

From: [CASTLE Philip * DPSST](#)
To: [Kemple Toni C](#); [Tarron Anderson](#); [SCHUBACK Steven](#); [Stewart Lauri K](#); [LESC](#)
Subject: Re: LESC Sub-Committee Meeting: Moral Character
Date: Friday, September 26, 2025 5:52:19 AM
Attachments: [Outlook-g4crqrgj](#)
[Misuse of Authority Report.docx](#)

CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL* This email originated from outside of DOJ. Treat attachments and links with caution. *CAUTION EXTERNAL EMAIL

Hello LESC sub-committee,

As requested, this is a recent pull from our database as to what we've seen in terms of misuse of authority. The manager over our CJ department in Professional Standards has included a writeup at the beginning, providing some context. Also, he notes that typically this is an accompanying charge vs something that stands alone. You'll see that he includes the corrections side of the house and that this charge travels into the sexual harassment/misconduct side of the house. Thank you.

Phil Castle

Agency Director

Department of Public Safety Standards and Training
4190 Aumsville Hwy SE
Salem, OR 97317
(503) 931-0178



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2025 11:47 AM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: LESC Sub-Committee Meeting: Moral Character
When: Wednesday, September 24, 2025 3:00 PM-4:00 PM.
Where: ZoomGov

Topic: LESC Sub-Committee Meeting: Moral Character
Time: Sep 24, 2025 03:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join ZoomGov Meeting

[https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1607032816?
pwd=uTaAvh4fgCcX0Vqa5rkXUV4qDfDJvm.1](https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1607032816?pwd=uTaAvh4fgCcX0Vqa5rkXUV4qDfDJvm.1)

Meeting ID: 160 703 2816

Passcode: 178040

One tap mobile

+16692545252,,1607032816#,,,,*178040# US (San Jose)

+14154494000,,1607032816#,,,,*178040# US (US Spanish Line)

Dial by your location

- +1 669 254 5252 US (San Jose)
- +1 415 449 4000 US (US Spanish Line)
- +1 669 216 1590 US (San Jose)
- +1 646 964 1167 US (US Spanish Line)
- +1 551 285 1373 US (New Jersey)
- +1 646 828 7666 US (New York)

Meeting ID: 160 703 2816

Passcode: 178040

Find your local number: <https://www.zoomgov.com/u/abjgsY9l6s>

***** CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE ***** This e-mail may contain information that is privileged, confidential, or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the addressee or it appears from the context or otherwise that you have received this e-mail in error, please advise me immediately by reply e-mail, keep the contents confidential, and immediately delete the message and any attachments from your system.

Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 259-008-0300(3)(B) defines Misuse of Authority as *intentional conduct that includes the use or attempted use of one's position or authority as a public safety professional to obtain a benefit, avoid a detriment or harm another*, and is one of three moral fitness violations that the DPSST identifies in Discretionary Professional Standards cases that may result in the revocation or denial of certification. The DPSST is notified of potential Moral Fitness Violations when an officer is arrested, when an officer receives a criminal citation to appear (or its equivalent), when an officer receives discipline or an economic sanction from an agency, by any separation from employment or utilization as a public safety professional, through the receipt of complaints against officers or agencies, and by Law Enforcement Data System (LEDS) notifications. In rare circumstances, news reports may also initiate a preliminary review.

After receiving notice of potential Moral Fitness Violations, the DPSST collects information through LEDS, court records, and current or prior employers, to determine if moral fitness violations have been made by the officer. The DPSST does not investigate whether the conduct occurred but instead relies on records that have already made the determination that the conduct has occurred; the DPSST investigates whether the conduct meets the definition of a Moral Fitness Violation. Misuse of Authority that does not rise to a criminal disposition, does not result in sustained allegations in an internal investigation, or does not result in discipline or separation from employment, has the potential of not being reported to or received by the DPSST, even if the conduct occurred.

The DPSST maintains a publicly accessible database of Criminal Justice Professional Standards Cases at <https://www.oregon.gov/dpsst/cj/pages/cases.aspx>, which can be filtered to show the reason for revocation or denial, such as Misuse of Authority. Since 2018, the DPSST has found Misuse of Authority as a Moral Fitness Violation and revoked the certification of officers (or is in the process of revoking certification) in thirty-seven Professional Standards cases. Of these cases, three were reported to the DPSST for arrests or criminal dispositions, one as a complaint, and the remaining twenty-three by agencies reporting a separation from employment.

