STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COMMISSION ON

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY ADVISORY BOARD

(POSAAB) MEETING

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2025

9:02 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:
Connie J. Parchman,
California Certified Shorthand Reporter #6137

A P P E A R A N C E S

POSAAB MEMBERS PRESENT

JOYCE DUDLEY
Governor Appointee
Attorney
(Chairperson)

NICOLE CLAVO, Psy.D.
Governor Appointee
Public Member

REGINA HATCHER-CRAWFORD
Governor Appointee
Public Member

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---

PEACE OFFICER STANDARDS ACCOUNTABILITY
ADVISORY BOARD LEGAL COUNSEL

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

---o0o---

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

POST STAFF

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

WILLIAM DARDEN
Chief Counsel
Legal Affairs Bureau

PAUL NANFITO
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Los Angeles County Bureau

CARRIE WOOLLEY
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

SCOTT BALAND
Law Enforcement Consultant
Professional Conduct Northern Bureau

BRIAN HOFFMAN
Attorney IV
Legal Affairs Bureau

CHANDLER KNAPP
Staff Services Manager
Executive Office

---o0o---

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

ALSO PRESENT

JARED BRITTAIN, POST ID C63-Z34

ROBERT SASEK, POST ID C81-Z88

APPEARING REMOTELY:

KYLIE COLEMAN, ESQ.
Representing Jared Brittain

SUKHBIR GILL
Public comment

--o0o--

I N D E X


| PROCEEDINGS | PAGE |
|---|---|
| I. CALL TO ORDER | 6 |
| II. ROLL CALL OF POSAAB MEMBERS | 6 |
| III. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA | 7 |
| IV. NEW CASES - REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO COMMISSION | |
| 1. POST2316745 - Jared Brittain (POST ID: C63-Z34) Last employing Agency: Orange County Sheriff's Department | 11 |
| 2. POST2318309 - Robert Sasek (POST ID: C81-Z88) Last employing Agency: Oroville Police Department | 88 |
| V. CLOSED SESSION | |
| (Transcripts prepared and bound under separate cover) | |
| 1. POST2316745 - Jared Brittain (POST ID: C63-Z34) Last employing Agency: Orange County Sheriff's Department | 87 |
| 2. POST2318309 - Robert Sasek (POST ID: C81-Z88) Last employing Agency: Oroville Police Department | 135 |
| VI. FUTURE BOARD MEETING DATES | 137 |
| VII. ADJOURNMENT | 138 |
| CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER | 139 |
| ERRATA SHEET | 140 |


---o0o---

THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2025 9:02 A.M.

West Sacramento, California

---oOo---

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Good morning, everyone. Today's Thursday, July 17th, 2025, and the time is 9:02.

Thank you all for attending the Police Officers Standards Accountability Advisory Board hearing.

Please note that this hearing is being live streamed, recorded, transcribed.

Further, please note that the microphones are auto on/off. When you begin speaking, they will go live. With this, you will need to watch your crosstalk.

We will now call the roll for Board Members.

Chandler.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning, Members of the Board.

Member Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Here.

MR. KNAPP: Member Crawford7.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Here.

MR. KNAPP: Member Doyle.

(No response.)

MR. KNAPP: Chair Dudley.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Here.

MR. KNAPP: Mr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Johnson.
(No response.)
MR. KNAPP: Lara.
MEMBER LARA: Present.
MR. KNAPP: And Pena.
MEMBER PENA: Here.
MR. KNAPP: Madam Chair, six members present.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. A quorum has been established.
I would like to introduce Board Counsel, to my left, Christopher Beatty and Board Assistant Executive Director Annemarie Del Mugnaio.
And this is now the time set aside for members of the public who wish to comment on items not on the agenda, but those within the Board's jurisdiction.
Public comment on matters on the agenda will be heard after each item is presented.
Public comment on specific peace officer revocation cases to be heard today will be heard at the time of the hearing of each such matter.
Please be advised that the Board cannot take action on items not on the agenda and may discuss those matters only to the extent necessary to determine whether any matter should be made an agenda item at a future

meeting, to respond briefly to statements or questions posed, to request clarification or to refer items to staff.

Please remember that this meeting is being transcribed, so I may politely interrupt and ask you to repeat or speak slowly and clearly so your comment can be correctly captured in the transcript.

As the Board Chair, I may ask members of the public to limit their remarks to no more than three minutes pursuant to existing Board policy.

I may conclude the public comment period if multiple speakers are voicing repetitive or similar statements and the 15-minute public comment period has expired.

You'll be given three minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly enforced.

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

Before I open public comment on matters not on the agenda, please note if you wish to comment on disciplinary matters scheduled to be heard today by the Board, you must wait until that matter is called to offer public comment.

If you have a specific complaint about an officer that is not on today's agenda, you should file a

complaint with POST or with the officer's employing agency.

Staff will assist you in this regard.

I would like to remind individuals making comments to not discuss pending complaints or pending disciplinary actions that may later come before this Board for recommendation if the Board takes action on your complaint. You will have an opportunity to address the Board at that time.

Following these rules is necessary to comply with the law and to avoid compromising the Board's mission.

So now, is there anyone present in the audience or appearing remotely who would like to address the Board during public comment?

Let's start with anyone present in the audience first? Is there anyone present who would like to address the board?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none, let me check if there's anyone remotely.

And there is not.

Okay. So we now move on to the next items on the agenda.

We have two cases to hear today. We will only be reviewing the facts and evidence as presented by this

Division.

This is not an evidentiary hearing. The rules of evidence do not apply here. Evidence is not formally admitted into the record. There is no need to make any objections and objections will not be ruled upon.

Under the Penal Code and applicable state regulations, this initial hearing will determine only if the matter will proceed forward to the Commission Review. And then should the Commission approve for an evidentiary hearing before an Administrative Law Judge to determine whether the allegations are true and justify discipline.

For those commenting on each item at this early stage, the Board must only consider the facts that the Division, after investigation, believes can be proven at a later evidentiary hearing.

For that reason, today the Board will entertain arguments as to whether or not those facts, as presented by the Division, demonstrate clear and convincing evidence.

In other words, a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code Section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205, occurred.

This finding results in the matter being moved forward. No action by the Board or the Commission prior

to a full evidentiary hearing amount to a final determination that an officer did, in fact, engage in misconduct or that revocation or suspension is ordered.

That will be determined after the evidentiary hearing.

At the conclusion of each law enforcement consultant's presentation, the Board will have the opportunity to ask questions. Then public comment from the subject officer and/or their counsel will be taken, followed by the members of the public.

Further discussion by the Board will be allowed, if necessary.

The Board may then go into closed session, deliberations, after each case or wait until the end of all cases have been presented and adjourn to closed session to deliberate on all cases presented.

After reconvening into regular session, votes will be taken on each case.

We're now going to move on to POST case number 2316745, Jared Brittain, POST C63-Z34.

At this time, I will now call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Paul Nanfito, Professional Conduct Southern Bureau and Carrie Woolley, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on case POST2316745, Jared Brittain who, at the time of the events at issue

in this case, was employed with the Orange County Sheriff's Department.

MR. BEATTY: Madam Chair, I just wanted to recognize --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Please.

MR. BEATTY: I believe that Board Member Johnson was missed on the roll call and is present.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BEATTY: Correct, Board Member Johnson?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. BEATTY: There you are.

I don't know whether I missed it -- good morning.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Counsel.

And we're now ready for the presentation.

MR. NANFITO: Thank you. Good morning, Madam Chair and Members of the Board.

My name is Paul Nanfito and I'm one of the law enforcement consultants assigned to the Professional Conduct Southern Bureau in the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division.

With me today is Carrie Woolley, an attorney with our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I am here today to present case number POST2316745.

It involves Deputy Jared Nathanial Brittain from the Orange County Sheriff's Department.

Hereinafter he will be referred to as Respondent.

It is the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate the Respondent committed multiple acts of serious misconduct as set forth in Penal Code Section 13510.8 on multiple days between June 1st, 2022, and October 5th, 2023.

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

Dishonesty, 13510.8(b)(1) providing false statements and information to Internal Affairs investigators during four separate Internal Affairs investigations.

Acts that violate the law.

13510.8(b)(6) acts that are sufficiently egregious or repeated to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of the members of the public as determined by the Commission.

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

The Respondent began his career with the Orange County Sheriff's Department on March 31st, 2017, as a trainee and on November 8th, 2017, he was promoted to

the position of deputy sheriff.

