The Kansas Commission on Peace Officers' Standards and Training (KSCPOST) is committed to providing the citizens of Kansas with qualified, trained, ethical, competent, and professional peace officers. It is also dedicated to adopting and enforcing professional standards for certification of peace officers to promote public safety and preserve public trust and confidence.

Anyone reading this Integrity Bulletin will recognize that KSCPOST is active in monitoring the actions of Kansas law enforcement and pursuing certification actions in appropriate cases. Kansas law enforcement officers should review and be thoroughly aware of the Kansas Law Enforcement Training Act (KLETA) and Kansas Administrative Regulations that regulate officer certifications. Both are readily available on our website.

Vendors may contact agencies or officers saying that their training program has received advanced approval or certification from KSCPOST for purposes of annual in-service training credit. Agencies and officers should know that KSCPOST does not approve training in advance. Recently, KSCPOST was made aware of a vendor contacting agencies saying their training was approved by KSCPOST as training to provide certification for an officer in the use of a specific product. KSCPOST does not approve “product certification” training. Training of this type, if directly related to law enforcement, and approved by the agency head in advance, would certainly be counted towards in-service training credit.

A primary function of KSCPOST is maintaining accurate and up to date records of officer demographic, employment, and training records. This service is important to both agencies and officers. KLETA requires that “within 30 days of appointment, election or termination, every city, county and state agency, every school district and every community college shall submit the name of any person appointed elected to or terminated from the position of police officer or law enforcement officer within its jurisdiction.” Agencies should complete employment demographic forms and status change forms within 30 days of a hiring or termination. Not doing so creates several potential problems for the agencies and officers:

1. Provisional certifications are issued when a properly completed demographic form is received by KSCPOST. The provisional certification begins on the date listed on the form as employment as a law enforcement officer. A person cannot work in the capacity of an officer without a provisional certification. Agencies that employ a person as an officer before sending a demographic form and receiving provisional certification should consult with their legal counsel regarding the potential liability and consider the impact on investigations.
2. KSCPOST has received forms as much as 12 months late. Provisional certifications are good for one year from the date of hire. If an officer’s provisional expires he will not be eligible for a new provisional for 1 year.

3. A certificate holder must be employed by a law enforcement agency to report training. Training records cannot be monitored and updated if the officer is certified inactive (unemployed). KSCPOST relies on the demographic form and status change to update the proper employment status.

4. A certified officer is disadvantaged if he or she is seeking employment and his or her previous employer has not completed timely and appropriate status change forms or annual in-service training forms.

5. A potential employer is disadvantaged if the previous agency has not submitted timely and appropriate status change forms or annual in-service training forms and the agency sends an information request to KSCPOST.

Agency heads can expect to receive a letter from KSCPOST documenting when Central Registry forms are submitted beyond the thirty days.

**Case Summaries**

An officer’s girlfriend requested that he run license plate and warrant checks on her coworkers. The officer ran the checks and gave the information to his girlfriend by text message. The officer’s employing agency received a complaint about the confidential information that was being disclosed to the girlfriend and opened an investigation. In an interview, the officer repeatedly denied that he disclosed NCIC or other confidential information to his girlfriend. The agency retrieved over 8,800 text messages from the officer’s girlfriend. They directly contradicted the statements the officer made in the interview and proved that he disclosed confidential information to his girlfriend. Additionally, the text messages included an exchange between the officer and his girlfriend where he agreed to arrest one of the girlfriend’s coworkers in exchange for oral sex. The officer then actively attempted to locate the coworker to arrest him.

After a hearing before the KSCPOST Hearing Panel, an Order was issued revoking the officer’s certification for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(e) Unprofessional Conduct, taking action as an officer if the action is or reasonably would appear to be motivated by a familial, financial, social, sexual, romantic, physical, intimate, or emotional relationship.

