POST Record of Proceedings
Transcription Cover Page

Transcript of Proceedings

Following is the record of an Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board (POSAAB) Hearing held on 11/6/2025. The hearing was recorded, and a true and correct copy of the recording is being maintained by POST. The Hearing was also transcribed by Zoom. This transcript was reviewed and prepared by Associate Govermental Program Analyst, Chandler T. Knapp, Executive Office.

Staff Present: Assistant Executive Director Annemarie Del Mugnio, Law Enforcement Consultant William Imboden, Professional Conduct Southern Bureau, Simone Renteria, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, Chandler T. Knapp, AGPA, Executive Office.

Board Members Present: Dr. Nicole Clavo Psy.D, Regina Hatcher-Crawford, Robert Doyle, Joyce E. Dudley, Cephus Johnson, Captain Charles Lara, and Margaret Peña

Board Members Absent: Professor Jack Glaser

Other Parties Present: Christopher Beatty, Deputy Attorney General and Counsel to the POSAAB and Leslie Wilcox, Counsel for Luke Baxter Walden

ON THE RECORD – MEETING CONVENED 10:03 AM

-

Chairperson Dudley: Good morning, everyone. Today is Thursday, November 6th and the time is 10:03 AM. Thank you for attending the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board hearing.

Members of this body are participating remotely from their respective locations. Under provision set forth in the Bagley Keene-Open Meetings Act Members of an advisory body such as the board are allowed to participate remotely in public meetings of that body. That's Government Code section 11123.5.

The location of a member of the Advisory Board attending remotely need not be disclosed, and that location need not be accessible to the public. And that's according to Government Code Section 1123.5, Subdivision D.

The primary physical meeting location for this meeting, where members of the public may physically attend the meeting, observe and hear the meeting, and participate in the meeting is 860 Stillwater Road, West Sacramento, CA 95605.

Please note that this hearing is being live streamed and recorded. We will now call the roll the board members.

Mr. Knapp.

Mr. Knapp:
Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the body, if you would just unmute.

Member Clavo.

Member Clavo: Present.

Mr. Knapp: Clavo present. Member Crawford.

Member Crawford: Present.

Mr. Knapp: Crawford present. Member Doyle.

Member Doyle: Present.

Mr. Knapp: Doyle present. Chair Dudley.

Chair Dudley: Present

Mr. Knapp: Dudley present. Glacier. Glacier absent. Member Johnson.

Member Johnson: Present

Mr. Knapp: Johnson present. Member Laura.

Member Laura: Present.

Mr. Knapp: Laura present. And member Pena.

Member Pena: Present.

Mr. Knapp: Member Pena is present.

We have seven of eight members present.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you.

Therefore, quorum has been established.

I would now like to introduce Board Council Christopher Beatty, who is appearing remotely and Post Assistant Executive Director Anne Marie Del Megado, who is present at the primary teleconference location post headquarters in West Sacramento.

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 manner. Please be advised that the Board cannot take action on items not on the agenda and may discuss those matters only to the extent necessary to

determine whether any matter should be made an agenda item at a future meeting, to respond briefly to statements or questions posed, to request clarification, or to refer the item to staff.

Please remember that 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 in the transcript. As the Board chair, I may ask members of the public to limit their remarks to no more than 3 minutes. Pursuing to exist in Board policy, I may conclude the public comment period. If multiple speakers are voicing repetitive or similar statements and the 15 minute public comment period has expired, you will be given 3 minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly enforced, so Please ensure that you complete your thoughts within the allotted time.

Before I open comment on 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 opinion.

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 can assist you in this manner. I would like to remind individuals making comments to not discuss pending complaints or pending disciplinary actions that may later come before the Board for recommendation. If the Board takes action on your complaint, you will have an ample opportunity to address the Board at that time. Following these rules is necessary to comply with the laws and to avoid compromising the Board's mission.

I will now yield to the Assistant Executive Director to manage and call for public comment.

