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

Are you ready for a break?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Let's take a break now. It is 1:45. And if I could please ask everybody to come back at 1:55. We still have three [sic] more cases. And it is close to 2:00 o'clock. Thank you.

(Break taken in proceedings.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: It is now 1:55. Thank you all for being on time.

And let's move on to the next case. That is Blake Williams.

At this time, I will now call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Loralynne Kong, Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau; and Bryant Henley, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on Case POST2305781, Blake Williams, who, at the time of the events at issue in this case, was employed by the Torrance Police Department.

Thank you.

MS. KONG: Good afternoon, Chair Dudley and members of the Board. My name is Loralynne Kong. I'm one of the law enforcement consultants assigned to the Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau in the Peace Officer Standard and Accountability Division.

With me today, again, is Bryant Henley, an attorney

with our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I'm here today to present Case Number POST2305781 involving Blake Williams and the Torrance Police Department.

It is the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that Blake Williams committed acts of serious misconduct as set forth in Penal Code section 13510.8, between July 2028 -- July 2018, sorry -- and September 2019.

Specifically, the Division has determined that Blake Williams committed the following acts of serious misconduct:

Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(5) and Commission Regulation 1205(a)(5), demonstrating bias on the basis of race, religion, and sexual orientation.

The serious misconduct in this case is -- in this case not only violated the Torrance Police Department's policies, the misconduct was completely inconsistent with the peace officer's obligation to carry out the officer's duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

In this presentation, I will present a brief outline of the Division's findings of investigation in this matter.

Blake Williams began his career with the Torrance Police Department on June 9, 2016, as an officer. Blake

William holds POST certification, their basic certificate, which was issued in June -- on June 12th, 2017.

He has two previous incidents of discipline: One was for an incident that occurred on July 5th, 2018, related to policy violations associated with a vehicle pursuit. Respondent was issued a one-day suspension.

The other was for an incident that occurred on May 11, 2020, related to policy violations associated with discourteous, disrespectful, or discriminatory treatment of any member of the public or any member of the Torrance Police Department or the City of Torrance.

On May 20th, 2020, Respondent was issued a written reprimand.

The courteous -- the discourteous treatment at issue did not involve bias.

Just to give you a little background on this investigation, I know some of it is a little repetitive from the last one.

In 2000 -- in January 2020, two Torrance police officers were the subjects of a criminal investigation, wherein it was alleged they had vandalized an arrestee's vehicle by, among other things, spray painting a swastika on the interior of the arrestee's vehicle.

As a result of the criminal investigation, Torrance

Police detectives obtained a search warrant for the officer's personally-owned cellular telephones.

The data extracted from the cellular telephones was forensically analyzed by an investigator with the intent to determine whether the two suspect officers had any ties to white supremacy.

During the review of that data, it was discovered that approximately 390 messages were sent between the two officers, as well as other officers, including respondent.

Several of the messages were believed to contained -- contain or reference racist, discriminatory, and/or anti-Semitic remarks.

The forensic review revealed Respondent was part of a WhatsApp group text titled "The Boys," which included approximately 15 members of the Torrance Police Department. WhatsApp is a cellular telephone app used for sending text messages.

Based on this information, the Torrance Police Department utilized Norman A. Traub & Associates to conduct the administrative investigation.

This investigation was separate from the other two officers' criminal investigation. The administrative investigation as it relates to Respondent focused on 13 messages that were received, sent, or responded to by

Respondent while on- and off-duty, that were alleged to demonstrate bias.

Of the 13 messages, all but one were sustained as being policy violations related to receiving, sending, and responding to discriminatory text messages.

Six of these messages are described in further detail within the Investigative Summary and Findings, and are the subject of today's meeting.

I will review the actual text messages and photos with you and then address each one.

Please be advised, the content about to be shown contains offensive material due to the topic of the allegations.

Next slide.

In July 4th, 2018, in a WhatsApp message to "The Boys" group, Respondent mentions Officer David Chandler needing to get off probation.

Officer Chandler responds, "I'll eat sweaty ass at this point with dingleberries," end quote.

Slide 4.

A few minutes later, Respondent replied with an image of a male adult in blackface.

Respondent's post: "I googled dingle berry and this popped up. Way funnier."

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary,

blackface is a dark makeup worn to mimic the appearance of a Black person and especially to mock or ridicule Black people. Note: The wearing of blackface by white performers was from early 19th through mid-20th centuries, a prominent feature of minstrel shows and similar forms of entertainment featuring exaggerated and inaccurate caricatures of Black people. The use of blackface is considered deeply offensive.

