-thirds vote of commissioners present and shall be based on whether the record, in its entirety, supports the board's conclusion that serious misconduct has been established by clear and convincing evidence. In any case in which the commission reaches a different determination than the board's recommendation, it shall set forth its analysis and reasons for reaching a different determination in writing.

(6) The commission shall return any determination requiring action to be taken against an individual's certification to the division, which shall initiate proceedings for a formal hearing before an administrative law judge in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code), which shall be subject to judicial review as set forth in that act.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 832.7, the hearings of the board and the review by the commission under this section, administrative adjudications held pursuant to paragraph (6) of subdivision (a), and any records introduced during those proceedings, shall be public. These public records may, in the discretion of the division, be redacted for the reasons set forth in paragraphs (6) and (7) of subdivision (b) of Section 832.7. This subdivision does not preclude the board or the commission, or both, from reviewing the unredacted versions of these records in

closed session and using them as the basis for any action taken.

. . . .

9. On or about September 17, 2024, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.8, subdivision (c), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (Division) found reasonable grounds for disciplinary action against Respondent's Certification. Respondent was properly notified and timely requested a review of the determination under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(2).

10. On January 16, 2025, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(4), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board (Board) reviewed the Division's determination, concluded that clear and convincing evidence existed for a disciplinary action against Respondent, and recommended that the Commission revoke Respondent's Certification.

11. On March 6, 2025, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(5), the Commission reviewed the Board's determination and recommendation and found that it was supported by clear and convincing evidence. Pursuant to Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(6), this Accusation is filed to initiate proceedings for a formal hearing before an administrative law judge in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, as prescribed by Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

12. Code section 13510.8 states:

> (a)(1) The commission shall revoke the certification of a certified peace officer if the person is or has become ineligible to hold office as a peace officer pursuant to Section 1029 of the Government Code.
>
> (2) The commission may suspend or revoke the certification of a peace officer if the person has been terminated for cause from employment as a peace officer for, or has, while employed as a peace officer, otherwise engaged in, any serious misconduct as described in subdivision (b).
>
> (3) The commission may cancel the certificate or proof of eligibility of a peace officer if the commission determines that there was fraud or misrepresentation made by an applicant at any time during the application process that resulted in the issuance of the certification.

(b) By January 1, 2023, the commission shall adopt by regulation a definition of 'serious misconduct' that shall serve as the criteria to be considered for ineligibility for, or revocation of, certification. This definition shall include all of the following:

. . .

(5) Demonstrating bias on the basis of race, national origin, religion, gender identity or expression, housing status, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or other protected status in violation of law or department policy or inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to carry out their duties in a fair and unbiased manner. This paragraph does not limit an employee's rights under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

. . .

(c) . . .

(5) . . . The commission shall consider the peace officer's prior conduct and service record, and any instances of misconduct, including any incidents occurring beyond the time limitation for investigation in evaluating whether to revoke certification for the incident under investigation.

. . .

(d) Upon arrest or indictment of a peace officer for any crime described in Section 1029 of the Government Code, or discharge from any law enforcement agency for grounds set forth in subdivision (a), or separation from employment of a peace officer during a pending investigation into allegations of serious misconduct, the executive director shall order the immediate temporary suspension of any certificate or proof of eligibility held by that peace officer upon the determination by the executive director that the temporary suspension is in the best interest of the health, safety, or welfare of the public. The order of temporary suspension shall be made in writing and shall specify the basis for the executive director's determination. Following the issuance of a temporary suspension order, proceedings of the commission in the exercise of its authority to discipline any peace officer shall be promptly scheduled as provided for in this section. The temporary suspension shall continue in effect until issuance of the final decision on revocation pursuant to this section or until the order is withdrawn by the executive director.

. . .

(g)(1) The commission may initiate proceedings to revoke or suspend a peace officer's certification for conduct that occurred before January 1, 2022, only for either of the following:

(A) Serious misconduct pursuant to paragraph (1) or (4) of subdivision (b) or pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) for the use of deadly force that results in death or serious bodily injury.

(B) If the employing agency makes a final determination regarding its investigation of the misconduct after January 1, 2022.

(2) Nothing in this subdivision prevents the commission from considering the peace officer's prior conduct and service record in determining whether suspension or revocation is appropriate for serious misconduct.

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

13. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1205 states:

(a) Serious Misconduct is:

. . .

(5) Demonstrating bias on the basis of actual or perceived race, national origin, religion, gender identity or expression, housing status, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or other protected status in violation of law or department policy or inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to carry out their duties in a fair and unbiased manner. This paragraph does not limit an employee's rights under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

(A) An officer is "demonstrating" bias for purposes of this Regulation when the officer either shows or displays, by words, actions or other conduct, prejudice, intolerance, contempt, or hatred towards one or more persons due to that person's membership within a class of persons identified in Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5), when such words, actions or other conduct would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the officer has not fairly and impartially performed, or will not fairly and impartially perform, their law enforcement duties.

