

INVESTIGATIVE SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

PEACE OFFICER NAME: Brian Keith Kawamoto

POST ID NUMBER: C34-D38

EMPLOYING AGENCY: Torrance Police Department

POST CASE NUMBER: POST2305110

WRITTEN BY: LEC Robert Bringolf

DATE: 04/11/2025

Contents

I. Executive Summary 3

II. Background Information 3

a. Identity of Respondent 3

b. Respondent's Service Record, Relevant Training, and Prior Complaints and Discipline 3

c. Prior Employment History 4

d. Peace Officer Certification 4

e. The Present Allegations of Serious Misconduct 4

III. Investigative Methodology 5

IV. Factual Summary 6

V. Analysis and Findings 12

a. Establishing Jurisdiction 12

b. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code 13510.8(b)(5) and California Regulation 1205(a)(5) – Demonstration of bias on the basis of race? 12

VI. Supporting Evidence and Documentation 19

VII. Findings 19

I. Executive Summary

This case was submitted by the Torrance Police Department (TPD) which alleged the subject officer, Officer Brian Keith Kawamoto, hereinafter, "Respondent," was involved in serious misconduct when he sent text messages that contained racist, homophobic and transphobic sentiments which demonstrated his bias and inability to fairly and impartially perform his duties as a peace officer.

II. Background Information

a. Identity of Respondent

At the time of the events at issue, Respondent was employed as a Police Officer with the TPD. The Respondent was terminated from the TPD on October 4th, 2022.

b. Respondent's Service Record, Relevant Training, and Prior Complaints and Discipline

When evaluating whether suspension or revocation is appropriate, Penal Code section 13510.8(c)(5) and California Regulation section 1213(a)(5) authorize the Commission to consider Respondent's prior conduct, discipline and service record. The relevance and weight the Commission may choose to assign to a peace officer's prior conduct and service record will depend on the facts in each case.

Respondent had no disciplinary actions on file with the Torrance Police Department and his most recent performance review indicated that his performance was generally meeting standards or above standards.

While employed as a peace officer, or deputy trainee, Respondent received the following training relevant to this allegation:

- Basic Police Academy
- Racial Profiling

- Racial Profiling Update – 4 Hours – 03/12/2019

c. Prior Employment History

Respondent began his law enforcement career with the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Office as a deputy sheriff on March 12, 2011; Respondent was hired by the Torrance Police Department on November 17, 2014. Respondent was terminated from the Torrance Police Department on October 4, 2022.

d. Peace Officer Certification

Respondent is assigned POST ID C34-D38. He received the following peace officer certificates from the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST):

- Basic #145522 (Issued: March 26, 2012)
- Intermediate #122441 (Issued: March 19, 2013)
- Advanced #113286 (Issued: March 20, 2017)

e. The Present Allegations of Serious Misconduct

1. ***Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(5), as clarified by Commission Regulation 1205(a)(5)[1] – Demonstrating Bias:***

> (a)(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

[1] See 11 Cal. Code Regs. § 1205(a)(5) (as modified on April 18, 2024).

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.

III. Investigative Methodology

This report summarizes the findings related to allegations of serious misconduct. This investigation was conducted in accordance with the regulations and policies of POST. The investigation included the review of TPD’s administrative investigation which contained interviews of witness officers and the subject officer. The TPD also provided the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (Division) the raw data seized from the cellular telephones of other Torrance Police Officers during a criminal investigation.

Information obtained was analyzed using the clear and convincing evidence standard. 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."

This report is necessarily summary in nature and does not include every fact or issue that might be found in the underlying investigation and attachments.[2] It does, however, contain reference to that evidence that I believe establishes the requisite facts, and proves the serious misconduct charged, by clear and convincing evidence.

IV. Factual Summary

On March 26, 2023, Torrance Police Department (TPD) reported allegations of serious misconduct against Respondent to POST pursuant to California Penal Code Section 13510.9(a)(3). The allegations stemmed from the discovery of homophobic, transphobic and racist texts sent between members of the TPD between May 2018 and February 2022.

