CLOSED CASE SUMMARY



ISSUED DATE: APRIL 17, 2023

FROM: DIRECTOR GINO BETTS **6**

OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2022OPA-0355

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	16.090 In Car and Body Worn Video 5. Employees Recording	Not Sustained - Inconclusive
	Police Activity b. When Employees Record Activity	

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:

It is alleged that Named Employee #1 (NE#1) failed to activate his body-worn video (BWV) equipment as required.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

During its certification review, the Office of Inspector General noted NE#1's BWV was sparse from 03/23/2022 to 06/03/2022 and 07/28/2021 to 01/2022. OPA opened an investigation, reviewing NE#1's BWV, audit logs, and training records. OPA also interviewed NE#1.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

16.090 In Car and Body Worn Video 5. Employees Recording Police Activity b. When Employees Record Activity

It was allegedly that NE#1 failed to activate BWV as required.

When safe and practical, employees will record policy activity, including traffic and *Terry* stops. SPD Policy 16.090-POL-5(b).

Here, at all relevant times, NE#1 worked in the Traffic Unit. From 07/28/2021 to 01/01/2022, OPA compared NE#1's citation issuances with his BWV activations and flagged several occurrences of NE#1 issuing citations without activating BWV.

- 7/30/21
- 8/4/21 (twice)
- 8/18/21
- 8/31/21 (seven times)



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPA CASE NUMBER: 2022OPA-0355

- 9/3/21 (five times)
- 9/8/21 (eight times)
- 9/22/21 (seven times)
- 10/1/21
- 10/20/21
- 10/21/21 (three times)
- 11/22/21 (five times)
- 11/23/21 (nine times)
- 12/1/21 (seven times)
- 12/7/21 (five times)
- 12/8/21 (twice)
- 12/15/21 (three times)

OPA also reviewed NE#1's BWV audit trails, which showed minimal activity and no equipment errors during that period. NE#1's training records showed he received 2017 BWV training, which outlined how to use BWV and the related department policy. However, NE#1's computer-aided dispatch history showed a possible BWV error on 3/23/22. Specifically, it showed 13 BWV activations when NE#1 was only dispatched four times. Further, NE#1 told OPA he received new BWV equipment after a sergeant notified him his equipment displayed an error.¹ Last, another officer's BWV showed NE#1's BWV equipment properly affixed during the 10/20/21 traffic stop. However, OPA could not determine from that footage whether it was activated.

Accordingly, where OPA could not determine whether NE#1 willfully violated policy or experienced faulty equipment, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained - Inconclusive

^{1.}

¹ NE#1 was unable to pinpoint when he was issued new equipment.