ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
THOMAS L. RINALDI
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
DIANA PETIKYAN
Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 306153
300 So. Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Telephone: (213) 269-6193
Facsimile: (916) 731-2126
E-mail: Diana.Petikyan@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Complainant

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **TOMMY THOMPSON** [redacted] **Basic Certificate No. 91044** **Intermediate Certificate No. 75530** **Advanced Certificate No. 83084** **Supervisory Certificate No. 85061** Respondent.	Case No. 2400920 **ACCUSATION**

PARTIES

1. Manuel Alvarez, Jr. (Complainant) brings this Accusation solely in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (Commission).

2. On or about January 5, 1998, the Commission issued Basic Certificate Number 91044, to Tommy Thompson (Respondent). On or about September 23, 2002, the Commission issued Intermediate Certificate Number 75530, to Respondent. On or about August 5, 2009, the Commission issued Advanced Certificate Number 83084, to Respondent. On or about February 17, 2016, the Commission issued Supervisory Certificate Number 85061, to Respondent (collectively "Certification"). The Certification was in full force and effect at all relevant times to the charges brought herein.

JURISDICTION

3. This Accusation is brought before the Commission under the authority of the following laws. All section references are to the Penal Code (Code) unless otherwise indicated.

4. Code section 830 states:

> Any person who comes within the provisions of this chapter and who otherwise meets all standards imposed by law on a peace officer is a peace officer, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person other than those designated in this chapter is a peace officer. The restriction of peace officer functions of any public officer or employee shall not affect his or her status for purposes of retirement.

5. Code section 830.1, subdivision (a), states, in pertinent part: "... a police officer, employed in that capacity and appointed by the chief of police ... of a city ... is a peace officer."

6. Code section 13510.1 states, in pertinent part:

> (a) The commission shall establish a certification program for peace officers described in Section 830.1, 830.2 with the exception of those described in subdivision (d) of that section, 830.3, 830.32, or 830.33, or any other peace officer employed by an agency that participates in the Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) program. A certificate or proof of eligibility issued pursuant to this section shall be considered the property of the commission.
>
> (b) Basic, intermediate, advanced, supervisory, management, and executive certificates shall be established for the purpose of fostering professionalization, education, and experience necessary to adequately accomplish the general police service duties performed by peace officer members of city police departments, county sheriffs' departments, districts, university and state university and college departments, or by the California Highway Patrol.
>
> ...
>
> (e) The commission shall assign each person who applies for or receives certification a unique identifier that shall be used to track certification status from application for certification through that person's career as a peace officer.
>
> (f) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the commission shall have the authority to suspend, revoke, or cancel any certification pursuant to this chapter. This authority extends to any certificate or proof of eligibility issued by the commission including, without limitation, any certificate or proof of eligibility that is invalid, inactive, expired, or canceled.
>
> ...
>
> (i) As used in this chapter, "certification" means any and all valid and unexpired certificates issued pursuant to subdivision (b), including basic, intermediate, advanced, supervisory, management, and executive certificates or any proof of eligibility issued by the commission pursuant to this section.

7. Code section 13510.85, subdivisions (a) and (b), state:

(a)(1) When, upon the completion of a serious misconduct investigation conducted pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 13510.8, the division finds reasonable grounds for the denial, revocation, or suspension of a peace officer's certification, it shall take the appropriate steps to promptly notify the peace officer involved, in writing, of its determination and reasons therefore, and shall provide the peace officer with a detailed explanation of the decertification procedure and the peace officer's rights to contest and appeal.

(2) Upon notification, the peace officer may, within 30 days, file a request for a review of the determination by the board and commission. If the peace officer does not file a request for review within 30 days, the peace officer's certification shall be suspended or revoked, consistent with the division's determination, without further proceedings. If the peace officer files a timely review, the board shall schedule the case for hearing.

(3) The board shall meet as required to conduct public hearings, but no fewer than four times per year.

(4) At each public hearing, the board shall review the findings of investigations presented by the division pursuant to paragraph (1) and shall make a recommendation on what action should be taken on the certification of the peace officer involved. The board shall only recommend revocation if the factual basis for revocation is established by clear and convincing evidence. If the board determines that the facts and circumstances revealed by the investigation warrant a sanction other than revocation, it may recommend that a peace officer's certification be suspended for a period of time. The board shall issue a written decision explaining its reasons for decertification or suspension.

(5) The commission shall review all recommendations made by the board. The commission's decision to adopt a recommendation by the board to seek revocation shall require a two-thirds vote of commissioners present and shall be based on whether the record, in its entirety, supports the board's conclusion that serious misconduct has been established by clear and convincing evidence. In any case in which the commission reaches a different determination than the board's recommendation, it shall set forth its analysis and reasons for reaching a different determination in writing.