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnaio: Thank you, Madam Chair. Is there anyone here physically at the location that would like to make a public comment today?

Seeing none in the room, is there anyone online who wishes to come to make a public comment on matters not on the agenda today?

Madam Chair, I have no opening public comments.

Chairperson Dudley:
Thank you.

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnaio:
Thank you, ma'am.

Chairperson Dudley: We now move to the next item on the agenda. We have only one case to hear today. We will only be reviewing the facts and evidence as presented by this division. This is not an evidentiary hearing. The rules of evidence do not apply here. Evidence is not formally admitted into the record. There is no need to make any objections, and objections will not be ruled upon under the Penal Code and applicable state regulations. This initial hearing will determine only if the matter proceeds forward for Commission review and then, should the Commission approve, for a full evidentiary hearing before an administrative law judge to determine whether the allegations are true and justify discipline for those commenting on each item. At this early stage, the Board must only consider the facts that the Division, after investigation, believes can be proven at a later evidentiary hearing. For that reason, today the Board will entertain arguments as to whether or not those facts, as presented by the Division, demonstrate clear and convincing evidence. In other words, a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205 occurred. Actions by the Board or the Commission prior to a full evidentiary hearing do not amount to a final determination that an officer did in fact engage in misconduct or that revocation or suspension is ordered. That would be determined after the evidentiary hearing. At the conclusion of the Law Enforcement Consultant's presentation, the Board will have an opportunity to ask questions, then public comment from the subject officer and or their counsel will be taken, followed by the members of the public. Further discussion by the board will be allowed If necessary. The Board may go into closed session deliberations after the case or wait and adjourn into closed session to deliberate on

all cases. But in this case, since there is only one case we would choose, if we chose to go into closed session, it would be on this case exclusively. After reconvening into regular session, votes will be taken on each case at this time.

I will now call upon law enforcement consultant William Imboden, Professional Conduct, Los Angeles County Bureau, and Simone Renteria, Attorney IV Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on case POST2306324, Luke Baxter Walden, who at the time of the events at issues in this case, was employed by the Los Angeles Police Department.

LEC Imboden: Good morning, Madam Chair. Members of the Board, my name is William Imboden. I'm one of the law enforcement consultants assigned to the Professional Conduct Bureau for Southern California in the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division. With me today is Simone Renteria, an attorney with our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I'm here today to present a supplemental report to case post 2306324 involving respondent Officer Luke Baxter Walden. This matter was previously heard by the Board on July 16th, 2025. Following the conclusion of that hearing, the Board voted to recommend revocation of respondent's certification. On September 10th, 2025, the Board's recommendation and the record before the Board were presented to the Commission for their consideration. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission returned the case to the Division with the direction to obtain additional documents and information to supplement the record and that this matter be scheduled for further hearing before the Board.

It is the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that respondent committed an act of serious misconduct as set forth in Penal Code section 13510.8. Specifically, the Division has determined that respondent committed the following acts of 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 a 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 the purposes of concealing misconduct and acts that violate the law and are sufficiently egregious or repeated as to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public as determined by the Commission.

I will present a brief outline of the Division's findings of investigation in this matter as presented to this Board on July 16th, 2025. On April 22nd, 2021, US Customs and Border Protection intercepted a suspicious package from China at the Los Angeles International Airport mail facility. The package, which was labeled "fuel filter" and addressed to respondent at his home address, actually contained an illegal firearm silencer. Upon

learning respondent was a current Los Angeles Police Department officer, the investigation was turned over to the LAPD Internal Affairs Bureau.

LAPD inspected the item and determined that it was a firearm silencer as defined by Penal Code section 17210. Further, an automotive expert determined it could not function as a fuel filter as it had no filtering properties.

LAPD conducted an audit of respondents Internet search history on department computers and discovered respondent had conducted numerous searches of websites selling firearm silencers advertised as fuel filters. The searches ended on March 15th, 2021. A search of respondent's personal PayPal account revealed a transaction on March 17th, 2021 for $45.96 for the purchase of a "Napa 4003 Wix 24003 1/2 x 28 5/8 x 24 fuel filter aluminum solvent trap 1/2 by 28 XH" from a vendor in China.

