



MEMORANDUM

Austin Police Department *Office of the Chief of Police*

TO: Susan Sinz, Director of Civil Service

FROM: Lisa Davis, Chief of Police

DATE: May 19, 2026

SUBJECT: Indefinite Suspension of Police Officer Phillip Sparkman #7795
Internal Affairs Control Number 2026-01162

Pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 143 of the Texas Local Government Code, Section 143.052, and Rule 10, Rules of Procedure for the Firefighters', Police Officers' and Emergency Medical Service Personnel's Civil Service Commission, I have indefinitely suspended Police Officer Phillip Sparkman #7795 from duty as a City of Austin, Texas police officer effective May 19, 2026.¹

¹ Ofc. Sparkman is currently indefinitely suspended pursuant to a memorandum I issued to him on December 13, 2024, for Internal Affairs Control Numbers 2024-0659 and 2024-1132. That case is still pending on appeal, as Ofc. Sparkman and his representatives abated the appeal until his criminal cases were completely adjudicated. That case stems from his arrest (and recently completed deferred adjudication) for Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) and Unauthorized Carrying of a Weapon (UCW) by the Round Rock Police Department (RRPD) in 2024 and the subsequent "missing persons" report APD filed with the RRPD, when Ofc. Sparkman was AWOL, as it was later discovered he had traveled to Bogota, Colombia without authorization. Even though he was already indefinitely suspended, he is still an APD employee until the appeal is decided and is subject to the department's policies pursuant to established case law. See *Walter B. Goode v. Firefighters' & Police Officers' Civil Service Comm'n of the City of Houston*, 976 S.W.2d 822 (Tex. App. Houston [1st Dist.] 1998, pet. denied)...

Additionally, Ofc. Sparkman is currently suspended pursuant to another memorandum I issued to him on May 11, 2026, for Internal Affairs Control Number 2025-1049. That case is also pending on appeal. Ofc. Sparkman was indefinitely suspended in that matter for his conduct connected with his arrest for Criminal Trespass on or about May 21, 2025, specifically for conduct prejudicial to good order and/or for violating departmental rules and regulations, including APD General Order Acts Bringing Discredit upon the Department.

I took this action because Officer Sparkman violated Civil Service Commission Rule 10.03, which sets forth the grounds for disciplinary suspensions of employees in the classified service, and states:

No employee of the classified service of the City of Austin shall engage in, or be involved in, any of the following acts or conduct, and the same shall constitute cause for suspension of an employee from the classified service of the City:

- H. Conduct prejudicial to good order; and
- L. Violation of any of the rules and regulations of the Fire Department or Police Department or of special orders, as applicable.

The following are the specific acts committed by Ofc. Sparkman in violation of Rule 10:

I. Introduction

On June 22, 2024, Officer Phillip Sparkman was arrested for Driving While Intoxicated (DWI) by the Round Rock Police Department (IA Case 2024-0659). The Round Rock Police Department (RRPD) conducted a blood draw of Ofc. Sparkman during their arrest of him and submitted the blood for examination. The RRPD submitted Ofc. Sparkman's blood to test for the presence of alcohol in 2024. Ofc. Sparkman was charged with DWI.

In 2025, the RRPD submitted Ofc. Sparkman's blood to test for the presence of drugs.

Ofc. Sparkman entered into a deferred adjudication for the DWI charge, which had been based upon on-scene physical observations, blood alcohol, and/or blood/drug test results. On April 23, 2026, after completing required classes, the court dismissed the DWI charge.²

On April 21, 2026, Austin Police Department (APD) Internal Affairs (IA) received notice, for the first time, of results of Officer Sparkman's 2025 blood test for the presence of drugs.³ The blood test results showed Officer Sparkman's blood contained Delta 9 THC

² The fact that the criminal charges were ultimately dismissed has no bearing on this administrative case, pursuant to LGC 143.056 (f), which states:

"Acquittal or dismissal of an indictment or a complaint does not mean that a fire fighter or police officer has not violated civil service rules and does not negate the charges that may have been or may be brought against the fire fighter or police officer by the Department head."