(6) The commission shall return any determination requiring action to be taken against an individual's certification to the division, which shall initiate proceedings for a formal hearing before an administrative law judge in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act (Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 11500) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code), which shall be subject to judicial review as set forth in that act.

(b) Notwithstanding Section 832.7, the hearings of the board and the review by the commission under this section, administrative adjudications held pursuant to paragraph (6) of subdivision (a), and any records introduced during those proceedings, shall be public. These public records may, in the discretion of the division, be redacted for the reasons set forth in paragraphs (6) and (7) of subdivision (b) of Section 832.7. This subdivision does not preclude the board or the commission, or both, from reviewing the unredacted versions of these records in closed session and using them as the basis for any action taken.

8. On October 29, 2024, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.8, subdivision (c), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (Division) found reasonable grounds for a disciplinary action against Respondent's Certification. Respondent was properly notified and timely requested a review of the determination under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(2). On January 16, 2025, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(4), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board (Board) determined that clear and convincing evidence existed for a disciplinary action against Respondent's Certification. On March 5, 2025, pursuant to its authority under Code section 13510.85, subdivision (a)(5), the Commission determined that Respondent's Certification should be revoked. Complainant explicitly reserves all rights to amend this accusation under Government Code section 11507, should a settlement not be reached or adopted by the Commission.

STATUTORY PROVISIONS

9. Code section 13510.8 states, in pertinent part:

> (a) (1) A certified peace officer shall have their certification revoked if the person is or has become ineligible to hold office as a peace officer pursuant to Section 1029 of the Government Code.
>
> (2) A peace officer may have their certification suspended or revoked if the person has been terminated for cause from employment as a peace officer for, or has, while employed as a peace officer, otherwise engaged in, any serious misconduct as described in subdivision (b).
>
> (3) The commission may cancel the certificate or proof of eligibility of a peace officer if the commission determines that there was fraud or misrepresentation made by an applicant at any time during the application process that resulted in the issuance of the certification.
>
> (b) By January 1, 2023, the commission shall adopt by regulation a definition of "serious misconduct" that shall serve as the criteria to be considered for ineligibility for, or revocation of, certification. This definition shall include all of the following:
>
> . . .
>
> (6) 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.

. . . .

REGULATORY PROVISIONS

10. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1205, states, in pertinent part:

(a) Serious Misconduct is:

. . .

(6) 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.

. . .

11. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1212 states:

(a) The Commission shall have the authority to suspend, revoke, or cancel any certification issued pursuant to Chapter 1 of Title 4 of Part 4 of the Penal Code.

(b) At the hearing, conducted by the Commission, to review a recommendation made by the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Advisory Board (the "board"):

(1) The Commission's decision to adopt a recommendation by the board to seek revocation shall require a two-thirds vote of Commissioners present.

(2) The decision shall be based on whether the record, in its entirety, supports the board's conclusion that serious misconduct has been established by clear and convincing evidence.

(3) The Commission may conduct deliberations in closed session.

(4) In any case which the Commission reaches a different determination than the board's recommendation, it shall set forth its analysis and reasons for reaching a different determination in writing. A copy of the written decision shall be provided to:

(A) The board,

(B) The Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division (the "division"), and

(C) The involved peace officer or designated representative.

(c) The Commission shall return any determination requiring action to be taken against an individual's certification to the division, which shall initiate proceedings for a formal hearing before an administrative law judge in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act.

(1) After the hearing, the Commission will receive the proposed decision from the administrative law judge.

(2) The proposed decision shall be reviewed by the Commission in accordance with Government Code Section 11517(c)(2).

(3) The Commission's decision shall be considered final 30 days after the date of service of the decision upon the involved peace officer or their legal representative. A copy of the written decision shall be provided to:

(A) The board,

(B) The division,

(C) The involved peace officer or designated representative, and

(D) The head of the agency that employs or employed the involved peace officer.

(d) The commission shall publish the names of any peace officer whose certification is suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation on the POST website.

(e) The commission shall notify the National Decertification Index of the International Association of Directors of Law Enforcement Standards and Training of any peace officer whose certification is suspended or revoked and the basis for the suspension or revocation.

12. California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1213 states:

(a) In considering whether to take action against a peace officer's certification, and in considering whether a revocation or suspension is appropriate in light of the facts of the particular case, the Commission shall consider any of the following factors:

(1) The nature and severity of the act or omission.

(2) The circumstances surrounding the conduct and the extent to which the act or omission caused any actual or potential harm to or impact upon the victim, the public, other peace officers, the employing agency, or the law enforcement profession.