An individual left employment as a law enforcement officer and became employed at a retail store. He continued to hold an active law enforcement certification. The individual stole items from the store and also committed time fraud. He was convicted of stealing in Missouri, where the retail store was located. He also feloniously damaged a coworker’s vehicle in Kansas and was charged with felony criminal damage.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(26) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime or a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. felony criminal damage and theft.
An officer was hired by a law enforcement agency and granted a provisional certification. Prior to completing a basic academy and becoming full-time certified, the officer was involved in a vehicle collision in his personal vehicle with a private citizen. The officer was identifiable as an officer as he was wearing some department-issued clothing. The officer gave the citizen a false name and claimed that he reported the collision to his agency, despite not having done so. The officer re-contacted the citizen later in the evening, providing proof of insurance that was not in effect and additional false information regarding where he worked as a law enforcement officer and what his duties entailed. The officer was charged in district court and took a diversion on one count of official misconduct.

The officer’s provisional certification was automatically revoked once he was terminated from his agency prior to completing basic training. However, after the one-year waiting period following a provisional revocation, the officer and a potential law enforcement employer submitted a request, pursuant to K.S.A. 74-5605(c), to KS CPOST to determine if the former officer would be granted a new certification.

The officer’s request for certification was denied by Summary Order of Certification Denial for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(45) & (35) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. official misconduct and interference with law enforcement.

An officer’s coworker was searching for gun oil and discovered an agency paycheck in the officer’s name. The paycheck had been altered to reflect that the officer earned twice as much as his actual pay rate. The altered paycheck was located next to a flash drive containing altered bank statements for the officer and a business loan application. In an internal interview, the officer denied having ever seen the altered paycheck before. However, once presented with the flash drive, the officer admitted that he had altered the documents with the intent to submit them with his loan application for his firearms business. The officer had not submitted the documents.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Consent Agreement and Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime under the laws of this state, i.e. forgery.

An officer was convicted in district court of sexual exploitation of a child, a felony, along with attempted sexual battery, official misconduct, and harassment by telecommunications device.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) felony conviction, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(12),(45) & (51) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime or a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. sexual battery, official misconduct, and harassment by telecommunications device.

An officer was found guilty of DUI in 2000. The officer was again arrested for DUI in 2017 and entered a diversion agreement in district court. Due to allegations about the officer’s conduct at the bar just before his DUI arrest in 2017, it was necessary for KS CPOST to interview the officer. The officer did not cooperate with the KS CPOST investigation, despite receiving notification and other communication regarding his scheduled interview.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3) failing to cooperate in a commission.
investigation to determine a person’s continued suitability for law enforcement certification, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(58) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. second or subsequent occurrence of DUI.

An officer was referred for a Fitness for Duty Examination. A licensed psychologist found that the officer was not fit for duty. Additionally, the officer took over $22,000 cash that had been seized in various drug crimes and was being stored in evidence. He was convicted of felony theft in district court.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation under of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(7) be free of any physical or mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety and judgment, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) felony conviction.

Law enforcement arrived to arrest an officer’s spouse on a warrant. The officer indicated that the spouse was sleeping but refused to either retrieve the spouse or allow the arresting officers access or entry into the house. The officer restricted entry into the home, allowing the spouse time to flee the residence. The officer was charged with interference with law enforcement in district court and entered a diversion agreement.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(35) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. interference with law enforcement.

An officer was an hour late to shift when a coworker called him. Once he arrived at a dispatched call, other officers observed an odor of alcohol coming from him and observed behavior indicating he was under the influence of alcohol. The officer was given a PBT, the result of which was 0.301 blood alcohol content.


An officer was involved in a traffic stop. The officer located drug paraphernalia and personal items belonging to the driver. The officer told the driver he would destroy the paraphernalia in exchange for information about the driver’s drug dealers. After being released from jail, the driver contacted the agency and requested the return of the personal property, including two cell phones. The officer denied taking the cell phones and claimed he submitted them in the driver’s property at the jail as required by agency policy. An investigation revealed that the officer destroyed the drug paraphernalia. The driver’s personal property was found in the officer’s patrol vehicle, contrary to his claims that he submitted it into evidence. The officer admitted that he destroyed evidence of a crime and that he had done so three or four other times during his employment with the agency. The officer was charged in district court with official misconduct and entered a diversion agreement.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(45) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. official misconduct.
An officer was on-duty and working with his assigned FTO. The FTO smelled an odor of alcohol on the officer and observed behavior indicating that the officer was under the influence of alcohol. The officer was given a breath test, the result of which was 0.15 blood alcohol content.


