



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1373

Issued Date: 05/18/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.140 (2) Bias-Free Policing: Officers Will Not Engage in Bias Based Policing (Policy that was issued August 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Inconclusive)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Inconclusive)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Complainant attempted to file a report with the Named Employee.

## COMPLAINT

The complainant alleges that the Named Employee failed to document an incident on a General Offense (GO) report regarding property destruction and vandalism, and felt that the refusal to take a report was based on her race.

## 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

## ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee refused to take her vandalism report due to racial bias on the part of the Named Employee. The complainant did not cite any specific statements made by the Named Employee or other actions which she believed were indications of bias. However, the complainant told OPA that she believed racial bias was behind the Named Employee's refusal to take a report and his statement that taking a police report about the damage to her property would be a "waste of taxpayer money." The Named Employee retired from SPD after the incident but before OPA had an opportunity to interview him. Since the Named Employee was no longer an employee, any interview with OPA would be voluntary on his part. The Named Employee was contacted by OPA and a request for an interview made. The Named Employee declined to participate in an interview.

## FINDINGS

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

There was not a preponderance of evidence to either support or refute the allegation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Bias-Free Policing: Officers Will Not Engage in Bias Based Policing*.

#### Allegation #2

There was not a preponderance of evidence to either support or refute the allegation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

*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.*