³ This indefinite suspension is timely. I waited until the conclusion or the final disposition of the criminal process pursuant to Local Government Code (LGC) 143.056 (c) and/or (d) to impose this discipline, which was after Ofc. Sparkman plead to the DWI through the deferred adjudication process and garnered a dismissal of that case on or about April 23, 2026. Based upon LGC 143.056 (c) and/or (d) I had at least 30 days to administer discipline for this newly discovered criminally related violation by May 22, 2026. And based upon LGC 143.052 (h), APD may have had 180 days from April 21, 2026, which would have been on or about October 18, 2026, to imposed discipline for this newly discovered criminal related offense(s).

and Delta 9 Carboxy THC on or about June 22, 2024. Delta 9 THC is the active ingredient in Marijuana, while Delta 9 Carboxy THC is an inactive metabolite.

II. Allegation and Associated Policies:

On April 30, 2026, Ofc. Sparkman's Commander submitted an Internal Complaint Memorandum to IA. The complaint stated:

On or about, June 22, 2024, Officer Sparkman was arrested for DWI by Round Rock Police Department. A sample of Officer Sparkman's blood was taken as part of the investigation and tested.

A report was generated on March 18, 2025 indicating lab results from the sample were positive for (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC).

On or about, April 21, 2026, Sergeant Investigator Richard Mabe with Williamson County emailed these test results to Internal Affairs.

These test results indicate that, on or about and/or before, June 22, 2024, Officer Sparkman may have been in possession and/or used a substance containing (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and/or Delta-9 THC) while on-duty and/or off-duty. Through these actions, Officer Sparkman may have violated policy and/or criminal law.

A. Investigative Actions:

IA reviewed the following documentation and media in relation to the Administrative Investigation:

- IA Digital Case File
 - Internal Complaint
 - Officer Sparkman's Blood test results
 - Officer Sparkman's history of sustained IA complaints.
 - Time Sheet for June 19-June 22, 2024
 - Time Log for June 19-June 22, 2024

During the course of the administrative investigation, IA conducted an interview of the following:

- Officer Phillip Sparkman #7795 on May 6, 2026

III. Ofc. Sparkman's May 6, 2026, IA Interview

Ofc. Sparkman and his representative (attorney) were provided with a copy of the drug test/lab report before and during his IA interview. IA asked Ofc. Sparkman during his IA interview, if he could explain why there was Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC in

his system according to the blood test. Ofc. Sparkman responded that he did not have any THC in his blood. IA asked Officer Sparkman if he consumed in any manner any products containing THC from June 19, 2024, to June 22, 2024, and he denied consuming any THC containing products. Ofc. Sparkman also denied using any products containing CBD. IA asked Ofc. Sparkman if there was any reason his Chain of Command should doubt the test results, and he replied in the affirmative. Ofc. Sparkman said the test results were inaccurate, and he did not consume any THC. IA asked Ofc. Sparkman if he could explain why his blood results showed he had THC in his system and he said he could not.

At the conclusion of his interview, Ofc. Sparkman said he did not violate Policy 916.2 because he did not have THC in his system.

IV. Unanimous Recommendation from the Chain of Command (COC) in the Notice of Sustained Allegation (NOSA)

The Chain of Command reviewed the IA investigation and made the following recommendation to me, Chief Lisa Davis. The NOSA states in part:

“Your Chain of Command has conducted a review of the investigation into the allegation(s) of misconduct that were made against you. Having reviewed the investigation, your Chain of Command has made the following recommendations as to how your conduct violates the below listed General Orders (GOs):

1) 900.3.1 HONESTY

Honesty is of the utmost importance in the police profession. Employees are expected to be truthful at all times in the performance of their duties.

Employees will speak the truth at all times and reflect the truth in all reports and written communications. Any statement or omission of pertinent or material information which intentionally misrepresents facts or misleads others through an official statement will be considered a false official statement. The following are examples of an "official statement":

(a), 2. Verbal or written statements made by an officer in connection with their official duties to:

An investigator conducting an administrative or criminal investigation of the officer or another person's conduct.

(c) Employees will not attempt to conceal, divert, or mitigate their true culpability in a situation, nor will they engage in efforts to thwart, influence, or interfere with an internal or criminal investigation.

