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

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

CASE NO.: POST2600506 **SUBJECT OFFICER:** Tommy Tsoi

POST ID: C52-M52 **EMPLOYING AGENCY:** California Highway Patrol

---

POST INVESTIGATOR: Brandon Kiely

NOD DATE OF ISSUANCE: August 25, 2026

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT: PC 13510.8(b)(1)/11 CCR 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

In January of 2026, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) submitted a report of potential serious misconduct to POST against former Officer Tommy Tsoi, hereinafter referred to as "Respondent," alleging that Respondent was dishonest regarding their administrative investigation into a traffic collision.

On May 1, 2025, Respondent was on-duty and driving a marked patrol unit eastbound State Route 60 (SR-60) to northbound Interstate 15 (I-15) when he rear-ended a Nissan Frontier truck. The collision took place on a transition road that merges from two lanes into one. The collision did not result in any injuries and both parties immediately pulled off onto the shoulder of the roadway.

After the driver of the Nissan Frontier, identified as Victim , looked at the damage to his vehicle, he clearly pointed the damage out to Respondent. Victim later stated in an interview that after pointing the damage out to Respondent, Respondent told him (Victim), "I didn't do that," and both parties left the scene. There is clear and convincing evidence to establish Respondent then carried out multiple acts for the purpose of concealing a crime.

After the traffic collision, Respondent denied to Victim having caused the damage to the Nissan Frontier truck. The damage was clear and obviously new damage in the location of where his patrol vehicle made impact. Respondent failed to provide his name, address, and the registered owner information of the patrol vehicle he was driving to Victim . Respondent never took any steps at the scene of occurrence to formally document or report the traffic collision. At the time of the traffic collision, Respondent had been employed with CHP for approximately ten years and had investigated multiple traffic collisions. Respondent was well aware of what reasonable steps any driver should take after a traffic collision. Additionally,

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

Respondent was previously involved in a prior on-duty traffic collision where Respondent was determined to be at fault and would have reasonably known what steps he was required to take administratively for reporting the collision. Respondent would have reasonably known that he was the at fault party in the traffic collision and had violated the California Vehicle Code (Vehicle Code section 20002), a misdemeanor.

Respondent denied having caused any damage to the other involved vehicle when Victim specifically pointed out new damage directly related to the collision; an act consistent with Respondent intentionally avoiding clear and obvious evidence of damage to either vehicle at the scene in order to avoid accountability for his actions in violating the California Vehicle Code. Respondent never turned on his patrol vehicle's Wireless Mobile Video/Audio Recording System (WMVARS), which would have clearly documented the incident and his interaction with Victim. The CHP administrative investigation took the investigative step of obtaining "loop footage" from the WMVARS, which ultimately captured a recording of the traffic collision and Respondent's actions afterwards. Respondent later admitted during his administrative interview that at the time of the collision he was unaware that the "loop footage" from the WMVARS could be obtained and made available for review.

Following the traffic collision, Victim was unsure of what to do so he went about his work route and called his supervisor. The supervisor advised Victim to call and make a formal report regarding the collision. Victim then called 911 to make a formal report. A CHP officer responded and completed a CHP 555 Traffic Crash Report investigation. The investigation determined that Respondent was the at fault party in the collision due to travelling at an "unsafe speed for the traffic conditions" in violation of California Vehicle Code section 22350.

Respondent committed dishonesty when immediately following the traffic collision, Respondent engaged in a series of premeditated acts of deception in an attempt to conceal the true circumstances of the origin of the traffic collision and having violated the California Vehicle Code, which resulted in him tampering with evidence for the purposes of concealing a crime.

Respondent committed dishonesty when he developed a ruse and sent a text message to his supervisor that while he was driving, he was hit by debris falling from another vehicle and that the impact from the debris caused the damage to the patrol vehicle, which was a false statement made to his supervisor for the purpose of concealing a crime.

