



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0357

Issued Date: 10/04/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 6.181 (1) Performing Inventory Searches: Inventory Searches Serve an Administrative Function (Policy that was issued 10/17/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee transported the complainant to the King County Jail.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged the Named Employee failed to safeguard detainee property. The complainant was then missing money that was documented to be in his property when he was arrested.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Review of In-Car Videos
3. Review of Holding Cell video
4. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
5. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee failed to safeguard the personal property of a subject the Named Employee transported to the King County Jail (KCJ). The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation shows that the Named Employee took custody of a bag containing personal property, including \$50.02 in cash, belonging to the subject. This happened at the precinct prior to the transport of the subject to the KCJ. The Named Employee also received paperwork filled out by the arresting officer listing \$50.02 as part of the subject's personal property. However, there was no verbal or personal exchange of information between the arresting officer and the Named Employee in which the Named Employee was specifically told that the subject's personal property included \$50.02 in cash. It seems most likely the Named Employee either did not read the paperwork closely or did not notice the fact that cash was listed among the items of personal property. The Named Employee transported the bag containing the cash and other personal items, along with the subject, to the KCJ. There the Named Employee turned the bag over to KCJ staff. The Named Employee did not verbally advise the KCJ staff of the presence of cash in the bag, nor did he take the cash to the KCJ cashier as is the normal procedure. There is no evidence to suggest the Named Employee took the cash. It is more likely than not the money was in the property bag when the Named Employee delivered it to the staff at KCJ. This investigation was unable to determine what happened to the cash after the Named Employee gave the bag to the KCJ staff. Had the Named Employee taken the time to review the property paperwork completed by the arresting officer and noted the presence of money, it is likely the Named Employee would have told the KCJ staff about the money and turned it over to the cashier according to the usual procedure. The Named Employee told OPA he has learned from this experience and changed his practice. He now circles the place on the property sheet where money is listed. This reminds him to check for any money and to notify the KCJ staff. It is good to see an officer apply the lessons of such an experience.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence shows that the Named Employee has learned from this experience and changed his practice on handling detainee property. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Performing Inventory Searches: Inventory Searches Serve an Administrative Function*.

Required Training: The lessons learned from this experience and applied by the Named Employee should be the subject of a supportive and affirming conversation between the Named Employee and his supervisor.

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.