



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0371

Issued Date: 04/15/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VI.A)(1) Integrity: Conflicts of Interest(Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VI.A)(3) Integrity: Misuse of Authority (Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee developed a technique while he had his own consulting company in 2010 and allowed the Seattle Police Department to use the information for strictly internal purposes only. The technique was placed into a Seattle Police Department Education and Training Section lesson plan that was subsequently shared with other agencies. The named employee asserted a copyright claim on the information.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the department, alleged that the named employee possibly created a conflict of interest by asserting a copyright claim on information in a Seattle Police Department Education and Training Section lesson plan that may have been completed on Department time for personal benefit.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The named employee did have his own business in 2010 and he did develop the technique for his business. While the named employee allowed his intellectual property to be used for internal Department purposes only, he objected to its use in a lesson plan that had been shared with other agencies. The named employee did not make a claim for financial benefit from the Department regarding the use of the intellectual property. It appears to be a simple misunderstanding between the named employee and the Department and not one of misconduct.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the named employee developed the intellectual property when he started his business in 2010. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Integrity: Conflicts of Interest*.

Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the named employee did not make a claim for financial benefit from the Seattle Police Department regarding the use of intellectual property. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Integrity: Misuse of Authority*.

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.