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

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

this case was employed with the Oroville Police Department.

MR. BALAND: Good morning, Chair and Members of the Board. My name is Scott Baland and I'm one of the law enforcement consultants assigned to the Professional Conduct Northern Bureau in the Peace Officer Standards Accountability Division.

With me today is Brian Hoffman an attorney with our Legal Affairs Bureau.

I'm here today to present case number POST2318309, involving the Respondent, Robert Sasek formerly an officer with the Oroville Police Department.

It is the Division's determination that clear and convincing evidence exists to demonstrate that the Respondent committed an act of serious misconduct as set forth in Penal Code Section 13510.8 on September 1st, 2022.

Specifically, the Division has determined that Robert Sasek committed the following act of serious misconduct.

Penal Code Section 13510.8(b)(2), abuse of power.

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

The Respondent began his career as an officer with

the Oroville Police Department on April 28th, 2021.

The Respondent received a 30-day suspension and a 90-day performance improvement plan penalty as result of the Oroville Police Department investigation into this incident.

Later, the Respondent was terminated from Oroville Police Department on August 9th, 2024, resulting from an investigation into a separate incident, not a POST related matter. And the Respondent currently possesses a basic POST certificate.

There is no other relevant discipline or complaints against the Respondent.

We'll start with the timeline.

On September 1st, 2022, at approximately 1330 hours, or 1:30 P.M., the Complainant was arrested by Butte County Sheriff's Office for trespassing on private property when she was found swimming in the backyard pool of a private residence.

The Complainant was transported without her shoes or purse to Butte County Jail and was later booked.

The Complainant stated in her interview that she had taken methamphetamines earlier in the day, was feeling the effects of the narcotics and was hot and dehydrated, explaining why she was in the pool.

The complainant was released from the jail at

approximately 1617 hours or 4:17 P.M.

At approximately 2052 hours or 8:52 P.M. the Complainant entered a Dollar General store in the City of Oroville and began hiding under some merchandise carts in the back store room.

Employees called and requested Oroville Police Department for assistance.

The Respondent was dispatched to the Dollar General at approximately 2053 hours, 8:53 P.M.

The Respondent arrived on scene at approximately 2055 hours, two minutes later.

The Complainant was ultimately arrested by the Respondent for trespassing at approximately 2121 hours, 9:21 P.M. after removing her from underneath the carts.

Respondent transported the Complainant to Butte County Jail. The Butte County Jail nursing staff refused the Complainant for booking because she was experiencing high blood pressure and required her to get medical clearance prior to booking.

The Respondent began transporting the Complainant to Oroville Medical Center at 2143 hours or 9:43 P.M.

The Respondent arrived at Oroville Medical Center five minutes later at 2148 hours and entered the emergency room. However, the Respondent did not bring the Complainant in for medical treatment. Instead, he

left her in the patrol vehicle.

The Respondent returned a short time later, removed the Complainant from his patrol vehicle and cited and released her and told her she needed to seek medical treatment because that's why she wasn't booked.

A security guard at Oroville Medical Center, who was a former Oroville Police Department officer, advised POST in his interview that he told the Respondent that the Complainant was going to continue to be a problem.

Next slide please.

The Respondent left Oroville Medical Center on his own at approximately 2201 hours, 10:01 P.M.

Immediately after the Respondent left, the Complainant began attempting to access restricted areas of the Medical Center and locked herself in an employee-only restroom in a restricted area.

The security guard advised the Complainant -- advised that the Complainant exited the bathroom after multiple command and announcements.

The security guard advised the Complainant then ran and got underneath an MRI trailer and refused to come out.

The security guard called the Respondent back to have him respond to the Medical Center to deal with the Complainant.

The Respondent was dispatched back to the Medical Center. This call came at approximately 2211 hours, 10:11 P.M. or ten minutes after the Respondent initially left the Medical Center.

When asked, the security guard stated based on his experience as a peace officer he believed that the Complainant was under the influence of methamphetamine at this time.

The Respondent returned to the Medical Center and arrived at approximately 2213 hours, 10:13 P.M.

Sergeant Khan, his supervisor, also arrived on scene around this time.

The Respondent was able to get the Complainant out from underneath the MRI trailer. This was the second time Respondent had to remove the Complainant from underneath a structure or item.

During this encounter, neither the Respondent nor Sergeant Khan had their body-worn cameras activated.

The Respondent walked the Complainant back to his patrol vehicle and placed her in the back seat of his caged patrol vehicle.

There are conflicting statements about whether or not Complainant was handcuffed or not at this time.

Around this time, a separate officer, Officer Isaac Herrera, arrived on seen and parked

near the Respondent's patrol vehicle and remained seated in the driver's seat of his patrol vehicle.

The Respondent and Sergeant Khan stood at the driver's side door of Officer Herrera's patrol vehicle.

At this time, it was decided that the Respondent would transport the Complainant to Chico where she resides.

The Respondent admitted that he was frustrated that he was going to have to drive the Complainant all the way to Chico.

Officer Herrera stated he also observed that the Respondent seemed frustrated and he said he made a joke, or a comment, that the Respondent should quote/unquote drop that bitch off on Neal Road.

Officer Herrera stated the Respondent definitely heard the comment because he smirked afterwards. Officers Herrera stated that Sergeant Khan also heard the comment and just shrugged his shoulders in response.

