STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

(POSAAB) MEETING

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2025

10:00 A.M.

MEETING HELD

AT THE OFFICES OF

COMMISSION ON POST

860 STILLWATER ROAD, SUITE 100

WEST SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Stenographically Reported By:
Kathryn S. Swank
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #13061, RPR

A P P E A R A N C E S

POSAAB MEMBERS PRESENT

JOYCE DUDLEY
Governor Appointee
Attorney
(Chairperson)

NICOLE CLAVO, Psy.D.
Governor Appointee
Public Member

REGINA HATCHER-CRAWFORD
Governor Appointee
Public Member

CEPHUS JOHNSON
Governor Appointee
Public Member

CHARLES LARA
Governor Appointee
Management Rank Peace Officer

MARGARET PENA
Speaker of Assembly Appointee
Public Member

---o0o---

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
ADVISORY BOARD LEGAL COUNSEL

CHRISTOPHER BEATTY
Deputy Attorney General
Department of Justice
Office of the Attorney General

---o0o---

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

POST STAFF

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

RAYMOND BECHLER
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Northern Bureau

BRYANT HENLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

BRIAN HOFFMAN
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

CHANDLER KNAPP
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Executive Office

BRIAN SOUTH
Bureau Chief
Professional Conduct Central Bureau

ROBERT TRIPP
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Central Bureau

SARAH WALLACE
Bureau Chief
Intake and Disposition Bureau

---o0o---

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

ALSO PRESENT

BEATRICE JOHNSON
Public Speaker

ELLIOTT LOPEZ
POST ID: C15-H32

APPEARING REMOTELY:

OLIVIA KRUEGER
Public speaker

RICHARD ADAMS
POST ID: C56-Q43

JASON EWERT
Counsel for Richard Adams,
POST ID: C56-Q43

---o0o---

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
I. CALL TO ORDER	7
II. ROLL CALL OF POSAAB MEMBERS	90
III. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA	--
IV. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMENTS	12
V. NEW BUSINESS	
a. Election of Vice Chair (Incumbent: Doyle)	12
b. Report on Data for Serious Misconduct Reporting, Investigations, and Disciplinary Action Outcomes	14
VI. APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPTS	11
a. Approval of Meeting Transcript from the October 09, 2025 and November 06, 2025 Meetings	
VII. NEW CASES - REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION	
a. POST2316280 - Khammouane Kevin Thakham (POST ID: A45-Q53) Last Employing Agency: Fresno Police Department (Current)	70
b. POST2402838 - Elliott Lopez (POST ID: C15-H32) Last Employing Agency: California Highway Patrol	91
c. POST2403212 - Richard Adams (POST ID: C56-Q43) Last Employing Agency: California Highway Patrol	153
VIII. CLOSED SESSION	
(Transcripts prepared and bound under separate cover)	
a. POST2316280 - Khammouane Kevin Thakham (POST ID: A45-Q53) Last Employing Agency: Fresno Police Department (Current)	90

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

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
b. POST2402838 - Elliott Lopez (POST ID: C15-H32) Last Employing Agency: California Highway Patrol	149
IX. FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES	--
April 15-16, 2026 - POST, West Sacramento July 15-16, 2026 - POST, West Sacramento October 14-15, 2026 - POST, West Sacramento	
ADJOURNMENT	195
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	196
ERRATA SHEET	197

---o0o---

Thursday, February 5, 2026, 10:01 a.m.

West Sacramento, California

---o0o---

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Good morning, everyone. Today is Thursday, February 5th, and the time is 10:00 a.m.

Thank you all for attending the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board hearing.

Please note that this hearing is being live-streamed, recorded, and transcribed.

Further, please note that the microphones are auto on/off. When you begin speaking, they will go live. With this, you will need to watch your cross-talk.

We will now call the roll of board members.

Chandler.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Chair Dudley.

Good morning, Members.

Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Member Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Member Doyle.

(No response.)

MR. KNAPP: Chair Dudley.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Here.

