



WELD COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION REPORT

Complainant:	Sergeant Jason Law
Date/Time complaint received:	01/14/2022 11:38:00
Subject Employee:	Patrol Deputy Chad Benoit
Employee Supervisor:	Sergeant Jon Patton
Criminal Case Number:	22W005765
IA Case Number:	AI2022-0006
Date/Time of incident:	02/13/2022 11:13:00
Location of incident:	1950 O'O St, Greeley Colorado 80631
Investigator:	Sergeant Dave Porter

ABSTRACT

Field Training Deputy reports to his sergeant that Patrol Deputy (in training) Chad Benoit had lied in a report.

COMPLAINANT ALLEGATIONS

Criminal conduct
Administrative violations

BACKGROUND

- Dep. Benoit was hired on 08/01/2016. He was assigned to the detentions division from 08/01/2016 to 08/24/2021 when he was transferred to patrol as a deputy.
 - Dep. Benoit earned a step increase on 10/16/2021 to 39/7.

COMPLAINANT'S STATEMENT(S)

Written complaint of Sergeant Jason Law [REDACTED] [Sgt Law to Sgt Porter-Statement]. Statement taken by Sgt. Dave Porter on 02/16/2022 at 11:28 by email.

To: Sgt. Dave Porter
From: Sgt. Jason Law
Date: 2/16/2022
Subject: 22W005765 Chad Benoit Ethical Concerns

On Monday, February 14th, 2022 when starting my shift I called Sgt. Miller and during our conversation he advised me about a report he read and unapproved (22W005765) that was submitted by Deputy Benoit, and how he gave a several items for Benoit to follow up on. Later in the morning at approximately 1130 hours I received a phone call from Deputy Mclaughlan

reference concerns about his trainee, Deputy Chad Benoit, and alleged Deputy Benoit was being dishonest and lying in a report.

Deputy Mclaughlan explained me to the original report associated to 22W005765 had been denied by Sgt. Miller, and Deputy Benoit had resubmitted the report for approved as corrections completed without going back out to the scene. Deputy Mclaughlan reviewed the revised report and noticed statements being made in the report did not happen from what he observed while he was on scene, and that it could be verified through body cam. Deputy Mclaughlan saved the report that had been submitted as corrections completed before Deputy Benoit made any additional changes to it and emailed me a copy of it. Due to the allegations being associate to integrity and lying on a report, I told Deputy Mclaughlan to have Deputy Benoit go to the main office on admin and to wait there until told otherwise.

I immediately notified Sgt. Porter (IA) and Sgt. Patton who is over the FTO program and the direct supervisor to Deputy Benoit of the allegations. I was later told by Sgt. Patton they had talked with Deputy Mclaughlan, and this is more of a Patrol issue than a Training Unit issue and I need to verify whether the allegations are in fact associated to integrity or if it is an issue with Deputy Benoit's experience and training and advise Sgt. Porter of my findings. I called Deputy Mclaughlan and told him he can go back out with Deputy Benoit and to allow him to work his shift as normal. During the shift Deputy Benoit did go back out the scene and write a third rendition on the original report, and that is the same report that will be currently viewed if pulled up in Spillman.

I reviewed the body camera video and compare it to the report Deputy Benoit submitted as corrections completed for approval. After viewing the entirety of the BWC recording, and rewatching the key parts it is my opinion it is an integrity issue as Deputy Benoit is not being honest with his actions and documenting statements from the victims pertaining to evidence collections that never happened.

In the 8th paragraph of the report Deputy Mclaughlan saved, Deputy Benoit documented, "I asked if any pellets would be found around the area they were standing and they said they were so small you cannot find any. I did not observe any damage when I looked around the property or see any pellets." In reviewing the BWC recording this conversation in fact never happened. Additionally, Deputy Benoit was in one spot while talking with the victims, they pointed out where they were when they were hit by shotgun pellets, how cows were hit, and a metal building was hit. Deputy Benoit was even invited to be shown to gat a better perspective, however, he stayed in the one area the entire time. Other than possibly looking around by swiveling his head, and he would need Superman vision to see any evidence, Deputy Benoit never made any attempts to look for damage or shotgun pellets on the victim's property.

