

INTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVESTIGATION

2009TOL-007

IMPORTANT

RETURN TO INTERNAL
AFFAIRS PERSONNEL
AFTER EACH REVIEW
FOR PROPER TRACKING

Professional Standards Bureau Investigation

2009IA-035



Subject Employee:

Deputy Steve Vasquez #481

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT SACRAMENTO COUNTY



Sergeant Todd Thiessen #196
Professional Standards Bureau
Email: tthiessen@sacsheriff.com

JOHN P. MCGINNESS, Sheriff

520 9TH STREET, ROOM 202 · SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
Office (916) 874-8292 · **PC 832 7 (b)(5)(B)** · Fax (916) 874-8635



COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Final Order of Discipline

JOHN P. MCGINNESS

Sheriff

TO: DEPUTY SHERIFF STEVE VASQUEZ

AND TO: Sacramento County Board of Labor Relations

FROM: JOHN MCGINNESS, SHERIFF

Subject: DISCIPLINARY ACTION – TERMINATION

A copy of a Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action was served on you. In the Notice you were advised a recommendation had been made that you be terminated from your position as Deputy Sheriff with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. At your request, Undersheriff Iwasa conducted a *Skelly* review and sustained the allegation(s) against you. He recommended termination. I have, therefore, considered the matters set forth in the Notice and have decided that you should be terminated.

THEREFORE, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that you are terminated from your position as Deputy Sheriff with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department.

This action is being taken against you for cause (Agreement Between the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association Section(s)

18.5). The specific facts upon which this action is based are as follows:

On June 18, 2008, you were on patrol. You attempted to stop a vehicle for "swerving." The vehicle fled and you pursued along with several other deputies. After apprehending the driver of the vehicle, PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B), you arrested him for felony violations of Penal Code 245, Vehicle Code 2800.1 and a parole violation. You wrote a probable cause statement and crime report. The pursuit was captured on video by your in-car camera system.

You have a duty to be truthful in all matters relating to your duties. You shall not make false statements in testimony, written reports, or other official documents, or when questioned or interviewed. You were dishonest

in both the probable cause statement and the crime report. For example, you wrote on the probable cause form and the crime report that the suspect's vehicle was swerving between lanes. The video demonstrates, and you admit, that the vehicle was not swerving. You wrote on the probable cause form that the suspect attempted to run head-on into your vehicle. The video demonstrates, and you admit, that the suspect did not attempt to run into you head-on. On the probable cause form you wrote that the suspect rammed into other patrol vehicles. Again, the video demonstrates that this is a false statement. Finally, you wrote on the police report that the suspect was taken into custody without incident when, in reality, a Taser was deployed and a police dog bit the suspect.

The District Attorney recognized the discrepancies in your statement of probable cause and crime report versus the facts as documented on the video and chose to offer reduced charges.

This constitutes the following disciplinary violations:

ALLEGATION I: You included false statements in your documentation of a felony arrest, in violation of the Agreement Between the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association Sections 18.5 (f) (Dishonesty) and General Order 3/00 (Professional Responsibility).

Prior Relevant Conduct

In administrative case 2008IA-063, allegations of dishonesty and a violation of your professional responsibility were sustained against you after you falsely documented a vehicle stop and use of force incident. PC 832.7 (b)(3)

[REDACTED]


You have been placed on the District Attorney's *Brady* list.

Materials upon which this Disciplinary Action is based are included in case file 2009IA-035, and are incorporated herein by reference. By reason of the foregoing, termination is deemed appropriate.

YOU ARE FURTHER ADVISED that no later than fifteen (15) calendar days after you receive this Order, you may file with the Director of Labor Relations of Sacramento County at 700 H Street, #7650, Sacramento, California 95814, a written Notice of Appeal from this Order. If you fail to file a written Notice of Appeal within the specified

fifteen (15) day period, the personnel action of this Order shall be final, without further action from the Director of Labor Relations.

DATED: 11-12-09


JOHN MCGINNESS, SHERIFF
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, M. KENNISON, do hereby declare:

1. I am employed in the position of SERGEANT
with the County of Sacramento Sheriff's Department.

2. On NOVEMBER 13, 2009, at approximately 1 a.m./p.m.
at FOLSON / POWER INN (location) I personally served a copy of the
attached "Final Order" upon STEVE VASQUEZ, by handing such
a copy to him/her.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on NOVEMBER 13, 2009, at SACRAMENTO California.



(Signature)

UPON SERVICE RETURN AFFIDAVIT TO LEGAL AFFAIRS



JOHN McGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: October 1, 2009

To: FILE

From: UNDERSHERIFF MARK IWASA *MI*

Subject: SKELLY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION; 2009IA-035

On today's date at approximately 0930 hours, a Skelly hearing was conducted with Deputy Steve Vasquez regarding the above case. Also present at the hearing was Captain Scott Jones and Deputy Vasquez' representative, attorney Chris Miller. The hearing was not tape recorded, at the request of Deputy Vasquez.

The original recommendation from Captain Trang To was to sustain a single charge of dishonesty and recommend termination. Chief R.C. Smith sustained the allegation against Deputy Vasquez and similarly recommended termination.

This case has remarkable similarities to case 2008IA-063, wherein Deputy Vasquez' reports were not accurate representations of events that transpired. In other words, his reports were either deliberately untruthful or woefully lacking in accuracy. This is exacerbated in this case by the fact that the untrue statements were contained in a probable cause declaration, under penalty of perjury, and was the only information the judge considered when safeguarding the defendant's rights in the determination of probable cause. Although the other case actually occurred later in time to the instant matter, the Skelly hearing for that case has already been conducted, with a finding of dishonesty and an attendant recommendation of termination therefor.

This case came to the Department's attention because the defense in the case filed a Pitchess motion. After reviewing the in-car camera (ICC) video, the legal advisor did not feel he could defend the motion because of the discrepancies. After review, the Deputy District Attorney offered reduced charges to the defendant. As a poignant aside, Deputy Vasquez is already on the "Brady list" for dishonesty for the other case.

As in the prior case, Deputy Vasquez denies being untruthful. In this case, he blames his inaccurate reports on the fact that he was developing a granite/tile business concurrently with his primary duties of being a patrol deputy. The time demands of both, according to Deputy Vasquez, caused him to lose "clarity control" over his recollection of events. When asked to explain the discrepancies, Deputy Vasquez cited

"sleep deprivation." Deputy Vasquez related that he has now hired help for the secondary business and can be more balanced and focused on being a patrol deputy.


The ultimate question remains, however, of whether Deputy Vasquez was dishonest or merely negligent, as he would have us believe. In the final analysis, I think it is a distinction without a difference, because he was either deliberately dishonest, or he was so extremely negligent as to forever cast doubt on his ability to recall, relate and testify to events to a degree required of any peace officer. Either way, he has once again proven that he is unable to satisfactorily carry out his duties as a peace officer.

That being said, I do find that Deputy Vasquez was dishonest in his documentation of the incident. Necessarily, I recommend that he be terminated from employment as a deputy sheriff.

**MASTAGNI, HOLSTEDT, AMICK,
MILLER & JOHNSEN**
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

DAVID P. MASTAGNI
JOHN R. HOLSTEDT
MICHAEL D. AMICK
CRAIG E. JOHNSEN
CHRISTOPHER W. MILLER
BRIAN A. DIXON
STEVEN W. WELTY
STUART C. WOO
DAVID E. MASTAGNI
JONATHAN W.A. LIFF
RICHARD J. ROMANSKI
JOHN P. TRIBUANO
PHILLIP R.A. MASTAGNI
KATHLEEN N. STORM
KEVIN L. BRYANT
JAMES B. CARR

SACRAMENTO OFFICE
1912 I STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA
95811 - 3151
(916) 446-4692
FAX (916) 447-4614



CHICO: 895-3836
STOCKTON: 948-6158
SAN JOSE: 292-4802
FRESNO: 486-5580
FED. ID# 94-2678460

WILL P. CREGER
WILLIAM M. BRIGGS
MELANIE BRONNY
ANTHONY F. DONOGHUE
ANDY KIRK
DAVID D. KING
SEAN D. CURRIN
SEAN D. HOWELL
ADRIENNE P. ALLEN
ISAAC S. STEVENS
DANIEL T. MCNAMARA
KRISTINA T. JANSEN
PAUL T. DOLBERG
ANTHONY S. FRANCESCHI
DAWNIELLA A. ZAVALA

September 14, 2009

Via Facsimile and U. S. Mail

Mark Iwasa, Undersheriff
Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
711 G Street, Fourth Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

**Re: Steven Vasquez/2009IA-035
Our File No. RET/09-0641**

Dear Undersheriff Iwasa:

Please accept this letter as a request by Steven Vasquez for a pre-disciplinary appeal from the proposed termination in this matter. Pending that hearing, please make available to me a copy of the materials on which the action is based, including but not limited to the following materials:

1. A copy of all policies and procedures alleged to have been violated.
2. All written reports related to the incident and investigation.
3. All investigator(s) notes, including raw notes; summaries; and activity logs.
4. A copy of any radio transmissions related to the investigation.
5. A copy of any audio and/or video record of the incident.
6. All written or recorded statements of any potential witness(es).
7. All prior criminal history of any known complainant or potential witness.

Undersheriff Mark Iwasa

September 14, 2009


Page 2

8. A record of any statements by my client, oral or written, however recorded or preserved.
9. The names and addresses of any witness who may have knowledge of the events giving rise to the disciplinary action.

I will schedule the hearing once I have had an opportunity to review these materials. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions or concerns regarding this request.

Yours truly,

**MASTAGNI, HOLSTEDT, AMICK,
MILLER & JOHNSEN**



CHRISTOPHER W. MILLER
Attorney at Law

/cwm

cc: Steven Vasquez
Marlin Weinberger, SCDSA (via e-mail only)



JOHN P. MCGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Proposed Disciplinary Action

To: Sheriff's Deputy Steve Vasquez
Central Division

From: Chief Deputy Robert Smith
Field and Investigative Services

Subject: PROPOSED DISCIPLINARY ACTION-TERMINATION

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED that I have recommended you be terminated from your position as Sheriff's Deputy with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. The facts upon which the Proposed Disciplinary Action is based are as follows:

On June 18, 2008, you were on patrol. You attempted to stop a vehicle for "swerving." The vehicle fled and you pursued along with several other deputies. After apprehending the driver of the vehicle, **PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)**, you arrested him for felony violations of Penal Code 245, Vehicle Code 2800.1 and a parole violation. You wrote a probable cause statement and crime report. The pursuit was captured on video by your in-car camera system.

You have a duty to be truthful in all matters relating to your duties. You shall not make false statements in testimony, written reports, or other official documents, or when questioned or interviewed. You were dishonest in both the probable cause statement and the crime report. For example, you wrote on the probable cause form and the crime report that the suspect's vehicle was swerving between lanes. The video demonstrates, and you admit, that the vehicle was not swerving. You wrote on the probable cause form that the suspect attempted to run head-on into your vehicle. The video demonstrates, and you admit, that the suspect did not attempt to run into you head-on. On the probable cause form you wrote that the suspect rammed into other patrol vehicles. Again, the video demonstrates that this is a false statement. Finally, you wrote on the police report that the suspect was taken into custody without incident when, in reality, a Taser was deployed and a police dog bit the suspect.

The District Attorney recognized the discrepancies in your statement of probable cause and crime report versus the facts as documented on the video and chose to offer reduced charges.

This constitutes the following disciplinary violations:

ALLEGATION I: You included false statements in your documentation of a felony arrest, in violation of the Agreement Between the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association Sections 18.5 (f) (Dishonesty) and General Order 3/00 (Professional Responsibility).

Prior Relevant Conduct

In administrative case 2008IA-063, allegations of dishonesty and violation of your professional responsibility were sustained against you after you falsely documented a vehicle stop and use of force incident. PC 832.7 (b)(3)

You have been placed on the District Attorney's *Brady* list.

The above facts are considered good cause for disciplinary action (Agreement Between the County of Sacramento and the Sacramento County Deputy Sheriff's Association Section(s) 18.5). Materials upon which the Proposed Disciplinary Action is based are included in case file 2009IA-035, and are incorporated herein by reference.

I have reviewed the allegations contained therein, and find that cause appears to exist for the discipline recommended. However, before a final decision is made in this matter, you have ten (10) calendar days from the date you are served with a copy of this notice, either personally or by mail, to request a review.

If you desire to examine or review the complaint which forms a part of the basis for the Proposed Disciplinary Action, you shall be given a reasonable amount of time off for such purposes by your request therefore duly submitted to your supervisor. The review shall be conducted at the Professional Standards Bureau office at 520 9th Street, Suite 202, Sacramento, California, telephone number 874-5098. Unless other arrangements are made, such examination shall take place during the normal duty hours of the Professional Standards Bureau (Monday through Friday, between 8:00

a.m. and 5:00 p.m.). For your convenience, you should call the Professional Standards Bureau and make an appointment to conduct your examination of the complaint.

If you desire to respond personally, contact the Office of the Legal Advisor at 520 9th Street, Suite 202, Sacramento, California, telephone number 874-6035, to schedule a "Skelly Review" in this matter before a Department Hearing Officer. General Order 3/07 delineates the procedural and legal issues of the review.

If you do not respond to this Proposed Disciplinary Action either personally or in writing, or both personally and in writing, on or before the expiration of the ten-day period above, the Sheriff will make a final decision based upon the foregoing reasons mentioned above and any materials indicated.

DATED: 9-11-09


CHIEF DEPUTY ROBERT SMITH
Field and Investigative Services

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE


I, Carlos F. Ponce, do hereby declare:

1. I am employed in the position of Detective Sergeant with the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department.

2. On September 11th, 2009, at approximately 1:45 PM at Folsom Boulevard and Power Inn Road I personally served a copy of the attached proposed disciplinary action upon Steven Vasquez, by handing such a copy to him.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on September 11th, 2009, at Sacramento, California.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Sgt. Carlos F. Ponce". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

(Signature)

UPON SERVICE RETURN AFFIDAVIT TO LEGAL AFFAIRS

ADMINISTRATIVE DISCIPLINARY REVIEW ROUTE SHEET

IA CASE NO. 2009IA-035

DIVISION COMMANDER: Recommended Disposition		
DATE RCVD.	COMMANDER'S NAME Captain Trang To	DIVISION Central Division
DATE DUE	FINDINGS: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">M.O.U. - 18.5 (f) - Dishonesty</div> <div style="float: right; text-align: right;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED REPORT <div style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">SUSTAINED</div> </div>	
DATE FWD.	RECOMMENDATIONS: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">TERMINATION FROM EMPLOYMENT</div> <div style="float: right; text-align: right;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED REPORT </div>	
SIGNATURE	DATE	
<div style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">[Signature]</div> <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">9-8-09</div>		

RETURN TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

SERVICE CHIEF: Proposed Disposition		
DATE RCVD.	CHIEF'S NAME Chief RC Smith	SERVICE AREA Field and Investigative Services
DATE DUE	FINDINGS: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">MOU 18.5 (f) . Dishonesty</div> <div style="float: right; text-align: right;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED REPORT <div style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">SUSTAINED</div> </div>	
DATE FWD.	PROPOSAL: <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">TERMINATION FROM EMPLOYMENT</div> <div style="float: right; text-align: right;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED REPORT </div>	
SIGNATURE	DATE	
<div style="font-size: 1.5em; font-family: cursive;">[Signature] CHIEF RC SMITH</div> <div style="font-size: 1.2em; font-family: cursive;">9-9-09</div>		

RETURN TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE SKELLY HEARING PANEL: Findings after hearing	
DATE RCVD. HEARING DATE DATE FWD.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed discipline affirmed <input type="checkbox"/> Discipline modified as outlined below <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Internal Affairs. </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED DIRECTIVE </div> </div> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">INSTRUCTIONS:</p>
SIGNATURE, PANEL PRESIDENT DATE	

RETURN TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

Final Determination and Order	
DATE RCVD. DATE DUE DATE FWD.	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Proposed discipline affirmed. <input type="checkbox"/> Discipline modified as outlined below: <input type="checkbox"/> Returned to Internal Affairs. </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="checkbox"/> SEE ATTACHED DIRECTIVE </div> </div> <p style="margin-top: 10px;">INSTRUCTIONS:</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin-top: 10px;"><i>Termination from employment.</i></p>
SIGNATURE DATE	

James McLenis

10/28/04

RETURN TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

<input type="checkbox"/> NOT APPLICABLE LEGAL AFFAIRS OFFICE: Final order			
DATE RCVD.	ACTION	DATE	SIGNATURE
DATE DUE			
DATE FWD.	COMMENTS:		

RETURN TO INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU



JOHN McGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: September 10, 2009

To: FILE

From: CHIEF DEPUTY ROBERT "R.C." SMITH
Field and Investigative Services

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RC Smith", written over the name of the sender.

Subject: **INTERNAL AFFAIRS CASE #2009IA-035**
DEPUTY STEVE VASQUEZ

I have read this investigative package in its entirety as well as reviewed all video and audio evidence. At issue is the truthfulness of Deputy Vasquez's statements in crime report #08-33021 and the related probable cause declaration. The allegation is that Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in both reports.