The Division believes the respondent's statement that the blackface photo is way funnier than other Google search results he obtained for the term "dingleberry" shows his disregard for a specific protected class of persons and is inconsistent with the respondent's obligation to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

It is highly probable if a reasonable person saw or heard about this message, they would conclude that the officer will not fairly and impartially perform their law enforcement duties.

The Torrance Police Department found the message violated several of the Department's policies, including but not limited to the prohibited use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on-duty or in uniform, and the prohibition against bias-based policing.

It is the Torrance Police Department policy to provide law enforcement services and to enforce the law equally, fairly, and objectively, and without discrimination toward any individual group.

Torrance Police Department reviewed several text messages, including the same text messages which are part of this Division's Investigative Summary and Findings. The department concluded that the respondent's involvement in sending, receiving, and responding to discriminatory messaging constituted grounds for Respondent's termination.

Next slide.

On July 5th, 2018, Respondent sent a WhatsApp group message to "The Boys." The message contained an image of two muscular Black males fighting or wrestling.

Respondent's captioned message was as follows: "Hey Young, everyday you don't work out, just know some gorilla looking fuck is getting it in over in the shadow lands."

Young is believed to be Torrance Police Department Officer Young, a member of "The Boys" group chat.

The Division believes the reference "gorilla looking fuck" is referring to the two muscular Black males in this photo.

This message is racist and offensive -- and an

offensive characterization of the individuals in this photograph.

It is also inconsistent with the respondent's obligation to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner. It is highly probable if a reasonable person saw or heard about this message, they would conclude that the officer will not fairly or im- -- and impartially perform the officer's law enforcement duties.

The Torrance Police Department found this message violated several of the Department's policies, including but not limited to the prohibited use of obscene, indecent, profane, or derogatory language while on-duty or in uniform; and the prohibition against bias-based policing.

It is the Torrance Police Department's policy to provide law enforcement services to enforce the law equally, fairly, and objectively, and without discrimination toward any individual group.

The department concluded that this message, along with other discriminatory message that -- messages that Respondent either sent, received, or responded to, constituted grounds for Respondent's termination.

On August 23rd, 2018, one of the messages to "The Boys" mentioned Omar, who was believed to be a Torrance

Police Department Omar Alonso, who was one of the members of the text group.

The message string began with Respondent: "Omar was though."

"Jam him up."

Officer Joshua Satterfield responds, "I'll Superman punch Omar on the run and then just keep going and see if they chase me."

Respondent replied: "Bro ... not a good idea. The big brown war machine would not be pleased. Generations of field work has left his knees numb and calloused."

Officer Satterfield responds: "I can out run Omar. I would have to be careful hopping fences though. That's where he'd gain his ground."

Respondent replied: "Omar's people excel at fence hopping -- at fence hopping to."

Officer Satterfield replied: "Oh, shit lol sick burn."

The Division's analysis is, the Division believes this message is a stereotypical and derogatory reference toward Latin Americans. The use of stereotypical and demeaning descriptions of Latin-American persons as means of amusement or any joking manner are inconsistent with an officer's obligation to carry out his duties when interacting with this protected class of persons in

the Torrance community.

It is highly probable if a person -- if a reasonable person saw or heard about this message, they would be offended by the stereotyping of Latin-American field workers and/or the reference to Latin American fence hopping.

The Torrance Police Department found this message violated several of the Department's policies, including but not limited to prohibited acts on- or off-duty that brings discredit to the department; and prohibition against bias-based policing.

It is the Torrance Police Department's policy to provide law enforcement services and to encourage the law -- to enforce the law -- sorry -- equally, fairly and objectively, and without discrimination toward any individual group.

The Department included that this message, along with other discriminatory messages that respondent either sent, received, or responded to, constituted grounds for respondent's termination.

Next slide.

On November 4th, 2018, members of "The Boys" chat group were discussing the types of inappropriate content that might be found on other Torrance police officers' social media accounts.

The text message from Officer David Chandler to "The Boys" WhatsApp group reads: "Dude, you have no idea. I am literally on fire right now. I can't believe we hired a racist cock like this. Don't we check facebooks and shit. WTF is this."

Next slide.

Shortly after, the respondent sent a message that contained the image of a scene of a lynching, including two apparently deceased Black males who had been hung, and a third apparently deceased Black male down on the ground. There was a group of older white males looking on.

Respondent commented: "They missed this on mine."

