



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: MARCH 24, 2020

CASE NUMBER: 2020OPA-0123

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	11.050 - Detainee Property 1. Officers Secure Detainee Property	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 Subject's ring and bracelet were taken from him after his arrest by an unknown SPD employee and were then misappropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the review and approval of the Office of Inspector General for Public Safety, believed that it could reach and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation and without interviewing the Named Employee. As such, the Named Employee was not interviewed as part of this case.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegations #1

11.050 - Detainee Property 1. Officers Secure Detainee Property

The Complainant initiated this OPA investigation on behalf of the Subject. She alleged that, after the Subject was arrested by SPD officers, a bracelet and a ring in his possession were taken from him and then misappropriated. OPA contacted the Complainant in order to interview her. At that time, the Complainant told OPA that the Subject believed that King County Jail (KCJ) staff was responsible for the missing bracelet and ring.

OPA reviewed the underlying documentation concerning the Subject's arrest, as well as the video of his time in custody. OPA learned that there was probable cause to arrest the Subject for robbery. By viewing Body Worn Video (BWV) recorded at the time of arrest, OPA determined that, while the Subject was wearing a ring similar to that described by the Complainant, he was not in possession of a bracelet. OPA further determined that the ring remained on the Subject's finger for the entire time that he was in SPD custody.

OPA again spoke with the Complainant and informed her of what the BWV showed. At that time, the Complainant disclosed that the Subject told her that a female KCJ employee took off his ring and commented on the inscription on it. This provided further evidence that the ring, if misappropriated, was taken by KCJ staff.



OPA spoke with a KCJ Sergeant who watched the video of the Subject's intake into the jail. The KCJ Sergeant stated that, while the video was grainy and somewhat unclear, it did show a KCJ employee manipulating the Subject's finger, which could be consistent with the removal of the ring. The KCJ Sergeant further stated that it was normal procedure to remove all clothing and jewelry before providing detainees with jail attire. Lastly, OPA reviewed the KCJ records of the property returned to the Complainant. While it did not itemize each individual item, the description read: "Sealed bag – May include wallet, keys, jewelry, and small items.

Based on the totality of the evidence gathered and reviewed during OPA's investigation, it is conclusively established that no SPD officers misappropriated any of the Subject's possessions. While it is certainly unfortunate that this occurred, it seems that the likely culprit is employed by KCJ, not SPD. Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

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