The probable cause declaration is signed by Deputy Vasquez declaring under penalty of perjury that the information contained within is true and correct. In the probable cause declaration Deputy Vasquez makes the following statements which are clearly refuted by a review of all in-car camera videos, portions of the crime report written by others as well as Deputy Vasquez's own interview with Professional Standards Bureau:

- ***"I observed S-1 swerving between lanes."*** The recorded 30 second lead prior to Code 3 activation of Deputy Vasquez's in-car camera shows the suspect's vehicle remaining well centered within his lane the entire time. In his interview, Deputy Vasquez admits *"He was remaining in his lane."* [page 8]
- ***"S-1...attempted to run head on into my vehicle."*** At no time does Deputy Vasquez's in-car camera show the suspect attempting to run "head on" into his vehicle. At one point the suspect, when partially blocked by Deputy Vasquez, backs into Deputy's Vasquez's patrol vehicle while attempting to escape being boxed in. In his interview, Deputy Vasquez is asked if the suspect at any point during the pursuit attempted to run head on into his vehicle. After going back and forth on the issue, he finally responds *"No."* [page 5]

- **"S-1 again rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle."** The suspect did not ram, run into or purposely collide with any other patrol vehicle. Deputies did attempt PIT maneuvers on three occasions during this pursuit, striking the suspect's vehicle with a patrol vehicle each time.
- **"S-1 again rammed his vehicle into three different SSD patrol vehicles."** Other than the above noted time in which the suspect backed into Deputy's Vasquez's patrol vehicle while attempting to escape being boxed in the suspect did not ram, run into or purposely collide with any other patrol vehicle. Collisions occurred when deputies attempted PIT maneuvers three times during this pursuit, striking the suspect's vehicle with a patrol vehicle each time.

In crime report #08-33021 Deputy Vasquez makes the following statements which are clearly refuted by a review of all in-car camera videos, portions of the crime report written by others as well as Deputy Vasquez's own interview with Professional Standards Bureau:

- **Page 7 "PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued to swerve from the number one lane into the number two lane."** The recorded 30 second lead prior to Code 3 activation of Deputy Vasquez's in-car camera shows the suspect's vehicle remaining well centered within his lane the entire time. In his interview, Deputy Vasquez admits *"He was remaining in his lane."* [page 8]
- **Page 8 "PC 832.7 (b)(5) was taken into custody without incident."** In actuality a taser was deployed and the suspect was inadvertently bitten by a K9. The fire department was requested to provide aid at the scene.

The evidence is clear that Deputy Vasquez entered false information in his reports related to this incident. The violation of M.O.U. 18.5 (f) - Dishonesty by Deputy Vasquez is **Sustained**

Deputy Vasquez has a previous finding of SUSTAINED for M.O.U. 18.5 (f) - Dishonesty (2008-IA-063). I am familiar with the specifics as I made the finding in that case as well. The fact patterns surrounding the violations in these two cases are very similar. Both involved false, inaccurate information entered into official reports.

Deputy Vasquez should be **TERMINATED FROM HIS POSITION AS A DEPUTY SHERIFF.**



JOHN McGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: September 8, 2009

To: CHIEF DEPUTY ROBERT "RC" SMITH
Field and Investigative Services

From: CAPTAIN TRANG TO, COMMANDER
Central Division

Subject: **FINDINGS AND COMMENDATIONS
INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION 09-IA-035 – DEPUTY STEVE
VASQUEZ**

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

On May 28, 2009, The Sheriff's Department received a notice of a Pitchess Motion on Deputy Steve Vasquez for an arrest he made of Mr. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) on June 18, 2008. The Pitchess Motion alleges Deputy Vasquez was dishonest on his probable cause declaration and the crime report he submitted.

After comparing the In Car Camera (ICC) video to the probable cause declaration and the crime report, Deputy Peter Cress, the Sheriff's Department Legal Advisor noted there were many discrepancies between them. As a result, the District Attorney's Office elected to offer Mr. PC 832.7 (b) lesser charges and sentences, to which Mr. PC 832.7 (b) accepted the offers.

CHARGES

This allegation, if true, would constitute a violation of:

1. M.O.U. 18.5 (f)–Dishonesty

INVESTIGATION:

Sergeant Todd Thiessen of the Professional Standards Bureau was assigned to investigate this case. His investigations included crime reports, In Car Camera video, Dispatch audio, Administrative Messages printouts, and interview of Deputy Vasquez.

I have reviewed the attached documentation in its entirety. The following are my findings and recommendations.

ALLEGATION AND FINDINGS:

1. **It is alleged that Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in report 08-33021 and the Probable Cause Declaration for the arrest of** PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

Related to charge 1.

Sergeant Thiessen's investigation is thorough and complete and set forth in such a manner as to facilitate a proper finding.

Deputy Vasquez attempts to explain the reasons for the discrepancies surrounding his arrest were confusing, irrational and disappointing. As a seasoned patrol officer, he should know the importance of writing accurate reports. In this instance, Deputy Vasquez failed to do so and was dishonest in the following statements:

"S1 struck my patrol vehicle (122-656) and attempted to run head on into my vehicle." When asked if this was true. Deputy Vasquez stated, ***"No."***

"S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle and continued to flee." When asked which vehicle S1 ran into, Deputy Vasquez stated, ***"Mine."***

"I observed S1 swerving between lanes." When asked what he meant by "between lanes," he stated, ***"He was remaining in his lane."***

In addition to the above discrepancies, Deputy Vasquez wrote in his crime report,

"PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was taken into custody without incident."

I found this statement to be greatly inaccurate and without merit. As the primary officer, Deputy Vasquez knows or should have known that he is responsible for the entire narrative of the incident, to include other officers' actions. In this instance, once he found out that Mr. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was bitten by a K9 and was subsequently treated by fire personnel for his wounds, this was certainly an important fact to include in his crime report. Furthermore, Deputy Vasquez should have completed an "Observation" report of Mr. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B). The fact that Deputy Vasquez failed to recognize the obvious errors and inaccuracy of his reports, pales in comparison to the fact he blamed his peers during his Internal Affairs interview for the inaccuracy of his report. This is beyond reprehensible. Deputy Vasquez stated, ***"...I just figured everybody else would cover their part. It was his dog, he would cover it and some won't."***

The charge related to this allegation is **SUSTAINED**

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Deputy Vasquez' conduct in this case is contrary to the following core values of our organization:

- ❖ Be accountable to the public trust
- ❖ Lead through exemplary conduct, appearance and demeanor
- ❖ Maintain ethical behavior both on and off the job
- ❖ Recognize the legacy created by our actions
- ❖ Be a reliable teammate
- ❖ Protect and serve our diverse community to the best of our ability

Deputy Vasquez has done tremendous damage to his credibility as a deputy sheriff. It is clear to me that Deputy Vasquez will not accept his own responsibility but rather blames it on everyone else when things goes wrong.

Therefore, for the sustained violation, **I recommend that Deputy Vasquez be terminated from employment with the Sacramento Sheriff's Department.** In doing so, I have taken into consideration the previous Internal Affairs investigation 08-IA-063, where as, the circumstances of the facts in that case were similar to this one in that Deputy Vasquez' reports were also inconsistent with many discrepancies between his reports and the In Car Camera video. However, with the case 08-IA-063, I gave Deputy Vasquez the benefit of the doubt due to the lack of credibility of the witnesses and I also felt his recollection was truly impaired by the pain medication he took for his injured shoulder. In light of this investigation, I recognize a pattern of inaccurate report writing and inconsistencies in representing facts and am now convinced Deputy Vasquez was dishonest in the 08-IA-063 Internal Affairs investigation as well.



JOHN MCGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: July 9, 2009

To: LIEUTENANT MILO FITCH, COMMANDER
Professional Standards Bureau

From: SERGEANT TODD THIESSEN
Professional Standards Bureau

Subject: CASE SUMMARY: 2009IA-035

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

On June 18, 2008, Deputy Vasquez arrested PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) for assault with a deadly weapon (PC 245), evading a peace officer (VC 2800.1) and parole violation (PC 3056). On May 28, 2009, the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department received a Pitchess Motion request from PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s attorney. In this motion the defense made allegations of dishonesty on the part of Deputy Vasquez in reference to his submitted crime report 08-33021 and the probable cause statement for the arrest.

While previewing the In Car Camera (ICC) video and reviewing the above documents, Deputy Peter Cress (Sheriff's Department Legal Advisor) did not feel he could defend the department's or Deputy Vasquez' interest at the court proceeding. According to Deputy Cress he too saw differences between the In Car Camera video and the documentation submitted by Deputy Vasquez. Since Deputy Cress noted these discrepancies, Lieutenant Fitch had a meeting with Assistant Chief Deputy District Attorney Marv Stern and asked him to review the video and report. After viewing the video, the District Attorney's Office offered reduced charges and sentences to PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s defense attorney. On the day of the scheduled Pitchess Motion Deputy Cress learned the motion was cancelled because PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) had agreed to plea to the charges.

CHARGES

If true, these acts could constitute a violation of the following:

1. M.O.U. 18.5 (f) – Dishonesty

SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS AND RELATED CHARGES

1. It is alleged that Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in report 08-33021 and the Probable Cause Declaration for the arrest of PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B).

Related to Charge 1

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

1. It is alleged that Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in report 08-33021 and the Probable Cause Declaration for the arrest of PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B).

During the course of this investigation I spoke with Deputy Cress about his position as the Legal Advisor for the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department. Deputy Cress stated one of his assignments was to defend the department and it's deputies from Pitchess Motions. Without going into detail, Deputy Cress told me PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s defense attorney was making allegations of dishonesty against Deputy Vasquez because the video and documentation did not match. He stated the defense's issues pertained to the portion of the Probable Cause Declaration referring to PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) ramming Deputy Vasquez head on and the number of vehicles PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was accused of ramming.

I reviewed evidence in the case which consisted of several items. I read the Crime Report (08-33021), the Probable Cause Declaration, watched the In Car Camera video from several patrol cars, and listened to the dispatch audio recording of the incident in question. After reviewing the above pieces of evidence, I found several inconsistencies and/ or discrepancies between them. In an attempt to clear up the discrepancies I called Deputy Vasquez in for an interview. During Deputy Vasquez' interview he made several statements which contradicted what he wrote in the report and on the probable cause form. In addition to contradicting the paper he generated in the arrest of PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B), he provided answers later in the interview which directly opposed his own prior statements he gave earlier. When asked about some of the statements which appeared to contradict his paperwork, he was asked if what he had written was inaccurate and he replied, no.

During the course of this investigation I interviewed Deputy Vasquez. Prior to the interview, I provided Deputy Vasquez and his attorney a copy of Crime Report 08-33021 which included the Probable Cause Declaration. I also provided them a copy of Deputy Vasquez' In Car Camera video (ICC) to watch. Deputy Vasquez' attorney came to my office and informed me they were finished reviewing the video and report, and were ready to begin the interview. Deputy Vasquez stated he did not remember initiating a pursuit on PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B). I asked Deputy Vasquez if he had been provided the opportunity to review the ICC video and the report I provided him before the interview and he said, "Yes." I asked Deputy Vasquez if he recalled the incident and he stated, yes.

Deputy Vasquez wrote the Probable Cause Declaration on the night of the pursuit after arresting PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B), but before he was transported to the jail. He stated he wrote the crime report the next day and that both were accurate. Deputy Vasquez did not review the In Car Camera footage prior to writing the probable cause form but did review it later that night. He stated the probable cause form is used to explain why the person was arrested and to show probable cause for arresting that person. He explained the Judicial Decision Section of the form was to allow a judge the opportunity to give you (the deputy) a decision on whether your probable cause was good or not. Deputy Vasquez believed the judge based his or her decision on the information he provided on the form.

While interviewing Deputy Vasquez, I asked him several questions regarding the statement, "S1 struck my patrol vehicle (122-656) and attempted to run head on into my vehicle" which he wrote on the form. The below excerpt is dialogue from our interview:

THIESSEN: *Did you see in the video where S1 turned around and drove directly at your vehicle?*

VASQUEZ: *Yes.*

THIESSEN: *And did S1 strike your patrol vehicle and attempt to run head-on into your vehicle?*

VASQUEZ: *No. S1 rammed the front right quarter panel of my vehicle.*

THIESSEN: *OK. So he didn't run head-on into your vehicle?*

VASQUEZ: *From the tip of the front of the car back was damaged, so yes, that was the front of my vehicle.*

THIESSEN: *OK. So he ran head-on into your vehicle?*

VASQUEZ: *He backed into my vehicle and struck the front of my patrol vehicle.*

THIESSEN: *OK. In the report the probable cause you state, "S1 struck my patrol vehicle (122-656) and attempted to run head on into my vehicle." Did he or did he not attempt to run head-on into your vehicle? It's a yes or no question.*

VASQUEZ: *No.*

THIESSEN: *So is that an inaccurate statement in your probable cause?*

VASQUEZ: *No.*

THIESSEN: *How do you explain that?*

VASQUEZ: *Because he was directly in front of me, I pulled in directly behind him and he put it in reverse and rammed my vehicle.*

THIESSEN: *So you're saying he ran head-on into your vehicle, which you just answered no to?*

VASQUEZ: *I don't know how else to explain it to you. Obviously you don't understand what I'm saying. The video clearly shows--*

THIESSEN: *Can you?*

MERKINS: *My impression of that is somebody backs into your car.*

VASQUEZ: *Mm-hmm. (yes)*

MERKINS: *So that's not...I would think that most people when you say somebody's driving head-on into your car you're picturing the front end of their car coming in contact with the front end of your car and that's not what happened in that video.*

VASQUEZ: *Well I don't understand how it's different, if they're driving backwards or forwards and they rammed the front of your car it's still a collision in the front of my car.*

THIESSEN: *Correct. It is a collision. Let me do it this way. Can you define head-on? What is head-on to you?*

VASQUEZ: *Front to front.*

THIESSEN: *Front to front?*

VASQUEZ: *Yes.*

MERKINS: *So was it not the back end of his car that hit you?*

VASQUEZ: *It was the back of his car that hit the front of my car.*

THIESSEN: *OK. So at any point during that pursuit did he attempt to run head-on into your vehicle?*

VASQUEZ: *No.*

THIESSEN: OK. And did you write in this probable cause form that he attempted to run head-on into your vehicle? And it would be this line right here indicated with a red arrow.

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: So would that be an inaccurate statement?

VASQUEZ: From my recollection of the point in time, no it wouldn't. That's how I, I know it was not head-on but he did ram the front of my patrol vehicle.

THIESSEN: OK. And you wrote that he attempted to ram your vehicle head-on?

VASQUEZ: I wrote it.

THIESSEN: OK. But that didn't occur?

VASQUEZ: No.

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Pages 4-6]

While listening to the radio traffic (**TAB 5, Dispatch Audio**) from the incident, Deputy Vasquez is heard voicing to dispatch that the suspect just rammed him head on. Deputy Vasquez stated he did not remember voicing this over the radio but said he heard it while watching the video, prior to our interview. I asked him if that would be an inaccurate statement to dispatch and he said:

"No. Because at the time he rammed me I didn't have time to stop and get out of my car and actually look at the damage."

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 12]

I then asked Deputy Vasquez about a second statement from his probable cause form. In his form he wrote, "S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle and continued to flee." The following excerpt is from that portion of the interview:

THIESSEN: OK. In this probable cause form is also another quote from there: "S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle and continued to flee."

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Which vehicle did he run into?

VASQUEZ: Mine.

THIESSEN: OK. But you say another. "Into another." Which other vehicle did he run into and continue to flee from?

VASQUEZ: Um...

THIESSEN: Do you want me to show you that part?

VASQUEZ: No, I know what I wrote.

THIESSEN: OK. I'm just trying to help you out.

VASQUEZ: Could you ask the question?

THIESSEN: Yes, sir. In your report you wrote S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County vehicle and continued to flee. Which other Sacramento County Sheriff's Vehicle did the suspect ram?

VASQUEZ: He ran into the front of I don't know whose vehicle.

MASTAGNI: If you remember. Don't guess.

VASQUEZ: I don't remember.

THIESSEN: OK. Did he run into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: You just don't remember whose vehicle?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: And did you see that on the tape?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. And where was that at in the intersection if you can recall?

VASQUEZ: I don't.

THIESSEN: OK. We'll go back and look in just a few minutes.

MERKINS: *Is that based off of your recollection or did somebody else tell you that he hit their car?*

VASQUEZ: *I was told he hit their car.*

MERKINS: *Do you recall who told you?*

VASQUEZ: *No, there were over 15 units involved in the pursuit by the time it was over.*

THIESSEN: *And do you recall how they told you? Was it in person?*

VASQUEZ: *I have no idea, I don't remember.*

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 6-7]

During the interview, Deputy Vasquez stated PC 832.7 (b) rammed two vehicles while engaged in the pursuit. He stated this is what he remembered at the time of the interview and earlier during the interview he stated he saw PC 832.7 (b) ram two patrol vehicles on the In Car Camera. I brought up a statement he wrote in the Probable Cause Declaration:

"S-1 rammed his vehicle into three different SSD patrol vehicles."

[TAB 5, Probable Cause Declaration]

I asked Deputy Vasquez when he reviewed the video prior to our interview if he saw PC 832.7 (b) ram his vehicle into three different vehicles including Deputy Vasquez' own. Deputy Vasquez replied he saw PC 832.7 (b) strike two vehicles.

Deputy Vasquez wrote another statement in the crime report's synopsis, the probable cause statement, and in his narrative. Deputy Vasquez wrote that he saw PC 832.7 (b) swerving between lanes and indicated this was his probable cause for the vehicle stop. I attempted to clarify this statement because of a discrepancy between this statement and the video recorded from Deputy Vasquez' car. When activated the camera records the previous 30 seconds of activity. In this previous 30 seconds PC 832.7 (b)'s vehicle is visible driving in the #1 lane and does not swerve between the lanes. I asked Deputy Vasquez about this discrepancy and he gave answers which directly contradict his statements written in the report. The following is an excerpt of the questioning and his responses.

THIESSEN: *What was your probable cause for the stop, sir?*

VASQUEZ: *The vehicle was swerving between lanes.*

THIESSEN: *OK. Was the suspect swerving between the lanes prior to your camera coming on?*

VASQUEZ: *On the video he was swerving between lanes.*

THIESSEN: *OK. And then can you define between lanes? What do you mean when the suspect is swerving between lanes?*

VASQUEZ: *If I'm in my lane driving behind a vehicle it starts to sway or swerve and then starts to swerve back.*

THIESSEN: *OK. And when you're talking about swerving is he remaining in his lane or is he crossing the lane markers?*

VASQUEZ: *He was remaining in his lane.*

THIESSEN: *OK. So he was swerving in his lane?*

VASQUEZ: *Yes.*

THIESSEN: *And you said that's depicted on the video?*

VASQUEZ: *Correct.*

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 8]

As the interview moved on, Deputy Vasquez stated he signed the probable cause form under penalty of perjury. Deputy Vasquez defined perjury as lying and added he did not lie when he completed the form.