In cases where Misuse of Authority has been found, there are two common findings as Misuse of Authority Moral Fitness Violations: using restricted resources or databases for unofficial purposes, and engaging in inappropriate relationships with a power dynamic. Notably, Misuse of Authority is not present in the database as the sole basis or finding for a Moral Fitness Violation; it is always in addition to one or both Moral Fitness Violations of Dishonesty or Misconduct. Dishonesty and Misconduct, however, are used as the sole basis for Moral Fitness Violations that resulted in an officer's certification being denied or revoked.

The found Misuse of Authority violations from the database include:

- ...misusing [department] resources to gauge the location of other on-duty [department] officers to avoid being seen at the victim's house.
- ...intentionally made an arrest and seizure that lacked probable cause or reasonable suspicion. The respondent harmed another by using unreasonable force in order to detain them without lawful authority.
- ...used systems available to him as a law enforcement officer for his benefit and the detriment of others. The systems used placed traffic stops in the files of people who were not stopped and were used to document stops to reflect data points for him to meet department goals.
- ...intimidate AICs by subjecting them to sexually explicit photos and comments, threatening retaliation, and engaging in intimidating physical contact. [Respondent] breached the standard of care of correctional officers by using his professional position of authority over an AIC to create a hostile work and living environment.
- ...access confidential information in order to intentionally look up an adult in custody who exposed themselves to your wife and daughters, for your personal benefit.
- ...used confidential information about others he obtained working as a captain to harm them by disclosing information about medical procedures, childhood experiences, and prior internal investigations.
- ...access records from a secured system to lookup the owners of different phone numbers for a friend.
- ...used your patrol car and emergency lights to get through the scene of an accident in order [to] avoid a traffic cue.
- ...used your position with the [department] to take property that you knew belonged to the [victim].
- ...by receiving money to provide contraband to inmates inside a correctional facility.
- ...displayed your police identification in an attempt to gain access to the business that was closed.
- ...initiated an inappropriate sexual relationship with an individual you met while she was in the custody of the [agency], who was later on supervision.
- ...to obtain information about the location of marine deputies on duty because you wanted your under age kids to ride your jet ski.
- ...used his authority and position as a corrections officer to instruct an AIC to be dishonest.
- ...threatened the employment of persons.
- ...to issue sanctions to AIC for conduct that did not occur.

- ...to obtain personal contact information for a citizen in order to engage in a relationship with the citizen. You further used your [agency]-issued computer and cell phone to obtain and provide the citizen restricted images and data obtained through restricted law enforcement databases.
- ...ran the license plate of the vehicle owned by her romantic partner after she was questioned about her relationship with him.
- ...gained relationships with men on supervision and had a resident repair her purse.
- ...to harm an AIC for his benefit. [Respondent] did so by sharing a photo of an [AIC] who was injured and lying in a hospital bed with a coworker for a laugh, over Facebook Messenger.
- ...a personal relationship with an AIC.
- ...to have a relationship with an AIC.
- ...to sexually harass a co-worker with whom you were offering peer support.
- ...provided confidential information you obtained for official law enforcement purposes to an individual, not related to law enforcement, that you were engaged in a personal relationship with.
- ...to promote and foster a romantic relationship with a subordinate employee at work and outside of work.
- ...accessed LEDS to retrieve personal information of citizens, primarily female citizens.
- ...to encourage and conspire to hide the truth about a sexual relationship he was having with a subordinate...
- ...engaging in a sexual relationship with a subordinate while she was under his specialized training instruction...
- ...to bring harm to female subordinates by exposing them to gender-related communications that offended them.
- ...to compel an officer in training to receive taser exposure.
- ...retaliated against co-workers who reported concerns about her conduct.
- ...to access agency computers with the intent to show pictures and other information about herself and other staff to AICs...
- ...to develop a personal relationship with an AIC...
- ...falsified tier check reports...
- ...to initiate a personal, intimate relationship with the female AOS...
- ...by deploying OC spray without any legitimate reason or correctional objective.
- ...to engage in an intimate relationship with an AIC/Probationer.
- ...to initiate a criminal investigation outside of our jurisdiction for the benefit of your personal acquaintance.

- ...to make decisions regarding an applicant's background and fitness for employment while he was in a sexual relationship with her...
- ...to obtain the benefit of building a personal relationship with an AIC.