

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 **BEFORE THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE TRAINING COMMISSION**  
8 **IN AND FOR THE STATE OF WASHINGTON**

9 In re the Certification of:

10 ROBERT L. MEYERS,

11 Respondent.

NO. 19-734

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS  
OF LAW, AND ORDER REVOKING  
PEACE OFFICER CERTIFICATION

12 An administrative hearing in this matter was held on January 26, 2021, via Zoom, before  
13 the Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission Hearing Panel (Hearing Panel) to  
14 determine whether Respondent Robert L. Meyers's peace officer certification should be revoked.  
15 The Hearing Panel consisted of Presiding Member Sergeant Sean Madison of the Sequim Police  
16 Department, Sheriff Anthony Hawley of the Okanagan County Sheriff's Office, Chief Bradley  
17 Moericke of the Sumner Police Department, Sergeant Brian Cassidy of the Thurston County  
18 Sheriff's Office, and Professor Loreli Thompson of Brandman University, and was advised by  
19 Assistant Attorney General Justin Kato. The Petitioner was represented by Assistant Attorney  
20 General Susie Giles-Klein. Mr. Meyers appeared *pro se*.

21 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

22 1.1 Robert Meyers was terminated from the King County Sheriff's Office (KCSO) on  
23 or about March 25, 2019. Prior to his termination, Mr. Meyers had been employed as a deputy with  
24 the KCSO.

25 1.2 On or about August 5, 2020, the Criminal Justice Training Commission  
26 (Commission) filed a Statement of Charges seeking to revoke Mr. Meyers's peace officer

1 certification on the grounds that he was discharged from the KCSO for disqualifying misconduct  
2 as defined by RCW 43.101.010(8)(b).<sup>1</sup> The Statement of Charges alleged that Mr. Meyers was  
3 discharged for engaging in conduct constituting crimes involving dishonesty or false statement  
4 within the meaning of Evidence Rule 609(a), to wit: Making a False or Misleading Statement to  
5 a Public Servant. RCW 9A.76.175.

6 1.3 Mr. Meyers timely requested a hearing.

## 7 II. HEARING

8 2.1 A hearing was held on January 26, 2021, via the Zoom teleconferencing  
9 application, before the Hearing Panel.

10 2.2 The Petitioner presented the testimony of KCSO Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham,  
11 KCSO Sergeant David Lyon, KCSO Sergeant George Drazich, KCSO Sergeant Edward Hall,  
12 and KCSO Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht.

13 2.3 Mr. Meyers testified on his own behalf.

14 2.4 The Petitioner offered the following exhibits, which were admitted by the  
15 Presiding Member at the Second Telephonic Prehearing Conference on January 12, 2021:

- 16 1. Statement of Charges, *In re the Certification of Robert L. Meyers*, dated  
17 August 5, 2020 (5 pages);
- 18 2. Request for Hearing, dated October 6, 2020 (1 page);
- 19 3. Peace Officer Certification Application for Robert L. Meyers, dated  
20 October 12, 2015 (1 page);
- 21 4. Notice of Peace Officer Separation for Robert L. Meyers, dated  
22 April 3, 2019 (1 page);
- 23 5. Preliminary Complaint Submission Form, signed by Sergeant Jeffrey  
24 Cunningham, dated May 12, 2018 (2 pages);
- 25 6. Statement of Sergeant David Lyon, dated May 12, 2018 (1 page);
- 26 7. Blue Team Follow-Up Report by Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham, dated May 13,  
2018 (1 page);
8. Preliminary Complaint Commander Review by Captain William R. Bridges,  
undated (2 pages);

---

<sup>1</sup> RCW 43.101 was updated in 2020 to include the certification of corrections officers. Thus, RCW 43.101.010(8)(b) as cited in the Statement of Charges is now found under RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(B). The language is identical.