Respondent was arrested by LAPD, charged with a felony and at a pretrial hearing pled no contest to a misdemeanor. During the LAPD administrative investigation into respondents attempt to purchase a silencer, respondent was dishonest when he stated several times to the IA investigators that he did not try to buy- purchase a firearm silencer.

LAPD sustained the allegation of attempting to possess a firearm silencer and referred respondent to a Board of Rights with a recommendation for termination from employment. At the Board of Rights hearing, respondent continued to deny that he tried to buy a firearm silencer and repeated that he attempted to buy a fuel filter for a Toyota. However, the item seized would not only not fit a Toyota, but it would also be useless as a fuel filter because it had no filtering properties.

At the conclusion of that hearing, the Board of Rights unanimously agreed that respondent was guilty of the allegation that he, quote, attempted to obtain a firearm silencer, but reduced the penalty from termination to a 30-day suspension. At the conclusion of the presentation to this Board on July 16th, 2025, the Board deliberated unanimously recommended that respondents post certification be revoked and referred the matter to the POST Commission for consideration. On September 10th, 2025, during their regularly scheduled meeting, the Commission reviewed the recommendation of the Board.

At the conclusion of their presentation and discussion of this matter, the Commission directed the Division to supplement the record with the following documents and return the case to the Board for consideration for those documents. The entire LAPD Internal affairs investigation report CF21-001144, the LAPD administrative adjudication, known as the letter of transmittal, the Board of Rights decision rationales, the Board of Rights hearing transcripts.

Additionally, the Commission wanted an explanation from LAPD as to why an allegation of dishonesty had not been included in their findings and an understanding of whether respondent was demoted from a supervisory detective position to a non-supervisory position and whether that action was disciplinary in nature.

At the hearing before the Board on July 16th, 2025 and Commission hearing on September 10th, 2025, the Division presentation included documents in support of their investigation to include ATF bulletins regarding solvent traps and fuel filters, the LAPD criminalist report, criminal court documents, the Board of Rights rationale following the

guilt phase of their proceeding, and numerous pictures of the seized item, the packaging, and an actual fuel filter. Fuel filter respondent purchase through Amazon.

At the direction of the Commission, Division has attached to the supplemental investigative Summary and Findings additional documents for the Board to review and consider, including the entire Internal Affairs report as well as documents that were listed as addenda in that report. The LAPD's Letter of Transmittal and the Board of Rights decision, rationales and transcripts. With the exception of the Board of Rights transcripts, that were not yet available at the time of the that the notice of intent to revoke was served on respondent, and the Board of Rights Rationale on Penalty, The Division possessed these items at the time of its initial investigation and information from them was incorporated into the investigative summary and findings were relevant.

The additional records acquired failed to reveal any information that materially altered the Division's analysis and findings that Respondent engaged in serious misconduct, both acts that violate the law and dishonesty. Rather, the additional documentation strengthen the Division's allegations and provided clarity on why LAPD did not put forth an allegation of dishonesty in their IA report.

LAPD Professional Standards Unit (PSU) Captain David Wang notified the division that LAPD made the decision not to "stack" the allegations against respondent by including an allegation of dishonesty when an employee denies convening acts of misconduct. However, he clarified the lack of a formal allegation was in no way an indication that the department believed respondent's testimony to IA was truthful. In fact, the Board of Rights transcript make it clear LAPD was concerned with respondents lack of honesty, even if it wasn't framed in the form of an allegation.

The agency asserted during their closing arguments before the Board of Rights that respondent failed to take accountability for his actions every time the opportunity was presented. He was deceitful in providing false evidence and lacked personal integrity, stating "he displayed a series of evidence trying to either deceive or convince us that his actions were not what he was taking accountability for." With respect to the Respondent's reclassification from supervising detective to a non-supervising detective. According to the LAPD's PSU, the move was made as part of a management decision not tied to discipline and allowed for within LAPD Policy Section 3-763.55. However, the reclassification resulted in Respondent being placed into a lower pay grade, which took effect June 5, 2025. By policy, no specific reason for the reclassification was required or given.