One of the other contentions brought up by PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B)'s defense attorney was contained in Deputy Vasquez' narrative portion of the report, in his report he wrote:

"PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) was taken into custody without incident."

[TAB 5, Crime Report 08-33021, Deputy Vasquez' Narrative]

Deputy Vasquez explained he meant PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) did not run or fight but was just taken into custody, when he wrote the above statement. Deputy Vasquez was the second unit in the pursuit when PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) finally pulled over and got out of his vehicle. Deputy Vasquez stated PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) exited the vehicle and got onto his knees by the time he got to him. Deputy Vasquez was the second deputy who got to the suspect and stated he dove on him. He stated he did not recall who handcuffed him but remembered four deputies on or around the suspect. Deputy Vasquez stated he saw a K9 deputy but did not see a dog.

Deputy Vasquez stated he did not recall if anyone had deployed a Taser and did not see a K9 bite PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) during his apprehension. He continued to say he remembered seeing the K9 deputy and dog, and if he had seen the dog bite he would have included that in his report. Deputy Vasquez stated an unknown person, told him after he wrote his report that PC 832.7 (b) (5)(B) had been bitten by a K9.

In the video recorded from Deputy Vasquez' car, Deputy Limbird (K97) came back towards the front of Deputy Vasquez' car from the area where the suspect had been apprehended. While he walked from the front of Deputy Vasquez' vehicle towards the suspect's vehicle he voiced over the radio:

"K97 need fire no code for dog bite 13th and 50 Street."

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez ICC, 06-18-2008 0150 hours]

[TAB 5, CAD Event, Page 4 Line 12]

When he called dispatch for the fire department (over the radio) for the dog bite he walked right by Deputy Vasquez, who walked to the front of his vehicle. A few minutes later the fire department arrived and appeared to be checking PC 832.7 (b) (5)(D)'s injury with a group of unknown deputies standing by. Deputy Vasquez did not recall whether he was present on scene when the fire department arrived. I researched the administrative messages from some of the units on this call and during a message from Deputy Guzman (62H1) to Deputy Limbird (K97) Deputy Guzman stated:

"THE BIT WAS NOT CAUGHT ON MY CAMERA//ILL TELL 63H1 (Deputy Vasquez) TO REVIEW HIS CAR CAMERA IT WAS IN THE POSITION TO VIEW S-1 WHEN HE GOT OUT OF THE CAR."

[TAB 5, Admin Messages, 62H1 AM's, Page 1 Line 1]

Later towards the end of our interview Deputy Vasquez' attorney asked him some questions regarding the incident. After he finished questioning his client, Sergeant Merkins asked to clarify a few items. She confirmed that Deputy Vasquez did not remember who told him PC 832.7 (b) (5)(D) had been bitten by the K9. She then asked if Deputy Vasquez was told PC 832.7 (b) (5)(D) had been bitten by K9 before or after he wrote the crime report and he contradicted what he told me earlier by saying, "it was before." Sergeant Merkins then asked if this was an important fact (PC 832.7 (b) (5)(D) being bitten by K9) to include in his report and he said:

"No, I just figured everybody else would cover their part. It was his dog, he would cover it and some won't."

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 21]

In the probable cause statement filled out by Deputy Vasquez he wrote PC 832.7 (b) (5)(D) rammed three SSD patrol vehicles. I asked him why he did not cover this in his crime report and he said:

"Because the people that he actually rammed or they conducted the PIT on they're to cover that."

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 13]

I attempted to clarify whether Deputy Vasquez was viewing the three PIT attempts as the suspect ramming our SSD patrol vehicles and asked him about this.

Deputy Vasquez first stated he was associating PC 832.7 (b) ramming our vehicles with the time when our deputies were performing a PIT maneuver on PC 832.7 (b). I asked Deputy Vasquez if this is why he concluded PC 832.7 (b) had rammed three of our vehicles including his own and he replied, no. This contradicted what he had previously told me in the interview.

Sergeant Merkins explained to Deputy Vasquez that we were trying to clarify whether the acts he documented on the probable cause did or did not happen. She continued to tell him that we were trying to help him by getting him to justify what he wrote because what is seen on the video is different than what we read in his documentation. Deputy Vasquez agreed to explain these items so we could understand. Sergeant Merkins asked Deputy Vasquez if a deputy is performing a PIT maneuver would he consider that different from someone ramming someone else and he replied, yes.

To simplify and pinpoint the PIT attempts and ramming topic each event was broken down individually and discussed separately. I covered Deputy Vasquez' PIT maneuver first. Deputy Vasquez stated he attempted to PIT PC 832.7 (b) but he did not consider this a time when PC 832.7 (b) was ramming his patrol vehicle. I confirmed his statement by asking if he considered this a PIT and he said, correct. I then discussed Deputy Martin's attempted PIT to PC 832.7 (b)'s vehicle at Elk Grove Florin. Deputy Vasquez stated he considered that a PIT maneuver and did not consider the incident as PC 832.7 (b) ramming Deputy Martin's patrol vehicle. The last PIT we addressed was when Deputy Burton attempted the PIT maneuver on PC 832.7 (b)'s vehicle. Deputy Vasquez agreed again, this was a PIT maneuver and stated he did not consider this a time when PC 832.7 (b) was ramming a patrol vehicle.

After breaking down the PIT maneuvers attempted by all three deputies and establishing that Deputy Vasquez did not consider them as the suspect ramming patrol vehicles Sergeant Merkins asked:

"So then I guess we're back to the other question: where are the three different rams with the suspect vehicle ramming Sheriff's cars?"

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez' Transcript, Page 17]

Deputy Vasquez answered:

"Those would all be in relation to the PITs."

[TAB 5, Deputy Vasquez, Page 17]

INVESTIGATIVE CHRONOLOGY


2009IA-035

June 11, 2009	I was assigned this case by Lieutenant Fitch.
June 15, 2009	I entered the case into IA PRO. I researched Deputy Vasquez' submitted reports in RMS and looked for PC forms which appeared to be completed by Deputy Vasquez. I printed three reports for the interview to verify he completed the probable cause forms (Handwriting comparison).
June 16, 2009	Notified Deputy Vasquez of interview and his Attorney Dan McNamara scheduled the interview for Thursday at 1600 hours.
June 18, 2009	Sergeant Merkins and I interviewed Deputy Vasquez.
June 19, 2009	The criminal case plead to a lesser charge. Pitchess cancelled.

WORK / COMPLAINT HISTORY
Divisional Investigation
2009IA-035


I. WORK HISTORY

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




Division Assignment Date and duties:

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




II. COMMENDATIONS

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




III. SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE REPORTS (Last 5 Years)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




IV. COMPLAINT HISTORY (Last 5 Years)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)




- IA number 2008IA-063

PC 832.7 (b)(3)



M.O.U. 18.5 (f) Dishonesty

PC 832.7 (b)(3)



All Allegations sustained on 7/6/09 pending a Skelly Hearing.

V. OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION –

SSDWEB[Home](#)[Contact Webmaster](#)[Webmail Login](#)

Employees	Assignments	Family	General	Notification	Reserve Info	Training	Print Report
---------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)

VASQUEZ, STEVE AL**Promotions**

Date	Class
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	

Assignments

Date	Division
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	

Employment Dates**Date of Hire**

PC 832.7 (b)

Department Date

PC 832.7 (b)

Rank Date

PC 832.7 (b)

Seniority Date

PC 832.7 (b)

Tie Breaker

P

Evaluations**Eval. Due Date**

PC 832.7 (b)

Last Evaluation

PC 832.7 (b)

Education**College Degree****Units****Post****Incentive Pay****Divisional Assignments****Call Sign****Assignment****Shift****Days Off****FTO-RTO**

PC

PC

PC 832.7

PC

SSDWEB[Home](#)[Contact Webmaster](#)[Webmail Login](#)

Employees	Assignments	Family	General	Notification	Reserve Info	Training	Print Report
---------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)

VASQUEZ, STEVE AL

Date of Birth	Place of Birth	Ethnicity	Sex	Height	Weight	Hair	Eyes	Married
PC 832.7	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	P	PC	P	PC	PC	P

SSN	Driver's Lic. #	Emp PIN	X-Ref #	Fingerprint #	PCard #	Photo #	Badge
PC 832.7 (b)(5)		PC 832.7	PC 832.7		PC		P

Blood Type	Allergies	Foreign Languages Spoken

Home Address	City	State	Zip Code
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	PC 832.7 (b)	PC	PC

Mailing Address	City	State	Zip Code
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	PC 832.7 (b)	PC	PC

Home Phone	Pager	Mobile Phone	Department E-mail Address
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)		PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)

Current Service Area	Current Assigned Division	Currently Assigned Bureau
PC	PC	

Status	Cost Center	Position #	Limited Term
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	PC 832.7	PC



JOHN MCGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: June 19th, 2009

To: LIEUTENANT MILO FITCH, COMMANDER
Professional Standards Bureau

From: SERGEANT TODD THIESSEN
Professional Standards Bureau

Subject: INTERVIEW WITH STEVE VASQUEZ, 2009IA-035

THIESSEN: Today is Thursday June 18th 2009 the time is approximately 16:20 hours. I'm Sergeant Todd Thiessen of the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department Professional Standards Bureau. Also sitting in on this interview from our office is Sergeant Connie Merkins. We are located at the Professional Standards office in Sacramento California speaking with Deputy Steve Vasquez. He is being represented today by Dan McNamara with Mastagni's Law Firm. This interview is in regards to Internal Affairs case 2009IA-035 in which it is alleged Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in both report 08-33021 and the probable cause declaration for the arrest of PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B). Prior to going on tape I gave Deputy Vasquez an administrative admonishment ordering him to make a truthful statement regarding this investigation. Deputy Vasquez has read and signed the admonishment. He has also provided a non-waiver SCDSA statement. Deputy Vasquez, you are advised this Internal Affairs investigation is confidential. You are directed not to disclose any information, questions or answers we discuss today with any person other than your representative, legal or spiritual advisor until the final disposition of this case. Do you understand this is being recorded, sir?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And before we start could you say your full name and spell your last please?

VASQUEZ: Steven Al Vasquez, V-A-S-Q-U-E-Z.

THIESSEN: By whom are you employed, sir?

VASQUEZ: Sacramento County Sheriff's Department.

THIESSEN: And what's your position within the Department?

VASQUEZ: Deputy Sheriff.

THIESSEN: And how long have you held that spot?

VASQUEZ: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)

THIESSEN: And you're assigned to PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A) ?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: Morning watch?

VASQUEZ: Graveyard.

THIESSEN: Do you recall initiating a pursuit on PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) in June of 2008?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. Prior to this interview I provided you the opportunity to review a report, correct?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And a video of a pursuit that you were involved in?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: Do you recall that incident?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. On the report copy that you have there I have the probable cause form flagged. On this probable cause form for report 0833-021 who wrote that probable cause statement?

VASQUEZ: I did.

THIESSEN: And is this your signature?

VASQUEZ: Correct, it is my signature.

THIESSEN: What is a probable cause declaration, sir?

VASQUEZ: It explains your probable cause for the arrest.

THIESSEN: OK. And for the record, that person up here that you list as the defendant is the person who committed the acts also?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: And do you know what the purpose for that form is?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And what's the purpose for that form?

VASQUEZ: To explain why I arrested somebody.

THIESSEN: OK. Do you know what the judicial decision section right here on the form is for?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And what's that for, sir?

VASQUEZ: It's to basically give you a decision on whether your probable cause was good or not.

THIESSEN: OK. And who makes that decision?

VASQUEZ: A judge makes that decision.

THIESSEN: OK. And would he make that decision based on your form?

VASQUEZ: I don't see why not.

THIESSEN: OK. When did you fill out this probable cause form, sir?

VASQUEZ: The night of the arrest.

THIESSEN: OK. And do you know approximately when in relation to the end of the pursuit when Mr. PC 832.7 (b) was taken into custody?

VASQUEZ: No, I don't recall. It was sometime after he was taken into custody.

THIESSEN: OK. Did you transport Mr. PC 832.7 (b) to the Jail?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: Did TS (Transportation Unit) or another Deputy transport him?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: So the probable cause was done on scene?

VASQUEZ: Yes, it was.

THIESSEN: Is this form accurate, sir?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Did you see in the video where S1 turned around and drove directly at your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And did S1 strike your patrol vehicle and attempt to run head-on into your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: No. S1 rammed the front right quarter panel of my vehicle.

THIESSEN: OK. So he didn't run head-on into your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: From the tip of the front of the car back was damaged, so yes, that was the front of my vehicle.

THIESSEN: OK. So he ran head-on into your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: He backed into my vehicle and struck the front of my patrol vehicle.

THIESSEN: OK. In the report the probable cause you state, "S1 struck my patrol vehicle (122-656) and attempted to run head on into my vehicle." Did he or did he not attempt to run head-on into your vehicle? It's a yes or no question.

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: So is that an inaccurate statement in your probable cause?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: How do you explain that?

VASQUEZ: Because he was directly in front of me, I pulled in directly behind him and he put it in reverse and rammed my vehicle.

THIESSEN: So you're saying he ran head-on into your vehicle, which you just answered no to?

VASQUEZ: I don't know how else to explain it to you. Obviously you don't understand what I'm saying. The video clearly shows--

THIESSEN: Can you?

MERKINS: My impression of that is somebody backs into your car.

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes)

MERKINS: So that's not...I would think that most people when you say somebody's driving head-on into your car you're picturing the front end of their car coming in contact with the front end of your car and that's not what happened in that video.

VASQUEZ: Well I don't understand how it's different, if they're driving backwards or forwards and they rammed the front of your car it's still a collision in the front of my car.

THIESSEN: Correct. It is a collision. Let me do it this way. Can you define head-on? What is head-on to you?

VASQUEZ: Front to front.

THIESSEN: Front to front?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: So was it not the back end of his car that hit you?

VASQUEZ: It was the back of his car that hit the front of my car.

THIESSEN: OK. So at any point during that pursuit did he attempt to run head-on into your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. And did you write in this probable cause form that he attempted to run head-on into your vehicle? And it would be this line right here indicated with a red arrow.

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: So would that be an inaccurate statement?

VASQUEZ: From my recollection of the point in time, no it wouldn't. That's how I, I know it was not head-on but he did ram the front of my patrol vehicle.

THIESSEN: OK. And you wrote that he attempted to ram your vehicle head-on?

VASQUEZ: I wrote it.

THIESSEN: OK. But that didn't occur?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. In this probable cause form is also another quote from there: "S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle and continued to flee."

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Which vehicle did he run into?

VASQUEZ: Mine.

THIESSEN: OK. But you say another. "Into another." Which other vehicle did he run into and continue to flee from?

VASQUEZ: Um...

THIESSEN: Do you want me to show you that part?

VASQUEZ: No, I know what I wrote.

THIESSEN: OK. I'm just trying to help you out.

VASQUEZ: Could you ask the question?

THIESSEN: Yes, sir. In your report you wrote S1 rammed his vehicle into another Sacramento County vehicle and continued to flee. Which other Sacramento County Sheriff's Vehicle did the suspect ram?

VASQUEZ: He ran into the front of I don't know whose vehicle.

MASTAGNI: If you remember. Don't guess.

VASQUEZ: I don't remember.

THIESSEN: OK. Did he run into another Sacramento County Sheriff's vehicle?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: You just don't remember whose vehicle?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: And did you see that on the tape?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. And where was that at in the intersection if you can recall?

VASQUEZ: I don't.

THIESSEN: OK. We'll go back and look in just a few minutes.

MERKINS: Is that based off of your recollection or did somebody else tell you that he hit their car?

VASQUEZ: I was told he hit their car.

MERKINS: Do you recall who told you?

VASQUEZ: No, there were over 15 units involved in the pursuit by the time it was over.

THIESSEN: And do you recall how they told you? Was it in person?

VASQUEZ: I have no idea, I don't remember.

THIESSEN: OK. How many vehicles did S1 ram during this pursuit?

VASQUEZ: Two to my recollection.

THIESSEN: OK. In your probable cause form you wrote S1 rammed his vehicle into three different SSD patrol vehicles.

VASQUEZ: That's what I remember right now.

THIESSEN: OK. You remember two?

VASQUEZ: Right now, yes.

THIESSEN: OK. When you reviewed your video did you see S1 ram his vehicle into three different vehicles—including yours?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: How many vehicles did you see him ram into on that video?

MASTAGNI: The video speaks for himself...don't know if it's fair to ask him to recount a 20 minute chase with 15 different cars involved. I don't

know if it's necessarily fair to ask him to recall exactly what's on the video, but he can obviously answer to the extent that he's capable.

VASQUEZ: Two.

THIESSEN: What was your probable cause for the stop, sir?

VASQUEZ: The vehicle was swerving between lanes.

THIESSEN: OK. Was the suspect swerving between the lanes prior to your camera coming on?

VASQUEZ: On the video he was swerving between lanes.

THIESSEN: OK. And then can you define between lanes? What do you mean when the suspect is swerving between lanes?

VASQUEZ: If I'm in my lane driving behind a vehicle it starts to sway or swerve and then starts to swerve back.

THIESSEN: OK. And when you're talking about swerving is he remaining in his lane or is he crossing the lane markers?

VASQUEZ: He was remaining in his lane.

THIESSEN: OK. So he was swerving in his lane?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And you said that's depicted on the video?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK. Did you sign this probable cause form under penalty of perjury?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Can you please give me your definition of perjury?

VASQUEZ: To lie.