In the 9th paragraph of the report Deputy Benoit wrote, "I asked [REDACTED] what he caliber he was shooting and he said he did not know, but they were very small and not slugs. When asked if they were small pellets, he said yes." After watching the BWC this conversation is adlibbed, the suspect never talked about not shooting slugs.

Deputy Benoit's coworkers from the jail and to include his FTO's on patrol have made observations that he can be lazy and will often only do the bare minimum amount of work required. This reputation was initially brought to my attention by Deputy Cantin and I encouraged Deputy Cantin to discuss it with Deputy Benoit and to be very blunt about what his reputation is becoming. I also told Deputy Cantin to provide him with solutions to improve his reputation and his relationships with his coworkers on patrol. I was told by Deputy Cantin he had the discussion with Deputy Benoit and he claimed he is a hard worker and was more concerned about knowing who was talking about him versus considering what is being said and how to improve. These issues were directed to the training unit, and I told Deputy Cantin to ensure he is documenting it in the FTO files. From my initial observations of Deputy Benoit and after reading report 22W005765, in my opinion, the root cause that led the untruthful documentation is laziness and to avoid having to go back out the property. The report resubmitted for approval did not cover all the items addressed by Sgt. Miller when he unapproved the report, and these actions are consistent with concerns about Deputy Benoit's work ethic brought up by Deputy Benoit's FTOs.

WITNESS STATEMENT(S)

Email from FTO Deputy Jeremy McLaughlan [REDACTED] to Sgt. Law. [Dep McLaughlan to Sgt Law-Fwd_ Benoit]. Forwarded to Sgt. Porter on 02/14/2022 at 11:33.

Hey,

I attached a report from yesterday that Benoit did. He sent this up on his own and I never looked at before he sent it. Miller kicked it back with some questions, so I looked at it again once he cc'd back. I highlighted two things that he lied about doing and never did, but I'm not able to look at his BWC to see if he failed to do anything else. I was not with him the entire time so I can't confirm a lot of it. Could you please review this and his BWC.

The following is copied from the attachment Dep. McLaughlan sent to Sgt. Law:

On 02/13/2022 at 1043, I was dispatched to a meet at [REDACTED], unincorporated Weld County, State of Colorado. Dispatch advised the reporting party had concerns the neighbor firing their gun was in an unsafe direction.

I called the reporting party, [REDACTED] and asked him to explain what happened. [REDACTED] stated his neighbors to his north were hunting geese and had set up decoys in a clear field that was between his house and the neighbors. [REDACTED] stated the neighbors were shooting a shotgun and the pellets were falling onto his property due to the direction the guns were being shot toward. I

asked [REDACTED] if there was any damage to any property and he said there was none. [REDACTED] stated he did not wish to pursue charges; he only wanted his neighbors to be talked to about the direction they were shooting in. I asked if anyone was hurt and he said no.

I arrived on scene and met [REDACTED] at his front gate to the property. He explained the same story as above, while adding that pellets did hit his wife and a veterinarian on the property who was working on a horse. [REDACTED] stated he had no cameras on the property that caught anything. I followed [REDACTED] onto the property to meet his wife and the vet. [REDACTED] pointed out the field and the distance to the neighbors residence. There was an empty field between the two properties.

[REDACTED] met me at the car and explained the neighbors had been shooting at the same place since yesterday. [REDACTED] stated it wasn't an issue until their direction was toward their home and the pellets began falling on them today. I observed the area [REDACTED] pointed out as being approximately 100 yards into the neighbors property in an open and empty field. The place [REDACTED] were when they said the pellets began raining down was approximately 100 yards into their own property near a barn, effectively 200 yards away from where the shooting allegedly was taking place. [REDACTED] stated they were shooting from a grass area toward the center of the field where decoys were set up. I did not see any grass areas [REDACTED] described or pointed to.

I asked [REDACTED] where the pellets hit her and she said the right side of her face around her cheek, she felt a single pellet hit her. I did not observe any marks, bruises, or signs of a pellet hitting her. I took pictures of [REDACTED] and her face and entered those into evidence.

[REDACTED] stated an unknown amount of pellets hit her in the back while she was bent over caring for the horse. [REDACTED] explained she was wearing a thick jacket and does not think any penetrated the fabric. I took pictures of [REDACTED] and observed no marks, bruises or torn/ripped fabric near the area she said they touched her.