The Respondent holds the following POST certifications: Basic, intermediate and advanced POST certificates.

The Respondent has no prior disciplinary issues to discuss.

Respondent was ordered -- awarded the Orange County Sheriff's Department's Medal of Valor for his response to a critical incident that occurred on August 23rd, 2023.

This was an incident involving an active shooter who shot multiple people and engaged responding deputies in a seven-minute gun battle.

The Respondent was recognized for making a courageous decision to form a team, climb a hill behind the suspect from a flank position.

This is a verbal presentation, which I'm providing from a prepared statement, which will be followed by a PowerPoint presentation.

The PowerPoint will provide a visual representation of the timeline of events and some of the specific statements which you will hear during the verbal presentation.

In summary, this case will cover two different Internal Affairs investigations, which included four

interviews. These events took place over a 17-month period from June 1st, 2022, through October 5th, 2023.

On June 1st, 2022, the Respondent was off duty and was stopped by the California Highway Patrol.

Prior to the traffic stop, the CHP officer made the following observations: The driver of a black Ram 1500 pickup truck driven by the Respondent was bumper-paced at approximately 104 miles per hour.

He was also weaving dramatically from left to right within the traffic lane, crossing over the lines on both sides of the lane.

The CHP officer initiated a traffic stop and contacted the driver who was identified as the Respondent.

He identified himself as an off-duty peace officer and that he had multiple weapons in his vehicle. Respondent had a firearm at his waist and had SWAT weapons inside the pickup.

On October 7th, 2022, the Respondent pled guilty to two misdemeanor counts of driving under the influence of alcohol and admitted to having a blood alcohol content of greater than .20 in the Orange County Superior Court.

As a result of this conviction, the Department of Motor Vehicles suspended the Respondent's driver's license.

The DMV mailed the Respondent a notice of this suspension, which was dated October 14th, 2022. This suspension was effective from October 7th, 2022, through April 7th, 2023.

The notice was sent to the Respondent's home address, notifying him the suspension was effective on October 28th, 2022.

The Respondent was in court when he was advised by the Court of a Superior Court document, which is referred to as a declaration regarding Vehicle Code Section 3 -- 13550, which notified the Respondent his driver's license was confiscated at the time of his arrest and it had not been lawfully reissued.

It was signed by his attorney and was dated October 7th, 2022, and the Respondent was present when this occurred.

The Respondent did not notify his chain of command at the Stanton Substation of his driver's license suspension. He continued to work is regularly assigned patrol shifts at this station.

During the week of December 20th, 2022, the Respondent went to his mailbox and retrieved a notification from DMV which was dated October 14th, 2022.

The document was the DMV order of suspension, which

reads in part: Your privilege to operate a motor vehicle has been suspended effective October 7th, 2022, and shall not be reinstated before April 7th, 2023.

The Respondent acknowledged that it was this document which was the catalyst for him to respond to the DMV on December 20th and obtain the restrictions on his license which would allow him to legally drive a motor vehicle.

On December 20th, the Respondent went to the DMV office where he received and signed a DMV verbal notice of actions. This document lists two separate licenses suspensions one was effective 10-7-2022 and one was effective 10-28-22.

By signing this document the Respondent was notified about both suspensions and the length of those suspensions.

This date and these notifications are critically important because the Respondent attended his first Internal Affairs interview the following day on December 21st, 2022.

This interview was the first inquiry into his DUI arrest by the Orange County Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs investigators.

Now I will provide you of some examples of statements made by the Respondent which have been

determined to be dishonest.

During this interview, the IA investigator asked the Respondent if his license was fully suspended at any time.

In response he said, "for a period of, I believe, 30 days from the sentencing until I could get it restricted."

It is important to note that just the day before making this statement about a 30-day suspension, the Respondent just received those restrictions on his license allowing him to drive legally.

This document which brought him to the DMV that day stated his license had been suspended effective October 7th, 2022, and could not be fully reinstated until April 27th, 2023.

On the day he signed the DMV verbal notice of action, which notified him his driver's license was fully suspended on October 7th, 2022, until December 20th, 2022.

This is clearly not a 30-day suspension and there is not a document which mentions a 30-day suspension.

The IA investigator asked the Respondent the following specific and direct question.

He asked, "How did you get to work?"

The Respondent said, I had a friend drive me that I

work with and I had a trainee in the car I was working with.

The IA investigator specifically asked the Respondent, so you had the trainee driving the whole time while you were doing your patrol work?

The Respondent said, "Yes, sir."

In review of traffic cameras within the City of Stanton, California showed the defendant driving a black Ram 1500 on ten specific dates between October 7th, 2022, and November 7th, 2022.

The Respondent's driver's license was fully suspended during this time frame. Surveillance cameras at the Orange County Sheriff's substation in Stanton, California showed the Respondent driving a black Ram 1500 pickup truck into the parking structure across the street from the substation.

The Respondent attended a follow-up administrative interview regarding the DUI arrest on February 15th, 2023.

This was another opportunity where the Respondent could have been forthright and advised the investigator that he had been driving during the period of his suspension.

Instead, he provided deceptive and dishonest statements. He also provided another affirmative answer

to a question about his trainee driving him while at a work and that he only received a 30-day suspended driver's license.

The following excerpt from this interview illustrates the continuing deception of the Respondent.

The IA investigator asked the Respondent, "You had a 30-day suspended license?" To which he said, "yes, sir."

The IA investigator then specified, "And that was at the time of the conviction, so October 7th to November 7th?"

Respondent answered, "From what I recall, sir."

As previously noted, the Respondent received DMV paperwork on December 20th, 2022, which clearly stated the length of his suspensions.

These statements are simply not true.

The IA investigators focused on the time period between October 7th, 2022, and November 7th, 2022.

They did not focus their inquiry and evidence collection from November 8th, 2022, through December 20th, 2022, because the Respondent kept telling them his license was only suspended for 30 days from October 7th through November 7th.

The Respondent's deception resulted in the loss of traffic camera videos and photos as well as Stanton

substation surveillance photos during the Division's inquiry.

The IA investigator asked a clarifying question, "And I think you mentioned in the video you were getting a ride to and from work and you had a trainee."

The Respondent said, "Yes, sir."

On December 28th, 2022, seven days after his first IA interview, officers from the Anaheim Police Department responded to a call from a citizen who reported finding a firearm in a black Ram 1500 pickup she had rented from a local car dealership on December 14th, 2022.

The reporting party told the officer she was cleaning and checking the rental vehicle at her home with intention of returning the vehicle to the dealership on December 29th, 2022.

The reporting party told the officer -- excuse me -- while checking the vehicle, she lifted the front seat, center armrest and discovered a firearm. The reporting party told the officer she had not noticed the firearm until she lifted the armrest and she immediately called the Anaheim Police Department.

This officer secured the firearm, a Glock 19, which was later determined to have a full magazine of 15 rounds with one round in the chamber.

And Anaheim police officers ran the serial number on the firearm and determined that it belonged to the Respondent and it had not been reported missing or stolen.

Anaheim police officers contacted Respondent on December 28th about the firearm and asked him if it was in his possession.

The Respondent replied, "That's a good question."

Respondent then told the officers he had not seen the firearm in a month or two and did not report it as missing or stolen because he had not noticed it was missing.

On January 3rd, 2023, the Orange County Sheriff's Department initiated a second Internal Affairs investigation regarding the Respondent's personal Glock firearm that was located inside a rental truck on December 28th.

It should be noted that the Respondent returned the Ram 1500 rental truck on December 13th, 2022. The next day it was rented to another citizen in the City of Anaheim.

This citizen drove this vehicle unaware there was a loaded firearm beneath the center armrest for two weeks.

Respondent violated Penal Code Section 25140(b) when he left his handgun unsecured in the rental

vehicle. Under Penal Code Section 25452, a peace officers shall, when leaving a handgun in unattended vehicle, secure the handgun in the vehicle pursuant to Penal Code Section 25140.

The Respondent attended his first IA interview regarding the unsecured handgun on August 9th, 2023.

This would be his third IA interview since December 21st, 2022.

During this interview, the IA investigator asked follow-up questions about the Respondent's truthfulness during his first two administrative interviews.

The IA investigator had located traffic camera video and pictures that showed the Respondent driving a black Ram 1500 pickup in the City of Stanton and into the parking structure across from the Orange County Sheriff's Department Stanton Substation.

He also located surveillance photographs of the Respondent walking into the Stanton Substation.

This IA investigator was aware of the previous IA regarding the DUI arrest. These photographs are what led him to ask the Respondent some follow-up questions about the Respondent's truthfulness during the first two IA interviews.