Respondent committed dishonesty when he sought out another party committing a violation of the California Vehicle Code to carry out a traffic enforcement stop. The WMVARS "loop footage" recording clearly showed Respondent examining the areas of damage to the patrol vehicle in the parking lot of his assigned CHP station prior to carrying out the traffic enforcement stop, which he was unaware of at the time would capture his actions. During the traffic enforcement stop, Respondent proceeded to pretend he discovered the damage to the patrol vehicle for the first time during the traffic stop, when the damage was in fact clearly caused by

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

the prior traffic collision Respondent was involved in. Respondent did so by intentionally activating his WMVARS for the traffic enforcement stop and appearing to examine the damage for the first time during and shortly after the traffic enforcement stop. Respondent took these actions to formally document the damage to the patrol vehicle, which tampered with the true origin of the evidence for the purpose of concealing a crime.

Respondent committed dishonesty when he completed a CHP415 *Activity Tracking Sheet* falsely reporting what caused the damage to the patrol vehicle, which was done for the purpose of concealing a crime.

Finally, there is clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed dishonesty when he made untruthful statements during his administrative interview.

POST reviewed the CHP administrative investigative report, the CHP 555 Traffic Crash Report, WMVARS recordings, administrative interview recordings, and administrative interview transcripts. The clear and convincing evidence identified through this review establishes with high probability that Respondent committed serious misconduct related to dishonesty. These facts constitute serious misconduct in violation of California Penal Code Section 13510.8 (b)(1) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations Section 1205 (a)(1) – Dishonesty.

ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

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

   Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation section 1205(a)(1) defines as serious misconduct: *"Dishonesty relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, a peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, false statements, intentionally filing false reports, tampering with, falsifying, destroying, or concealing evidence, perjury, and tampering with data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct."*

   Respondent carried out multiple acts of deception after the traffic collision in order to conceal the true origin of the damage to his patrol vehicle and having committed a misdemeanor violation of the California Vehicle Code. Following the traffic collision, Respondent failed to provide his name, address, and the registered owner information of the patrol vehicle he was driving to the driver of the other vehicle involved. Respondent never activated his WMVARS to record the incident and never took any steps at the scene of occurrence to formally document or report the traffic collision. Respondent was employed with CHP for approximately ten years at the time of the incident, investigated multiple traffic collisions,

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

and was well aware of what reasonable steps any driver should take after a traffic collision. Respondent was previously involved in a prior on-duty collision where he was determined to be at fault and was well aware of what steps he should have taken from an administrative standpoint when involved in an on-duty traffic collision.

After leaving the scene of the collision, Respondent immediately drove his patrol vehicle back to the CHP Rancho Cucamonga Area Office (his assigned station). Once at the station the WMVARS loop recording captured Respondent walking up to the left front portion of the patrol vehicle and immediately examining that specific area (the opposite area and side from what he appeared to examine at the scene of the traffic collision). Respondent can then be seen going inside of the station and later come back out. Respondent never made any notification to any other CHP personnel about the traffic collision while he was at the station. Respondent then got back into the same patrol vehicle and drove away from the station.

Shortly after leaving the station, Respondent made an enforcement stop on another vehicle for an observed California Vehicle Code violation, which occurred on the freeway. During the enforcement stop, Respondent can be seen on the WMVARS recording, now knowing that the WMVARS would be activated and recording in order to capture the traffic enforcement stop, appearing to act out discovering damage to the patrol vehicle for the first time. Respondent, after appearing to act out noticing the damage to the patrol vehicle, can be seen on the WMVARS recording using his cell phone and appearing to take photographs of the damage. Respondent's actions were consistent with him taking deliberate steps to make sure that he was captured in the view frame of the patrol vehicle's WMVARS recording camera throughout this process. While taking the photographs, Respondent was willing to jeopardize his safety as well as the general public's safety in carrying out this deception, as Respondent took the photographs on a busy four lane freeway where an on-ramp also converged into the four lanes of traffic and created an unnecessary hazard (California Vehicle Code Section 21809(a)(1) directs drivers to proceed with making a lane change into an available lane not immediately adjacent to the authorized emergency vehicle that is displaying emergency lights).

Respondent was dishonest when he falsely reported to his supervisor, Sergeant Farner, what actually caused the damage to the patrol vehicle in an attempt to conceal its true origin and his crime of violating the California Vehicle Code. Respondent sent Sergeant Farner a text message at approximately 9:31 a.m. The text message stated, "Sigh. My fucking bad luck taking out the sgt car. Prior to making this stop, I was driving and a huge black metal debris came underneath a car around Haven, and heard a clank. I didn't think much of it until I made this stop. I checked the pv and…IDK what the hell it was…But let me clear this 20002 and I'll call you." Attached to the text message was a picture of damage to a patrol vehicle, which matched the damage of the vehicle he was driving at the time of the traffic collision.