An officer was transporting a prisoner approximately 15 miles to jail. The officer asked the female prisoner, who was handcuffed in the backseat and had never been arrested before, to show him her breasts. The officer was unsure what to do so she exposed her breasts. The officer reached through the partition and touched the prisoner’s breast. The officer was dishonest in the agency internal investigation into the incident. The officer was convicted of aggravated battery in district court.


An officer was working in the jail. While an inmate’s chow hole was open, the officer touched her vagina. The inmate also touched the officer’s penis, which was erect at the time. The officer was dishonest when interviewed during the agency investigation. The officer was convicted of aggravated battery in district court.


An officer was receiving unemployment benefits prior to becoming employed with a law enforcement agency. When he began employment with the agency, the officer was no longer eligible to claim or receive unemployment benefits. However, the officer’s wife continued to claim unemployment benefits on his behalf after he started his employment. The officer accepted and spent the unemployment benefits, in the amount of $1,422.00, that were unlawfully claimed on his behalf.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(26) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. theft.

An officer entered a diversion agreement in district court for one count of making false information, a felony. The officer entered a Consent Agreement with KS CPOST.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Consent Agreement and Order of Revocation for violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) felony conviction.

An agency received a complaint that an officer engaged in sexual harassment in the workplace and opened an investigation. The officer was interviewed as part of the investigation. The officer admitted to asking two coworkers on a date but denied any other romantic involvement with other employees. The investigation revealed that the officer romantically engaged a total of 5 coworkers, one of whom participated in a consensual sexual relationship with the officer. The officer admitted that he was dishonest in the investigation. The officer entered a Consent Agreement with KS CPOST.

Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication.

An officer was found guilty in the United States District Court of one count of misprision of a felony.


An officer was off-duty and involved in a vehicular collision in his personal vehicle. The officer had two passengers in the vehicle at the time of the collision but assisted them in leaving the scene. The officer lied to responding officers that were investigating the collision, repeatedly claiming that he was the sole vehicle occupant at the time of the crash. The officer signed a motor vehicle accident report that he knew to contain false information. The officer’s employing agency opened an investigation regarding the officer’s conduct. Although the officer admitted in the internal investigation that there were two passengers in the collision and that he lied to responding officers, he was dishonest with the interviewers regarding injuries sustained by the passengers in the collision.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(35) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime or a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. felony perjury and interference with law enforcement.

An officer set her house on fire with the intent to defraud her insurance company. The officer was convicted in district court of a fraudulent insurance act, a felony.


An officer and his girlfriend ended their relationship. The officer relentlessly worked to conduct surveillance and take enforcement actions against his ex-girlfriend and her new boyfriend. The officer asked other officers in his agency to assist with his enforcement efforts. Some of the officers were aware of the officer’s relationship with the subjects of his enforcement efforts, others were not. The officer printed and distributed booking photos of the new boyfriend on which he wrote a description of his vehicle, tag, and address. The officer ran NCIC and KCJIS checks on his ex-girlfriend, her new boyfriend, and her brother. He used that information to assist in his enforcement efforts. Both the boyfriend and the brother received citations as a result of the officer’s enforcement campaign. The officer was charged in district court with felony computer crimes, stalking, and official misconduct. Pursuant to a plea bargain, he was convicted of four counts of official misconduct and one count of assault.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(e) Unprofessional Conduct, taking action as an officer if the action is or reasonably would appear to be motivated by a familial, financial, social, sexual, romantic, physical, intimate, or emotional relationship, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(5) & (10) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a felony crime or a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. felony unlawful acts concerning computers, assault, and stalking.
An officer sold a firearm to an individual he knew to be a felon. He was convicted in the United States District Court with Sale or Transfer to Prohibited Person, a felony. The officer entered a Consent Agreement with KS CPOST.


