



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1888

Issued Date: 07/06/2016

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 02/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (5) In Car Video System: Employees Will Log In and Perform a Systems Check (Policy that was issued 02/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee responded as a backing officer to an on-view Fraud call being handled by another officer.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the Named Employee did not activate In-Car Video (ICV) on a call. OPA added the additional violation of failing to conduct an ICV System Check.

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. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The Named Employee responded as a backing officer to an on-view Fraud call being handled by another officer. SPD Policy § 16.090(6) requires uniformed officers in In-Car Video (ICV) equipped cars to activate the ICV and record police activity. The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation shows that the Named Employee failed to activate his ICV and audio/video record at any time while he was responding to or at the scene of the reported criminal activity. The Named Employee told OPA he did not know why he failed to activate the ICV and must have forgotten. There were no known mechanical or other reasons why the Named Employee was unable to activate the ICV in connection with this incident.

The Named Employee performed a systems check of his ICV system on the date of the incident. SPD Policy § 16.090(5) requires uniformed officers in ICV equipped cars to conduct a systems check, including recording themselves in front of the car and then checking the recording to ensure both the video and audio recording functions are working properly. The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation shows that the Named Employee properly logged in to the ICV system and then conducted the check in front of the car. However, the evidence shows the Named Employee did not play back the recording to ensure both the video and audio recording functions were working properly. The Named Employee told OPA he did not know policy required him to play back the recording.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that Named Employee #1 violated the policy. Therefore **Sustained** was issued for *In Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

Allegation #2

The evidence supports that Named Employee #1 violated the policy. Therefore **Sustained** was issued for *In Car Video System: Employees Will Log In and Perform a Systems Check*.

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.