On January 27, 2020, two other Torrance Police Officers, Christopher Tomsic and Cody Weldin, were the subject of a criminal investigation wherein it was alleged they had vandalized an arrestee's vehicle by, among other means, spray painting a swastika and a smiley face on the interior of the arrestee's vehicle during an inventory/search.[3]

[2] The Division, as described further below, received information concerning approximately 390 messages exchanged between several peace officers. Respondent both received and responded to a certain subset of these 390 messages. The Division also reviewed instances where Respondent's words, acts or other conduct did **not** demonstrate bias by clear and convincing evidence. The Division's Investigative Summary and Findings in this case does not attempt to summarize every single instance in which Respondent sent or received a message, however. Instead, the Division's Investigative Summary and Findings addresses specific messages where Respondent's words, acts or other conduct demonstrated bias within the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5).

[3] On Thursday April 10, 2025, Officers Tomsic and Weldin plead guilty to felony vandalism. They will spend two years on probation and must give up their right to serve as law enforcement officers in California as well as complete 100 hours of community service and 15 hours of anti-racism training.

As a result of the criminal investigation, Torrance Police Detectives obtained a search warrant for Tomsic's and Weldin's DNA and their personally owned cellular telephones.

The data from the cellular telephones was provided to an analyst at the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office for review and with the intent to determine whether the two suspect officers had any ties to white supremacy.

During the review of the data, the District Attorney's analyst discovered around 390 messages that were believed to contain or reference antisemitic, homophobic, racist, or transphobic remarks. Those messages were sent between Tomsic, Weldin and several other officers, including Respondent.

On **March 25, 2019**, in a direct text with Officer Weldin, Officer Weldin texted, "Just had a shooting." Respondent replied, "Fuck," and, "I trust y'all have them moon crickets[4] in custody in no time!"

On **May 2, 2019**, Officer Weldin texted Respondent directly, "If it's any consolation, I like sober 'beating-up-savage monkeys' Brian, and I also like drunk 'hood-rat-shit-with-my-friends' Brian." Respondent replied, "Well I appreciate that lol."

On **September 10, 2019**, Respondent texted officers Weldin, Tomsic, and Alonso a photo of coffins saying, "This is from the coffin display at rice mortuary. Look at the one on the bottom." Weldon responded, "For all them nigglets we put down." Respondent replied, "Haha yeah, I got a water heater box that's just as good I can sell you for the half the price if you're interested though."

On **November 19, 2019**, Respondent texted Officer Weldin, "Happy birfday, nigga!" Weldin responded, "Just making sure you don't go to that location due to the fact that they have 7 fewer employees now to serfe up some spicy chicken sandwiches[.]" Respondent

[4] "Moon Cricket is a racial slur against black people. The exact origin is obscure. One theory suggests it began with US slaves, who sang as a pastime – an act of community and resistance- at night after their labor – Source: dictionary.com

sent, “Good call. What’s the game plan for your birthday?” Weldin texted, “Make money, beat niggas[.]” Respondent replied, “I know nothing puts a bigger smile on yo grill.”

On **December 24, 2019**, Respondent texted an image meme[5] to Officers Alonso, Tomsic, and Weldin. In that image meme there were three Christmas-related images (a star for the top of a Christmas tree, a Christmas ornament, and a candy cane) and an old black and white image of a Black person (appearing to be a slave). On the top of the image meme were the words, “Which one doesn’t belong?” at the bottom of the meme were the words, “That’s right, you don’t hang the star”.

On April 1, 2022, Respondent was interviewed as part of a large-scale internal affairs investigation stemming from the discovery of the above-mentioned messages. During the interview Respondent was advised of his Constitutional Rights per 3303(h) of the Government Code. Respondent invoked his right to remain silent and was compelled to provide a statement. The interviewer admonished Respondent pursuant to *Lybarger*[6] and then the interview continued.

During the internal affairs investigation Respondent provided his cellular telephone number to the investigator[7]. Respondent advised he had a work cell phone for an abbreviated time while he worked for TPD. Respondent stated his wife would occasionally use his phone, but it was safe to say that all the messages were his[8]. Respondent told investigators that he did not allow others to send text messages from his phone and that he used the cell phone to send and receive text messages to and from Torrance Police Department co-workers.

[5] an image, video, piece of text, etc., typically humorous in nature, that is copied and spread rapidly by internet users, often with slight variations.
[6] *Lybarger v. City of Los Angeles,* 40 Cal. 3d 825 (1985).
[7] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 7.
[8] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Transcript Pg 7.

City of Torrance and TPD Policies

Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(5) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(5) both establish that the demonstration of bias in violation of department policy constitutes serious misconduct. The City of Torrance and the TPD enforce several policies relating to the conduct of their employees. What follows is a summary of some of the most relevant policies which relate directly to Respondent's conduct in this case:

- The Law Enforcement code of Ethics, Policy 104 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."

