



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1334

Issued Date: 05/08/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee was on the scene of an Arson Investigation.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, the OPA, alleged the Named Employee may have violated SPD policy when he turned off his In-Car Video (ICV) prior to leaving the scene of an investigation.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence from this investigation showed that the Named Employee was completely consistent with SPD Policy 16.090(8) when he turned off his ICV. As the Named Employee stated in his OPA interview, he had met all three conditions for when an event has been concluded. In fact, it appeared the Named Employee was being careful to not turn the ICV off too early. He is to be commended for his commitment to following the policy so scrupulously. What caused a problem for the Named Employee was that he remained in the vicinity of the incident after he turned off his ICV, drove back to the scene of the incident to hand an officer a piece of paper with witness information on it, and then logged out of the call on Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD). The Named Employee told OPA he remained in the area and logged to the call so he could be close by and available should his assistance be needed. The Named Employee did not want to go in-service because he might then be dispatched to another call and not be available nearby. As to returning to the scene to hand the officer the piece of paper, the Named Employee told OPA he specifically did not do anything else at the scene or speak to anyone about the incident. He just handed over the piece of paper. The Named Employee would be well-advised to keep his ICV on when he stays near the scene of an incident in which he was involved and to which he is still logged in CAD. Furthermore, when he was asked to drive back to the scene to give the other officer the witness information written on a piece of paper, the Named Employee could be seen as being back involved in the incident and required to have his ICV activated.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

Required Training: The Named Employee's supervisor should meet with the Named Employee and provide him with guidance and direction concerning their expectations regarding the ICV-related issues raised in this incident.

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.