



## Memorandum

**TO:** Carlos Bowdre, Officer  
Patrol Operations Division

**FROM:** Chris Murtha, Chief of Police

**DATE:** July 31, 2025

**SUBJECT:** Final Disciplinary Action (PSR #25-F-0010)

---

### BACKGROUND

Officer Carlos Bowdre has been employed by the Wheat Ridge Police Department, Wheat Ridge, Colorado since July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Officer Bowdre is currently assigned to the Patrol Operations Division. By virtue of such employment, Officer Bowdre is subject to the provisions of the Wheat Ridge Personnel Policies and all rules, regulations, policies, and procedures established by the City of Wheat Ridge and the Police Department.

### FACTS

- 1) On May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2025, at approximately 0042 hours, Officer Bowdre, Officer Leeret, Officer Sandoval, and Officer Corbett were dispatched to the Valero gas station located at 3201 Wadsworth Blvd, Wheat Ridge, Colorado, on an assist to another agency.
- 2) Dispatch advised that the reporting party on the call stated his wife's laptop had been stolen earlier in the evening in the City of Arvada and that the laptop had been tracked to this location. The reporting party advised he had video footage of the suspect who stole the laptop, and he now saw the same suspect at the gas station standing next to a blue BMW. The reporting party described the suspect as a Hispanic male in his 40s wearing a red sweatshirt, dark pants, and red hat. The reporting party advised dispatch he had not observed any weapons but did not know if the suspect was under the influence of drugs or alcohol.
- 3) Officer Bowdre, Officer Leeret, Officer Sandoval, and Officer Corbett arrived on scene at nearly the same time and confronted the suspect. The suspect almost immediately began running northbound through the parking lot as all the officers began to give chase.
- 4) Officer Bowdre unholstered his firearm and began chasing the suspect. As Officer Bowdre was chasing the suspect with his firearm in his hand, he pointed it at Officer Leeret while moving his arms while running. Officer Bowdre then climbed an approximately 4-foot fence with his firearm in his hand.

- 5) Officer Corbett was closest to the suspect and was yelling "Get the fuck down" as he was chasing the suspect. Upon tackling the suspect, Officer Corbett yelled, "Give me your fucking hands, give me your hands." Officer Sandoval was the first person with Officer Corbett after the subject was tackled and began assisting Officer Corbett to grab the suspect's hands
- 6) Officer Bowdre arrived at the location where the male was lying face down on the ground shortly after Officer Sandoval. Officer Bowdre had his firearm in his left hand, and pushed his gun into the suspect's temple while yelling, "I'll put a bullet in your fucking head." Officer Bowdre's right hand was on the back of the suspect's neck at this time, holding the suspect to the ground. When Officer Bowdre made the statement of "I'll put a bullet in your fucking head," both of the suspects hands were visible and behind his back.
- 7) Shortly after this, Officer Bowdre pulled his right hand off of the suspect, to key his radio microphone to advise "custody" while pushing his gun into the suspect's head. At that time, the suspect still has both hands behind his back, with a handcuff on the suspect's left hand.
- 8) Officer Bowdre then briefly removes his gun from the suspect's head while still pointing it at his head. Officer Bowdre then pushes the gun back against the suspect's head as he keys his microphone again to say "affirm" into the radio. Both the suspect's hands were handcuffed when he did this.
- 9) Officer Bowdre then says, "why would you start running? Huh? If you didn't do nothing, why would you start running? Oh ok then." While saying this, Officer Bowdre is moving his gun and points it briefly at the suspect again. Officer Bowdre then stands up and holsters his firearm.
- 10) During the investigation, Officer Bowdre wrote in his use of force memorandum that *"Officer Corbett was able to take the male subject to the ground. The male was given several loud verbal commands to present his arms to officers. The male subject denied this by keeping his arms tucked underneath his body, concealing his hands. At that moment because of the male was concealing his hands from officer and ignoring all commands given to him I felt as if the male had the opportunity to locate a weapon on his person where he could potentially harm myself and other officer on scene. I then placed muzzle of my weapon on the male's head to attempt to allow the male to comply with other officer commands. Then male then complied and placed both his hands behind his back."* [sic]
- 11) During a recorded interview as part of the investigation, Officer Bowdre reported that the subject was actively resisting and that he would rather just "show the force" than use it. Officer Bowdre admitted that "It doesn't look pretty, it did not look good. It's not something I'm proud of, but I was locked in only solely on his head at that point because of the way Dalton's (Officer Corbett) arched over this guy trying to pull his hands. And he is still actively resisting. I don't know if he had a weapon or anything. He had his hands tucked under his body."

