



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0709

Issued Date: 12/23/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (1) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued 01/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.140 (2) Bias-Free Policing: Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing (Policy that was issued 01/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The named employee was dispatched to a suspicious person call. The female caller to 911, the complainant, stated that she had been assaulted by two other females. The complainant had flagged down an AMR ambulance and was receiving treatment when the named employees arrived. The named employee spoke with the other females. The named employee determined that no robbery had occurred.

## **COMPLAINT**

The complainant alleged that the named employee was not accurate in completing his report of the incident. It is further alleged that the named employee was biased in his investigation because of her race by failing to arrest the individual who assaulted her and he hindered her ability to obtain emergent medical care for her injury.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Interview of the complainant
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Review of In-Car Video (ICV)
4. Interview of SPD employees

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The investigation identified that the interaction with the complainant and others at the scene was documented by In-Car Video (ICV). The named employee conducted a primary investigation and determined that no crime had occurred. The named employee determined that the dispute over a cell phone as collateral for a monetary loan was civil in nature and did not collect the phone in question from the other party. The named employee did not arrest the other individual because he determined that no crime had occurred. The documentation clearly shows that the complainant received treatment at the scene and was transported to a hospital for additional treatment.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

The evidence supports that the named employee conducted a proper investigation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence*.

#### Allegation #2

The evidence does not support the allegations of bias as raised by the complainant against the named employee. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Bias-Free Policing: Officers Will Not Engage in Bias-Based Policing*.

*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.*