A former officer was no longer working in law enforcement. He became upset after observing two juveniles driving through the cemetery in what he considered a reckless manner. He followed their vehicle and made contact with them. He told the juveniles that they had committed the crime of destruction of property and identified himself as a law enforcement officer. The juveniles had not damaged the cemetery grounds. He was convicted in district court with false impersonation.

After a hearing before the KS CPOST Hearing Panel, the officer’s certification was revoked by Order for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(25) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. false impersonation.

A former officer was employed in a teaching position. He engaged in consensual sexual intercourse, lewd fondling or touching, or sodomy with a 17-year-old who was enrolled as a student. He was convicted in district court with two counts of unlawful sexual relations, a felony.


An officer was convicted in district court with three counts of aggravated indecent liberties with a child, a felony.


An officer conducted a traffic stop on two vehicles that were traveling together on the highway, both faster than the posted speed limit. One driver was female, the other male, and both were issued a citation. He issued a citation to a third driver on an unrelated traffic stop. The officer did not submit the citations as required by policy. They were later discovered in his residence and he was directed to submit them, so they could be turned over to court. The officer destroyed the citations for the male and female travel companions but ultimately submitted the third citation. The officer used information obtained in the traffic stop to locate and contact the female driver through Facebook Messenger. He informed the female that he had dismissed the traffic citations he previously issued to her and her travel companion. The officer then complimented the female and commented on her appearance. The conversation became “romantic” and the officer referenced toy handcuffs. He also made comments about being able to find the female, with the help of other officers, when she was back in the area. The officer’s comments scared the female, who reported the comments to his agency.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(e) Unprofessional Conduct, taking action as an officer if the action is or reasonably would appear to be motivated by a familial, financial, social, sexual, romantic, physical, intimate, or emotional relationship.
An officer served as the evidence custodian for his agency, which received information indicating that the officer took home evidence that was to be destroyed pursuant to policy. Once confronted, the officer confessed that he had taken a circular saw from evidence without authority and kept it in his garage for approximately two years. Based on the officer’s conduct, an interview with KS CPOST was necessary. The officer did not cooperate with the KS CPOST investigation, despite receiving notification of his scheduled interview.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3) failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person’s continued suitability for law enforcement certification, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2(b)(26) or (28) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. theft, or alternatively, criminal deprivation of property.

On several occasions, an officer touched a 15-year-old victim’s breasts and touched her genital area outside her underwear. He was convicted of three counts of sexual battery in district court.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2(a)(12) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. sexual battery.

An officer serving as the agency head completed and submitted paperwork to have newly hired officers attend basic training at KLETC. The officer submitted paperwork certifying that two law enforcement applicants had completed written psychological testing given by the agency, but their tests were never submitted for evaluation. The officer submitted an additional certification for an applicant who was not given any psychological testing. On all three certifications, the officer provided a date of the psychological examination and doctor or company who administered the examination, despite the examinations having never been completed.

Separately, the officer was drinking alcohol and became upset. He pushed his wife, broke chairs, and punched a hole in the wall. The officer’s son positioned himself between his parents during the argument and suffered a thumb injury while trying to protect his mother. The officer entered a diversion agreement in district court for one count of domestic battery, one count of battery, and two counts of criminal damage to property, all misdemeanors.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(3) misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2(a)(6) & (30) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. battery and criminal damage to property.

An agency received complaints that an officer attended a party and consumed alcohol where minors were also drinking alcohol and where police were called out several times due to noise complaints; that the officer provided alcohol to two minors; and that the officer was photographed during a separate incident at his residence with two underage females who appeared to be consuming alcohol. The agency investigated and found the officer to be dishonest in the investigation. Based on the officer’s conduct, an interview with KS CPOST was necessary. The officer did not cooperate with the KS CPOST investigation, despite receiving notification of his scheduled interview.
The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, and K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3) failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person’s continued suitability for law enforcement certification.

