



## CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JANUARY 29, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2019OPA-0820

### Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

**Named Employee #1**

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional	Sustained Rapid Adjudication

**Imposed Discipline**

Oral Reprimand
----------------

***This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.***

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) was unprofessional towards him. Specifically, the Complainant alleged that NE#1 made the following inappropriate statement to him: “You know what? You can take your East Coast attitude and go back to the fuckin’ East Coast, or we can help you out?” The Body Worn Video (BWV) for this incident confirmed that NE#1 made the comment attributed to her.

The Complainant further alleged that another officer inaccurately reported a statement that the Complainant made and, by doing so, put words in the Complainant's mouth.

### ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

NE#1 informed OPA she wished to process her case with Rapid Adjudication (RA). RA is provided for in the Seattle Police Officers’ Guild’s collective bargaining agreement (CBA) with the City. It allows for employees to recognize that their conduct was inconsistent with Department policies and standards, and to accept discipline for the policy violation rather than undergoing a full OPA investigation.

After reviewing the complaint and completing its intake investigation, OPA determined this case could be appropriate for resolution by RA. However, before proceeding with its recommendation, OPA sought the Office of Inspector General’s (OIG) input. The OIG concurred with the OPA’s determination. Consistent with the procedure in the CBA, OPA forwarded to the Chief of Police its recommended disposition and proposed discipline in the form of an oral reprimand. The Chief of Police concurred with OPA’s recommended findings and proposed discipline. NE#1 also agreed to the discipline and, in doing so, stipulated that the finding and discipline were final and could not be appealed or otherwise later disputed.

OPA evaluated the Complainant’s allegation against NE#2 during its intake investigation. Though the Complainant believed that his statement was inaccurately documented, OPA found that the manner in which the statement was recorded was only slightly different. OPA also discovered that NE#2 did not watch BWV prior to writing the report. As such, OPA believed that this allegation was better handled via a Supervisor Action and it was not subject to a full investigation.



**CONCLUSION:**

**Named Employee #1 - Allegations #1**

***5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Shall Strive to be Professional***

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees “strive to be professional at all times.” The policy further instructs that “employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers.” (SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.)

The statement made by NE#1 towards the Complainant, which is detailed above, was unprofessional in violation of SPD policy. By requesting and then agreeing to proceed with RA, NE#1 recognized that her actions violated the Department’s professionalism policy. OPA appreciates and commends NE#1 for taking accountability for this incident and for utilizing RA. OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained – Rapid Adjudication. This finding is both final and binding.

Recommended Finding: **Rapid Adjudication - Sustained**