



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0674

Issued Date: 04/15/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (1) Primary Investigation: Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued 05/21/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee responded to a 911 call of a residential burglary. The named employee determined that the suspect gained entry into the residence through an open window after removing a window screen. The named employee took the inventory of missing items from the complainant. The named employee did not see any fingerprints.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the named employee failed to conduct a thorough investigation when the officer did not lift fingerprints from a burglary scene or provide the complainant with a victim follow-up form.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint email
2. Interview of the complainant
3. Review of the 911 call
4. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
5. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence showed that the named employee responded to the call of the residential burglary in the evening after it had recently rained. The named employee stated that he did not see any prints on the inside or outside of the window. The complainant had touched the window showing where the subject had come into the residence. The named employee said that if he had seen visible fingerprints on the inside of the window, he would have thought that they belonged to the complainant. As it had rained, he explained that he would not have been able to lift any prints from the outside of the window. Five days later another officer was able to see visible prints and was able to lift the prints. It was in the daylight hours and it had not recently rained, therefore the window was dry. The named employee failed to give the complainant a victim follow-up form. As he went to retrieve the form, an urgent call had been dispatched over the radio that he responded to.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that it was not unreasonable that the named employee did not attempt to lift fingerprints due to the darkness and the fact that the window was wet. However, the named employee would benefit from further training in fingerprint searches and lifting techniques. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Primary Investigation: Search for Evidence*.

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.