

**PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS DIVISION
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 15, 2026

TO: DISTRIBUTION

FROM: CAPTAIN ROBERT OSTERLAND ^{RO}
Professional Standards Division

SUBJECT: SHERIFF'S FINDING

Per Sheriff Gualtieri, Deputy Bryan Beeler, #59216, will receive the following as a result of AI 26-014:

1. A forty (40) hour Suspension to be served on:
September 18, 2026 (12 hours), September 19, 2026 (12 hours), September 20, 2026 (12 hours), and September 23, 2026 (4 hours).
2. Remedial training on law and constitutional law.

DISTRIBUTION:

Sheriff Bob Gualtieri
Chief Deputy Dave Danzig
Assistant Chief Deputy Paul Carey
Assistant Chief Deputy Dennis Komar
Colonel Joe Gerretz
Major Jose Camacho
Major Deanna Carey
Major Greg Danzig
Major Alyson Henry
Major Jon Tobeck
Major Matt Wroe
Director Jennifer Crockett
Director Susan Krause
Director Jason Malpass
Director Kristi Wong
Shannon Lockheart, General Counsel
Payroll
Purchasing-Uniform Supply
Deputy Bryan Beeler

RO/blb

**PINELLAS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE
OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM**

DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2026

TO: DEPUTY BRYAN BEELER, #59216

FROM: SHERIFF BOB GUALTIERI

SUBJECT: CHARGES RE: AI 26-014

An investigation has been conducted by the Administrative Investigations Section, Professional Standards Division, of the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office. As a result of this investigation, the Administrative Review Board has determined you committed the following violation:

On, but not limited to, December 28, 2025, while on duty in Pinellas County, Florida, you violated the Pinellas County Sheriff's Civil Service Act Laws of Florida, 89-404 as amended by Laws of Florida 08-285, Section 6, Subsection 4, by violating the provisions of law or the rules, regulations, and operating procedures of the Office of the Sheriff.

1. You violated Pinellas County Sheriff's Office General Order 3-1.1, Rule and Regulation 5.4, Duties and Responsibilities.

Synopsis: On December 28, 2025, while assisting with a lodging-related dispute, you failed to take prompt and effective action within the scope of your duties. You failed to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation, establish an adequate legal basis for the subject's arrest for obtaining lodging with intent to defraud, intervene when additional investigation was warranted, maintain appropriate supervision of the arrestee, refrain from participating in an unlawful search of the subject's hotel room and property, properly safeguard and document the subject's personal property, appropriately verify and reconcile material substance-testing information, and completely and accurately document your investigative actions.

At approximately 1147 hours, you responded as a backup deputy to a local hotel regarding a complaint involving a guest who refused to leave. Hotel staff advised that the guest's original reservation ended on December 27, 2025, and requested that she be removed from the property. Hotel staff also stated that the guest had another reservation, but the hotel did not accept it. You received a single page of hotel documentation showing a December 27 checkout date, briefly reviewed it, folded it, and placed it in your pocket. You did not obtain identifying or demographic information for the hotel employees, request additional registration or booking records, review payment information, determine why the second reservation was not accepted, verify whether prepaid funds had been returned, or determine whether the applicable statutory requirements for removal had been satisfied. You also failed to document in your supplemental report that hotel staff had provided you with the reservation paperwork upon which you relied. At the time of the

incident, you did not know the specific statutory elements necessary to establish the offense of obtaining lodging with intent to defraud.

The subject invited you and the primary deputy into the hotel room and attempted to locate documentation supporting her claimed extended reservation. She was given just over two minutes to locate the information before the primary deputy initiated an arrest. You did not intervene to slow the investigation or ensure the second reservation, payment information, and applicable statutory requirements were adequately investigated before assisting with the arrest. During the Administrative Review Board (ARB), you acknowledged that you should have asked more questions and agreed that, as a deputy on scene, you had a duty to intervene when an investigation was proceeding in the wrong direction. When asked whether it was your duty to step in under those circumstances, you responded, "It absolutely is."

