



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number 2017OPA-0225

Issued Date: 08/09/2017

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 March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee responded to an incident.

COMPLAINT

While investigating another complaint for professionalism, OPA discovered that the Named Employee may have violated SPD policy on In-Car Video (ICV) System by not recording an incident to which he responded.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Named Employee #1 violated Manual Policy 16.090 by failing to activate his ICV during police activity, namely an incident to which he responded.

The incident in question was a knock and talk at the address of a potential warrant subject. The responding officers, which included Named Employee #1, inadvertently went to the wrong address and, after speaking briefly with the occupant of the residence, left the location. Named Employee #1 stated that, at some point after he spoke with the occupant and left the residence, he looked down at his ICV and noticed that it was not on. Upon realizing that his ICV had not been on as required by policy, Named Employee #1 sent dispatch a message indicating that there was a technical problem with his ICV and sent a subsequent message clearing out the call.

While Named Employee #1 notified dispatch of what he asserted was a technical problem, he did not take any troubleshooting steps, such as notifying a supervisor of this issue or contacting IT as outlined in SPD Policy 16.090-TSK-1. The Manual Policy requires either recording the police activity or taking troubleshooting steps until any potential malfunction is clearly resolved, and Named Employee #1 did neither.

Notably, at the beginning of his shift, Named Employee #1 conducted a system check and the system appeared to be functioning properly. In addition, during the remainder of his shift, Named Employee #1 properly documented three subsequent incidents with his ICV, none of which appeared to have any problems.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that there was a lack of video, lack of compliance with the requirements of SPD Policy 16.090, and evidence that the ICV system was in fact working on the date in question. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

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.