Respondent's answers to some of these questions continued to be deceptive and dishonest.

During this interview, the IA investigator stated to the Respondent, "I have you on camera driving to work."

The Respondent said, "Yes, sir."

The IA investigator added, "In your rented truck during those days?"

Again the Respondent said, "Yes, sir."

The IA investigator then asked the Respondent very directly, "So when you say you were being driven to work, is that the truth? Or were you driving yourself to work?"

The Respondent said, "I drove myself to work, sir."

The IA investigator assigned to investigate the unsecured firearm scheduled a second interview with the Respondent on October 5th, 2023. This would be the Respondent's fourth interview over the course of approximately ten months.

The critical incident that was previously mentioned occurred on August 23rd, 2023, which is after his third interview, but before his fourth IA interview.

There were several statements Respondent made during his final interview which were determined to be dishonest.

Leading up to this interview, the IA investigator obtained body-worn camera footage showing the Respondent

driving a patrol car between October 7th, 2022, and November 7th, 2022. His license was suspended during this time frame.

The IA investigator asked the Respondent if he remembered stating during the interviews with the first IA investigator and later with him, that your trainee drove your patrol car while you were at work?

The Respondent said, "Yes, sir."

The IA investigator then asked, "Is there anything about that statement you would like to change?"

The Respondent replied, "After you guys advised me of the dates in question, there may have been a day that I had driven, whether it was to move the vehicle or I may have driven on my own. I don't recall specifically what day that was."

During the Respondent's fourth and final interview, he offered an explanation as to why he didn't answer completely about driving during his suspension period.

Specifically, the Respondent said, "I obviously drove during work, and I couldn't recall specifically when or if I did. And in thinking back into it, ultimately I was confused on the dates. There's multiple suspension dates that I was given and the reason I gave the answer that I did."

The evidence shows that any confusion about the

suspension dates on the part of the Respondent was cleared up when the Respondent went to DMV on December 20th, 2022, where he received his verbal notice of actions with the actual suspension dates as well as receiving the order of suspension earlier that week.

At the Respondent's request, he was interviewed by the Division on October 23rd, 2024. During this interview, he again made the assertion that he was confused about the dates of his suspension and said the suspension may have been in effect later in November of 2022.

Respondent stated he would provide copies of DMV paperwork to show the different suspension dates that created his confusion.

The Division later received an email from Respondent's attorney stating he could not locate the DMV paperwork he referenced during his interview; however, the Respondent's attorney did provide the Division with a letter from retired Orange County Sheriff's Department Assistant Sheriff Steven Kea, which was presented at the Respondent's Skelly hearing. A copy of that letter is included as Attachment O to the ISF.

In the letter, Retired Assistant Sheriff Kea addressed several specific points of the Respondent's

interviews and argued that the Respondent was not untruthful because he responded to the questions he was asked, which did not directly ask him whether he ever drove to work or ever drove on patrol.

Not only does this representation of the Respondent's answers misrepresent the evidence, but Retired Assistant Sheriff Kea's summary does not address the Respondent's affirmative statement to investigators that his driver's license was suspended for 30 days from the date of his conviction.

Further, from the contents of this letter, it appears that Retired Assistant Sheriff Kea was unaware the Respondent visited the DMV on December 20, 2022, the day before his first IA interview, where he obtained a restricted license which allowed him to drive legally to and from and in the course of employment.

The document received on this date clearly would have shown Retired Assistant Sheriff Kea the dishonesty in the statements the Respondent made on December 21st, 2022, and during subsequent interviews.

For these reasons, the Division did not find Retired Assistant Sheriff Kea's letter persuasive.

Following this interview, the Division received DMV documents from the Orange County Sheriff's Department Internal Affairs Division. Specifically, the Division

received a copy of the order of suspension dated October 14th, 2022, and the verbal notice of actions dated December 20th, 2022.

Based on the dates of the suspensions listed on these documents, the Division requested additional documentation.

The Division obtained body-worn camera footage, Respondent's patrol schedules, Respondent's time sheets, field training officer and trainee assignment schedules and daily observation reports for two trainees. All the requested documents were for a time period from October 7th, 2022, through December 20th, 2022.

The preceding information was reviewed which revealed the Respondent drove a patrol car on many additional dates during the time he was assigned a trainee.

This information revealed that a trainee was not available frequently enough to be able to drive the Respondent the whole time he was working his patrol shifts.

Based on this new information, the Division requested that the Respondent participate in a second interview. This interview took place on January 14th, 2025.

During this interview, the Division reviewed with

the Respondent the order of suspension and the verbal notice of actions.

The Respondent was asked specifically how long his driver's license was suspended before obtaining the restriction on his driver's license.

The Respondent said, "Knowing what I know now, it was from 10-7 to 12-20, sir."

The Division then asked the Respondent, "So that wasn't explained to you when you obtained this document or you didn't deduce that from receiving this document on December 20th?"

In response he said, "No, sir, like I stated in the interviews, I was confused on the entire process. I had not received a DUI or dealt with a license suspension before. And my experience with it in the field was limited as well."

The documents that Division reviewed with the Respondent were copies of the exact same documents he received on December 20th, 2022.

Based on this, it is highly probable that he had the exact same knowledge about his suspensions on December 20th, 2022, and on December 21st, '22, during his first IA interview.

The Respondent was also asked about who had provided him with rides to and from work.

He specifically mentioned Deputy Minero, a coworker from the Stanton Substation who provided him rides to work.

Based on this information, the Division scheduled an interview with Deputy Minero on March 4th, 2025.

During this interview, Deputy Minero was asked if he had provided rides to work for the Respondent during the time his license was suspended.

His answers were initially vague, but eventually he described some ridesharing the two would do for SWAT training.

At the end of the interview, Deputy Minero's attorney asked a clarifying question about whether Deputy Minero gave the Respondent rides to the Stanton Substation, and I quote, "During the time you guys worked there together."

Deputy Minero responded, "Not that I can remember."

The Division obtained the patrol schedule and time sheets for Deputy Minero.

The information showed that Deputy Minero's schedule was considerably different than the Respondent's making it very improbable that he was even in a position to provide transportation for the Respondent during the time frame his license was suspended.

The facts that I just recited support the Division's finding that Jared Nathaniel Brittain was involved in serious misconduct, specifically dishonesty and repeated and/or egregious acts that violate the law.

The facts of this case clearly establish that the Respondent was untruthful during four administrative interviews, had multiple opportunities to provide complete and truthful answers, but he chose not to.

The acts that violate the law included DUI, driving on a suspended license on multiple dates, and leaving an unsecured firearm in a vehicle.

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 Jared Nathaniel Brittain's POST certification be revoked.

I will now present the PowerPoint presentation to provide a visual timeline of the events and information provided during this presentation.

Next slide.

So this slide represents the beginning of the triggering events for this whole investigation

June 1st, 2022. I just want to highlight two things about that DUI arrest.

He was stopped for doing 104 miles an hour and he had a BAC of .20, which is extremely -- more than twice the legal limit.

October 7th is when he pled guilty to the two misdemeanor DUI counts and admitted to having a .20 BAC.

October 14th is the date that I mentioned several times. This is when DMV sent the order of suspension. This is an important document that comes up later on December -- the week of December 20th.

Next slide.

This is the actual screenshot of the order of suspension and it's not very clear, on the screen there, but I want to read that first line above the little spreadsheet there. It is where it says, it's the very first sentence on this document.

It says, your privilege to operate a motor vehicle is suspended effective October 7th, 2022, and shall not be reinstated before April 7th, 2023.

It is a very simple document, one-page document, easy to read, easy to understand.

Next slide, please.

Okay. This is the -- December 20th. This is the day before the first IA interview. It was this week

that he obtained the previous document, the order of suspension. And then on this date he went into DMV and this is the document that he signed. It is the verbal notice of actions.

This is the document, lists two specific suspensions. And as you can see there, one is effective 10-7-2022 through December 20th. The other is 10-28-22 through December 20th.

The Respondent acknowledging in his Division interview that he did sign for this document.

This is actually a written document that notices the person that they were verbally notified of these suspensions by DMV.

Next slide, please.

Again, he attended his first interview on December 21st, the very next day.

Next slide, please.

As we pointed out in the presentation, the Respondent was asked specifically if he, you know, if his license was fully suspended at any time. And his responses do not reflect what he just learned on December 20th. The period that he was suspended is actually 74 days, not 30 days.

Next slide.

