BEFORE THE
EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES AUTHORITY
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

ADAM E. CLINT, Respondent

Agency Case No. 21-0190

OAH No. 2025020255

PROPOSED DECISION

Michelle C. Hollimon, Administrative Law Judge, Office of Administrative Hearings, State of California, heard this matter by videoconference on June 11, 2025.

Craig S. Menchin, Deputy Attorney General, represented complainant, Kimberly Lew, Licensing, Standards and Training Branch Chief, Emergency Medical Services Authority (EMSA), State of California.

David J. Givot, Attorney at Law, represented respondent, Adam E. Clint, who was present at the hearing.

Oral and documentary evidence was received. The record was closed, and the matter was submitted for decision on June 11, 2025.

FACTUAL FINDINGS

Jurisdictional Matters

1. On March 10, 2005, EMSA issued respondent Paramedic License No. P22097. The license is current and will expire on October 31, 2025, unless it is renewed.

2. On November 1, 2024, complainant, in her official capacity, signed an accusation against respondent seeking the revocation of his paramedic license. The accusation alleges three causes for discipline stemming from respondent's August 19, 2022, felony conviction for assault with force likely to result in great bodily injury: (1) conviction of a substantially related crime; (2) demonstration of irrational behavior that may impair the ability to perform normal duties; and (3) mandatory license revocation pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100174, subdivision (b)(2)[1].

3. Respondent timely submitted a notice of defense. This hearing followed.

Respondent's Criminal Conviction

4. On August 19, 2022, in Case No. PA096927, in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles, respondent was convicted by a jury of a felony violation of Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(4), assault with force likely to result in great bodily injury. Respondent was acquitted of violating Penal Code section 135, destroying or concealing evidence. A third charge of violating Penal Code section 417,

[1] California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100174 was renumbered to section 100111.02 effective January 1, 2025.

subdivision (a)(1), exhibiting a deadly weapon other than a firearm, was dismissed prior to the conclusion of the trial in that matter.

5. On January 6, 2023, the court suspended imposition of sentencing and respondent was placed on two years formal probation, ordered to serve one day in custody, with credit for time served, ordered to complete an anger management program of 52 sessions, attend an eight-hour anti-bias program, perform twenty days of community service, and to pay fines and fees, as well as other terms and conditions.

6. The circumstances underlying respondent's August 19, 2022, conviction are as follows: On the morning of July 3, 2021, respondent and another individual (Mr. P) got into a verbal altercation at respondent's front door over respondent yelling at Mr. P's significant other earlier that morning[2]. Respondent told Mr. P to leave and

[2] These facts are taken from the law enforcement reports that were received in evidence under *Lake v. Reed* (1997) 16 Cal.4th 448, 461-464 which held that portions of a law enforcement officer's report are admissible in an administrative proceeding over a hearsay objection, including the officer's percipient observations and the party's admissions. That opinion concluded that the report was admissible under Evidence Code section 1280, the public employee records exception to the hearsay rule. A law enforcement officer's direct observations memorialized in the officer's report were also admissible under Evidence Code section 1280 and were sufficient to support a factual finding. Admissions by a party memorialized in the report were admissible under Evidence Code section 1220 and were sufficient to support a factual finding. Under Government Code section 11513, other hearsay statements set forth in the officer's report could be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but they were not sufficient by themselves to support a factual finding unless – as with

went inside his residence. Respondent went upstairs, retrieved his phone and his gun, and came back downstairs. Mr. P remained on respondent's property. Respondent and Mr. P continued to argue. At some point when both respondent and Mr. P were outside of respondent's home, respondent struck Mr. P in the neck with his fist. Mr. P fell to the ground. Los Angeles County Sheriff Deputy K. Borbon observed that Mr. P had an approximate three-inch abrasion to his right knee, an approximate two-inch scratch to the right side of his neck, and a two-inch scratch on his left forearm.

Mr. P alleged that respondent pushed him while facing respondent, and then when he turned to walk away, respondent punched him on the right side of his neck and pushed him as well. Other witnesses allegedly saw respondent punch and/or kick Mr. P. Respondent denied punching, kicking or assaulting Mr. P when asked by law enforcement. Mr. P alleged that respondent pointed a gun at him, which respondent denied when asked by law enforcement as well. Respondent told law enforcement nothing happened other than Mr. P threatening to assault him.

Respondent was arrested for assault with a deadly weapon and transported to the Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff's Station for booking.

