



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2017-0167

Issued Date: 06/08/2017

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	<b>Sustained</b>
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (5) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Log in and Perform a System Check (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	<b>Sustained</b>
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Named Employee was dispatched to a call where he assumed command as Incident Commander.

#### **COMPLAINT**

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the Named Employee responded to an incident and took command, but did not activate In-Car Video (ICV). During the complaint intake, OPA observed that the Named Employee regularly did not log into the ICV system at the beginning of his shift or complete a required function check.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee was dispatched to a call, responded, and arrived. The evidence also showed that the Named Employee did not activate his ICV before he arrived on-scene or at any time while he was there engaged in police activity. As a result, he did not record his police activity as required by SPD Policy 16.090(6). On the day of the incident, the Named Employee told the Duty Captain that he (the Named Employee) did not have ICV because he had not logged into the ICV system before he was dispatched and did not have time to do so before responding to the incident to take over as Incident Commander. The Named Employee told OPA he thought he was not required to activate his ICV because he was Incident Commander and engaged in tactical decisions. The Named Employee acknowledged to OPA that he had since reviewed the ICV policy and realized no such exemption was in place.

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee did not log in and perform a systems check of the ICV system as required by this policy. The OPA investigation also showed a pattern of the Named Employee not logging into the ICV system and conducting a system check on some of the days when he worked.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee did not activate his ICV before he arrived on-scene or at any time while he was there engaged in police activity. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

#### Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee did not log in and perform a systems check of the ICV system as required by this policy. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Log in and Perform a System Check*.

Discipline Imposed: Written Reprimand

*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.*