- 1 9. Internal Investigations Unit Complaint Notification for Robert L. Meyers, signed  
by Sergeant Edward Hall, dated June 11, 2018 (1 page);
- 2 10. Internal Investigations Unit Complaint Notification for Robert L. Meyers, signed  
by Sergeant Edward Hall, dated July 9, 2018 (1 page);
- 3 11. Email from Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham to Robert L. Meyers, dated March 15,  
2018 (1 page);
- 4 12. Email from Robert L. Meyers to Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham, dated April 10,  
2018 (1 page);
- 5 13. Outlook Notification to Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham re: Missed Call from  
Robert L. Meyers, dated May 4, 2018 (1 page);
- 6 14. Email from Sergeant David Lyon to Sergeant George Drazich and Sergeant  
Jeffrey Cunningham, dated May 4, 2018 (1 page);
- 7 15. Emails from Sergeant Tony Lockhart, various dates (2 pages);
- 8 16. First Interview for Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-262, from June 19, 2018 (11  
pages);
- 9 17. Interview of Sergeant David Lyon for IIU 2018-262, from June 20, 2018 (4  
pages);
- 10 18. Interview of Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham for IIU 2018-262, from July 3, 2018  
(9 pages);
- 11 19. Second Interview for Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-262, from July 16, 2018 (13  
pages);
- 12 20. Third Interview for Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-262, from September 5, 2018 (8  
pages);
- 13 21. Audio Recordings of Three Interviews of Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-262;
- 14 22. Report of Sergeant Edward Hall for IIU 2018-262, undated (5 pages);
- 15 23. Preliminary Complaint Submission Form, signed by Sergeant George Drazich,  
date reported May 14, 2018 (2 pages);
- 16 24. Supervisor Investigative Steps by Sergeant George Drazich, undated (8 pages);
- 17 25. Preliminary Complaint Commander Review by Captain William R. Bridges,  
undated (2 pages);
- 18 26. Internal Investigation Unit Complaint Notification for Robert L. Meyers for IIU  
2018-280, signed by Sergeant Edward Hall, dated July 26, 2018 (1 page);
- 19 27. Emails from Sergeant George Drazich, dated May 6, 2018 (2 pages);
- 20 28. CAD Information for May 7, 2018 (3 pages);
- 21 29. CAD Information for May 9, 2018 (5 pages);
- 22 30. Statement of Officer Glen G. Brannon for IIU 2018-280, dated October 25, 2018  
(2 pages);
- 23 31. Email from Sergeant George Drazich to Robert L. Meyers and Others, dated May  
16, 2018 (1 page);
- 24 32. Internal Investigations Unit First Interview for Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-280  
from August 6, 2018 (37 pages);

33. Internal Investigations Unit Second Interview for Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-262, from October 10, 2018 (6 pages);
34. Audio Recordings of Two Interviews of Robert Meyers for IIU 2018-280;
35. Report of Sergeant Edward Hall for IIU 2018-280, undated (8 pages);
36. Administrative Leave Memorandum from Captain Rick Bridges to Robert L. Meyers, dated October 10, 2018 (2 pages);
37. Notice of Loudermill Memorandum from Undersheriff Scott Somers to Robert Meyers, dated November 6, 2018 (12 pages);
38. Loudermill Hearing Decision from Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht to Robert Meyers, dated March 22, 2019 (11 pages);
39. Request for Personnel Order for Robert L. Meyers, dated March 26, 2019 and Personnel Order dated March 27, 2019 (2 pages);
40. Brady Notification regarding Robert Meyers, dated December 19, 2018 (1 page);
41. Step 2 Grievance Response from Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht regarding Robert Meyers, dated June 19, 2019 (1 page);
42. Letter from Robert Meyers to Certification Manager Tisha Jones, undated (4 pages [page 4 is blank]).

2.5 Mr. Meyers offered the following exhibits, which were admitted by the Presiding

Member at the Second Telephonic Prehearing Conference on January 12, 2021

1. 3/14/18 and 3/15/18 email between Cunningham and Meyers regarding CIT class
2. 3/15/18 email between Cunningham and Lockhart
3. Excerpt of Sergeant Hall Report for IIU 262.
4. Excerpt of IIU 262 interview of Sergeant Cunningham
5. Excerpt of IIU 262 interview of Sergeant Lyon
- 6.1-5 CAD Report
7. 5/16/2018 Email from George Drazich
8. 5/16/2018 CAD log
9. 5/17/2018 CAD log
10. 8/6/2018 CAD log
- 11.1-4 CAD logs from various dates

2.6 The parties made their respective arguments, which were considered by the

Hearing Panel.