Respondent's Evidence

RESPONDENT'S TESTIMONY

7. The following is a summary of the testimony of respondent: On July 3, 2021, respondent was inside his motorhome, which was parked in front of his

---

the public employee records exception and the party admission exception to the hearsay rule – such hearsay would be admissible over objection in civil actions.

residence. Respondent saw his neighbor (Ms. A) speeding up the street, causing debris from recent roadwork to hit his motorhome. He walked up the street to take a picture of Ms. A's license plate to make a report to law enforcement. Ms. A came out of her home, and Ms. A and respondent got into a verbal argument, during which respondent told her she "could slow the fuck down". Respondent walked home and called law enforcement to request someone come to take a report regarding Ms. A's speeding.

8. Shortly thereafter, respondent was alerted to motion at his front door. Respondent walked out the front door to find Mr. P, who respondent testified "immediately started getting in my face, pointing fingers." Respondent testified Mr. P would not let him speak and told him "if you ever cuss at my wife again, I will fuck you up." Respondent testified that he told Mr. P that he would curse at his wife again if she continued to speed down the street and told Mr. P to "get the fuck off my property dickhead."

9. Respondent testified that he felt threatened by Mr. P, did not know what Mr. P was going to do, and "went into fight or flight mode" given his paramedic background. Respondent went back inside his house, shut his front door, and went upstairs to his bedroom, where he retrieved a handgun and a magazine of bullets from his gun safe. Respondent exited his bedroom and when he was back at the top of his home's staircase, he saw that his front door was wide open. Respondent testified he was unsure how the door got opened, was unsure why he had not locked it behind him when he came inside after the confrontation with Mr. P, and was concerned about the possibility that Mr. P had opened it.

10. When asked why he did not simply lock his door and call the police, respondent testified he was scared. His two younger children and his nephew were

inside the home. He knew he had the gun upstairs, which he had owned for a year or less, and which he had never before retrieved for home protection.

11. Once he was about halfway down his staircase, respondent saw Mr. P outside on his walkway. Respondent testified that Mr. P was laughing at him and taunting him and commented on respondent getting a gun. Respondent testified he set the gun down on a table near the front door and went outside. Respondent testified he had no intention of using the gun, but rather his intention was to scare Mr. P. The bullets were loaded but not chambered, and the safety was still on.

12. Respondent and Mr. P continued yelling at one another, with respondent repeatedly telling him to "get the fuck off my property." Respondent and Mr. P "got nose to nose", respondent saw Mr. P raise both fists, and in response respondent clinched his right fist and hit Mr. P on the left side of his head. Mr. P stumbled and fell to his knees. Respondent testified he crouched over Mr. P to make sure he was not going to hit him or had been knocked unconscious. Once he knew Mr. P was okay, respondent then backed up toward his home. Mr. P stood up, respondent told him to get off his property, walked back to his house, and closed the door. Respondent then called the sheriff's office, told them there was an intruder on his property that threatened him, and law enforcement assistance was needed immediately.

13. Several sheriff deputies arrived and spoke with both Mr. P and respondent. Respondent was handcuffed and placed under arrest. Respondent admitted he was not truthful with law enforcement when asked if he assaulted Mr. P, telling law enforcement he did not punch or kick Mr. P. Respondent testified that he does not know why he was not truthful about his assault of Mr. P, but attributes it to, among other things, being scared and in shock, his kids looking at him, and having

never been arrested before. Respondent testified that he regrets to this day not being truthful, and that there is no excuse for him being untruthful.

14. Respondent was charged with but acquitted of destroying evidence, namely home security video footage of the July 3, 2021, incident. Respondent reiterated during his testimony that he did not destroy any evidence. His security camera is set to activate by motion or when someone rings his doorbell, and is set to record for 30 seconds.

15. Respondent was ordered to attend an anti-bias program as part of his criminal sentence. Respondent testified he was unsure why he was ordered to participate in this program and just assumed it was part of the terms of probation.

16. Respondent was terminated from the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) as a result of this incident. During his 21-year career with the LAFD, respondent received various service awards. Respondent never received any complaints from paramedic patients and was never disciplined during his career. Respondent never reacted in any manner similar to his interaction with Mr. P in any work situation, before or after the July 3, 2021, incident.

17. Respondent is currently employed with Cal Fire as a firefighter paramedic. He no longer holds the rank of captain, which he held with the LAFD. Respondent will not be able to maintain his current employment as a firefighter paramedic without his paramedic license.

