NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

CASE NO.: POST2305890 **SUBJECT OFFICER:** Christian Tapia

POST ID: C58-A08 **EMPLOYING AGENCY:** Greenfield Police Department

---

POST INVESTIGATOR: Nathan Weissich

NOD DATE OF ISSUANCE: April 27, 2026

ALLEGED MISCONDUCT: PC 13510.8(b)(6)/Title 11 CCR 1205(a)(6) – Acts That Violate the Law & PC 13510.8(b)(1)/Title 11 CCR 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the time of the following events, Christian Tapia, hereinafter "Respondent," was employed as a police officer by the Greenfield Police Department, a position defined as a peace officer under Penal Code section 830.1(a). On the evening of May 1, 2022, Respondent had been out wine tasting and drinking at a bar with a friend, hereinafter "IV," when Respondent viewed a video posted to Snapchat. The video depicted Respondent's girlfriend, hereinafter "MV," and her ex-boyfriend, hereinafter "Victim," at the same party. The party was attended primarily by relatives of MV and IV, who are brother and sister, at the home of their uncle, hereinafter "AV," located in Gonzales.

Upon viewing the Snapchat video, Respondent immediately sent MV a photo of Victim captured from the video followed by four vulgar text messages, all sent within one minute of each other. Within minutes, Respondent and IV arrived at AV's house. Respondent let himself in the unlocked front door followed by IV, and they walked quickly through the house without speaking to or acknowledging AV, who was inside the house. Respondent continued straight out the back sliding door with IV following him into the backyard where most of the partygoers were located. Victim was standing a few feet from the door facing away from the house. Without warning, Respondent quickly approached Victim and punched him on the forehead causing Victim to fall to the ground dazed. Respondent followed Victim to the ground and had to be pulled off Victim and restrained. At the same time, IV got into a fight with other people in the backyard. Respondent and IV were restrained by other partygoers. IV was forcefully escorted through the house to the front yard, and Respondent walked out on his own.

9-1-1 operators received a call from a witness at the party, and officers with the Gonzales Police Department arrived within minutes. Respondent, who was acquainted with some of the Gonzales Police officers, was repeatedly dishonest and obstructive with the investigating officers on the scene. Respondent repeatedly denied that he had been fighting and told officers that no one had been fighting. Respondent told officers that IV was accosted by several individuals at the party, and Respondent merely separated the parties and took IV outside. Respondent stated that he asked the homeowner, AV, if he and IV should leave the party, and AV told them to stay;

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

however, everyone immediately came at IV. Respondent later stated that he pushed several people away when they came at IV, and that Victim was one of the people he pushed. Respondent unequivocally stated that he only pushed Victim back when Victim came at IV, but he did not fight or punch Victim.

IV was uncooperative with officers and was detained in handcuffs. Respondent repeatedly demanded to know why IV was in handcuffs and demanded that he be uncuffed, even after officers explained that IV was being uncooperative. Respondent told an officer that if they attempted to arrest IV, the whole family would come at them. As officers interviewed numerous witnesses, Respondent demanded multiple times that officers ask if anyone wanted to seek criminal charges, and if not, the officers needed to release IV and himself. The officers continued to tell Respondent to stop interfering and to let them finish their investigation.

Because Victim initially declined to pursue criminal charges, Respondent was released at the scene to his sergeant from the Greenfield Police Department. Shortly after Respondent left the scene, Victim changed his mind and indicated he wished to pursue charges. Victim sustained a raised bump and bruising on the left side of his forehead. Victim reported that the bruise lasted about one week, and he suffered moderate pain at the site for approximately two weeks.

The following day, Respondent learned that his sergeant from the Greenfield Police Department intended to contact potential witnesses who lived at the house where the incident occurred. Respondent called the owner of the house, AV, and told him that his boss was on his way to talk to him and asked if he could please help him. Minutes later, a sergeant from Greenfield Police Department arrived at the house and took a statement from AV. In his statement, AV said that IV entered the house and walked into the backyard first, followed by Respondent. AV said after hearing a commotion in the backyard, he saw Respondent separating people and making peace.