THIESSEN: OK. So by signing this you're signing that you're not lying? Is that what you're saying?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK. Did you intentionally not tell the truth on this document?

VASQUEZ: No, I did not.

THIESSEN: Can you explain why the In-Car Camera does not support your documentation on this form of the incident?

MASTAGNI: I don't know that we established that it didn't.

THIESSEN: We did. On this form he wrote S1 rammed his vehicle into three different vehicles and from watching the video he said he saw the suspect only hit two SSD vehicles.

MASTAGNI: You can answer the question to the extent you are capable.

VASQUEZ: I don't understand. What's the question?

THIESSEN: Can you explain why the In-Car Camera that you just watched—the video doesn't support your documentation of the incident where you state—

VASQUEZ: This was written on scene. And I didn't watch the camera before I sat there and wrote the PC form.

THIESSEN: OK. And did you complete the crime report associated with this arrest?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Is that report accurate, sir?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: In your crime report you typed "01:21 hours PC 832.7 (b) was taken into custody without incident." Correct?

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes)

THIESSEN: And that's on page two of your narrative, line 71. I believe one of your narratives is going to have the line markers all the way down the page and the other one will not because of how it prints out.

VASQUEZ: Where are you talking about?

THIESSEN: Can I?

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes).

THIESSEN: This was printed from RMS, so RMS I don't know if you're aware prints out multiple copies of your statements for some reason. So this is just another way it prints it out kind of like our old format with the numbers down the edge of the page it's the same, that's the first one. But right here line 71 where it says "PC 832.7 (b)(5)(D) was taken into custody without incident."

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes)

THIESSEN: Can you describe what "without incident" means to you?

VASQUEZ: He didn't run, he didn't fight. He was taken into custody.

THIESSEN: OK. When the pursuit ended where was your vehicle positioned in relation? Were you first or second or third?

VASQUEZ: Second.

THIESSEN: You were second?

VASQUEZ: Yeah.

THIESSEN: When the suspect got out of the car do you recall what he did?

VASQUEZ: No. When I got to him he was already on his knees.

THIESSEN: OK. If PC 832.7 (b)(5)(D) had fought with you that would be an incident then? It wouldn't be without incident?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK. If he reached for his waistband and someone deployed a taser is that without incident or would you consider that an incident?

VASQUEZ: I'd consider that an incident.

THIESSEN: OK. Did you see anyone deploy a taser during that time?

VASQUEZ: I don't recall.

THIESSEN: OK. If you had seen someone deploy a taser would you have included that in your report?

VASQUEZ: Yes, I would have.

THIESSEN: OK. Do you recall if you saw a K9 bite PC 832.7 (b)(5)(D)?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. You did not see that?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. If you had seen that would that be something you would include in your narrative?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: Were you told that there was a K9 bite?

VASQUEZ: Yes, afterwards. Now, yes, I do recall that.

MERKINS: Was that prior to writing your report or after you wrote your report?

VASQUEZ: It was after I wrote my report.

THIESSEN: You were told that he was bit after you wrote your report?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK.

MERKINS: Do you recall who told you that?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: Were you still on scene when the Fire Department arrived to treat PC 832.7 (b)'s injury?

VASQUEZ: I don't recall.

MERKINS: You don't recall if you were on scene or you don't recall if you remember when they arrived?

VASQUEZ: I don't recall if I was there when they arrived.

THIESSEN: Do you recall seeing the K9 officer pull his dog from PC 832.7 (b)?

VASQUEZ: No. I remember the K9 officer having the dog.

THIESSEN: OK. Did you have a portable radio on your person that night?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Do you recall hearing a K9 officer voice over the radio that he needed Code 2 Fire for a dog bite?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. When PC 832.7 (b)
(5)(D) pulled across Florin Road near Chandler he was facing northbound in the westbound lanes?

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes)

THIESSEN: Can you describe how you tried to block him in? Do you recall that section of the video I'm talking about?

VASQUEZ: Yes. I pulled in at his...he was kind of at an angle and I pulled in on his driver side behind him.

THIESSEN: OK. And where was the front right corner of your car in location to his?

VASQUEZ: Behind his left driver side area.

THIESSEN: OK. And would you consider that pulling in behind him?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Is this when he backed into the passenger side of your vehicle?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: When you advised dispatch right after that he rammed your vehicle did you clarify how he rammed you?

VASQUEZ: I don't recall.

THIESSEN: OK. Do you recall voicing that he rammed you head-on?

VASQUEZ: No, but I heard that in the video.

THIESSEN: OK. Would that be an inaccurate statement?

VASQUEZ: No. Because at the time he rammed me I didn't have time to stop and get out of my car and actually look at the damage.

THIESSEN: OK. But earlier in this interview you described head-on meaning to you as the front of a car hitting the front of another car.

VASQUEZ: Yes, we went over that.

THIESSEN: OK. So it's not inaccurate what you said on the radio?

VASQUEZ: Excuse me?

THIESSEN: So it wasn't inaccurate when you voiced that he rammed you head-on on the radio?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: OK. If you documented in your probable cause statement PC 832.7 (b) ramming three SSD patrol vehicles how come that's not documented in your report?

VASQUEZ: Because the people that he actually rammed or they conducted the PIT on they're to cover that.

THIESSEN: OK. Is it your contention that when the SSD vehicles conducted a PIT on PC 832.7 (b) that that is when he rammed them?

VASQUEZ: I can't be responsible for everybody else's actions or actions they don't write.

THIESSEN: OK. But what I'm asking is that when you are associating him ramming another vehicle? Is when they are PIT-ing him?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. And so that would be how you got he rammed three SSD vehicles because he rammed your car?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: No? How many times was a PIT attempted on PC 832.7 (b)? Do you know?

VASQUEZ: Three to my recollection right now.

THIESSEN: OK. And do you recall who the officers were?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: Did you try and PIT PC 832.7 (b)?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: And do you consider him ramming you doing your PIT?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: You consider that a PIT on your action?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: But when referring to the other two officers who attempted to PIT PC 832.7 (b) you associate him ramming their vehicle with that?

VASQUEZ: At that point in time I don't know what's going on. I'm not in their driver seat. I'm not driving with them. I don't know their intentions, I don't know his intentions. I'm not directly involved in that moment. You're asking me to speak for somebody else.

THIESSEN: Well I was asking referring to the tape.

VASQUEZ: I just covered what I thought happened at the moment.

THIESSEN: And you said that you thought that you associated him ramming an SSD vehicle with when they PITed him, that's why I asked that question.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: So when those other two vehicles PITed PC 832.7 (b) you're associating him ramming those vehicles?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: Isn't that what he just said?

MERKINS: Well, I think what we're trying to clarify, Mr. Vasquez, is that you've written this on a probable cause declaration so you are speaking to it even based on what other officer did or did not have happen to them. So I think we're kind of splitting hairs when we're saying well I'm not in their driver seat. But you put that on a probable cause, so you did speak for them.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: So now we are trying to as a Department justify what you put on that form.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: So we're actually trying to help you out here by saying how do you justify this because what we see and what we read are two different things so can you please explain so that we can understand. Does that make sense?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: OK. So when you say that the other officers PITed him, a PIT is definitely different from somebody ramming somebody.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: So that in my mind if we're saying that somebody got rammed three times and then there's two additional PITs involved there, now we're talking about five different events, not three, not two.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: But we don't see that so if he rammed three vehicles we need to identify those three different rams, and if he was PITed three different times we need to identify those three different PITs.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: OK?

VASQUEZ: OK.

MERKINS: So when you did your maneuver on his driver side door and he backs into you, that's not a head-on event, that's he is backing in and he's actually trying to escape.

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: I'm trying to think, I don't know which vehicle number it is...

THIESSEN: I believe it's Martin at Elk Grove Florin where he attempts to PIT on the left rear quarter panel of the suspect's car. Correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: And that is considered a PIT. Correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: It was not successful only because he probably didn't go up far enough on the car. Actually, before we go further can I clarify—you've been trained in EVOC to do PITs, correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MERKINS: And do you recall the date that you attended the EVOC and did the PIT class?

VASQUEZ: It was less than a year ago.

MERKINS: Less than a year ago?

VASQUEZ: Yeah.

MERKINS: OK. So your fairly familiar with how a PIT is done and what speeds you need to be at when you do a PIT?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: So in that example that I was explaining to you where Deputy Martin tried to PIT PC 832.7 it appeared the only reason it was unsuccessful is he wasn't far enough forward—from the video, I'm not asking a question I'm just explaining what I saw.

VASQUEZ: Mm-hmm. (yes)

THIESSEN: But we both agree that that was an attempted PIT, correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK. And would be both agree that that was not the suspect ramming Deputy Martin's car?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK. And then he makes a U-turn around the island?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: And when he's coming back the other way Deputy Burton attempts to PIT him on the other side. Do you recall that?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. And do we agree that that is a PIT also?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: And would we agree that that is not the suspect ramming Deputy Burton?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

THIESSEN: OK.

MERKINS: So then I guess we're back to the other question: where are the three different rams with the suspect vehicle ramming Sheriff's cars?

VASQUEZ: Those would all be in relation to the PITs.

THIESSEN: OK. So you are associating the PITs with him ramming them?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: OK. Are you aware when you fill out your probable cause form and you book someone into the Jail that that form goes to a clerk who then reads your form and everything you wrote—and that's why it says under penalty of perjury—to a judge who then makes judicial review in his opinion whether or not there's enough probable cause to hold that individual on the charges you listed?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

THIESSEN: Do you have any other questions? I was going to go back and watch the video but he just described the rams and PITs, he's associating both of them together so I don't have to go back and watch the video.

MERKINS: OK.

THIESSEN: Do you have anything to add, sir?

MCNAMARA: Yeah. How long does this chase last for?

VASQUEZ: I think a little over, right around 15 minutes.

MCNAMARA: All right. How fast is this guy going?

VASQUEZ: We get up to I think a top speed right around 100mph.

MCNAMARA: OK. Do you recall how many Sheriff's cars are involved in that?

VASQUEZ: No, I don't recall exactly.

MCNAMARA: Do you have an approximation?

VASQUEZ: Probably 15.

MCNAMARA: And there are citizens' vehicles present at the time. Is that correct?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MCNAMARA: When did you write this report?

VASQUEZ: The next day I believe.

MCNAMARA: You didn't review the In-Car Camera before you wrote it?

VASQUEZ: Mm...yes, I did.

MCNAMARA: You did?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MCNAMARA: When did you review the In-Car Camera?

VASQUEZ: I want to say that night briefly after everything was over.

MCNAMARA: OK. And this is right after the chase, is that correct?

VASQUEZ: Yeah.

MCNAMARA: As far as taking him into custody were you directly involved in that?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MCNAMARA: OK. You said you had arrived on scene and he was on his knees already, is that right?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MCNAMARA: So when you first came into contact with him he as already in custody, is that fair to say?

VASQUEZ: Yes. There was already the one deputy there and then I ran up next.

MCNAMARA: OK. And can you explain, you were kind of back and forth on the head-on collision and all that stuff. Can you just explain what you meant by that?

VASQUEZ: Well...could you repeat that?

MCNAMARA: You had a back and forth about being hit head-on by this guy?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MCNAMARA: Can you just explain what you meant by that and just kind of elaborate on that whole situation?

VASQUEZ: Just with the adrenaline pumping that's just the first thing that came out of my mouth so...

MCNAMARA: And the guy hit the front of your car, correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MCNAMARA: OK. The probable cause statement that you reviewed, the time that you wrote it did you believe that everything in there was accurate?

VASQUEZ: Yes, I did.

MCNAMARA: And the report, at the time that you wrote it did you believe everything in there was accurate?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MCNAMARA: And how long ago did this chase take place, do you know?

VASQUEZ: Last year. About a year ago approximately.

MCNAMARA: And then since that time the first time you saw the video again was today, correct?

VASQUEZ: Correct.

MCNAMARA: That's all.

MERKINS: Can I clarify a couple things?

THIESSEN: Yes.

MERKINS: When we were talking about vehicles and ramming and not ramming and how many and so forth I noted that you said that you had not watched the video prior to writing any of your paperwork. And I think you just clarified for your attorney that you had watched the video briefly so--

VASQUEZ: Just the PC form. I didn't watch it when I wrote the actual PC on the arrest. That moment, that's what I—I'm sorry.

MERKINS: OK. Good, thank you for clarifying that. OK. So prior to writing your PC you had not watched the video?

VASQUEZ: No.

MERKINS: And then prior to actually writing your report you watched just a little bit of the video?

VASQUEZ: Correct. I kind of just went through to get the streets and...

MERKINS: The highlights?

VASQUEZ: Yeah, basically to figure out what I needed to write.

MERKINS: OK.

THIESSEN: Where did you view the video from the In-Car Camera?

VASQUEZ: In my car.

THIESSEN: In your car. And just to clarify when you were second on scene and the suspect PC 832.7 (b) was seen on his knees, what were your actions then?

VASQUEZ: I dove on him.

THIESSEN: OK.

MERKINS: He was not handcuffed at that time?

VASQUEZ: No.

THIESSEN: And do you know who handcuffed him?

VASQUEZ: I don't recall if I helped grab one arm but I was directly on top of him. It was every, I mean it was chaos until he was taken into custody. (inaud) adrenaline everybody and that was it.

THIESSEN: OK. Approximately how many people do you think were there like on him or around him?

VASQUEZ: Four.

THIESSEN: OK. And you didn't see the dog come in, just to clarify?

VASQUEZ: No. But I did see the dog with a K9 officer.

THIESSEN: OK.

MERKINS: Again, can I clarify we talked about the somebody and you weren't sure who it was told you later the dog had bit PC 832.7 (b)?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: And that was before you wrote your report or after you wrote your report?

VASQUEZ: It was before.

MERKINS: Before you wrote the report?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: Did you think maybe that would have been something important to clarify and put in the report?

VASQUEZ: No, I just figured everybody else would cover their part. It was his dog, he would cover it and some won't.

MERKINS: OK. Were you the primary officer?

VASQUEZ: Yes.

MERKINS: So you were basically responsible for writing kind of the chrono of the report and then everybody puts in their supplements?

VASQUEZ: Correct, yes.

MERKINS: Did you review any of the other supplements of the reports to verify that the K9 officer actually put in there that his dog bit--

VASQUEZ: No. You don't give an anonymous.

MERKINS: You can verify that through them though that they put that in there? You could have a verbal?

VASQUEZ: Oh, yes. Most definitely, and I did not.

MERKINS: You did not. OK. All right.

THIESSEN: Anything else, sir?

MCNAMARA: No.

THIESSEN: OK. I'm going to go ahead and end this interview. The time is now 16:53 hours.

(S.Vasquez.2009IA-035)mjp

Incident
Report Date: 06/18/2008
Activity Num: 2008-0033021

Sacramento Sheriff's Department
7000 65th Street
Sacramento, CA 95823

SUMMARY

Occurred: 06/18/2008 01:08 Hrs - 01:21 Hrs Date Prepared: 06/18/2008
Location: Stockton Blvd & Fleming Ave Sacramento, CA 95823
Offense: PC 245(A)(1) Force/Assault With A Deadly Weapon-Not Firearm:Gbi Likely
VC 2800.1(A) Evading Peace Officer
PC 3056 Violation Parole
ZZ TOWED/STORED/RECOV VEH Towed/Stored/Recov Vehicle

Activity Notes: S-1 was observed swerving between lanes on a public roadway. Deputies attempted to conduct a vehicle stop. S-1 fled in his vehicle leading Deputies in a vehicle pursuit. S-1 attempted to to conduct a u-turn as Deputies pulled behind S-1. S-1 rammed his vehicle into Deputies marked patrol vehicle. S-1 continue to flee from Deputies at speeds in excess of 90 MPH. S-1 drove through several red lights and stop signs at speeds in excess of 70 MPH. S-1's vehicle became disabled and came to a stop. S-1 was taken into custody without incident. S-1's breath had a strong odor of an alcoholic beverage emitting from it. S-1 admitted to drinking several alcoholic beverages before driving. **updated by Records**

IBR ACTIVITY

Suspected of Using: Used alcohol
Bias Motivation: None
Domestic Violence: No
Location Type: Highway/road/alley

ACTIVITY ATTRIBUTES

Crime-Arrest Report:	Yes	Comment: ASSOC
CSI Request:	Yes	Comment: ASSOC
RMS Additional XRef:	Yes	Comment: 07/07/2008 11:52:42
Supplemental Report:	Additional property report	
Supplemental Report:	Additional officer report	
Watch Summary:	Yes	Comment: ASSOC

METHOD

Place of activity: Highway/road/alley
Structure: Not applicable
Surroundings: Residential

PARTICIPANTS

S1	Arrestee	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	DOB: PC 832.7 (b)
	Agency Identifier:	PC 832.7	
	Height:	PC 832.7 (b)	Weight: PC 832.7 (b) Build: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
	Home Address:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	
	Arrest Address:	13th Ave & 50th St Sacramento, CA 95820	
	Eye color:	PC	
	Hair color:	PC	
	Parole Status:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	
	Resident Status:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	
	Sobriety Tests	Blood	
	Performed:		
	Sobriety:	HBD - Under Influence	
	Social Security	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	
	Number #:		
	Operator License	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	
	Number #:		
	Tattoo location:	Arm, Lower Left	
	Tattoo location:	Arm, Lower Right	
	Driver		
	1989 Pontiac Grand AM	License: PC 832.7	VIN: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
	Unknown:		
	Work Hours:	From:	To:
	Days Off:	From:	To:

Arrest Information

Contact Type:	Cite Number:
Booking Date:	In Custody: N
Booking Number:	Contact Dispo: Felony. booked
Booking Type: New booking	Booking Location: Jail
Arrest Date: 06/18/2008 01:21	Resulting From:
Court:	Statement: N
Blood Alcohol Test:	Blood Alcohol Level: 0
Arraignment Date:	Bail Amount: \$.00
Outside Agency:	Outside Custody:
Outside Case:	Agency Action:
Arrest Type: Onsite Arrest	Transaction #:
Armed With: Unarmed	

