

STATE OF ALASKA

ALASKA POLICE STANDARDS COUNCIL

In the Matter of )  
 )  
 Paul Secor, ) **APSC No. 2020-10**  
 )  
 Respondent, )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

ORDER OF REVOCATION

The Alaska Police Standards Council of the State of Alaska, having duly convened on the 1st day of December, 2020, and having reviewed and discussed the Accusation against the Respondent, which was served August 5, 2020, in accordance with AS 44.62.380, takes official notice that a Notice of Defense or a Request for Hearing has not been received from Respondent as required by AS 44.62.390. The Council also takes official notice that under AS 44.62.530, if the Respondent does not file a Notice of Defense, the Council may take action based upon other evidence and an Accusation may be used without notice to the Respondent.

Accordingly, the Council has considered the Accusation dated August 5, 2020.

Based on the Council's consideration of the facts recited in the referenced Accusation,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED

1. That the allegations made in the Accusation against the Respondent dated August 5, 2020, are hereby adopted and the Accusation is made, by reference, a part of this Order as though set forth fully herein.
2. That the Respondent's State of Alaska Police Officer certification is hereby revoked; and
3. That this Order of Revocation shall take effect in accordance with AS 44.62.520(a).

DATED this 1st day of December, 2020.

  
 Justin Doll (Dec 4, 2020 12:27 AKST)  
 Justin Doll, Chairman  
 Alaska Police Standards Council

State of Alaska  
 Alaska Police Standards Council  
 Box 111288  
 Juneau, Alaska 99811-1200

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

STATE OF ALASKA

ALASKA POLICE STANDARDS COUNCIL

In the Matter of: )  
 )  
 Paul Secor, ) No. APSC 2020-10  
 )  
 Respondent )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

**ACCUSATION**

Sarah Hieb, Administrative Investigator of the Alaska Police Standards Council (APSC), State of Alaska, on behalf of the Executive Director for APSC, is seeking to revoke the Alaska police officer certificate of Respondent Paul Secor under the legal authority of AS 18.65.220, AS 18.65.240(c), the Council’s regulations in 13 AAC 85.110, and under the procedures governed by the Administrative Procedure Act in AS 44.62.330, et. seq. The Executive Director alleges as follows:

1. On or about May 10, 2010, the Respondent was hired by the Department of Public Safety (DPS) as an Alaska State Trooper (AST). Respondent was a lateral hire from Kentucky where he had been a police officer for over eight years.
2. On or about June 27, 2011, Respondent was certified as a police officer by the Alaska Police Standards Council.
3. On or about April 24, 2018, while on duty and in his patrol vehicle, Respondent contacted a female (L.B.) walking on the side of the road. Respondent gave the female a courtesy transport without informing dispatch or providing his mileage, as required by DPS policy. During the transport, their conversation was

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

sexually explicit. Respondent allowed L.B. to touch his arm and vest while sharing the sexually charged conversation.

4. On or about September 18, 2019, a female, E.M, was contacted by Respondent while he was investigating a domestic violence incident where she was the victim. Respondent provided a transport of the female to the local women’s shelter. Later in that shift, Respondent texted the female regarding the case using his state issued cell phone. Their texts became sexually explicit. During the next twelve days they exchanged text messages, Respondent used his work issued phone, then his personal cell phone, and then returned to using his work issued phone.

5. On or about October 1, 2019, E.M. complained to Sergeant Sjogren with the Kenai Police Department (KPD) about her contacts with Respondent. Sergeant Sjogren alerted DPS and DPS started an administrative investigation.

6. On or about January 3, 2020, during the pendency of the above investigation, L.B. spoke with Trooper Woodruff on an unrelated incident and spoke about being given courtesy transports by Respondent and that she had fallen in love with him. Trooper Woodruff relayed this information to Sergeant Hunter who then spoke with Sergeant Lewis. Sergeant Lewis said he had also spoken with L.B. on an unrelated incident about her desire to reconnect with and her love for Respondent. Both sergeants were concerned that improper transports may have occurred and requested an administrative investigation (A.I.) be conducted.

7. As part of the administrative investigation, Alaska State Park Ranger Tom Anthony told DPS investigators of his February 2019 contact with M.S., a female who had told him that she had a date with Respondent. When investigators

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

spoke with M.S., she denied knowing who Respondent was and said no date had occurred.

8. During the AI interview on March 3, 2020, Respondent acknowledged the text messages to E.M. on his state phone were inappropriate and that was why he transitioned to his personal phone. Respondent said he transitioned back to his work phone because he was embarrassed by the content of the messages on his personal phone and did not want this family to see the messages. He said he deleted the messages on his phones out of personal embarrassment. Respondent said he felt the messages were a personal issue and that he was unaware they were a violation of the DPS Operations and Procedures.

9. During the same employee interview, when asked about L.B., Respondent said he just forgot to advise dispatch of the transport of L.B. or to provide mileage. He said he did not remember the conversation as sexual. However, after listening to the audio of his contact, he then said remembered the conversation and agreed it was sexual in nature. He said he did recall allowing the female to touch his hand and his vest.

10. When questioned about his relationship with M.S., Respondent said that he had given her a courtesy transport, but denied having a date with her. Investigators did not find any evidence in the radio logs of Respondent advising dispatch of the transport, as required by department policy.

