

Angeles Police Department ("LAPD"). Claimant was sworn with the LAPD on [REDACTED].

Claimant promoted through the ranks over his career, ultimately promoting to Captain III of

[REDACTED] Division on or about [REDACTED].

In October of 2011, Claimant sat as the chairperson on a certain Board of Rights. The Board of Rights is the administrative proceeding all sworn peace officers are afforded under the law when the Chief of Police recommends they be terminated. At the culmination of this Board, Claimant did NOT recommend termination, but rather, a lesser penalty. As a result, the employees at issue were not terminated.

Less than one-month later, in November 2011, Claimant was summoned to an in-person meeting with Assistant Chief [REDACTED] to discuss Claimant's determination that the officers at the Board should NOT have been terminated. Claimant was advised that both Assistant Chief [REDACTED] and Chief Beck were "disappointed" in the decision not to terminate. Claimant was also advised that he would be receiving "training" by Deputy Chief [REDACTED], the then-commanding officer of Internal Affairs Group.

In December 2011, the employees that Claimant recommended should NOT be fired were transferred to Claimant's division at [REDACTED]. They have done very well since that time.

In January 2012, Claimant attended a LEADS training session, which is held for people at and above the rank of Captain. During his opening remarks, Chief Beck stated his "expectation" that Captains sitting on Boards were to terminate employees that he (the Chief) ordered to a Board for termination, or that such captains would have to answer to him.

Also in January 2012, 3-days after the LEADS meeting, Claimant received his in-person training concerning Boards and how they should be handled. That training was received from Deputy Chief [REDACTED].

In February 2012, Claimant was ordered to a follow-up meeting with Assistant Chief [REDACTED] to discuss the training Claimant had received and what he learned from it.

In May 2013, Claimant was served with his annual rating. In the rating, the only thing in the "needs improvement" section was Claimant's decisions in Boards of Rights. Such had never been done before, despite sitting on many Boards.

Claimant had sat on many other Boards, and in those other circumstances had decided on the most serious penalty at issue. And, after those Boards, Claimant never received counseling, or training, nor writings that he "needs improvement" concerning Boards of Rights.