While reviewing the Board of Rights transcripts, the following exchanges between Respondent and the LAPD Advocate were found to corroborate the Division's prior determination. Respondent is asked what training he has received related to firearm silencers. Respondent states, "zero." However, upon further questioning, respondent admits under oath that he fired firearms with silencers during an LAPD training day with vendors to test these weapons because LAPD was considering purchasing suppressed weapons. This contradicts Respondent's statements made during the July 16th, 2025, board hearing. While answering questions from the board, respondents stated, "I've never dealt with a suppressor. I've never seen one in real life."

Respondent offers that he did Google picture searches of suppressors or silencers and that as part of those searches, he looked at items marketed as fuel filters that were used as firearm silencers.

Respondent explained his research on silencers as the unit's firearm expert and stated he researched them so that he could identify them if his unit got one from a gang member.

However, Respondent made the argument at his July 16th, 2025, board hearing that he did not know, after doing months of research that included the Napa 4003 fuel filter as a pseudonym for a silencer, that Napa 4003 item he purchased using his PayPal account was a firearm silencer.

Respondent was specifically asked if he looked at items marketed as fuel filters that were used as firearm silencers. He responded with “yes”. He is then asked if he saw pictures of items marketed as solvent traps used as firearm silencers and he answered, “At some point I think that popped up.” Having seen those pictures prior to purchasing the purported fuel filter from China, he would have recognized the item he purchased as being an illegal silencer being marketed as a fuel filter. This is further supported by the testimony of LAPD Lieutenant Bixler who supervised Respondent when he worked in the gun unit. Lieutenant Bixler testified at the Board of Rights hearing that an individual who belongs to the LAPD Gun Unit would be able to discern a silencer if they saw it. Additionally, in response to the question, “would the feature of monolithic core be something that Luke Walden was familiar with from his time in the gun unit?”, Lieutenant Bixler responded yes. After it is established that “Napa 4003” is code for firearm silencers marketed as fuel filters, Respondent is asked, “so is there any reason you ordered a “Napa 4003” after repeatedly looking into Napa 4003 as part of your duties into suppressors in your job?” Respondent answered, “well, I ordered a fuel filter for my car. Whatever the code delineation for that part, I don't remember what it was.”

Finally, in reviewing the Board of Rights rationale for the penalty phase, the Board of Rights panel made it clear they unanimously found respondent guilty of purchasing A firearm silencer. However, they decided to reduce Respondent’s discipline due to his years of service and commendations received.

After reviewing the attached documents and the information gathered from LAPD for this supplemental investigation, coupled with the investigative summary and findings dated March 13th, 2025, the Division believes the evidence is clear and convincing Respondent was dishonest when he denied purchasing a firearm silencer and attempted to mislead investigators with the excuse of trying to buy a high performance fuel filter. Respondent continued his dishonest statements throughout the Board of Rights hearing denying he intentionally purchased a firearm silencer marketed as a fuel filter despite stating he had researched that very item for work related purposes, including seeing pictures of fuel filters and solvent traps marketed as firearm silencers prior to making his purchase. As indicated above, Respondent continued to be dishonest during the Board's July 16th, 2025, serious misconduct hearing.

Additionally, clear and convincing evidence exists to show respondents committed a felony when he purchased an illegal firearm silencer over the internet from a company in China and had it shipped to his home address. 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's recommendation, I'm sorry. The Division recommends that respondents POST certification be revoked or suspended as stated at the July 16th, 2025, Board hearing.

The Division's recommendation is based on the following:

Clear and convincing evidence exists to show respondent purposefully committed a felony after conducting research for months in advance and then purchased purchasing an item that was clearly intended to be used as a firearm silencer. This is in direct conflict with Respondents general duty to uphold the law and it's in fact the exact type of crime respondent was charged with preventing as part of the specialty unit he was assigned to.