MR. KNAPP: Member Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Member Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Present.
MR. KNAPP: And Member Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Madam Chair, that's six of nine members present.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. A quorum has been established.
I would now like to introduce board counsel, to my left, Christopher Beatty; and POST Assistant Executive Director Annemarie Del Mugnaio.
This time is set aside for members of the public who wish to comment on items not on the agenda, but those within the Board's jurisdiction. Public comment on matters on the agenda will be heard after each item is presented. Public comment on specific peace officer revocation cases to be heard today will be heard at the time of the hearing of each such matter.
Is there anyone present in the audience or appearing remotely who would like to address the Board during public comment?
First checking the audience.
(No response.)
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing no one.

Is there anyone remotely?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: There's nobody remotely either. Please be advised that the Board cannot take action on items not in the agenda and may discuss those items only to the extent necessary to determine whether any matter should be made an agenda item for further meetings, to respond briefly to statements or questions posed, to request clarification, or to refer to -- the items to the staff.

Please remember this meeting is being transcribed, so I may politely interrupt and ask you to repeat or speak slowly and clearly so your comment can be correctly captured on the transcript.

As the Board Chair, I may ask members of public to limit their remarks to no more than three minutes pursuant to existing board policy.

I may conclude the public comment period if multiple speakers are voicing repetitive already similar statements and the 15-public -- 15-minute public comment period has expired.

You will be given five minutes to speak and the limits will be strictly enforced, so please ensure that you complete your thoughts within the allotted time.

Before I open public comment or matters not on the

agenda, please note that if you wish to comment on disciplinary matters scheduled to be heard today by the Board, you must wait until that matter is called to offer public comment.

If you have a specific complaint about an officer that is not on today's agenda, you should file a complaint with POST or with the officer's employing agency. Staff will assist you in this regard.

I would like to remind individuals making comments to discuss [sic] pending complaints or pending disciplinary actions that may later come before this board for a recommendation. If the Board takes action on your complaint, you will have an opportunity to address the Board at that time. Following these rules is necessary to comply with the law and to avoid compromising the Board's mission.

When it is your turn, you may state your name and organizations.

So is there any public comment?

Again, looking out into the audience.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And remotely?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: No. There's no public comment.

One moment, please.

Is there anyone present or appearing remotely or by phone who would like to address the Board regarding the approval of the October/November meeting transcripts? When it is your turn, you may state your name and organization if you wish. Each gets three minutes.

Anybody want to comment on the agenda?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Are there any questions or comments from the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none.

If the Board concludes [sic], the appropriate action would be a motion to approve the meeting transcripts from the October and November 2025 meetings.

Is there such a motion?

MEMBER LARA: I can make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

MEMBER CLAVO: I second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Is there any opposition? Any abstentions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: At this time I will ask -- okay. So I think that, then, the motion passes.

And at this time, POST Assistant Executive Director

back room, as we have done many times. Or at times, sometimes, people just felt there was no need to deliberate and they wanted to have the discussion out here.

Okay. So let's start.

At this time, I will now call upon the Bureau Chief Robert Tripp, formerly the Professional Conduct Central Bureau, and Brian Hoffman, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on Case POST2316280, Khammouane Kevin Thakham, T-H-A-K-H-A-M, who, at the time of the events at issue in this case, was, and still is, employed with the Fresno Police Department.

MR. TRIPP: Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of the Board. My name is Robert Tripp. And as was mentioned, I am a bureau chief and law enforcement consultant previously assigned to the Professional Conduct Central Bureau in the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division.

With me today is Brian Hoffman, an attorney in our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I'm here today to present POST Case POST2316280, involving Khammouane Kevin Thakham of the Fresno Police Department.

Next slide, please.

It is the Division's determination that clear and

convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that Khammouane Kevin Thakham committed acts of serious misconduct, as set forth in Penal Code 13510.8 on August 10th and August 11th, 2023.

Specifically, the Division determined that Officer Thakham committed the following acts of serious misconduct: Dishonesty and acts that violate the law.

He committed these acts when he placed three anonymous calls to the Fresno Police Department, reporting an ongoing violent disturbance at the residence of a former romantic person. He knew no such incident was happening and made the reports to prompt an emergency response.

