STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

(POSAAB) MEETING

THURSDAY, JANUARY 16, 2025

9:01 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
Registered Professional Reporter

A P P E A R A N C E S

POSAAB MEMBERS PRESENT

JOYCE E. DUDLEY
(Board Chairperson)
Governor Appointee
Attorney

NICOLE CLAVO, Psy.D.
Governor Appointee
Public Member

REGINA HATCHER-CRAWFORD
Governor Appointee
Public Member

ROBERT DOYLE
Governor Appointee
Former Command Rank Peace Officer

JACK GLASER
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---

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

POST COMMISSION STAFF

ROBERT BRINGOLF
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

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

BRAD EHRMAN
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

CHRISTINE FORD
Bureau Chief
Professional Conduct Southern Bureau

BRYANT HENLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

CHANDLER KNAPP
Staff Services Manager
Executive Office

LORALYNNE KONG
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

SARAH WALLACE
Bureau Chief
Intake & Disposition Bureau

CARRIE WOOLLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

---oOo---

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

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
ADVISORY BOARD LEGAL COUNSEL

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

---o0o---

ALSO PRESENT

ELIZABETH GIBBONS
Counsel for
Braulio Robledo
POST ID A83-R39
(Via videoconference)

COREY GLAVE
Counsel for
Blake Williams
POST ID C57-X01
(Via videoconference)

BEATRICE JOHNSON
Public Comment

BRAULIO ROBLEDO
POST ID A83-R39
(Via videoconference)

DANNY SANCHEZ
Public Comment
(Via videoconference)

TOMMY THOMPSON
POST ID B81-T83
(Via videoconference)

LESLIE WILCOX
Counsel for
Gabriel Gaxiola
POST ID B9-S96

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

TOM YU
Counsel for
Joshua Satterfield
POST ID C46-V20
(Via videoconference)

---o0o---

I N D E X

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
I. CALL TO ORDER	8
II. ROLL CALL OF POSAAB MEMBERS	8
III PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA	9
IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING TRANSCRIPTS	11
V. ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMENTS	14
VI. NEW BUSINESS	
a. Report on Data for Serious Misconduct Reporting, Investigations, and Disciplinary Action Outcomes	15
VII. NEW CASES – REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION	
a. POST2400920 - Tommy Thompson (POST ID: B81-T83) Last employing agency: Los Angeles Police Department	39
b. POST2302971 - Gabriel Gaxiola (POST ID: B49-S96) Last employing agency: Los Angeles Police Department	90
c. POST2305109 - Joshua Satterfield (POST ID: C46-V20) Last employing agency: Torrance Police Department	124
d. POST2305781 - Blake Williams (POST ID: C57-X01) Last employing agency: Torrance Police Department	153
e. POST2309558 - Braulio Robledo (POST ID: A83-R39) Last employing agency: Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department	187

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

PROCEEDINGS	PAGE
VIII. CLOSED SESSION	
(Transcript prepared and bound under separate cover)	
a. POST2400920 - Tommy Thompson (POST ID: B81-T83)	83
b. POST2302971 - Gabriel Gaxiola (POST ID: B49-S96)	118
c. POST2305109 - Joshua Satterfield (POST ID: C46-V20) (Not held)	--
d. POST2305781 - Blake Williams (POST ID: C57-X01) (Not held)	--
e. POST2309558 - Braulio Robledo (POST ID: A83-R39)	237
IX. FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES	259
X. ADJOURNMENT	261
CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	262
ERRATA SHEET	263

---o0o---

Thursday, January 16, 2025, 9:01 a.m.

West Sacramento, California

---o0o---

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you all for being on time.

Good morning, everyone. Today is Thursday, January 16th. And the time is 9:00 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 in mind, you will need to watch your cross-talk.

We will now start with our roll call for our board meetings.

Mr. Knapp, please take roll call.

MR. KNAPP: Good morning, Members of the Board. Welcome. Good to see you today.