- The City's Anti-Harassment Policy 34.10a, Protected Classifications prohibits harassment or discrimination because of an individual's protected classification. This 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.

- The City's Anti-Harassment Policy 34.10d, Visual or Written Harassment prohibits 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.

- The City's Anti-Harassment Policy 134.05 requires that all City employees 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.

- The City's Anti-Harassment Policy 134.15 states it is the employee's responsibility to report any conduct which fits the definition of discriminatory harassment to their immediate supervisor or appropriate authority figure.

- General Orders 1.10.3(B), 2.01.1(A), 2.33.1(D) explain the Department's philosophy and expectations of personnel in their service to the community. Section 1.10.3(B) Service to the Community, emphasizes the rules and regulations of the Department such as maintaining a professional attitude and demeanor that will not in any manner communicate any personal prejudices. In addition, 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. General Order 2.01.1(A) explains 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. General Order 2.33.1(D) defines prohibited speech, expression, and conduct which tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation, or professionalism of the TPD or its employees, such as speech or expression that could reasonably be foreseen as having a negative impact on the credibility of the employee as

a witness, and additionally speech or expression that is contrary to the Mission Statement or Core Values of the TPD.

- TPD policies 319.4, 319.5.7(i), 319.5.8, 319.5.9, 401.2, 401.3, 1021.4 - TPD Policy Manual 319.5.8(i) prohibits any act on or off duty that brings discredit to the department. TPD Policy 319.5.9(g) prohibits the use of obscene, indecent, profane or derogatory language while on duty or in uniform; and 319.5.9(m) prohibits any other on duty or off duty conduct which any member knows or reasonably should know is unbecoming a member of the department, is contrary to good order, efficiency or morale, or tends to reflect unfavorably upon this department or its members. Furthermore, TPD Policy Manual 401.2 states the TPD 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 the TPD to provide law enforcement services and to enforce the law equally, fairly, and objectively and without discrimination toward any individual group. TPD Policy Manual 401.3 prohibits bias based policing.

On October 4, 2022, the City of Torrance, CA sent Respondent a letter of intent to terminate his employment as a police officer with TPD. In the letter, authored by then-Assistant City Manager Danny E. Santana, Respondent's involvement in the above-listed messages was classified as racist, and TPD terminated Respondent based on Respondent's violation of several Torrance Police Department Policies.

On May 8, 2023, the Commission on POST's Assistant Executive Director, Annemarie Del Mugnaio issued an immediate temporary suspension for Respondent's POST Certification.

V. Analysis and Findings

a. Establishing Jurisdiction

The Commission on POST may initiate proceedings to revoke or suspend a peace officer's certification for conduct which occurred before January 1, 2022 if the employing agency makes a final determination regarding its investigation of the misconduct after January 1, 2022.[9]

The final determination in this allegation of serious misconduct resulted in Respondent's termination, which occurred on October 4, 2022.[10] The investigation was still ongoing after January 1, 2022 as evidenced by Respondent's internal affairs investigation interview on April 1, 2022.[11] Because the TPD made its final determination regarding its investigation of Respondent after January 1, 2022, the Commission on POST has jurisdiction to consider this serious misconduct action.

b. Does the alleged conduct violate Penal Code 13510.8(b)(5) and California Regulation 1205(a)(5) – Demonstration of bias on the basis of race?

When analyzing the serious misconduct allegation of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Regulation 1205(a)(5), "demonstrating bias," the Division evaluates whether the subject officer, through words, action or other conduct showed prejudice, intolerance, contempt or hatred towards a protected class of persons. If the subject officer did show prejudice, intolerance, contempt or hatred towards a protected class of persons, the Division then considers whether the words, action or conduct would lead a reasonable person to conclude that the officer has not or will not fairly and impartially perform the

[9] California Penal Code section 13510.8(g)(1)(B).
[10] Termination letter dated October 4, 2022, Pg 1.
[11] Compendium file, Respondent's Interview Transcripts.

officer's law enforcement duties. If so, serious misconduct is shown if the officer's words, action or conduct either: 1) violates applicable law, 2) violates department policy, or 3) is inconsistent with the officer's obligation to carry out the officer's duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

During the analysis of each instance of potentially biased behavior, the conduct was analyzed based on the above guidelines to determine whether the allegation of bias was true to a clear and convincing standard.