On May 12, 2022, AV was interviewed by an officer from the Gonzales Police Department. In that interview, AV stated that Respondent entered the house and walked into the backyard first, followed by IV. AV said that there was suddenly a loud commotion in the backyard. AV said he got up and went to the backyard where he saw a cluster of family members fighting. AV said he did not see how the fighting started, but his daughters later told him it started when Respondent hit Victim. Later that day, AV's daughter, hereinafter "JV," called the same Gonzales Police officer and told him that on May 2, 2022, she witnessed AV receive a phone call from Respondent. JV said that AV answered the call on speakerphone. JV said she heard Respondent ask AV for a favor. JV stated Respondent said his boss would be coming to talk to AV, and Respondent asked AV to tell his boss that Respondent was only separating people. JV said AV walked outside, and she did not hear the rest of the conversation. JV took a screenshot of AV's call log showing the phone call, which came from Respondent's cell phone number on May 2, 2022, at 1:09 p.m. with a duration of 3 minutes and 45 seconds.

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

On May 13, 2022, AV was interviewed by the same Gonzales Police officer and asked about Respondent's phone call on May 2, 2022. AV stated that Respondent called AV and asked him to tell the officer from the Greenfield Police Department that Respondent was only separating parties from fighting. AV said he told Respondent he could not say what happened in the backyard because he was not there.

On May 18, 2022, AV was interviewed by investigators from the Monterey County District Attorney's Office. The investigators asked AV about the discrepancies between his previous statements and questioned him about Respondent's phone call on May 2, 2022. AV recanted his statement to the Greenfield Police sergeant and admitted that he was influenced by Respondent's phone call to falsify some details of his statement. AV told the investigators that Respondent let himself in the front door without knocking, and IV followed him inside. They both looked angry, and neither of them responded to AV's greeting. Respondent walked into the backyard first, and almost immediately AV heard a commotion. When AV stood up and looked, he saw both Respondent and IV being restrained by other people.

The Monterey County District Attorney's Office filed felony charges against Respondent for violations of Penal Code (PC) sections 245(a)(4) – Assault by means likely to produce great bodily injury and 136.1(b)(2) – Dissuading a witness from prosecuting a crime, and a misdemeanor count of Penal Code section 242 – Battery. At the preliminary hearing, the Court found there was probable cause to hold Respondent to answer for a felony count of PC section 136.1(b)(2). However, the Court did not find sufficient cause to hold Respondent to answer for the felony violation of PC section 245(a)(4) and reduced this count to a misdemeanor pursuant to PC section 17(b). This count, as well as the misdemeanor violation of PC section 242 were certified to Superior Court, as they arose out of the same incident. On the first day of the trial, April 5, 2023, Respondent pled no contest to the misdemeanor count of PC section 242, and the other charges were dismissed pursuant to a plea agreement. Pursuant to PC section 29805(a)(1), Respondent's conviction resulted in a 10-year prohibition from owning or possessing firearms. Respondent resigned from the Greenfield Police Department the following day.

Clear and convincing evidence, including, but not limited to, statements, photos, forensic cell phone analysis, law enforcement reports and body worn camera (BWC) recordings establishes that Respondent violated PC section 242 – Battery, by willfully and unlawfully using violence upon Victim's person which resulted in an injury. Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Respondents acts that violated the law were sufficiently egregious as to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public.

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Respondent committed dishonesty related to the reporting, investigation or prosecution of a crime by repeatedly making false statements to the Gonzales Police officers who were conducting a criminal investigation at the incident scene. BWC recordings and police reports showed that Respondent repeatedly told officers that no one had been fighting and denied that he had been fighting. Respondent told officers he had only

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

separated people that came at IV. Respondent stated that he only pushed Victim back because Victim came at IV. Respondent stated that he spoke with AV and asked if IV and Respondent should leave, and AV told them to stay. And Respondent unequivocally denied fighting with or punching Victim. However, Victim's and witness statements, photos, forensic cell phone analysis, law enforcement reports and BWC recordings established, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent attacked Victim without warning and punched Victim in the head causing a visible injury, and that Victim was not approaching Respondent or IV at the time. The evidence also establishes that Respondent did not speak to AV while in the house or backyard.