(B) An officer engaging in racial profiling in violation of Penal Code section 13519.4 is demonstrating bias because profiling casts suspicion on a class of people without individualized suspicion as to the person being stopped.

. . . .

14. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1212 states:

(a) The Commission shall have the authority to suspend, revoke, or cancel any certification issued pursuant to Chapter 1 of Title 4 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

(b) At the hearing, conducted by the Commission, to review a recommendation made by the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board (the 'board'):

(1) The Commission's decision to adopt a recommendation by the board to seek revocation shall require a two-thirds vote of Commissioners present.

(2) The decision shall be based on whether the record, in its entirety, supports the board's conclusion that serious misconduct has been established by clear and convincing evidence.

(3) The Commission may conduct deliberations in closed session.

(4) In any case which the Commission reaches a different determination than the board's recommendation, it shall set forth its analysis and reasons for reaching a different determination in writing. A copy of the written decision shall be provided to:

(A) The board,

(B) The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (the 'division'), and

(C) The involved peace officer or designated representative.

(c) The Commission shall return any determination requiring action to be taken against an individual's certification to the division, which shall initiate proceedings for a formal hearing before an administrative law judge in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

(1) After the hearing, the Commission will receive the proposed decision from the administrative law judge.

(2) The proposed decision shall be reviewed by the Commission in accordance with Government Code Section 11517(c)(2).

(3) The Commission's decision shall be considered final 30 days after the date of service of the decision upon the involved peace officer or their legal representative. A copy of the written decision shall be provided to:

(A) The board,

(B) The division,

(C) The involved peace officer or designated representative, and

(D) The head of the agency that employs or employed the involved peace officer.

(d) The commission shall publish the names of any peace officer whose certification is suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation on the POST website.

(e) The commission shall notify the National Decertification Index of the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training of any peace officer whose certification is suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation.

15. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1213 states:

(a) In considering whether to take action against a peace officer's certification, and in considering whether a revocation or suspension is appropriate in light of the facts of the particular case, the Commission shall consider any of the following factors:

(1) The nature and severity of the act or omission.

(2) 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.

(3) Whether the involved peace officer is currently employed as a peace officer.

(4) Whether the alleged conduct was committed under the color of authority or

while the peace officer was acting in the capacity of a peace officer.

(5) The peace officer's prior conduct, discipline and service record, and any prior instances of misconduct.

(6) The proximity or remoteness in time since the conduct occurred.

(7) Any mitigating or aggravating factors and/or evidence of rehabilitation.

(8) The degree of accountability and cooperation with the investigation evidenced by the peace officer.

(9) The extent to which discipline, or forbearance from discipline, would impact the best interests of the public, the public service, the employing agency, and/or the law enforcement profession.

(10) The motives of the peace officer that resulted in the conduct.

(11) Consistency of the penalty with those imposed upon other peace officers for the same or similar offense.

(12) The clarity with which the peace officer was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense.

(13) The extent to which the act or omission was done intentionally, willfully, or maliciously.

(14) The likelihood of recurrence.

(15) Any other aggravating or mitigating factors relevant to the Commission's determination.

(b) A suspension shall not exceed three years.

(c) A peace officer whose certification has been suspended may not be assigned duties which include the exercise of peace officer powers.

RELEVANT TORRANCE POLICE DEPARTMENT POLICIES

16. Law Enforcement Code of Ethics, Policy 104.3, states:

. . .

I WILL keep my private life unsullied as an example to all....

I RECOGNIZE the badge of my office as a symbol of public faith, and I accept it as a public trust to be held so long as I am true to the ethics of the police service.

. . . .

17. Anti-Harassment Policy 34.10a, Protected Classifications, states:

This Policy prohibits harassment or discrimination because of an individual's protected classification. "Protected Classification" includes race, religious creed,

color, national origin, ancestry, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age for individuals over 40 years of age, military and veteran status, and sexual orientation.

Harassment can consist of virtually any form or combination of verbal, physical, visual or hostile work environment conduct. It need not be explicit, nor even specifically directed at the victim. . . .

. . . .

18. Anti-Harassment Policy 34.10d, Visual or Written Harassment, states:

The display or circulation of offensive or derogatory visual or written material related to race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age for individuals over 40 years of age, military and veteran status, and sexual orientation. This may include, but is not limited to, posters, cartoons, drawings, graffiti, reading materials, computer graphics or electronic media transmissions.