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

Respondent was dishonest and attempted to conceal the evidence of his crime in violating the California Vehicle Code when he completed his CHP 415 *Activity Tracking Sheet* regarding the origin of the damage to the patrol vehicle. The CHP 415 *Activity Tracking Sheet* is used by the CHP as the primary source of information regarding attendance and field activities for officers and sergeants. Respondent submitted a CHP 415 *Activity Tracking Sheet* for May 1, 2025 (the date the vehicle collision occurred). Respondent did not note the traffic collision anywhere in the CHP 415 *Activity Tracking Sheet.* Respondent referenced that he changed out one patrol vehicle for another and noted in the "Activity Comment" section "RT 1019 FOR S-1 / OPERATIONAL DAMAGE TO PV / SWAPPED ANOTHER PV." Respondent confirmed in his administrative interview that he checked the box on the CHP 415 *Activity Tracking Sheet,* that stated, " I certify this 415 is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge."

Respondent was also dishonest during his formal administrative interview when he made untruthful statements that were in direct conflict with Victim 's statements and the physical evidence related to the traffic collision:

- When asked why the vehicle collision was excluded from his CHP *415 Activity Tracking Sheet*; Respondent stated, "I excluded the patrol vehicle crash and what happened because, when it occurred, I believed that there was no damages to the vehicle -- to my patrol vehicle. And when I was speaking to the other driver, I believe who was solo, we both agreed that there was no damage to either of our vehicles."

- When asked regarding Victim ever having pointed out the damage; Respondent stated, "Based on what I recall, I recall him saying that it was old damage, to me."

- When asked if Victim ever said or insinuated anything about Respondent's patrol vehicle causing any damage to the truck; Respondent stated, "I don't recall."

- When Respondent was asked if he ever told or insinuated to Victim that his (Respondent's) patrol vehicle did not cause damage to the Nissan Frontier truck; Respondent replied "No."

Respondent's answers above appeared untruthful based upon the following:

- Respondent was merging from his right to his left, was trailing behind the Nissan Frontier truck in the opposite lane and would be aware that the point of impact from the resulting collision would be the right rear bumper area of the truck and the left front bumper area of his patrol car.

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

- The WMVARS loop recording showed no damage to the truck just prior to the collision, clearly captured the collision, and clearly captured the resulting damage to the truck after both vehicles separated after the impact.

- The Nissan Frontier truck involved was a newer model truck and per Victim there was no previous damage to it (consistent with the WMVARS recording showing no damage before the collision and damage afterward).

- The WMVARS loop recording clearly captured Victim appearing to point out the specific damage to the right rear bumper area of the truck to Respondent (consistent with Victim 's statement).

- Victim 's statement that he pointed out the damage to Respondent at the scene of the collision and associated the damage as having just been caused by the collision.

- Victim 's statement regarding Respondent's response when the damage was pointed out to Respondent was, "I didn't do that" referring to the damage to the right rear bumper area of the Nissan Frontier truck.

- Victim again confirming the interaction and Respondent's statement of not having caused the damage when asked by Sergeant Calderwood, "I'm sorry. You said that he told you I didn't do that?" to which Victim replied, "Well, yeah. So I was like okay well, it's right there on the -- on the lamp or whatever it's called."

- The photographs of the patrol vehicle Respondent had been driving at the time of the collision showed what appeared to be paint transfer on its left front push bumper that was white in color (the Nissan Frontier truck was white in color).

FINDINGS

The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division has determined by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation section 1205(a)(1) - Dishonesty relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a crime, or relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, a peace officer or custodial officer. For purposes of this report, clear and convincing evidence means "evidence of a charge is clear and convincing so long as there is a 'high probability' that the charge is true. The evidence need not establish a fact beyond a reasonable doubt."

Based on its investigation and the consideration of factors enumerated in Title 11, California

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

Code of Regulations section 1213(a), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division determined that reasonable grounds exist to seek suspension or revocation of Respondent's certifications, in accordance with Penal Code section 13510.85.