18. Respondent testified as to the steps he has taken since this incident to prevent it from happening again, which included completing all court ordered requirements of his criminal case, staying active, as well as therapy. Respondent testified that he understands some of the things he saw during his career as a

firefighter affected him, as well as a friend of his being shot and killed at his fire station not long before the July 3, 2021, incident.

19. Respondent expressed that he made wrong decisions on July 3, 2021, and exercised poor judgment. He knows the decisions he made impacted his family and Mr. P and Ms. A as well. He was given the opportunity and did apologize to them both at his sentencing hearing. Respondent testified that he does not think it is unreasonable for EMSA to be concerned about his temper, but stressed that the July 3, 2021, incident was an isolated incident when he was off duty, never happened before, and would never happen again.

RESPONDENT'S DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

20. Respondent submitted several supporting documents that were considered, including but not limited to, home security video footage of a part of the encounter on July 3, 2021, between respondent and Mr. P, the Los Angeles Civil Service Commission Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Recommendation (LACSC recommendation) related to respondent's appeal of his termination from the LAFD, as well as respondent's closing brief from that hearing, a personal statement written by respondent, the minute order evidencing reduction of the felony conviction against respondent to a misdemeanor, the order dismissing respondent's criminal conviction related to the July 3, 2021, incident pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.4, and multiple character reference letters. Some of the supporting documents provided by respondent are discussed in further detail below.

21. Respondent's provided home security video footage of a 32-second exchange between him and Mr. P at respondent's front door. The video begins with Mr. P near the front door of respondent's home and respondent coming outside of his

home through the front door. Mr. P speaks first, asking respondent if he was cussing at his wife. Respondent can be seen moving to his left and Mr. P can be seen moving toward respondent as he does so. Mr. P can be seen pointing his fingers and respondent and can be heard repeatedly telling respondent to "listen." A verbal exchange continues between the two of them, consistent with respondent's testimony. At the end of the video, respondent can be seen moving toward the door of his home, and Mr. P moving closer to him, with respondent ultimately entering his home.

22. Respondent provided the LACSC recommendation related to respondent's appeal of his termination from the LAFD. The LACSC recommendation noted as part of its factual findings that it was not established that respondent used any racially offensive term or that respondent wielded a firearm during the incident, which respondent confirmed during his testimony at the hearing, and which were considered in the department's decision to discharge respondent. The LACSC recommendation also noted that that respondent felt threatened by Mr. P's behavior at his front door, which respondent confirmed during his testimony at the hearing as well. The LACSC recommendation concluded that discharge was not appropriate, but rather a 30-day suspension, given respondent's length of employment and competent work performance with LAFD, no prior discipline against respondent, Mr. P's coming to respondent's home and that he was aggressive, respondent being under the stress of his encounter with Mr. P when he struck him, acceptance of responsibility and remorse expressed by respondent, compliance with the terms of probation, reduction of charges to a misdemeanor and subsequent dismissal, his misconduct being "an isolated, uncharacteristic lapse in judgment not likely to be repeated", and lesser discipline being allowed under county guidelines.

23. Respondent provided an undated personal statement in which he apologized to both Ms. A and Mr. P, accepted responsibility for his actions and admitted he made "many poor choices that day."

24. Respondent provided the May 17, 2023, minute order from respondent's criminal matter (Case No. PA096927) evidencing reduction of the felony conviction against respondent to a misdemeanor pursuant to Penal Code section 17, subdivision (b)(3). Respondent also provided the January 31, 2024, order from the same matter dismissing respondent's criminal conviction related to the July 3, 2021, incident pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.4.

25. Respondent submitted into evidence over 20 character reference letters from family, friends, and neighbors. Many of the letters were addressed to the judge in respondent's criminal matter, and many of the authors appeared to have knowledge of the allegations against respondent. The letters noted respondent's dedication to his family and community, helpfulness, and kind nature.

26. Of particular note are the nine letters submitted by respondent's former fellow firefighters, summarized briefly as follows:

- In an undated letter, Bryan Good, an LAFD Captain who worked with respondent for 20 years, vouched for respondent's calm demeanor and critical thinking skills, as well as "unwavering dedication, leadership abilities, and commitment to service."

- In a letter dated June 9, 2023, Retired Captain Steve Messick, who worked with respondent for several years, described respondent as "exceptionally patient, caring and diplomatic". Mr. Messick wrote that despite the

"regrettable events" that led to the hearing, respondent is a good man "devoted to self-improvement and the service of others."

