



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0155

Issued Date: 02/02/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (2) Employees Must Adhere to Laws and Department Policy (Policy that was issued 07/16/2014)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Professionalism (Policy that was issued 07/16/2014)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee was involved in an on-duty collision.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the named employee did not have a valid driver's license at the time he was involved in an on-duty collision.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence showed that the named employee was involved in a non-injury traffic collision, on-duty, while driving a Seattle Police Department vehicle. During the administrative employee collision investigation, the named employee's driving status was determined to be invalid. The named employee was placed on suspension by his supervisor. This case was sent to the City Attorney's Office for criminal review. They declined to file criminal charges, citing office policy that charges are not filed if there were no prior reports since 2010 for this type of invalid license. The named employee never intended to have his license suspended for an off-duty speeding violation and had assumed that there had been a court delay in sending him a notice to appear. He stated that he did not receive the notice that his license had been suspended for failure to respond to his off-duty speeding violation. The named employee took immediate steps to get his license re-instated. Department of Licensing records show that the license was re-instated the day after the accident occurred.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the named employee did not have a valid driver's license on the day of the on-duty accident. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *Employees Must Adhere to Laws and Department Policy*.

Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the named employee corrected the suspended license issue as soon as it was brought to his attention. 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.