



1999 N Amidon, Suite 350
Wichita, KS 67203

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

Doug Schroeder, Executive Director

Laura Kelly, Governor

Integrity Bulletin

Volume 14

July 2021

By way of introduction, I, Doug Schroeder, am thrilled to have recently been appointed the Executive Director of the Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training (KS-CPOST). After 20 years serving as a chief of police, I recognize the importance of well trained, capable and compassionate law enforcement officers in our communities. The Commission is here to serve chiefs, sheriffs and directors in the pursuit of excellence. As we work on plans to provide more agency outreach/education, I invite agency administrators to contact us with any questions, so that we can serve you to the best of our abilities.

The Commission has a mission to provide 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.

The Commission, a 12-member body appointed by the Governor, oversees law enforcement training in the State of Kansas. Among its many duties and responsibilities is that of approving the basic core training curriculum for all Kansas law enforcement and police officers and granting certification to all Kansas full and part-time officers who meet the prerequisites for certification.

The Commission may suspend, revoke, or deny the certification of a law enforcement officer who fails to meet the requirements of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Act or has met such requirements by falsifying documents or failing to disclose information required for certification.

The Integrity Bulletin is a compilation of cases that the Commission has adjudicated in the first half of 2021. It is openly provided to the public to demonstrate transparency and to law enforcement agency personnel, so that they are fully aware of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Act (KLETA) and Kansas Administrative Regulations that regulate officer certifications.

With excitement, I look forward to our joint efforts to progress Kansas law enforcement officers to the next level of professionalism.

Executive Director
Doug Schroeder
KS-CPOST

KSCPOST Statistics

	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020	FY2021
Central Registry:					
Demographic Forms Processed	1184	1294	1340	1155	1339
Number of Officers Certified	614	484	603	602	605*
Provisionals Licenses Issued	696	794	808	698	788
Status Change Forms Processed	1782	1631	1992	1616	1780
Agency Information Requests Received	484	500	518	441	416
Agency Requests Filled	475	518	514	467	424
KORA Requests Received	26	47	51	55	49
Investigations:					
Status Change Forms w/ Training Act Violation	78	87	111	79	89
Cases Presented to Investigative Committee	84	105	164	106	144
Number of Delinquent Officers	129	82	92	108	115
Extensions	52	73	50	54	29
Modifications & Waivers	12	9	10	2	*
Investigations	5	10	6	6	*
Certification Actions:	50	72	51	45	43
Complaints:	89	90	168	162	85

* Incomplete data

Case Summaries

Rumors circulated that an officer was having an affair with a non-certified agency employee. The officer's supervisor addressed the rumors with the officer, who denied the affair. Months later, the rumors continued to circulate, the officer's supervisor again addressed the rumors with him, and the officer again denied the affair.

Several years later, the officer made a complaint to his supervisor about the employee. The officer claimed that the employee was harassing him via text messages and harassing his family through social media. The officer indicated that he had been having the issues with the employee for years but did not want to get her in trouble. In an internal interview regarding the harassment complaint, the officer denied ever being romantically involved with the employee. The employee was interviewed regarding the officer's complaint against her. The employee stated that she had been in a sexual and romantic relationship with the married officer between 2008 and 2018. When interviewed a second time, the officer admitted that he had been involved in a sexual relationship with the employee. The officer was evasive and misleading throughout the second interview. The officer failed to cooperate with the Commission investigation by failing to submit to an interview.

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)(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.

In June 2019, an officer arrested an individual on an outstanding warrant. During a search incident to arrest, the officer found a baggie of suspected meth on the individual. The officer put the baggie in his own pants pocket. The officer obtained a search warrant for the individual's vehicle. Two other officers then conducted the search of the vehicle. Later, the officer asked the officers that conducted the search warrant to list the baggie that was found on the individual on the search warrant return for the vehicle. The first officer refused. The second officer completed the search warrant return to include the baggie based on the officer's claim that he located the baggie in the vehicle. One of the officers that conducted the search warrant returned it to the judge. Upon noticing that the baggie was listed on the return, the returning officer informed the judge that the baggie was not found during the search of the vehicle, drew a line through the entry on the warrant return, and initialed next to the strikethrough. However, during a Commission interview with the officer who was the subject of the investigation, the officer claimed that he returned the warrant to the judge after telling the other officer to strikethrough the entry. This statement was not supported by the evidence.

