



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0604

Issued Date: 11/1/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued September 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employees responded to an incident involving a theft in a grocery store.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the department, alleged that the Named Employees may have used excessive force during the arrest of a subject.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Review of SPD officer statements

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that the Named Employees used excessive force while arresting the subject. The subject was identified as a shoplift subject by Loss Prevention officers at a grocery store. Officers attempted to make contact but the subject ran from the scene. Multiple officers responded to the incident. The subject was located by the Named Employees. The subject stated that he complied with their orders and was willing to submit to handcuffing. He alleged that the Named Employees threw him to the ground for no reason causing injury to his knees. The incident was captured on ICV. The Named Employees could be heard talking professionally to the subject ordering him to the ground. They took control of the subject's arms and ordered him to the ground. The subject initially appeared to comply by going to his knees but then resisted going onto his stomach. He was taken to the ground and placed in handcuffs. When the Named Employees got him to his feet he complained of injuries to his knees. He had one abrasion on each knee that was treated. A preponderance of the evidence supported the conclusion that the tactics used by the Named Employees were consistent with training and SPD policy. The injuries sustained by the subject were a result of his resistance to the Named Employees attempting to handcuff him.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1 and #2

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence supported the conclusion that the tactics used by the Named Employees were consistent with training and SPD policy. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Using Force: Use of Force: When Authorized*.

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.