



1999 N Amidon, Suite 350
Wichita, KS 67203

Doug Schroeder, Executive Director

Phone: (316) 832-9906
Fax: (316) 832-9679
Email: dschroeder@kscpost.org
www.kscpost.org

Laura Kelly, Governor

Integrity Bulletin

Volume 16

August 2022

The Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training (KSCPOST) is committed to providing the citizens of Kansas with qualified, trained, ethical, competent, and professional peace officers. It is also dedicated to adopting and enforcing professional standards for certification of peace officers to promote public safety and preserve public trust and confidence.

Anyone reading this Integrity Bulletin will recognize that KSCPOST is active in monitoring the actions of Kansas law enforcement and pursuing certification actions in appropriate cases. Kansas law enforcement officers should review and be thoroughly aware of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Act (K.S.A. 74-5601 et seq.) and Kansas Administrative Regulations (K.A.R 106) that regulate officer certifications. Both are available on our website.

If you have not subscribed to receive KSCPOST updates to include future Integrity Bulletins and monthly "Spotlight" topics, as well as other valuable information, please do so via our website. To promote transparency, subscribing to our updates is open to law enforcement and the citizens we serve. We suggest posting this bulletin and monthly spotlights in agencies so that other nonsubscribers can read.

Topics examined to date:

- January 2022 – Updated demographic and employment forms
- February 2022 – Anatomy of a POST investigation
- March 2022 – The POST approach to officer mental health and "Fit for Duty"
- April 2022 – KSCPOST as an agency resource for applicant background checks
- May 2022 – Part-time officers and auxiliary personnel
- June 2022 – Annual 40 hours of law enforcement education or training
- July 2022 – Self-Report Form, Administrative Regulation 106-2-2b
- August 2022 – Fiscal Year / Training Year in Review

Case Summaries

Certification actions that became final between January 2022 and July 2022

CPOST investigations were opened on two unrelated officers who failed to complete their annual in-service training. CPOST investigators contacted the officers on numerous occasions, but neither submitted an extension request or completed their in-service training hours in a timely manner.

"INTEGRITAS AC VERITATIIS DEFENSORES"

The certifications of both officers were reprimanded by Summary Order of Reprimand for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(4), K.S.A. 74-5607a **every full-time police officer or law enforcement officer shall complete annually 40 hours of law enforcement education or training.**

An officer was driving an unmarked vehicle and working in plain clothes. The officer observed a vehicle and believed the driver had an active warrant. The officer followed the vehicle to the driver's residence. As the driver approached his house, the officer approached the driver, stated he had a warrant, and told the driver to put his hands behind his back. The officer claimed that the driver "cocked back and I thought he was going to hit me, so I socked him in the face twice." The two wrestled and the officer was eventually able to handcuff the driver.

The officer claimed that he verbally identified himself as police on first contact with the driver, but the driver stated he was confused about the officer's identity and why he was being contacted on private property. After taking the driver into custody, the officer searched the passenger, who had taken a video of the incident between the officer and the driver. The officer found the video on the passenger's phone, deleted it, then pulled up the trash folder and deleted the video permanently. When asked why he deleted the video, the officer stated that it "did not look good...." The officer was criminally charged and convicted of interference with law enforcement.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(35), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., interference with law enforcement.**

An officer was assigned to perform weekly tests on the agency's Intoxilyzer. After a defense attorney requested paperwork regarding the Intoxilyzer, the agency discovered that the weekly calibration check had not been performed and was unable to locate several weeks' worth of reports. The agency opened an investigation and contacted the KDHE, whose records indicated that the weekly Intoxilyzer testing had not been completed for over three months. However, the officer had emailed the KDHE stating that the calibrations had not been logged but that they had been completed monthly. The officer also falsified Intoxilyzer log calibration check entries on two occasions. Multiple DUI cases were dismissed due to the officer's failure to perform the required checks, her dishonesty about what was performed, and the falsified log entries.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), **engaged in conduct which, whether charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime under the laws of this state, i.e., making false information.**

An individual entered a police agency and stated that he had drowned his child in a pond. An officer reported to the pond and located the infant, who was initially non-responsive. The officer began administering first aid to the infant while waiting for EMS to arrive.