When asked in follow-up interviews, both the Respondent and Sergeant Khan stated they never heard the joke or comment, even though according to Officer Herrera they were standing in close proximity and were less than a foot away from him at the time the joke or comment was made.

At 2218 hours, 10:18 P.M., the Respondent provided

Oroville Police Department dispatch with his beginning mileage to an unknown location in the Chico area.

It was at this time the Respondent attempted to restart the RIMS application on his work cellphone in an effort to reboot that system because he stated he had been having issues with it throughout the shift.

RIMS is known as Records Information Management System, is an application to receive computer dispatch logs and also has the function to send messages to dispatch and other officers. It runs as an application on a cellphone and doesn't interfere with the cellular phone's capabilities to make or receive calls or text messages.

The Respondent never reported having RIMS issues to anyone that day, including Sergeant Khan.

At the time of transport, Respondent still had not activated his body-worn camera.

The Respondent then began transporting the Complainant towards Chico.

After approximately 15 and a half miles, and as they approached Neal Road -- and just as a reminder, this is the same location mentioned by Officer Herrera's comment -- the Respondent stated that the Complainant's mood, slash, demeanor changed and she demanded to be let out of the patrol vehicle.

The Respondent exited onto Neal Road and traveled in an easterly direction. Respondent stated he pulled over near the entrance to the Old Worm Farm, which is approximately .6 miles from Highway 99.

And if you can go to the next slide, please.

It's hard to see on here, but there's a distance measurement. That area to the left is the entrance to the Worm Farm to the right is Highway 99 and it's, according to my calculations, straight line, it's .63 miles.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Just a question. Is it literally a worm farm? Or it's just referred to --

MR. BALAND: It was formerly a worm farm. And that's such a thing, I guess. I never heard of it myself.

After the Paradise fires, it was burned down, to my knowledge and never reopened, so it's just a vacant --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

MR. BALAND: If you could do the next slide, please.

This is the entrance to the Worm Farm and Neal Road shown there east and westbound. As you can see, just kind of a dirt shoulder, no overhead lighting from the business or anything like that.

The Respondent stated he opened the rear door of

the caged patrol vehicle and the Complainant exited and began shouting expletives and "mother effing" him, as he said, towards him and kicking rocks.

When asked, the Respondent stated he didn't think to activate his body-worn camera to capture the Complainant's alleged actions.

The Respondent stated he thought to himself "bye," and got into the patrol vehicle and left the scene.

When asked, the Respondent stated he did not try to contact Sergeant Khan or the Oroville Police Department dispatch either by radio or cellphone.

Respondent stated that there's always radio problems when traveling towards Chico, but he admitted he did not attempt to utilize his radio to see if he could successfully broadcast information.

The Respondent also stated that he didn't attempt to change radio frequencies to possibly contact an allied agency, even though he stated, and others have stated, that that is a capability of the radio system.

The Respondent also stated he did not attempt to use either his personal or work cellphone to contact dispatch or Sergeant Khan, because he didn't think about it, even though he stated he has contacted them previously by that method.

The Respondent began traveling back towards the

City of Oroville and reactivated his RIMS as he reentered the Oroville area, at that time, at approximately 2247 hours or 10:47 P.M.

And he put out that any mileage from his transport of the Complainant. The Respondent stated in his interview that he didn't document what the actual ending time or mileage was when he dropped the Complainant off on Neal Road. Instead he just provided what the mileage was as he reentered Oroville.

The Respondent advised Sergeant Khan in person that he had dropped the Complainant off on Neal Road, but didn't explain the circumstances that lead up to him dropping her off.

Sergeant Khan stated in his interviews that at the time he thought Neal Road was the location of a well-known homeless area called "The Estates." And he had known -- and had he known it was a dark, desolate location with no services, he would have made the Respondent return to Neal Road and provide service to the Complainant.

When asked, Sergeant Khan stated the Respondent never advised him of any issues with RIMS that day and there were no other reported issues with RIMS by other officers.

When the Respondent was asked why he didn't reach

out to Sergeant Khan or dispatch, the Respondent said he just didn't think of it. In hindsight, he should have.

Respondent stated the reason he left the Complainant out on Neal Road was he felt it was a courtesy transport and he didn't feel he had the authority to keep her in his car.

When questioned about his responsibility for getting the Complainant to a safe location because she had been experiencing medical issues that required treatment, and was under the influence of a narcotic, he stated that she had been making good decisions and felt she could care for herself. However, when asked in his interview by POST, the Respondent admitted he left the Complainant in a worse position that when he took her into his care or custody and he stated he didn't offer to contact anyone for her or to let her use his cellphone prior to leaving.

When the Complainant was interviewed by POST, she had a conflicting account of the circumstances as they reached Neal Road.

The Complainant advised when she was being transported she thought she was being taken to a hospital or somewhere else to receive services.

The Complainant advised she was still experiencing dehydration and was still feeling the effects of

methamphetamine, so she was laying down in the rear seat of the caged patrol vehicle.

The Complainant stated that she felt the patrol vehicle exiting the freeway on Neal Road, she realized that they were heading towards Paradise, not Chico, so she asked the Respondent where they were going or where he was taking her and he replied, "Just shut the fuck up."