PC 245(A)(1) Force/Assault With A Deadly Weapon-Not Firearm:Gbi Likely
IBR: Aggravated assault IBR Primary: Yes

State: Assault with deadly weapon
Category: Felony
Dismissable: N
Domestic Violence: N

Class:
Case Required:

VC 2800.1(A) Evading Peace Officer
IBR: All other reportable offenses
State: Miscellaneous traffic
Category: Felony
Dismissable: N
Domestic Violence: N

Class:
Case Required:

PC 3056 Violation Parole
IBR: All other reportable offenses
State: Parole violation - fel
Category: Felony
Dismissable: N
Domestic Violence: N
Relationship: Vasquez, Steve - Stranger

Class:
Case Required:

V1 Victim-confidential

Vasquez, Steve - PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A) DOB: PC 832.7 (b)
Home Address: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)
Work Address: 711 G St Sacramento, CA 95632
Victim Type: Law enforcement officer
Assault Activity: Traffic pursuit and stop
Assignment Type: One-officer vehicle. assisted
Violation(s): PC 245(A)(1) Force/Assault With A Deadly Weapon-Not
Firearm:Gbi Likely
Injuries: None
Circumstances: Assault on law enforcement officer
Domestic Violence: No
Resident Status: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(A)
Business phone: (916) 874-5115
Phone:
Full time: Sacramento County Sheriffs Department
Occupation: Deputy Sheriff
Work Hours: From: 22:00 To: 08:00
Days Off: From: Saturday To: Monday
Relationship: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) - Stranger

Registered owner

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) Unknown
LKA Address: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
Registered owner
1989 Pontiac Grand AM License: PC 832.7 (b) VIN: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

ACTIVITY STATUS

Bus Date: 06/20/2008
Bus Set By: Martin, Ricardo Flores
Status Date: 06/18/2008
Status Set By: Limbird, Mark Glenn

Status: Cleared by arrest
Exception:
Status: Active case
Exception:

Activity Num:2008-0033021

Status Date: 06/18/2008

Status: Cleared by arrest

Status Set By: Vasquez, Steve Al

Exception:

INVOLVED PERSONNEL

Approved by - Goncalves, Craig L.	Badge: 73
Approved by - Rinelli, Michael Lee	Badge: 2007
Approved by - Shijo, Diana L.	Badge: 118
Approved by - Butler, Michael Robert	Badge: 17L
Approved by - Costanzo, Anthony Frank	Badge: 33
Arresting officer - Vasquez, Steve Al	Badge: 481
Narrative Officer - Vasquez, Steve Al	Badge: 481
Reporting officer - Vasquez, Steve Al	Badge: 481
Reporting officer - Rickett, Lori Lynn	Badge: 210
Reporting officer - Saunders, Gregory Allen	Badge: 375
Reporting officer - Martin, Ricardo Flores	Badge: 1293
Reporting officer - Limbird, Mark Glenn	Badge: 179
Reporting officer - Hart, James Franklin	Badge: 17
Reporting officer - Burton, Jon G.	Badge: 126

VIOLATIONS

PC 245(A)(1) Force/Assault With A Deadly Weapon-Not Firearm:Gbi Likely

Counts: 1

Dismissable: N

Vio Category: Felony

IBR: Aggravated assault

State: Assault with deadly weapon

Criminal/Gang: None or unknown gang

Weapon/Force: Vehicle used as weapon

VC 2800.1(A) Evading Peace Officer

Counts: 1

Dismissable: N

Vio Category: Felony

IBR: All other reportable offenses

State: Reckless driving

PC 3056 Violation Parole

Counts: 1

Dismissable: N

Vio Category: Felony

IBR: All other reportable offenses

ZZ TOWED/STORED/RECOV VEH Towed/Stored/Recov Vehicle

Counts: 1

Dismissable: N

IBR: Nonreportable violation

State: Nonreportable offense

LOCATIONS

Occurrence address Stockton Blvd & Fleming Ave Sacramento, CA 95823

VEHICLES

1989 Pontiac Grand AM - License #: PC 832.7 (b) State: PC Exp. Date: PC 832.7

Stored Vehicle

VIN:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
Driver:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
Registered owner:	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
Impound Status:	Towed
LIC. Clear in SVS:	Yes
VIN Clear in SVS:	Yes
Color Top:	Gray
Color Bottom:	Gray
Body type:	4-Door

PROPERTY

Status	Loss Qty	Rec Qty	Item	Property Desc	Loss Value	Rec Value	Damage Value
--------	----------	---------	------	---------------	------------	-----------	--------------

1		1 EA	CD	disk containing scene photographs			
---	--	------	----	-----------------------------------	--	--	--

Recovered by: Rickett, Lori Lynn
Attribute: Bar Code AFR issued

Activity Num:2008-0033021

Attribute: Evidence Type Evidence
Attribute: Item Booked Individually

Evidence	1 EA	DVD	DVD-Rom containing in-car camera footage.	\$1.00		
Recovered by: Hart, James Franklin						
Attribute: Bar Code AFR issued						
Attribute: Evidence Type Evidence						
Attribute: Item Booked Packing List						
Totals:				\$0.00	\$1.00	\$0.00

RELATED CASES

No Related Cases associated with this report

0112 Hours; 06-18-2008 (Wednesday): I, Deputy L. Rickett #1358 (CSI Unit ID11E), requested a vehicle pursuit follow involving damage to three marked Sheriff's Department patrol vehicles at the intersection of 13th Avenue and 50th Street where the pursuit terminated with suspect in custody. An update advised the suspect, later identified as PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) (PC 832.7 (b)(5)), sustained a minor dog bite injury while being taken into custody.

0135 Hours: I arrived and took the following digital photographs:

- Overall views of Sheriff's marked patrol vehicles # 122-656, #122-783B, and #122-717 depicting general condition.
- Overall views of Sheriff's marked patrol vehicle #122-656, exempt license plate 1252736, depicting front bumper damage, crack through front passenger side of bumper, bent black push bar, and rear quarter panel dents. These views also depicting interior of driver area where no airbag deployment was present.
- Overall views of Sheriff's marked patrol vehicle #122-783B, exempt license plate 1274775, depicting damage to front push bar and bumper, siren detached and dangling.
- Overall views of Sheriff's marked patrol vehicle #122-717, exempt license plate 1271291, depicting damage/scratches/paint transfer to front passenger bumper
- Overall views of PC 832.7 (b)(5), in rear of patrol vehicle, handcuffed, depicting general condition.
- Close up views of outer and inner right lower leg of PC 832.7 (b)(5) depicting horizontal scratches, front apparent Sheriff's K9 deployment.
- Close up views of left side of PC 832.7 (b)(5)'s face depicting apparent abrasion on cheek area.
- Overall views of suspect vehicle, gray Pontiac Grand Prix (PC 832.7 (b)(5)) in middle of intersection at 13th Avenue/50th Street.
- Overall, mid-range, and close-up views of both driver and passenger sides of Pontiac depicting apparent indentations and paint transfers.
- Overall, mid-range, and close-up views of front passenger rim, exposing no tire, of Pontiac.
- Overall views of roadway leading toward suspect vehicle, depicting apparent scratches on street where rim of vehicle was driven.
- Overall interior views of suspect vehicle depicting general condition.

0154 Hours: I cleared this location and resumed my normal CSI duties.

0108 Hours/06-18-2008: I, Deputy J. Burton #126 (Unit 65G1), was on patrol in my assigned district when I heard Deputy S. Vasquez #481 (Unit 63H1) advise on the radio that he was in pursuit of Pontiac in the area of Stockton Boulevard and Fleming. Deputy Vasquez gave repeated updates of the suspect vehicle failing to stop at stop signs and stop lights.

0111 Hours: I was monitoring the pursuit when I heard Deputy Vasquez advise that the suspect vehicle had rammed his patrol vehicle. I joined the pursuit which was east bound on Florin Road from Palmerhouse. The suspect vehicle was driving east bound in the west bound lanes of Florin Road. The vehicle was driving with the headlights turned off. The suspect vehicle reached speeds of ninety (90) miles per hour. As the pursuit neared east bound Florin Road west of Elk Grove-Florin Road, the suspect vehicle lost a tire. The vehicle was driving on a rim and sparks were coming out from underneath the vehicle.

0113 Hours: I observed the suspect vehicle as Deputy R. Martin attempted to perform a P.I.T. on the vehicle at East bound Florin Road east of Elk Grove-Florin Road. The suspect vehicle spun around and appeared to be stopped facing west bound in the west bound lane of Florin Road just east of Elk Grove-Florin Boulevard. I had pulled my vehicle into the west bound lanes in anticipation of conducting a felony vehicle stop. The suspect vehicle began to travel west bound on Florin Road towards my location. As the vehicle drove towards me, I started to turn around. The suspect vehicle drove in front of my vehicle. Believing that the suspect was going to injure or kill a Deputy or citizen if the pursuit continued, I tried to perform a legal intervention on the suspect vehicle by hitting the rear passenger side quarter panel with my push bar on the front of my patrol vehicle. The legal intervention was unsuccessful and the suspect vehicle continued west bound on Florin Road.

I continued with the pursuit until the suspect vehicle went east bound on 15th Avenue from 53rd Street, at which time Deputy Vasquez attempted to use the P.I.T. again to stop the suspect vehicle. I pulled up next to Deputy Martin's patrol vehicle to conduct a felony vehicle stop. As I pulled up, Deputy Martin threw his driver's side door open in front of my patrol vehicle. The front of my patrol vehicle made light contact with the door on Deputy Martin's patrol vehicle.

The suspect vehicle continued west bound on 15th Avenue. I continued with the pursuit until the suspect exited the vehicle on 13th Avenue east of Stockton Boulevard. I handcuffed the suspect who was then placed in the rear of a nearby patrol vehicle.

0100 Hours, 06-18-2008 (Wednesday): I Deputy S. Vasquez #481 (Unit 63H1) was assigned to the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department as a marked patrol unit. I was dressed in full uniform and driving a marked patrol vehicle (122-656).

0108 Hours: I was driving southbound on Stockton Blvd. approaching Fleming Avenue. I observed a grey Pontiac Grand Prix

(Plate **PC 832.7 (b)(5)**) driving southbound in the number one lane of Stockton Blvd. The Pontiac was occupied by one male driver. The driver was later identified as **PC 832.7 (b)(5)**. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** continued to swerve from the number one lane into the number two lane. Through training and experience most vehicles which swerve from lane to lane have a driver that is under the influence of an alcoholic beverage, or is impaired by an unknown substance.

I advised dispatched (via radio), I would be conducting a vehicle stop on the Pontiac. I advised dispatched of my location and activated my overhead lights (red and blue). **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** continued southbound on Stockton Blvd and turned eastbound onto White Willow drive. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** began to pull to the shoulder and suddenly accelerated at a high rate of speed. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** turned northbound onto Whisper Willow drive from White Willow drive. I advised dispatched I was in pursuit of **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** and further advised our location.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued northbound on Whisper Willow drive and attempted to conduct a u-turn, at the intersection of Rachel Court and Whisper Willow drive. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** drove over the front yard (grass) of **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** Rachel Court almost colliding into the house. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** continued southbound on Whisper Willow drive and immediately turned westbound onto Walter Ave. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** drove through the stop sign at Walter Ave. and Stockton Blvd at speeds in excess of 50 miles per hour. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** continued northbound on Stockton Blvd. from Walter Ave.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) turned eastbound onto Chandler drive from Stockton Blvd. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** drove through the stop sign at the intersection of Chandler drive and Barkley way, at speeds in excess of 50 miles per hour. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** continued on Chandler drive at speeds in excess of 60 miles per hour. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** again drove through the stop sign at the intersection Chandler drive and Florin road.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) crossed the center divide of Florin road and attempted to turn westbound from the center divide. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** drove straight into the curb on the north side of Florin road, just east of Chandler drive. The front of **PC 832.7 (b)(5)**'s vehicle was facing north in the westbound lanes of traffic. I pulled behind **PC 832.7 (b)(5)**'s vehicle, in an attempt to block him in. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** immediately put his vehicle into reverse and rammed my patrol vehicle. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)**'s left rear quarter panel struck the front right side of my bumper and rammed into the right rear side of my patrol vehicle. I advised dispatched **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** had just rammed my patrol vehicle with his vehicle.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) then turned eastbound and drove east on Florin road, against traffic in the westbound lanes. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** was driving at speeds in excess of 90 miles per hour, in the westbound lanes of traffic. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** turned the lights to his vehicle off and continued to drive eastbound in the westbound lanes of traffic blacked out. **PC 832.7 (b)(5)** drove through the red light at the intersection of

Briggs drive with no regard to public safety. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued to drive eastbound in the westbound lanes of traffic at speeds of 90 miles per hour.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) drove over the center median of Florin road as he approached the intersection of Florin road and Power Inn road. PC 832.7 (b)(5) was now driving in the eastbound lanes of traffic on Florin road. The front right tire to PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle came off of his vehicle. PC 832.7 (b)(5) was now driving on the rim and continued to flee from Deputies in his vehicle. PC 832.7 (b)(5) crossed the intersection of Florin road and Power Inn road and continued to flee from Deputies eastbound on Florin road. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued eastbound on Florin road and ran the red light at the intersection of French road and Florin road. PC 832.7 (b)(5) drove through the intersection at speeds of 90 miles per hour. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued eastbound with no regard for public safety. PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle was smoking and scraping the ground on the right front rim as he continued eastbound on Florin road.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) crossed the intersection of Elk Grove Florin road and attempted to conduct a u-turn on Florin road just east of Elk Grove Florin road. Deputy R. Martin (Unit 63G1) conducted a Pursuit Intervention Technique (P.I.T) on PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle as he began to conduct his u-turn on Florin road. PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle spun out, but he quickly recovered. PC 832.7 (b)(5) again accelerated and Deputy J. Burton (65G1) again attempted to conduct a Legal intervention maneuver, with negative results. PC 832.7 (b)(5) crossed Elk Grove Florin road westbound on Florin road. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued to flee from Deputies while driving at approximately 90 miles per hour.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) again drove through the red lights at the intersection of Elk Grove Florin road and Florin road, French road and Florin road, Power Inn road and Florin road, Briggs road and Florin road and Stockton Blvd and Florin road. PC 832.7 (b)(5) drove through all of these intersections at speeds in excess of 90 miles per hour.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) turned northbound onto Stockton blvd. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued northbound on Stockton blvd. while fleeing from Deputies at speeds of 90 miles per hour. PC 832.7 (b)(5) drove through the red light at the intersection of 47th avenue and Stockton blvd., Fruitridge road and Stockton blvd., and 14th avenue and Stockton blvd. PC 832.7 (b)(5) turned eastbound onto 14th avenue from Stockton blvd.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) turned eastbound onto 14th avenue from Stockton blvd. PC 832.7 (b)(5) turned southbound onto 53rd street and quickly began to turn eastbound onto 15th avenue from 53rd street. I determined the conditions were safe and in fear PC 832.7 (b)(5) was going to severely injure somebody if the pursuit continued I conducted a P.I.T on PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle. PC 832.7 (b)(5)'S vehicle spun around and came to a stop facing westbound on 15th avenue. PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued westbound on 15th avenue and drove through the stop sign at the intersection of 15th avenue and Stockton blvd.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) continued northbound on Stockton blvd and turned eastbound onto 13th avenue. PC 832.7 (b)(5) stopped his vehicle in the intersection of 13th avenue and 50th street. PC 832.7 (b)(5) exited his vehicle and placed his hands in the air.

0121 Hours: PC 832.7 (b)(5) was taken into custody without incident. A records check of PC 832.7 (b)(5) revealed he was on active Parole.

PC 832.7 (b)(5) had a strong alcoholic beverage odor emitting from his breath. His eyes were blood shot and glassy. PC 832.7 (b)(5) admitted to drinking an alcohol beverage earlier in the evening.

My patrol vehicle (122-656) sustained major damage to the front bumper area. The push bumper was bent over and the right side of the front bumper was smashed in and broken. The rear quarter panel above the right rear tire area was dented in from being struck by PC 832.7 (b)(5) vehicle. The dented area was approximately twenty inches in length and ten inches high.

0130Hrs: (June 18, 2008) Wednesday: I, Deputy R. Martin #1293 (Unit 63G1) was assigned to the central division of the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department as a patrol deputy. I was dressed in full uniform and driving a marked patrol vehicle.

I responded to assist Deputy S. Vasquez who was involved in a vehicle pursuit. I responded with my overhead emergency lights and siren.

I joined Deputy Vasquez and Deputy K. Bunn as they pursued the suspect vehicle west on Florin Road. The suspect vehicle was traveling at speeds in excess of 90 miles per hour and was driving erratically.

The vehicle slowed as it arrived the intersection of Florin Road and Elk Grove Florin Road. I saw an opportunity to use a Pursuit Intervention Technique (PIT) and performed it just east of the above intersection on Florin Road. The PIT was unsuccessful. The suspect vehicle made a u-turn and the pursuit continued west on Florin Road. During the Pursuit the suspect, later identified as PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) (S1), was constantly reaching under his seat. I suspected the PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) possibly had a weapon concealed under his seat.

The Pursuit ended on 13th Avenue east of Stockton Boulevard when the PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) stopped his vehicle and stepped out. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) was ordered to lie face down on the ground and place his hands behind his back.

I deployed my Taser and pointed it at PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) as deputies approached to handcuff him. As deputies approached PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) he moved his hands away from the back of his head and moved them down towards his waist. I felt PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) was possibly reaching towards his waistband to reach for a concealed weapon.

I depressed the trigger of my Taser in order to prevent PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) from reaching a possible weapon. I noticed PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) was placing his hands at the rear of his back and not reaching for a weapon. The Taser has a slight delay in discharging and I was able to point the Taser in a safe direction. The Taser cartridge discharged and struck the pavement. The Taser prongs did not impact PC 832.7 (b)(5)(P) or anyone else.