Regarding the **March 25, 2019** message between Respondent and Officer Weldin, Weldin texted Respondent stating, "Just had a shooting". Respondent replied, "Fuck" and, "I trust y'all have them moon crickets in custody in no time!" During Respondent's internal affairs interview, when asked about his use of the term "moon crickets," Respondent stated the following: "So moon crickets is a word that…I heard it like in training or something once that I thought was funny, but refers to Black people and I don't know why specifically I said that, but yeah, I shouldn't have sent that either, sir. It's offensive."[12] When the internal affairs investigator asked if the March 25, 2019 message represented the only time when Respondent ever used the term "moon cricket" when referring to Black people, Respondent answered: "Probably not sir."[13]

As Respondent acknowledged during his internal affairs interview, the exchange between Officer Weldin and Respondent is inherently offensive. It is also racist. Respondent's conduct, in sending the message "I trust y'all have them moon crickets in custody in no time!" shows prejudice and intolerance towards a protected class of persons. Respondent's message also violated

[12] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 43.
[13] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 45.

several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-Harassment Policies (34.10 through 34.25, and 134.05 through 134.20), and General Orders 1.10.1, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). Even when viewed in the light most favorable to Respondent, the racist epithet used to describe the suspects in a shooting who might be subject to enforcement action from the Torrance Police Department necessarily erodes the public's confidence in Respondent's ability to fairly perform his law enforcement duties. A reasonable person would conclude that Respondent's message shows Respondent has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of persons in the Torrance community, specifically because Respondent makes a statement indicating he assumed the suspects in the shooting would be black without possessing any other information about the crime.

Regarding the **May 2, 2019** text in which Officer Weldin texted Respondent directly, "If it's any consolation, I like sober 'beating-up-savage monkeys' Brian, and I also like drunk 'hood-rat-shit-with-my-friends' Brian." Respondent replied, "Well I appreciate that lol." This message is another example of the use of a racist epithet and an indication of a use of force on a protected class of persons. When Respondent was asked what Officer Weldin meant when he texted: "…I like sober beating up savage monkeys…", Respondent answered: "*Sounds like he's referring to beating up black people, sir.*"[14]

While the racist epithet was not used by Respondent, his reply to Officer Weldin "[w]ell I appreciate that lol" indicates a tacit approval of the use of dehumanizing and racist language and shows intolerance and prejudice toward black people. It is also reasonable to believe that Officer Weldin is indicating Respondent is

[14] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 66.

known for using physical force against black people, or that using physical force against black people is a foregone conclusion between these two officers. This message exchange violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-Harassment Policies (34.10 through 34.25, and 134.05 through 134.20), and General Orders 1.10.1, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). After reading this message exchange, a reasonable person would conclude that Respondent has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of persons in the Torrance community.

Regarding the **September 10, 2019** text in which Respondent texted Officers Weldin, Tomsic and Alonso a photo of coffins saying, "This is from the coffin display at rice mortuary. Look at the one on the bottom." Weldon responded, "For all them nigglets we put down." Respondent replied, "Haha yeah. I got a water heater box that's just as good I can sell you for half the price if you're interested though". When asked during his internal affairs interview what Officer Weldon meant when he texted "[f]or all the nigglets we put down," Respondent answered: "[i]t sounds like [Officer Weldin is] talking about being for all the black children that he said we've put down."[15] The internal affairs investigator then asked what Respondent believed the term "nigglets" meant. Respondent answered: "I think it refers to black children. I think he's mixing the N word with piglet type of thing."[16]

I find this is another example of a pervasive theme among Respondent and several of his coworkers. I find that a reasonable person would consider the use of the term "nigglets" to be racist and an explicit demonstration of bias.

[15] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 39.
[16] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 39.

Further, the officers make jokes about a cardboard box being used for all the "nigglets [they] put down." I find a reasonable person here would infer that the officers were saying the cardboard coffins were for all of the black children the officers have killed or will kill. The fact that Respondent laughed, agreed, and then offered a "water heater box" as an alternative shows participation in joking about killing black children and using cardboard coffins to bury the decedents. Further, it is inferred they are making light of fatal police enforcement contacts involving black people. I find this text and perpetuation of the discourse to be an explicit demonstration of bias, which is inconsistent with Respondent's obligation to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner. This message exchange also violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-Harassment Policies (34.10 through 34.25, and 134.05 through 134.20), and General Orders 1.10.1, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). A reasonable person, after viewing the disparaging communications between these officers, would conclude that Respondent has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of persons in the Torrance community.