Board Member Buchen.

(No response.)

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Present.

MR. KNAPP: Board Member Doyle.
MEMBER DOYLE: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Chair Dudley.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Johnson.
MEMBER JOHNSON: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Board Member Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Present.
MR. KNAPP: And Board Member Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Present.
MR. KNAPP: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: It looks like we are just missing one person, and a quorum has been established.
I would now like to introduce Board Counsel Christopher Beatty and Board Assistant Executive Director Annemarie Del Mugnaio. Right?
This time is set aside for members of the public who wish to comment on items not on the agenda but with -- excuse me -- 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

Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Glaser, 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.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: 6-1.

So there were no abstentions this time.

Okay. That motion passes six to one.

Did I get that right?

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: 7-1.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: 7-1, and that motion passes. No abstentions. One no.

Okay. Thank you, everyone.

Okay. Moving on to case 3.

At this time, I will call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Robert Bringolf, Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau; and Bryant Henley, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on case

POST2305109, Joshua Satterfield, who, at the time of the events at issue in this case, was employed with the Torrance Police Department.

Please begin.

MR. BRINGOLF: Thanks. Good afternoon, everybody. I am still Robert Bringolf, and next to me is Bryant Henley.

I just want to put a little disclaimer out in front of this case. There's going to be some offensive language. So allegedly racist terms, some racist terms. So I want to put that out there and just kind of forewarn everybody.

As I said, I'm still Robert Bringolf. This is Bryant Henley. I'm assigned to PCLA.

I'm here today to present Case 235109 [sic] involving Joshua Satterfield.

It is the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that Joshua Satterfield committed an act of serious misconduct, as set forth in Penal Code section 13510.8, while sending text messages to coworkers between August 2018 and April 2019.

Specifically, the Division has determined that Joshua Satterfield committed the following acts of serious misconduct:

Demonstrating bias as defined in section 13510.8(b)(5) of the Penal Code.

This afternoon I'm going to present a brief outline of our findings. And I will begin doing that now.

So Mr. Satterfield began his law enforcement career with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office as a deputy trainee on January 9th of 2014.

After that, he was promoted to deputy sheriff on June 1st of 2014.

He had ten days off between working as a deputy sheriff and starting as a police officer at the Torrance Police Department.

And he holds a POST basic certificate, which was issued July 14th, 2015.

On March 26, 2023, Torrance Police Department -- or TPD as I may refer to them -- reported allegations of serious misconduct against Mr. Satterfield to POST, pursuant to California Penal Code section 13510.9(a)(3).

The allegations stem from the discovery of homophobic, transphobic, and racist texts sent between members of the TPD between May 2018 and February 2022.

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 officer's law enforcement duties.

If so, serious misconduct is shown if the officer's words, action, or conduct either: One, violate applicable law; two, violate department policy; or, three, are 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 guidelines I just mentioned to determine whether the allegation of bias was true to a clear and convincing standard.

Regarding a message sent an August 23rd, 2018, Torrance Police Officer Chavez sent a text to Officer Satterfield that was a link to an article titled, quote, "Grand Rapids Man Accused of Urinating on Black Child, Calling her N-word," end quote.

Chavez wrote: "Josh when he's older."

Satterfield wrote: "What's the crime," end quote.

The exchange between Officer Chavez and Officer Satterfield is inherently offensive and racist. Satterfield's conduct in sending the message "what's the crime" in response to an article describing allegations of an adult male urinating on a female child and calling her the N-word clearly shows prejudice.

Even when viewed in the light most favorable to Officer Satterfield, the "what's the crime" response shows his indifference towards a specific protected class. This necessarily erodes the public's confidence in his ability to fairly perform his law enforcement duties. This message constitutes a demonstration of bias.

It is also highly probable that a reasonable person would conclude that Mr. Satterfield's August 23rd message -- in which he asked "What's the crime" in response to an article entitled "Grand Rapids Man Accused of Urinating on a Black Child, Calling Her the N-word" -- demonstrates that Mr. Satterfield has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with a protected class of persons.