End of Narrative.

0108 Hours, 6/18/08(Wednesday): I, Deputy M. Limbird #179 (K97) was patrolling in the Northeast Division of Sacramento

County. I was in full Sheriff's department uniform and was driving a fully marked Sheriff's K9 patrol vehicle with overhead red and blue lights.

While patrolling in the Northeast Division I overheard Deputy Vasquez (63H1) conduct a vehicle stop on a Pontiac in the area of Stockton Boulevard and Fleming Avenue. Shortly after voicing the vehicle stop, Deputy Vasquez voiced he was in pursuit of the Pontiac. I activated my emergency lights and siren and headed towards Deputy Vasquez's location. Deputy Vasquez continued to update his direction of travel. He stated the suspect (Later identified as PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) S-1) was traveling in excess of 80 miles per hour on surface streets running several red lights and stop signs.

0111 Hours, Deputy Vasquez voiced that PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) had rammed his patrol vehicle head on and was still attempting to flee from him.

Deputy Vasquez continued to update his direction of travel, and that PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was traveling at approximately 90 miles per hour on surface streets. He later voiced that PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) turned the lights off on his vehicle and was still driving in a reckless manor at times against traffic.

0120 Hours, Deputy Vasquez voiced that PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was reaching underneath his seat. He also voiced that PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) had rammed two

other Sheriff's Patrol units head on in the pursuit. The patrol units had attempted to end the vehicle pursuit several times via the pursuit intervention technique (Pit) but were unsuccessful. (Refer to Deputy Vasquez's report for exact route and driving conditions during the vehicle pursuit)

0120 Hours, I caught up with the vehicle pursuit and was the forth Sheriff's Patrol unit in the vehicle pursuit. I caught up with the

vehicle pursuit as they turned northbound onto Stockton Boulevard from 15th Avenue. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) then turned eastbound onto 13th Avenue from Stockton Boulevard. PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) came to a stop at 13th Avenue and 50th Street and exited his vehicle. I exited my patrol vehicle with my K9 partner Kaleo and started running towards PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B). There were several Sheriff's patrol units arriving with their lights and sirens on. I exited my patrol vehicle with my K9 partner Kaleo for the following reasons:

- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was wanted for fresh violent felony charges
- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) had shown wanton disregard for the safety of the public during the vehicle pursuit
- Since he had rammed several Sheriff's patrol vehicles during the pursuit
- I didn't know if he was trying to flee
- Was unsearched
- Was seen by officers reaching underneath his seat during the vehicle pursuit

As I was running towards PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s location, my hand slipped off of Kaleo's collar. Kaleo subsequently contacted PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) on his right ankle. I removed Kaleo and PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) was taken into custody.

I requested the fire department respond to evaluate the injury to PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s leg. Sacramento City Fire Department Engine 6 later arrived and treated PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B). They treated PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) and deemed him fit for incarceration.

Crime Scene Officer Rickett arrived and photographed the injury to PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)'s leg.

Observations

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) sustained two tooth drag marks approximately an inch and a half in length on his inner right ankle. He also sustained two tooth drag marks approximately an inch and a half in length on the outer portion of his right ankle.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL
VEHICLE REPORT
CHP 180 (Rev. 2-99) OPI 061

NOTE: CHP 180 IS FURNISHED TO ALL PEACE
OFFICERS BY THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

REPORTING DEPARTMENT SACRAMENTO SHERIFF		LOCATION CODE 3400	DATE / TIME OF REPORT 6/18/08 0200	NOTICE OF STORED VEHICLE DELIVERED PERSONALLY <input type="checkbox"/>	FILE NO. 08-33021
TOWED / STOLEN FROM 50TH STREET / 13TH AVE		ODOMETER READING	VIN CLEAR IN SVS? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO LIC. CLEAR IN SVS? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	DATE / TIME DISPATCH NOTIFIED	LOG NO.
YEAR 89	MAKE PONTIAC	MODEL GRAND PRIX	BODY TYPE 2DR	COLOR GREY	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) <input type="checkbox"/> ONE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TWO <input type="checkbox"/> PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) <input type="checkbox"/> PC 832.7
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)			ENGINE NO.	VALUATION BY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OFFICER <input type="checkbox"/> OWNER <input type="checkbox"/> 0-300 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 301-400 <input type="checkbox"/> 4001+ <input type="checkbox"/> \$	
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)			LEGAL OWNER		
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)			<input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS R/O		

☒ **STORED** ☐ **IMPOUNDED** ☐ **RELEASED** ☐ **RECOVERED - VEHICLE / COMPONENT**

TOWING / STORAGE CONCERN (NAME, ADDRESS, PHONE) **SHANAHANS TOW 6211 POWER INN RD** STORAGE AUTHORITY (REASON) **22651(h) CVC**

TOWED TO / STORED AT **SHANAHANS TOW** AIRBAG? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ 1 ☐ 2 DRIVEABLE? ☐ YES ☒ NO ☐ JUNK ☐ UNK VIN SWITCHED? ☐ YES ☐ NO

CONDITION	YES	NO	ITEMS	YES	NO	ITEMS	YES	NO	ITEMS	YES	NO	TIRES / WHEELS	CONDITION
WRECKED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		SEAT (FRONT)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		REGISTRATION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		CAMPER		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LEFT FRONT	stock
BURNED HULK per 431(c) VC		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SEAT (REAR)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		ALT. / GENERATOR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		VESSEL AS LOAD		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RIGHT FRONT	FLAT
VANDALIZED		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RADIO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		BATTERY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		FIREARMS		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LEFT REAR	stock
ENG. / TRANS. STRIP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TAPE DECK		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DIFFERENTIAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		OTHER		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RIGHT REAR	
MISC. PARTS STRIP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TAPES		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TRANSMISSION	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					SPARE	
BODY METAL STRIP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OTHER RADIO		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AUTOMATIC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					HUB CAPS	
SURGICAL STRIP per 431(b) VC		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	IGNITION KEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		MANUAL		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				SPECIAL WHEELS	

REI... VEHICLE TO: ☐ R/O OR AGENT ☐ AGENCY HOLD ☐ 22850.3 VC PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) DATE / TIME

NAME OF PERSON / AGENCY AUTHORIZING RELEASE I.D. NO. DATE AUTHORIZED AND ENTITLED TO TAKE POSSESSION OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED VEHICLE.

SIGNATURE OF PERSON AUTHORIZING RELEASE SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING POSSESSION

☐ **STOLEN VEHICLE / COMPONENT** ☐ **EMBEZZLED VEHICLE** ☐ **PLATE(S) REPORT**






DATE / TIME OF OCCURRENCE	DATE / TIME REPORTED	NAME OF REPORTING PARTY (R/P)	DRIVER LICENSE NO. / STATE
LAST DRIVER OF VEHICLE	DATE / TIME	ADDRESS OF R/P	TELEPHONE OF R/P

I CERTIFY OR DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT. SIGNATURE OF PERSON MAKING REPORT

REMARKS
(LIST PROPERTY, TOOLS, VEHICLE DAMAGE, ARRESTS)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) ARRESTED / SECTION? ☒ YES ☐ NO **245(a)(1) PC** REPORTED BY CARGO / TYPE? ☐ YES ☒ NO VALUE \$ ☐ BILL OF LADING ATTACHED

ABOVE SUBJECT LED DEPUTIES ON A LENGTHY HIGH SPEED PURSUIT, SUBJECT CRASHED INTO / RAMMED SEVERAL POLICE VEHICLES BEFORE COMING TO A STOP. SUBJECT WAS ARRESTED AND VEHICLE TOWED PER 22651(h) CVC

 FRONT	 LEFT SIDE	 RIGHT SIDE	 REAR	 TOP
SIGNATURE OF OFFICER TAKING REPORT SAUNDERS		I.D. NO. 375	SUPERVISOR	REQUIRED NOTICES SENT TO REGISTERED AND LEGAL OWNERS PER 22852 VC? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
		DATE NOTIFIED		

Property/Evidence Package Label

Report No.:CD 2008-0033021


Report Date: 07/07/2008

Evidence Officer: Hart, James (#17)

Offenses:

Subjects:

Special Request:

Tag #	Status Type	Article Description	Barcode
JFH1	Evidence	1 EA - DVD Source: In-Car Camera System	 *08ZFTB*

Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
Chain of Custody Form

Place AFR Packing Label Over This Box
OR
Complete Information Below

Report # 08-33021

Item/Tag #	Barcode
LLR-PH	08Z543

Item/Tag #	Barcode

Sacramento County Sheriff's Department
Chain of Custody Form

SEND COPY OF THIS FORM TO PROPERTY WAREHOUSE AFTER EACH CHANGE OF CUSTODY

Item/Tag Number(s)	From	To	Date
LLR-PH	Print: RICKETT	Print: MCGINNIS	6/16/08
	Sign	Sign	
	Print	Print	
	Sign	Sign	
	Print	Print	
	Sign	Sign	
	Print	Print	
	Sign	Sign	
	Print	Print	
	Sign	Sign	
	Print	Print	
	Sign	Sign	

OF - 33021
REPORT NUMBER

FOUND

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) AGE SEX RACE

08YJ6E

SIGNATURE

§

PAGE	OF
------	----

TIME BOOKED

PROPERTY WAREHOUSE

SACRAMENTO COUNTY JAIL

SSD
☐ CLEAR-UP

☐ SPD

08-3302.

23 WARRANT CHECK RUN <input type="checkbox"/> SSD <input type="checkbox"/> CPO <input type="checkbox"/> CLTS	24 IS ARRESTEE PAROLEE? <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES: <input type="checkbox"/> CAA <input type="checkbox"/> CYA
---	---

TO ACCOMPLISH

<input type="checkbox"/> REFUSED	<input type="checkbox"/> URINE	17 SIGNATURE OF DEPUTY PROBATION OFFICER RECEIVING CUSTODY X
----------------------------------	--------------------------------	---

4	<input type="checkbox"/> OUTSTANDING WARRANT(S)	8	<input type="checkbox"/> DEMANDS TO SEE <u>MAJESTY OF OFFICER</u> TO SIGN CITATION
5	<input type="checkbox"/> UNSATISFACTORY IDENTIFICATION	9	<input type="checkbox"/> OTHER REASON(S): <u>PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)</u>

Figure 1. The effect of the *Salmonella* infection on the expression of the *IL-1 β* gene in the spleen of mice. The mice were infected with *Salmonella* and the spleen was removed at 24 h post-infection. The spleen was then homogenized and the total RNA was extracted. The *IL-1 β* gene expression was analyzed by RT-PCR. The results are shown as the mean \pm SD of three independent experiments. **p* < 0.05, ***p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001.

7400 FORM 059 (5/94)	SSD ADULT 1-RECORDS 2-D.A. DETAIL/OTHER AGENCY 3-ID SECTION	JUVENILE 1-RECORDS 2-YOUTH DIV 3-EDUCATION	SPD ADULT 1-COUNTY JAIL 2-PUBLIC COUNTER 3-PROCESS/DOCK	JUVENILE 1-IDENTIFICATION 2-JUVENILE HALL
----------------------	---	--	---	--

SSD ADULT

1-RECORDS
2-D A DETAIL/OTHER AGENCY
3-I D SECTION

JUVENILE 1

-RECORDS
-YOUTH DIV
-PROBATION

SPD ADULT

1-COUNTY JAIL.
2-PUBLIC COUNTER
3-OFFICER COPY

JUVENILE

1-IDENTIFICATION
2-JUVENILE HALL
3-OFFICER COPY

PAGE 1 OF 1

**PROBABLE CAUSE DECLARATION FOR IN CUSTODY DETAINEES
(DO NOT ATTACH BOOKING SUMMARY TO ADULT DETAINEE)**

DEFENDANT NAME PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	X-REF PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	AGENCY 550	REPORT NO. 08-33021
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------------

I declare the above named person has been arrested and is detained in the Sacramento County Jail ☐ Jail ☐ Juvenile Hall. I am informed of and believe the facts below which establish probable cause to detain this individual: (Print in blank ink; circle description of witness, and "saw" or "heard" as appropriate).

EVIDENCE ESTABLISHING A CRIME WAS COMMITTED

Witness / Victim / Officer S. VASQUEZ #481 stated he/she saw/heard the following

1) S-1 WAS THE DRIVER AND SOLE OCCUPANT IN A PONTIAC GRAND PRIX PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
I OBSERVED S-1 SWERVING BETWEEN LANES. I ATTEMPTED TO CONDUCT A
TRAFFIC STOP. S-1 SLOWED AND BEGAN TO PULL OVER. S-1 SUDDENLY ACCELERATED
AND FLED IN HIS VEHICLE. S-1 TURNED AROUND AND DROVE DIRECTLY (If necessary, continue below)

EVIDENCE ESTABLISHING THAT THE ARRESTED PERSON COMMITTED THE CRIME

Witness / Victim / Officer POICER stated he/she saw/heard the following

2) AT ME IN MY PATROL VEHICLE, S-1 STUCK MY VEHICLE (112-656) AND
ATTEMPTED TO RUN HEAD ON INTO MY VEHICLE. DEPUTIES CONDUCTED A P.I.T.
MANEUVER IN AN ATTEMPT TO STOP S-1. S-1 AGAIN RAMMED HIS VEHICLE
INTO ANOTHER SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFFS VEHICLE AND CONTINUED (If necessary, continue below)

SIGNATURE - I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. 3)

PRINT NAME <u>S. VASQUEZ</u>	DATE <u>6/15/08</u>	BADGE NO. <u>481</u>
---------------------------------	------------------------	-------------------------

JUDICIAL DECISION RE: PROBABLE CAUSE TO DETAIN

- ☐ I find the declaration DOES establish probable cause to believe this arrestee committed a crime. The arrestee may be detained.
- ☐ I find the declaration DOES NOT establish probable cause to detain. The arrestee should be released on the charge(s).

SIGNATURE OF MAGISTRATE	DATE	TIME
-------------------------	------	------

VC 23153 (a-b) BAIL/OR INFORMATION

VICTIM(S) NAME(S)	AGE	EXTENT OF INJURY	HOSPITALIZED	IF YES, WHERE
<u>TO FLEE IN HIS VEHICLE, S-1 DROVE THROUGH</u>			YES	<u>SEVERAL STOP SIGNS</u>
<u>AND RED LIGHTS WHILE NO SIGNAL TO PUBLIC SAFETY. S-1 DROVE THROUGH THE</u>				
<u>INTERSECTIONS AT SPEEDS IN EXCESS OF 70 MPH. S-1 RAMMED HIS VEHICLE INTO</u>				
<u>AT THREE DIFFERENT 550' PATROL VEHICLES. S-1 FLED FROM DEPUTIES AT SPEEDS</u>				

4)

PC 273.5 BAIL/OR INFORMATION

YES	NO	UNK	QUESTIONS (FOR "YES" ANSWERS, EXPLAIN BELOW)	YES	NO	UNK	QUESTIONS (FOR "YES" ANSWERS, EXPLAIN BELOW)
			1. Prior documented domestic violence history?				5. Is the victim fearful of further violence?
			2. Documented history of violence?				6. Has the victim sought alternative housing?
			3. Other temporary housing available to arrestee?				7. Were minor children threatened or endangered?
			4. Was violation of a court order involved?				8. Any statement by arrestee as to further violence?