Again, in the same interview, he's asked questions

and the BWC footage that was collected at two different points in this investigation, the first five were collected by the IA investigators, the rest were collected when I requested them during the investigation.

He drove 18 times in a patrol car. And I just want to point out that during the investigation, we requested just one sample of driving during those -- we didn't request every BWC footage available on each of those dates.

Next slide, please.

Again, he says, "So you had the trainee driving the whole time while you were doing your patrol work?"

This simply isn't possible. There -- on page 22 of the ISF you'll find a simple spreadsheet that lists all 18 of those dates. There were seven times that he had a trainee in the time where he still drove the patrol car.

Next slide, please.

December 28th is the day that the firearm was located in the rental truck. And as discussed, the investigation was authorized on January 3rd. And on February 15th he had a second interview regarding the DUI arrest.

Next slide, please.

Again, he continues to say that he had a 30-day

suspended license. It's simply not true. The information he obtained on December 20th clearly showed the length of his suspensions.

Again, I want to point out that the suspended license was effective for 74 days before restrictions.

Next slide.

August 9th he has his first interview regarding the unsecured firearm. And this is where the investigator began questioning about his truthfulness in the first two administrative investigations.

Next slide.

Respondent again gives a statement that some days his father and then Deputy Minero, who's the person driving him to and from work. As I noted in my interview with the -- Deputy Minero, he did not recall doing that.

Next slide, please.

October 5th, 2023, this is the final interview and the second one regarding the unsecured firearm.

Next slide.

Again, the BWC footage contradicts his statements.

Next slide.

On December 14th, 2023, the Orange County Sheriff's Department served the Respondent a notice of intent to terminate.

He had a Skelly hearing and following that Skelly hearing, he was provided the last chance agreement which resulted in his demotion and reassigned to the jail.

Next slide.

The Respondent -- Division mailed a letter of investigation on September 12th. At his request, he was interviewed on October 23rd, and then again on January 14th, 2025.

Next slide.

Again he was asked about how he would -- who was driving the patrol car. And he said, "When I had a trainee in the vehicle, yes."

BWC footage contradicts that, shows him driving while he did have a trainee. Also the trainees were not available to drive him during all the dates he worked during that time frame.

Next slide.

So under Vehicle Section 14601.2(a) a person shall not drive a motor vehicle at any time when that person's driving privilege is suspended or revoked for a conviction of violation of 23152 if the person so driving has knowledge of the suspension or revocation.

It also states that knowledge of the suspension or revocation of the driving privilege is conclusively presumed if mailed notice by the DMV pursuant to Vehicle

Code Section 13106.

As previously noted and the documents show, he was mailed that notice on October 14th, 2022.

Next slide.

This is the specific section mentioned in the presentation regarding the unsecured firearm. The important thing that I want to point out about this, this is not a case of an officer leaving a firearm in his truck parked out in front of his driveway.

This is a case where citizen was driving a vehicle for two weeks with a loaded firearm unbeknownst to that person.

Next slide.

That's it.

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

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. From the Board, are there any questions?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, Dr. Clavo, did you have a question?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes, ma'am. The Dodge Ram, that was a police vehicle?

MR. NANFITO: No, it was not. It was a rented vehicle from a dealership.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. And then it was -- a Glock that was left in the car 15 rounds and one in the chamber?

MR. NANFITO: Correct.

MEMBER CLAVO: And who notified the department, the DMV? Or did Mr. Brittain notify them eventually?

MR. NANFITO: Of the suspensions?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

MR. NANFITO: The reports reflect that the Respondent did not notify his Stanton Substation that he had a suspended driver's license.

I'm not sure at what point the Department received the DMV documents that I showed you. Those were obtained during the Internal Affairs process.

The Department, I can't explain why they were unaware of the suspension. The typical process would be DMV would notify them, but they apparently weren't notified.

MEMBER CLAVO: And then it was ten days that you guys pretty much pulled that was on camera showing him driving? Was -- did I write that right?

MR. NANFITO: The traffic camera systems in Stanton, California were obtained by the IA investigators for a period of October 7th to November 7th. And those -- those, were the dates that

are -- that are identified.

The dates from November 8th to December 20th, because the Division made that request in 2024, had already been purged. So they were unavailable.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. One last question.

Did I -- did I hear or understand right that the Sheriff wrote a supporting letter on -- the Assistant Sheriff wrote a supporting letter on behalf of Mr. Brittain, but not having all the facts?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: That was retired Assistant Sheriff.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. It was retired.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I didn't answer your question, I just wanted to clarify that that was --

MEMBER CLAVO: It was -- retired.

MR. NANFITO: That was Retired Assistant Sheriff, he wrote that letter for the Skelly hearing.

In that letter, and nor in the IA investigations, is there any mention of the documents that the Respondent received on December 20th and the week of December 20th.

So I do not know why or if he had that knowledge, but it was not in the letter.

MEMBER CLAVO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you, Dr. Clavo.

Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Yeah, thank you.

Just for clarification, and I'm sorry if I missed it.

What was the impetus for the December 21 IA interview?

If -- had they obtained information about the suspension at that point?

MR. NANFITO: No, that -- the December 21st, 2022, interview was regarding the DUI arrest that occurred on June 1st, 2022. It was the first IA interview for that reason.

MEMBER GLASER: And was it -- is it just a coincidence that occurred a day after his visit to the DMV on December 20th?

MR. NANFITO: Yes, presumably.

MEMBER GLASER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Any other questions? Okay.

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Seeing none.

At this time, does the subject officer and/or their counsel -- I believe the subject officer's present.

I believe that counsel is appearing remotely.

Do either of you wish to make a comment?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes. If so, you will each be given three minutes to speak. And the time limit will be strictly enforced, so please be sure that you complete your comments within the allotted time.

And while commenting -- comments, 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 defense 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 clear and convincing evidence of a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined by Penal Code Section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205, occurred.

So, Officer, would you like to be heard?

MR. BRITTAIN: Good morning. And thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak today.

I want to begin by saying that I --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Excuse me, Officer, I misspoke. You have at least five minutes. Okay?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

I would like to begin by saying that I completely own the mistakes that I made. I do not deny them or make excuses for them.

But I would like to provide some context of why I'm in front of you today.

I've had time to reflect on the decisions I made during the lowest point in my life. I carry the weight of those choices every single day.

Plain and simple, I put others at risk and did not conduct myself as one in the profession should. And that was unacceptable.

I know I have made mistakes in the past, but I have also learned from them. I understand the difficult decisions this Board has to make and I've read most of the misconduct you have investigated.

I believe this process and your role is absolutely necessary.

I also believe the Board's primary concern in my instance is the issue of my dishonesty and I don't shy away from that. I failed to live to the standards of integrity without compromise.

I know better because I have never omitted or falsified information in the past.

But in this instance, to save my career, I betrayed not just the Department's values, but my own.

Before this I had never been in trouble and on the other side of an investigation. I was nervous and I followed legal advice I thought would guide me through

the process. But looking back, I realize I should have been more direct, forthcoming and transparent.

When I was questioned about whether I drove during my suspension, I tried to shield myself by offering partial truths. I said others drove me, which was true, but I omitted that I also drove myself. I convinced myself I was answering the questions just well enough to move past them.

But omission is deception and failure of integrity on my part.

Once the evidence came out and I was asked, I admitted to it. But by then I had already lost the trust of my department.

I've spent most of my adult life in service. I started as an explorer with the Sheriff's Department, served for six years in the Marine Corps, and the past eight years as a deputy.

I've handled hundreds of investigations, served with distinction, and responded to life-threatening situations without hesitation.

But, I've also struggled.

I've had troubles with PTSD, depression and anxiety, issues I tried to bury instead of address.

I coped poorly with those and I had an unhealthy patterns of alcohol abuse that contributed to my poor

decision-making.

Since then I've done the work. I've gone through constant counseling, joined AA, remained sober and developed healthy ways in order to manage my stress and trauma.

I accepted a demotion and I worked in custody this past year without incident and was repromoted, earning my way back to patrol with strong performance evaluations.

Towards the end of this investigation unfolding, I had the opportunity to be involved in the most critical and traumatic incident in my career and in Orange County.

It was an active shooter who had already killed multiple people and was firing at deputies from an elevated and fortified position.

While under direct fire, I led a team to flank and neutral -- help neutralize the suspect in order to begin life-saving measures. For that I was awarded the Medal of Courage.

That day reminded why I those this career. To serve, protect and act when others are in danger.