- On or about, June 22, 2024, you were arrested for DWI by the Round Rock Police Department. As part of the investigation, a blood sample was obtained pursuant to a search warrant and tested.
- A toxicology report was generated on March 18, 2025, indicating lab results from the sample were positive for (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC). This test was conducted by NMS laboratory, and the report was signed by Estuardo Miranda, Forensic Toxicologist.
- On or about, April 21, 2026, the APD was notified about these positive THC test results by Sergeant Investigator Richard Mabe with Williamson County, when he emailed these test results to APD's IA division. APD IA subsequently notified APD executive staff. Moreover, APD was also notified that Ofc. Sparkman entered into a deferred adjudication for his associated DWI arrest and that the "final disposition" of this criminal matter was set to be on or about April 23, 2026,
- Based on the preponderance of evidence, these test results show that, on or about and/or before, June 22, 2024, you were in possession and/or used a substance containing (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and/or Delta-9 THC) while on-duty and/or off-duty.
- Your assertions regarding these test results during your IA interview after you and your counsel were provided with these results before your interview (and shown to you during the interview), were deemed not credible by your entire Chain of Command.
- Specifically, on May 6, 2026, during your IA interview, you were asked to explain why the above test results showed the presence of (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC) in your blood. You responded, *"I did not have any THC in my blood."*
- You were asked separately for each individual date, if you consumed in any manner, any substance that contained THC on or about 6/19/2024, 6/20/2024, 6/21/2024 or 6/22/2024. All four times, you responded, *"No, ma'am."*
- This conduct appears to be a pattern. A previous test was conducted on the same blood sample by Texas DPS Austin Crime Lab and signed by Estuardo Miranda, Forensic Toxicologist. This test showed a blood alcohol content (BAC) of [REDACTED]
- During the previous IA investigation of your DWI arrest (24-0659), you were interviewed by IA on September 18, 2024. During that interview, you denied consuming any alcoholic beverages. You were subsequently asked to explain the positive test results for ethyl alcohol in your system.

IA asked, “Okay. Uh, and during that time, once you got out of the [REDACTED] they - and you've already touched on it, that they took blood from you. Um, they obtained a search warrant to, uh, obtain, um, your blood, two vials of your blood, um, for testing. During those tests, uh, the results showed that you had alcohol in your system. Um, do you have any explanation as to how the – the officers who are on scene detected an odor, uh, metabolize alcohol on your person and then the blood results later detected alcohol in your system?”

You responded, “Uh, I don't have an explanation.”

- Given this context, you are not only claiming that you did not have THC in your system and that NMS labs somehow made a mistake, but that two independent lab test results from two independent labs made a mistake.
- Further supporting this recommendation: you indicated that you took properly [REDACTED] which contained [REDACTED]. The same blood results that supported your assertion that you properly consumed the prescribed medicine are the same blood test results for the same sample that showed the presence of alcohol and THC. Nonetheless, you denied consuming THC or alcohol and professed to be dumbfounded by these tests results.
- Additional circumstantial evidence is the fact that you entered into a deferred adjudication (garnering the subsequent dismissal) for the DWI (for the blood/alcohol and/or positive THC result) after the blood test results showed the positive THC results.

2) 916 Drug and Alcohol-Free Workplace

916.1.2 DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply to this order.

Drug - Includes the following:

- (a) Illegal drugs.
- (b) Prescription drugs not prescribed to the employee by a physician.
- (c) Non-medical Inhalants.
- (d) Marijuana (Regardless of legality in location used, consumed, or possessed).
- (e) Any product that contains THC (Regardless of legality in location used, consumed, or possessed).

916.2 GENERAL GUIDELINES

This order specifically prohibits employees from:

(a) .5 Using, possessing, selling, purchasing, distributing, or being under the influence of any prohibited drug while off-duty.

.6 Testing positive for a drug.

- On or about, June 22, 2024, you were arrested for DWI by [the RRPD]. As part of the investigation, a blood sample was obtained pursuant to a search warrant and tested.
- A toxicology report was generated on March 18, 2025, indicating lab results from the sample were positive for (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC). This test was conducted by NMS labs, and the report was signed by Estuardo Miranda, Forensic Toxicologist.
- Records show you worked on the day leading up to the arrest as well as June 18th through June 21st of the preceding week before the arrest. In addition, you were scheduled to work from June 25th through June 28th. The preponderance of the evidence shows that you violated the above-mentioned General Order[s] on one and/or more dates.
- It is important to note that the APD, including any Assistant Chief of Police or of greater rank, did not become aware of this specific “criminally related” offense, nor the below and/or above-mentioned specific “criminally related” offenses until on or after April 21, 2026.