[REDACTED] explained they were near the storage shed when the pellets came raining down on them. [REDACTED] explained he attempted to call out to his neighbors who were shooting to tell them to stop shooting toward them but he was ignored. [REDACTED] stated their neighbors ignored any requests at communicating over the incident.

[REDACTED] stated they did not feel pain and did not wish to press charges, only that a discussion would be had with the neighbors. I asked if any pellets would be found around the area they were standing and they said they were so small you cannot find any. I did not observe any damage when I looked around the property or see any pellets.

I drove to [REDACTED] and spoke with [REDACTED] stated he and his sons were not aiming toward [REDACTED] property at any time, and explained he has had problems with his neighbors before for their "false reporting." [REDACTED] explained he was hunting geese on his property and showed me his hunting license. I asked [REDACTED] what he caliber he was shooting and he said he did not know, but they were very small and not slugs. When asked if they were small pellets, he said yes.

I asked [REDACTED] ever tried talking to him at any point today and he said yes, but thought nothing of it because of their prior issues between the two. I asked [REDACTED] if he heard what [REDACTED] l

was saying and he said he heard him say "stop shooting." [REDACTED] said he looked over at him but he was so far away he didn't hear anything else that was said. [REDACTED] stated they kept shooting and didn't hear anything else from the neighbors.

The field in which this incident occurred was between the two properties, with nothing nearby for about a mile. No area check was done for this reason. I conducted a law enforcement search due to [REDACTED] false reporting allegations against [REDACTED] and could not find any documented incident involving either party for the last two years.

I spoke to [REDACTED] and informed him his neighbor was talked to, but unfortunately I cannot determine anything one way or the other due to the conflicting statements and no other proof to go off of. [REDACTED] stated he only was wanting them talked to and he did not wish to go any further with this anyway.

Case status to be suspended due to lack of leads.

SUBJECT STATEMENT(S)

Interview of Deputy Chad Benoit [REDACTED] Audio/Video recorded – [02-16-2022_1325 Dep. Benoit]. Statement taken by Sgt. Dave Porter at WCSO HQ in interview room 1 on 02/16/2022 at 13:25. Dep. Benoit was advised of Garrity and obligations.

When [02/13/2022] Dep. Benoit was dispatched [22W005765], to a call where the reporting party [REDACTED] was saying his neighbor [REDACTED] was shooting and the pellets were falling onto his property. Dep. Benoit asked [REDACTED] if there were injured people or damage because of the shooting and [REDACTED] responded there wasn't. Dep. Benoit drove to [REDACTED] and talked with [REDACTED] at his gate. He said his wife [REDACTED] and a veterinarian ([REDACTED]) had been hit with the falling pellets. Dep. Benoit asked if [REDACTED] wanted to press charges and he said he didn't, he just wanted his neighbor to stop shooting toward his property. Dep. Benoit did not hear anyone shooting at that time.

Dep. Benoit pointed out that he was in phase four (field training) and was trying to figure out how to investigate a case like this. At first, he thought it was a good idea to speak with [REDACTED] first to ensure he wasn't going to start shooting again but thought better of it and went onto [REDACTED] property first. There he took pictures of [REDACTED] cheek and [REDACTED] back because this is where they said they were hit. Dep. Benoit was "stumped" at this point, so he decided to speak with [REDACTED]. When Dep. Benoit told him [REDACTED] was claiming [REDACTED] was shooting toward his property and the "stuff was falling on them, he [REDACTED] called bullshit right away." Dep. Benoit was, "getting the vibe that he's [REDACTED] just not being forthcoming." When he, "tried to ask" [REDACTED] what he was shooting and, "he said something." Dep. Benoit said he thought he had gotten as much of [REDACTED] story as he could and he "ran out of questions." When he got back to the patrol cruiser, Dep. McLaughlan asked him if [REDACTED] had a hunting license and if he had run [REDACTED] through CCIC/NCIC. Dep. Benoit said, "I guess I have a bad habit of not remembering to run people's names" so he ran [REDACTED] while at [REDACTED] gate. Dep. Benoit isn't a hunter, so he doesn't know anything about hunting or Colorado hunting law. Dep. Benoit called Dep. Derek Knott and Dep. Kelly Carmin. Dep. Knott sent him some "hunting stuff" from Google that pertained to goose hunting. Dep. Benoit did not want to go back onto [REDACTED] property, so he

called him, and his wife answered. [REDACTED] walked up to the gate about two minutes later and he asked him if he had a hunter's license. [REDACTED] responded that he did, and Dep. Benoit asked to see the license [REDACTED] answered, "uh no, something like that." [REDACTED], "pulled out something green that looks like maybe a hunters license. I don't know what the hell they look like." Dep. Benoit said he saw the date of "March something" on the green thing. Dep. Benoit asked [REDACTED] "Is that valid? and he's like yeah. I was like ok." Dep. Benoit saw something that looked like a hunter's license to him so he "called it good." Dep. Benoit handled another call and wrote his report.