In this presentation, I will present a brief outline of the Division's findings of investigation in this matter. My plan is, first, to provide some background on the respondent, and then a timeline of key events to guide you through the incidents.

I will then play excerpts from the calls to identify some of the respondent's false statements, followed by body-worn camera video from responding officers to illustrate victim impact.

Finally, I will provide an analysis supporting the Division's determination that the respondent's actions constituted serious misconduct.

And so, to begin, the respondent's background.

Next slide.

The respondent has spent his entire career with the Fresno Police Department, where he is currently employed. He joined the department in 1994 as a reserve officer, a Level II reserve officer, and became a police officer in 1996. He holds Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced POST certificates.

During his career, he has served in several assignments including patrol, violent crime suppression, Night Detective Unit, and U.S. Marshalls Task Force. He was also a member of the SWAT team for 19 years, both as an operator and later as a part of the support team. In this role, he gained extensive experience with emergency responses, and that is pertinent to the allegations at hand.

Fresno Police Department reported that prior to this incident, he had no disciplinary actions on file. After the incident, however, he did receive a letter of reprimand for failure to activate his body-worn camera while driving Code 3, lights and sirens.

This came to light after he collided with another car during that response. It is to note, though, that POST has no allegations of serious misconduct on file related to this specific incident.

I would like to move now to the sequence of events, which provide the factual basis for the Division's analysis, using a timeline to mark key events associated with the incident.

Next slide.

The respondent began a relationship with a woman to whom I will refer to as Victim 1 in the summer of 2022. At some point later in that year, Victim 1 moved into the respondent's residence.

In July 2023, however, Victim 1 moved out and partially broke off communication with the respondent.

In an interview with POST, the respondent stated Victim 1 would communicate with him in certain public situations when others were around, but, in private, would not initiate or respond to communications with the respondent.

The respondent nevertheless persisted in trying to contact Victim 1, and to her adult son, to whom I will refer to as Victim 2.

During the August 11th incident, Victim 2 reported the respondent once knocked on his door for 30 minutes and kept knocking and calling until neighbors came out to see what was happening. Victim 2 described the respondent's behavior more generally as stalking and harassment.

Approximately one month after Victim 1 moved out, the respondent placed the first anonymous call to the Fresno Police Department Communications Center. That call was placed at 4:41 a.m. on August 10th, 2023. The respondent did not give his name, and he blocked his caller ID.

In this call, the respondent reported a female was being assaulted. He provided an address for the assault, which was the residence of Victim 1 and Victim 2.

The police dispatcher designated this call as Priority 0, and noted in the dispatch log, this was an emergency, presumed life-threatening situation.

Now, for context, Fresno dispatchers prioritize calls using a numbering system. Priority 0 are the highest priority calls involving threats to life.

Priority 1 calls are also urgent, but not necessarily involving a threat to life.

And Priority 2 and Priority 3 calls are nonurgent situations, such as welfare checks and historical property crimes.

The event log noted at least one officer did, in fact, proceed to the scene Code 3, lights and sirens. And other officers did respond. On scene, officers conducted an investigation, determined there was no

disturbance, and departed.

At 10:08 p.m. on the following evening, approximately 41 hours after the first call, the respondent again called the Fresno Police Department Communications Center to report an in-progress disturbance. And, again, he blocked his number and declined to give his name.

After giving that report, 15 minutes later, at 10:26 p.m., he called the Communications Center a third time and provided additional details about the violent disturbance.

The Fresno dispatcher designated the incident as Priority 1, urgent, non-life-threatening property -- property crime in progress.

And units again responded and determined there was no disturbance.

During this response, the victims shared their suspicion that the respondent placed the calls, which lead to his identification as the anonymous caller.

Next slide.

So I've already given a brief summary of the call content. But now I would like to provide you with more specific detail by playing the calls themselves. The combined duration of the calls is nearly ten minutes, so to keep things moving along, I will play excerpts,

starting with excerpts from call 1.

Now, I do note that personal information regarding the victims has been redacted, accounting for some short gaps on the recordings.

