

# BEFORE THE KANSAS COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICERS' STANDARDS AND TRAINING

1999 N. AMIDON, SUITE 350 • WICHITA, KANSAS 67203 Tel (316) 832-9906 • Fax (316) 832-9679

In the Matter of	)		
ANTHONY WEBB	)	Case No.	2022-0078
#23764	)		

# SUMMARY ORDER OF REVOCATION

Pursuant to K.S.A. 77-537

The above-captioned matter comes on for Commission action through a summary proceeding under the Kansas Administrative Procedures Act, K.S.A. 77-537, regarding the law enforcement certification of ANTHONY WEBB (Respondent).

#### STATEMENT OF FACTS

- The Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training (Commission) granted full-time certification to Respondent, certification number 23764.
- 2. Respondent was employed as a full-time law enforcement officer with the Kansas Alcoholic Beverage Control Division (ABC) from February 24, 2019 to May 6, 2022.
- 3. The ABC conducted an internal investigation into allegations that Respondent falsely reported information into their report database; falsely reported activity in his weekly log; falsely reported the amount of time he worked in the time entry database; and made false statements during an investigation. The ABC conducted a review of Respondent's activities, including document entries, phone use, and vehicle use.

- 4. On February 11, 2022, Respondent entered information into the POSSE data management system and on his weekly summary indicating that he conducted four inspections on that date. However, ABC records revealed that Respondent's agency vehicle was not driven that day. ABC policy requires that inspections of licensed premises be conducted in person. When questioned about the four inspections he entered as having been completed on February 11, Respondent indicated that he had actually conducted the inspections on January 4, 2022, but had not entered them at that time. He stated that upon realizing that the inspections were pending, he entered the inspections on February 11. Respondent was required to manually enter the date of the inspection and intentionally used the February 11 date instead of the correct date. Respondent also admitted that he made phone contact on one of the inspections and did not conduct the inspection in person. Additionally, Respondent wrote on his activity sheet that he "brought cases to Riley County District Court" on February 11. When asked about this activity, Respondent stated that he did so in person. When confronted with the fact that his vehicle was not used on that date, Respondent admitted that he did not, in fact, drop off the cases at court on that day. Respondent reported that he worked six hours on his timesheet for February 11. When it became clear that Respondent did not perform the activities he claimed, he was asked if he worked at all that day. Respondent replied, "I don't know. I guess not." Respondent admitted that he filed reports that were not true or inaccurate.
- 5. On February 8, 2022, Respondent drove the ABC vehicle to his dentist's office. The vehicle was parked there from 7:27 a.m. to 8:22 a.m. When interviewed, Respondent denied that he used the agency vehicle to go to the dentist but, instead, claimed he had parked near the office and visited a grocery store that was connected to the dentist office for work-related business. Respondent did not document the complaint he alleged he was investigating. During two separate interviews, Respondent provided an incorrect description of where he parked the ABC vehicle and denied that he went to the dentist on February 8. Subsequently, Respondent confirmed that he did have a dentist appointment at the office where he parked the ABC vehicle on February 8. He was unable to provide a reason for why he used the agency vehicle for a personal trip to the dentist.

- 6. On February 17, 2020, Respondent's supervisor conducted an unannounced vehicle inspection and observed small footprints on the dash and glove box area of the agency vehicle issued to Respondent. Respondent volunteered that the footprints were from his son. Following the inspection, Respondent and other ABC employees were reminded of the State of Kansas vehicle usage policy and that family members were not allowed to ride in agency vehicles. Despite his statements to his supervisor in 2020, Respondent stated that his family members have never been in his agency vehicle when interviewed during the ABC investigation in 2022. When interviewed by Commission Investigator Michael Oliver, Respondent stated that the footprints were from a confidential informant that he transported. Therefore, Respondent was either dishonest with his supervisor in 2020 or dishonest with Investigator Oliver in the Commission interview.
- 7. During the ABC investigation, Respondent stated that he used his agency phone exclusively to conduct ABC business. However, he told Investigator Oliver that he used his personal cell phone a lot to speak with other agents and conduct agency business. Again, Respondent was inconsistent with his accounting of the work he performed with the ABC.
- 8. As a whole, Respondent was unable to account for a great deal of his time as an ABC agent working out of a home office.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

# <u>Unprofessional Conduct – False Statement</u>

- 9. Pursuant to K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), the Commission may revoke the certification of any police or law enforcement officer who has engaged in unprofessional conduct as defined by rules and regulations of the Commission.
- 10. K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) defines unprofessional conduct as, except for a legitimate law enforcement purpose, intentionally using a false statement in any official document or official communication.

11. Respondent made multiple false statements and submitted false and incorrect documents during his employment with the ABC and during an internal investigation into his conduct. His dishonesty was not associated with a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

## **Summary Proceedings**

12. Under K.S.A. 77-537, the Commission may conduct these summary proceedings, subject to Respondent's request for a hearing. The Commission finds that the use of summary proceedings in these circumstances does not violate any provisions of law and the protection of the public interest does not require the Commission to give notice and opportunity to participate to any person other than Respondent.

### **ORDER**

Based on the above Statement of Facts and Conclusions of Law, the Commission orders that the Kansas Law Enforcement Officer Certification of ANTHONY WEBB be revoked.

ACCORDINGLY, THE KANSAS COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICERS'
STANDARDS AND TRAINING CERTIFICATE OF ANTHONY WEBB IS HEREBY
REVOKED.

FURTHER, Respondent is ordered to surrender and return to the Commission all evidence of his certification as a law enforcement officer.

DATED this 30 day of 4ug., 2023.

KANSAS COMMISSION ON PEACE OFFICERS' STANDARDS AND TRAINING

Jeff Level

Chair, Commission Investigative Committee

## NOTICE OF RELIEF FROM THIS SUMMARY ORDER

Pursuant to K.S.A. 77-537, the Summary Order is subject to your request for a hearing. If you desire a hearing, you must direct a written request for a hearing to the Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training, 1999 N. Amidon, Suite 350, Wichita, Kansas 67203. This written request must be filed within fifteen (15) days from the date indicated in the Certificate of Service below. If a written request for hearing is not so made, this Summary Order becomes final and effective upon the expiration of the time for requesting a hearing.

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that on the 30th day of 2023, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing Summary Order of Revocation was deposited in the United States mail, certified, postage prepaid, return receipt requested, and deposited in the United States mail, with tracking, postage prepaid, addressed to:

ANTHONY WEBB

Staff

Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training