Officer Chandler responds: "Geezus Blake haha.

"That's history though. There's knowledge in that."

Short after -- shortly after that message, Respondent sent another message: "Hanging with the homies."

According to the NAACP, a lynching --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Ms. Kong, let me just stop you for one second.

MS. KONG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I want to ask the board members: Is there anybody who hasn't read all this and

considered all this? Do you need this reiterated in any way, shape, or form; the evidence that was in your binder?

Yes. Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: I will say that some of the context is somewhat helpful. I didn't understand the reference previously to "They missed this one on mine," for example.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MEMBER GLASER: That just was the beginning of the quote.

So if there's any context like that, that explains and clarifies some of this, that would be welcome.

Otherwise, I think we get the point.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Anybody else have any -- we'll keep going, then. Because I want you to feel that you have gotten all the information.

Okay. Thank you, Ms. Kong. Please go ahead.

MS. KONG: Okay.

I will just go through the slides.

According to the NAACP, the lynching is a public killing of an individual who has not received any due process. They were violent, public acts with white people used to terrorize and control Black people in the 19th and 20th Centuries, particularly in the South.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Again, the message for the Board was if there's any context, additional context.

So Dr. Glaser, just to be clear, you don't need anything reiterated that was in your binder. It is just if there's anything additional.

So given the nature of this information, given that the Board has seen it, let me just ask you to shorten your comments to just include anything along the lines that Dr. Glaser was requesting.

MR. HENLEY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think with that, we will -- because I think this Board understands the regulation and how it applies with regard to these messages, I don't think we will have to describe how we concluded that.

But, of course, we're prepared to answer any questions you may have.

And Lora, with that, I think kind of moving through the rest of the slides. I would just go to the next slide for context.

Maybe we can just allow the Board to read it. It is -- this provides the context for the messaging. We'll give the Board some time to read this message, and we'll move on to the next one if that's appropriate.

If the Board -- we have one more slide to show. And if the Board is finished reading this slide. Okay.

This is the final message that is within the Investigative Summary and Findings. Of course, if there are -- if there are questions, the slide speaks for itself.

But if there are any questions, we are prepared to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Again, I think you have all seen this.

So are there any questions about context or anything else?

Yes.

MEMBER PENA: I just have one. In an earlier slide, there's a reference in one of the messages to "shadow lands." Is that -- does that have any significance, or does that mean something?

MR. HENLEY: Thank you, Board Member Pena.

Yeah, it is certainly speculation.

But the reference to "shadow lands" meaning sort of a darker area, it is really derived -- derogatory towards persons of a certain race. That's, I think, how some reasonable persons could construe it.

I defer to every board member to interpret it as they will.

But I think there's -- it is certainly an implication there: "Shadow lands" was meant as a

reference to persons of a certain color who are not in the open, but in the shadows.

MEMBER PENA: It is not a specific location?

MR. HENLEY: Certainly, I don't think either of us construed it to be a specific location, no.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Any other questions for either the consultant, Ms. Kong, or the attorney, Mr. Henley?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you, both.

At this time, does the subject officer and/or their counsel wish to make public comment? If so, you will each be given four minutes to speak, and the time limits 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 as presented by 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 a later hearing, do those facts demonstrate a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205, occurred?

Now, is there anyone what would like to make a comment?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Either the Respondent or Counsel?

MR. HENLEY: We may have Counsel online. I'm looking to our colleagues here.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MR. GLAVE: Good afternoon. Corey Glave is online. My mic is open, but my video is not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Now, Mr. Glaves [sic]. Joyce Dudley here. We can hear you.

MR. GLAVE: All right. Thank you, Chair Dudley. It is nice to see you again.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes.

MR. GLAVE: Honorable Board Members, thank you for the opportunity to address you.

This matter comes before you without a final decision from the employer, as the appeal process for the discipline is still pending.

We would ask that you do not attribute other officers' conduct to my client, as it's not relevant, and he did not participate in those other activities for which you heard discussed.

The search warrant that brought the messages here

had a specific order from the court that has been reaffirmed by the court. They could not use, review, or disclose, yet here we are using the same messages.

Even if the facts are true, there is no actual conduct for POST to act on. No evidence the officer acted inconsistent with peace officer obligations to carry out his duties in a fair and unbiased manner.

No allegations of bias, other than certain memes.

No allegations of excessive force or any other allegation that falls under Penal Code section 13510.8(b).

There is no comments here directed towards any community members or anybody of the community.