- 12) During the same recorded interview Officer Bowdre reported that he had no information that the suspect was armed. Officer Bowdre also reported that he thought the suspect was concealing his hands for approximately 30 seconds. Body Worn Camera footage showed the entire incident from Officer Bowdre yelling "I'll put a fucking bullet in your head" to holstering his weapon was approximately 20 seconds.
- 13) When Officer Bowdre was asked if he had ever been trained to press the weapon against suspect's head, he stated, "No, not trained to do. It was just at the best moment. That's what I felt would be the best practice at that time to try and get the guy to comply."
- 14) During the investigation, Officer Bowdre also stated that the public perspective of this incident would look "terrible" and that if they saw the video of him, "putting a gun to the guy's head, it looks horrifying. It looks like the cops are just gonna, are bullies, they look like they're a bunch of gang members."
- 15) The criminal case against the suspect was dismissed by the Jefferson County District Attorney's Office because the "conduct by Officer Bowdre was too aggravating for the charges filed." Additionally, the Deputy District Attorney handling the case stated that the conduct of Officer Bowdre was "too egregious for what was charged and that Officer Bowdre's "conduct was not appropriate" especially since there were "2-4 other officers there." The DDA also stated that it was, "personally, one of the most egregious things I've seen" and that it wasn't in the best interest of justice to pursue the case. The DDA also stated that the "level of escalation was a substantial jump from where we started" and that Officer Bowdre's articulation of fearing the suspect had a weapon and not being able to see his hands was weak.

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The investigation of this incident has revealed the following:

Under Section 9.5 of the City of Wheat Ridge Personnel Policies, there is cause for disciplinary action for violations of the following rules relating to the above outlined facts:

- A. Section 9.5 (A) (1) Unsatisfactory work performance, including a failure to demonstrate reasonable competence or failure to perform the duties of the position in a satisfactory manner;
- B. Section 9.5 (A) (2) Violation of any of the provisions of these Personnel Policies, procedures, ordinances, administrative regulations or any departmental guidelines
- C. Section 9.5 (A) (10) Discourteous behavior or treatment of others that violates City Values or departmental conduct standards
- D. Section 3.42 Code of Professional Conduct of the Wheat Ridge Police Policy Directives Manual:

#### 3.42.02 DIRECTIVES AND EXPECTATIONS

Members shall make affirmative and consistent efforts to observe and comply with the

lawful directives and expectations (e.g., work rules, policies, procedures, practices and traditions) established for the effective, efficient and safe operations of the department.

#### 3.42.06 RESPECT FOR OTHERS

Members shall willfully observe and obey the lawful verbal and written rules, duties, policies, procedures and practices of the department. Members shall also subordinate their personal preferences and work priorities to the lawful verbal and written rules, duties, policies, procedures and practices of the department as well as to the lawful orders and directives of supervisory personnel.

Members shall display courtesy and respect in words, deeds, gestures and actions towards other department members, outside agencies and the general public.

#### 3.42.09 NEGLECT OF DUTY

Members shall competently perform all assigned or assumed job responsibilities, duties and tasks. Neglect of duty includes performance that fails to meet departmental standards.

#### 3.42.12 RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE

Police officers shall never employ unnecessary force or violence and shall use only such force in the discharge of duty as is reasonable in all circumstances. While the use of force is occasionally unavoidable, police officers shall refrain from applying the unnecessary infliction of pain or suffering and shall never engage in cruel, degrading or inhuman treatment of any person. Use of force shall be documented in accordance with Professional Standards procedures.

### **DUE PROCESS HEARING-“LOUDERMILL HEARING”**

On July 10, 2025, at 1100 hours Division Chief Kellogg and I met with you to offer you the opportunity to present any information or evidence that you felt was pertinent to this case and to refute any of the previously provided findings. At this meeting you described the steps you are taking to correct your behavior and to address issues that you have identified as problematic. You also took responsibility for your actions and expressed a strong desire to return to work and fix issues associated with this incident through various means. I asked if you had any additional information, and you did offer an apology and a desire to align future decisions with policy.