Regarding the **November 19, 2019**, text conversation in which Respondent texted Officer Weldin, "Happy birfday, nigga!" Weldin responded, "Just making sure you don't go to that location due to the fact that they have 7 fewer employees now to serfe up some spicy chicken sandwiches[.]" Respondent sent, "Good call. What's the game plan for your birthday?" Weldin texted, "Make money, beat niggas[.]" Respondent replied, "I know nothing puts a bigger smile on yo grill."

I find this is another example of a pervasive theme among Respondent and several of his coworkers in which they mock black people. These messages are inherently offensive and racist. The messages also violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-

Harassment Policies (34.10 through 34.25, and 134.05 through 134.20), and General Orders 1.10.1, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). Respondent's conduct, in sending the message shows prejudice and intolerance towards a protected class of persons. Even when viewed in the light most favorable to Respondent this message erodes the public's confidence in Respondent's ability to fairly perform his law enforcement duties. A reasonable person would conclude that Respondent's message shows Respondent has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of persons in the Torrance community.

These types of statements and messages discredit the Torrance Police Department in potentially irreparable ways and violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy (34.05, et seq.), and General Orders 1.10, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D).[17] Accordingly, the Division finds that Respondent demonstrated bias within the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Regulation 1205(a)(5) when he sent the above-listed text messages.

Regarding the **December 24, 2019** text in which Respondent sent an image meme to Officers Alonso, Tomsic and Weldin which referenced hanging a person. In that image meme there were three Christmas-related images (a star for the top of a Christmas tree, a Christmas ornament, and a candy cane) and an old black and white image of a Black person (appearing to be a slave). On the top of the image meme were the words, "Which one doesn't belong?" at the

[17] Attachment F: Torrance Policies

bottom of the meme were the words, “That’s right, you don’t hang the star.” After Officer Weldin replied “I done nearly pissed myself”, Respondent texted “Happy kwanza (sic)”. When asked by the internal affairs investigator if he remembered sending the messages, Respondent replied: “*Yes, sir, I do. There’s no excuse. I understand it’s offensive…*”[18] The internal affairs investigator subsequently asked Respondent whether this message was disparaging or discriminatory towards Black people. Respondent replied: “*I feel like it was offensive to Black people…Because it’s making references to when Black people had been hung in the perspective*.”[19]

This image and the messaging associated with the image is inherently offensive and racist. The image and messages also violated several of the Torrance Police Department’s policies, including but not limited to: TPD’s Anti-Harassment Policies (34.10 through 34.25, and 134.05 through 134.20), and General Orders 1.10.1, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D). Respondent himself acknowledged that he knew the message “was offensive to Black people.” Respondent’s conduct, in sending the message shows prejudice and intolerance towards a protected class of persons. Even when viewed in the light most favorable to Respondent, sending a picture of a black person and suggesting that the black person should be hanged, followed by the message “Happy kwanza (sic)” is unequivocally racist and erodes the public’s confidence in Respondent’s ability to fairly perform his law enforcement duties. A reasonable person would conclude that Respondent’s message shows Respondent has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of persons in the Torrance community.

[18] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 22.
[19] Attachment D: Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview Pg 23.

These types of statements and messages discredit the Torrance Police Department in potentially irreparable ways and violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to: TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy (34.05, et seq.), and General Orders 1.10, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D).[20] Accordingly, the Division finds that Respondent demonstrated bias within the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Regulation 1205(a)(5) when he sent the above-listed text messages.

VI. Supporting Evidence and Documentation

Attachment "A" – Executive Review and Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division Recommendation

Attachment "B" - Respondent's EDI Report

Attachment "C" - Termination Letter

Attachment "D" – Excerpts from Respondent Transcripts 4/01/22 Interview

Attachment "E"- Text messages – sorted by date

Attachment "F" - Applicable Torrance Policies

VII. Findings

Based on the evidence that Respondent sent discriminatory texts in violation of TPD policies, and because a reasonable person would conclude that Respondent has not or will not perform his duties fairly and impartially as a result, the Division finds there is clear and convincing evidence that Respondent engaged in serious misconduct, to wit demonstrating bias in violation of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(5). Therefore, reasonable grounds exist to submit this case to the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board and the POST Commission for consideration of suspension or

[20] See Torrance Policies

revocation of Respondent's POST certification in accordance with the Executive Review and Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division Recommendation.[21]

[21] See Attachment "A".