[On 02/14/2022] Sgt. Thomas Miller rejected the report and asked several questions that Dep. Benoit did not think to ask either involved parties. Dep. Benoit wrote out what he "believed" happened and sent the report back for approval. Dep. McLaughlan read the report and said, 'I call bullshit.' Dep. Benoit asked what Dep. McLaughlan was saying, and he responded that all hunters know the type of round they are using. Dep. Benoit believed [REDACTED] didn't remember the cartridge he was shooting. Dep. Benoit reviewed his bodycam footage to be sure and saw [REDACTED] did not say he didn't know what he was shooting. Dep. Benoit "immediately changed my report – that part." Dep. Benoit knew he also needed to follow up to address the problem. Dep. Benoit sent the report "back to myself" [22W005765_From Spillman on 12-15-2022]. He didn't see where [REDACTED] were standing when the shot fell onto them. He also didn't take pictures, "I was just starting to realize, I just messed up."

Dep. Benoit called [REDACTED] before he left the office. When he asked if he could ask some follow up questions [REDACTED] said, 'no I've give you enough I'm not going to say anymore.' Dep. Benoit followed up with [REDACTED] by calling them and going to [REDACTED] showed him where she and [REDACTED] were standing. He didn't see any "pellets" where [REDACTED] was standing. [REDACTED] climbed onto a cattle fence and looked into the shelter and didn't see any shot on the roof. Dep. Benoit also asked where [REDACTED] was shooting from, and [REDACTED] pointed the area out.

Based on his statements, Dep. Benoit did not separate his actions chronologically. Dep. Benoit was allowed to view the portion of his report in question:

[REDACTED] stated they did not feel pain and did not wish to press charges, only that a discussion would be had with the neighbors. I asked if any pellets would be found around the area they were standing and they said they were so small you cannot find any. I did not observe any damage when I looked around the property or see any pellets."

"I drove to [REDACTED] and spoke with [REDACTED] he and his sons were not aiming toward [REDACTED] property at any time, and explained he has had problems with his neighbors before for their "false reporting." [REDACTED] explained he was hunting geese on his property and showed me his hunting license. I asked [REDACTED] what he caliber he was shooting and he said he did not know, but they were very small and not slugs. When asked if they were small pellets, he said yes."

Dep. Benoit was asked why he wrote the report in this way when he did not take the action, ask the questions, or receive the answers it implies he did. Dep. Benoit answered that he wrote the report as, "I guess a play on words." What he meant was, "where I was standing, I couldn't see nothin. Not that I was walking around the property lookin' for all this stuff." Dep. Benoit said he

did not intend to convey that he moved around the property searching for shot or damage from the shot. Rather, from his vantage point, he looked at the area where [REDACTED] were standing. From that vantage point he saw no shot or damage to the buildings.

Dep. Benoit was asked if he had questioned [REDACTED] about the caliber he was shooting. Dep. Benoit did not ask [REDACTED] what caliber or gauge “whatever shotguns come in” or shot size he was shooting. [REDACTED] simply answered, “it’s not buckshot cause it’s illegal.” Dep. Benoit modified his report to show that he had not asked [REDACTED] about the caliber or shot size. Dep. Benoit said he thought he had asked this question, but when he reviewed bodycam, he realized he hadn’t.

Dep. Benoit was asked why he was muting his camera so often. He said this is habit. He was also taught in phase 1 when he wasn’t in contact with the public, to do this. Dep. Benoit was allowed to view his bodycam footage. After watching his first conversation with [REDACTED], he said he was muting so he and Dep. McLaughlan could discuss training issues.

Dep. Benoit was asked [REDACTED] When asked if he inquired about the “pellets” with [REDACTED] he said “I could have” asked on the phone or during his follow up. Dep. Benoit said he wrote the report his “mind remembered it.”