The week following that incident, I was placed on administrative leave pending terminations for my actions we're discussing today. I showed myself I had strength

by not resorting to alcohol and maintaining a positive attitude.

I used that time to continue the positive progress that I made, thankful to have a second chance at life and in this profession.

Since returning to work, I have also taken the responsibility of mentoring younger deputies, using my own mistakes to help avoid -- them avoid the same pitfalls.

I'm not here just to keep a job. I'm here because I want to become the kind of deputy that teaches others the value of integrity and what accountability looks like.

I'm not asking for forgiveness, but I'm asking for a chance to continue serving the public and guiding others by example.

I hope the Board can see that I'm not defined by the worst chapter in my career, but by the growth and accountability that came after.

Thank you again for your time and allowing me to speak.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

And let me ask you some rather direct questions.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And if you don't want to

answer them, don't.

But you put several things out there that I want to follow up on.

You heard the presentation today. You've read all the documents. You've been accused of multiple acts of dishonesty.

Are you telling us today that you, in fact, committed all those acts of dishonesty.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You also said just now that you have found ways to deal with your PTSD.

Can you tell me what you did to deal with the PTSD?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes. Primarily reached -- returning to faith, attending church consistently and exercising. Begin doing endurance sports that helped me to decompress and come back to reality.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Did you go to any specific therapy that deals with PTSD, EMDR or anything else?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, the counseling that I've been attending with TCTI, I've been doing that very, very consistently. And also tried the EMDR.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And how many times did you try EMDR?

MR. BRITTAIN: Twice, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm sorry?

MR. BRITTAIN: Twice, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And was it helpful?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. The act that you engaged in that ultimately you ended up at the Medal of Courage, that occurred after your suspension?

Knowledge of your suspension, but before your suspension occurred?

I was unclear on the timing of that.

MR. BRITTAIN: The incident occurred and then I was suspended for six months, the week after.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. The incident occurred, then you were suspended, and then when did you get the medal of courage?

MR. BRITTAIN: Upon returning back to work.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. How long have you -- when was the last time you had any alcohol?

MR. BRITTAIN: It's been nine months, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And how long ago was the incident with driving under the influence with the over a .20?

MR. BRITTAIN: Over three years, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So at some point you stopped drinking, and then you started drinking again?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes. I've been battling with

sobriety and maintaining it consistently.

It's very hard. When things get difficult, it's easy to go to a drink. I've learned that and have been successful at maintaining that now.

After having short relapses of a few drinks and then feeling guilty about it afterwards.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Why do you think -- so after the DUI, you stopped. And then you went back to drinking. And then nine months ago you stopped.

Why do you think you've been successful this time, whereas you were intermittently successful in the past?

MR. BRITTAIN: Ultimately realizing the trouble that it has caused me and the risk that I put upon other people and leading me into this situation where I'm losing my career.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Have you ever substituted drugs for alcohol? Either prescription drugs or unlawful drugs?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So it's always been alcohol?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Is there anything else -- other Board Members may have questions, too, of course.

Is there anything else you want this Board to know

about you that you haven't said?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you very much for your honesty and for coming here today and telling us a little more about you.

Other members of the Board?

Yes, let's start with Ms. Pena.

MEMBER PENA: How many -- how many days sober have you had now?

MR. BRITTAIN: Days?

MEMBER PENA: Days, months.

MR. BRITTAIN: I don't track the days. I try not to focus on the days of sobriety in order to just keep pushing towards them.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. Do you -- did your sponsor come with you today?

MR. BRITTAIN: I do not have a sponsor. I'm not directly involved in AA anymore. I was after the DUI.

MEMBER PENA: Do you go to any other type of counseling program for alcoholism besides your time in AA? Do you do anything else now?

MR. BRITTAIN: With my counselor from TCTI.

MEMBER PENA: What's that exactly?

MR. BRITTAIN: It is an organization that has partnered with our Department to provide counseling for

us.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. How often do you go to that?

MR. BRITTAIN: It's based on availability. And it's about every month or two months, depending on availability.

MEMBER PENA: I'm -- there have been various comments that you've made either on the record or through what's reported in investigations and what you've said here today about -- I think today you said you've taken full responsibility for your actions.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: However, you submitted a written statement to us today that I actually had the opportunity to read.

It's dated July 10th, 2025, which is obviously not very long ago, a week ago.

And in your third paragraph where you actually begin to talk about what occurred, the last line in that sentence says -- or paragraph says, in talking about your ability to answer questions honestly, about when you drove et cetera, when you didn't drive.

You say, "That omission, while not an outright lie, was misleading and not in line with the level of transparency expected of someone in our position."

So in that paragraph, which is the first one where

you talk about what occurred, you say an omission was not an outright lie -- was not an outright lie.

I mean, you talk about the investigation as if you didn't lie about anything, you just left things out.

And leaving things out is a lie.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: So which is it?

MR. BRITTAIN: It is a lie. An omission is deception and is dishonest.

MEMBER PENA: You also say some of your reasoning for answering questions is because you were following legal advice.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: Was the legal advice to mislead? Or omit? Or lie?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: It was?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes.

MEMBER PENA: You got legal advice telling you not to answer questions accurately?

MR. BRITTAIN: Upon concluding the first interview, I realized that I had made incorrect statements.

I looked back in my paperwork and realized the dishonesty of the dates that I knew my license was suspended.

After that, I brought it to the attention of my attorney at the time. And I said, "Hey, I made this mistake, I believe I should tell them."

And he said, "Don't mention it unless they directly ask you in the future."

I know that driving on a suspended was another violation after my DUI and could possibly face termination, so I went with that advice and I answered the questions vaguely and not directly.

MEMBER PENA: Thank you.

MEMBER CLAVO: When you attended AA, how long did you go for?

MR. BRITTAIN: About six months.

MEMBER CLAVO: About six months.

And then do you have any other support mechanisms?

And I heard you say that you have the acronym. EMDR. EMDR. The counselor that you may attend once a month or every other month.

But do you have any family -- I heard you mention faith, that you're leaning in on faith.

So do you have a pastor, a priest, a minister that you meet with regularly that provides you some emotional, mental support?

Or are you leaning in on yourself to do all this by yourself?

I heard you say nine months clean, which isn't very long. You don't know the number of days, which kind of concerns me for -- for a person who's battling with alcoholism.

So do you have a support team? Do you have a support mechanism in place?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am. I have a family that I resort to as well as some friends that I directly worship together with.

And that are also in the profession that can relate and I can open up to things about.

Previously I completely tried to do this on my own and I realized it's very difficult for me to open up to other people. And that did not do well for me.

MEMBER CLAVO: One last question.

I believe I read or heard somewhere that stress, different things, and we know what contributes to PTSD.

So you are in a very stressful job.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: And any day it can go from zero to 100.

With that being said, how will you cope with the next time you're faced with some -- life or death, or a stressful situation that may push you towards alcohol again?

MR. BRITTAIN: Just resorting back to everything that has happened in the past three years. I've grown tremendously from it. And I know those different coping mechanisms and the outlets that I have, whether it's counseling or friends, in order to open up to and address those issues before they become issues.

MEMBER GLASER: First, I want to thank you for being present today and for answering our questions and presenting your statement.

I also want to thank you for your service both to the nation and to Orange County and law enforcement.

I want to get back to what Board Member Pena was talking about with respect to dishonesty in the context of omission versus commission.

And I'm -- I want to give you another opportunity to talk about whether your dishonesty took the form of only omission or if there was direct deception on your part.

Because, you know, I would characterize it as if the Internal Affairs interviewers had asked you if you ever let your trainees drive and you said, yes, that would be a deception by omission.

But I think that they asked you if you drove and you said no.

And that sounds more like a direct deception. And

I would like to hear your answer with respect to that and other instances in which you gave dishonest responses, and whether you consider them only to be by omission.

MR. BRITTAIN: I do not believe it only to be omission. I believe it to be dishonest now that I have been through this investigates and I knew that. Yes, sir.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Okay. Thank you for coming and being -- being honest with the Board, as I see it.

I'm -- I don't drink, but I do have a son that has the same issues you have.

It's a difficult -- it's difficult. You know, it's hereditary, it runs in families. And it is a sickness. And I will always say that.

But given -- given the job that you do, and you know, the commitment of being an example, it is one of the things I'm -- I'm struggling with, is that, you know, we expect more for our officers. And I'm speaking from what I do is -- you know, we want you to be honest, because just as we want you to be honest, you expect the public to be honest.

And I kind of sense that you were struggling, you know, you were given poor advice, but I'm not an attorney.

