



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0283

Issued Date: 09/26/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.1800 (1) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (5) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report – All reports must be complete, thorough and accurate (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.1800 (1) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (5) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report – All reports must be complete, thorough and accurate (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)

OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employees responded to a disturbance call.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged the Named Employees conducted an incomplete investigation and/or did not document all their actions and/or discoveries in the General Offense Report.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation shows that Named Employee #2, assisted by Named Employee #1 who was Named Employee #2’s Field Training Officer, performed an adequate search of the subject’s apartment for evidence.

Named Employee #1 was Field Training Officer (FTO) for Named Employee #2 on the day of this incident. Named Employee #2 was assigned the responsibility of writing the General Offense Report (GOR) for the incident. However, as Field Training Officer for Named Employee #2, Named Employee #1 had a duty to make certain Named Employee #2’s GOR was “complete, thorough and accurate” as required by policy. The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation shows that the GOR written by Named Employee #2 was incomplete. For example, the GOR did not include details concerning the search for evidence, specific items and details observed, and the fact that the door to the apartment was deadbolt locked from inside with no sign of forced entry anywhere.

Named Employee #2 was assigned the responsibility of writing the General Offense Report (GOR) for the incident. The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation shows that the GOR written by Named Employee #2 was incomplete. For example, the GOR did not include details concerning the search for evidence, specific items and details observed, and the fact that the door to the apartment was deadbolt locked from inside with no sign of forced entry anywhere. It is recognized that Named Employee #2 was a student officer at the time of this incident and still in Phase 2 of his field training. As such, it is expected that there may have been performance gaps in his work as a student officer. Nonetheless, it is important that Named Employee #2 now clearly understand the importance of writing GO Reports that are complete, thorough and accurate.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that Named Employee #1 performed an adequate search of the subject's apartment for evidence. 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 supports Named Employee #1 would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report – All reports must be complete, thorough and accurate*.

Required Training: Named Employee #1's supervisor, working with the Field Training Coordinator for SPD, should provide Named Employee #1 with guidance and direction regarding his role as an FTO in reviewing the work of student officers assigned to him and teaching them to produce quality work that meets standards.

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that Named Employee #2 with the assistance of Named Employee #1 performed an adequate search of the subject's apartment for evidence. 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 supports Named Employee #2 would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report – All reports must be complete, thorough and accurate.*

Required Training: Named Employee #2 should receive specific coaching and counseling from his supervisor concerning the importance of writing GO Reports that thoroughly and accurately document his actions, observations and evidence gathered in connection with an incident or investigation.

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.