Dep. Benoit admits he did not completely read all his report to ensure its accuracy the second time he made corrections. Dep. Benoit understands that the perception could be that he was being untruthful on his report, but he was not lying.

DISPUTED FACTS

Dep. Benoit’s report on 02/13/2022 at 18:17:32 under “REPORT NARRATIVE”

Paragraph eight reads:

[REDACTED] stated they did not feel pain and did not wish to press charges, only that a discussion would be had with the neighbors. I asked if any pellets would be found around the area they were standing and they said they were so small you cannot find any. I did not observe any damage when I looked around the property or see any pellets.

1. BWC footage [0213220_W0259] shows that:
 - a. Dep. Benoit never asked [REDACTED] where any of the alleged shot could be found.
 - b. [REDACTED] never commented about the size of the shot.
 - c. Dep. Benoit never examined any of the buildings or areas where [REDACTED] [REDACTED] indicate they were when the alleged impact from the shot took place.

Paragraph nine reads:

I drove to [REDACTED] and spoke with [REDACTED] stated he and his sons were not aiming toward [REDACTED] property at any time, and explained he has had problems with his

neighbors before for their "false reporting." [REDACTED] explained he was hunting geese on his property and showed me his hunting license.

Dep. Benoit's report on 02/14/2022 at 16:24:29 under "REPORT NARRATIVE"

Paragraph eight reads:

[REDACTED] stated they did not wish to press charges, only that a discussion would be had with the neighbors. I asked if any pellets would be found around the area they were standing and they said they were so small you cannot find any. I did not observe any damage when I looked around the property or see any pellets. The area [REDACTED] was standing at when they were hit with pellets was muddy and slushy due to the recent snow melt and was the home to a bunch of cows.

1. BWC footage [0214220_W0259] shows:
 - a. Dep. Benoit asked [REDACTED] where the pellets landed. At that time, he was outside the pen where she said she was hit.
 - b. Dep. Benoit asked [REDACTED] what building was hit with the shot. She showed him the roof of a cattle shelter. She looked at the roof and told him there was no damage from the shot on the roof. Dep. Benoit asked if some dents in the north wall of the shed was from the shot. She said it wasn't.
 - c. Dep. Benoit's report did not explain that he had gone back to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] to make the above observations.

Paragraph nine reads:

I drove to [REDACTED] and spoke with [REDACTED] stated he and his sons were not aiming toward [REDACTED] property at any time, and explained he has had problems with his neighbors before for their "false reporting." [REDACTED] explained he was hunting geese on his property and showed me his hunting license. I asked [REDACTED] what he caliber he was shooting and he said he did not know, but they were very small and not slugs. When asked if they were small pellets, he said yes.

1. BWC footage [0213220_W0259] shows:
 - a. Dep. Benoit asked [REDACTED]s, "What you guys shooting?" [REDACTED] responds, "Eh, its goose season." Dep. Benoit asks, "shotguns?" [REDACTED]s responds, "Yeah." Dep. Benoit asks, "What kind of pellets?" [REDACTED] responds, "I don't know." Dep. Benoit asks, "See. Is it like buckshot or birdshot?" [REDACTED] responds, "It aint buckshot, buckshots illegal for geese." Dep. Benoit responds, "Ok. Alright."

Paragraph 11 reads:

[REDACTED] would not disclose any additional information about what gauge he was shooting because of what he regarded as a false reporting incident on his neighbors behalf when I spoke with him at 1145 on 02/14/2022. [REDACTED] would not answer any other follow up questions I had and said he did not have to provide any further information as he had given enough already.

1. Dep. Benoit did not record his second attempt at conversation with [REDACTED]

2. Dep. Benoit did not ask [REDACTED] what caliber he was shooting on 02/13/2022.
3. [REDACTED] did not articulate the size of the shot or cartridge he was using on 02/13/2022. He only responded that, "I don't know." and "It aint buckshot".
4. Dep. Benoit did not ask [REDACTED] if the shot was small pellets and Charles did not respond "yes" on 02/13/2022.

ADDITIONAL RELEVANT INFORMATION

Evidence reference [22W005765_From Spillman on 12-15-2022] and [22W005765-Narrative Details_From PSIT]

On 02/13/2022 at 18:05, Dep. Benoit finished his original narrative report in 22W005765. He sent it as owner approved "OA" to "PSBLUE" at 18:17:32.