Several attorneys are sitting here. But it's common for them to tell you only answer the question and, you know, and to do that. And so you were put in a position where you look -- sounds like you were struggling, you know, between omission, dishonesty.

And so right now this Board has to look at the fact of dishonesty issue.

And, I'm sorry, I'm always a person that believes in second chances. But it's not only up to me, but I -- the reason why I'm speaking is I want you to understand we are sympathetic. I am, at least, to your struggle.

And that you got a long journey to do and you're, right now, at a crossroads. Like you said, you are fighting for your position. For your job. And I pray that you do take this and -- so that others learn from it.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am, thank you.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: So --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

MEMBER LARA: Deputy, good morning. I wanted to echo the Board, to thank you for your service both to the country, to your county.

You clearly show great martial courage, obviously -- even under fire. And that is not anything to be taken lightly.

I obviously think that the Board understands also that we need to see great ethical courage from deputies and officers that do work.

A couple of questions for you.

Does -- and if you don't know, please, it's fine to say no.

Does your agency intend to keep you on as a deputy?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER LARA: And how do you know this?

MR. BRITTAIN: I signed a last chance agreement upon returning to work stating that I was on probation period for the two-years regarding alcohol and drug related and dishonesty.

I completed my demotion period, which was a little over a year. And I have since been repromoted returning to patrol operations.

There's nothing in there that says termination date other than what the determination of POST is.

MEMBER LARA: Okay. If I could just have a moment. That's all I have. Thank you.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Johnson speaking.

Thank you for you are your service. I toured as a vet.

I want you to think about the -- take us back to the truck rental.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Was your license suspended when you rented the truck?

MR. BRITTAIN: I do not recall the specific dates, but the dealership gave me a loaner vehicle while it was in the shop.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So you are not sure if your license was suspended at the time?

MR. BRITTAIN: I can't recall right now the dates that I received the truck and the suspension, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I will ask clarity for that in a second.

My next question is, you've been employed as an officer for 11 years?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, sir, a little over 8 1/2.

MEMBER JOHNSON: 8 1/2.

During that time period, had it come to knowledge that one of the most important things, about being honest?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir. And during my time in the military.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Now, in that time period, did you know anyone that was going through any issues concerning being dishonest?

MR. BRITTAIN: Not directly, but I've heard

stories, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So you was pretty much aware of how important honesty is?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: All right. I want to go back to that truck, on the rental vehicle, since you really don't remember if your license was suspended or not.

What was the purpose of having a firearm in the rental vehicle?

MR. BRITTAIN: The firearm was along with multiple firearms that I had when I went shooting. And it was misplaced inside the vehicle, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So you misplaced it in the vehicle and then when asked about it, you could not remember where it was at or what you had done with it?

MR. BRITTAIN: Correct.

MEMBER JOHNSON: That in itself is a violation, unsecured firearm.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I'll put it there.

I would like to ask about the license suspension and the truck rental.

MR. NANFITO: During my review of the Internal Affairs investigations, it indicated that the Ram 1500 was rented in September of 2022, prior to his conviction

on October 7th, 2022.

The suspensions took effect either on October 7th, 2022, or October 28th, 2022.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So now I'm confused.

At the time that he rented the truck, did he have a suspended license?

MR. NANFITO: After his arrest, he hired an attorney for the --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I couldn't hear you.

MR. NANFITO: I'm sorry?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I couldn't hear you.

MR. NANFITO: Oh. After his arrest, he hired an attorney to handle his admin per se issues and that was stayed until the court adjudicated the case.

The case was adjudicated on October 7th, 2022. That was when the first suspension took effect. A second suspension took effect on October 28th, 2022. And based on the information I reviewed in the Internal Affairs investigations, the Ram 1500 was given to him in September of 2022.

So no license suspensions had taken effect, to my knowledge, at that time.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So I'm an attorney, and I didn't understand all that.

So let's -- let's be clear.

So the answer to my question, unless I'm confused, is he rented it on September 22nd and at that point his license was not suspended; is that correct?

MR. NANFITO: To my knowledge, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Yes, it was not suspended?

MS. WOOLLEY: And just to be clear, we don't know what date in September he rented it because we did not get that information from the dealership. But it was sometime in late September of 2022.

It might help to explain how the suspensions worked out.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Let's do that.

MS. WOOLLEY: Just to clarify, so when you get a driving under the influence charge, there are two suspensions that happen.

You get a suspension as a result of the arrest.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Right.

MS. WOOLLEY: Which is sometimes called an admin per se.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Right.

MS. WOOLLEY: That was the suspension implemented on October 28th.

Then there's the suspension that you get as a

result of a conviction when you get convicted in court. And that's the suspension that happened on October 7th.

The reason why there's two is because there's administrative one from the arrest. It's a separate proceeding.

Those can actually happen ahead of time. But it depends. You can ask the DMV to basically continue your hearing out until your court proceedings finish out and the DMV is usually very good about doing that.

So what happened here was that process was still going, while he waited for his criminal proceedings to finish. And at some point he had an issue I think with his truck, Mr. Brittain can certainly correct me if I'm wrong, and he got the truck sometime in late September 2022 while his license was still good and then had it until December 13th, 2022.

But the suspension took place and took effect on October 7th, because that's the day he was convicted in the criminal proceedings.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yeah, I did -- I used to prosecute DUIs so I understand that.

But the two suspensions, one began October 7th, one began October 28th. The car was initially rented at the end of the September?

MS. WOOLLEY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So when you rented the truck, you did not have a suspended license, you had a license. Is that your understanding now?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. But, you had the truck until when?

MR. BRITTAIN: It was the date they mentioned in December. I believe the 12th or 13th.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So at any point when you had the truck, were you driving it on a suspended license?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Now, why did you drive the truck on a suspended license?

MR. BRITTAIN: So the truck in question was not rented it -- in order to deceive or avoid detection.

It was because there were issues with my vehicle and I had it for an extended period of time.

I drove because I had the obligation and -- to show up for work. Because I already had shown that I have caused issues with myself, with the Department, I didn't want to inconvenience the Department anymore. Being a brand new training officer and having to be there. So I wanted to build upon my reputation and come back from the DUI that I had previously received.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Do you think it builds on your

reputation to unlawfully drive the truck?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, ma'am. And that's where I was getting at. I now realize that I put my partners and everybody else in a more inconvenience because of everything that occurred from driving on a suspended license.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So you're driving the truck on a suspended license. You're driving in to your job as a law enforcement officer, breaking the law driving on a suspended license.

You are going hunting, driving on a suspended license; correct?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And you are taking your gun and you're -- have your gun in your truck. And the gun is not secured.

Help me understand how you left a gun that was not secured in your truck.

And further, when asked about where's the gun, you said, "I didn't even know it was missing."

This is a deadly weapon. Help me understand why you didn't know where your deadly weapon was?

MR. BRITTAIN: That's a good question.

I've been taught, and whether it was in the military or as a SWAT officer, in order to -- good

weapon accountability and everything like that.

With that being in mind, I have a case that secures my pistols and there's multiple in there. And I take it out when I go and I secured it and I brought that out of the truck.

I was unaware that I left that firearm underneath an armrest when I was clearing out my vehicle.

That case then goes into a safe when I get home. And I was unsure -- I should have maintained accountability and checking that they were all inside there, but I did not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Help me understand a little more about that.

For me it would be tantamount to leaving my child in a car seat. Oops, left the kid in the car seat, you know. Leaving a gun, a loaded gun, in a car unsecured, were you drinking when you were driving then?

What was happening in your thought process?

You have a loaded gun in the car and then weeks later not even know where that gun was.

MR. BRITTAIN: I have no excuse. And no, I was not drinking, I have not drunk -- drank and drove since I was arrested for it and I will never do it that again.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So you can't help me understand a little more about your thought process, you

just forgot?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am. I don't have any excuse.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Anything else? Yes --

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: -- Dr. Clavo?

MEMBER CLAVO: You stated that you signed a last-chance agreement.

When did you sign that?

MR. BRITTAIN: It was in the beginning of 2024.

MEMBER CLAVO: Can you give me some insight on -- on that last chance agreement?

Were you not supposed to have any alcoholic beverages from that time on?

What was the stipulations of that last-chance agreement?

MR. BRITTAIN: From the top of my head, it is no violations of policy regarding alcohol, relating with alcohol, drug use or dishonesty.

No complete abstinence -- abstinence from alcohol use. But --

MEMBER CLAVO: No complete or you were to have complete abstinence from alcohol?