The message exchange in respondent's -- sorry about

that.

I just lost my spot here. My computer was helping me in going back to the top of the page. So give me a second.

Okay. The message exchanged in Respondent's "what's the crime" response violated several of the Torrance Police Department's policies, including but not limited to, TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy, which is 34.05, et seq., and General Orders 1.10, 1.10.3(B), and 2.33.1(D).

Accordingly, the Division finds that Satterfield demonstrated bias with the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Regulation 1205(a)(5), when he responded "what's the crime" to Chavez's message.

On December 13th, 2018, Officer Chavez sent a group text thread a photo from the social media account of a T Flats rapper that contained an image of an assault rifle sitting upright on a table with a target underneath.

Under some discussion, Satterfield messaged the group: "You happen to notice the rounds put through that target on the table? I'm confident he won't be hitting any of us with that unzeroed Eotech." E-O-T-E-C-H. "Kinda reminds me of Chandler's targets by evidence of" --

And then he named a member of the Torrance

community that I refer to as IP1 in the Division's Investigative Summary and Findings.

Officer Chandler responded, "I'm a deadeye shot, biotch. Who is IP1?"

Officer Satterfield replied: "That nigglet you failed to kill. Grandma said you need to be a better shot," end quote.

Mr. Satterfield's message clearly shows prejudice and intolerance. Satterfield refers to a member of the Torrance community as "that nigglet" and goes on to criticize Officer Chandler because he, quote, "failed to kill" the individual during a previous police encounter.

Even when viewed in the light most favorable to Mr. Satterfield, his racist epithet used to describe a member of the Torrance community, and statement that Officer Chandler failed to kill the Torrance community member shows his indifference toward a specific protected class.

Again, this necessarily erodes the public's confidence in his ability to fairly perform his law enforcement duties. And a reasonable person would conclude that Mr. Satterfield's message shows he has not or will not fairly and impartially perform his law enforcement duties when interacting with certain protected classes of the persons -- sorry, protected

classes of persons in the Torrance community.

Further, the specificity of the language in this exchange is severe. And Satterfield asserts that Officer Chavez failed to kill a member of the Torrance community, an individual Satterfield identified using an offensive term associated with that community member's apparent race.

Coupling the racist epithets with the implication that the appropriate outcome through a use of lethal force is the death of the suspect, rather than stopping the threat, also suggests a reasonable person could conclude Satterfield's statement reveals Satterfield's predisposition to use force in an unfair or unbiased manner. I'm sorry. Unfair or biased manner.

Stated another way, a reasonable person would also conclude that Satterfield believes the appropriate use of force will depend on the suspect's race.

This type of statement violates several department policies and discredits the Torrance Police Department in potentially irreparable ways.

His remarks violated several of the TPD policies, including but not limited to TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy in General Orders. Accordingly, the Division finds that Mr. Satterfield demonstrated bias with the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and

Regulation 1205(a)(5) when he wrote "That nigglet you failed to kill. Grandma said you needed to be a better shot."

On April 30th, 2019, Torrance Police Officer Nelson shared a Black Lives Matter Instagram post to, quote, "The Boys" group chat.

The post read, quote, "Torrance, California, police shot and killed" -- and then we have omitted the decedent's name -- "within 15 seconds."

"Just released bodycam footage shows police murder" -- decedent's name is omitted -- and then there's ellipses, end quote.

Mr. Satterfield replied, "Aww" and "His little son will grow up without a father now. Oh wait, that's standard for any African American family to be absent a father. He'll be fine," end quote.

Mr. Satterfield's April 30th message shows prejudice, intolerance, contempt, and hatred toward a protected class of persons.