3) 900.1.1 RESPONSIBILITY TO KNOW AND COMPLY

The rules of conduct set forth in this order do not serve as an all-inclusive list of requirements, limitations, or prohibitions on employee conduct and activities; employees are required to know and comply with all Department policies, procedures, and written directives.

- (a) Employees will maintain a working knowledge and comply with the laws, ordinances, statutes, regulations, and APD written directives which pertain to their assigned duties.
- (b) Employees who do not understand their assigned duties or responsibilities will read the relevant directives and guidelines, and will consult their immediate supervisor for clarification and explanation.
- (c) A lack of knowledge of an APD written directive is not a defense to disciplinary action.

To wit:

Texas Health and Safety Code - HEALTH & SAFETY § 481.121. Offense: Possession of Marihuana

(a) Except as authorized by this chapter, a person commits an offense if the person knowingly or intentionally possesses a usable quantity of marihuana.

(b) An offense under Subsection (a) is:

(1) a Class B misdemeanor if the amount of marihuana possessed is two ounces or less;

(2) a Class A misdemeanor if the amount of marihuana possessed is four ounces or less but more than two ounces;

Which would be at the very least a Class B misdemeanor criminally related violation by the preponderance of the evidence (from an administrative standard/burden of proof)

- On or about June 22, 2024, you were arrested for DWI by [the RRPD]. As part of the investigation, a blood sample was obtained pursuant to a search warrant and tested.
- A toxicology report was generated on March 18, 2025, indicating lab results from the sample were positive for (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC). This test was conducted by NMS laboratory, and the report was signed by Estuardo Miranda, Forensic Toxicologist.
- On or about, April 21, 2026, Sergeant Investigator Richard Mabe with Williamson County emailed these test results to Internal Affairs.

Based on the preponderance of evidence, these test results show that, on or about and/or before, June 22, 2024, you were in possession and/or used a substance and/or was under the influence of a substance containing (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and/or Delta-9 THC) while on-duty and/or off-duty.

- On May 6, 2026, during your [IA] interview, you were asked to explain why the above test results showed the presence of (Delta-9 Carboxy THC and Delta-9 THC) in your blood. You responded, *"I did not have any THC in my blood."*
- Based on the preponderance of evidence, your positive test result for THC and/or combined with your subsequent dishonesty, demonstrate it is more likely than not that you possessed and/or consumed a substance and/or was under the influence of a substance containing THC through illicit means, in violation of policy, state and/or federal law."

V. Conclusion

I concur with the Chain of Command's unanimous recommendation that Ofc. Sparkman be sustained by a preponderance of the evidence for every General Order violation notated in the May 11, 2026, NOSA. I also concur with the Chain of Command's recommendation to me that he be indefinitely suspended.

The evidence demonstrates that Ofc. Sparkman violated the three General Orders listed above. It is important to note that I would have made the decision to indefinitely suspend him for any one of the following General Order violations in IAD 2026-01162, independent of each of the other:

- 1) 900.1.1 Responsibility to Know and Comply-to wit: Texas Health and Safety Code 481.121 – Offense: Possession of Marijuana

The blood test results demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that Ofc. Sparkman possessed and used marijuana in violation of state law and APD General Order 900.1.1. This alone warrants an indefinite suspension. The fact that he had THC in his blood while operating a motor vehicle is deeply concerning. APD has had a well-documented zero-tolerance DWI policy that has been in place since 2015. Every APD officer has been placed on notice as to this policy and it is reflected in APD General Order's and APD's disciplinary matrix, along with published video messages viewed by all officers. Every officer arrested for DWI since the implementation of that General Order policy has either been indefinitely suspended by the then Chief of Police, or the officer resigned in lieu of termination. While I indefinitely suspended Ofc. Sparkman based in part on his blood/alcohol content from the June 22, 2024, incident, the new information that he was under the influence of marijuana content is a new and distinct violation of DWI statute by the preponderance of the evidence administrative standard, and additional grounds for his indefinite suspension.

