



AZ POST

INTEGRITY BULLETIN

Volume No. 107

April – June 2024



The Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board (AZ POST) is mandated by the legislature to establish and enforce the physical, mental, and moral fitness standards, for all peace officers, in the state. The Board meets the charge to protect the public by overseeing the integrity of Arizona's law enforcement officers by reviewing cases and taking action against the certification of individuals who violate the AZ POST Rules. The following is a summary of the actions taken by the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board at its April, May and June public meetings. Each action is considered on its own facts and circumstances.

The Board publishes this bulletin to provide insight into the Board's position on various types of officer misconduct. As always, the Compliance Specialist for your agency is available to discuss any matter and to assist you with any questions you might have.

REVOCATIONS:

None for this quarter.

SUSPENSIONS:

Case 2023-239. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for an eighteen month (18) suspension. On three occasions, the officer had sex while wearing a patrol or training uniform and while on duty. On two occasions the sexual misconduct occurred in a marked patrol vehicle.

Case 2023-225. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for an eighteen month (18) suspension. The officer impact-pushed an individual, knocking him to the ground. The individual was a resident from a nearby house who walked up to his patrol car and wanted to know why the police were in front of his house.

Case 2022-225. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for a twenty four month (24) suspension. The deputy had discharged a department issued rifle at a vehicle when there was no viable threat to engage.

Case 2024-125. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for an eighteen month (18) suspension. The officer, while off duty, drove his personal vehicle into a highway median, where his vehicle rolled. The officer drove impaired with a BAC of .167.

Case 2023-236. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for a forty hour (40) suspension. The officer, while off duty, engaged in a verbal confrontation with two individuals.

DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION:

Case 2023-082. The Board accepted an administrative law judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law and permanently denied peace officer certification. The recruit was dishonest to academy staff.

Case 2023-234. The Board accepted a proposed consent agreement for a twenty four month (24) denial of certification, after which date, the recruit may be eligible to reapply. The recruit was dishonest in the completion of a homework assignment.

VOLUNTARY RELINQUISHMENTS:

Respondents, without admitting any allegations made against them, permanently relinquished their Arizona peace officer certifications. The Board accepted the voluntary relinquishments/denials of peace officer certification for the following cases:

2023-186	2023-237	2024-101	2024-118
2024-029	2024-012	2023-215	2024-129
2024-046	2024-056	2023-216	2024-150
2024-066	2024-069	2024-007	
2024-067	2024-073	2024-065	
2024-068	2024-087	2024-089	

NO ACTIONS:

The Board voted to close out the following cases without initiating a Complaint for disciplinary action. This is neither a finding that no misconduct occurred nor a comment that the Board condones the conduct. The Board may choose not to initiate a Complaint in a case even though there is misconduct if, considering all the circumstances, including agency discipline, the conduct does not rise to the level requiring a formal administrative proceeding. In many of these cases, the Board makes a statement that the conduct is an important consideration for a future hiring agency. By not taking disciplinary action, the Board leaves the matter to the discretion of an agency head who may choose to consider the officer for appointment. The Board relies on and enforces the statutory requirement of A.R.S. §41-1828.01 that agencies share information about misconduct with each other, even in cases where the Board has chosen not to take additional independent disciplinary action. Additionally, in some of these cases, further information is necessary before a charging decision can be properly made.

Case 2023-145. At final action, the Board adopted the findings of fact and conclusions of law and voted to take no action, but with agency discretion.