Mr. Satterfield facetiously laments the death of a member of the Torrance community by messaging "Aww." He then goes on to reinforce racist stereotypes and expresses a callous indifference concerning the future of the decedent's child, when he states, quote, the decedent's "little son will grow up without a father

now. Oh way [sic] that's standard for any African American family to be absent a father. He'll be fine." End quote.

Satterfield reacted to the death of a member of the Torrance community by using racist stereotypes while, at the same time, displaying no empathy for the decedent's young son.

A reasonable person would conclude that Satterfield's message demonstrates he 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.

Further, the April 30th message is another message that discredits the Torrance Police Department in potentially irreparable ways.

His remarks violated a number of their policies, to include but not limited to, TPD's Anti-Harassment Policy, as I have mentioned before; the General Orders 1.10, 1.10.3(B) and 2.33.1(D).

And accordingly, the Division finds that Mr. Satterfield demonstrated bias within the meaning of Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Regulation 1205(a)(5) when he wrote, "Aww" and when he wrote, quote, "His little son will grow up without a father now."

The facts I have just recited support the Division's finding that Joshua Satterfield was involved in serious misconduct, specifically demonstrating bias.

For 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 that Joshua Satterfield POST's certification be revoked.

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

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Does anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there anyone in the public that would like to address the Board at this time?

Yes.

And let me just say that -- pardon me?

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: We have the officer's attorney on the line.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. We haven't gotten to that.

You may state your name and organization if you wish. You will be given three minutes to speak, and the

time limits will be strictly enforced, so please ensure that you complete your comments within that allotted time.

MS. JOHNSON: My name is Beatrice Johnson. And I'm here with Families United for Justice, which is a network of families who have lost loved ones to police killing. And some have actually had racial epithets before they were killed, including Oscar Grant.

I want to talk about the mindset. It's devastating that in 2025, 2024, this kind of mindset still exists, and it still exists in the police department.

As you know, for the community like mine, we understand that policing started with slavery. Catching slaves. That mentality that still exists today is very heartbreaking. It is painful. It was very painful to hear this case in reading this case. I really wasn't prepared for it today.

Because we do have a network of over 1500 families who have lost loved ones to police, and a lot have experienced these racial epithets before their loved ones was killed.

So I feel like if we're going to change the culture of policing, that mindsets like this should not be tolerated in any way. In any way.

That's all I want to say.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Mrs. Johnson.

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

If so, you will each be given four minutes to speak, and the time limit will be strictly enforced. So please ensure that you complete your comments within the allotted time.

While commenting, keep in mind that the Board will only consider the facts presented from the Division today, and will not consider any additional facts or defenses at this time.

The sole question before the Board today is the following: If the facts offered by the Division today are, in fact, proven at later hearing, do these facts demonstrate a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code section 13501.8 [sic] and Commission Regulation 1205 occurred?

So do we have the attorney or the respondent?

MR. YU: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, we can. Thank you.

MR. YU: Yes. Hi. Good afternoon.

My name is Tom Yu. I am Officer Satterfield's legal counsel.

I just want to make sure my sound bite is coming in because it's not -- it's not -- I don't see myself on

the Zoom meeting.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm hearing you --

MR. YU: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: -- and the Board is hearing you perfectly well. Thank you for checking.

MR. YU: Okay. Very well.

I wanted to comment on three things, and I will go in turn. If the facts proven in this allegation is true, there is not a amount of evidence that would tend to prove that any of these text messages, number one, was sent by my client, Officer Satterfield. Nothing in the record would show that Officer Satterfield, himself, sent this message.

The standard is: Words of tolerance or contempt for hatred of a protected class and whether or not that -- those action would implicate any type of effect that my client cannot perform his official duties in a manner consistent with department policy.

There has been zero evidence of all the investigations that Officer Satterfield had any racial bias towards any minority groups.

The T Flats case that the law enforcement consultant was talking about was a Hispanic gang member that was killed after the confrontation with Officer Chavez and Concannon.

That was the separate incident that my client was not involved in. The facts in this case tends to conflate that Officer Satterfield had some involvement in that shooting. In fact, my client had zero involvement in that shooting. And nothing here demonstrated or would tend to prove that Officer Satterfield took any enforcement actions that were biased or had any kind of ill will towards any race -- of any minority races.

The Anti-Harassment Policy that the Commission has referred to does not apply here. If proven at a hearing, the Anti-Harassment Policy for the Torrance Police Department is not to use any race, gender, or otherwise protected class to engage in inappropriate behavior of city employees.

So when the consultant is talking about this Anti-Harassment Policy, that is very misleading. The Anti-Harassment Policy is not to prevent off- -- I'm not saying the officer should harass the citizens. But the policy that he cited does not apply to this case. Nor is there any kind of evidence that tends to point out the disposition that my client has any kind of ill will towards minority groups.

That type of reasonable person predisposition is founded on nothing but speculation. It is speculation

that my client did something to a citizen of the Torrance community because of their race.

In fact, if you look at Officer Satterfield's arrest, most of the people he arrested were Caucasian. They are not Blacks or Hispanics.

I think to end the public comment, what is shameful for the Torrance Police Department is how they got these messages. They illegally searched another officer's phone and extracted private text messages that they would not otherwise be in possession of.

I think it should not be lost on this Commission that law enforcement officers in all fronts should uphold the law, and they cannot break a law to enforce a law.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

And just a comment back. There has been no designation -- no lawful designation that the taking of those -- that messages was illegal.

Okay. Any other questions or comments from the Board for Mr. Yu?

MEMBER DOYLE: Yes. So Mr. Yu, so it is your position that there's no proof that your client sent those text messages?

MR. YU: Correct.

MEMBER DOYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

MR. YU: It is my position for the purpose of public comment with the evidence presented.

Yes, Mr. Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Ms. Pena.

MEMBER PENA: So just to follow up on that, because I'm a little bit confused.

So your first argument is Satterfield didn't send these messages, and there's no evidence to prove that. But your second argument is even if he did, it doesn't show he doesn't have racial bias?

MR. YU: No. The second argument I have is from the messages presented by the consultant to -- in this hearing. Those messages, themselves, do not demonstrate the second prong of whether these words or actions or conduct have an impact of my client's official performance of his duties as a law enforcement officer.

His comment and plain jokes of African Americans or Hispanics, whatever race, there's no evidence that is linked to any of his performance as a law enforcement officer or whether or not those text messages were or statements purportedly made by him had any impact on him performing his duties as a police officer.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm not sure that Ms. Pena is done. Hang on.

Ms. Pena, did you have anything else?

MEMBER PENA: That's fine. I'm fine.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Board Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: As a Black female, as a Black woman, as the mother of a Black child, I'm having difficulty understanding or hearing that you think or you believe that racial epithets in a text message has no weight or bearing on how a person goes about their daily responsibilities in completing their job.

I, as a citizen, tax-paying citizen, could not put my trust in any organization, be it police, fire, any type of public service, medical, into a person who thinks it's okay to have those type of conversations.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I don't think that was a question for you, Mr. Yu. I think that was a statement as to her feelings.

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

So moving on to Ms. Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Thank you.

She pretty much said the same thing I'm thinking, as a mother, as a community leader, as a community

citizen.

One of the things that I find insulting is that he hisself did not appear before this Board. What you -- what we read and what we seen in evidence is serious.

I am a mother of two sons and a daughter, and I have a grandson now. And I pray every day that my children do not come before an officer with that type of mindset or spirit or in their heart.

It would have been better for him to come before this Board. Because as we know, you are a paid attorney. And the best attorneys who tell -- who may project a story is not always evidence to truly how he felt. He did himself a disservice because if he truly believed this, or it wasn't him, he should have been before this Board, and that was my comment.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Let me just make sure everybody understands.

He had no duty to appear before this Board. We don't know why he's not appearing before this Board. It just is that he's not appearing before this Board.