- 2) 900.3.1 Honesty

APD also zero-tolerance policy for dishonesty in violation of General Order 900.3.1 Honesty. Officers receive training on this policy. Therefore, any one the statements his Chain of Command and I found, by a preponderance of the evidence, not to be credible or honest would have caused me to indefinitely suspend Ofc. Sparkman independent of any other violation in this memorandum. Those statements are:

- A) His on-scene statement to one or more of the RRPD officers that he had not consumed any drugs on the day and/or days before his arrest.
- B) His assertions to IA that he did not consume any drugs and/or consume anything taking and drugs and/or anything containing THC prior to his arrest, including during the preceding weeks.

- 3) 916 Drug and Alcohol-Free Workplace

I agree with the Chain of Command's conclusion that the evidence shows by the preponderance of the evidence that Ofc. Sparkman had illegal drugs in his system, while off-duty. That alone is grounds for his indefinite suspension, and I would have indefinitely suspended him for that reason alone, which was in line with the unanimous recommendation of the Chain of Command. Moreover, it is a policy violation for an employee to use, possess, sell, purchase, distribute, or being under the influence of any

prohibited drug while off-duty. Ofc. Sparkman clearly and at the very least possessed the drug that was found in his system.

Additionally, the preponderance of the evidence shows he had illegal drugs in his system on one or more days when he was at work (on or about June 22, 2024 and the preceding days) and/or was scheduled to work on days when he would have had unprescribed and/or unauthorized drugs in his system, but for his June 22, 2024 arrest and being placed on restricted duty by me. It is unacceptable for an APD officer to have drugs in their system, particularly when they are driving a patrol vehicle, performing law enforcement duties and are authorized to discharge a weapon, including their firearm or taser in the performance of their duties.⁴ This indiscretion and associated liability it created is a separate and distinct grounds for Ofc. Sparkman's indefinite suspension, without consideration of the other offenses in this memorandum.

In addition to the General Orders the Chain of Command referenced in the NOSA, Ofc. Sparkman's conduct was prejudicial to good order and/or brought discredit to APD, in violation of City of Austin Civil Service Rules and/or APD General Order 900.3.2 (a). This is in part because on June 22, 2024, when Ofc. Sparkman was arrested, he identified himself as an APD officer to the three RRPD officers, as captured on Body Worn Camera (BWC). Therefore, not only are members of the RRPD and Williamson County EMS aware of his arrest, but some members of the criminal justice system, including a Williamson County Court judge and/or their staff, are aware of this positive drug test result of Ofc. Sparkman. Ofc. Sparkman's actions are inconsistent with the expectation of a police officer, who is tasked with upholding the law, and not committing the same conduct he is tasked with enforcing. Additionally, some or all of the above-mentioned individuals are also all aware of Ofc. Sparkman entering into a deferred adjudication and garnering a dismissal via that process on/or about April 23, 2026.

For the above-stated individual and/or collective reasons, Ofc. Sparkman leaves me with no choice but to indefinitely suspend him.

Moreover, while I would have indefinitely suspended Ofc. Sparkman solely for the above stated reasons without consideration of anything else, I also considered the fact that I have previously indefinitely suspended Ofc. Sparkman three times. The details of each of these indefinite suspensions are set forth in memorandums dated December 13, 2024, and/or May 11, 2026. Ofc. Sparkman has appealed those indefinite suspensions, and each appeal remains pending.

Moreover, Ofc. Sparkman's newly discovered conduct in this third indefinite suspension case (associated with his first indefinite suspension case) adds to my inability to trust his decision-making skills and compromises his credibility and fitness to serve as an APD police officer, including any testimony he may have to give in the future. Moreover, if I retained Ofc. Sparkman, I would send the wrong message to the public and/or his peers that this type of behavior is somewhat tolerable by APD, when it is clearly not. Therefore,

⁴ There are some exceptions, including but not limited to the [REDACTED] Ofc. Sparkman was taking.

after careful deliberation and consideration of all of these factors, I have made the decision to indefinitely suspend Ofc. Sparkman, effective immediately.

By these actions, Ofc. Sparkman violated Rule 10.03(L) of the Civil Service Rules by violating the following rules and regulations of the Austin Police Department:

➤ **Austin Police Department Policy 900.1.1: General Conduct and Responsibilities: Responsibility to Know and Comply**

900.1.1 Responsibility to Know and Comply

The rules of conduct set forth in this order do not serve as an all-inclusive list of requirements, limitations, or prohibitions on employee conduct and activities; employees are required to know and comply with all Department policies, procedures, and written directives.