19. Anti-Harassment Policy 134.05, Anti-Harassment Procedure, states:

All persons shall immediately report any evidence of discriminatory harassment or complaints regarding sexual harassment made to them or which they have directly observed whether or not reported by the employee who is the object of the harassment to their supervisor, manager, or to the Human Resources Division. . . .

20. Anti-Harassment Policy 134.15, Employees' Responsibilities, states:

Report any conduct which fits the definition of discriminatory harassment to their immediate supervisor or appropriate authority figure.

21. General Order Section 1.10.3(B), Service to the Community, Policy, states:

The rules and regulations of the Department regarding police service in general, and public contact specifically, shall be as follows:

. . .

2. A police department employee shall maintain a professional attitude and demeanor that will not in any manner communicate any personal prejudices.

. . .

4. Members of the Department shall avoid behavior which would tend to bring about criticism of the Department. Conduct, whether on or off duty, shall be such as to merit the respect and confidence of the public.

. . . .

22. General Order 2.01.1(A), Employee Rules and Regulations, Employee Responsibility, states:

It is the duty of all employees to familiarize themselves with and abide by

Department rules and regulations. Employees who fail to comply are subject to disciplinary action up to and including termination. . . .

23. General Order 2.33.1(D), Social Media, Prohibited Speech, Expression, and Conduct states:

> To meet the Department's safety, performance, and public-trust needs, the following is prohibited unless the speech is otherwise protected. . . :
>
> 2. Speech or expression that, while not made pursuant to an official duty, is significantly linked to, or related to, the Torrance Police Department and tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation, or professionalism of the Torrance Police Department or its employees;
>
> 3. Speech or expression that could reasonably be foreseen as having a negative impact on the credibility of the employee as a witness. For example, posting statements or expressions to a website that glorify or endorse dishonesty, unlawful discrimination, or illegal behavior;
>
> . . .
>
> 5. Speech or expression that is contrary to the Mission Statement or Core Values of the Torrance Police Department.

24. Standards of Conduct, Policy 319.4, General Standards, states:

> Members shall conduct themselves, whether on- or off-duty, in accordance with the United States and California Constitutions and all applicable laws, ordinances and rules enacted or established pursuant to legal authority.
>
> Members shall familiarize themselves with policies and procedures and are responsible for compliance with each. Members should seek clarification and guidance from supervisors in the event of any perceived ambiguity or uncertainty.

25. Standards of Conduct, Policy 319.5.8, Performance, prohibits:

> (i) Any act on or off duty that brings discredit to the department.

26. Standards of Conduct, Policy 319.5.9, Conduct, prohibits:

> . . .
>
> (f) Discourteous, disrespectful, or discriminatory treatment of any member of the public or any member of this department or the City.
>
> (g) Use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on-duty or in uniform.
>
> . . .
>
> (m) Any other on- or off-duty conduct which any member knows or reasonably should know is unbecoming a member of this department, is contrary to good order, efficiency, or morale, or tends to reflect unfavorably upon this department or its members.

. . . .

27. TPD Policy Manual, Policy 401.2, Policy, states:

> The Torrance Police Department is committed to providing law enforcement services to the community with due regard for the racial, cultural or other differences of those served. It is the policy of this department to provide law enforcement services and to enforce the law equally, fairly, and objectively and without discrimination toward any individual or group.

28. TPD Policy Manual, Policy 401.3, Biased-Based Policing Prohibited, states:

> Bias-based policing is strictly prohibited.
>
> . . . .

29. TPD Policy Manual, Policy 1021.4, Prohibited Speech, Expression and Conduct, states:

> To meet the department's safety, performance and public-trust needs, the following are prohibited unless the speech is otherwise protected (for example, an employee speaking as a private citizen, including acting as an authorized member of a recognized bargaining unit or officer associations, on a matter of public concern):
>
> . . .
>
> (b) Speech or expression that, while not made pursuant to an official duty, is significantly linked to, or related to, the Torrance Police Department and tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation or professionalism of the Torrance Police Department or its employees. . . .
>
> (c) Speech or expression that could reasonably be foreseen as having a negative impact on the credibility of the employee as a witness. For example, posting statements or expressions to a website that glorify or endorse dishonesty, unlawful discrimination or illegal behavior.
>
> . . .
>
> (e) Speech or expression that is contrary to the canons of the Law Enforcement Code of Ethics as adopted by the Torrance Police Department.
>
> . . . .

CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Demonstrating Bias)

30. Respondent has subjected his Certification to disciplinary action on the grounds of serious misconduct under Code section 13510.8, subdivision (b)(5), and California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1205, subdivision (a)(5), in that through repetitive words, action, or other conduct, Respondent showed prejudice, intolerance, contempt, or hatred towards a protected

class of persons which would lead a reasonable person to conclude that Respondent has not fairly and impartially performed, or will not fairly and impartially perform, his law enforcement duties. Respondent's repetitive words, actions, or conduct violated TPD policies and were inconsistent with his obligation to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

Respondent's Background

31. Respondent began his employment with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) as a deputy trainee on January 9, 2014. On June 1, 2014, he promoted to deputy sheriff. He resigned from LASD on February 12, 2016 and began his employment with the TPD as a police officer on February 22, 2016. On September 22, 2022, the TPD terminated Respondent's employment for sending, receiving, and responding to discriminatory messages with fellow officers for over one year and failing to report receiving the messages, in violation of TPD policies. On March 26, 2023, the TPD reported the allegations of serious misconduct to the Commission, as mandated by Code section 13510.9(a)(3).

Discriminatory Text Messaging with TPD Officers

32. On or about January 27, 2020, two TPD officers were criminally investigated for vandalism and a hate crime when they allegedly, among other means, spray painted a swastika and smiley face on the interior of an arrestee's vehicle during an inventory/search. The officers' cellular telephones were searched to determine whether they had any ties to white supremacy. A WhatsApp group text chat titled, "The Boys," among 15 TPD officers, including Respondent, was discovered. The investigation revealed that between May 2018 and February 2022, the TPD officers exchanged approximately 390 messages that included, but were not limited to, antisemitic, homophobic, racist, or transphobic remarks.

33. Concerning Respondent, from approximately May 2018 to approximately September 2019, Respondent received, sent, or responded to a certain subset of those messages, while both on and off duty, including but not limited to, the following:

August 23, 2018 Message

34. On August 23, 2018, Officer Tony Chavez sent a text to Respondent that was a link to an article titled, "Grand Rapids Man Accused of Urinating on Black Child, Calling Her N-

word." Respondent responded, "What's the crime [?]"

December 13, 2018 Message

35. On December 13, 2018, Officer Chavez sent a photo from the social media account of a T Flats rapper that contained an image of an assault rifle sitting upright on a table with a target underneath. After some discussion, Respondent messaged the group, "You happen to notice the rounds put through that target on the table?? [*sic*] I'm confident he won't be hitting any of us with that un-zeroed eotech… kinda reminds me of [Officer David] Chandler's targets" and "By evidence of [IP1.]"[1] Officer Chandler responded, "I'm a deadeye shot biotch. Who's [IP1?]" Respondent replied, "That nigglet you failed to kill. Grandma said you need to be a better shot[.]"

April 30, 2019 Message

36. On April 30, 2019, Officer Lance Nelson shared a Black Lives Matter Instagram post to "The Boys" group chat. The post read, "TORRANCE, CA POLICE SHOT AND KILLED [IP2] WITHIN 15 SECONDS. Just released bodycam footage shows police murder [IP2]..." Respondent responded, "Aww" and "His little son will grow up without a father now. Oh way [*sic*] that's standard for any African American family to be absent a father. He'll be fine[.]"

37. Respondent's above-mentioned unequivocally bigoted words, action, or other conduct demonstrated bias and violated several TPD's policies, including but not limited to, TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy 34.05, et seq. and General Orders 1.10 et seq., 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). They also discredited the TPD in potentially irreparable ways.

DISCIPLINE CONSIDERATIONS

38. When evaluating whether suspension or revocation is appropriate, Code section 13510.8, subdivisions (c)(5) and (g)(2), and California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1213, subdivision (a)(5), authorize the Commission to consider Respondent's prior conduct, discipline, and service record. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges as follows:

[1] IP1 and IP2 refer to involved parties who are members of the Torrance community in a protected class.

A. Respondent was issued a written reprimand on December 13, 2019 for policy violations associated with leaving his assigned beat and failing to advise dispatch of his location.

B. On January 22, 2019, Respondent was issued a 30-day suspension for an event that occurred on April 10, 2018 wherein he committed policy violations associated with missing a court appearance.

C. That same day, another 30-day suspension was issued to Respondent for a separate incident that occurred on August 20, 2018 wherein Respondent, while off-duty and intoxicated, used a LASD deputy's radio to broadcast an "officer needs help" radio call and then immediately turned off the radio. That offense resulted in a county-wide status check/roll call on the radio.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Commission issue a decision revoking the Basic Certificate issued to Respondent Joshua G. Satterfield, or taking other appropriate disciplinary action according to evidence.

DATED: 06/25/2025

MANUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
Executive Director
Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
State of California
Complainant

LA2025301505
67648174.docx