The officer returned to the agency and immediately walked up to the suspect, who was handcuffed behind his back and sitting in a chair. The officer grabbed the suspect out of the chair, threw him to the ground, got on top of him, and began screaming at him while striking him in the face with a closed fist. The officer was eventually pulled off the suspect and left the area, indicating that he was quitting because he crossed the line. The suspect sustained injuries to his face that included a laceration and bruising. The officer was criminally charged and convicted in federal court for violation of 18

U.S.C. 242, that is, while acting under color of law, willfully depriving an individual of the right to be free from unreasonable seizure, which includes the right to be free from the unreasonable use of force by one acting under the color of law.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3), **felony conviction**.

An officer met a female on a traffic stop. Later that year, the officer arrested the female, who eventually provided information that aided in criminal investigations. In exchange, some of the female's pending criminal charges were dismissed at the request of the officer. The officer sent the female a friend request through Facebook and the two exchanged extensive messages over the next several months. During this time, the female had an active warrant. The officer was heard commenting that he did not want the female picked up on her warrant. The agency received a tip from a caller, who wished to remain anonymous, regarding the female's location. The officer's coworkers thought the officer warned the female that officers were on their way and disclosed the identity of the anonymous caller. The female texted the person who called in the tip and stated she knew about the call.

An investigation was initiated, and the female was interviewed. She stated that the officer had notified her that the police were on the way to arrest her. The officer then picked her up in his patrol vehicle and drove her away so that she would not be arrested. The officer's last contact with the female occurred several days later when he notified her that he was going to get in trouble for talking with her and asked her not to cooperate with the investigation. GPS records and Facebook messages corroborated the female's statement. The officer was criminally charged and ultimately convicted on one count of Official Misconduct pursuant to a plea agreement.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(45)&(40), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., official misconduct and obstructing apprehension or prosecution**.

A mother and her 7-year-old child went to a police agency to report that the child's uncle had touched her on her genitalia. An officer, who knew the child and was friendly with her uncle, took the report. The case was referred to a different investigator and the officer was directed not to discuss the investigation with the child's uncle or his family. After the child met with a different investigator, the officer asked what the child disclosed and was given a very specific detail regarding a wooden spoon. A few days later, the officer contacted the assigned investigator and stated that he had spoken to the uncle's parents, who attempted to provide an alternate explanation regarding the wooden spoon. The officer also stated that the uncle denied touching the child and offered to take a polygraph. The investigator was concerned that the officer had disclosed information to the uncle that could discredit the child's account. An internal investigation was opened.

During the investigation, the officer denied knowing anything about the wooden spoon in two different interviews. The officer denied speaking to the uncle's family about the case. After being interviewed, the officer later contacted his supervisors and confessed that he knew about the spoon all along and admitted that he lied in the interview.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification**.

A law enforcement agency was investigating a human trafficking case in which a 17-year-old female was taken into protective custody and an individual was arrested for paying to have sex with her. A search warrant was executed on the juvenile's phone and revealed concerning messages between her and an officer. When the female was 16 years old, the officer sent her a message requesting her to send him nude photos. The officer also sent the female messages attempting to arrange for them to meet and encouraging her to sneak out and meet with him in defiance of the girl's mother. The officer cooperated with a search warrant of his phone but invoked his right to an attorney and would not speak to criminal investigators about his relationship with the juvenile female. The officer refused to cooperate with an internal investigation conducted by his employing agency and was terminated from his employment. The juvenile was uncooperative with both the criminal investigation and the internal investigation conducted by the officer's employing agency.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification.**