The investigator has analytical gaps that the use of memes created by others in access -- accessible on the internet would lead a reasonable person that Respondent has not acted or will not act fairly in his law enforcement duties.

In fact, there's no evidence of any bias. The department looked into it on his arrest and his actions and determined there was no other bias.

I understand you are now using a regulation that has recently been enacted, and it appears using a law that doesn't go into effect until January 2026.

Importantly, supposition and belief, or

speculation, does not constitute facts, let alone clear and convincing evidence. And throughout this, you have heard suppositions.

There is no evidence -- and it is important to note that these are messages from 2018, one in 2019, before the laws that you are now acting under. And there's no exception of -- excuse me -- 1315 -- 13510.8(g), as far as the subsections.

You have heard a reference to other cases that aren't before you in the arguments. And in one case, there was a shooting. My client showed no bias and, in fact, he was the officer that moved forward in front of other officers, pulled the suspect out of the car, and tried to save his life.

On multiple occasions, he's tried to save people's lives. He was a combat medic. He treats people without regard to bias, both American soldiers and enemy combatants.

As POST trains, all persons have bias: Myself, my client, everybody on this board; some of them have been expressed today.

The problem is only where you show that you act on that bias and it interferes with one's profession.

There is no evidence of that in this case.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Mr. Glaves, you have another

25 seconds.

MR. GLAVE: I have much more than that, but I know how the Board is going to vote and probably won't even deliberate. So I will allow them to take the actions that they need, so that we can get to appeal hearing.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. That's your choice.

Thank you.

Any -- any comment from either of the attorneys at this point?

MR. HENLEY: I would address a couple of -- there are obviously a litany of arguments that were presented here; maybe only a couple that are worth emphasizing.

There was -- there's a suggestion that there hasn't been a final decision from the employer. That's incorrect, as the Investigative Summary and Findings shows.

That finding -- the way that the City of Torrance policies work, they have -- they have an ordinance that they impose. It is Torrance Municipal Code section 14.47.1. It provides the city manager with the authority to make a final decision on termination. The city manager, indeed, has made that determination. It is among the attachments you have to this Investigative Summary and Findings.

What Mr. Glave, I believe, is referring to is the

fact that his client has appealed that decision.

But, again, that is of no matter, as the Penal Code provides in Penal Code section 13510.8(c)(6), that an action by an agency or a decision that results from appeal -- from an appeal of an agency's decision does not preclude action by the Commission.

So suffice it to say, even were this -- it is under appeal. That has no import on whether this Board and the Commission can take action, irrespective of some appeal that may be existing.

Keeping in mind that from these are -- this is conduct. The first was discovered in 2020. We're now in 2025, and that begs the question how long we should wait to take action in this case.

The only other matter I would address is there is a discussion about a search warrant. The fact that the search warrant -- that there were orders from the court regarding how that search warrant could be used.

As Chair Dudley has already referenced -- and it's in your Investigative Summary and Findings -- Mr. Glaves and his colleague, Mr. Yu, on behalf of their clients, went to the court, attempted to make the very arguments they are making for you today. The trial judge rejected those arguments. Mr. Yu and Mr. Glave appealed that decision. The court of appeal summarily denied those

arguments.

And if Mr. Glave and Mr. Yu wish to make those arguments again, if this Board recommends revocation, and the Commission concurs, there will certainly be another opportunity for them to brief it in more fulsome detail if they wish to do so.

The other last piece I will say -- and, again, I don't want to belabor it, but it's really important to emphasize, since these are the first two bias cases that have been presented to this Board; there's been a lot of argument and suggestion that somehow if you can prove that you have acted on your bias, that's what's required for this regulation. That seems to be the argument we're hearing.

That is absolutely incorrect. That's a mischaracterization of what the regulation says. And I see heads nodding, so I won't belabor it.

But I will finally say, for the record, the question here, for this Board, is: Would a reasonable person believe, after seeing the messages, the communications, would they believe that that officer who communicates in these ways could fairly and impartially perform their duties?

We respectfully submit, absolutely not. And that's why we have brought this case to you today.

And with that, Madam Chair, I have no further comment.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Yes. Please, Ms. Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: I would like to have a discussion quickly with Christopher, if that's okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You want to ask a question of the attorney?

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Offline, for a second, real quick.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Well, there's nothing offline. But you can certainly ask a question.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Okay. So that is -- it is publicly known, I am a representative of the NAACP.

MR. GLAVE: Madam Chair, if we could ask her to bring her mic down. I can't hear her.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Sure. Yeah.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: You know I hate this thing.