If you will advance the slide, that will start the excerpts.

(Call 1 played.)

MR. TRIPP: Salient points in the first call are as follows: There's some kind of an ongoing violent disturbance involving a female who is screaming for help. There is frequent traffic through the apartment. The situation is happening right now, in realtime. And the caller does not want to give his name.

Next slide.

I will now play excerpts from the second call placed the following evening.

(Call 2 played.)

MR. TRIPP: The key points of this call are similar to the first: A female is screaming "Stop." The situation is happening in realtime. Additionally, the dispatcher does confirm that units will respond.

Next slide.

I will now play an excerpt from the final call placed just 15 minutes after the previous call. This excerpt begins 26 seconds into the conversation.

(Call 3 played.)

MR. TRIPP: This call amplifies the urgency of the situation. The caller describes the physical dispute involving breaking objects and says it is bad. The dispatcher confirms he's in contact with the officers and will relay the caller's information.

Regarding the response, Fresno police responded to the victim's residence on both days, August 10th and August 11th.

On August 10th, officers arrived on scene at 4:52 a.m., interviewed Victim 1 and Victim 2, determined there was no disturbance or assault, and departed within 15 minutes.

The interaction on that night between officers and victims was relatively cordial. Although officers woke both victims, they allowed them into the apartment without delay and cooperated fully with the investigation.

The response on the following day was more involved.

Officers arrived at the residence at 10:50 p.m. and were on scene for well over an hour. Officers interviewed Victim 1 and Victim 2 separately, who again stated there was no disturbance. This time, however, victims informed officers they suspected the respondent

placed the anonymous calls.

In addition to interviewing Victim 1 and Victim 2, officers canvassed other apartments. The canvass confirmed there had been no other disturbance as described by the anonymous caller.

Responding officers reported these allegations against the respondent to supervisory personnel and departed the scene sometime after midnight.

Next slide.

As Commission Regulation 1213(a)(2) designates victim impact as a factor when considering action against a peace officer's certification, I will provide a short excerpt from the body-worn camera video from the August 11th response.

This clip captures the initial interaction between officers and the victims. Now, when the video starts, officers have been knocking on the apartment door for exactly one minute.

Advance the slide.

(Video 1 played.)

MR. TRIPP: This was not the same cordial interaction that I described regarding the first encounter.

As you have seen, the video shows Victim 2 did not immediately allow officers into the department, but,

first, insisted on receiving some sort of identification despite the fact that the officers were in full uniform.

The reason for the victim's guarded demeanor was that he simply did not trust the police after they had showed up on his door a second time ostensibly for no reason.

Later, after the officers had rebuilt rapport, Victim 2 said he thought, quote, "Maybe you guys were friends and trying to harass us," unquote.

As I mentioned, responding officers communicated the victims' suspicions to supervisors. The department reviewed the three anonymous calls, recognized the respondent's voice, and subsequently initiated an Internal Affairs investigation.

Internal Affairs interviewed the respondent on October 10th, 2023. In that interview and in an interview with POST conducted on November 6th, 2025, he admitted he made the three anonymous calls to the Fresno Police Communication Center.

He stated he was at his own residence when he made the calls and that he fabricated the situation he described to the dispatcher. He stated he made these calls with the hope that Victim 1 would reach out to him. He thought that if he created a problem for Victim 1 with law enforcement, Victim 1 might seek his

advice since he, too, was a law enforcement officer.

In both his IA interview and his POST interview, the respondent accepted responsibility for his actions and stated he was not thinking rationally when he placed the call.

Next slide.

Following the conclusion of the Internal Affairs investigation, Fresno Police Department sustained five allegations against the respondent, including integrity and violating any misdemeanor statute.

He was initially proposed for dismissal. But following his Skelly hearing, he received a 160-hour suspension, demotion from his corporal assignment, and a lifetime last-chance agreement.

Next slide.

Regarding the dishonesty allegation -- and I have the code of the -- I have the text of the Penal Code and Commission Regulation on the screen -- the facts of the respondent's conduct are not in dispute.

Next slide.