### **CHIEF’S DECISION**

I have reviewed all the relevant information, evidence, and associated statements with respect to this investigation. Based upon my review of this incident, the subsequent investigation, and your statements I have concluded that your conduct and behavior in this matter was unacceptable and in violation of police department policy and procedure. Your actions also violated the City of Wheat Ridge Personnel Policies. This investigation has revealed information that can undermine the trust the public places in its public officials, especially police officers. Your actions can and may still greatly impact our standing in our community and bring negative attention to this agency. The inability of the District Attorney’s Office to prosecute the criminal case, due in large part to your actions associated with this misconduct, is highly problematic. Your use of a careless and excessive use of a

firearm and subsequent statements used to intimidate a suspect is not just a reflection on you but on the entire department and to a greater extent on our profession.

I have weighed all the factors and evidence. I find that Sufficient evidence exists to **SUSTAIN** the charges of 3.42.06 RESPECT FOR OTHERS, 3.42.09 NEGLECT OF DUTY, and 3.42.12 RESPONSE TO RESISTANCE as well as City of Wheat Ridge Personnel Policies. The City of Wheat Ridge Personnel Policy violations are 9.5 (A)1 UNSATISFACTORY WORK PERFORMANCE, 9.5 (A)2 VIOLATION OF ANY PROVISION OF THESE PERSONNEL POLICIES, PROCEDURES, ORDINANCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS OR ANY DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES, Section 9.5 (A)10 DISCOURTEOUS BEHAVIOR OR TREATMENT OF OTHERS THAT VIOLATES THE CITY VALUES OR DEPARTMENTAL CONDUCT STANDARDS, and Section 3.42 CODE OF PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT OF THE WHEAT RIDGE POLICE POLCE DIRECTIVES MANUAL. Your behavior towards a member of the community while engaged in making an arrest failed to meet the Police Departments Policy standards, the City of Wheat Ridge Personnel Policy and was a violation of all the above listed policies. In considering the charges I have looked closely and narrowly at your behavior to determine what level of discipline is appropriate. I have considered all possible options, possible explanations, and your response provided during the Loudermill Hearing. The only option that meets the level of misconduct in this event for the infractions listed is termination. It is my determination that the appropriate discipline for these infractions is **TERMINATION**.

### APPEALS

A. Employees, except those identified below, have the right to appeal disciplinary actions that include discharge, demotion, or suspension for more than two (2) working days.

Exceptions:

- Employees identified in Section 9.2;
- When the City Manager serves in the capacity of the employee's Department Director.

B. An appeal may only be initiated by filing a written notification to the City Manager within seven (7) business days after their receipt of the written notice of a disciplinary action. The appeal must specifically state the facts upon which the appeal is based.

C. The City Manager shall meet with the appellant within seven (7) business days after receipt of the appellant's request and permit the appellant to state his/her reasons for any modification of the disciplinary action.

1. The meeting with the appellant can be limited in time by the City Manager. The appellant may bring whatever matters to the City Manager's attention that are relevant including any discipline imposed upon others; his/her own work and discipline record; any mitigating circumstances, including any physical or emotional illness of appellant; and any other matters.

2. The appellant shall not be entitled to bring any witnesses to the meeting, except as may be specifically permitted by the City Manager upon prior request. The appellant may appear with his/her legal counsel at his/her expense and the City may be represented by any person of choice. There shall be no transcript of the meeting nor is it necessary to retain any submittals.

3. Subsequent to the meeting, the City Manager shall inform the appellant, in writing within seven (7) business days, unless good cause exists for additional time, stating whatever determination has been made regarding modification of the disciplinary action. The City Manager shall order whatever action is necessary, if any, to implement his/her decision and shall notify the appellant, the Department Director and the Human Resources Manager accordingly.

D. For the City's internal appeal process, the City Manager's decision is final.

#### 1.8. TIME LIMITS

A. Should an employee not meet the deadlines established for each step of the appeal process and follow the prescribed procedure, the appeal shall revert to the highest level at which an official decision was given, and he/she shall lose his/her right to further appeal in the matter.


B. Should the administration herein defined as supervisory and management personnel in the appeal process, not act according to the procedures outlined, the appeal is carried automatically to the next highest authority immediately after the prescribed time limit passes.

C. Time limits may be waived and/or extended only by mutual written agreement of the parties involved.

  
(Chief of Police)      7/31/28  
(Date)

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I have read this memorandum, understand it, and have received a copy.

  
(Carlos Bowdre)      7.31.25  
(Date)