



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1832

Issued Date: 06/29/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.260 (2) Collision Investigations: Officers Take Collision Reports For All Mandatory Reportable Collisions (Policy that was issued 05/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee attempted to make contact with 911 callers regarding a DUI collision.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged he called 911 to report a DUI collision and the police did not come for over 12 hours. OPA added an additional allegation that the Named Employee deactivated her In-Car Video (ICV) before leaving the scene and did not conduct an investigation.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint email
2. Interview of the complainant

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The preponderance of the evidence in this OPA investigation showed that the Named Employee stopped recording before she got out of her car and walked to the house of one of the reporting parties for this call in an attempt to make contact. Clearly this attempt and any subsequent contact should have been recorded as part of the Named Employee's investigation into the reported hit and run. During her OPA interview, the Named Employee offered no explanation for the fact she ended the recording before she completed her investigation. The Named Employee was aware that more than one person called 911 hours before she arrived on scene. They had reported a driver striking parked cars and then driving away. By the time the Named Employee was dispatched and arrived on scene, no one was out on the street, the suspect vehicle had reportedly been towed away by someone associated with the suspect driver, and no damage to parked cars was seen. The Named Employee knocked on the door of one of the callers and got no answer. By that time it was late at night. The name of another caller, the owner of one of the parked cars struck, was also in the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) Incident History, but the Named Employee did not attempt contact saying during her OPA interview that she had not seen this information the night of the incident. However, the Named Employee did have enough information to begin the collision report. She had the tag number of the suspect vehicle and contact information of potential victims and witnesses.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that the Named Employee violated the policy. Therefore a **Sustained** was issued for *In Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

Allegation #2

The evidence supports that the Named Employee violated the policy. Therefore a **Sustained** was issued for *Collision Investigations: Officers Take Collision Reports For All Mandatory Reportable Collisions*.

Discipline imposed: Written Reprimand

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.