- In an email dated July 13, 2022, Armando Ramirez, who has worked with respondent his entire career, described respondent as hardworking, caring and honest. Mr. Ramirez went on to state that respondent is not known for losing his temper and any violence by respondent "would be way out of character for him."

- In a letter dated February 9, 2022, Captain David Bowman, who has known respondent for at least 20 years, and worked closely with him, described respondent as a true leader and well liked by his peers. Captain Bowman wrote that they have been "yelled out, assaulted, and put in harms' way" many times, and in every instance, respondent was "cool, calm, and focused….working with me to affect the situation safely and without escalating or enflaming the scene." Captain Bowman pointed out in his letter that he is African American and that race has never been a point of conversation between he and respondent, except when Captain Bowman encountered negative people in public, noting that respondent "was the first person to stand up on my behalf."

- In a letter dated February 10, 2022, retired Captain Gregory C. Hitchcock wrote that he had known respondent for 17 years and had worked together at various times throughout the years. Captain Hitchcock wrote that he was "troubled and very surprised" about the charges brought against respondent, noting it was very out of character for respondent. Captain Hitchcock described respondent as a hard worker, compassionate, patient, and always willing to help.

- In an undated letter, Anthony Duncan, firefighter specialist, noted that he has worked and lived in close quarters at the firehouse with respondent. Mr. Duncan described respondent as a "compassionate well-rounded leader" who "always put his firefighter's safety and needs ahead of his own." Mr. Duncan stated that respondent is selfless, compassionate and someone he would "gladly work for anytime without hesitation because I know and trust his judgment".

- In a letter dated February 8, 2022, Jon Heller wrote that he began working with respondent in 2003 and that they previously worked togethers as partners on the paramedic squad of their fire stations. Mr. Heller described respondent as "low tempered and slow to anger", calm, focused and a hard worker. Mr. Heller described respondent as a "good" captain, which he described to be, among other things, as having "a special ability to remain calm during chaos" at the scene of an incident.

- In an undated letter, retired Captain Robert Shick noted that he was in the fire service for over 30 years and worked with respondent for several years and recommended him for reinstatement. Captain Shick described respondent as selfless, hardworking, and dependable. Captain Shick also noted that respondent is able to manage difficult employees, is "patient but firm", and "never gets loud or angry". Captain Shick stated that respondent "is the kind of captain many firefighters want to work for because he is competent, caring, and is an example of servant leadership."

- In a letter dated May 25, 2022, Retired Assistant Fire Chief Bill Niccum noted that he has known respondent since 2008. Chief Niccum noted that he was aware of respondent's arrest and further wrote that "while I don't condone

Captain Clint's reactions in this unfortunate incident, I deem it as unusual and out of character." Chief Niccum describe respondent as a "model employee", never known to be "disrespectful, rude or racist in his personal or professional roles", and an asset to the fire department.

LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

The Purpose of Disciplinary Proceedings

1. Administrative proceedings to revoke, suspend or impose discipline on a professional license are noncriminal and nonpenal; they are not intended to punish the licensee but rather to protect the public. (*Griffiths v. Superior Court* (2001) 96 Cal.App.4th 757, 768.) The main purpose of license discipline is protection of the public through the prevention of future harm and the rehabilitation of the licensee. (*Id.* at p. 772.)

Burden and Standard of Proof

2. Complainant bears the burden of proof of establishing that the charges in the accusation are true. (Evid. Code § 115.)

3. The standard of proof in an administrative action seeking to suspend or revoke a professional license is "clear and convincing evidence." (*Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Insurance* (1982) 135 Cal.App.3d 853, 856.) Clear and convincing evidence requires a finding of high probability, or evidence so clear as to leave no substantial doubt; it requires sufficiently strong evidence to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind. (*Christian Research Institute v. Alnor* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 71, 84.) In a disciplinary proceeding, the burden of proof is on respondent

to produce positive evidence of rehabilitation. (*Epstein v. California Horse Racing Board* (1963) 222 Cal.App.2d 831, 842-843.)

Applicable Statutory Authority

4. Pursuant to Health & Safety Code section 1798.200, subdivision (b), the authority may deny, suspend, revoke a paramedic license, or place a paramedic license or paramedic license holder on probation for any actions listed in subdivision (c), which provides:

> (c) Any of the following actions shall be considered evidence of a threat to the public health and safety and may result in the denial, suspension, or revocation of a certificate or license issued under this division, or in the placement on probation of a certification holder or licenseholder under this division:
>
> [¶] . . . [¶]
>
> (6) Conviction of any crime which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of prehospital personnel. The record of conviction or a certified copy of the record shall be conclusive evidence of the conviction.
>
> [¶] . . . [¶]
>
> (11) Demonstration of irrational behavior or occurrence of a physical disability to the extent that a reasonable and prudent person would have reasonable cause to believe

that the ability to perform the duties normally expected may be impaired. . . .