This blatant dismissal of the law alone is egregious enough to warrant revocation of Respondent's peace officer certification. But in addition to violating the laws he was sworn to uphold, Respondent lied repeatedly to Internal Affairs and at his Board of Rights hearing when he was confronted with his behavior in an obvious attempt to keep his job through consistent denial despite the evidence of his guilt.

Respondent has broken the public trust through his actions and his words and cannot be entrusted to truthfully, honestly, and ethically uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public.

With that, I'm happy to answer any questions the Board may have. Thank you.

Chairperson Dudley: I don't, I was looking for the hand raising I'm and I'm not seeing it on my computer. So let me ask the assistant director if you wouldn't mind calling on people so they can get asked their questions. So now what I'll be doing is asking the board members. Do any board members have any questions at this point?

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnaio: Madam Chair, I don't see any hands raised or anyone wishing to speak.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you.

At this time does the subject officer and/or their council wish to make a public comment? If so, you'll each be given 10 minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly

enforced. So please ensure that you have that you complete your comments within the allotted time.

While commenting, the Board will only consider the facts as presented by the division today and will not consider any additional facts or defense at this time. The sole question before the Board today is the following: Does anything in the new material presented today warrant a new or different recommendation from the previous recommendation of the Board to revoke the officer's certification?

If the Board concludes that there was no longer clear and convincing evidence sufficient to support a finding that serious misconduct occurred or if the Board concludes that the evidence no longer warranted revocation and instead warranted suspension.

I will again yield to Assistant Director Del Mugnaio to manage the call for public comment.

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnaio: Thank you, Madam Chair. I believe we have Leslie Wilcox who is representing Luke Walden. So I will turn the floor over to you, Leslie.

Leslie Wilcox: Thank you. Good morning, everyone.

Detective Walden intended to be here, but he was subpoenaed for testimony in an LA Superior Court case for today at 8:30 AM, so he could not join us. And I want to thank you all again for your time and seeing you remotely. My position after the amended investigation is that there is not clear and convincing evidence established that Detective Walden was dishonest in his testimony to the Board of Rights.

The Division appears mostly to be relying on closing argument in order to determine why LAPD believed that he was being dishonest. But there is no indication that LAPD, as the department or as the investigators that were most familiar with the case, believed that Detective Walden was being dishonest, or they would have framed an allegation of such, which they do frequently.

The standard in the LAPD investigations is preponderance of the evidence, which means more likely than not for POST, as you've heard, your standard is clear and convincing, which is a much higher probability that something occurred. It is not quite as high as beyond a reasonable doubt in Criminal Court. It's more in between those two, but it is significantly higher than a preponderance of the evidence, meaning it probably happened or it's more likely than not that it happened. I don't think that even with the board transcripts that you have that you have evidence that Detective Walden was intentionally lying or misleading about his purchase of the fuel filter. You do have an employee who was denying the allegations that the department brought against him, and I don't think that that on its own is enough for POST to add an allegation of dishonesty on these facts. I'm not disputing that POST has the ability to add allegations of whatever they want when they review an investigation. In this particular one - I don't think that it meets the standard for dishonesty. In particular, if you read the Board's rationale on fine on penalty, which is the second part of their rationale on the hearing, they specifically characterized Detective Walden's purchase of the fuel filter as a mistake. They did not say that they didn't believe him or that they thought he was lying. And the Board of Rights would have been in the best position to evaluate all of the witnesses' credibility and that's the determination that they ended up making.

I appreciate the investigation noting on page 11 that they're withdrawing their assertion that his second fuel filter purchased in August of 2021 was not-cannot be proven that he was doing that just for an alibi. I don't know if you read through all of the transcripts, but he indicated that since he didn't receive the first one, he had to order another one. And that was originally believed that he knew about this investigation from internal affairs and that was the reason that he made this additional purchase in August of '21 to sort of, I don't know, show that he was buying fuel filters all the time.