Any other questions or comments?

Dr. Glaser.

Then Mr. Lara.

MEMBER GLASER: Just for clarification, given that Mr. Yu implied or insinuated that there would need to be

evidence linking the expression of these racial -- of racial bias with actual performance, or actual behavior, the Penal Code -- the relevant Penal Code language says:

"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.

And that is our guiding language.

And then I would like to say, as researcher of prejudice and discrimination who has been studying that for over 30 years, that attitudes do affect behavior, and it is a reasonable inference that if somebody expresses these kinds of hateful, racist attitudes in one context, it could very well influence their behavior in another.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Dr. Glaser.

Yes. Mr. Lara.

MEMBER LARA: Just a question, again, for the

investigator.

Robert, the -- the -- it is being said by the attorney that the -- it was not established that Mr. Satterfield sent these messages.

Could you just lay out to us how you established that he sent these messages.

MR. BRINGOLF: I would direct your attention to Attachment E, which are transcripts from his interview with Internal Affairs.

We were able to correlate the phone number that was on the WhatsApp messages to his personal cell phone number.

And then in his interview -- I could read it to you, or you could just take a look at Attachment E. But essentially they ask him about, "Have you had this cell phone? How long have you had this cell phone prior to working at Torrance? Did anybody else use your cell phone?"

So his attorney, Mr. Yu, I believe, at the time, said, "Well, that assumes that person told him that they used his cell phone."

But then it was clear -- cleared up so that no one has told you or that no -- he hadn't discovered that anybody else used his cell phone to send these messages.

There's no indication to believe that somebody else

sent those messages.

So I believe the clear and convincing evidence standard has been met. So, yeah, I would bring your attention to Attachment E. There's not a doubt from this investigator's standpoint that those messages were sent by his phone and likely sent by him.

MEMBER LARA: I asked the question. I saw the attachment. I asked the question in the vein of just making it clear for the listeners who may not be privy to that material.

MR. BRINGOLF: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON SALAZAR: Thank you, Mr. Lara.

MR. YU: Madam Chair, may I respond to the comments that were made?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Not yet.

Let me make sure there aren't any more comments.

Looks like Mr. Johnson has a comment.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I do. And I believe this is also for the Division.

The particular group that his number and his association with, what -- do we know what this particular group was formed for, and were there other racial epithets used in this same group?

MR. BRINGOLF: Yeah, there were.

I don't know why it was formed, necessarily. I

think it was just a communication platform. So it was like a group of people from an agency that would all text and communicate on the same platform. I think they used WhatsApp in one of these instances. Other instances where they are just texts, like iChat texts.

Yes. There were other racial epithets used.

You will hear another case today. A case following mine is another case that the case came -- was borne out of the same incident. Right? So same agency, and a different officer and different text messages that are all related to one another. That's the next case that you will be hearing.

So, yes, there are others.

Does that answer your question, Mr. Johnson?

MEMBER JOHNSON: It does to a degree.

What about the size of the group? How big was the group?

MR. BRINGOLF: Oh, gosh, I don't remember specifically. But so the one thing -- yeah, the one thing to remember is not all of these messages happened in the same group.

So some of these text messages were sent in smaller groups of texts sent between different people. They all have a common person, though, or common people. And those people were two officers who were subject to a

search warrant.

And so those people had to be involved in the text chains. We don't know what texts happened outside of those. And so these are different groups that all involved two specific officers.

MR. HENLEY: If I may.

MR. BRINGOLF: Please, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Please, go ahead.

MR. HENLEY: Madam Chair, if I may --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Sure.

MR. HENLEY: -- just to add to Mr. Bringolf's answer, Board Member Johnson.

This particular -- these threads of texts that you have heard today came from a group chat. There's -- so WhatsApp being one of the applications that you can communicate via text. These were handled on WhatsApp.