On 02/14/2022 at 03:04, Sgt. Thomas Miller sent the report back to Dep. Benoit with the following message:

how far were the shooting pits/stands from the property line, from the alleged impact with wife and vet, shot is not so small that they could not have found it if they looked, what prior calls have there been and how were they cleared. is this possibly an issue with false reporting? what were they shooting, cartridge wise? there is a big difference form a 3" 12 gauge and a 2.5" 410

On 02/14/2022 at 16:24 Dep. Benoit finished his corrections and sent the report as corrections completed "CC" to "PSBLUE". Dep. Benoit made more modifications after sending the "CC" version. He last modified the report on 02/14/2022 at 18:36. These modifications did not substantially change the statements in question.

INVESTIGATOR'S ANALYSIS

Dep. Benoit did not take key action he claimed he did in his report

While speaking with [REDACTED] on 02/13/2022, Dep. Benoit did not make efforts to examine the scene as he claims in his report. While in contact with [REDACTED], he does not ask sufficiently specific questions or follow up questions about the weapon/s caliber and cartridges [REDACTED] and his son were shooting. Dep. Benoit doesn't accurately represent [REDACTED] answers to his questions. He failed to clarify what [REDACTED] was shooting beyond a shotgun. Dep. Benoit sent his report for sergeant review despite its inaccuracies.

The next day 02/14/2022, Dep. benoit did ask [REDACTED] questions about the "pellets" and damage but he fails to explain he did this on 02/14/2022 this in his report. In calling [REDACTED], he did not obtain any clarification on the weapon or the cartridges he used. Despite these failures, the inaccurate statements in question remained largely unchanged.

Dep. Benoit does not appear to understand the weight of his position

Dep. Benoit either feigns ignorance or doesn't fully comprehend how serious accurate reporting is in criminal justice. Several times during his interview, he states that his articulation is "garbage." Despite this and Sgt. Miller's report rejection he did not take the time to ensure his reports accuracy. Dep. Benoit also made statements like "that's how my mind remembered it" or other such statements implying he recalled things differently than how they occurred. Had he been taking notes or reviewing his bodycam footage to ensure accuracy he would have written a more accurate report.

INVESTIGATOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS

There are no recommendations in this incident.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

THESE ARE NOT FINDINGS. THESE ARE POTENTIAL POLICY VIOLATIONS. THE ADMINISTRATIVE CAPTAIN OR THEIR DESIGNEE MAY USE THEIR DISCRETION WHEN MAKING A FINDINGS DETERMINATION.

Patrol Policy 318 Report Preparation

318.1.1 REPORT PREPARATION

Employees should ensure that their reports are sufficiently detailed for their purpose and reasonably free of errors prior to submission. It is the responsibility of the assigned employee to complete and submit all reports taken during the shift before going off-duty, unless permission to delay submission of the report has been approved by a supervisor. Generally, reports requiring prompt follow-up action on active leads or arrest reports where the suspect remains in custody should not be delayed.

Handwritten reports must be prepared legibly. If the report is not prepared legibly, the submitting employee will be required by the reviewing supervisor to promptly make corrections and resubmit the report. Employees who dictate reports shall use appropriate grammar, as content is not the responsibility of the typist. Employees who generate reports on computers are subject to all requirements of this policy.

All reports shall accurately reflect the identity of the persons involved, witnesses, all pertinent information seen, heard or assimilated by any other sense and any actions taken. Employees shall not suppress, conceal or distort the facts of any reported incident, nor shall any employee make a false report orally or in writing. Generally, the reporting employee's opinions should not be included in reports unless specifically identified as such.

Patrol Policy 1112 Standards of Conduct

1112.6 RULES

1. Conduct Unbecoming a Deputy
 - a. Deputies shall not engage in any conduct or activities on-or off-duty that reflect discredit on the members of the Sheriff's Office, tend to bring the agency into disrepute, or impair its efficient and effective operations
 - b. On-duty Deputies and employees shall remain alert and vigilant in the performance of assignments and duties

4. Accountability, Responsibility, and Discipline
 - c. Deputies and employees shall be accurate, complete, and truthful in all matters



Digitally signed by David Porter
Date: 2022.03.04 12:42:51 -07'00'

Internal Affairs Sergeant Dave Porter