



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0821

Issued Date: 12/22/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual 5.002 (4) Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Complaints of Possible Misconduct: Retaliation is Prohibited (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)</u>
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual 5.002 (4) Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Complaints of Possible Misconduct: Retaliation is Prohibited (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)</u>
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employees, a student officer and a Field Training Officer (FTO), responded to a report of a vehicle colliding with a tree. The complainant indicated that another vehicle had cut her off and caused the accident. The other driver reported that he had made a lane change after he looked into his rear view mirror and noted that the lane was clear and did not see the complainant's vehicle until it had collided into the tree. Neither driver was cited. The complainant attempted to obtain a copy of the collision report, but was unable to do so and

contacted OPA for assistance. As the report had been completed by the student office, it had been held up in the electronic reporting system and needed some corrections. Eventually the report was approved and the complainant was able to obtain a copy of it.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the accident report is inaccurate. The collision investigation found her to be at fault, and she does not agree with these findings. She believes that “this version of the police report is inaccurate, and has been written on a bias against me due to the complaint I made to your office.”

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint email
2. Review of email correspondence with the complainant
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Review of In-Car Videos
5. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

OPA reviewed all of the available information related to the investigation and documentation of the collision. The evidence showed that the named employees investigated a vehicle collision involving the complainant and that named employee #1 completed a report which, after getting lost in the approval process, was finally approved by her supervisor. The evidence showed that named employee #1 made no changes to the report after being notified of the complaint.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1 and #2

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employees were not biased when they wrote the collision report nor did they change the report as a result of the complaint made to OPA. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Responsibilities of Employees Concerning Complaints of Possible Misconduct: Retaliation is Prohibited*.

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.