I'm not really sure what the assumption was, but it was determined in Mr. Imboden's investigation that in fact, Detective Walden was unaware of the investigation at that time.

Detective Walden accepted the Board's decision. He didn't take that further. He didn't appeal that further. He is asking at this point that the Commission, the Advisory Board,

reevaluate a recommendation for either revocation or suspension because the acts that violate the law are not a felony.

He pled no contest to a misdemeanor, but more importantly, the Penal Code that you are set up under 13510.8(C)(5) specifically requires that you consider their prior conduct, discipline and service record. There is no pattern of evidence for this. You heard from Mr. Imboden today that his rank of detective one was not disciplinary in nature, was the needs of the department. He has only one minor sustained complaint for a traffic collision from 2002. The dishonesty allegation- I don't believe if this ends up going all the way to an ALJ- is going to be able to be proven by a clear and convincing evidence standard based on merely his denials of the department's questions or actions about the purchase of the fuel filter.

If you do see on page 13 of the investigation, there's the back and forth questioning that Mr. Imboden was talking about. The end of Detective Walden's answer is very detailed about what he was anticipating finding on that fuel filter. This is not someone who doesn't know how to repair cars.

I would also just point out some common sense that while there are ATF Flyers and there is obviously evidence that some fuel filters are instead silencers or suppressors, that does not mean that all fuel filters are silencers or suppressors. I mean, anyone can go into an AutoZone and get a fuel filter and hopefully no one's going to be arrested for trying to buy a silencer.

I believe that a recommendation for suspension only for acts that violate the law, not for dishonesty, is more appropriate in this case. And I'll be happy to answer any of the advisory board's questions if you haven't.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you. Let me ask, at this point, are there any board members that have any questions?

Member Lara: Yes.

Assistant Executive Director De Mugnaio: Thank you, Board member Laura.

Member Lara: OK, can you hear me?

Chairperson Dudley: Yes.

Member Lara: All right. So, I've been a police officer for 26 years and I can remember, with precision, every single time that I have fired a suppressed weapon. one time and that-that happened a number of months ago. We have an indoor police range. We used suppressed AR-15s within the-within the indoor range because of the sound.

I'm curious that given the, the strict gun laws and then the high control of a suppressed weapon in the United States, and particularly so in California, that a gentleman who works in a gun unit and who fired suppressed weapons or silenced weapons, if you, if you will, during training could say credibly that he's never seen a suppressor or a silencer in real life.

Leslie Wilcox: I, I can't answer that for Detective Walden. I- I don't know about specifically about what training he's had.

Chairperson Dudley: Anything else? Mr. Lara? Sergeant, Captain?

Member Lara: No, I'm good. Thank you.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you. I appreciate your comments and I appreciate your response. Is there any other board member who would, who has a question?

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnio: Vice Chair Doyle.

Vice Chair Doyle: yeah, I have a question to the attorney. So-so does your sort of like your proposition that he didn't get what he ordered, so therefore all of the questions that he answered at the board sort of supported that? Is that- is that what your position is?

Leslie Wilcox: Do you mean that he ordered something different than what was shipped to him?

Vice Chair Doyle: Well- well, correct bec-because you seem to discount the answer to his questions at the board is being sort of irrelevant. And so I'm I'm just wondering if that's your position is that he ordered something else but got what was deemed to be a suppressor and illegal.

Leslie Wilcox: My understanding from being - I did not represent him at the board of rights. So I am reading the transcript like all of you did, but my understanding is that he was not intending to order something that was, one, wasn't going to work for his car, or two, that could be mistaken for a silencer. I-I don't know if what he clicked on was... I believe he intended to order whatever was sent to him. I think he didn't know that it was-n't an actual fuel filter if-if that makes sense.

Vice Chair Doyle: Thank you.

Chairperson Dudley: Are there any other board members who have any questions of the attorney?