In October 2019, two individuals were arrested for a fight at a local bar. One individual was initially combative and placed in a holding cell. The individual's boss was allowed in the holding cell and successfully calmed the individual down. The officer, who had access to the jail cameras on his phone, noticed a civilian in the jail cell and went to the jail. The officer entered the cell with the individual and his boss. The officer shouted at the individual, stating, "you're not going to be drunk and stupid in my jail." The boss again calmed the individual down and he laid down on a bunk. The officer approached and used a pressure point then choke hold on the individual. The incident was captured on video without audio. At a hearing, several certified officers testified that they would not have used force in the same situation. During a Commission interview regarding the incident at the jail, the officer's statements were inconsistent with the video evidence, written reports, and witness accounts.

In August 2020, a licensed psychologist concluded that the officer is psychologically unfit for the responsibilities of a law enforcement officer.

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)(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), **providing false information in a Commission investigation to determine a person's continued suitability for law enforcement certification**, 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)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(7) **be free of any physical or mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety, and judgment.**

A previously certified individual was arrested for domestic battery and other criminal charges in district court in 1999. The individual was not working as a law enforcement officer at the time. The individual entered a diversion agreement on one count of domestic battery and one count of violation of a protective order in March 2000, thereby rendering him ineligible for law enforcement certification. However, the individual subsequently regained employment as an officer. When the individual once again found himself under investigation for domestic battery, the investigating agency discovered the prior DV conviction and notified the Commission.

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

The individual'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 seen leaving the agency fueling facility in his personal vehicle. The coworker who spotted the officer noticed that the gas pump showed twenty-one gallons of pumped fuel, but there was no corresponding entry in the handwritten log. Based on this situation, an agency internal investigation was opened regarding the officer's fuel receipts. The investigation revealed that the officer, while off-duty and wearing civilian clothing, washed his personally owned vehicle at a car wash. The officer charged the car wash to his agency credit card and completed paperwork indicating that it was for his agency patrol vehicle. On a separate occasion, the officer pumped fuel into his personally owned vehicle at a gas station using his agency credit card. At the time, the officer signed the receipt and noted that the fuel was used for his patrol vehicle. Based on the officer's actions, he was charged and convicted of theft in district court.

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), **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.**

An officer and his wife were discussing getting a divorce. The officer asked his wife to sit on the couch with him, but instead she stood up from her seat and tried to leave the room. The officer grabbed his wife from behind and prevented her from leaving, telling her he wanted to have sex. The wife was able to break free, but the officer grabbed her and restrained her a second time. The officer's wife recorded the encounter. On the recording, a physical struggle can be heard along with the officer's wife repeatedly telling him, "No" and that she did not want to have sex with him. The officer told his 5-year-old son to kick his wife in the vagina and offered his son candy if he did so.

The officer's certification was revoked by Consent Agreement and 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)(4)&(15), **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 restraint and contributing to a child's misconduct or deprivation.**

An agency received a complaint that a male officer, who was a supervisor, was having a sexual relationship with his subordinate officer, who was a female. The agency opened an internal investigation to determine if their "conflict of interest" policy had been violated. When interviewed, both officers denied that they were involved in a dating or sexual relationship. The female officer was also dishonest regarding her overnight stays at the male officer's home. Both officers were dishonest about an overnight hotel stay in a different town.

Both officers' certifications were 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.**

A police department received a call from a resident who had returned home and noticed damage to his residence walls. The homeowner located a bullet in one wall, and what appeared to be bullet holes in two other walls. An officer lived next to the homeowner. The investigating police department also located a bullet hole in the exterior of the officer's house. The bullet hole in the officer's house appeared to be an exit point, while the homeowner's bullet hole appeared to be an entry point. The officer's wife stated that she heard a loud bang at 5:00 pm on the day the bullet holes were discovered. However, the officer, who was in his home at the time getting ready for work, told the investigating agency

that he did not hear anything. The homeowner reviewed his front door video camera and noticed that the officer had come to his home twice and knocked on the door after 5:00 pm when the bang was heard.