1 Based on the evidence presented at the hearing, the Hearing Panel enters the following  
2 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

3 **III. FINDINGS OF FACT**

4 3.1 Robert Meyers was hired as an officer by the KCSO on or about  
5 September 25, 2014.

6 3.2 At all times relevant to the events described herein, Mr. Meyers was employed  
7 by the KCSO as a peace officer.

8 **A. IIU 2018-262**

9 3.3 On March 15, 2018, while Deputy Meyers was on parental leave, Sergeant Jeffrey  
10 Cunningham sent him an email about an upcoming CIT training. The email informed Deputy  
11 Meyers that he was scheduled to attend this training from May 7-11, 2018 (the May Class).

12 3.4 Deputy Meyers returned to work from parental leave on or about April 9, 2018.  
13 The following day, April 10, 2018, he responded to Sergeant Cunningham's email. In his email,  
14 Deputy Meyers suggested he would be unavailable for the May Class, and requested to be  
15 transferred to an earlier class. The earlier class was scheduled to occur from April 23-27, 2018  
16 (the April Class).

17 3.5 Also on or about April 10, 2018, Deputy Meyers met with Sergeant Cunningham  
18 in his office to discuss rescheduling his training. During the meeting, Deputy Meyers asked to  
19 be transferred to the April Class because Sergeant Corey told him that he would probably be  
20 training a new recruit the week of the May Class. This was a false statement, as Sergeant Corey  
21 never told him he would be getting a new recruit in May.

22 3.6 Sergeant Cunningham, who was in constant communication with Sergeant Corey  
23 and very familiar with the training schedule, knew that there were no recruits scheduled for  
24 training in May. Sergeant Cunningham told Deputy Meyers that he would not be getting a recruit  
25 in May, and told him he was required to go to the May Class as scheduled.

1           3.7     During this meeting, Deputy Meyers specifically asked to be transferred to the  
2 earlier April Class – not a later class.

3           3.8     Sergeant Cunningham and Deputy Meyers had no further discussion on the  
4 subject of switching classes, and Deputy Meyers did not bring up any additional reasons for  
5 wanting the switch

6           3.9     Following this conversation, Sergeant Cunningham asked Sergeant Corey if he  
7 told Deputy Meyers he might be getting a recruit in May. Sergeant Corey stated that he told  
8 Deputy Meyers no such thing.

9           3.10    On May 4, 2018, the Friday before the May Class, Deputy Meyers called Sergeant  
10 Cunningham. Sergeant Cunningham was on vacation, and so did not receive the call. Deputy  
11 Meyers did not leave a voicemail or send a follow-up email.

12          3.11    Deputy Meyers then called Sergeant Lyon, who was in charge of scheduling.  
13 Deputy Meyers told Sergeant Lyon that his schedule was incorrect, that the May Class had been  
14 “cancelled,” and to put him back on the schedule for regular service. This was a false statement.

15          3.12    Sergeant Lyon took Deputy Meyers at his word, and changed his schedule. Later  
16 that day, Sergeant Lyon sent Sergeant Cunningham an email letting him know that Deputy  
17 Meyers told him that his training was “cancelled.”

18          3.13    The May Class was not cancelled, and Deputy Meyers was not excused from  
19 attending. The day of the May Class, Sergeant James Lockhart send an email to Sergeant  
20 Cunningham informing him that Deputy Meyers did not attend the May Class as scheduled.

21          3.14    On May 13, 2018, after he returned from vacation and discovered what  
22 happened, Sergeant Cunningham spoke with Deputy Meyers and informed him he would be  
23 filing a report regarding the missed class. Deputy Meyers said something to the effect of “you  
24 know me sarge, I’m flighty. I’ll take whatever punishment you want to give me.”

25          3.15    Over the course of three internal investigation interviews with Sergeant Edward  
26 Hall, Deputy Meyers gave multiple conflicting statements concerning his April 10, 2018 meeting

1 with Sergeant Cunningham. In his first interview, Deputy Meyers implied that he asked Sergeant  
2 Cunningham to switch to a later class – one scheduled *after* the May Class – because he just got  
3 back from parental leave and didn’t want to attend a week-long training that would interrupt  
4 “getting back into the swing of things” at work.<sup>2</sup> Deputy Meyers also falsely claimed that  
5 Sergeant Cunningham offered to reschedule him for a later class, one in July or August.

