



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0229

Issued Date: 09/11/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VII.6) Professionalism – Prohibitions Concerning Derogatory Language (Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Inconclusive)
Allegation #3	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VII.10) Professionalism – Criticism of Orders and Others (Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Oral Reprimand and Training on Manual Policy Section 5.125

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee while on duty wrote a response on social media and posted additional material.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor on the Department, alleged that the named employee had used derogatory language on social media and posted additional material.

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 employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence showed that the named employee did use derogatory language on social media and posted the additional material. Regardless of duty status, employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers. Words which imply derogatory connotations or manifest contempt or disrespect toward any race, creed, religion, sexual orientation, or national origin shall not be used at any time by employees of the Department. Employees shall not publically criticize or ridicule the Department, its policies, or other employees, other law enforcement agencies or the criminal justice system while on duty or in uniform where such expression undermines the effectiveness of the Department.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employee used language that was derogatory in nature. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *Professionalism – Prohibitions Concerning Derogatory Language*.

Allegation #2

The evidence could not prove or disprove that the named employee intentionally wrote the comment with malice. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

Allegation #3

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employee used language that undermined the Department. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *Professionalism – Criticism of Orders and Others*.

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.