When the officer arrived at work that evening, he sold a rifle to another officer, the caliber of which was consistent with the size and velocity of the wall damage to both homes. The officer's employing agency became aware that the officer's house had been shot and was concerned about whether this was targeted at him as a police officer. The employing agency spoke with the officer and the investigating agency. The employing agency discovered that the officer's account of the situation was not consistent with what he told the investigating agency. Due to these inconsistencies, the employing agency opened an internal investigation and interviewed the officer. When confronted with the inconsistencies between his account to the employing agency and the investigating agency, the physical evidence, and inconsistent statements within the internal investigation, the officer abruptly resigned. The officer attended a scheduled interview with a Commission Investigator but refused to discuss the shooting or the inconsistencies in his accounts of the shooting. The officer stated he understood that his failure to cooperate in the Commission investigation could impact his certification and stated that he was willing to let his certification go.

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.**

An agency chief asked an officer to prepare a photo lineup and show it to a witness in an ongoing criminal investigation. The chief provided the officer with a printed DL photo to use in the lineup. The officer contacted the witness and requested that he appear at the station to view the lineup. In his written report, the officer stated that he showed the witness a copy of the photograph and the witness immediately said, "That's him." Several days later, the chief asked the officer if a lineup was used during the ID process. The officer stated that he did not remember being told to use a lineup, only to show the victim the DL picture he received from the chief. The chief reminded the officer that a lineup was necessary, where the lineup creation program was located, and how to receive assistance with the program, if necessary. After this conversation, the officer informed the chief that he remembered speaking to him about using a lineup, but that he was dealing with family issues and was not paying attention as he should have been. The officer then stated that when the witness entered the building, the door between the front entrance and the officers' room was open and that while standing in the doorway, the witness immediately saw the photograph on the officer's computer monitor. The officer's account led the chief to believe that the officer intended to take the witness to the interview room to show him a lineup but did not because the witness inadvertently saw the suspect photo on the officer's computer monitor.

At a subsequent meeting, the officer told his fellow officers to be certain the door to the officers' room was closed. The officer repeated his claim that the witness had seen the suspect photo on his computer from the doorway because the door was open. The chief reviewed video footage covering the main hallway and the officers' room from the day of the incident. The footage showed that the officer and the witness entered the main entrance and walked straight to the officer's desk as the witness followed. The officer handed the witness a piece of paper, which the witness bent over and signed. At no time did the witness pause in the doorway to the officers' room. The chief contacted the witness to ask what occurred during the photo ID. The witness stated that the officer led him to the officer's desk, that he looked at a photo image on the screen and was also handed a paper with the same person on it. The witness recognized the individual in the photo as one of his attackers. Based on the discrepancies with the officer's statement and the other evidence, the agency opened an internal investigation. During an interview, the officer stated that he did not have much experience with photo lineups and became frustrated. The officer admits he should have shown the witness six photos but only showed him one. The officer admitted, "My story kept bouncing all over the place."

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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)(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 responded to a busy intersection due to reports of a large number of motorcyclists who were committing traffic infractions, driving recklessly, and evading law enforcement. As the officer was driving southbound in the northbound lane, he accelerated toward a motorcycle that was stopped in the turn lane. The motorcycle driver turned to the right and attempted to accelerate around the officer. The officer struck the back of the motorcycle with his patrol car, causing the motorcycle to go down. The driver was thrown from the motorcycle and rolled into the ditch, got up and ran from the officer, then hopped on the back of another motorcycle. The officer chased this motorcycle on foot and unholstered his taser but did not get close enough to deploy it before the motorcycle fled. Shortly thereafter, the officer ran toward another motorcycle driving past and deployed his taser on the driver. The driver filed a complaint with the officer's agency, concerned he could have been seriously injured or killed by the taser deployment while he was operating the motorcycle. As motorcycles continued to drive by, the officer ran after several. He attempted to grab a rider off a motorcycle as it drove by. A witness stopped in traffic at the intersection called dispatch to complain about the officer's actions. The witness felt that he and his child were in danger in their vehicle due to the officer's actions toward the motorcycles.

The officer's certification was suspended for a period of one year by Summary Order of Suspension for violation of 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.**

An officer, who was the agency head, had a close, personal relationship with a female. The female was pulled over on suspicion of DUI. During the vehicle stop, the female called the officer with whom she had the relationship and handed the phone to the investigating officer. The agency head attempted to persuade the investigating officer to discontinue the investigation, allow him to pick the female up from the scene, and remove her without an arrest. The investigating officer declined the agency head's request and ultimately arrested the female for DUI. As the investigating officer transported the female to jail, the agency head again contacted him through his supervisor and attempted to persuade him to abandon the arrest of the female.