ANALYSIS/FINDINGS:

1. **The alleged misconduct violated Penal Code section 13510.8 (b)(6) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations section 1205(a)(6) – Acts That Violate the Law.**

Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(6) and Commission Regulation section 1205(a)(6) define as serious misconduct: "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."

PC section 242 - Battery

Clear and convincing evidence substantiates that Respondent violated PC section 242 – Battery, a misdemeanor, which is defined as follows: *"A battery is any willful and unlawful use of force or violence upon the person of another."*

- Respondent pled no contest to the charge of PC section 242 – Battery.
- Multiple witnesses stated that Respondent used physical force upon the person of Victim without provocation causing Victim to fall to the ground. Multiple witnesses specified that Respondent struck Victim on the head with a closed fist.
- IV told an officer that Respondent was mad that Victim was at the party, and when they showed up, Respondent started "beating on" Victim.
- Witnesses stated Victim was facing away from Respondent when Respondent approached and punched Victim.
- Witnesses stated that Respondent had to be pulled off Victim and restrained.
- Victim stated he was standing in the backyard looking at his phone when he suddenly felt a blow to the side of his head, which caused him to fall to the ground dazed. Victim stated he felt multiple punches to his body while he was lying on the ground dazed. When Victim came to his senses after approximately 30 seconds, he saw other partygoers restraining Respondent.

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

- Photographic evidence shows that Victim sustained a raised bump and bruising on the left side of his forehead where he was punched by Respondent.

Egregiousness of the Acts That Violated the Law

Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Respondent's acts that violated the law were sufficiently egregious as to be inconsistent with a peace officer's obligation to uphold the law or respect the rights of members of the public.

Per PC section 29805(a)(1), a person convicted for PC section 242 is prohibited from owning or possessing a firearm for a period of ten years following the conviction. The State Legislature's decision to prohibit firearm possession for ten years reflects how seriously it views the offense. The inability to possess a firearm is incompatible with the duties of a peace officer.

The clear and convincing evidence shows that Respondent became jealous after seeing a video depicting his girlfriend, MV, at the same party as her ex-boyfriend, Victim. Respondent reacted immediately by sending vulgar text messages to his girlfriend. Respondent, who was intoxicated at the time, rode in a vehicle with his intoxicated friend driving, to the location of the party. Respondent, by his own admission, let his intoxicated friend drive, because he did not want to risk being arrested for driving under the influence. This act demonstrates Respondent's ability to think clearly enough to assess the risk that driving under the influence posed to his employment. Despite that ability, Respondent did not reassess his decision to go to the party and confront Victim.

When they arrived, Respondent let himself into the house without knocking or being invited in and walked quickly to the backyard. Without warning, Respondent approached Victim from behind and struck Victim in the head with a closed fist with enough force to knock Victim to the ground where he lay dazed for about 30 seconds. Respondent had to be pulled off Victim and restrained while Victim lay dazed on the ground. Respondent's actions demonstrated clear intent to batter Victim and cause him physical harm. The manner in which Respondent battered Victim, by blindsiding him with a forceful blow to the head, posed a significant risk of causing serious bodily injury.

2. The alleged misconduct violated Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Title 11, California Code of Regulations section 1205(a)(1) – Dishonesty.

