



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1309

Issued Date: 03/18/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.100 (III.A.1.c) Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Sergeant Responsibilities (Policy that was issued 07/20/2010)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.130-TSK-1 (15.130-PRO-3) Missing Person: Officer Investigating a Missing Child Incident (Policy that was issued 01/15/2014)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee responded to an ongoing missing child investigation as a supervisor.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the named employee did not completely perform his duties when conducting a missing child investigation.

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 policy regarding Patrol Sergeant Responsibilities indicates that a patrol sergeant is required to directly supervise “any incident involving multiple units.” This particular incident involved only one patrol officer and the evidence supported the conclusion that the named employee provided direct supervision to the assigned patrol officer. The policy regarding investigation of a missing child incident provides a list of specific actions to be taken and decisions to be made by an officer assigned to a report of a missing child. At the request of the primary officer, the named employee responded and assumed command of the missing child investigation. The named employee, therefore, was responsible to make certain the requirements of the policy were followed. The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation supported the conclusion that the named employee should have notified the on-duty lieutenant and informed him that “A Child Is Missing Alert” (ACIM) was needed. The named employee did not do this. The named employee did take the time to look up the policy concerning missing persons in order to make certain he took the required action and handled the call appropriately. It appears his conclusion that the criteria for an Amber Alert had not been met may have diverted his attention away from the requirement to contact a lieutenant and make an ACIM notification. This failure on the part of the named employee was not deliberate. Therefore, a training referral was considered to be appropriate.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supported that the named employee provided direct supervision to the assigned patrol officer. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Operations Bureau Individual Responsibilities: Patrol Sergeant Responsibilities*.

Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the named employee should be provided training and counseling on this policy. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Missing Person: Officer Investigating a Missing Child Incident*.

Required Training: The named employee should receive specific training from his supervisor in the obligations of a sergeant under Policy 15.130, especially in cases involving missing children. In particular, the named employee should be shown the benefits of involving a lieutenant or other command level personnel, along with any appropriate follow up unit or specialist resources, in such cases or when he is uncertain.

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.