- ☐ Explanation of any "Yes" answer above in 273.5 PC cases, and describe extent of injury.
- ☐ Continuation of answer(s) from above.
- ☐ (Check if applicable) Minor admitted to Officer _____ that he/she

IN EXCESS OF 100 MPH S-1'S VEHICLE BECAME DISABLED AND HE CAME TO A STOP
S-1 WAS ATTAINED A RECORDS CHECK REVEALED S-1 WAS ON ACTIVE PROBATION
S-1'S EYES WERE ALMOND AND GLASSY, S-1 BREATH HAD A STRONG ALCOHOL
ALCOHOL BREATHALYZER DETECTED FROM HIS BREATH. S-1 ADMITTED TO DRINKING SEVERAL
ALCOHOL BEVERAGES BEFORE BEING STOPPED.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

CENTRAL DIVISION



Date	Day of Week	Watch and Team	Prepared By
06-17-08	TUESDAY	NIGHT	SGT D. JOHNSON

Unit #	Watch Supervisor	Car	Phone	Comments
L53	LT. M. PETERSON		PC 832.7	Watch Commander
56S1	SGT. BRICKER		PC 832.7	Field Supervisor

Unit #	Deputy	Deputy	Car	Phone	Comments
63G1	RICKY MARTIN		717	PC 832.7	TSR, LER
64G1	KELLY BUNN		649	PC 832.7	TSR
65G1	JON BURTON		783	PC 832.7	TSR, LER
66G2	STEVE SALMERON (OD)	JORDAN MILLER (T)	652	PC 832.7	TSR
62H1	L. GUZMAN		641	PC 832.7	TSR
63H1	STEVE VASQUEZ		656	PC 832.7	TSR, LER

SUPPORT UNITS					
Unit #	Deputy	Deputy	Car	Phone	Comments

TIME OFF				VAC - CTO - HIL - SLS - SLF - 4850 - PL - ML - UTO - SCH - ADM - LWOP - TDY	
Type	Name	Type	Name		
VAC	CHRIS ARBUCLKE				
MIL	SGT. D. JOHNSON				

CAD Event Report

Created : 6/9/2009

Event Number 081700065	Init Datetime 6/18/2008 1:08:29 AM	Create Datetime 6/18/2008 3:16:23 AM
Event Owners: DP5	DP5	DP5 DP5
Call Information:		
Call Type: VS	VEHICLE STOP	
Location: SB STOCK AT FLEMING PC 832.7	Apt:	
Addnl: PC 832.7		
City:	Area: 6	Zone: 1
Complainant Information:		
Name: 63H1		
Address: SB STOCK AT FLEMING PC 832.7		
Phone:		
SB STOCK AT FLEMING PC 832.7		
Related Information:		

Event Comments		
6/18/2008 1:08:56 AM	DP5	GOLD PONT W/1 WILL ADV
6/18/2008 1:09:16 AM	DP5	63H1, EB WHITEWILLOW NB WHISPERWILLOW
6/18/2008 1:09:25 AM	DP5	56S1 MONITERING
6/18/2008 1:09:36 AM	DP5	63H, SB WHISPERWILLOW
6/18/2008 1:09:40 AM	DP5	WB WALTER APR STOCKTON
6/18/2008 1:09:53 AM	DP5	NB STOCK FROM WALTER
6/18/2008 1:09:57 AM	DP5	OCC 1 X
6/18/2008 1:10:06 AM	DP5	PASSING FLEMING NB
6/18/2008 1:10:13 AM	DP5	CONT NB SPEEDS 80 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:10:27 AM	DP5	EB CHANDLER FROM STOCK THRU STOP
6/18/2008 1:10:31 AM	DP5	CHANDLER & LINDALE
6/18/2008 1:10:41 AM	DP5	ARCLEY & LINDALE BLEW STOP
6/18/2008 1:10:45 AM	DP5	BLEW STOP AT FLORIN
6/18/2008 1:10:56 AM	DP5	64S COPY CAN PIT

6/18/2008 1:11:01 AM	DP5	EB LANES
6/18/2008 1:11:19 AM	DP5	SUBJ JUST RAMMED A CAR HEAD ON
6/18/2008 1:11:36 AM	DP5	63 EB FLORIN FROM PALMERHOUSE
6/18/2008 1:11:46 AM	DP6	PENDING MASTER FILE RECORD LIC#: YRMD:89 MAKE:PONT BTM :CP VIN :PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) R/O PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) CITY PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) C.C.:PC ZIP#PC
6/18/2008 1:11:48 AM	DP6	SPD ADVD
6/18/2008 1:11:52 AM	DP5	63G, DRIVER BMA WHI SHIRT RED & YELLOW STRIPES BALD HEAD
6/18/2008 1:11:57 AM	DP5	SPEEDS 90 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:12:04 AM	DP5	62H, SUBJ IS BLACKED OUT
6/18/2008 1:12:14 AM	DP5	EB FLORIN PASSING REESE APR FRENCH
6/18/2008 1:12:27 AM	DP5	EB FLORIN FROM FRENCH
6/18/2008 1:12:46 AM	DP5	HEADED TWDS EGF NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:12:54 AM	DP5	ADV EGPD
6/18/2008 1:13:03 AM	DP5	63G, SUBJ LOST REAR PASS WHEEL POSS FRONT
6/18/2008 1:13:16 AM	DP5	EB FLORIN FROM EGF
6/18/2008 1:13:21 AM	DP5	SUBJ COMING TO A STOP
6/18/2008 1:13:29 AM	DP5	62H PITTED BUT RECOVERED
6/18/2008 1:13:40 AM	DP5	62H, WB FLORIN FROM EGF ON 1 WHEEL
6/18/2008 1:13:44 AM	DP5	HIT-UNITS CAR
6/18/2008 1:13:54 AM	DP5	WB FLORIN NO TRAFFIC ON 3 WHEELS
6/18/2008 1:14:08 AM	DP5	WB FLORIN SPDS 80 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:14:24 AM	DP5	63G, WB FLORIN APR FRENCH SPDS 70 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:14:41 AM	DP5	63G, BLEW LITEFRENCH WB FLORIN
6/18/2008 1:14:51 AM	DP5	SPDS 80 PASSING FRENCH
6/18/2008 1:15:05 AM	DP5	63, WB FLORIN PASSING
6/18/2008 1:15:07 AM	DP5	APR PI

6/18/2008 1:15:38 AM	DP5	WB FLORIN APP PALMERHOUSE, BLEW LITE
6/18/2008 1:15:53 AM	DP5	APPR RIMROCK & FLORIN SPDS 60 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:16:13 AM	DP5	PASSING CHANDLER & FLORIN NO TRAFFIC, SUBJS CAR APPRS TO BE COMING APART
6/18/2008 1:16:18 AM	DP5	NB STOCK FROM FLORIN
6/18/2008 1:16:28 AM	DP5	63, NB STOCK FROM FLORIN
6/18/2008 1:16:52 AM	DP5	63, NB STOCK FROM FOWLER
6/18/2008 1:16:58 AM	DP5	SPEEDS 60 STAR7 WITH US
6/18/2008 1:17:14 AM	DP5	63G, NB STOCK PASSING ELDERCREEK BLEW LITE
6/18/2008 1:17:24 AM	DP5	63G BLEW LITE STOCK & DIAZ SPDS UP TO 70
6/18/2008 1:17:33 AM	DP5	NB STOCK FROM LEMON HILL
6/18/2008 1:17:44 AM	DP6	PER SPD ON HL, THEY R NOT AUTH TO USE TAC STRIPS PER THEIR LT DUE TO A 245 PENDING
6/18/2008 1:18:01 AM	DP5	63G, NB STOCK APR FRUIT, BLEW LITE AT FRUIT
6/18/2008 1:18:07 AM	DP5	SPDS UP TO 80 NO TRAFFIC
6/18/2008 1:18:17 AM	DP5	NB STOCK FROM FLORIN SPDS 90
6/18/2008 1:18:29 AM	DP5	NB STOCK APR 14 AV
6/18/2008 1:18:43 AM	C12	R/O - PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) EXT ARRESTS INCLUDING 211 - PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5) ID PROBLEM - ADDR IN KPF HIST PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) *****
6/18/2008 1:18:51 AM	DP5	NB STOCK , EB 14 AV FROM STOCK
6/18/2008 1:19:02 AM	DP5	EB 14TH AV REACHING UNDER SEAT
6/18/2008 1:19:08 AM	DP5	DRIVER KEEPS REACHING UNDER SEAT
6/18/2008 1:19:17 AM	DP5	63G, EB 14TH FROM 52 ST
6/18/2008 1:19:28 AM	DP5	SB 53 FROM 14 AV
6/18/2008 1:19:44 AM	DP5	STAR7, PITTED BUT CONT
6/18/2008 1:19:54 AM	DP5	63G, WB 15 AV
6/18/2008 1:20:01 AM	DP5	STAR7, PED ON S SDWALK
6/18/2008 1:20:19 AM	DP5	63G, WB 15 AV FROM , RAMMED 2 SSD UNITS HEAD ON

6/18/2008 1:20:35 AM	DP5	63G EB 13 AV FROM STOCK
6/18/2008 1:20:57 AM	DP5	DRIVERS OUT PRONED HIMSELF OUT, K997
6/18/2008 1:21:31 AM	DP5	51G1, REDUCE INCOMING SUBJ BEING CUFFED
6/18/2008 1:21:57 AM	DP5	STAR7, EB 13 1 BLK EOF STOCK DRIVER DET
6/18/2008 1:22:16 AM	DP5	63H1, NEED CSI
6/18/2008 1:23:21 AM	DP5	64G1, RESUME, NEED CHP AT 13TH AT 50
6/18/2008 1:23:26 AM	DP5	CHP ADVD VIA HL
6/18/2008 1:23:30 AM	DP5	Per 86G2 REDUCED
6/18/2008 1:23:44 AM	C12	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) .. ID PROB - ****3056 211 245 PC PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) - NO PHOTOS ON EITHER IN KPF - ****PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) , ID PROBLEM , PC 832.7 (b)
6/18/2008 1:24:00 AM	DP5	081700065:CC to C2 , 56S1, NEED TOW FOR SUSP VEH
6/18/2008 1:24:13 AM	C2	COPY
6/18/2008 1:24:20 AM	DP5	081700065:CC to C2 , K97, NEED FIRE NO CODE FOR DOG BITE 13TH & 50 ST
6/18/2008 1:24:33 AM	C2	COPY
6/18/2008 1:24:41 AM	DP5	081700065:CC to C2 , 63H1, MEDIA 97 PLZ ADV S1
6/18/2008 1:24:41 AM	C2	FIRE ADV
6/18/2008 1:25:02 AM	DP5	EVENT INFO UPDATED BY COMM CTR
6/18/2008 1:25:02 AM	C2	S1 ADVD
6/18/2008 1:25:34 AM	DP5	EVENT INFO UPDATED BY COMM CTR
6/18/2008 1:27:40 AM	C2	SHANAHANS TOW ADVD PC 832.7 (b)
6/18/2008 1:27:47 AM	S1	S1 COPY
6/18/2008 1:28:39 AM	DP5	EVENT INFO UPDATED BY COMM CTR
6/18/2008 1:29:01 AM	DP5	Per 62H1 PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) //DRIVER
6/18/2008 1:33:26 AM	DP5	Per 58X1 REPT FOR THIS 08-33021/245 PC V1 VASQUEZ,STEVE #481
6/18/2008 1:34:49 AM	DP5	K97, ENG 96 97
6/18/2008		Per 58X1 THIS SUBJ SAYING SUSP VEH BELONGS TO HER, SHE WALKED UP IN SCENE ND TOOK KEYS BUT DEP'S RECOVERED THEM: PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

1:35:51 AM	DP5	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
6/18/2008 1:39:38 AM	DP5	PENDING MASTER FILE RECORD LIC#: YRMD:89 MAKE:PONT BTM :CP VIN PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) R/O PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) CITY PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) C.C. PC ZIP# PC SOLD PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) RCID:CMD:CLETSUPDATE:05/13/08 LOCD:0
6/18/2008 1:44:59 AM	DP5	081700065:CC to C2 , 63H1, NEED CHP FOR DUI EVAL AT 13TH & 50 ST
6/18/2008 1:45:07 AM	DP5	EVENT INFO UPDATED BY COMM CTR
6/18/2008 1:45:24 AM	C2	T4 CHP ADVD
6/18/2008 1:49:46 AM	DP5	081700065:CC to C2 , 51G3, CD4 CHP
6/18/2008 1:50:15 AM	C2	COPY CHP ADV
6/18/2008 1:56:49 AM	DP5	58X1, TOW 97
6/18/2008 2:10:26 AM	DP5	Per 80G1 924MJ W/ 1
6/18/2008 2:16:31 AM	DP5	Per 65G1 924 CAS FOR A NEW VEH
6/18/2008 2:17:23 AM	DP5	Per 62H1 924 CAS 4 A NEW VEHICLE
6/18/2008 2:27:43 AM	DP5	Per 62H1 97 CAS
6/18/2008 2:28:52 AM	DP5	Per 80G1 97 MJ
6/18/2008 3:16:23 AM	DP5	EVENT INFO UPDATED BY COMM CTR

Unit History				
6/18/2008 1:08:56 AM	63H1	OV		
6/18/2008 1:09:47 AM	64G1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:09:47 AM	65G1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:10:34 AM	STAR7	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:10:49 AM	52G2	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:10:49 AM	62H1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:11:46 AM	ID11E	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:12:17 AM	ID11E	51	VS	
6/18/2008 1:12:33 AM	52G2	DP	VS	
6/18/2008	52G2	FR		Autofree 52G2 on 081700065

1:12:33 AM				
6/18/2008 1:12:51 AM	58X1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:13:08 AM	55E4	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:13:37 AM	ID11E	C3	VS	STATUS UPDATED TO ENROUTE DISPATCHED 01:11 1 VS ENROUTE 01:12 VS TYPE: VS EN: 081700065 LOC: SB STOCK AT FLEMING PC 832.7 APT: COMPLAINANT: 63H1
6/18/2008 1:13:59 AM	53G12	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:12 AM	L43	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:14 AM	L53	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:19 AM	L43	FR	Freed	Unit status set by operator
6/18/2008 1:15:25 AM	63G1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:28 AM	56S1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:29 AM	L53	51	VS	
6/18/2008 1:15:42 AM	52G2	FR		Autofree 52G2 on 081700065
6/18/2008 1:15:42 AM	52G2	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:17:02 AM	STAR7	97	VS	Unit status set by operator
6/18/2008 1:17:24 AM	58X1	97	VS	DP:
6/18/2008 1:17:40 AM	86G2	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:18:12 AM	86G2	C3	VS	
6/18/2008 1:18:22 AM	80G1	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:19:34 AM	41G2	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:19:35 AM	0K97	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:21:35 AM	56S1	97	VS	DP:
6/18/2008 1:22:04 AM	41G2	CL	OTH	SUFF
6/18/2008 1:22:52 AM	ID11E	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:22:52 AM	ID11E	FR		Autofree ID11E on 081700065
6/18/2008 1:26:01 AM	52G2	CL	OTH	ASST D6
6/18/2008	STAR7	CL	CVR	

1:28:20 AM				
6/18/2008 1:28:32 AM	53G12	CL	OTH	ASST D6
6/18/2008 1:28:49 AM	86G2	CL	OTH	SUFF
6/18/2008 1:34:25 AM	51G3	DP	VS	
6/18/2008 1:35:38 AM	80G1	97	VS	DP:
6/18/2008 1:43:04 AM	86G2	97		
6/18/2008 1:54:45 AM	ID11E	CL	REP	PIX
6/18/2008 1:59:01 AM	0K97	CL	ARR	SUBJ IN CUST
6/18/2008 2:00:38 AM	55E4	CL	CVR	ASST D6
6/18/2008 2:04:43 AM	51G3	CL	CVR	ASST D6
6/18/2008 2:06:03 AM	64G1	CL	OTH	CVR 63H
6/18/2008 2:07:18 AM	L53	CL	OTH	GR8T JOB BY ALL
6/18/2008 2:13:21 AM	56S1	CL	OTH	
6/18/2008 2:17:11 AM	58X1	CL	OTH	ASST D6/TOW
6/18/2008 2:17:48 AM	86G2	CL	OTH	ASST D6
6/18/2008 2:27:51 AM	62H1	CL	ARR	GOT HIM
6/18/2008 2:41:17 AM	65G1	CL	REP	
6/18/2008 2:45:11 AM	63G1	CL	OTH	
6/18/2008 3:11:18 AM	63H1	CL	ARR	ARR.PC245//08-33021
6/18/2008 3:16:49 AM	80G1	CL	OTH	ASST D6/TS

This page contains confidential information which may not be released to the public.

In Car Camera Video

CD #1

Deputy Vasquez
Deputy Martin
Deputy Burton #1
Deputy Burton #2

In Car Camera Video

CD #2

Deputy Bunn
Deputy Bliss #1
Deputy Bliss #2
Sergeant Bricker
Deputy Sutter #1
Deputy Sutter #2
Deputy Crosby
Deputy Limbird #1
Deputy Limbird #2

CAD Search

[Home](#)[Event
Search](#)[Unit
Search](#)[Logsheet](#)[CAD
View](#)[AM
Search](#)[Help](#)[Logout](#)[Contact
Us](#)

MARK KENNISON

Date

Event
NumberMessage Sent
ByMessage
Received By

Message Text

Specific Date..

63H1

Start Date

06/18/2008

[Find Messages](#)[Clear Form](#)

* Found 16 record(s) *

[Download as Excel file](#)

Sent By	Sent To	Event Number	Message Sent on	Message Text
63H1	64G1		6/18/2008 5:29:43 AM	I SAW THT 2NIT63H1 @0526 //U ALL THE B GIRLS COMIN OUT THIS EARLY ON STKN
63H1	DP5		6/18/2008 5:11:47 AM	I NO I M SRRY 63H1 @0508 //R U TALKING ABOUT THE ROOM & BOARD CALL ON 43RD? SHE SOUNDS WACKO.....CALLED LAST NITE TOO
63H1	DP5		6/18/2008 2:44:57 AM	K THNK U VERY MUCH 63H1 @0241 //ITS ONLY GVIN ME 25 COMMNTS ISNT THR MORE/ YEP ..U WIL HAVE TO HAVE IT FAXD TO U
63H1	STAR7		6/18/2008 2:25:42 AM	THNKS 4 THE HELP 63H1 @0222 //STAR7 @0213 //305663H1 @0148 //SO WHAT WAS HE RUNNING FOR?///INTERESTING... GOOD PURSUIT, THOUGH. THAT "SEA OF SPARKS" EFFECT GIVES A GOOD SHOW FROM THE AIR.
63H1	DP1		6/18/2008 2:21:27 AM	WER HE AT W THE LOJAC ALMDT @0217 //FYI LOJACK CODE FOR SUZUKI T851..PC 832.7 IF U GET A SIGNAL
63H1	STAR7		6/18/2008 2:16:37 AM	305663H1 @0148 //SO WHAT WAS HE RUNNING FOR?
63H1	DP6		6/18/2008 2:16:28 AM	THNKS I WAS LIK THT I SAID THT WHO THE HELL IS RUNNING MY GLORY// I NO WER IM GOING HHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAHAD 63H1 @0148 //SORRY ABOUT THAT SPD K9 WHO CAME UP ON OUR AIR... I WAS RELAYING EEVRRYYTTTHHNNGGG TO SPD ON HL
63H1	63E1		6/18/2008 12:39:32 AM	OK THNKS 4 THE HEAD STRT 62H1 @0035 //63H1 @0035 //63G1 @0035 //65G1 @0035 //UNOCC T851 PC 832.7 1995 STRN SL 4D GRN N FRT OF VACNT HSE ON FLORINDA 2-3DRS S/O LOUCRETA,,,DONT RECALL SEEIN IT THER YEST,TKN 6/17 SO MAY JUS B A DUMP,BUT YA NEVA K
			6/18/2008	NOP A SUPER TROOPER HAAAAHA 63H1 @0033 //HAHAHAHA, ITS

63H1	DP5		12:36:59 AM	ONLY HUMAN....BUT THEN AGAIN UR NOT SPOSED TO BE HUMAN AFTER YOU PUT THAT UNIFORM ON ;))
63H1	DP5		6/18/2008 12:35:35 AM	NOW I FEEL BTTR CUZ I NOT THE ONLY 1 GETTN LOST 63H1 @0031 //KK DONE.....PLEASE 63H1 @0029 //IS THAT WHY SPD LOST???? U WANT ME TO LET THEM KNOW.....THER NO CIRCT CITY IT IS NOW DOLLAR TREE
63H1	DP5		6/18/2008 12:33:00 AM	PLEASE 63H1 @0029 //IS THAT WHY SPD LOST???? U WANT ME TO LET THEM KNOW.....THER NO CIRCT CITY IT IS NOW DOLLAR TREE
63H1	C2		6/18/2008 12:28:56 AM	THOS GUYS R RETARDS
63H1	C2		6/18/2008 12:27:27 AM	NO THY ANT 63H1 @0024 //65 N STCKTN,,THEY R THERE
63H1	C2		6/18/2008 12:26:40 AM	65 N STCKTN
63H1	DP5		6/18/2008 12:26:04 AM	I AT 65 N STCK/ I GOIN 2 55 N FLRN THE OLD CRT CITY

Next >>

This search has been accessed 1408 times since 2/10/2003

CAD Search

[Home](#)[Event
Search](#)[Unit
Search](#)[Logsheet](#)[CAD
View](#)[AM
Search](#)[Help](#)[Logout](#)[Contact
Us](#)

MARK KENNISON

Date

Event
NumberMessage Sent
ByMessage
Received By

Message Text

Specific Date..