After the subject was arrested and secured in the rear prisoner compartment of an agency vehicle, you and the primary deputy returned to the hotel room to continue the investigation, conduct presumptive drug testing, and search the subject's property. No deputy remained with the subject, and no third deputy was requested to stand by with her. The subject remained alone in the secured agency vehicle while both deputies were inside the hotel room, with only intermittent checks of the vehicle. During your subject interview, you acknowledged that a deputy should remain nearby and that deputies should consistently check the vehicle to ensure the arrestee is secure.

After returning to the room, you began searching the subject's property. Body-worn-camera footage showed you moving, opening, and emptying belongings before the suspected white powder observed in plain view had been presumptively tested. During the ARB, you acknowledged, "It was a mistake," and agreed that your actions constituted a search.

During the ARB, you acknowledged that the search of the hotel room and property was not justified as a search incident to arrest. Although you characterized your actions as an inventory, the subject's property was not taken into agency custody, no inventory was prepared documenting the property examined or left behind, and the property ultimately remained at the hotel. The ARB determined there was no lawful basis to conduct an inventory under these circumstances, and you agreed that the resulting search was unlawful.

The subject requested that a family member be permitted to retrieve her property. You did not accommodate that request, and you took no action to change the decision. During the ARB, when asked whether you agreed with that decision, you stated, "By my inaction, yes." You further acknowledged that the subject should have been permitted to have someone retrieve her property.

Two samples of white powder were presumptively tested for cocaine. Although you did not visually confirm the test results at the time, you documented in your ACISS Supplement that "both substances were presumptive positive for cocaine." During your July 29, 2026, administrative interview, you reviewed the body-worn-camera footage, observed that one of the test pouches appeared entirely pink, and acknowledged that the pink result indicated a negative test for cocaine. You further acknowledged that you did not visually observe the result of the second presumptive test at the scene before documenting both substances as positive.

During the search of the hotel room, a bag containing sixty (60) pink, cake-shaped pills was located. You tested one pill with an agency-issued presumptive substance-identification device. The device failed two consecutive self-checks and subsequently returned a Clear/Dextrose result. You communicated the dextrose result and advised that the substance should be submitted to the laboratory for additional testing.

Later that same day, you learned that a separate field test of the pills reportedly produced a positive result for MDMA. Despite knowing that this result conflicted with the Clear/Dextrose result you personally obtained, you did not reconcile, further investigate, or document the conflicting test results in your supplemental report.

You completed your supplemental report without first reviewing the primary report. Your report omitted the testing of the pills entirely and did not document the failed self-checks, the Clear/Dextrose result, or the later conflicting MDMA result. During the ARB, when asked why the testing information was omitted, you stated, "I don't have a good answer." You acknowledged that your report should have included additional information and that the investigation and documentation were not complete and thorough.

On February 18, 2026, the Pinellas County Forensic Laboratory reported that the sixty (60) submitted pills and the submitted white powder contained no controlled substances.

During the ARB, you acknowledged that, although you were serving as the backup deputy, you shared responsibility for the investigation. You admitted that you should have asked more questions during the initial contact with hotel staff, had a duty to interject if the investigation was proceeding in the wrong direction, could have taken steps to slow or stop aspects of the investigation, and that your documentation could have been better. You ultimately acknowledged that you bore some responsibility for the deficiencies discussed during the ARB.

The Administrative Review Board determined that you committed the violation.

Your failure to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation, establish an adequate legal basis for the subject's arrest, intervene when additional investigation was warranted, maintain appropriate supervision of the arrestee, refrain from participating in an unlawful search of the subject's hotel room and property, properly safeguard and document the subject's personal property, appropriately verify and reconcile material substance-testing information, and completely and accurately document your investigative actions violated General Order 3-1.1, Rule and Regulation 5.4, Duties and Responsibilities.

Disciplinary Points and Recommended Discipline Range:

You were found to be in violation of one (1) Level Five Rule and Regulation violation totaling fifty (50) points. These points, which were affected by no modified points from previous discipline, resulted in fifty (50) progressive discipline points. At this point level, the recommended discipline range is from a forty (40) hour Suspension to termination.

Disciplinary action shall be consistent with progressive discipline, for cause, in accordance with the provisions of the Pinellas County Civil Service Act.



MAJOR ALYSON HENRY
PATROL OPERATIONS BUREAU
FOR BOB GUALTIERI, SHERIFF

I have received a copy:

Date 9-15-26

Time 1009



Member's Signature

BG:PEH:RO