It is known that I am a representative of the NAACP, serving in several different capacities.

I do not want to taint the counselor's position or POST. So I don't know if I should recuse myself from this or not.

And so, Christopher, I'm looking for your advice.

MR. BEATTY: Yeah. I mean, I think in an abundance of caution, that when somebody feels like a presence of potential bias could impact the progress of a case -- without specific to this one individually -- I think it may be that a recusal makes sense.

And so in that context, without like analysis of if there's an actual issue of bias, and you're -- because I have not heard enough from you to make a determination of law, right? Like, this is what I advise as legal counsel.

But based on the potential, sometimes recusal is a wise decision. So that's my knee-jerk reaction. And, you know, potentially some of your other colleagues -- well, that's what I would say.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I think you described it beautifully.

And I think you could make that internal decision. Thank you.

Other questions or comments?

MEMBER DOYLE: I just wanted to clarification with POST Counsel.

In the appeal to the city manager, it really doesn't matter how that appeal comes out because SB 2 is independent of any finding, correct?

MR. HENLEY: That's exactly correct, Board Member

Doyle.

The statute and Senate Bill 2, that statute I referenced -- 13510.8 -- specifically says that regardless of what happens on an appeal or ultimate outcome of a termination decision of a local agency, it is of no import or consequence for the Board or the Commission to take action.

The only exception to that is -- and it's not true in this case -- but there could be a circumstance where a agency has a hearing, that hearing concludes, and there's a finding based on that hearing.

That procedure could have some collateral estoppel effect. That's a legal term that basically says, can you retry something that's been heard by another body? So that's the one exception. It's not applicable here.

And so you said it more succinctly than I, and I probably should have gone with your interpretation because that's correct. That is -- that is true. This Board can proceed irrespective of what happens with any appeal.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Yes.

MEMBER CLAVO: I wanted to ask the attorney what law was he referring to that is not in place until 2026. I'm not familiar with --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Are you asking Corey Glaves that question?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Please.

Mr. Glaves.

MR. GLAVE: Yes, thank you.

We -- in researching for this hearing, we noticed that there was a regulations by your board created, I believe it's December of 2024, and then Penal Code 13510.6, which goes into the standards for bias. It is not operative until January 1, 2026.

MR. HENLEY: And Madam Chair, I'm happy to comment on that, if you would like.

Well, first and foremost, I will have to go back and look at the statute that Mr. Glave is referring to. But it is really not important to look at it because it is not the authority upon which this regulation was adopted.

This regulation was adopted based upon Senate Bill 2. The regulation was in effect prior to this case coming to POST. And so the statute, 13510.6, whether it was adopted in 2024 or not -- I can go back and look -- but either way, it's not the statute that resulted in this regulation. It's not relied upon for this regulation. And so it has no application to this case.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Any other questions of Mr. Glaves or the attorney or Investigator Kong?

Yes. Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Before -- there's a motion or a further comment?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Right now it's just --

MEMBER GLASER: I'm going to make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. What I'm going to tell you is that there's also a caller on the line. So we have more.

So just as to my question related just to Glaves, Attorney Glaves, or the attorneys here or Ms. Kong, Investigator Kong.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Glaves.

And we have another call on public comment.

MR. SANCHEZ: Hi there. Hi everyone. My name is Danny Sanchez (phonetic). I'm a 19-year veteran in law enforcement.

And it's been an interesting hearing today, especially this -- this sort of hearing.

I would like to add that this type of behavior is very, very common in law enforcement. It's also very

common within law enforcement, within departments. You know, not only do -- do some of us have to deal with employees who think this way, privileged employees and entitled employees, you know, but we also have to deal with it when retaliation happens against some of us who are minorities who speak out. You know, like I said, it's a very, very common behavior.

Public perception is very important. I mean, officers like this make the rest of us look like bad -- bad employees. And it is very hard to convince the public that we're doing the right thing when we have -- when we have employees who do -- who behave in this manner.

Now, to add to the comment from earlier in regards to, you know, clear and convincing evidence and the nexus between this behavior and interfering with a person's career, there are many other ways that a person can act out when they have these kind of thoughts, and one of them is use of force.

If a person has these biases, they will tend to act out in a more aggressive manner when it comes to use of force against specific type of person or protected person.

You know, in my experience, I have crossed paths with employees who are biased, who seem to target only a

certain group of people and who seem to be more aggressive with a certain group of people.