There was a group of 15 police officers, either former or current police officers, working for the Torrance Police Department that were part of this group. The group was labeled "The Boys," quote/unquote. And the messages were communicated to quote/unquote "The Boys." Respondent, Officer Satterfield, former Officer Satterfield, was among the 15 persons who were part of that messaging thread.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Right. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Any other comments before I turn it back over to Mr. Yu for a minute?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Seeing none.

Mr. Yu, I will give you one minute to respond.

MR. YU: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The standard of what would lead a reasonable person to conclude is purely speculative. The evidence before this Commission has zero evidence that would lead a reasonable person to believe that Officer Satterfield used some kind of racial bias when he was performing his job as a police officer.

You would think the Torrance Police Department would go back through years and years of arrests, citizens' complaint, nothing to that sort. You are looking forward where you should be looking backwards. Looking forward is speculation. When you are looking forward, you are saying what might happen. What could happen, as Dr. Glaser could say.

What could this officer have done? But what did happen was nothing happened. Nothing of racial discrimination. Nothing of racial harassment occurred.

Torrance Police Department did an in-depth investigation on the entirety of all of Officer Satterfield's arrests, and they came up with nothing.

Zero evidence to show that race was even a factor in his previous arrests.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Yu. You did get your minute.

And everybody heard the piece that Dr. Glaser read, and you also heard from Mr. Yu.

Mr. Yu, thank you.

Are there -- would you like to deliberate or not?

MR. HENLEY: Madam Chair --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes.

MR. HENLEY: If appropriate, I would like to respond to Mr. Yu's comments.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Sure. Absolutely.

MR. HENLEY: I defer to you. Thank you.

There are really two points.

And Mr. Glaser of your Board has already addressed one, and I don't want to belabor it.

But I respectfully want to submit that Mr. Yu has mischaracterized what the statute and the regulations say.

And just to try to bring us back to what the regulation says, it is important to emphasize, it is not a question of whether Mr. Yu or his client believe that they are engaging in racial behavior -- racist behaviors. The question is whether through the words,

acts, or other conduct, would a reasonable person conclude that the officer has not fairly and impartially performed or will not fairly and impartially perform their law enforcement duties.

We would respectfully submit to you that the evidence is much higher than clear and convincing. There is a monument of evidence to demonstrate that a reasonable person reading these text messages among 15 officers would easily conclude this officer cannot fairly and impartially perform his duties.

The last point I would just like to make briefly is, Mr. Yu references that there is no evidence that these texts resulted in any racial or discriminatory behavior. And I think it is worth mentioning at this point -- it is in the Investigative Summary and Findings. The reason these text messages came to light started with two other peace officers: Officers Weldin and Tomsic, former officers. They are currently under a criminal prosecution for their conduct.

What led to these texts being found was that a swastika was spray-painted on a victim's car.

It turns out that, right now, those individuals, Officer Tomsic and Weldin, are being prosecuted for the spray painting and vandalism in a felony case; spray painting that swastika on a vehicle. Precise --

precisely the types of behaviors that are abhorrent and can be found within the text messages that were found following that investigation.

And so I respectfully, but strongly, disagree with Mr. Yu's characterization as to whether these messages have any importance or not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So here's my question:

Would anybody like to go in the back room and deliberate on this case?

(Noes.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: There is a "no" response from everybody.

So now let me ask if there's a motion.

MEMBER LARA: I would like to make a motion to revoke.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: I second it.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Discussion? Comments? Questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: All right. Please take a roll call.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.
MR. KNAPP: Clavo, aye.
Crawford.
MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Yes.
MR. KNAPP: Crawford, aye.
Doyle.
MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.
MR. KNAPP: Doyle, aye.
Dudley.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes.
MR. KNAPP: Dudley, aye.
Glaser.
MEMBER GLASER: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Glaser, 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.
Motion passes unanimously.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

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, a 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 5th day of February 2025.

KATHRYN S. SWANK, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 13061