11. As a result of investigation regarding L.B. and M.S. DPS sustained sexual misconduct, unbecoming conduct damaging the reputation and effectiveness of the Alaska State Troopers, and that Respondent was untruthful during the AI investigation by withholding information about his contact with L.B. and was not

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

forthcoming about their contact until presented with specific evidence contradictory to his initial statements.

12. As a result of the investigation regarding E.M., DPS found Respondent violated DPS policy regarding sexual misconduct, that his conduct was damaging the reputation and effectiveness of DPS, and unbecoming conduct.

13. On or about March 18, 2020, Trooper Wertanen reported to DPS that he had spoken to a female, S.B., about Respondent meeting her for a beer a couple of days after Respondent had provided her transport away from her residence where he had responded and investigated a domestic incident. DPS initiated an internal investigation into this report.

14. On or about March 21, 2020, after completing their internal investigations into Respondent's contact with E.M., L.B., and M.S, DPS terminated Respondent. DPS reported on the APSC Personnel Action Form that he was under investigation at the time of his termination and that they recommended he be de-certified.

15. On or about May 12, 2020, DPS interviewed S.B. She said she met with Respondent after he texted her a day or two after the incident, while he was off duty, to check on her. She invited him to visit her at the hotel bar and have a drink. She said that they had met, had a beer, and then he left. S.B. said their conversation was harmless, however she acknowledged it was weird to have the contact from him. She said the text message she received after the meeting were flirtatious from him, but she was not interested, and the messages stopped. She understood that the contact was inappropriate.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

16. On or about May 13, 2020, DPS completed the investigation involving S. B. and submitted a follow-up Personnel Action Form to APSC stating their investigation had sustained additional misconduct on the part of Respondent regarding his actions involving S.B. They reported he was under investigation at the time they filled out the Personnel Action Form and that they recommended he be de-certified.

17. Respondent's actions of having inappropriate on and off-duty contacts with victims and suspects, violating well established and long-standing departmental procedures by providing un-documented transports, sending sexual text messages to victims of domestic violence, and not being forthcoming investigators during the A.I. interview was detrimental to the integrity and reputation of the Alaska State Troopers and created substantial doubt about Respondent's honesty, fairness, and respect for the rights of others and for the laws of this states and the United State.

18. AS 18.65.240(c) provides that the APSC may deny or revoke the certificate of a police officer who does not meet the standards adopted under (a) (2) of that section.

19. 13 AAC 85.110(a)(2) provides that the council may revoke a basic, intermediate, or advanced certificate upon a finding that the holder of the certificate has been discharged from employment as a police officer in this state for inefficiency, incompetence, or some other reason that adversely affects the ability and fitness of the police officer to perform job duties or that is detrimental to the reputation, integrity, or discipline of the police department where the police officer worked.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

20. 13 AAC 85.110(a)(3) provides that the council may revoke a basic, intermediate, or advanced certificate upon a finding that the holder of the certificate does not meet the standards in 13 AAC 85.010(a) or (b).

21. 13 AAC 85.110(b)(3) provides that the council will revoke a basic, intermediate, or advanced certificate upon a finding that the holder of the certificate has been discharged from employment as police officer in this state for conduct that would cause a reasonable person to have substantial doubt about an individual's honesty, fairness, and respect for the rights of others and for the laws of this states and the United State or that is detrimental to the integrity of the police department where the police officer worked.

**COUNT I**

Paragraphs 1-21 are incorporated by reference. Based upon the facts described above, Respondent was discharged from employment as a police officer in this state for inefficiency, incompetence, or some other reason that adversely affects the ability and fitness of Respondent to perform job duties, which is grounds for discretionary revocation under 13 AAC 85.110(a)(2).

**COUNT II**

Paragraphs 1-21 are incorporated by reference. Based upon the facts described above, Respondent was discharged from employment as a police officer in this state for inefficiency, incompetence, or some other reason that was detrimental to the reputation, integrity, or discipline of the Alaska State Troopers, which is grounds for discretionary revocation under 13 AAC 85.110(a)(2).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
28  
30  
31  
32

**COUNT III**

Paragraphs 1-21 are incorporated by reference. Based upon the facts described above, Respondent does not meet the minimum standards for a certified police officer established under 13 AAC 85.010(a)(3). Respondent lacks good moral character, which is grounds for discretionary revocation under 13 AAC 85.110(a)(3).

**COUNT IV**

Paragraphs 1-21 are incorporated by reference. Based upon the facts described above, Respondent has been discharged from employment as police officer in this state for conduct that would cause a reasonable person to have substantial doubt about an individual's honesty, fairness, and respect for the rights of others and for the laws of this states and the United State, which is grounds for mandatory revocation under 13 AAC 85.110(b)(3).

**COUNT V**

Paragraphs 1-21 are incorporated by reference. Based upon the facts described above, Respondent has been discharged from employment as police officer in this state for conduct that is detrimental to the integrity of the Alaska State Troopers, which is grounds for mandatory revocation under 13 AAC 85.110(b)(3).

DATED this 5th day of August 2020, at Juneau, Alaska.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah Hieb, Administrative Investigator  
Alaska Police Standards Council