Applicable Regulatory Authority

5. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.02, states, in part:

(b) The Authority shall deny/revoke a paramedic license, if any of the following apply to the applicant:

[¶] . . . [¶]

(2) Has been convicted and released from incarceration for said offense during the preceding ten (10) years for any offense punishable as a felony.

[¶] . . . [¶]

(d) Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to convictions that have been pardoned by the governor, and shall only apply to convictions where the applicant/licensee was prosecuted as an adult. Equivalent convictions from other states shall apply to the type of offenses listed in (a) and (b). As used in this section, "felony" or "offense punishable as a felony" refers to an offense for which the law prescribes imprisonment in the state prison as either an alternative or the sole penalty, regardless of the sentence the particular defendant received.

[¶] . . . [¶]

> (g) The Director of the Authority may grant a license to anyone otherwise precluded under subsections (a) and (b) of this section if the Director of the Authority believes that extraordinary circumstances exist to warrant such an exemption. . . .

6. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.03, subdivision (a)[3], provides that a crime is substantially related to the qualifications, functions and/or duties of a paramedic if "to a substantial degree it evidences present or potential unfitness of a paramedic to perform the functions authorized by her/his license in a manner consistent with the public health and safety."

7. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.03, subdivision (b), provides the record of conviction or a certified copy of the record shall be conclusive evidence of such conviction.

Rehabilitation

8. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.04[4] states that when considering denial, placement on probation, suspension, or revocation of a license, EMSA shall consider the following criteria when evaluating rehabilitation: nature and severity of the acts or crimes; evidence of any acts committed subsequent

[3] California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100175 was renumbered to section 100111.03 effective January 1, 2025.

[4] California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100176 was renumbered to section 100111.04 effective January 1, 2025.

to the acts or crimes; time elapsed since the acts or crimes; compliance with criminal parole, probation, restitution, or other sanctions; evidence of expungement, if applicable; and evidence of rehabilitation submitted by the person.

9. EMSA's Recommended Guidelines for Disciplinary Orders and Conditions of Probation (7/26/2008) (guidelines) state the following factors shall be considered when determining the appropriate discipline:

> 1. Nature and severity of the act(s), offense(s), or crime(s) under consideration;
>
> 2. Actual or potential harm to the public;
>
> 3. Actual or potential harm to any patient;
>
> 4. Prior disciplinary record;
>
> 5. Prior warnings on record or prior remediation;
>
> 6. Number and/or variety of current violations;
>
> 7. Aggravating evidence;
>
> 8. Mitigating evidence;
>
> 9. Any discipline imposed by the paramedic's employer for the same occurrence of that conduct;
>
> 10. Rehabilitation evidence;
>
> 11. In the case of a criminal conviction, compliance with terms of the sentence and/or court-ordered probation;

12. Overall criminal record;

13. Time that has elapsed since the act(s) or offense(s) occurred;

14. If applicable, evidence of expungement proceedings pursuant to Penal Code 1203.4.

10. Rehabilitation is a state of mind. A person who has reformed should be rewarded with the opportunity to serve. (*Pacheco v. State Bar* (1987) 43 Cal. 3d 1041, 1058.) Fully acknowledging the wrongfulness of past actions is an essential step towards rehabilitation. (*Seide v. Committee of Bar Examiners* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 933, 940.) The evidentiary significance of misconduct is greatly diminished by the passage of time and by the absence of similar, more recent misconduct. (*Kwasnik v. State Bar* (1990) 50 Cal.3d 1061, 1070.)

Cause Exists to Impose Discipline on Respondent's License

11. Complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that cause exists to impose discipline against respondent's paramedic license pursuant to Health and Safety Code section 1798.200, subdivision (c)(6), as alleged in the first cause for discipline, due to respondent's felony conviction on August 19, 2022, for assault with force likely to result in great bodily injury being substantially related to the qualifications, functions, or duties of a paramedic, as it is evidence of respondent's potential inability to carry out the duties of a paramedic consistent with public health and safety. (California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.03, subdivision (a)).