- (a) Employees will maintain a working knowledge and comply with the laws, ordinances, statutes, regulations, and APD written directives which pertain to their assigned duties.
- (b) Employees who do not understand their assigned duties or responsibilities will read the relevant directives and guidelines, and will consult their immediate supervisor for clarification and explanation.
- (c) A lack of knowledge of an APD written directive is not a defense to disciplinary action.

To Wit:

Texas Health and Safety Code 481.121 – Offense: Possession of Marijuana

- (a) Except as authorized by this chapter, a person commits an offense if the person knowingly or intentionally possesses a usable quantity of marihuana.
- (b) An offense under Subsection (a) is:
 - (1) a Class B misdemeanor if the amount of marihuana possessed is two ounces or less;
 - (2) a Class A misdemeanor if the amount of marihuana possessed is four ounces or less but more than two ounces;

➤ **Austin Police Department Policy 900.3.1(a)(c): General Conduct and Responsibilities: Honesty**

900.3.1(a)(c) Honesty

Honesty is of the utmost importance in the police profession. Employees are expected to be truthful at all times in the performance of their duties.

- (a) Employees will speak the truth at all times and reflect the truth in all reports and written communications. Any statement or omission of pertinent or material information which intentionally misrepresents facts or misleads others through an official statement will be considered a false official statement. The following are examples of an "official statement":
 - (2) Verbal or written statements made by an officer in connection with their official duties to:
 - (a) An investigator conducting an administrative or criminal investigation of the officer or another person's conduct.
- (c) Employees will not attempt to conceal, divert, or mitigate their true culpability in a situation, nor will they engage in efforts to thwart, influence, or interfere with an internal or criminal investigation.

➤ **Austin Police Department Policy 916.1.2: Drug and Alcohol-Free Workplace: Definitions**

916.1.2 Definitions

The following definitions apply to this order.

Drug - Includes the following:

- (a) Illegal drugs.
- (b) Prescription drugs not prescribed to the employee by a physician.
- (c) Non-medical Inhalants.
- (d) Marijuana (Regardless of legality in location used, consumed, or possessed).
- (e) Any product that contains THC (Regardless of legality in location used, consumed, or possessed).

➤ **Austin Police Department Policy 916.2: Drug and Alcohol Free Workplace: General Guidelines**

916.2 General Guidelines

- (a) This order specifically prohibits employees from:
 - (5) Using, possessing, selling, purchasing, distributing, or being under the influence of any prohibited drug while off-duty.

(6) Testing positive for a drug.

By copy of this memo, Officer Sparkman is hereby advised of this indefinite suspension and that the suspension may be appealed to the Civil Service Commission by filing with the Director of Civil Service, within ten (10) days after receipt of a copy of this memo, a proper notice of appeal in accordance with Section 143.010 of the Texas Local Government Code.

By copy of this memo and as required by Section 143.057 of the Texas Local Government Code, Officer Sparkman is hereby advised that such section and the Agreement Between the City of Austin and the Austin Police Association provide for an appeal to an independent third-party hearing examiner, in accordance with the provisions of such Agreement. If appeal is made to a hearing examiner, all rights of appeal to a District Court are waived, except as provided by Subsection (j) of Section 143.057 of the Texas Local Government Code. That section states that the State District Court may hear appeals of an award of a hearing examiner only on the grounds that the arbitration panel was without jurisdiction or exceeded its jurisdiction, or that the order was procured by fraud, collusion or other unlawful means. In order to appeal to a hearing examiner, the original notice of appeal submitted to the Director of Civil Service must state that appeal is made to a hearing examiner.



LISA DAVIS, Chief of Police

5.19.26 2:16 pm

Date & Time

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I hereby acknowledge receipt of the above and foregoing memorandum of indefinite suspension and I have been advised that if I desire to appeal that I have ten (10) calendar days from the date of this receipt to file written notice of appeal with the Director of Civil Service in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 143 of the Texas Local Government Code.



Police Officer Phillip Sparkman #7795

5-19-2026 1457

Date & Time