An administrative hearing was scheduled regarding the female's driver's license. The agency head contacted several of the investigating officer's supervisors and attempted to obtain their assistance in persuading the investigating officer not to attend or testify at the administrative hearing. Based on his conduct, the agency head was ousted from public office through a court proceeding.

The officer's certification was reprimanded by Summary Order of Reprimand for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(35) & (39), **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 and intimidation of a witness or victim.**

An agency head received complaints about an officer's Facebook activity. An article about a homicide in Africa was posted on Facebook with a photo of three African men. The officer posted the comment, "That's what low IQ animals do." Another Facebook user replied, "Shut the fuck up pig." The officer tagged that user and wrote, "Do you wanna play? I got some 55gr over 223 cfe powder just dying to get out of their magazines!" The individual who was tagged considered this a threat and was in fear for her life as a result. The Facebook messages were subsequently removed.

The agency head phoned the officer, inquiring about the Facebook post. The officer stated that someone had hacked his Facebook account and posted the comments. He indicated that he thought about deleting the whole account. The officer was directed to report to the office for further discussion. When asked why he would post such comments, the officer

stated that he was drinking with an old Army buddy and became upset. The officer was confronted about lying when he previously stated that his Facebook account was hacked. The officer replied that his account was hacked but admitted to posting the comments in question when pressed further. Because the comments contained a threat involving a weapon, the officer was required to turn in his duty sidearm and long guns. The long guns consisted of a shotgun and AR15 rifle that fire 55gr 223.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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)(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 agency opened an investigation on an officer after several incidents and complaints regarding his conduct. The investigation focused on dishonest statements from the officer to his supervisors. In addition to other minor allegations of untruthfulness, these included an incident in which the officer spoke to a superior officer about bonding his girlfriend out of jail; a situation in which the officer was dishonest about the time and location of his uncle's funeral when attempting to trade shifts; a traffic stop involving a possible DUI; and an investigation into whether the officer offered money for explicit photos or sex to two separate adult females. The investigation revealed that the officer was dishonest in the internal investigation. After separating from employment with the agency, the officer began illegally using methamphetamine.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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)(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)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(5) **Unprofessional Conduct, using any controlled substance that is unlawful to possess.**

An agency held an employee counseling session with an officer regarding his work productivity and time management. During the session, the officer disclosed that he had falsified timesheets by billing time for investigations that he had not worked. In total, the officer falsely reported between 100 and 152.5 hours on his timesheet for work he did not complete. The total loss for hours the officer submitted but did not work was between \$2,100 and \$3,225.

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), **engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime under the laws of this state or a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e., making false information and theft.**

Two witnesses called 911 to report seeing two suspects shoot into a house and then leave in a truck. An officer was dispatched to the vicinity for a shots-fired call and was contacted by the witnesses. The witnesses told the officer that they observed shell casings in the street and near the driveway directly in front of the house. They also observed a set of car keys in the middle of the road where the shooters had been standing. One of the witnesses gave the keys to the officer. The officer cleared the call as unfounded approximately ten minutes after arriving and did not log any of the evidence identified by the witnesses in the property room.

A detective with the agency was subsequently investigating a homicide in the same area and discovered the 911 call in which the witnesses relayed the information about finding shell casings and keys after observing a shooting. After learning that these items were not logged or recorded, the agency opened an investigation. The officer was interviewed about the shots-fired call. The officer stated that one of the witnesses had a set of keys in hand but never gave them to him. The officer also stated that he searched for shell casings on foot and did not locate any. After further investigation, the officer was interviewed a second time. After being confronted about his honesty in the previous interview, the officer

acknowledged that the witness handed him car keys and he later placed them in his patrol vehicle. He stated that he intended to complete a found property report for the keys but could not locate them. The officer stated that he observed shell casings in the street but decided they looked old and decided not to collect them. He admitted that he was dishonest in his first interview.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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)(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 asked his supervisor if he could have a ride-along. The supervisor explained that the officer would be required to complete a ride-along form and receive prior approval from the commanding officer. The supervisor also informed the officer that the ride-along was unlikely to be approved as the officer was newly hired with that agency and still a probationary employee. The officer never completed the ride-along paperwork. A week or two after the officer's inquiry, the supervisor responded to a call to assist the officer. The supervisor observed an unknown female in the officer's patrol vehicle. When questioned about the female, the officer stated that she was his girlfriend. The supervisor sternly instructed the officer that he could not have a ride-along and the officer stated that he understood.

