



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0570

Issued Date: 02/03/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (10) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Be Truthful and Complete In All Communication (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (2) Standards and Duties: Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (10) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Be Truthful and Complete In All Communication (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (2) Standards and Duties: Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)

OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Named Employees reviewed traffic safety camera videos.

### **COMPLAINT**

The complainant alleged that the Named Employees were potentially in violation of 5.001(2) Violation of Law - Perjury and 5.001 (10) Truthfulness. The Named Employees reviewed traffic safety camera videos, watched videos to determine that the traffic signs installed on each side of the school speed zone were flashing and ascertained the vehicle license plates to determine the registered owner to whom the infraction was issued. The complainant alleged that the Named Employees signed statements 'under penalty of perjury' that were false when they signed infractions that appear not to have occurred, as traffic lights were not operating properly.

### **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
2. Interviews of SPD employees

### **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation supported the conclusion that Named Employees #1 and #2 reasonably relied on information provided to them by the vendor operating the school zone speed camera system when they signed the statements for issuance of citations. As a result, the OPA Director concluded that Named Employees #1 and #2 did not knowingly provide false or incomplete information, and did not commit perjury when they signed these statements.

### **FINDINGS**

#### **Named Employees #1 and #2**

##### **Allegation #1**

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employees #1 and #2 did not knowingly provide false or incomplete information. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Be Truthful and Complete In All Communication.*

Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employees #1 and #2 did not commit perjury when they signed the infractions. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy*.

*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.*