MR. BRITTAIN: It did not mention anything about that.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. And then I think I just heard you say that the gun was in the armrest. Is that what you stated? That it was in the armrest? The gun that was found in the Dodge Ram?

Or was it under the seat?

MR. BRITTAIN: So it's a truck with three front seats where the middle seat folds down. And it was underneath that.

MEMBER CLAVO: So it raises up and it was placed under that where it raises?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Is it -- is it a normal practice for you, or habit of yours, that you put your -- I'm a gun owner. I own several guns. I just went shooting the other day. So I'm very, you know -- I'm into it.

So is it a normal habit -- because I know where I place my guns when I come from the range. And you say you were coming from the range. So is it a habit for you to have your loaded Glock with 15 rounds and one in the chamber and place it under the seat? A fold-down seat that's in the front seat next to you?

I mean, I'm sure you're a concealed weapons carrier. But still my question remains.

MR. BRITTAIN: No, ma'am. That was a loaner vehicle that I was not familiar with. That is why I did

not normally place it there nor check it after.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Going back to driving to work, you had stated in your interviews that you had a trainee or a partner that drove you to work.

And of course the individual at some point said he didn't remember doing that at all.

Did you ever have a conversation with him about you was going to make that statement?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, sir. I was told not to discuss anything regarding my interview with anybody that could be involved. So that's all I have.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So just out of the blue, you said Morales -- I forget his name. I think it started with an M -- drove you to work.

MR. BRITTAIN: During my license suspension, there was multiple times where I used him, as a close friend, in order to drive me multiple places to include there.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So maybe I'm not clear. I thought he had mentioned that he was unaware that he had driven you to work.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir, I don't have a reason for that -- his answer. It was -- he was questioned three years after the incident.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Do we have clarity on that?

MR. NANFITO: His interview took place in March of 2025. This time period that we're talking about, it would be in October through December 2022.

So this resulted when his attorney asked a clarifying question and asked had he ever given rides to Mr. Brittain during the time period of his suspension or while they worked together at the Stanton Substation.

His answer was, "Not that I can remember."

MEMBER JOHNSON: It just sounds pretty strange. I'm sure he was aware of your situation.

And he had an opportunity to also be dishonest. And he chose not to be. So it's just kind of curious to me that a good friend of yours would not remember driving you to work.

And so I think about when you said that you've heard other officers getting in trouble by being dishonest, and it appears to me you continue to bury yourself in the situation that you was trying to get out of.

I'm just trying to get a better understanding of why.

I mean, you were clear at some point that you were being dishonesty and then you continued to be. And then you brought other folks in, hoping them to help you in

many ways cover up the dishonesty.

I think you put your friend in a very odd position, his career or you. And he chose his career.

Well, I'm hoping that you learned something from this.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Couple of housekeeping things.

Court reporter's been at it for an hour and 18 minutes.

So the -- there are two more things I'd like to do on this case. One is I want to check with Board Members to see if you have any other questions at this time.

The other thing is I want to give his attorney an opportunity to speak and an opportunity for you to ask questions.

So, just to give me a sense of timing, do you have any more questions for the officer?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: No.

Okay. And let me check, I'm sorry, I don't know your name. Is the attorney here?

MS. COLEMAN: Yes, ma'am. Kylie Coleman with Ferrone Law Group here.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And would you like to

use your five minutes to speak?

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Then what I'm going to do is give the court reporter a break and when we come back, you will have your five minutes.

And then if the Board has any more questions or comments, we can resume that after you speak. Okay?

So it is now 10:18, let's come back at 10:28.

Ten minutes. Thank you, everyone.

(Brief break.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Back on the record when you guys are ready.

And we'll get the attorney back on. Wonderful.

I had another question during the break, because my understanding is the DUI occurred on June 1st, 2022?

Does that sound about right?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yeah. And you rented the car in September. So explain to all of us -- so on June 1st you got the DUI -- and tell me if any of this is incorrect, because I'm just trying to remember back when I prosecuted DUIs.

You got -- you had to hand over your regular license to the police officer who gave you the DUI; is that correct?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Then he gave you a paper DUI, excuse me. I'm sorry, a paper license.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And then that paper license was only good for 30 days. So you or your attorney or somebody -- and again, correct me if I'm wrong -- had to get an extension, so beyond July 1, you had a valid license.

Do you remember any of that?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am. My attorney filed for an extension.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So you knew that the -- did you know how long that extension was good for?

MR. BRITTAIN: No. I heard that it was still backed up from the time during COVID and --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I'm sorry, say that again.

MR. BRITTAIN: I was -- I was told that the hearings were still held up from COVID and were delayed. So it was possibly going to be just before or after my court case.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So the -- and then your court case was October 28th and so there was that.

So you rented the truck on September 22nd. At that point, you had -- you were still under the extended

license, and so you knew at some point, you were going to be convicted of a DUI and it was going to have some ramification to your license.

Help me understand why you rented the truck if you had a car?

MR. BRITTAIN: My truck had issues, major electrical issues, so I brought it to the dealership where they gave me a loaner vehicle, not as a rental, but a loaner from the dealership.

MR. BRITTAIN: So this Ram truck that you rented was something that your -- the company that was repairing your truck gave you some kind of voucher to go get another one while it was being repaired?

MR. BRITTAIN: It was a loaner vehicle from the dealership, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So this was the loaner vehicle?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. That's where my confusion was.

So at that point you still had -- you were still on the -- for lack of a better term -- the extended license, but you knew something was going to be happening in the future with your license, you just hadn't been given that legal determination yet.

Okay. Thank you.

Any other questions on that?

Mr. Johnson, go ahead.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And help me understand too. I've never been pulled over for DUI so I don't understand the process. But I have a nephew that has.

And I think he had told me it took a couple times before he actually lost his license.

So my question is: Was this your first DUI?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And maybe for clarity, I guess, if you are stopped under the influence and it is a DUI, you automatically loses your license; is that correct?

MR. BRITTAIN: There's an admin hearing through the DMV that determines their suspension and then the court hearing that determines that suspension. It's not automatic, but yes, eventually it could be or it could be overturned.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Why would it be overturned?

MR. BRITTAIN: If the officer did not have probable cause to make the stop. If it was not a good stop in the first place. Or they did not drive under the influence.

MEMBER JOHNSON: If the driver wasn't under the influence. But you had a 2.0 or more.

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So it was obvious that it was a DUI.

And then the officer was procedurally correct in making the stop. So all that was correct.

It was just a matter of your own personal issue now of how to deal with this DUI.

And I think you make a petition to the Court through the DMV to extend; is that correct?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Get a temporary license?

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And you did that within the time frame. How quick did you do that?

MR. BRITTAIN: I do not recall specifically how quickly I did it, because my attorney did it. But you have up to 30 days to complete it.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. And I think that's the extension you were speaking of? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So the 30 -- my understanding is that at the time the license is physically taken away, you know, the license we all carry, you have 30 days to go back to DMV to get the extension. And that's what happened here.

That's my understanding.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: So Board Member --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, go ahead.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: For clarity, what I learned working with the DA and a former DA, that each county is different in terms of how the process worked.

Ventura County is totally different.

And then you have the other element of the DMV which is totally different.

And the only reason why I wanted to provide some clarity to that -- and it's funny I'm trying to make light of this -- is I just discovered that my license was suspended two years ago but the DMV didn't know it.

And when I went back to ask them, they're like, oh, we have never seen this.

So I just -- people need to understand in context that when you're working with two different agencies, it's a little different.

And then the counties it's different.

And so that's not to excuse anything. Point in case is the fact is that on September 22nd, what I'm hearing from your knowledge is you thought you had a valid license and you went to the dealership. And I know, I love going to the dealership and getting the rental cars there. They give them to you. And sometimes they don't check.

And so I just wanted to point that out.

Board Member Johnson, that was it.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Okay. Now, your attorney. We're going to hearing from your attorney now.

Please go ahead.

MS. COLEMAN: Thank you, ma'am. Good morning, Board Members. My name is Kylie Coleman and I represent deputy Jared Brittain.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

This is a case about accountability, transformation and the ability to rebuild trust after failure.

My client made serious mistakes. There's no question about that. Those missteps driven by personal struggles and deep shame compounded into the dishonest conduct we're here to address today.

Deputy Brittain does not deny it. Instead in his Skelly hearing, he stood before his department with no excuses, just honesty, context and the sincere desire to take responsibility.

Deputy Brittain explained the context of his actions, untreated PTSD and a reliance on alcohol that fueled his shame and poor decisions.

