**Summarize**

[**2001-10-04 Dishonesty Comm134.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/657791856194b423f1073b557cf0f80e/content#page=1)

* The document discusses a sustained complaint of dishonesty involving Officer Laurence Barker on October 4, 2001.
* It lists various exemptions that allow for redaction of certain information, including: Personal data or information of peace and custodial officers (Redaction #1) To preserve the anonymity of complainants and witnesses (Redaction #2) To protect confidential medical, financial, or other information (Redaction #3) To protect the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person (Redaction #4) To prevent the disclosure of criminal offender record information (Redaction #5) To protect preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda (Redaction #9) To protect records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures (Redaction #10) To protect photographs of the body of a deceased person (Redaction #11) To protect against an unwarranted invasion of privacy (Redaction #12) To protect confidential mental health records or juvenile records (Redaction #13-15) To protect attorney-client privilege or official information (Redaction #16)
* The document also references various California codes and statutes that support these exemptions.
* The document twice provides the address and contact information for the San Francisco Police Department Headquarters.

[**2001-10-04 Dishonesty Comm134 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/973e63b16ac62161ed1a0ba319db2b3c/content#page=1)

The document contains multiple references to the San Francisco Police Commission, which is the primary organization involved in the proceedings. It discusses a disciplinary hearing for Officer Laurence B. Barker, who is accused of violating department rules. The document also contains information about the resolution adopted by the Police Commission, the assignment of Commissioner Wayne Friday to conduct the taking of evidence, and the specific charges against Officer Barker. Additionally, the document contains multiple notices of unavailability from Earl J. Disselhorst, Esq., who is representing Officer Barker, as well as subpoenas for two individuals to appear as witnesses in the disciplinary hearing. Finally, there is a letter from the Police Commission to Mr. Disselhorst confirming the postponement of the disciplinary hearing.

[**1997-12-31 Dishonesty Comm133.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/9ba55ebf9395a2f7fe79fefc030a59d6/content#page=1)

* The document discusses records related to a sustained complaint of dishonesty involving Officer Peter Ma from July 1997 through December 1997.
* It includes a redaction index with various exemptions, including: California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A) which protects personal data or information of peace and custodial officers. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B) which preserves the anonymity of complainants and witnesses. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C) which protects confidential medical, financial, or other information. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D) which protects the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person.
* Other exemptions mentioned include: California Penal Code § 832.7(a) which makes personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers confidential. California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7) which protects personal identifying information. California Penal Code §§ 11076, 11105 (b) which restrict access to information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). California Penal Code §§ 13300(b) which restricts dissemination of criminal offender record information (CORI).
* The document also references California Government Code § 7927.500, which exempts preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda from disclosure.
* California Government Code § 7923.600 is mentioned as well, which exempts records of complaints, investigations, intelligence information, or security procedures from disclosure.
* California Code of Civil Procedure § 129 is referenced, which protects photographs of a deceased person taken by the coroner.
* The document also mentions California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328, which protects confidential mental health records, and California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827, which protects juvenile records.
* Finally, the document references California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, and Evidence Code § 954, which protect attorney-client privilege, and California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2), which allows a public entity to refuse to disclose official information.
* The document also mentions California Penal Code § 832.7(g) and § 832.7(h), which clarify that this section does not affect the discovery or disclosure of information in a peace or custodial officer's personnel file.

[**1997-12-31 Dishonesty Comm133 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/76a3e124a3985c857904fa9ee22ea724/content#page=1)

The document contains correspondence and notices from the San Francisco Police Commission to various individuals, including Officer Peter D. Ma, who is facing disciplinary charges. The Police Commission has scheduled a hearing for Officer Ma on May 21, 2001, and has outlined rules and regulations for the hearing, including information on evidence, witnesses, and confidentiality. The Commission has also provided details on the process for requesting and scheduling an investigative hearing.

The document discusses the Commission's rules regarding discovery, which the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) is following. The OCC has complied with discovery requirements by providing the Accused Officer with taped interviews and exculpatory evidence, and has also outlined rules for filing motions. However, the OCC is not required to provide the Accused Officer with an "evaluative summary" of the case, as it is exempt from discovery. The OCC argues that the Accused Officer is not entitled to post-interview summaries, as they are cumulative and would reveal work product.

The document also discusses the qualifications and selection process for Investigative Hearing Officers (IHOs), as well as the powers and duties of the IHOs. It outlines the definitions of various terms used in the document, such as "Proper Conduct" and "Discourtesy."

The document contains multiple subpoenas issued to various individuals to appear as witnesses in the trial against Officer Ma, and provides additional information about the charges against him, including the specific violations he is accused of. It also contains information about the assignment of a commissioner to conduct the taking of evidence in the case.

[**1994-06-06 Dishonesty SFPD193.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/a1fca959576d8144ac500238e595c539/content#page=1)

The document contains multiple correspondences between the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the Office of Citizen Complaints (OCC) regarding a complaint against Officer Guillermo Amigo. The complaint alleges that Officer Amigo took a marijuana pipe from a citizen and threw it down a storm drain without issuing a property receipt or writing a police report. The document provides additional details about the incident, including the location and time, as well as summaries of interviews with the complainant, Officer Amigo, and other officers involved. The OCC found the allegation of "unwarranted action" to be sustained and outlined their rationale for this finding. They recommended the complaint be submitted to the Police Commission. The Management Control Division (MCD) concurred with the OCC's findings and recommendation. The document also contains information about department policy regarding the handling of confiscated property. Chief of Police Anthony D. Ribera issued a written reprimand to Officer Amigo for violating these department rules.

[**1994-06-06 Dishonesty SFPD193 redaction index.pdf**](https://casetext.com/api/ai-assistant/proxy/document-uploads/5c85c99df6de4683970971358ac28af0/content#page=1)

* The document discusses records related to an incident involving member Guillermo Amigo on June 6, 1994.
* The records include documents related to Internal Affairs Report OCC 0430-94.
* Redactions have been made to the records based on various exemptions, which are outlined in the document.
* Exemptions include: Protecting personal data or information of peace and custodial officers (California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(A)) Preserving the anonymity of complainants and witnesses (California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(B)) Protecting confidential medical, financial, or other information (California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(C)) Protecting the physical safety of the peace officer, custodial officer, or another person (California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(5)(D)) Keeping personnel records of peace officers and custodial officers confidential (California Penal Code § 832.7(a)) Protecting personal identifying information (California Penal Code § 832.7(b)(7)) Restricting access to information from the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS) (California Penal Code §§ 11076, 11105 (b)) Restricting dissemination of criminal offender record information (CORI) (California Penal Code §§ 13300(b)) Exempting preliminary drafts, notes, or memoranda from disclosure (California Government Code § 7927.500) Exempting records of complaints, investigations, or security procedures from disclosure (California Government Code § 7923.600) Protecting photographs of a deceased person (California Code of Civil Procedure § 129) Protecting against an unwarranted invasion of privacy (California Government Code §§ 7927.700, 7927.705, 7930.100) Protecting confidential mental health records (California Welfare & Institutions Code § 5328) Protecting juvenile records (California Welfare & Institutions Code § 827, California Government Code § 6254(k)) Protecting attorney-client privilege (California Government Code §§ 7927.705, 7930.110, Evidence Code § 954) Allowing a public entity to refuse to disclose official information (California Evidence Code 1040(b)(2)) Clarifying that the section does not affect the criminal discovery process (California Penal Code § 832.7(g, h))