0k97

Start Date

06/18/2008

[Find Messages](#)[Clear Form](#)

* Found 7 record(s) *

[Download as Excel file](#)

Sent By	Sent To	Event Number	Message Sent on	Message Text
0K97	GRP09		6/18/2008 11:01:27 PM	IM OUT HV A GOOD WEEK
0K97	0K95		6/18/2008 10:55:48 PM	CHP GOLD
0K97	DP3		6/18/2008 8:51:25 PM	IM SO USED TO USING THE MAP IN MY CAR BUT STREET ISNT IN IT
0K97	DP3		6/18/2008 8:50:35 PM	YEAH SORRY I LOOKED UP WRONG PAGE I PULLED 339
0K97	62H1		6/18/2008 2:15:15 AM	0K97 @0211 //THXXS 4 THE ASST NO PROB SORRY IT TOOK SO LONG
0K97	GRP02		6/18/2008 12:52:56 AM	SUBJS GOA
0K97	28G1		6/18/2008 12:42:36 AM	16

This search has been accessed 1414 times since 2/10/2003

CAD Search

[Home](#)[Event
Search](#)[Unit
Search](#)[Logsheet](#)[CAD
View](#)[AM
Search](#)[Help](#)[Logout](#)[Contact
Us](#)

MARK KENNISON

Date

Event
NumberMessage Sent
ByMessage
Received By

Message Text

Specific Date..

62H1

Start Date

06/18/2008

[Find Messages](#)[Clear Form](#)

* Found 11 record(s) *

[Download as Excel file](#)

Sent By	Sent To	Event Number	Message Sent on	Message Text
62H1	OK97		6/18/2008 2:21:41 AM	THE BIT WAS NOT CAUGHT ON MY CAMERA//ILL TELL 63H1 TO REVIEW HIS CAR CAMERA IT WAS IN THE POSITION TO VIEW S-1 WHEN HE GOT OUT OF THE CAR
62H1	GRP5		6/18/2008 2:15:22 AM	THXXS 4 ALL THE HELP
62H1	OK97		6/18/2008 2:14:55 AM	THXXS 4 THE ASST
62H1	56S2	081700058	6/18/2008 1:10:13 AM	Unit 62H1 went ENROUTE C3 .. 2N VEH DRK COLRD 4DR SEDAN PARKED IN FRNT OF IT.. CAN SEE VEH PARTS LAYING ON THE GRND BHND THE VEH,, POSS CAR STRIPPING, NO1
62H1	56S1	081700058	6/18/2008 1:10:13 AM	Unit 62H1 went ENROUTE C3 .. 2N VEH DRK COLRD 4DR SEDAN PARKED IN FRNT OF IT.. CAN SEE VEH PARTS LAYING ON THE GRND BHND THE VEH,, POSS CAR STRIPPING, NO1
62H1	63G1		6/18/2008 12:28:42 AM	62H1 @0025 //63G1 @0025 //62H1 @0024 //63G1 @0024 //62H1 @0023 //63G1 @0023 //20? //STOCK ELSIE//KK GERBER PI //U ON A STOP?//NO CHP //U W/THEM//I WAS THEY GOOD
62H1	63G1		6/18/2008 12:28:02 AM	62H1 @0024 //63G1 @0024 //62H1 @0023 //63G1 @0023 //20? //STOCK ELSIE//KK GERBER PI //U ON A STOP?//NO CHP
62H1	63G1		6/18/2008 12:27:11 AM	62H1 @0023 //63G1 @0023 //20? //STOCK ELSIE//KK GERBER PI
62H1	63G1		6/18/2008 12:26:02 AM	20?
62H1	65G1		6/18/2008 12:25:06 AM	THXS AGAIN
62H1	65G1		6/18/2008 12:23:51 AM	62H1 @0020 // U WANT TO TAKE MY CALL AND I'LL TAKE 459R//COOL SOUNDS LIKE A PLAN/THXS

This search has been accessed 1413 times since 2/10/2003

Close Window

Details for PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)						
Name		XREF	DOB	Age	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)		PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)		
Sex	Race	Height	Weight	Hair	Eyes	
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	
Address						
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)						
Probation		Caution				
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)						
Gun Permit	Death Flag	PC 290	PC 457.1	HS 11590	Work Project	Home Detention
PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)	PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)


Warrants PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

Identifiers PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)


PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

Arrest History PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




Aliases PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




Remarks PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




Known Addresses PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




Custody Sessions PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)




PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)



Printed by Thiessen, Todd (SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT) on 6/16/2009 at 8:17 AM

PC 832.7 (b)(6)



6/16/2009

REGISTRY DETAIL (PF11)

JI8AF2

HELP
XREF- PC 832.7 (b) NAME- PC 832.7 (b) PC 832.7
SUMMARY-
DOB PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

BOOKING: REGISTRY NUMBER- PC 832.7 (b)(5) TYPE- PICKUP (FRESH ARREST)
DATE- 06/18/2008 TIME- 0357 OFFICER- PC 832.7 (b) LONGMIRE A
ARREST: LEA- CA0340000 OFFICER- 481 VASQUEZ
CRIME: LEA- CA0340000 NUMBER- 08-33021 DATE- 06/18/2008 TIME- 0130
COURT ID- 34470 CASE NO- PC 832.7 (b)(5)

CHARGES: CODE VIOLATION SEV CT CODE VIOLATION SEV CT CODE VIOLATION SEV CT
VC 2800.4 FEL 01 PC 245(A)(1) FEL 01

RELEASE: DATE- 06/20/2008 TIME- 1036 OFFICER- PC 832.7 (b) JANG R
TYPE- FILED AS MUNI COURT CASE AUTHORIZED BY-

BAIL: \$75,000.00 CHG BY CASH- BOND-
COMMENTS RELEASED UPON CREATION OF CASE 34470 PC 832.7 (b)(5)

ARRAIGN: COURT ID- 34470 CAL- DEPT- DATE- TIME-

PF: 1 MENU 2 PERSON 3 BOOKING 4 CLASS 5 MOVEMENT 6 VISITS
7 RELEASE 8 LIVELSCAN 10 INCIDENTS 11 BOOK SUM 12 CASE HIST

PB328-I NO FUTURE COURT DATE EXISTS PB340-I INMATE HAS BEEN TO COURT

COURT CASE INFORMATION (PF5)

JI9CF2
UPDATE- _

HELP- _

COURT ID- 34100 CASE NO.- PC 832.7 (b)(5) FILED DATE- 10/29/2008 ORIG. DEPT- 15
DEFENDANT NO.- 01 PC 832.7 (b)(5) PC 832.7
XREF- PC 832.7 (b) CASE STATUS- ACTIVE CUSTODY STATUS- CUST
BAIL: SET- \$75,000.00 POSTED- \$.00 BOND NO.-
AUTHORITY: LOG- 0000000
INTERPRETER NEEDED- HOME COURT- 62 4A TUESDAY

PROSECUTOR : NAME- MCGILL S.

DEF. ATTNY(S): TYPE- CAC NAME- DE LA ROSA MEL L
TYPE- NAME-

NEXT COURT DATE- 06/15/2009 TIME- 01:35 PM COURT- 34100 DEPT- 62 PRESENT- Y
REASONS- TRC TRIAL READINESS CONFERENCE

PF: 1 MENU 2 PERSON 3 CHARGES 4 CHG DISPO 5 CASE INFO
7 SENTENCE 9 TRACKING 11 CASE HIST 12 PERS HIST
C5101-I CASE HAS 1 DEFENDANT RECORDS

JB2PF2

***** PERSONAL DESCRIPTOR ***** (PF2)

HELP-

XREF- PC 832.7 (b) IN CUSTODY

DATA ENTRY- _ UPDATE- _

ALIAS- ADDRESS- REMARK- _ O/I- _ MH- _ LOCAL- _
E- PC 832.7 (b) PC 832.7 (b) PHONE- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)
ADDR- PC PC 832.7 (b) CITY- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)(5)
POB- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC COB- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PC 832.7 (b)
DOB- PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) SEX- P RACE- P HGT- PC WGT- PC HAIR- PC EYES- PC

IDENTIFIERS:

SSO PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) PDS PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) CII PC 832.7 (b)(5)
FBI PC 832.7 (b)(5) OLN PC 832.7 (b)(5) 96C PC
SSN PC 832.7 (b)(5) SSN PC 832.7 (b)(5) CDC PC 832.7 (b)
CDC PC 832.7 (b) GNG PC GNG PC
GNG PC TEL PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B) **MORE**

CAUTION-

SPECIAL NOTIFICATION NAME-

FLAGS: GUN PERMIT- DEATH FLAG- PC290- PAROLE- DATE-
DO NOT MERGE- PC457.1- HS11590- PROB- / DATE-

WARRANTS: FEL- 00 MIS- 00 INF- 00

PF: 1 MENU 2 PERSON 3 BOOKING 4 CLASS 5 MOVEMENT 6 VISITS
7 RELEASE 8 LIVSCAN 10 INCIDENTS 11 BOOK SUM 12 CASE HIST

W0313-I HAS 03 NAMES, 08 ADDRESSES

W0333-I HAS REMARKS

BOOKING SUMMARY (PF11)

JIB2F2

HELP- ENTER LINE NO.- INTAKE- PRINT CURR- PRINT ALL- PAGE- 1
XREF- PC 832.7 (b) NAME- PC 832.7 (b) PC 832.7 DOB PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

HOUSING LOCATION PC 832.7 (b)(5) CURRENT LOCATION

INTAKE: DATE 06/18/2008 TIME 0305


LINE	DATE	TIME	TYPE	BOOKING NUMBER	REGISTRY NUMBER	CASE	CODE SECTION	SEV	CHGS	BOOKING STATUS
1	06/18/2008	03:57	PU	09298144	01	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	VC 2800.4	FEL	2	FM
2	06/18/2008	03:58	PA	09298144	02	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	PC 3056		1	CNCL
3	06/20/2008	10:36	FM	09298144	03	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	VC 2800.2 (A)	FEL	2	FS
4	10/29/2008	12:38	FS	09298144	04	PC 832.7 (b)(5)	VC 2800.2 (A)	FEL	1	

NEXT XREF- _____


PF: 1 MENU 2 PERSON 3 BOOKING 4 CLASS 5 MOVEMENT 6 VISITS
7 RELEASE 8 LIVESCAN 10 INCIDENTS 11 BOOK SUM 12 CASE HIST
PB101-I END OF CURRENT CUSTODY PERIOD PB102-I HIT ENTER FOR PREV CUST PERIODS

6/16/2009 8:12:54 AM: Criminal History search on PC 832.7 (b)(6)


PC 832.7 (b)(6)




PC 832.7 (b)(6)




PC 832.7 (b)(6)




PC 832.7 (b)(6)




PC 832.7 (b)(6)



PC 832.7 (b)(6)



PC 832.7 (b)(6)



PHONE: (916) 441-4141
FAX: (916) 441-3504

NON-WAIVER STATEMENT

IMPORTANT! This form should not be used without prior consultation with an SCDSA business agent. (441-4141)

The Office of the Sheriff of Sacramento County, California, is conducting an

investigation regarding an/a alleged misconduct

and I, STEVE VASQUEZ, Deputy Sheriff or other SCDSA

represented employee of the County of Sacramento, have been ordered by a superior officer/Internal Affairs officer to make reports, letters or memos, and/or answer questions concerning said investigation.

I understand that if I do not comply with the order that I may be disciplined for insubordination and/or for refusing to obey a direct order. I have been advised that such discipline may include suspension or termination from employment.

In view of possible loss of employment, I have no alternative but to abide by the order and I will obey said order. However, by making said reports, letters, memos, or by answering questions, I do not waive my constitutional rights to remain silent under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United State Constitution, the protections of the California Constitution, and the protections afforded me under case law.

If, in the event the reports, letters or memos I prepare, or answers that I give are subsequently sought to be disclosed in any court proceedings or for any purpose other than this investigation, it is my express intention to invoke any privileges which may exist under law to resist such disclosure.

Signature of Officer/Employee

Date 6/18/2005 Time 4:12

Signature of SCDSA Representative

SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

ADMINISTRATIVE ADMONISHMENT

Deputy Steve Vasquez, you are hereby advised that:

An administrative investigation is in progress within this department in which it has become necessary to obtain a statement from you. If you cooperate fully at this time, your statements and any evidence arising therefrom may be used in any and all proceedings arising out of this administrative investigation. As a citizen and an employee of this department, you are hereby advised that if prior to, or during the taking of your statement, this department determines that you may be charged with a criminal offense, you will be advised of your Constitutional rights before questioning proceeds or continues.

If you decide not to give a statement at this time, you are now ordered, as an employee of this department, to answer all questions asked by investigators and to give a full, detailed and complete statement regarding your knowledge of or involvement in the matter now under investigation. Having been so ordered, any statements that you make cannot be used against you in any criminal proceeding. Your fitness to remain employed by this department is the object of this portion of the investigation and you are hereby directed to cooperate fully with investigators so that a decision on your job status may be made as soon as possible. If you fail to comply with this order, you may be dismissed from your employment with this agency on the ground of willful disobedience and insubordination.

Assuming that you now comply with this order and cooperate fully in this investigation, your statements and any evidence obtained through such statements will be used, as to you, solely to determine whether departmental disciplinary action is necessary. False statements, of course, will result in severe disciplinary action.

IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING YOUR RIGHTS, YOU MAY ASK THEM NOW.

I have read the above admonishment and order and I fully understand my rights and duties in this investigation.


Employee Signature


Witness Signature

DATE: 6/18/2009

TIME: 4:12



COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

JOHN P. McGINNESS

Sheriff

July 16, 2009

To: DEPUTY STEVE VASQUEZ
Central Division

From: SERGEANT TODD THIESSEN
Professional Standards Bureau

Subject: NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION: 2009IA-035

An investigation of suspected misconduct by an employee or member of this department is being conducted. You have been identified as:

- ☒ [X] The employee suspected of misconduct. Employees accused or suspected of misconduct should be aware that subsequent investigation/testimony may be used against them in administrative proceedings and may be discoverable pursuant to the Evidence Code. Employees so accused or suspected are entitled to specific procedural rights under Government Code Section 3300 et seq. These rights include a right to representation by a person of their choosing who is not involved in the same investigation either as a witness or suspect. If desired, it is the employee's responsibility to secure representation prior to the date and time of the scheduled interrogation.
- ☐ [] A witness to the incident. Personnel interviewed as witnesses are neither the subject of the investigation nor is any punitive action proposed or contemplated against the employee as a result of the alleged incident. Employees may decline to testify as a witness. Employees making such a decision may do so prior to or at any time during the interview by so advising the investigator. The investigator shall then regard the witness as if he/she were accused of the conduct complained of. The witness shall then be subject to all of the rights and conditions described in the preceding paragraph, including the right to representation.

In order to complete this investigation you are required to furnish a detailed account of your actions and/or observations as soon as possible. **You are hereby instructed not to discuss the substance of the investigation with anyone**, with the exception of your attorney (or representative if accused of misconduct charges) pending the conclusion of the investigation. For a detailed account of the Internal Investigations process, refer to General Orders 3/01 and 3/02.

NOTICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION
PAGE 2

- ☒ You have been scheduled for an interview on June 18, 2009 at 1600 hours with Sergeant Thiessen. Your scheduled interview will be at the Internal Affairs Office, 520 9th Street, Sacramento.
- ☐ Please contact Sergeant Thiessen as soon as possible at 874-8292 or PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B).
- ☐ Respond to the information contained below via Inter-Department Correspondence. Your IDC is due by _____. Please notify my office at (916) 874-5007 or 874-9015 to confirm receipt of this notice.

NAME OF ALLEGED VICTIM: SSD/ Arrested Subject PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B)

DATE AND TIME OF INCIDENT: June 18, 2008

LOCATION: Central Division

REPORT NUMBER: 08-33021 Crime Report and Probable Cause Statement

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT: It is alleged Deputy Vasquez made dishonest statements in both Report 08-33021 and the Probable Cause Declaration for the arrest of PC 832.7 (b)(5)(B).



JOHN P. McGINNESS

Sheriff

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

Inter-Department Correspondence

Date: July 16, 2009

To: CAPTAIN TRANG TO
Central Station

From: SERGEANT TODD THIESSEN
Professional Standards Bureau

Subject: Notification of Internal Affairs Investigation

The following case has been assigned to me for investigation:

Employee Name(s): Vasquez, Steve

Case Number: 2009IA-035

Allegations: Dishonesty

Complainant(s): SSD