An off-duty officer tried to enter a bar through the exit door. A bouncer working the door told the officer that he would need to enter the bar through the front door. The officer became upset at the bouncer, yelling, “stab me bro”, “pussy”, and “fucking pussy” at the bouncer repeatedly. The officer pushed the bouncer multiple times while yelling at him. The bouncer recorded the encounter on his cell phone. The officer attempted to conceal his face in the video, but his face was clearly visible. The bouncer recognized the officer from prior dealings with him when the officer was on-duty. Responding officers located the officer at a nearby bar. When questioned about the incident, the officer denied being at or behind the bar where the incident occurred that evening. The officer entered a diversion agreement in municipal court for disorderly conduct.

The officer’s certification was revoked by Summary Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-2a(a)(6) & (50) & (35) engaged in conduct which, whether or not charged as a crime or resulting in a conviction, would constitute a misdemeanor crime that the commission determines reflects on the honesty, trustworthiness, integrity or competence of the applicant, i.e. battery, disorderly conduct, and interference with law enforcement.

An officer was involved in a traffic stop. At some point he gained possession of a cell phone that belonged to one of the vehicle occupants. The cell phone was not returned to the vehicle occupant. After the traffic stop, family members of the vehicle occupant complained to the agency about the missing cell phone. The officer and all other officers involved in the traffic stop were instructed to check their patrol vehicles and duty bags for the missing cell phone. The officer denied locating the phone. He had, however, located the phone in his patrol vehicle, panicked, and dumped it in the grass near the location of the initial traffic stop. The officer wrote a memo and stated that he was advised by his sergeant two separate times to check his gear bags and that both checks yielded negative results. In an internal investigation, the officer admitted the memo was untruthful. During an interview, the officer initially denied finding the phone when searching his property. He then stated that he located the phone in his vehicle or duty bag and placed it in a department evidence bag but lost it when transferring vehicles. He finally admitted that he intentionally dumped the phone near the location of the traffic stop and admitted that he had lied multiple times in the internal interview. The officer entered a Consent Agreement with KS CPOST. The officer’s certification was revoked by Consent Agreement and Order of Revocation for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5606(b)(5), K.A.R. 106-2-4 Good Moral Character, K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(7), K.A.R. 106-2-3(j)(1) Unprofessional Conduct, intentionally using a false or deceptive statement in an official document or official communication.

An officer abruptly resigned from his agency and made numerous comments regarding his mental state and concerns that working in law enforcement was making him “crazy.” Due to his comments and the manner in which he left his agency, it was necessary for the officer to submit to a Fitness for Duty Examination to determine if the officer was suffering from a mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform as a law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety and judgment. The officer declined to sit for the examination.

The officer’s certification was suspended by Summary Order of Suspension for a violation of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(3), failing to cooperate in a commission investigation to determine a person’s continued suitability for law enforcement certification.
An officer was referred for a Fitness for Duty Examination. A licensed psychologist found that the officer was not fit for duty. The officer’s certification was suspended until the officer completes a psychological assessment, approved by KS CPOST, indicating that the officer is free of any mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform as a law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety and judgment.

The officer’s certification was suspended by Summary Order of Suspension under of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(1), K.S.A. 74-5605(b)(7) be free of any physical or mental condition which adversely affects the ability to perform the essential functions of a police officer or law enforcement officer with reasonable skill, safety and judgment.

In unrelated cases, 5 officers from different agencies throughout the state failed to complete the required annual 40 hours of law enforcement in-service training by the expiration of the training year or at the expiration of an extension granted by the Executive Director. All 5 officers were reprimanded.

The officers’ certifications were reprimanded by Summary Order of Reprimand for violations of K.S.A. 74-5616(b)(4), K.S.A. 74-5607a every full-time police officer or law enforcement officer shall complete annually 40 hours of law enforcement education or training.
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