An officer initiated a traffic stop and arrested a suspect, who exercised passive resistance while being handcuffed. The officer's use of force during the arrest appeared appropriate under the circumstances, although he could be heard on body camera calling the suspect a "dick weed." While booking the suspect into jail, the officer shoved the suspect in the chest, causing him to fall. The officer then yanked the suspect off the ground and placed him on a bench. The suspect reported to jail staff that the officer hurt his back during the arrest and complained about the officer's use of force. The officer's employing agency investigated and concluded that the officer's actions violated their policies regarding use of force and standards of conduct.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(f) **Unprofessional Conduct, using excessive physical force in carrying out a law enforcement objective**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification.**

An agency discovered that department photos and videos were being shared on Snapchat and opened an investigation. The officer who appeared to be posting most of the videos was interviewed. The officer denied recording any department video onto his phone and stated that he could not remember recording, copying, or disseminating body camera footage or recording department video footage and posting it on social media. After information was received that contradicted the officer's statements, he was interviewed again. The officer then stated that he only recalled two incidents where he sent video footage on Snapchat. The officer stated that his coworkers were lying if they said he sent out more than those two videos. However, the officer then admitted that he also sent pictures of evidence on Snapchat. The officer was called back for a third interview and possibly a polygraph exam. The officer then admitted to more instances of posting department video and "a lot" more instances of posting department photos on social media. He admitted to using his personal cell to record department video that he would then share on Snapchat. The officer admitted that in the first two interviews he believed he would be fired if the agency became aware of the full extent of his posting activities on social media. In both the agency and CPOST interviews, the officer dodged questions, often indicating that he could not recall information that he later described in great detail.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication.**

An officer, who was the head of a law enforcement agency, had control of public money by virtue of his official position and used that money in a manner not authorized by law. For example, the officer took \$100 from the commissary fund and gave it to his daughter. On other occasions, the officer used money from the commissary funds to pay for meals for his family. The officer also used agency vehicles to pick up groceries, transport his children, and drive to his personal land. The officer entered into a Consent Judgment for violations of the Kansas False Claims Act and agreed to the revocation of his law enforcement certification.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(45)&(46), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., official misconduct and misuse of public funds.**

An agency investigated a drug overdose in which the female subject survived. The female's cell phone was seized as evidence. The female told the agency that she needed her phone back as it contained messages from an officer, who was employed by the agency, that would hurt him professionally and personally. The agency opened an investigation, which revealed approximately 2,100 messages between the female and the officer. The messages included terms of endearment and suggested the possibility of a physical relationship between the two. The female was interviewed and stated that she met the officer when he arrested her. The officer admitted to exchanging flirtatious messages with the female but denied their relationship was ever physical. When a polygraph exam was requested, the officer refused the polygraph and resigned his position. After his resignation, the agency discovered sexually explicit videos on the female's phone that appeared to be of the officer.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification.**

Agency supervisors met with an officer to implement a Performance Improvement Plan. The supervisors asked to review the officer's Police Training Program Journal and the officer stated that he left it at home. When asked if his journal entries were current, the officer confirmed that they were. The officer was told that if his journal was not current, he needed to be honest. The officer again claimed that his journal was current. At the conclusion of the meeting, the officer was directed to go home to retrieve his journal. Shortly thereafter, the officer returned to inform his supervisors that he had not been truthful and had not completed several weeks' worth of journal entries.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication.**

An officer was at a party in the early morning after consuming multiple alcoholic beverages. The officer called several individuals at the gathering a "piece of shit". The officer was told to leave, and a physical altercation ensued. The officer was driven away by his daughter but walked back and continued to verbally engage with the other guests. During the CPOST interview, the officer stated that he got "pissed off", should have known better, and that once he was hit, he was

disorderly. The officer was criminally charged with Disorderly Conduct. He entered into, and successfully completed, a diversion agreement.