(3) Whether the involved peace officer is currently employed as a peace officer.

(4) Whether the alleged conduct was committed under the color of authority or while the peace officer was acting in the capacity of a peace officer.

(5) The peace officer's prior conduct, discipline and service record, and any prior instances of misconduct.

(6) The proximity or remoteness in time since the conduct occurred.

(7) Any mitigating or aggravating factors and/or evidence of rehabilitation.

(8) The degree of accountability and cooperation with the investigation evidenced by the peace officer.

(9) The extent to which discipline, or forbearance from discipline, would impact the best interests of the public, the public service, the employing agency, and/or the law enforcement profession.

(10) The motives of the peace officer that resulted in the conduct.

(11) Consistency of the penalty with those imposed upon other peace officers for the same or similar offense.

(12) The clarity with which the peace officer was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense.

(13) The extent to which the act or omission was done intentionally, willfully, or maliciously.

(14) The likelihood of recurrence.

(15) Any other aggravating or mitigating factors relevant to the Commission's determination.

(b) A suspension shall not exceed three years.

(c) A peace officer whose certification has been suspended may not be assigned duties which include the exercise of peace officer powers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

13. Beginning on or about June 10, 1996, Respondent was employed as a full-time police officer with the Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). Respondent was promoted to the rank of Detective on June 25, 2006. Respondent promoted to the rank of Detective II (Supervisor) on November 3, 2013. At the time of the incident described in this pleading, he was assigned as Detective II. Respondent was demoted from the rank of Detective II to Detective I on July 30, 2023, as a result of this incident. Respondent retired on August 31, 2024, and is not currently employed as a peace officer in the State of California.

14. On or about February 22, 2024, in the criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of California vs. Tommy Randell Thompson* (Superior Court of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. NEW3SC01776), Respondent was convicted by the court on his plea of nolo contendere to violating Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a) (Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol). Respondent was sentenced to serve four days in City Jail and placed on 60 months of probation with terms and conditions including: completing an 18-moth Driving Under the Influence Program and paying restitution and various fees/fines.

a. The circumstances were that on March 14, 2023, Respondent was arrested for driving under the influence (DUI) and a hit and run by the California Highway Patrol (CHP).

b. Prior to the arrest, Respondent was driving an unmarked police vehicle and

initially crashed into a tree. Respondent left the first crash scene and drove his vehicle to a nearby ARCO gas station, where he attempted to try to fix the crash damage to the front of the police vehicle. Respondent then left the ARCO gas station and drove to a Mobil gas station where he backed into another vehicle. Respondent ultimately left the Mobil gas station after which his vehicle stalled out. A Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD) Deputy observed Respondent in his stalled vehicle and pulled up behind him. The LASD Deputy observed Respondent to be slow and confused and told him to stay in his vehicle until CHP's arrival.

c. Upon CHP's arrival, a CHP officer observed that Respondent exhibited objective signs of impairment such as: red and watery eyes, the odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent's breath and person, slurred speech, an inability to provide requested documents, swaying in a circular motion, and periodically nodding off. When CHP officers attempted to have Respondent answer questions or perform tests to assess his level of impairment, Respondent informed them he would not answer any questions or conduct any tests.

d. Based on the vehicle accident and the CHP officer's observations, it was determined that Respondent drove his vehicle while under the combined influence of alcohol and drugs and that this had caused his vehicle accident. Respondent was transported to a CHP office where he submitted to a chemical breath test with results of 0.03% and 0.03% blood alcohol content respectively.

15. On or about February 22, 2024, in the criminal proceeding entitled *People of the State of California vs. Tommy Randell Thompson* (Superior Court of the State of California, County of Santa Clara, Case No. N EW3SC00911), Respondent was convicted by the court on his plea of guilty to violating Vehicle Code section 23103.5(a) (Wet Reckless). Respondent was sentenced to 12 months of probation with terms and conditions including: completion of a Licensed Driving Under the Influence Program and payment of a fine.

a. The circumstances were that on March 17, 2023, Respondent was involved in a single vehicle accident and was arrested for a DUI by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's

Department (LASD). Respondent was driving his personal vehicle prior to this arrest. A LASD Sergeant initially responded to an intersection regarding a single vehicle versus pole traffic collision where he encountered Respondent and detected a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from his person. An LASD deputy also communicated with Respondent and noted the strong odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from Respondent's breath and person and he observed him to be disheveled, with bloodshot/watery eyes. When the deputy had Respondent exit the patrol vehicle, Respondent was unsteady, off-balance and rested his hand on the patrol vehicle to remain upright. An open, and nearly empty container of alcohol was also located in Respondent's vehicle. Respondent was given a series of modified Standardized Field Sobriety Tests which he poorly performed.

b. Based on Respondent's poor performance in the modified Standardized Field Sobriety Tests and his observations, the deputy formed the opinion that Respondent was operating his vehicle while under the influence of an alcoholic beverage. Respondent was subsequently transported to the LASD Santa Clarita Station Jail where he submitted to a chemical breath test with results of 0.08% and 0.09% blood alcohol content respectively.