6 3.16 During his second and third interviews, after being confronted with his email  
7 from April 10, 2018 where he requested an *earlier* class, Deputy Meyers falsely told Sergeant  
8 Hall that he told Sergeant Cunningham that he wanted either an earlier *or* a later class. He  
9 continued to state that the request was somehow related to his effort not to disrupt his return to  
10 work. Eventually, Sergeant Hall directly asked Deputy Meyers if there was any other reason he  
11 wanted to attend the April Class. Deputy Meyers finally admitted that he had friends in that class,  
12 including Deputy Ashley Fuentes.

13 3.17 Following a Loudermill Hearing, Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht concluded that  
14 Deputy Meyers’s multiple conflicting statements to Sergeant Hall demonstrated a “clear lack of  
15 credibility.” She specifically found that Deputy Meyers was dishonest to Sergeant Cunningham  
16 when he said that Sergeant Corey told him he might be getting a recruit in May, and that he did  
17 this to get Sergeant Cunningham to reschedule his training so he could join his friends. The  
18 Sheriff concluded that Deputy Meyers’s dishonesty to Sergeant Cunningham warranted  
19 termination from employment.

20 3.18 Separately, Sheriff Johanknecht found that Deputy Meyers lied to Sergeant Lyon  
21 when he stated that his scheduled training had been “cancelled.” The Sheriff concluded that  
22 Deputy Meyers’s dishonesty to Sergeant Lyon warranted termination from employment.

23  
24  
25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>2</sup> Deputy Meyers never asked Sergeant Cunningham to switch to a later class, and never offered this explanation. Indeed, it makes little sense, as attending the April Class would have given Deputy Meyers only two weeks to adjust to returning to work, whereas if he attended the May Class as scheduled he would have had almost a month to acclimate.

1 **B. IIU 2018-282**

2 3.19 During the time period at issue in this case, Sergeant George Drazich supervised  
3 Deputy Meyers and Deputy Ashley Fuentes. On or about May 6, 2018, Sergeant Drazich became  
4 aware of rumors concerning an inappropriate on-duty relationship involving Deputies Meyers  
5 and Fuentes. Prior to that time, Sergeant Drazich had allowed Deputies Meyers and Fuentes to  
6 ride in a two-person car. However, after he became aware of the rumors of impropriety, Sergeant  
7 Drazich determined to end the two-person car practice.

8 3.20 On or about May 7, 2018, Sergeant Drazich spoke to Deputies Meyers and  
9 Fuentes and informed them of the change in policy. He explained he did not want them in the  
10 same car together going forward, and that the perception of propriety was important. Both  
11 deputies agreed not to ride together going forward.

12 3.21 In a separate conversation with Deputy Meyers, Sergeant Drazich again  
13 emphasized that public perception was important, and that if he wanted to ride in a two-person  
14 car with Deputy Fuentes in the future, he was to run it by him first. Deputy Meyers agreed to  
15 comply with Sergeant Drazich's directive.

16 3.22 On or about May 9, 2018, two days after their conversation with Sergeant  
17 Drazich, Deputies Meyers and Fuentes again rode in a two-person car. Detailed records from the  
18 KCSO's computer aided dispatch (CAD) system reveals that Deputies Meyers and Fuentes took  
19 active steps to conceal the fact that they were riding together, in defiance of Sergeant Drazich's  
20 directive. Specifically, Deputies Meyers and Fuentes: (1) did not notify dispatch that they were  
21 riding together, (2) used different call signs, and (3) reported they were "backing" each other  
22 and "clearing" details at different times, though they were in the same car. Deputy Meyers  
23 ultimately admitted to Sergeant Drazich that he and Deputy Fuentes rode together on May 9,  
24 2018, contrary to what is documented in CAD.

25 3.23 In a separate incident, on May 15, 2018, Deputy Meyers asked Sergeant Drazich  
26 to switch his swing shift assignment for May 16, 2018 to the K-1 district, because he claimed he



1 made plans to work with Deputy Hancock on that day. Deputy Fuentes was also assigned to  
2 work K-1 swing shift on May 16, 2018.

