



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1374

Issued Date: 06/08/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 11.050 (11.050-PRO-1) Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property (Policy that was issued October 1, 2014)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 11.050 (11.050-PRO-1) Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property (Policy that was issued October 1, 2014)
OPA Finding	<b>Sustained</b>
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 11.050 (3) Detainee Property: Officers Photograph Detainee Property (Policy that was issued October 1, 2014)
OPA Finding	<b>Allegation Removed</b>
Final Discipline	No Further Discipline Imposed

<b>Named Employee #3</b>	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 11.050 (11.050-PRO-1) Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property (Policy that was issued October 1, 2014)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

Named Employee #1 arrested a juvenile detainee (the subject), Named Employee #2 transported the subject to the Precinct, and Named Employee #3 transported the subject from the Precinct to the subject's home.

### **COMPLAINT**

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, was informed that the subject alleged that cash was missing from her purse when it was returned to her after her release. The complainant then alleged that the Named Employees may have violated SPD Policy 11.050 regarding the proper handling of detainees' property.

### **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. Review of In-Car Videos
4. Interviews of SPD employees

### **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation showed that Named Employee #1 was not the officer responsible for taking the property from the detainee. His only role was to place the detainee's purse inside a large paper bag in order to adequately secure the items inside the purse from being separated from it.

Named Employee #2 was the officer who transported the juvenile detainee from the store where she had been arrested for shoplifting to the Precinct. As part of that process, Named Employee #2 took possession of the detainee's property and inventoried it. The preponderance of the evidence from this investigation showed that Named Employee #2 did not photograph, complete

the "Detainee Property Form," or take any of the other steps required by SPD Policy 11.050-PRO-1.

The second allegation appeared to be redundant with the first in that SPD Policy 11.050-PRO-1, which states "Captures a digital image of the detainee's property and loads the image into DEMS," was addressed in allegation #1. The OPA Director directed that this allegation be removed due to its redundancy.

The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation showed that Named Employee #3 was not the officer responsible for taking the property from the detainee. His only role was to transport the detainee and her property, which was already placed inside a large paper bag.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #1 was not the officer responsible for taking the property from the detainee. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property*.

### **Named Employee #2**

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #2 did not photograph, complete the "Detainee Property Form," or take any of the other steps required by policy. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property*.

Allegation #2

This Allegation was removed.

Discipline Imposed: No Discipline

### **Named Employee #3**

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #3 was not the officer responsible for taking the property from the detainee. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Detainee Property: Securing and Transporting Detainee Property*.

*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.*