



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number 2017OPA-0258

Issued Date: 08/07/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (8) In-Car Video System: Once Recording Has Begun, Employees Shall Not Stop Recording Until the Event Has Concluded (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	Oral Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee was dispatched to an occupied stolen vehicle call.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged the Named Employee for unknown reason/s turned off his In-Car Video (ICV) system while still en-route to the listed incident. The Named Employee activated his ICV system again, after he had already arrived at the listed incident.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence from the OPA investigation showed that the Named Employee was operating an ICV-equipped police car and was dispatched to a report of an occupied stolen vehicle. Furthermore, the evidence showed that the ICV system was not recording when the Named Employee arrived at the location to which he was dispatched. The Named Employee told OPA that the ICV system began recording when he (the Named Employee) activated the overhead emergency lights on his car while he was on his way to the location. The Named Employee said he turned off the ICV because he thought he had some distance to go before arriving at the location. However, the Named Employee was closer than he thought and a short distance later he got into a collision trying to back away from the stolen car. This, according to the Named Employee, distracted him and it was a few minutes before he remembered to activate his ICV. Given the requirements of the policy, the Named Employee failed to begin recording before his arrival at the scene of an incident to which he had been dispatched.

The Named Employee did not manually begin his ICV the first time related to this call. The ICV was automatically activated by his light bar while the Named Employee was still on his way to the call. Since the Named Employee was not yet required to have his ICV recording at the time he turned it off while still en-route, the OPA Director did not believe he violated this policy.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee failed to begin recording before his arrival at the scene of an incident to which he had been dispatched. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

Discipline imposed: Oral Reprimand

Allegation #2

The OPA Investigation found no evidence of the allegation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *In-Car Video System: Once Recording Has Begun, Employees Shall Not Stop Recording Until the Event Has Concluded*.

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.