



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0700

Issued Date: 05/27/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.002 (4) Responsibilities of Employees concerning complaints of possible misconduct: Retaliation is prohibited (Policy that was issued 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Professionalism (Policy that was issued 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.002 (4) Responsibilities of Employees concerning complaints of possible misconduct: Retaliation is prohibited (Policy that was issued 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant reported that a Seattle Police Department Parking Enforcement Officer (PEO) came to his door and spoke to him about vehicles belonging to the complainant that may have been in violation of the ordinance limiting street parking to 72 hours. The complainant contacted the Parking Enforcement Office to complain about this, stating it was unusual for a PEO to come to his door. About a week later, two of the complainant's vehicles were issued parking citations by named employee #1. The complainant believed that the citations were in response to his previous complaint. The complainant went to a Parking Enforcement substation and contacted named employee #2 about the situation.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that named employee #1 issued citations in retaliation for his previous complaint about a PEO coming to his door about his vehicles. The complainant further alleged that named employee #2 was unprofessional and combative when he spoke to him at the substation. The complainant believes that he is being unfairly harassed and targeted by Parking Enforcement.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint email
2. Interview of the complainant
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

There is no evidence that named employee #1 or #3 knew of the complainant's previous contact with the Parking Enforcement Office, or that they knew that the cited cars belonged to the complainant. Named employee #2 was observed by a witness explaining to the complainant that there was no need to issue a warning before a 72 hour citation could be issued. The complainant appeared to be very upset and named employee #2 explained that the complainant could contest the tickets.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1 and #3

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employees did not know who the cars belonged to when the citations were issued. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Responsibilities of Employees concerning complaints of possible misconduct: Retaliation is prohibited.*

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employee behaved in a professional manner as observed by a witness. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Professionalism.*

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.