CAUSE FOR DISCIPLINE

(Serious Misconduct – Acts that Violate the Law)

16. Respondent has subjected his Certification to disciplinary action on the grounds of serious misconduct under Code section 13510.8, subdivision (b)(6), and section 1205, subsection (a)(6), of title 11 of the California Code of Regulations, because he committed acts that violate the law and were 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 alleged above in paragraphs 13-15 and as follows:

17. Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a) makes it unlawful for a person to drive a vehicle while under the influence of any alcoholic beverage or drug, or both and Vehicle Code 23103.5, subdivision (a) prohibits reckless driving. Respondent's repeated misconduct violated these sections of the Vehicle Code, violated the trust placed in him as a police officer, and is

generally inconsistent with the obligation of a peace officer to uphold the law and respect the rights of members of the public.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the Commission issue a decision revoking the Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Certificates issued to Respondent Tommy Thompson, or taking other appropriate disciplinary action according to evidence.

DATED: 06/30/2025

MANUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
Executive Director
Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
State of California
Complainant

LA2025301862
67733305

BEFORE THE
COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: **TOMMY THOMPSON** [redacted] **Basic Certificate No. 91044** **Intermediate Certificate No. 75530** **Advanced Certificate No. 83084** **Supervisory Certificate No. 85061** Respondent.	Case No. 2400920 **DEFAULT DECISION AND ORDER** [Gov. Code § 11520]

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. On June 30, 2025, Complainant Manuel Alvarez, Jr., in his official capacity as the Executive Director of the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training filed Accusation No. 2400920 against Tommy Thompson (Respondent) before the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (Commission). (Accusation attached as Exhibit A.)

2. On or about January 5, 1998, the Commission issued Basic Certificate Number 91044, to Respondent. On or about September 23, 2002, the Commission issued Intermediate Certificate Number 75530 to Respondent. On or about August 5, 2009, the Commission issued Advanced Certificate Number 83084 to Respondent. On or about February 17, 2016, the Commission issued Supervisory Certificate Number 85061 to Respondent (collectively "Certification").

3. On July 3, 3025 Respondent was served by Certified and First-Class Mail copies of the Accusation No. 2400920, Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery and Discovery Statutes (Government Code section 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7) at Respondent's address of record which, pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 11, section 1215, is required to be reported and maintained with the Commission.

4. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).

5. Government Code section 11506, subdivision (c) states:

> The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense or notice of participation, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation or District Statement of Reduction in Force not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense or notice of participation shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing. Unless objection is taken as provided in paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), all objections to the form of the accusation or District Statement of Reduction in Force shall be deemed waived.

6. The Commission takes official notice of its records and the fact that respondent failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. 2400920.

7. California Government Code section 11520, subdivision (a) states:

> If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense, or, as applicable, notice of participation, or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent; and where the burden of proof is on the respondent to establish that the respondent is entitled to the agency action sought, the agency may act without taking evidence.

8. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Commission finds Respondent is in default. The Commission will take action without further hearing and, based on the relevant evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet in this matter, finds that the charges and allegations in Accusation No. 2400920, are separately and severally, found to be true and correct by clear and convincing evidence.

DETERMINATION OF ISSUES

1. Based on the foregoing findings of fact, Respondent has subjected his Certification to discipline.

2. The Commission has jurisdiction to adjudicate this case by default.

3. The Commission is authorized to revoke Respondent's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, and Supervisory Certificates based upon the following violation alleged in the Accusation which are supported by the evidence contained in the Default Decision Investigatory Evidence Packet: Respondent Committed serious misconduct in violation of Code section 13510.8, subdivision (b)(6), and section 1205, subsection (a)(6), of title 11 of the California Code of Regulations, because he committed acts that violate the law and were 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.

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED that Basic Certificate No. 91044, Intermediate Certificate No. 75530, Advanced Certificate No. 83084, and Supervisory Certificate No. 85061 all issued to Respondent Tommy Thompson are revoked.

Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The Commission in its discretion may vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.

This Decision shall become effective on 09/23/2025.

It is so ORDERED 09/23/2025.

MANUEL ALVAREZ, JR.
Executive Director
Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
State of California
Complainant

Attachment:
Exhibit A: Accusation No. 2400920