



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JANUARY 30, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2019OPA-0719

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

| Allegation(s): | | Director's Findings |
|----------------|--|---------------------------|
| # 1 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties 5.001-POL | Not Sustained (Unfounded) |

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections are written in the first person.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Complainant alleged that the Named Employee was unprofessional towards her during a telephone call.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegations #1

5.001 - Standards and Duties 10. Employees Will Strive to Be Professional

The Complainant alleged to OPA that, when she called 911 and spoke with Named Employee #1 (NE#1), she was treated unprofessionally. Specifically, the Complainant stated that she called about a suspicious person trying to break into an apartment building across the street from her. She recounted that NE#1, the dispatcher who took the 911 call, did not believe her, treated her rudely and unprofessionally, and used a rude tone. This OPA investigation ensued.

As part of its investigation, OPA listened to the recording of the phone call between the Complainant and NE#1. During that call, the Complainant reported seeing a man who was potentially homeless and who had just exited an apartment complex. She asserted that the man was trying to get into apartments. NE#1 asked whether the Complainant actually saw the man enter an apartment building or access a window. The Complainant said no. In response to NE#1's questions, the Complainant stated that the man had walked away and appeared to be "camped out on the corner." NE#1 asked the Complainant why she believed the male was trying to break into buildings if he was "sitting down" and "possibly minding his own business now." NE#1 explained that she was trying to understand what crime was being committed. In response, the Complainant hung up the phone. NE#1 tried to call the Complainant back but she did not respond. NE#1 left a message for her.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10 requires that SPD employees "strive to be professional at all times." The policy further instructs that "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers." (SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10.) The policy further states the following: "Any time employees represent the Department or identify themselves as police officers or Department employees, they will not use profanity directed as an insult or any language that is derogatory, contemptuous, or disrespectful toward any person." (*Id.*)



Based on OPA's review of the audio recording of the call, there is no evidence supporting the Complainant's allegation of that NE#1 was dismissive, rude, or lacked professionalism. To the contrary, the recording indicated that NE#1 was calm and patient during the call and treated the Complainant respectfully. While NE#1 questioned the Complainant about she was reporting, this was not unprofessional. Indeed, it is a requirement of NE#1's job to do exactly that. As such, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained (Unfounded)**