Penal Code section 13510.8(b)(1) and Commission Regulation section 1205(a)(1) define as serious misconduct: "Dishonesty relating to the reporting, investigation, or prosecution of a

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

crime, or relating to the reporting of, or investigation of misconduct by, a peace officer or custodial officer, including, but not limited to, false statements, intentionally filing false reports, tampering with, falsifying, destroying, or concealing evidence, perjury, and tampering with data recorded by a body-worn camera or other recording device for purposes of concealing misconduct. For purposes of this subsection, in considering whether a suspension or revocation of certification is proper, the Commission will consider the extent to which the dishonesty related to a material or significant fact in the context of the statement or omission alleged to be dishonest, and will also consider whether the dishonesty appears to have been done willfully or intentionally, with the intent to deceive."

Clear and convincing evidence substantiates that Respondent made false statements to Gonzales Police officers who were conducting a criminal investigation. While conducting the investigation, officers asked Respondent questions about his involvement in the incident. Respondent's answers were related to the reporting, investigation and potential prosecution of the crime they were investigating and were material to the investigation. The officers' questions and Respondent's answers were captured on the officers' BWCs. [Note: Respondent and the officers were bilingual, and the conversations occurred in both English and Spanish. Spanish statements are noted as such and translated into English.]

Respondent repeatedly denied that he had been fighting. The following exchange is an example:

Officer: *Were you fighting?*

Respondent: *No.*

Respondent stated multiple times that nobody was fighting. The following exchange is an example:

Officer [in Spanish]: *Yes, dude, but then who got into a fight?*

Respondent: *Nobody.*

Respondent stated multiple times that there was no fight, and that the disturbance only consisted of family members attempting to remove IV from the house. The following exchange is an example:

Officer: *Okay. So - so who was fighting? You - you don't know?*

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

Respondent: *Nobody was fighting. They were trying to take him [IV] out of the house. That's what. There was no fucking fight. They were trying to take him out of the house."*

Respondent made the following statement when an officer asked Respondent for a "rundown" of what happened when Respondent and IV arrived at the house:

Can I tell you? We opened the door. We walk in there. They were in there and the guy with the cowboy hat [Victim] was walking towards him [IV]. There's another guy fucking tryin' to take him [IV] out… And I talked to one of his uncles. I – his name is [AV]… I was like, "Hey, are we good?" Like, "Can we stay here?" And he's like, "No – no – no, don't leave." We g- leave. And then as – as soon as that happens, we turn arou – we – we go and then everybody's tryin' to take him [IV] out. Everybody, like, everybody.

In the following exchange, Respondent unequivocally stated that he did not punch anybody:

Officer: *Um, All right. So, um, I mean, hopefully- I mean, I don't know if anybody, like, recorded or anything like that. They're not gonna sa- like, if they did, they're not gonna have any, like, you in there, like, throwin' punches. All right. Um...*

Respondent: *Punches are punches, and no, I did not punch anybody. I pushed people away.*

In the following exchange, Respondent unequivocally denied fighting Victim:

Officer: *So, you weren't fighting this dude [Victim]?*

Respondent: *No.*

In the following exchange, Respondent stated that he pushed Victim back because he tried to approach IV:

Officer: *Okay. Um, so you weren't in a fi...*

Respondent: *I guess…*

Officer: *...like - like, there was no issue with you and, like, some of the guy over- about your, what? Your – your girlfriend's ex? No.*

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

Respondent: *Who? Yeah, there is fuckin' – there is my girlfriend's ex inside. His name is…*

Officer: *Okay.*

Respondent: *[Victim] and he also was fuckin' tryin' to come over here, and I pushed him back. I did do that.*

Respondent repeatedly told the investigating officers that nobody was fighting and denied that he had been fighting. Respondent stated multiple times that the disturbance only consisted of people trying to remove IV from the house. Respondent stated that when he and IV arrived at the party, IV was immediately approached by people with the intent remove IV from the house. Respondent stated he asked the homeowner, AV, if they should leave, and AV told them to stay. Respondent stated that, immediately following AV's answer, everybody approached IV to take him out of the house.

Respondent stated that his only use of physical force was to push some people away from IV so he could escort IV out of the house himself. Respondent stated that Victim was one of the people he pushed, but he did so because Victim was one of the people who approached IV to take him out of the house. Respondent unequivocally stated that he did not punch Victim or anyone else.