After a hearing before the Commission Hearing Panel, the officer's certification was revoked for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(50), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., disorderly conduct.**

A convenience store employee notified an agency that an officer had poked her upper torso without permission, which was captured on surveillance video. The employee did not want to press charges but felt uncomfortable and wanted the officer to leave her alone. The agency also had concerns about the officer's account of a vehicle crash when compared with body camera video and other officer statements. The officer was interviewed about both incidents. The officer denied touching or even speaking with the convenience store employee, stating, "this is bullshit, she's a fucking liar" and "that bitch is a liar." The officer was terminated and told to return his agency property. The officer emailed the agency, "Well unless you have something proving I have all of the police stuff.... Good luck getting it back." He also claimed that he did not have to give his police property back. The officer ultimately returned the agency property.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(28), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., criminal deprivation of property.**

An officer's supervisor received complaints that the officer was not showing up for work and that tools needed for work were missing. The supervisor also noticed a reduction in productivity and discovered a fuel receipt that was signed by the officer for a day he took sick leave. An investigation was opened and revealed that the officer regularly used agency vehicles and equipment for personal use; used subordinate employees to perform labor on personal tasks; took agency property home, causing other employees to purchase new tools to complete official assignments; damaged an agency vehicle while towing his personal camper and used the agency credit card to pay for the repair; and used the agency credit card to buy fuel for his personal vehicles and for agency vehicles used for personal matters.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(26)&(45), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., theft and official misconduct.**

An officer was supposed to complete personal service on a subpoena. Instead of serving the named recipient, the officer served the daughter of the subpoenaed individual. The officer certified on the subpoena that he had completed personal service on the intended recipient. The officer was aware that serving the subpoenaed individual's daughter was improper service. The officer claimed that the subpoenaed person was on the phone at the time and accepted service through his daughter. However, the subpoenaed individual denied that he did so, stated that he would not honor the subpoena due to improper service, and filed a complaint with the officer's agency. The agency had questioned the officer's credibility in the past due to inconsistencies between his reports and video footage in multiple DUI investigations.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) **Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication.**

An officer was in a physical altercation with his female significant other. Several days later, the officer went to the female's home at 1:00 am, banged on her door, and called her names. When she would not answer, the officer continually called her phone. The female went to the officer's home a few days later while he was having a party. The female was in a physical altercation with another individual whom she suspected was involved with the officer. The female was arrested. The officer found the female's phone in his yard after she was arrested. The officer knew the phone passcode and accessed it. The officer took photos of messages on the female's phone and showed them to another person. The investigation also revealed that the officer had on-duty sex with the female in public places. During an off-duty sexual encounter, the officer used his police access code to enter the city zoo and engaged in sex with the female on a piece of play equipment.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(29)(47)&(51), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., criminal trespass, breach of privacy, and harassment by telecommunication device.**

Between January 2019 and June 2021, an officer was in three separate dating relationships with three different women. The first woman reported that while dating the officer, the two were in an argument and he would not let her leave his apartment. The woman tried to run away from the officer and hid in his bathroom. The officer would not let the woman leave the bathroom. He grabbed her and threw her on the floor, causing visible injuries. On a separate occasion, the two argued and the woman left the officer's home. The officer showed up at the woman's home and gained entry despite her attempts to stop him. The officer shoved the woman onto her bed, causing her to fall and strike her leg.

The second woman reported that the officer became upset with her when she did not want to have sex. The woman retreated to another room and locked the door. The officer forced the door open and pushed the woman into a wall, not letting her move. While attempting to get away, the woman received a cut and went to the bathroom. The officer would not let her leave the bathroom for an extended period.

The third woman reported that the officer became upset that she was at her apartment swimming pool with other males. The officer yelled at the woman, would not let her leave his apartment, and threw his cell phone at her, striking her in the arm. During the next two days, the officer cornered the woman in the parking lot of her building, restricted her access to her vehicle until she agreed to talk with him later, tried to push her into her apartment, and confronted her at her place of work, yelling and cursing at her as she left the building after her shift.