The respondent admitted he placed the three anonymous calls. In those calls, he described an ongoing violent disturbance for assault. He knew there was no ongoing violence taking place and the situation he described was fabricated. His false statements were

material to report and, indeed, his false statements constituted nearly everything he said to the dispatchers.

The respondent made these false statements deliberately with the intent to deceive the dispatcher and the responding officers into believing an emergency was in progress when he knew there was no emergency.

These points address the key elements of California Penal Code 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(1). Therefore, the Division has determined clear and convincing evidence demonstrates the respondent engaged in the serious misconduct of dishonesty.

Next slide.

Regarding acts that violate the law -- and, again, I have the text of the Penal Code and Commission Regulation on the screen -- although the respondent was not charged with a crime, the Division determined he violated California Penal Code 148.3(a), a misdemeanor.

Next slide.

The text of this law states, "Any individual who reports or causes any report to be made to any city, county, city and county, or state, department, district, agency, division, commission, or board that an emergency exists, knowing that report is false, is guilty of a

misdemeanor."

"Emergency" is further defined by Penal Code 148.3(c) as "Any condition that results in or could result in the response of a public official in an authorized emergency vehicle, among other circumstances."

Next slide.

And again, the facts of the situation are not in dispute.

The respondent reported a situation on three occasions to a city agency, namely the Fresno Police Department. Those facts described an ongoing violent disturbance involving a man and a woman in which a woman was screaming "help me" and "stop." He knew those reports to be false.

He knew how the Fresno Police Department prioritized calls for service and actually had personal experience with so-called Priority 0 and Priority 1 emergency calls.

Based on that knowledge and experience, he believed that call would be prioritized as an emergency, necessitating a response by Fresno police officers in authorized emergency vehicles. That is, in their patrol cars.

These points address the key elements of California

Penal Code 148.3. The Division therefore determined the clear and convincing evidence established that the respondent committed the facts that violated the law on three occasions in contravention of Penal Code 13510.8(b)(6)and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(6).

The facts I have just recited support the Division's finding that Officer Thakham was involved in serious misconduct, specifically dishonesty and acts that violate the law.

For the purposes of the Division's analysis, "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.

The Division recommends the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board consider action against Officer Thakham's POST certification.

The Division's recommendation is based on the following, which applies both to the dishonesty allegation and the acts that violate the law allegation, as the same fact pattern applies to both.

Next slide.

Now, as I stated above, the respondent's misconduct was repeated, material, and egregious, with the respondent making three fabricated reports over a

41-hour period.

In making those reports, he used his colleagues and their good faith response to a purported emergency as a means to coerce a former domestic partner.

The respondent also placed his colleagues in inherently dangerous situations, namely the emergency responses and potentially confrontational encounters with the public.

The respondent disrupted the lives of Victim 1 and Victim 2 with necessarily intrusive police investigations, and he also disrupted the lives of other residents in the apartment complex -- in particular, on the night of August 11th, when officers canvassed the entire building to determine if there had been a disturbance.

And, lastly, the respondent diverted police resources from protecting the City of Fresno to address his fabricated emergency.

Next slide.

And that concludes my presentation. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions from the Board.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Apparently, there are no

questions from the Board.

Thank you.

At this time, does the subject officer and/or their counsel wish to make public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there someone on this one?

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: No. No.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So there's no --

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Just the written comment. So they received the written comment.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yeah. The letter. Okay.

Okay.

MEMBER PENA: I actually have a question. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Go ahead, please.

MEMBER PENA: I was wondering if you could -- I know there's a provision in the code that talks about looking at the facts of the cases in light of -- (audio malfunction).

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We can't hear you. Would you mind starting again?

MEMBER PENA: Sure.

I think there's a provision in state law that talks about looking at these cases in light of the totality of the circumstances of the individual officer, looking at

their background, etc.

Can you talk a little bit about that provision?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: It's not so much in the law. I can tell you that it's -- we, as board members, can consider those kinds of things in making our recommendation.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. So it's not -- it's not in state law?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I don't think it is. I think it is part of the policies of this board. But let me check with the real lawyers here.