As described in the above analysis of Acts That Violate the Law, clear and convincing evidence substantiates that Respondent unlawfully battered Victim before officers arrived. The evidence shows that Respondent approached Victim and, without warning, punched Victim on the head with a closed fist, causing Victim to fall to the ground. Clear and convincing evidence establishes that Respondent arrived in the backyard before IV and immediately battered Victim before people intervened and restrained both Respondent and IV. Clear and convincing evidence, including multiple witness statements, shows that AV was inside the house when Respondent battered Victim, and Respondent did not speak to AV prior to battering Victim.

COMMISSION REGULATION SECTION 1213 FACTORS:

Commission Regulation section 1213 enumerates the factors the Commission shall consider in its decision to take regulatory action against a peace officer's certification. The following factors from the Commission Regulation were considered in light of the facts of this case:

- *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.*

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

Respondent's conduct caused physical injury to Victim and had the potential to cause serious bodily injury because he struck Victim in the head with a closed fist, and Victim was blindsided and had no opportunity to react or defend himself. Respondent's actions caused harm to his employing agency and the law enforcement profession when his actions were reported in the media.

- *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.*

  While Respondent was not acting in the capacity of a peace officer at the time, Respondent attempted to leverage his position and acquaintance with the Gonzales Police officers at the scene to influence their actions and the outcome of the case in Respondent's favor.

- *The degree of accountability and cooperation with the investigation evidenced by the peace officer.*

  Respondent was not accountable during the criminal investigation. Respondent was uncooperative and dishonest with the officers of the Gonzales Police Department to attempt to avoid responsibility for his actions. Respondent was not accountable during his agency's investigation. Upon learning that his sergeant would be contacting AV, Respondent called AV and asked him to tell the sergeant that Respondent was only separating people from fighting. AV told investigators from the Monterey County District Attorney's Office that he was influenced by Respondent's phone call to falsify some details of his statement to the Greenfield Police sergeant. Respondent continued to fail to be accountable during his interview with POST on February 10, 2026. During the interview, Respondent denied striking Victim or being the aggressor, stating that he only pushed Victim back because Victim was approaching IV aggressively. Clear and convincing evidence substantiates that Respondent's account was dishonest.

- *The motives of the peace officer that resulted in the conduct.*

  Respondent was motivated by jealousy and anger to seek out Victim and batter him without warning. Respondent was motivated to be dishonest to the investigating officers and induce a witness to provide false information to avoid accountability for his actions.

- *The extent to which the act or omission was done intentionally, willfully, or maliciously.*

  The evidence shows that Respondent's battery against Victim was intentional, willful and malicious. Respondent sought out Victim at another location, went straight up to

Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training
Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division
860 Stillwater Road, Suite 100
West Sacramento, CA 95605
www.post.ca.gov

him and battered him without warning. The evidence also shows that both Respondent's dishonesty to the officers at the scene and his act of contacting a witness and inducing him to make false statements to Respondent's supervisor were done willfully and maliciously.

- *Any other aggravating or mitigating factors relevant to the Commission's determination.*

  Respondent's attempt to subvert his agency's investigation of his peace officer misconduct by inducing a witness to provide a false statement was unethical and a betrayal of the public trust. Respondent's conduct demonstrated a fundamental incompatibility with employment as a peace officer in multiple background investigation dimensions, including Integrity, Impulse Control/Attention to Safety, Risk-Taking Behavior, Stress Tolerance, and Decision-Making/Judgment. Suspension or revocation of Respondent's peace officer certification is in the best interests of the public and the law enforcement profession.

FINDINGS

Based on its investigation and the consideration of factors enumerated in Title 11, California Code of Regulations section 1213(a), the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division has determined that reasonable grounds exist to seek suspension or revocation of the Respondent's certifications in this case in accordance with Penal Code section 13510.85.