The officer was criminally charged and ultimately convicted of one count of domestic battery and two counts of assault, pursuant to a plea agreement.

The officer's certification was revoked for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) **not have been convicted of a crime that would constitute a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(5), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., assault.**

An officer arrested a young female for DUI. The officer obtained the female's phone number during the DUI investigation. Shortly after the female was arrested and released, the officer began contacting her by phone and social media. The officer's messages made the female uneasy. She was worried about how to end her interaction with the officer as she did

not want to negatively impact her DUI case. The officer sent the female messages of a sexual nature and suggested getting a hotel room and liquor, despite having recently arrested the female for an alcohol-related offense.

Months later, the officer was in a physical altercation with his wife. Law enforcement was contacted when the wife sought medical treatment.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(h) **Unprofessional Conduct, exploiting or misusing the position as an officer to establish or attempt to establish a financial, social, sexual, romantic, physical, intimate, or emotional relationship**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification.**

An officer's 12-year-old son had a conflict with another family member and left the house on foot. The officer got in his vehicle and drove to find his son. Once located, the officer grabbed his son and put him against the vehicle. The officer held his son against the vehicle and picked him up by his head and shoulders. The officer lifted his son off the ground and threw him into the passenger side of the vehicle. The officer was "very mad" at the time and caused visible injury to his son. The officer was criminally charged and ultimately convicted of one count of battery, classified as a domestic violence offense, pursuant to a plea agreement.

The officer's certification was revoked for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(6), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., battery.**

An officer was intoxicated and involved in a physical altercation with his wife, resulting in her elbow being dislocated and possibly fractured. The incident was criminally investigated. Although criminal prosecution was not pursued, the officer admitted to at least five incidents where he hit his wife with an open hand to the head. The officer stated that the incidents occurred when he was drunk and that he gets violent after drinking whiskey or shots.

An interview with CPOST was necessary to determine the officer's continued suitability for law enforcement certification. The officer failed to submit to an interview and therefore failed to cooperate with the CPOST investigation.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), **failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification.**

An officer was involved in an altercation with his female significant other. The female called 911 and reported that the officer had hit her on the face and grabbed her arm. The female had discoloration and swelling on her face and red marks on her arm. The officer had marks on his hand where the female reported she grabbed him to get him off her. The officer denied having physical contact with the female but could not explain how she received the marks. The officer's account of the incident changed multiple times during the investigation. The officer entered a diversion agreement on one count of domestic battery.

A domestic battery conviction, for purposes of law enforcement certification, includes a diversion, deferred judgment, or expungement.

The officer's certification was revoked for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) **not have been convicted of a crime that would constitute a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.**

An officer was criminally investigated, mostly for allegations concerning his conduct toward his female significant other. The investigation included allegations that the officer had placed the female in fear of bodily harm with the use of a gun, had choked her, had pushed or hit her on multiple occasions, and had threatened her. The officer was also reported to have thrown and kicked a dog. The officer was criminally charged and ultimately convicted of one count of aggravated domestic battery, pursuant to a plea agreement.

The officer's certification was revoked for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), **Good Moral Character**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) **not have been convicted of a crime that would constitute a felony or a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.**

End

KSCPOST Staff

Doug Schroeder, Executive Director

dschroeder@kscpost.org

Michelle R. Meier, Legal Counsel

mmeier@kscpost.org

Matt Deffner, Central Registrar

mdeffner@kscpost.org

Eva Smith, Assistant Central Registrar

esmith@kscpost.org

Michael Oliver, Investigator

moliver@kscpost.org

Richard Powell, Investigator

rpowell@kscpost.org

George Brown, Investigator

gbrown@kscpost.org

Rose Ann Kelley, Sr. Administrative Assistant

rkelly@kscpost.org

Address

KSCPOST
1999 N. Amidon Suite #350
Wichita, KS 67203-2180

Phone

Office: 316-832-9906
Fax: 316-832-9679

Website

www.kscpost.org