MR. HOFFMAN: I think what you are referring to, Board Member Pena, are the 1213 factors in our regulations that look at the -- the different circumstances. That is going to be:

The nature and -- the nature and severity of the act that could be at issue;

The circumstances surrounding the conduct and the extent to which it impacted or caused any actual potential harm to the public;

Whether the officer is currently employed or not;

Whether it was committed under color of authority or while working in the capacity of the peace officer;

Peace officer's prior conduct, discipline, and service record;

The proximity or remoteness in time since it occurred;

Any mitigating or aggravating factors or evidence of rehabilitation;

The degree of accountability and cooperation with the investigation evidenced by the peace officer;

The extent to which discipline or forbearance would impact the best interest of the public, public service, the employing agency, and law enforcement;

The motives of the peace officer that resulted in the conduct;

Consistency of the penalty with those imposed upon other peace officers for the same or similars offense;

The clarity with which the peace officer was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense;

The extent to which the action or omission was done intentionally, willfully, or maliciously;

The likelihood of recurrence;

And any other aggravating or mitigating factors relevant to the Commission's determination.

Does that answer your question?

MEMBER PENA: I think so. I think so.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So it is all of those things. Yeah.

MR. LOGGINS: And also the -- just for a quick -- I think you might be referring to when it is use of force, there's the totality of the circumstances, and that is in law. And that's for use of force incidents.

MEMBER PENA: Okay.

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We may have yet another legal opinion. So stand by for a moment.

MR. HOFFMAN: In addition to the regulations, also section 13510 -- 13510 -- thank you. Point 8(g)(2). Thank you, Chief Counsel. That also refers to that any other aggravating or mitigating factors can be considered by the Commission. So I don't -- that is kind of a catchall that will catch those totalities as well.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Any other questions or comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So let me just say, is there anyone from the public who would like to address the Board at this time? When it is your turn, you may state your name and organization if you wish. You will each be given five minutes to speak, and the time limits will be strictly enforced. So please ensure that you

complete your comments within the allotted time.

So let me first ask, is there anyone in the audience who wishes to make a public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none, is there anyone remote?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Then let me ask the Board: Is there anyone who would like to go into closed session to discuss this, or are you comfortable discussing it publicly?

So first question: Anyone want to go into closed session?

MEMBER PENA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Then let's go.

It is also lunchtime. So when we're back there, we will have our lunch. We will discuss this. So we'll be back out here at 12:30 with our discussion and take it from there.

So we will now -- the meeting will adjourn into closed session for deliberations on this case and for lunch. The board members will now exit the room and be back at regular session at 12:30.

(Time noted: 11:53 a.m.)

---o0o---

(Closed session was held:
11:58 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.)

---o0o---

(Time noted: 12:34 p.m.)

---o0o---

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We will reconvene in regular session to take a vote on the Board's recommendation in the matter of case POST2316280. I'm afraid I'm not going to sound good on this. Khammouane Kevin Thakham, who at the time of the events at issue in this case was and still is employed with the Fresno Police Department.

What comments does the Board have on this matter?

Yes. Please. Nicole.

MEMBER CLAVO: I make a motion to decertify.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

Is there a second?

MEMBER LARA: I second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there anyone that wants to make any further comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. There's a second.

Mr. Knapp, will you please take a roll call.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Chair.

Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Clavo, aye.
Crawford.
MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Crawford, aye.
Dudley.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Dudley, aye.
Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Johnson, aye.
Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Lara, aye.
And Pena.
MEMBER PENA: No.
MR. KNAPP: That's five in favor. Motion carries.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So the motion passes. And there is an agreement for decertification.
Okay. Now calling the next -- thank you, gentlemen.
And at this time I will call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Raymond Bechler, Professional Conduct Northern; and Brian Hoffman, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on POST2402338 [sic], Elliott Lopez, who, at the time of the events at issue

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, KATHRYN S. SWANK, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing proceedings were reported, to the best of my ability, in shorthand by me, Kathryn S. Swank, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said proceedings nor in any way interested in the outcome of said proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 12th day of February 2026.

Kathryn S. Swank, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13061