12. Complainant did not establish by clear and convincing evidence that cause exists to impose discipline against respondent's paramedic license pursuant to

Health and Safety Code section 1798.200, subdivision (c)(11), as alleged in the second cause for discipline. While respondent's behavior underlying his felony conviction for assault likely to result in great bodily injury was irrational, his behavior was not so irrational as to call into question respondent's ability to perform his normal job duties. Guidelines for this cause for discipline provide the recommended discipline as stayed revocation and suspension until physical or mental disability resolved, indicating that a physical or mental disability should be found to exist to find this cause for discipline. No evidence presented at the hearing indicated that respondent suffered from any physical or mental disability.

13. Complainant established by clear and convincing evidence that cause exists to impose discipline against respondent's paramedic license pursuant to California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.02, subdivision (b)(2), as alleged in the third cause for discipline, in that respondent was convicted in the preceding 10 years of violating Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(4), assault with force likely to result in great bodily injury, a felony offense.

Disciplinary Guidelines

14. EMSA developed guidelines to provide consistent and equitable discipline in dealing with violations of Health and Safety Code section 1798.200. EMSA uses the guidelines as a standard in settling disciplinary matters and directs administrative law judges to use them as a guide in fashioning a disciplinary recommendation in a contested matter. Per the guidelines, the recommended discipline should be imposed in the absence of any aggravating or mitigating evidence. However, the administrative law judge may propose any discipline between the minimum discipline and maximum discipline for a particular violation. If recommended discipline is less than the minimum or exceeds the maximum

recommended discipline, a full explanation as to the recommendation shall be provided. Per Health and Safety Code section 1798.211, credit shall be given "for discipline imposed by the employer and for any immediate suspension imposed by the local EMS agency for the same conduct."

15. Pursuant to the guidelines, the conviction of any crime that is substantially related to the qualifications, functions, and duties of a paramedic carries the following level of discipline: the minimum discipline is stayed revocation with one year probation with all standard conditions; the recommended discipline is variable depending on the nature of the crime and terms and conditions; and the maximum discipline is revocation.

16. The guidelines do not provide any recommendations of discipline for violation of California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.02, subdivision (b)(2).

Evaluation of Appropriate Level of Discipline

17. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.02, subdivision (b)(2), requires the revocation of a paramedic license if the licensee has been convicted and released from incarceration for an offense punishable as a felony within the preceding 10 years. Respondent was convicted of a felony less than four years ago.

18. California Code of Regulations, title 22, section 100111.02, subdivision (g), allows an exemption to the requirement of revocation of a licensee if there are extraordinary circumstances existing to warrant such an exemption.

19. The nature and severity of respondent's underlying criminal conduct was serious. Respondent assaulted another individual with force likely to result in great

bodily injury. Respondent caused actual harm to this individual, punching him and causing him to fall to the ground.

20. Respondent has no prior disciplinary record. The criminal conviction given rise to the accusation is his only known conviction. He has no known prior arrest record. He received no prior warnings from EMSA. Since being terminated by the Los Angeles Fire Department in 2023, respondent was hired by Cal Fire. Since being hired by Cal Fire, respondent has worked as a paramedic without incident. There was no evidence presented of any subsequent criminal conduct since the incident in July 2021. Respondent complied with all terms of his criminal probation, and his conviction was dismissed pursuant to Penal Code section 1203.4.

21. Further, per Health and Safety Code section 1798.211, credit shall be given "for discipline imposed by the employer and for any immediate suspension imposed by the local EMS agency for the same conduct." Respondent was ultimately terminated by LAFD as result of the July 3, 2021, incident, and credit is therefore afforded this disciplinary action by his former employer.

22. Respondent's colleagues, neighbors, and family vouched for his dedication to his community and the people under his care, many referencing their knowledge of the criminal charges against him. Respondent has served as an active firefighter for over 20 years, and his superiors have found him to be an asset to his department and his patients. He has taken the initiative to engage in therapy as well.

23. Respondent provided substantial evidence of rehabilitation. However, none of the evidence presented demonstrates extraordinary circumstances warranting an exemption from the mandatory license revocation required California Code of

Regulations, title 22, section 10011.02, subdivision (b). As such, the appropriate level of discipline in this matter is revocation of respondent's license.

ORDER

Paramedic License No. P22097 issued to respondent Adam E. Clint is revoked.

DATE: July 9, 2025

M. C. Hollimon

M. C. Hollimon (Jul 9, 2025 09:12 PDT)

MICHELLE C. HOLLIMON

Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings