

Professional Standards Ethics Bulletin

Criminal Justice



STATISTICS:

Currently Certified Law Enforcement in Oregon:

- Police 5338
- Corrections 4058
- Tele/EMD 901/860
- P & P 611
- OLCC 38

Professional Standards Cases Opened: 13

- Police 4
- Corrections 6
- Tele/EMD 2
- P & P 0
- OLCC 1

Professional Standards Cases Pending as of January 31: 124

Mandatory Disqualifiers

- Police 23
- Corrections 12
- Tele/EMD 0
- P & P 1
- OLCC 1

Discretionary Disqualifiers

- Police 46
- Corrections 29
- Tele/EMD 8
- P & P 1
- OLCC 3

Cases Closed: 43

- Revoked 11
- Deny 0
- No Revoke 0
- No Deny 10
- No Action 22

To increase the public's trust, the Oregon legislature has mandated the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training establish minimum standards that are required to be met and maintained by Oregon's providers of public safety, including police officers, corrections officers, parole and probation officers, telecommunicators (9-1-1), emergency medical dispatchers, public safety instructors and OLCC regulatory specialists. The Department of Public Safety Standards and Training is responsible for certifying public safety professionals who meet all of the Board-established standards, and for denying or revoking the certification of those who do not meet or fall below the standards.

In addition to physical and intellectual standards, the Board has adopted minimum standards of moral fitness. Public safety professionals and applicants for public safety positions who have been convicted of a crime or have engaged in behavior that is deemed to fall below the minimum standards are subject to review as prescribed in Oregon Administrative Rule 259-008-0070. The sole purpose of this review is to determine if the Board's standards of moral fitness have been violated and if proceeding to deny or revoke public safety certification should be initiated. The review specifically looks for behavior that appears to involve dishonesty, disregard for the rights of others, misuse of authority, gross misconduct, misconduct, insubordination and incompetence.

The Professional Standards Ethics Bulletin has been developed as an educational tool aimed at providing insight and transparency into situations involving public safety professionals that may violate the Board's standard of moral fitness. The bulletin details the conduct and the resulting DPSST action. The names and agencies of the individuals in this report have been omitted to ensure focus remains on the behavior.

Questions about these incidents or about DPSST's processes and procedures can be directed to DPSST: (503) 378-2100 or oregon.dpsst@state.or.us.

The following cases have resulted in consideration of **revocation or denial** of certifications by DPSST in **January 2017**.

Officer A worked as a corrections officer from 2014 to 2016. DPSST received an F-4 stating that Officer A had been discharged for cause. Officer A was involved in an inappropriate physical relationship with a co-worker while on duty and used government/agency messaging to communicate with that individual. Officer A was also found to have falsified documents and slept on duty. Officer A was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer A's misconduct ended their 2 year career.

Officer A's Basic Corrections certification is Revoked.

Officer B worked as a corrections officer from 2014 to 2016. DPSST received an F-4 stating that Officer B had been discharged for cause. Officer B was involved in a crash causing damage to two agency vehicles, and was found to have been dishonest in statements made to supervisors during the course of an internal affairs investigation. Officer B was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer B's misconduct ended their 2 year career.

Officer B's Basic Corrections certification is Revoked.

Officer C worked as a corrections officer from 1989 to 2013. DPSST received a LEDS hit stating that Officer C had been arrested for the felony criminal charge of Sexual Abuse in the 1st Degree, 161.405(2)(c). Officer C subsequently plead guilty, and was convicted. Officer C was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing.

Officer C's Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced Corrections certifications are Revoked.

Officer D worked as a parole and probation officer from 2013 to 2016. DPSST received an F-4 stating that Officer D had been discharged for cause. Officer D was chosen to perform a random urinalysis test. Three of the four samples taken were diluted or inadequate samples and the fourth sample tested positive for Methadone. During the internal affairs investigation it was discovered that Officer D was not forthcoming and truthful when referencing prescription drug use and medical history. Officer D was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer D's misconduct ended their 3 year career.

Officer D's Basic Parole and Probation certification is Revoked.

Officer E worked as a police officer from 1995 to 2016. DPSST received an F-4 stating that Officer E had resigned during an investigation. Officer E was involved in an extramarital affair and utilized department issued equipment to communicate with the other party involved. During the internal affairs investigation it was discovered that Officer E was not truthful and forthcoming in reference to the affair. Officer E hindered the investigation by destroying evidence so it could not be forensically analyzed, which Officer E admitted to. Officer E signed a stipulation order permanently revoking Officer E's certifications. Officer E's misconduct ended their 16 year career.

Officer E's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Supervisory, and Management Police certifications are Revoked.

Officer F worked as a corrections officer from 2010 until 2016. DPSST received an F-4 stating that Officer F had resigned during an investigation. Officer F was charged with Harassment, 166.065(4), stemming from on-duty conduct, and was subsequently convicted. As part of the final judgement Officer F relinquished Corrections and Instructor certifications. Officer F's misconduct ended their 6 year career.

Officer F's Instructor and Basic and Intermediate Corrections certifications are Revoked.

Officer G worked as a corrections officer and resigned during an investigation involving misconduct and untruthfulness surrounding a use of force incident. Officer G was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board the revocation of Officer G's certifications. The CPC considered the following

factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer G's conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer G was untruthful in the use of force report. The Committee also found that Officer G participated in favoritism with inmates.
- Officer G's conduct involved Dishonesty. The CPC found that Officer G misreported their observations during a use of force incident when Officer G assumed and documented injuries to an inmate that did not occur. Although Officer G believed they used a Taser on an inmate, all evidence clearly indicates that they did not deploy the Taser on the inmate, but discharged the Taser after the incident. Officer G had knowledge that they did not use the Taser during the incident and was attempting to produce evidence to support the use of force. Officer G admitted to coercing a coworker that Officer G was frustrated and upset with by lying to the deputy about a Sergeant having told Officer G that the deputy had talked negatively about Officer G. Officer G went to great lengths, such as checking rosters, to identify deputies that were speaking to the Sergeant regarding the use of force incident.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer G was an instructor and individuals looked to Officer G for guidance and their standards should have reflected as such.
- Officer G did not show positive decision making and had shown a pattern of poor decision making skills related to use of force.

The CPC found no mitigating circumstances.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC. Officer G was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide request for a hearing. Officer G's misconduct ended their 7-year career.

Officer G's Basic and Intermediate Corrections certifications are Revoked.

Officer H resigned as the Chief during an investigation surrounding misconduct. It was determined that Officer H engaged in conduct that violated the Moral Fitness standards. Officer H was notified that a case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended revocation of Officer H's certifications to the Board. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer H's conduct involved Misconduct. The PPC found that Officer H's untruthful constitutes Misconduct.
- Officer H's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The PPC found that Officer H's conduct and minimization during the investigation and continuing dishonesty constituted Gross Misconduct.
- Officer H's conduct involved Misuse of Authority. The PPC found that Officer's H's behavior, minimization during the investigation and continued dishonesty was a Misuse of Authority.
- Officer H's conduct involved Disregard for the Rights of Others. The PPC found that Officer H requested their officers to lie, work without compensation and physically abused the officers by "pinching" them in order to intimidate.
- Officer H's conduct involved Dishonesty. The PPC found that Officer H requested the officers to lie and continued to minimize their conduct and engage in dishonesty throughout the investigation.

The PPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer H was the Chief of Police and should have held himself/herself to a higher standard and known the consequences. Officer H repeatedly placed employees at risk with their behavior.

The PPC found no mitigating circumstances.

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC. Officer H was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer H's conduct ended their 21-year career.

Officer H's Basic, Intermediate, Advanced, Supervisory, Management and Executive Police Certifications are Revoked.

Officer I was terminated from their position as a corrections officer after non-compliance with a court ordered diversion agreement and subsequent suspension of driving privileges for the charge of DUII. Failure to

complete the diversion program resulted in a criminal conviction. Officer I was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board revocation of Officer I's certifications. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer I's conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer I violated the law which resulted in a conviction of DUII.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer I's non-compliance with alcohol treatment and repeated submission of urinalysis' that were not valid due to dilution.
- Officer I was terminated for non-compliance with diversion and treatment.
- Officer I failed to pay the financial responsibilities to the court.

The CPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer I's courteous behavior with the arresting officer.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC. Officer I was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to provide a request for a hearing. Officer I's misconduct ended their 19-year career.

Officer I's Basic, Intermediate and Advanced Corrections certifications were Revoked.

Officer J was hired as a police officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer J had a conviction for Reckless Driving. Officer J was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer J's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer J's conduct involved Misconduct. The PPC found that Officer J violated the law by committing the crime of Reckless Driving.
- Officer J's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The PPC found that Reckless Driving is a presumed Category IV-Gross Misconduct crime based on the elements of the offense; Reckless Driving creates a danger or risk to person and property.

The PPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer J's Reckless Driving was part of a DUII incident and a crash with property damage.
- Officer J was also charged with possession of less than an ounce of marijuana.

The PPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer J's conviction occurred over seven years ago.
- Officer J wrote a letter to the victim taking responsibility for their conduct.
- Officer J completed all conditions of the court.
- The court reduced Officer J's misdemeanor to a violation.
- Officer J was found to be honest and forthcoming.

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer J's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer K was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer K had a conviction for DUII. Officer K was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer K's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer K's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer K violated the law by committing the crime of DUII.
- Officer K's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that DUII is a presumed Category IV-Gross Misconduct crime based on the elements of the offense; DUII creates a danger or risk to person and

property.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer K was issued a failure to appear warrant by the court.
- Officer K continued to drive while Officer K's driver's license was suspended, after the conviction of the DUII charge, resulting in the charge of driving while license suspended.
- Officer K did not complete the court ordered diversion.

The CPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer K's conviction occurred over six years ago.
- Officer K served in Iraq and Afghanistan and received an honorable discharge.
- Officer K went through an alcohol and drug program in Arizona, and reached out for assistance from the Veterans Agency for PTSD.
- In Officer K's letter to the committee, Officer K took responsibility for their actions, stating that they were immature at the time and did not make excuses for the behavior.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer K's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer L was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer L had a conviction for First Degree Negligent Driving in Washington. The Oregon equivalent criminal charge of First Degree Negligent Driving is Reckless Driving. Officer L was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer L's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer L's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer L violated the law by committing the crime of First Degree Negligent Driving.
- Officer L's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that Reckless Driving, the equivalent of First Degree Negligent Driving, is a presumed Category IV-Gross Misconduct crime based on the elements of the offense, Reckless Driving creates a danger or risk to person and property.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer L's behavior was found as an aggravating circumstance because even though alcohol was not part of the initial conviction there was some level of impairment due to intoxication.

The CPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer L took responsibility for the situation and was only 20 years old when the conviction occurred.
- Officer L is currently serving in the Air Force and has gone back to college to further their education.
- Officer L showed remorse for their poor decision making at the time of the incident.
- Officer L followed the court requirements and was cooperative with the arresting officer.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer L's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer M was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer M had convictions for Reckless Driving, two DUIIs, Criminal Driving while Suspended, and Reckless Burning. Officer M was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer M's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer M's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer M violated the law by committing the crimes of Reckless Driving, DUII twice, Criminal Driving While Suspended, and Reckless Burning.

- Officer M's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that Reckless Driving, DUII, Criminal Driving While Suspended, and Reckless Burning are presumed Category IV-Gross Misconduct crimes based on the elements of the offense, Reckless Driving, DUII, Criminal Driving While Suspended, and Reckless Burning create a danger or risk to person and property.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer M received a DUII in 2006 while still in diversion for the 2004 DUII conviction.
- The CPC identified a continuing pattern of reckless behavior that included Officer M's 2004 Reckless Driving and DUII, 2006 DUII, and 2012 for reckless burning.

The CPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer M's completion of all of the conditions requested by the court from the second DUII.
- Officer M's probation was terminated early based on the successful completion of diversion and the Driving while Suspended was converted into a violation and the Reckless Driving was dismissed.
- The length of time that has passed since Officer M's last conviction was taken into account as well as the fact that Officer M took responsibility for their actions.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer M's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer N was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer N had a conviction for Fourth Degree Assault and Reckless Driving. Officer N was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer N's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer N's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer N violated the law by committing the crime of Fourth Degree Assault and Reckless Driving.
- Officer N's conduct involved Gross Misconduct. The CPC found that Reckless Driving and Fourth Degree Assault are presumed Category IV-Gross Misconduct crimes based on the elements of the offense.

The CPC found aggravating circumstances:

- Officer N's behavior resulted in the injury of a passenger during the reckless driving.

The CPC found mitigating circumstances:

- Officer N took responsibility for the situation and was only 18 years old when the conviction occurred.
- Officer N served in the Marines for nine years.
- Officer N completed probation without any violations of the conditions.
- Officer N's Chief Deputy, at the agency, wrote a letter supporting Officer N.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer N's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer O was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned Officer O had been convicted of DUII. Officer O was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer O's Application for Training and subsequent certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer O's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer O's conduct violated the law and resulted in a conviction of DUII.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:

- Neither Officer O nor the agency submitted mitigation to the committee explaining the factors surrounding the DUII arrest.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:

- The incident occurred 10 years ago prior to Officer O's employment in public safety.
- Additionally, the PPC found Officer O has had no criminal conduct since.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer O's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer P was hired as a police officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned that Officer P had been convicted of Reckless Driving. Officer P was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer P's Application for Training and Subsequent Certification. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer P's conduct involved Misconduct. The PPC found that Officer P's Reckless Driving conviction violated the law.

The PPC found no aggravating circumstances.

The PPC found as mitigating circumstances:

- Officer P was 17-years old at the time of the conduct which occurred years prior to Officer P's employment in public safety.
- Additionally, the PPC found it mitigation that Officer P should never have been cited or charged with Reckless Driving and should have instead been written for a lesser traffic violation.
- The PPC considered the presence of the Sheriff at the meeting as well as additional supervising personnel to support Officer P as mitigation.

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer P's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer Q was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned that Officer Q had been convicted of Second Degree Disorderly Conduct. Officer Q was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer Q's Application for Training and Subsequent Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer Q's conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The CPC found Officer Q's behavior violated the law based on the Second Degree Disorderly Conduct conviction.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:

- Officer Q's conviction was a plea agreement and there was also a charge of interfering with a peace officer and harassment. Officer Q lunged at the arresting officer which resulted in use of force.
- Officer Q had a probation violation approximately one month after sentencing for attempting to purchase alcohol at a store and Officer Q was also found drinking with three minors.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:

- Officer Q completed treatment and received a letter of support from their father who attests to Officer Q's changed behavior.
- Officer Q's letters of support from the agency to include Officer Q's Sergeant and Undersheriff.
- Officer Q recognized the seriousness of the actions and position Officer Q placed the two officers in the night of their arrest.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer Q's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer R was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned that Officer R had been convicted of DUII. Officer R was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer R's Application for Training and Subsequent Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer R's conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The CPC found Officer R's behavior violated the law based on the DUII conviction.

The CPC did not find any aggravating circumstances.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:

- Officer R completed treatment and took responsibility for their actions.
- Officer R currently serves as a volunteer fire fighter for two agencies.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer R's Application for Training was Approved.

Officer S was hired as a corrections officer and submitted an Application for Training. During a routine background check DPSST learned that Officer S had been convicted of Criminal Trespass in the Third Degree in the State of Arizona. It was determined that the Oregon equivalent crime is Criminal Trespass in the Second Degree. Officer S was notified that the case would be reviewed by the Corrections Policy Committee (CPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The CPC met and recommended to the Board not to deny Officer S's Application for Training and Subsequent Certification. The CPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer S's conduct involved Misconduct. The CPC found that Officer S's behavior did involve violated the law and was subsequently convicted of a crime.

The CPC found as aggravating circumstances:

- Officer S showed signs of being highly intoxicated and it was noted in the staff report the arresting officers gave Officer S many opportunities to avoid being arrested, which he did not take advantage of.

The CPC found as mitigating circumstances:

- Officer S's letter showed remorse and took responsibility for their actions. Officer S's letters of support from the agency to include the Sergeant and Undersheriff.
- Officer S was cooperative during the arrest process and has since stopped consuming alcohol and has focused on a healthy lifestyle.

The Board approved the recommendation of the CPC in a vote of 16 to 1.

Officer S' Application for Training was Approved.

Officer T resigned in lieu of termination as a police officer. It was determined that Officer T's conduct surrounding their resignation involved violation of the Moral Fitness Standard. Officer T was notified that a case would be reviewed by the Police Policy Committee (PPC) and was given an opportunity to provide mitigation. The PPC met and recommended revocation of Officer T's certifications to the Board. The PPC considered the following factors in making their recommendation:

- Officer T's conduct involved Misconduct and Gross Misconduct. The PPC found that Officer T violated practices and standards generally followed in the Oregon public safety profession when they failed to report an allegation of suspected child abuse until approximately 10 days after receiving the information.
- Officer T's conduct involved Disregard for the Rights of Others. The PPC found that Officer T failed to report an allegation of suspected child abuse until approximately 10 days after receiving the information. Officer T repeatedly failed to properly document and investigate crimes. Officer T's neglect of duties in the investigation of an elder abuse crime placed a vulnerable victim at risk of being further victimized. Additionally, after taking a DV call from a female victim where Officer T believed the male should be charged, Officer T failed to conduct follow-up or take any action which caused another deputy to continue the investigation for two days, although Officer T worked both days. Officer T's neglect of duties was further aggravated when the female victim told Officer T that the suspect commonly had intercourse with her against her will. Officer T's failure to investigate the rape claim and ensure timely follow-up increased the potential that yet another vulnerable victim could be further harmed.
- Officer T's conduct involved Misuse of Authority. The PPC found that Officer T created serious public safety issues for vulnerable victims. Officer T misused their authority by failing to follow agency policies and procedures related to child abuse cases. Officer T neglected their duties when dealing with an elder abuse case and a DV case where the victim told Officer T she was being forced to have sex against her will. Officer T has repeatedly failed to properly document and investigate crimes, therefore abusing public trust.
- Officer T's conduct involved Dishonesty. The PPC found that Officer T admitted to being untruthful when Officer T lied to a Corporal, Sergeant and internal affairs investigators regarding their communications with

a child abuse complainant. During an interview with investigators, Officer T claims, "I heard that the allegations were already made and being looked into." When asked who told Officer T that information, they claimed they were told by another deputy. Officer T also told investigators that in fact they did not have any factual knowledge that the allegation was being investigated and that their belief amounted to an assumption. Officer T claimed that they was told by another deputy that the allegations were being looked into was dishonest based on Officer T's own admission. Officer T claimed that they did not investigate the allegation because they were the lone deputy assigned during the shift, in addition to the Sergeant. The agency checked schedules and unit history and showed that Officer T was working with another deputy on each day and much of Officer T's activity during those days was not driven by responding to calls for service, but by self-initiated activity.

The PPC found as aggravating circumstances:

- Officer T tried to placing the blame on the agency when Officer T's issues were all related to the fundamental duties of a public safety professional, regardless of the agency.
- Officer T was offered remedial training but refused.
- Officer T's behavior was chronic and contributed to the erosion of public trust within the profession.

The PPC found no mitigating circumstances.

The Board approved the recommendation of the PPC. Officer T was issued a Notice of Intent to Revoke and Officer T requested a hearing. Prior to a hearing Officer T withdrew the request for a hearing which resulted in a Default revocation. Officer T's conduct ended their 20-year career.

Officer T's Basic and Intermediate Police certifications are Revoked.

Officer U resigned as a corrections officer in 2013. In 2016 DPSST was notified by the media of Officer U's arrest for First Degree Custodial Sexual Misconduct and Supplying Contraband related to their prior employment as a corrections officer. Officer U was convicted of First Degree Custodial Sexual Misconduct, a felony crime. Officer U was served with a Notice of Intent to Revoke and failed to request a hearing.

Officer U's Basic Corrections certification is Revoked.

PLEASE DISSEMINATE THIS INFORMATION TO ALL PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS

www.dpsst.state.or.us

503-378-2100