However, he didn't deflect, he owned it. He

submitted over 20 letters of support from colleagues and community members, all affirming his strong character.

One of the most powerful came from his therapist who described the initial investigation as his rock bottom.

Once seen as one of the deputies' best, he had been suffering silently. But instead of continuing down that path he got treatment, regained his health and reconnected with his purpose.

The therapist noted that while sobriety is part of his healing, true change came when he took full accountability.

The Department made the change -- made the decision it rarely takes. It rescinded its determination for a termination and gave him a second chance.

Deputy Brittain accepted a demotion, gratefully, and simply said: Don't take my word, let me prove to you who I am now and who I'm working to become.

He then voluntarily proposed a last-chance agreement holding himself to the highest standard. If he violates any policy regarding dishonesty, alcohol or drug use, he will be immediately terminated.

He put that promise in writing on February 22nd, 2024, and he has lived up to that promise every day since.

He served over a year as a Deputy I in custody without a single incident, like he noted earning strong performance evaluations throughout and was later re-promoted to his Deputy II position and reassigned to patrol where he remains today in good standing.

He was a model deputy with no prior discipline and since this incident over three years ago he's proven that he still is.

Deputy Brittain mentors younger deputies, speaks openly about his past and reinforces that integrity isn't about being perfect, it's about owning your failures and proving you're learned from them. Again, the POST standard of integrity without compromise.

And Commissioners, here I understand, as does he, your duty to protect the credibility of this profession. But I ask that you look at the full picture, not lowest point, but the growth and commitment he has demonstrated since.

The department he has served faithfully for over eight years continues to stand by him. He's earned their trust back and we're respectfully asking you to allow him the opportunity to earn yours.

Deputy Brittain is not asking for leniency. He's asking for a chance to prove your trust won't be misplaced.

If it takes probation, check-ins, additional training, or temporary suspension, he's willing to accept whatever conditions you find appropriate to demonstrate that the man who is standing before you today is not the man who made those mistakes.

And we thank you for your time and commitment to this profession and for considering his future in it.

And that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Do you have the last-chance agreement in front of you?

MS. COLEMAN: I do, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. When was it signed?

MS. COLEMAN: It was signed on February 22nd, 2024.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Do you know what it said about alcohol use?

MS. COLEMAN: Yes. Let me pull it up.

Are you referring to whether there was any restrictions on drinking in its entirety or --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything about alcohol use.

MS. COLEMAN: Alcohol use personally, no.

It only touches on the fact that if there's any sustained allegation of dishonesty, any sustained allegation of misconduct where alcohol was a factor in Deputy Brittain's behavior or whether there's violation

of any alcohol related policy.

And then similarly for any controlled substance.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So misconduct that was alcohol related or --

MS. COLEMAN: Or where -- the violation of any alcohol-related policy.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So there was nothing in there about that he has to -- that he has to stop using alcohol or he can't drink at all. Or he can't -- he has to stay out of places where alcohol is the main form of blah-blah-blah.

MS. COLEMAN: No, ma'am. That is not in this agreement.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So no abstinence at all?

MS. COLEMAN: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

Any other questions for the attorney?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Let's go Dr. Glaser, then Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER GLASER: Thank you.

Ms. Coleman, you indicated that the last-chance agreement requires a sustained finding with respect to various categories of offense; is that true?

So that it would require an Internal affairs

Investigation and a sustained finding in order for his position to be revoked?

MS. COLEMAN: Correct. A sustained finding of dishonesty, alcohol or drug use would be an automatic termination.

MEMBER GLASER: Okay. Thank you.

MEMBER CLAVO: I want to go back to the EMDR. That's the only therapy you're in; correct?

MR. BRITTAIN: No, I'm in the normal therapy, with my therapist that I do see on a regular basis. I just tried EMDR for the PTSD.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. Then let me go back I may have missed that earlier.

How often are you seeing that therapist?

MR. BRITTAIN: Every one or two months. When it was at the height of this whole incident, I was seeing her every two weeks.

But, I have since stepped back to once a month or every two months.

MEMBER CLAVO: You've been going there since 2022 or --

MR. BRITTAIN: Yes.

MEMBER CLAVO: -- just recently?

MR. BRITTAIN: It's been over three years.

MEMBER CLAVO: Over three years. Okay. That's my

question.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

Yes, Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So you signed the last-chance agreement pertaining to dishonesty or alcohol. Is it for seven years? Or is it for a lifetime? Or career time, I should say.

MS. COLEMAN: The specific allegation is a two-year waiver of his rights if any of those sustained -- as I noted, are violated.

And then that is the two-year waiver, sir, to answer your question.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So that expires 2-22-26?

MS. COLEMAN: Correct. That would then be February 22nd of 2026.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Six months. Okay.

Anything else?

MEMBER JOHNSON: I guess my last question would be, was there given a choice of time length to determine whether you would sign that last chance?

In other words, was it offered that -- or did you propose the two years yourself?

Or could you have chosen five years?

MR. BRITTAIN: That is what the Department and County Counsel provided with me.

No back and forth from my understanding, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Would you be willing to do five years?

MR. BRITTAIN: I would do whatever time was necessary to maintain my profession.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

Okay. Anything else, Counsel?

MS. COLEMAN: No, ma'am, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Anything else, Officer?

MR. BRITTAIN: No.

MS. COLEMAN: And thank you, Board.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you for coming forward.

Would you like to go into discussion?

Okay. We'll take a few minutes now and go into --

Oh, is there any public comment?

There was somebody on the --

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: Yeah. Right here.

The gentleman raising his hand.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there a Mr. Gill?

MR. GILL: Yes, the level of standard for this officer is abysmal. He's made multiple mistakes, time and time again.

Regular citizens are held to this kind of standard. The racist remarks, the DUIs, firearms in the seat unsecured, PTSD, emotionally unintelligent.

That's all. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Mr. Gill? Mr. Gill, are you still there?

MR. GILL: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I -- first, thank you for calling.

You said something about racist comments by this officer? Or just officers in general?

Do you have any allegations you want to bring forward about this officer? Or just officers in general?

MR. GILL: This officer.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Well, what is it you want to say, Mr. Gill?

MR. GILL: Actually, I'm saying officers in general.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Okay. Is there anything else about this officer that you would like to say?

MR. GILL: Well, yes. The DUI, the PTSD, the un -- loaded firearm in the seat, emotionally unintelligent.

How can someone with PTSD and someone struggling with sobriety be able to carry a loaded firearm and deal with the public?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. I understand. And --

MR. GILL: Along with dishonest paperwork and lying time and time again.

The integrity is not to lie. Not you get caught and then you take responsibility for it.

It's taking responsibility for your actions. He's -- he's a dishonest officer.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes. Yes. He has been a dishonest officer and that is something that he has told us today and something we've seen, as you have seen, in this past.

And we thank you for your call.

MR. GILL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Bye-bye.

MR. BEATTY: Madam Chair, do we want to identify the public caller's name?

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: His name was Salvador Gill.

The court reporter got it.

I didn't get his first name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sakhbir.

MS. DEL MUGNAIO: For clarity, they're not required to identify themselves. So it is not an issue. We can just say "public comment."

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Let's go into chambers, or whatever that is. Conference room.

(Time noted: 10:43 A.M.)

---o0o---

(Closed session was held:
10:45 A.M. to 11:12 A.M.)

---o0o---

(Time noted: 11:15 A.M.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We will now reconvene to regular session to take a vote on the Board's recommendation in the matter of case POST2316745, Jared Brittain, who at the time of the events at issue in this case, was employed with the Orange County Sheriff's Department.

Does the Board have any comments in this matter?

Is there a motion to make a recommendation to the Commission in this matter?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Johnson. Recommend revocation, decertification.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there a second?

MEMBER GLASER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And Chandler, can you take the roll.

MR. KNAPP: Yes, Madam Chair.

Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Clavo, aye.

Crawford.

MEMBER CRAWFORD: Aye.
MR. KNAPP: Crawford, 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.
That's seven yeses. Motion carries.
CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Motion passes.
Okay. Now we're going to call the second case.
At this time I will now call upon Law Enforcement Consultant Scott Baland, Professional Conduct Northern Bureau and Brian Hoffman, Attorney IV, Legal Affairs Bureau, to provide a report on case POST2318309 Robert Sasek, who at the time of the events at issue in

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CONNIE J. PARCHMAN, 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, Connie J. Parchman, 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 1st day of August 2025.



Connie J. Parchman, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 6137