3 3.24 At the time Deputy Meyers made his request, Sergeant Drazich knew that Deputy  
4 Hancock would not be working swing shift on that day. Sergeant Drazich asked Deputy Meyers  
5 if he was sure he had plans to meet with Deputy Hancock on May 16, and Sergeant Meyers said  
6 “yes.” Sergeant Drazich then asked Deputy Meyers if Deputy Hancock would be flexing his  
7 schedule to accommodate working with him, and Sergeant Meyers said “yes.” Sergeant Drazich  
8 denied Deputy Meyers’s request to switch to K-1.

9 3.25 On May 16, 2018, Sergeant Drazich met with Deputy Hancock. Deputy Hancock  
10 stated that he had *no* plans to meet with Deputy Meyers that day, and was *not* flexing his  
11 schedule. Further, Deputy Hancock said that he and Deputy Meyers had no plans to meet up at  
12 any time, had never worked together as partners, had never doubled up in the same car, and had  
13 never made plans to meet up on-duty in the past.

14 3.26 Following a Loudermill hearing on IIU 2018-280, Sheriff Mitzi Johanknecht  
15 sustained the finding that on May 9, 2018, Deputies Meyers and Fuentes rode in the same car,  
16 but used different call signs in CAD to disguise this fact. The Sheriff concluded that Deputy  
17 Meyers’s attempt to conceal his behavior by entering false and misleading information into CAD  
18 warranted termination from employment.

19 3.27 Additionally, Sheriff Johanknecht found that Deputy Meyers had been dishonest  
20 with Sergeant Drazich when he attempted to switch districts by claiming he had plans to work  
21 with Deputy Hancock. The Sheriff determined that Deputy Meyers’s dishonesty warranted  
22 termination.

23 3.28 Any Conclusion of Law deemed to be properly considered a Finding of Fact is  
24 hereby adopted as such.

25 3.29 Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Hearing Panel makes the following:  
26

1 **IV. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 4.1 Revocation of Respondent Robert Meyers’s peace officer certification is  
3 governed by RCW 43.101 and WAC 139-06.

4 4.2 The Washington State Criminal Justice Training Commission and this  
5 Hearing Panel have jurisdiction over Mr. Meyers and these proceedings. RCW 43.101.085; RCW  
6 43.101.105; RCW 43.101.380.

7 4.3 RCW 43.101.105(1)(d) provides that the Commission may revoke a peace  
8 officer’s certification when “[t]he peace officer has been discharged for disqualifying  
9 misconduct, the discharge is final, and some or all of the acts or omissions forming the basis of  
10 the discharge proceedings occurred on or after January 1, 2002.”

11 4.4 The Petitioner bears the burden of proving “discharge for disqualifying  
12 misconduct” by “clear, cogent, and convincing evidence.” RCW 43.101.010(8);  
13 RCW 43.101.380(1).

14 4.5 RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(B) defines discharge for “disqualifying misconduct” to  
15 include discharge resulting from conduct constituting any of the crimes addressed in  
16 RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(A).

17 4.6 One of the crimes enumerated in RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(A) is “any crime  
18 involving dishonesty or false statement within the meaning of Evidence Rule 609(a).”

19 4.7 Any person who knowingly makes a false or misleading material statement to a  
20 public servant is guilty of a gross misdemeanor. RCW 9A.76.175. Making a false or misleading  
21 statement to a public servant is conduct that involves a crime of dishonesty or false statement  
22 within the meaning of Evidence Rule 609(a).

23 4.8 A person acts with knowledge when he or she has information which would lead  
24 a reasonable person in the same situation to believe that facts exist which facts are described by  
25 a statute defining an offense. RCW 9A.08.010(b)(ii). Police officers are public servants.  
26 Additionally, statements made by a peace officer to a fellow peace officer, supervisor, or in the

1 course of an internal investigation, are necessarily statements that are “reasonably likely to be  
2 relied upon” by public servants in the discharge of their official duties.

