



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0230

Issued Date: 10/19/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #4	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employees responded to a 911 call about a stolen laptop.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged the Named Employees used excessive force while arresting him.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Interview of the complainant
3. Review of the complaint memo
4. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
5. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
6. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that Named Employee #1, #2, #3, and #4 slammed his face onto the hood of a police car and that this force was excessive and not proportional. The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation showed that the force used by Named Employee #1, #2, #3, and #4 was not excessive, was proportional and did not involve slamming the complainant's face onto the hood of a police car.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the force used by Named Employee #1 was not excessive, was proportional and did not involve slamming the complainant's face onto the hood of a police car. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized*.

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the force used by Named Employee #2 was not excessive, was proportional and did not involve slamming the complainant's face onto the hood of a police car. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized*.

Named Employee #3

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the force used by Named Employee #3 was not excessive, was proportional and did not involve slamming the complainant's face onto the hood of a police car. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized*.

Named Employee #4

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the force used by Named Employee #4 was not excessive, was proportional and did not involve slamming the complainant's face onto the hood of a police car. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized*.

NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.