The Complainant stated that the Respondent pulled over, exited the patrol vehicle, opened the door, grabbed her arm and had her exit the patrol vehicle.

According to her federal lawsuit, the Complainant alleged that she was dropped off on Neal Road at the Neal Road Waste Facility, which is approximately 1.1 miles from SR-99 and about a half mile further east from the Worm Farm.

If you can go to the next picture, please.

It's -- again, it's kind of hard to show the distance. The point to the right is the Worm Farm and the point to the lower left is the Waste Facility.

The Complainant stated she asked him, "You're just going to leave me out here?

And the Respondent replied, quote, "You're not my fucking problem anymore, deal with it" and left the scene.

The Complainant was left on Neal Road during hours of darkness with no shoes, no purse, no cellphone, and no available services.

Neal Road, as you have seen, is a two-lane road that is situated in the east-west direction. There are no overhead lights and the only businesses in the general area are Franklin Construction and the Neal Road Waste Facility, neither of which were open at this time of night.

If you could go to the next slide, please.

Again, this just shows those two. On the bottom right is the waste facility. Kind in the upper middle the Franklin Construction. And again the Worm Farm is over on the left-hand side of the screen.

The Complainant stated she was scared, still feeling the effects of methamphetamine, experiencing anxiety, and was feeling nauseous because she had just got left out in the middle of nowhere in the dark. So she started walking back towards the way they came, towards Highway 99.

The Complainant stated she walked for about five minutes and then heard an oncoming vehicle.

The Complainant stated she turned around, saw the vehicle headlights and then felt an impact of being hit by the unknown vehicle. The vehicle did not stop to

render aid.

The Complainant stated she flew into the embankment, hit her head on some rocks, and was in and out of consciousness until the next morning September 2nd, 2022, when she climbed out of embankment and entered the grounds of Franklin Construction, where an employee called 911 at approximately 0934 hours, 9:34 A.M.

If you could show the next picture, please.

The arrow in the middle kind of shows where she was found on the side of Franklin Construction.

Next one, please, again.

This is closer look at it. Again the Worm Farm's on the upper left. The construction and the waste facility would be kind of off the screen down on the bottom. And then she was found near some water tanks on Franklin Construction.

The employee that reported the Complainant was on the property and appeared to be on something, quote/unquote.

The Complainant was ultimately transported to Enloe Medical Center where she was admitted for her injuries.

The California Highway Patrol was never contacted to complete a traffic collision report for the hit and run.

The Respondent completed his Dollar General arrest report the next day, which is September 2nd, 2022, and did not mention anything about his interaction with the Complainant at the Oroville Medical Center or the subsequent transport to Neal Road because the Respondent felt that they were two separate incidents.

However, no other type of incident report or documentation was prepared by the Respondent for the incident at the hospital, nor the transportation of the Complainant to Neal Road.

In his Dollar General arrest report that was completed the following morning, the Respondent stated he felt the Complainant was under the influence of a central nervous system stimulant. And this report was approved by Sergeant Khan.

As a result of being left on Neal Road and getting struck by the unknown vehicle, the Complainant suffered major injuries consisting of multiple contusions and lacerations, a ruptured small intestine, which caused internal bleeding. The Complainant had to have over one foot of her intestines removed. She had 30 to 40 percent of her colon removed, she had to use a colostomy bag and she spent seven days in intensive care and in total, almost a month at Enloe Hospital.

The Complainant developed sepsis from her injuries

and ended up having to have two of her toes amputated.

The facts that I've just recited support the Division's finding that Respondent was involved in serious misconduct, specifically abuse of power.

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 the Respondent's POST certification be revoked.

The Division's recommendation is based on the following:

The Respondent's actions during this incident were inexcusable and were performed out of frustration from having to deal with the Complainant on multiple occasions.

The willful and deliberate act of leaving the Complainant in a dark, desolate area without shoes, with no means of communication or availability of services, all while she's experienced mental and/or medical issues from narcotics, was significantly egregious, displayed a wanton disregard for public safety and was a complete dereliction and neglect of his duties and oath he took as a peace officer.

The Respondent purposely took the Complainant to this location approximately 15 and a half miles away as a means of removing her from the City of Oroville and to ensure he and the Oroville Police Department wouldn't have to deal with her again that night.

In an effort to conceal his actions, the Respondent deliberately failed to implement any of the safeguards he had available to him: Body-worn camera, radio system and two cell phones during this incident. And did not provide written documentation of the incident at Oroville Medical Center and the resulting transport to Neal Road.

These safeguards were supposed to be utilized to ensure the safety of the public and the officer by accurately documenting and capturing the actions of all involved parties.

As a result of the Respondent's actions on this date, the Complainant suffered life-altering injuries, which required lengthy hospitalizations and multiple surgeries, including the amputation of two of her toes.

The Complainant filed a Federal Civil Rights lawsuit against the City of Oroville, the Oroville Police Department, the Respondent and some others.

The City of Oroville settled the lawsuit for $3 million.

In closing, the Complainant stated in her interview to POST that even after this incident, she doesn't have any hard feelings towards law enforcement and believes that there are good cops that do what they're sworn to do.

She further stated, and this is a quote, "Regardless of what kind of situation I was in, if I was on drugs or not, I'm still a human being, and I should be treated like a human being. And for me to be left out there in the middle of nowhere with medical issues, and for this to happen to me, it shouldn't have happened because I'm a human being and my life is valuable. I believe that he put me in a worse situation than I was already in. I don't understand it. I never got an answer why, because he tried to cover up everything that he did."

I want to thank you for your time this morning and your consideration of this case.

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

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Couple of questions I have while I was reading all this. And appreciate your presentation, I especially appreciate the interview at the very end of your presentation. It gave us all more insight into the

Complainant.

Was there ever an investigation as to whether she was hit by a car?

MR. BALAND: No. Butte County Sheriffs, when they were out there the next morning, they walked the scene to look for vehicle debris and didn't find any. But that's assuming that glass broke or a mirror broke. If it's a glancing blow off a fender, it wouldn't necessarily leave any debris.

And as I mentioned, the California Highway Patrol normally would get called out in a situation like that to investigate the traffic collision, and that did not occur.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So no one called CHP?

MR. BALAND: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And did the physicians involved form an opinion as to mechanism of injuries?

MR. BALAND: We did not obtain the medical records for that, so I don't know if they made a determination. This is all based on the Complainant's statement.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: So we don't have any other insight into -- that was quite a collection of injuries and somewhat confusing collection of injuries.

And no one opined as to how she got them?

MR. BALAND: We did not, no.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Any other questions by other Board Members?

Yes.

MEMBER PENA: One point of clarification.

When you said that she believed she was being transported to a hospital, she thought she was being transported to a hospital in Chico, wasn't that correct?

MR. BALAND: When she first got put in the patrol vehicle, she assumed she was going either to the hospital or to Chico. She didn't -- somewhere to get services, because he had already told her before that she needed medical services.

MEMBER PENA: Did she -- do you know if she ever -- because she was suffering from high blood pressure, which obviously can be very serious.

Was she ever checked that day, any place, for her high blood pressure and treated?

MR. BALAND: So when she was at the jail from the initial arrest, they determined she had high blood pressure. That's why they told her that she had needed to go to the hospital to get medical clearance. She was never brought into the hospital. The Respondent left her in the patrol car instead of taking her into the hospital.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. She also complained of

dehydration, which also can be very serious. And it was -- wasn't it over 100 degrees that day?

MR. BALAND: She said it was over 100 degrees. And I did a cursory check of -- on the internet. It was a summer day in September. It was over 100 degrees that day.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I don't think she complained about the dehydration until the later interview.

I don't think that there was any indication she complained about it that day.

MR. BALAND: No. In our interview with her is when she said she was dehydrated that day.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Right.

MEMBER PENA: Did anybody ever offer her water?

MR. BALAND: Not to my knowledge.

MEMBER PENA: I mean, it's a hot day. She's in the back of a patrol car.

MR. BALAND: Yeah.

MEMBER PENA: One would think she might --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: I don't think we know if they did or didn't.

MR. BALAND: Nothing in the report said she was offered up water, but that's just --

MEMBER PENA: Yeah.

MR. BALAND: -- my assumption she was not.

MEMBER PENA: I mean, apparently it's why she was in the bathroom at the hospital, to get water. And why she was in the pool initially was because she was hot.

MR. BALAND: She did state that's why she was in the pool.

MEMBER PENA: That's according to her. And according to her that's why she was in the bathroom was to drink water out of the faucet.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: But again I think we just got that end interview, the most recent one, conducted by this officer.

MEMBER PENA: Uh-huh. Yes.

I think she also said in her interview that when she -- about, regarding her toes being removed, that at one point the doctor -- they wanted to remove a foot, but she argued against that and they ended up just removing her big toe.

MR. BALAND: Yeah, I know she had developed sepsis --

MEMBER PENA: Yes.

MR. BALAND: -- and at one point she said that her daughters got called because she was actually looking at maybe life-ending injuries or medical --

MEMBER PENA: Right.

MR. BALAND: -- illnesses, but she said that the

doctor tried a couple different things and I think that's why he was able to save her foot and just only lose a couple toes.

MEMBER PENA: And her daughters were looking for her that evening or subsequent to that; correct?

MR. BALAND: After this incident, yeah.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. They were calling around trying to find her; right?

MR. BALAND: Correct.

MEMBER PENA: And they were in Chico?

MR. BALAND: I don't know that for certain. I'm assuming that general area, Chico-Oroville. But I don't know where they lived.

MEMBER PENA: Because that's where she lived, apparently; right?

MR. BALAND: Correct. I don't know if she resides with either of her daughters or not.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. Any other questions from other Board Members?

Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: One question, this person's referred to as a Complainant, but is that in reference to the civil suit that she's engaged in? Not in reference to her standing with POST?

MR. BALAND: Correct. Yeah, complainant, we were toying with "victim" or you know, just without naming her.

MEMBER GLASER: But she -- this case came to POST through the agency?

MR. BALAND: Correct.

MEMBER GLASER: Through Oroville.

MR. BALAND: Yes.

MEMBER GLASER: Another question I have is, does anybody know if Neal Road is -- has a reputation as a particularly desolate area?

I mean, it's interesting that Officer Herrera suggested it and then that's where the Complainant ended up.

Is there any background on Neal Road that we should know about it? Because it keeps coming up.

MR. BALAND: I mean, not to my knowledge. I mean, it is desolate, as you've seen in the pictures and if you could just picture that at 10:30-ish at night with no streetlights it's, I would just assume, very dark. I've never driven out there at that time.

Again, the only businesses out there are an old, abandoned Worm Farm, Franklin Construction and then Neal Road Waste Facility or for lack of a better term, a dump, so --

MEMBER GLASER: Oh, no common lore about Neal Road?

MR. BALAND: Not that I know of, no.

MEMBER GLASER: And then I was unclear on the purpose of the transport to Chico. It sounded in one -- one part that I read, like it was just -- the mandate was just to take her to Chico because that's where she's from. And there was a question about whether that was to a medical facility or not. Is that -- is there any clarity --

MR. BALAND: From what I read, it doesn't seem like they really knew where they were going to end up.

And speaking from my experience in law enforcement, a lot of times if you're going to an unknown area, you'll get there and then you'll find a place that has services available at that time of night.

So I know in some of the other statements that were made by Sergeant Khan and some others, like oftentimes there's like a Home Depot there that they tend to drop people off at. But, again, at this time of night that wouldn't have been open either. So --

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: There was also this thought that she would not know the address, the physical address, but she might be able to point out as she got closer.

MR. BALAND: Correct.

MEMBER GLASER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah, Johnson.

I thought maybe for clarity, Neal Road, one of the officers said was a homeless camp?

MR. BALAND: So Sergeant Khan said he believed that where Neal Road was at, where he -- where he was told she was dropped was a homeless encampment. He didn't know. That's what he suspected it was. That's when he said he dropped her at off Neal Road, he assumed it was this homeless encampment.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. First question, what's the distance to the nearest services from where she was dropped off at?

MR. BALAND: I couldn't even tell you because I'm not familiar with that area.

But I know the City of Chico was only about another mile and a half, two miles away. So I would imagine there would have been services there.

Coming from Oroville, I'm not sure if there were services prior to that. But, again, if the intention was to go to Chico, another mile and a half, two miles, would have put them in the city proper of Chico.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Is that a dirt road by chance?

MR. BALAND: Is what --

MEMBER JOHNSON: Neal Road.

MR. BALAND: It's an asphalt road, there's -- yeah, it's a two-lane asphalt road, there's dirt shoulders.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. So R-I-M-S, what is that?

MR. BALAND: So it's a Records Information Management System. So as I said, it's an application on your cellphone that you use. And they use it in law enforcement. It's a means of communicating with dispatch. You get your calls sent to that phone, it's a CAD system, computer-aided dispatch. So it will give all the details of the calls that you are responding to. You can also message back and forth with that application.

MEMBER JOHNSON: That wasn't utilized.

MR. BALAND: It was turned off.

MEMBER JOHNSON: It was turned off.

BMC, body-worn camera.

MR. BALAND: BWC, yes.

MEMBER JOHNSON: That was also not activated?

MR. BALAND: Never activated.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Any communication devices were all not utilized to convey what was happening.

MR. BALAND: Correct.

MEMBER JOHNSON: How many times the Respondent came into contact with the Complainant prior to that night?

MR. BALAND: Prior to that incident, they had never encountered each other. But two times that night. The first time at the Dollar General and then the second time at the hospital when he had to re -- get recalled back out there to deal with her. So two times that night.

MEMBER JOHNSON: That answers my questions, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else from the Board?

Okay. At this time, does the subject officer and/or their counsel wish to make public comment?

If so, you will each be given five minutes to speak and the time limits will be strictly enforced. So please ensure you complete your comments within the allotted time. While commenting, keep in mind that the Board will only consider the facts as presented by the Division today and will not consider any additional facts or defenses at this time.

The sole question before the Board today is the following: If the facts offered by the Division today are, in fact, proven at a later hearing, do those facts demonstrate a high probability that serious misconduct, as defined in Penal Code Section 13510.8 and Commission Regulation 1205 occurred.

So is there anyone from -- so let me -- before we get to the public, let me find out if either the

attorney or the officer would like to speak.

MR. SASEK: I would like to speak.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Please, come on up.

Would you identify yourself for the record.

MR. SASEK: My name is Robert Sasek. I'm the officer in question.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MR. SASEK: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Good afternoon.

MR. SASEK: Good morning, since it's almost afternoon.

So I would like to take full responsibility for what happened. It was a mistake. I did it with no malice intent. And I've learned from it.

I spent my entire life, my entire adult life, in service from the Army to being an officer. That's what I love to do. And I don't think that one mistake should make me not be able to do that anymore.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Tell us what the mistake you made was.

MR. SASEK: The mistake that I made was lack of communication. I believe that I interpreted what I determined to be a potential Fourth Amendment violation over the 14th Amendment.

I did not intend to leave her in harm.

But, I also didn't know where to draw the line of what, you know, if she wants out and it's not a detention, I can't -- I can't unlawfully detain her.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And why was that a mistake?

COURT OFFICER: Because it led to her being placed in a worse position than she was in and she suffered injuries.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Does Oroville Police Department have a motto?

MR. SASEK: Not that I know of.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. When I think -- or when you think about the motto of law enforcement or military, what do you think of it being?

MR. SASEK: Protecting people that can't protect themselves.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Was she someone who could protect herself?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Knowing what I know now, no, I don't believe she was.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: You say knowing what you know now, do you know more about her now than you knew that night?

MR. SASEK: I do know more but about her now.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: What did you learn subsequent to this event that lets you believe that you know more

about her now?

MR. SASEK: I learned about her past history. I'm a wrestling coach and a lot of my parents are parents who had substance abuse issues. And I've had some parents tell me that she has a lifelong history of substance abuse. She's been arrested multiples times for that. And I understand it is a sickness and, you know, I wasn't aware at the time that she had such a prolonged use of it.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. About how old was she?

MR. SASEK: I would say she was -- I'm guessing -- in her '50s.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. So this is what I know about her.

I gathered she was around in her 50s. She's barefoot. She's using meth or has some mental health issues. She has high blood pressure.

She's either, you know, erratic in her behavior. Either screaming to get out of the car and screaming, you know, MF and throwing rocks. Or not.

She's all over the board. And when you dropped her off in -- at this desolate place in that condition, did you view that as protecting and serving?

MR. SASEK: No. But I also wasn't sure where she wanted to be.

I know from between Neal Road and Estates Drive which is where I believe Sergeant Khan had mentioned, was nothing but transient camps.

So when I made the decision to let her out of the vehicle when she requested, I did not want to leave her on Highway 99 because I didn't think that that would be a smart decision.

But if I let her make her own decisions from a safe place, that's her decision.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Questions?

MEMBER CLAVO: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Please. Dr. Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: You said that there's a lot of transient camps.

Was there transient camps in that area in which you dropped her off?

MR. SASEK: Not particularly. But, again, I did not want to leave her on Highway 99. I would say from about a quarter mile, maybe a little bit more, from Neal Road north, there starts to be transient camps. There's foliage and grass and like a golf course on the side of the road.

That entire strip, all the way into Chico, had transient camps in it. And I believe there's a wildlife preserve where people go fishing off the eastern side of

the road where I know there were several camps also.

MEMBER CLAVO: So knowing that it was that close in proximity, why didn't you drive her to the transient camps and drop her off, versus dropping her off in a desolate, unlit area?

MR. SASEK: Because the transient camps aren't necessarily accessible. They're behind roads.

So it would be a quarter of mile or half mile extra walk for her to get to a place where I would have been able to drop her off.

But I didn't feel it would be safe or smart leaving her on Highway 99.

MEMBER CLAVO: How many times in the past have you left individuals that were not detained in isolated areas?

MR. SASEK: None.

MEMBER CLAVO: Is that a common practice?

MR. SASEK: None, ma'am. This was a very rare occurrence.

MEMBER CLAVO: Is there a -- do Oroville have any policies or anything in place that give you direction on what to do with such a person?

MR. SASEK: No. I referred to my supervisor. I let Sergeant Khan know that she freaked out and he said, okay.

That would -- that was my interpretation of what I should do.

MEMBER CLAVO: Is there a policy about turning your camera on and off?

MR. SASEK: No. It was common practice of using it in an incident.

And then if it wasn't necessary, you could turn it off.

MEMBER CLAVO: That's your policy?

MR. SASEK: That was our policy, yes. Or at least our common practice.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. So there's a difference.

So is it policy or common practice?

MR. SASEK: I'm not sure. I'll give you that answer. I'm not entirely sure.

I know that -- I believe it's -- I believe that it's not required. Because I know that I had an incident when I was just off training where our lieutenant yelled at me about it should be a -- it should be a "shall" section.

MEMBER CLAVO: Okay. Next question.

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Do you have a daughter?

MR. SASEK: No, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Do you have a mother?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Would you want your mother dropped off in a random, isolated place, not lit, with no shoes on, under the influence of drugs or mental impairment?

MR. SASEK: No, ma'am, I would not.

MEMBER CLAVO: So why would you do someone else's mother that way?

MR. SASEK: Because she said that she wanted out and I didn't feel I had the right to detain her.

MEMBER CLAVO: That's all.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Yes, Dr. Glaser.

MEMBER GLASER: Do you think she knew where she was when she asked to get out of the vehicle?

MR. SASEK: I'm not sure she knew exactly where it was. It was her idea to go to Chico, so I believe she knew she was between Oroville and Chico.

MEMBER GLASER: Do you think at the time that you should have had questions about whether she was making a good judgment about getting out of that location?

MR. SASEK: Knowing what I know now, yes, I should have asked more questions.

But when she got out of the car, erratic, and trying to start a confrontation I didn't feel the need to ask any more questions.

MEMBER GLASER: At any point later in the night,

did it occur to you that you should alert somebody to her location, given that she was barefoot and in a desolate area?

MR. SASEK: I let Sergeant Khan know right when I got back into town, sir.

MEMBER CLAVO: I have another question.

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Knowing what you know now. I'm struggling with that statement, because I don't know what you know now that made a difference in how you acted then.

So I'm really -- can you walk me through that?

I'm a little confused.

MR. SASEK: Again, with the 14th Amendment, making sure that we leave people in a safer position, I wasn't as aware of how -- I'm trying to think how to say this.

How -- that it would give me more authority.

MEMBER CLAVO: Did you not know the amendments then?

MR. SASEK: No, ma'am. I knew the amendments, but I wasn't as sure on the 14th Amendment on its -- requirements to make sure you leave somebody in better care after contact.

MEMBER CLAVO: How long have you been an officer?

MR. SASEK: I was an officer at -- 14 months at the

time, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Fourteen months. And you were in the military prior to that?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER CLAVO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Just to follow up on Dr. Glaser. I'm not sure he's done.

You said that she -- remind me of your question again, Dr. Glaser because it was a take off on that.

MEMBER GLASER: Well, I first asked if it was likely that she knew where she was when she asked to get out of the vehicle.

And then I asked if Officer Sasek had contacted anyone -- or I asked if he thought to contact anyone.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Right. And what you said, I believe you told Sergeant Khan that she freaked out.

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Did you say anything else besides "she freaked out"?

MR. SASEK: I told him she freaked out and demanded to get out of my vehicle and he didn't ask any more questions.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And you're aware that he didn't remember you saying she freaked out.

MR. SASEK: I'm aware of that.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And did you say, hey, man, you know, she was barefoot. Anything else besides the words she "freaked out" and "demanded."

MR. SASEK: No, ma'am, I did not.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. And he didn't ask you anything -- any more follow-up questions on that.

And that was about the same time there was a fire and few other things going on.

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Do you think he heard you when you said she freaked out.

MR. SASEK: Yes, because he acknowledged me. He said "okay."

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Yes, ma'am.

Yeah, I just -- did you have some questions?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And one second, were you done?

Okay.

Yes, Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I think it was asked earlier, the motto of being the police. And what was your response?

MR. SASEK: To protect those that can't take care of themselves, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. I think the people expect

the motto to be, "Serve and protect." Right?

She was in need of service when you first contacted her; right?

And she was eventually of course taken to the hospital, created a commotion, and of course you responded. And the service you provided was to drop her off on a dark, dirt, two-mile, mile and a half, from services, by herself. And then she was struck by a vehicle.

Do you believe you provided her some service?

MR. SASEK: First service that she needed, sir, was she was trespassing so she was arrested for it.

And then afterwards, I believe I was trying to provide her a service because she said she wanted to go home.

And then, again, I go to the point where she wanted out and I didn't feel I had the right to detain her. So I left her off in where I deemed a safe area as quick as possible without violating her rights.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm struggling with that.

She thought she was going home. But she said she wanted to get out.

MR. SASEK: Yes.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And you felt it was okay just to put her out on the dark, dirt, lonely road, about a mile

and a half from services.

MR. SASEK: So this is the way I look at it, sir.

I was always explained from the beginning of the academy to -- any time in law enforcement, when it's a consensual encounter, a person has the right to walk away.

It doesn't matter if we're in mid conversation, if they start the conversation, if I start the conversation.

She said she wanted out. It's my legal obligation to allow her her freedom. That's how I interpret it.

MEMBER JOHNSON: I'm done. Yes.

MEMBER LARA: I have a couple of questions.

So you said earlier that one action should not define the sum of your career; is that correct?

MR. SASEK: Yes, sir.

MEMBER LARA: All right. This woman suffered sepsis, loss of toes, she now has to utilize a colostomy bag, and has lost a length of her small intestine.

Where do you draw the line? Does she have to die for you to have that one action define your career?

MR. SASEK: No.

MEMBER LARA: Second question.

Could this situation have been avoided by taking her to the hospital and getting her the medical

attention?

MR. SASEK: Yes, potentially.

But only in the meaning of if I would have gone in and got a medical clearance and then had continued the arrest, versus me arresting her, giving her her citation and saying: Here's the front door, you should go seek medical attention, which was what I did.

The only thing I didn't do was walk her into the hospital.

MEMBER LARA: And again, the best evidence for what transpired on the -- on Neal Road would have been preserved by a body-worn camera; is that true?

MR. SASEK: Yes.

MEMBER LARA: Okay. And do you know currently what the policy is for utilization of a body-worn camera?

MR. SASEK: I don't know if they've altered it or not.

MEMBER LARA: What was it at the time?

MR. SASEK: It was a "may use."

MEMBER LARA: Thank you.

MEMBER JOHNSON: All right. Johnson once again.

For clarity, the Internal Affairs interview, I believe you were asked a question about why the body-worn camera wasn't turned on.

MR. SASEK: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: What was that reason?

MR. SASEK: So the body-worn camera that we had at the time -- so let me ask the question to clarify.

Do you mean when I let her out of the vehicle or do you mean throughout the entirety?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Throughout the entire incident.

MR. SASEK: It wasn't common practice.

When I initially contacted her she was causing issues so my body camera was on.

And then when she calmed down and the arrest continued, we deactivated.

MEMBER JOHNSON: So the policy sits around that?

MR. SASEK: Yes, sir.

MEMBER JOHNSON: That if there's no confrontation, no need to turn it on?

MR. SASEK: That's correct. That's our common practice.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay. Is it policy or common practice?

MR. SASEK: I don't believe it's a policy violation.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you.

Ms. Pena.

MEMBER PENA: Thank you.

So she says in her interview that she didn't ask to get out there. That she didn't request to be let out of the car on Neal Road.

And she tried to ask you about it and you answered her very sternly about, don't ask me, basically.

MR. SASEK: So how she said I talked to her, that's not how I talk to people ma'am.

She requested to get out and I let her out. And when I let her out, I tried to say "what's going on?"

And she stormed off.

MEMBER PENA: Okay. So when you initially took her to the jail, they said she has high blood pressure, we can't admit her. Take her to the hospital? Right?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: Are you aware that high blood pressure can lead to stroke or heart attack?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER PENA: She also says in her interview that she was dehydrated.

Did she ever ask you for water?

Or did you offer her water at all?

MR. SASEK: No, ma'am. She did not ask me for water and I didn't have water in my vehicle at the time to offer her.

MEMBER PENA: What was the temperature that day?

MR. SASEK: It was hot. It would have been easily been in the 100s throughout the day.

It was the nighttime, so it was probably dropping down to 90s.

MEMBER PENA: Are you aware that dehydration can lead to delirium and disorientation?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am. She wasn't exhibiting any signs of dehydration when I contacted her.

MEMBER PENA: But sometimes disorientation can look like somebody's on drugs, for example.

Did you know that that's a symptom of dehydration?

MR. SASEK: Yes, ma'am.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Johnson. Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Ms. Pena.

MEMBER PENA: Nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Johnson.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Mr. Johnson.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yes.

The other officer had mentioned Neal Road.

And you were on your way to taking her to Oroville, if I remember correctly. Was it Oroville or -- Chico. Chico.

MR. SASEK: Yes, from Oroville to Chico.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And he suggested: Just drop her

off over there.

And it's my assumption that she didn't know where she was at and she questioned why you was taking her there and then she -- maybe out of fear -- wanted to get out the car.

Based on this whole experience for you, if you had a situation like this again, what would you do if -- what would you do differently?

MR. SASEK: If I could do the whole thing over again?

MEMBER JOHNSON: Yeah.

MR. SASEK: I would have got a jail clearance and I would have taken her back to jail. Had I not gotten a jail clearance, and I had to contact her at the hospital, my body-worn camera would have been on the entire time.

When I restarted RIMS, because it was acting up, which I was advised to do that in the past by Sergeant Khan, is when we have issues with RIMS just go do a hard reset on your phone. I would have stopped and waited and let the whole system reboot up.

I don't like to drive and be on my phone, even though we have an exemption, I still think it's unsafe.

So I wouldn't have, you know, stopped at a stoplight and tried to re -- turn it on. And then the

light turns green. And I'm not going to play on my phone. So my body camera would have been on. My RIMS would have been on. And I would have been able to avoid this situation.

MEMBER JOHNSON: And in the direction going to Chico, you probably wouldn't have dropped her off on some dirt road.

MR. SASEK: Had she requested to get out again, I probably would have stopped on the side of the road, contacted my supervisor and figured out what to do next.

MEMBER JOHNSON: Okay.

MR. SASEK: Again, I was a young officer at the beginning of this and I know that I made mistakes and it -- I don't know how to say it nicely. It sucks. Because this woman has experienced, you know, horrible things. And I'm sorry for that.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Anything else?

Thank you, Officer.

Is your attorney --

MR. SASEK: I don't have any counsel. It's just me, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay. Fine. Thank you.

Would the Board like to meet or would you like to -- would anyone like to raise a motion? What would -- oh, is there -- thank you.

Is there public comment?

Yes. Okay. Is there someone on remotely with public comment? Yes? No? No. Doesn't appear that there is someone interested in making public comment remotely.

Okay. So back to the Board.

Would anyone like to make a motion? Or would you like to meet privately? I'm sorry?

MEMBER GLASER: We would like to go into closed session.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Okay.

(Time noted: 12:09 P.M.)

---o0o---

(Closed session was held:
12:17 A.M. to 12:34 P.M.)

---o0o---

(Time noted: 12:36 P.M.)

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: We'll now reconvene to regular session to take a vote on the Board's recommendation in the matter of 2318309, Robert Sasek, who at the time of the events at issue in this case was employed with the Oroville Police Department.

Are there any comments that the Board has on this matter?

Okay. Before we get to a motion -- I'm sorry, did

you have a comment?

MEMBER PENA: No.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Before we get to a motion, I want to point out that Board Member Regina Crawford left about an hour ago because she had an earlier flight. We still have a quorum here so we're still going to go ahead with a motion, if there is such a motion.

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

MEMBER PENA: Yes. Move to decertify.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Is there a second?

MEMBER CLAVO: I second.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: And we will now take a roll call vote on the Board's recommendation.

Mr. Knapp, please take a roll call vote.

MR. KNAPP: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Clavo.

MEMBER CLAVO: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Clavo, 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.

And Pena.

MEMBER PENA: Aye.

MR. KNAPP: Pena, aye.

That's six yeses. Motion carries.

CHAIRPERSON DUDLEY: Thank you. Motion passes.

Future board meeting dates. Upcoming board meetings will be October 8, 9.

And all the board meetings will occur here in West Sacramento.

Next February, 4, 5, 2026.

April 15, 16, 2026.

July 15, 16, 2026.

As this was last item on the agenda, do any of the Members of the Board have any additional comments before we adjourn?

Seeing none, I'll make a motion to adjourn for the record.

Please clearly state -- seeing none, I'll make a motion to adjourn.

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