Again, I think that the work that you are doing is great work and is very interesting. I appreciate what you guys are doing.

I think that these things -- things like this need to come out more often. I think that you guys are giving us officers who work in law enforcement the ability to report these kind of things wherever we come across them.

You know, there's something that didn't exist in the past. And a lot of times, you know, we were basically taking steps and nobody would listen to us or hold anybody accountable for this kind of behavior.

Again, it's a very common behavior. It's happening within the organization that I work with. It still happens. It's changed over time because of SB 2 and because of the DOJ follow -- coming into the departments and investigating them. It is changing this whole -- this whole behavior.

And again, thank you. I appreciate you guys. Keep doing the good work. Keep doing this kind of work. It is necessary.

And, you know, this whole behavior in law enforcement, the wrong behavior in law enforcement needs

to change. And it is changing slowly, but it is happening.

And I want the public to understand that, that law enforcement has come a long way, considering how it used to behave decades ago. We are advancing little by little. We are changing.

And, again, it is kind of root out all these people who have been destroying law enforcement for years. It's time to get rid of them.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you for your call. Very much appreciate it.

Any other public comment either on the lines or here? Did I see a hand raised?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. It appears there is no further public comment.

Would you like to -- would any individual like to deliberate privately on this case? Any member of the Board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Is there a motion?

MEMBER DOYLE: I will make a motion to decertify. Doyle.

MEMBER LARA: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Second. Lara.

Okay. Any further discussion? Questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Would you take the roll call, please.

MEMBER GLASER: Can I provide some discussion?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, please.

MEMBER GLASER: One of my roles as an appointee on this Board is as an academic. That's an official capacity that I serve.

And I am -- I specialize my research in prejudice, discrimination, and hate crime. And I want to reflect on the evidence that we have seen and to say that the combination of image of blackface, of the very -- I don't even want to say insensitive -- but the indifferent view of lynchings of Black men and the approving response of the surrounding white men, and the sub-humanization of Black men and the reference to the gorilla-like people, this is a recognizable pattern of bigotry that is quite potent and should not be dismissed by any means.

I have seen this before, and it is quite predictive of behavior. I'm not saying that this officer engaged in biased behavior on the job, but this is not a trivial constellation of evidence. This is quite, quite

dramatic.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: And so --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, please.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: I'm going to -- only simply because the NAACP's name was used in your presentation. I do not want to taint anything.

But my personal comment: As the professor said, this is what SB 2 was built on, to -- to outsource the officers who are taking this type of bigotry stance.

And as a representative of the NAACP, I'm sorry, I'm appalled. But I do not want to taint it. So, therefore, I'm going to recuse myself so I have confidence in my colleagues.

So I guess I have to go outside during the vote, correct?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: No. You don't have to go outside during the vote.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: But you can -- when the roll is called, you can then articulate what your position is or just say "abstain" or whatever you would like to do.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: If there was a discussion that you would ultimately make a decision on, then you would

step outside, but since you have already said you are not making a decision, you can stay.

Now, anybody else have anything else to say?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So what we have is a first and a second.

Yes. Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm just thinking -- and I believe the attorney stated that in deed or in an action -- there has been no "demonstratable" biases.

So are we being asked to exclude texts and words when a person utilized those?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: No.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I mean, according to the -- to the regulation, it states that we can consider the words in the texts.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: That's right.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And that's what we're looking at today.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You can consider the words in the text.

If I understood the attorney's argument, it was based upon the fact that there wasn't any discernible action beyond the words and the texts.

But, absolutely, for purposes of your vote, you can

consider the texts because they are written, and written is part of the criteria.

Thank you.

Any other questions?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. We have a first. We have a second. We have had some discussion. It appears that there's no further discussion.

So Chandler, please go ahead with the vote.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

MR. KNAPP: Clavo, aye.

Crawford.

MEMBER HATCHER-CRAWFORD: I recuse myself.

MR. KNAPP: Crawford, recused.

Doyle.

MEMBER DOYLE: Yes.

MR. KNAPP: Doyle, aye.

Dudley.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Aye.

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.
Seven yeses; one recusal. Motion passes.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.
Just checking with the reporter. How are you doing?
THE COURT REPORTER: I'm okay.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You're okay. Keep going.
Okay, then we are on to the last case.
One moment, please.
In the matter case of POST 2305781, Blake Williams, who, at the time of the event at issues in this case, was employed with the Torrance Police Department.
(Commotion.)
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We just did that one.
As soon as I said that, I thought, no, that's not

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