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnio: Madam Chair, I do not see any further questions.

Chairperson Dudley: Okay, thank you.

Is there anyone from the public who would like to address the board at this time? When it's your turn, you may state your name and organization if you wish. You will each be given 3 minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly enforced. So, please ensure that you complete your comments within the allotted time. Assistant Director, I will again look to you.

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnio: I don't see any public comments in the room and I do not believe we have any online. Madam Chair, if you will, I believe Ms. Renteria would like to address the board.

Chairperson Dudley: Okay.

Simone Renteria: Good morning, Board members.

I just want to take some time to address the dishonesty charges and the statements made by Council regarding LAPD not bringing allegations of dishonesty here versus the Board and the, sorry, the Division bringing the allegations of dishonesty. As you probably well know, the Legislature set forth in the statute that governs the actions of the Board and the Commission, the fact that the neither the Board nor the Commission are bound by decisions that are made either by law enforcement employee agencies or by determinations made as a result of appeals of those determinations. Moreover, the Legislature also charged the Board and the Commission with independently reviewing investigations that they received for grounds for the certification. Any of the 9 grounds in the statute, we're obligated to review investigation and investigative materials to determine whether or not there are grounds for that, and we must do that independently of any investigation or finding by employing agencies. The Division chose to do that, as laid out in Mr. Imboden's presentation, as well as the initial ISF as well as - investigative summary and findings- as well as the supplemental investigative summary and findings. The Division has laid out all of the circumstances in which Mr. Walden was found to have been dishonest, including in his answers to this board.Thank you.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you very much. Are there any other comments from anybody? Any other comments or questions?

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnio: Madam Chair, I do not see any other comments or questions.

Chairperson Dudley: Okay, so now I'll be directing this question to the Board members. At this time, does the board wish to adjourn into closed session breakout room for deliberations on this case or is the board ready to take a vote on reaffirming their recommendation, revocation, to the Commission in this case?

Member Lara: I don't need to retire.

Member Clavo: I don't either.

Member Johnson: Yes, Cephus Johnson, I do not need to retire also.

Chairperson Dudley: Is there anyone that feels any member of the board that feels the need to retire?

Okay, then we will not retire. In the matter of the case POST2306324, Luke Baxter Walden, who at the time of the events at issues in this case was employed with the Los Angeles Police Department.

Does the, does the Board have any comments to take on this matter?

Assistant Executive Director Del Mugnio: I don't see any further comment, Madam Chair.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you.

Is there a motion to reaffirm the recommendation of revocation to the Commission?

Vice Chair Doyle: So Move Doyle.

Chairperson Dudley: is there a second?

Member Lara: Second.

Chairperson Dudley: And who is that?

Member Lara: I'm sorry, Charles.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you. We will now take a roll call vote on the board's recommendation. Mr. Knapp, will you please take a roll call vote?

Mr. Knapp: Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you.
Clavo

Member Clavo: Aye

Mr. Knapp: Clavo Aye. Crawford.

Member Crawford: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Crawford Aye. Doyle.

Vice Chair Doyle: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Doyle Aye. Dudley

Chairperson Dudlley: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Dudley Aye. Johnson.

Member Johnson: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Johnson Aye. Lara.

Member Lara: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Lara Aye. Pena.

Member Pena: Aye.

Mr. Knapp: Pena Aye. That's four "Ayes". Motion Carries. Sorry, seven- seven "Ayes!"

Chairperson Dudley: Yes, motion is passed. As this was the last item on the agenda, do any of the members of the board have any additional comments before we adjourn?

Member Lara: No, ma'am.

Member Clavo: No.

Member Crawford: None.

Chairperson Dudley: Seeing none and hearing none, I'll need a motion to adjourn. Is there a motion?

Member Clavo: I make a motion.

Chairperson Dudley: And a second?

Member Johnson: Johnson second.

Chairperson Dudley: Thank you. The meeting is now adjourned.

-

Off the Record – Meeting Adjourned at 10:40 AM.