3 4.9 The Panel concludes that Mr. Meyers was discharged for disqualifying  
4 misconduct within the meaning of RCW 43.101.010(8)(b).

5 4.10 The Panel concludes that Mr. Meyers’s discharge is final as that term is defined  
6 in RCW 43.101.010(9).

7 4.11 The Panel concludes that the Petitioner established by clear, cogent, and  
8 convincing evidence that on or about April 10, 2018, while employed as a deputy with KCSO,  
9 Mr. Meyers made false or misleading statements to Sergeant Jeffrey Cunningham when he stated  
10 that Sergeant Corey told him that he would be receiving a recruit during the May Class. At the  
11 time Mr. Meyers made this statement, Sergeant Cunningham knew that there were no recruits  
12 scheduled for May, and that Mr. Meyers was not being truthful. Sergeant Cunningham confirmed  
13 with Sergeant Corey that he never told Mr. Meyers he would be getting a recruit during that time  
14 period. Further, Mr. Meyers later admitted that his true motivation for asking to be transferred  
15 to the April Class was so he could be with his friends, including Deputy Ashley Fuentes. By  
16 providing false and misleading statements to Sergeant Cunningham, Mr. Meyers committed  
17 conduct constituting the crime of making a false or misleading statement to a public servant.  
18 This conduct is disqualifying misconduct under RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(B).

19 4.12 The Panel concludes that the Petitioner established by clear, cogent, and  
20 convincing evidence that on May 4, 2018, Mr. Meyers made false statements to Sergeant David  
21 Lyon when he stated that the May Class was “cancelled.” Though Mr. Meyers claimed that he  
22 told Sergeant Lyon that Sergeant Cunningham told him he could reschedule the class, this self-  
23 serving statement is inconsistent with Sergeant Lyon’s consistent recollection. This also  
24 constitutes disqualifying misconduct under RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(B).

25 4.13 The Panel concludes that Petitioner failed to establish by clear, cogent, and  
26 convincing evidence that Mr. Meyers entered false and misleading information into CAD on

1 May 9, 2018. In particular, Petitioner failed to show that it was Mr. Meyers and not Ms. Fuentes  
2 that may have been attempting to mislead.

3 4.14 Finally, the Panel concludes that the Petitioner established by clear, cogent, and  
4 convincing evidence that Mr. Meyers was dishonest with Sergeant Drazich on May 15, 2018  
5 when he claimed to have made plans to work with Deputy Hancock during swing shift the  
6 following day. At the time Mr. Meyers made this statement, Sergeant Drazich knew that Deputy  
7 Hancock was not scheduled to work swing shift on May 16. When asked about this, Mr. Meyers  
8 continued to lie by stating that that Deputy Hancock would be flexing his schedule to  
9 accommodate working with him. On May 16, when Sergeant Drazich asked Deputy Hancock  
10 whether he made plans to work with Mr. Meyers, Deputy Hancock said he never made plans and  
11 was not flexing his schedule.

12 4.15 Mr. Meyers's disqualifying misconduct warrants revocation of his peace officer  
13 certification. His false statements were "material" within the meaning of RCW 9A.76.175 in that  
14 they were "reasonably likely to be relied upon by a public servant in the discharge of his or her  
15 official duties." Sergeant Cunningham, Sergeant Lyon and Sergeant Drazich were public  
16 servants within the meaning of RCW 9A.04.110(23), and were relying on Mr. Meyers's  
17 statements in the course of their work as public employees. Thus, Mr. Meyers's false statements  
18 establish a pattern of making false or misleading statements to a public servant, and such conduct  
19 qualifies as disqualifying misconduct. RCW 9A.76.175; RCW 43.101.010(8)(a)(i)(A)(II).

20 4.16 Any finding of fact deemed to be properly considered a conclusion of law is  
21 hereby adopted as such.

22 ///

23 ///


24 ///

V. ORDER

1 5.1 Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the Hearing  
2 Panel now therefore issues the following ORDER:

3 That Mr. Meyers's peace officer certification is hereby REVOKED.

4 DATED this 11<sup>th</sup> day of FEBRUARY, 2021.  
5

6 

7 SERGEANT SEAN MADISON  
8 Sequim Police Department  
9 Presiding Panel Member  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26