About a month later, the officer was on-duty and sitting in his patrol vehicle on the side of the road when a pickup passed him. The officer pulled onto the road and accelerated after the pickup to conduct a traffic stop for an equipment violation. After the pickup failed to pull over, the officer chased the vehicle but ultimately lost sight of it and discontinued the chase. A supervisory review of the officer's vehicle pursuit was conducted. A supervisor reviewed the video footage and suspected that someone was in the vehicle with the officer during the pursuit, as another voice could be heard on the video. When questioned, the officer told his supervisor that he was on the phone with his girlfriend at the time of the pursuit and denied having a ride-along. A supervisor reviewed video footage of another traffic stop conducted by the officer just prior to the pursuit. During that traffic stop, a female voice can again be overheard in the background. The officer can be heard telling a backing officer from another agency, "That's my girlfriend." The officer was again questioned about whether someone was in the vehicle at the time of the pursuit. The officer again denied having anyone in the vehicle. When confronted with the evidence of his dishonesty, the officer admitted that he had been dishonest and that his girlfriend was with him at the time of the pursuit.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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)(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 agency received multiple complaints about an officer's conduct toward female coworkers. These complaints included allegations of nonconsensual physical contact and inappropriate and harassing comments. An investigation was opened and revealed multiple instances in which respondent made inappropriate sexual comments to females he worked with. The investigation also revealed that the officer touched a female coworker, without her consent, by grabbing her breasts on one occasion and putting his hands down her pants on another. When interviewed about his behavior, the officer admitted to making some of the inappropriate comments and to rubbing a coworker's buttocks under her pants. The officer acted confused, indicated he did not understand why some of his actions were wrong, failed to take accountability, and blamed the female victims. The officer failed to cooperate with the Commission investigation into his behavior.

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**, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(12), **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., sexual battery.**

An officer argued with his son. The officer grabbed his son by the shirt and pushed him toward the wall. The officer then placed his hand on his son's neck and applied pressure. Responding officers noticed injuries on the son's neck and throat area. The officer was convicted of two counts of battery and one count of criminal restraint.

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)(4) & (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., criminal restraint and battery.**

An officer was convicted of aggravated domestic battery, criminal threat, and aggravated endangerment of a child, all felonies.

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 was convicted of two counts of rape, two counts of aggravated criminal sodomy, and one count of sexual exploitation of a child. Each of these are felony crimes.

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's spouse informed him that she wanted a divorce and the two argued. The officer pointed his handgun at his spouse and threatened to kill her. The officer entered a diversion for aggravated assault and criminal threat, both felonies.

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 entered a diversion agreement on one count of domestic battery.

The officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation 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), **misdemeanor crime of domestic violence.**

In January 2018, an officer's certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation. The individual did not file a request for a hearing and the revocation became final. In November 2020, the individual filed a petition for reinstatement of his certification. Pursuant to K.S.A. 74-5622(b)(1), a person may file for certification reinstatement after the expiration of five years from the effective date of the revocation. In this case, the individual is not eligible to petition for reinstatement until January 2023. Therefore, the petition for reinstatement was dismissed because it was filed prematurely.

In unrelated cases, two individuals whose law enforcement certifications were previously revoked petitioned for reinstatement. After separate hearings on the petitions, the Hearing Panel determined that neither individual had demonstrated sufficient rehabilitation to warrant the public trust and denied the petitions for reinstatement.

In unrelated cases, two officers were suspended for failing a psychological fitness for duty evaluation. One of the officers was subsequently found fit for duty by a Commission approved psychologist and the suspension was lifted.

The officers' certifications were suspended under K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(7) **be free of any physical or mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety, and judgment.**

In three unrelated cases, concerns were presented regarding an officer's psychological fitness for duty. The officers failed to participate in an evaluation, requested and paid for by the Commission, to determine their fitness for duty.

Two officers' certifications were suspended and one officer's certification was revoked under K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(7) **be free of any physical or mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety, and judgment,** and 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.**

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

Bruce Mellor, Investigator

bmellor@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