



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: JUNE 11, 2024

FROM: DEPUTY DIRECTOR BONNIE GLENN ON BEHALF OF DIRECTOR GINO BETTS JR.,
OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0535

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication	Not Sustained - Unfounded (Expedited)

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 Named Employee #1 (NE#1) attempted to conceal a vehicular collision she was involved in.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was approved for Expedited Investigation. That means OPA, with the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) agreement, believed it could issue a recommended finding based solely on its intake investigation without interviewing the named employee. As such, OPA did not interview the named employee in this case.

On April 15, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

On December 14, 2023, an anonymous complainant filed an OPA complaint, writing that NE#1 attempted to conceal an accident she caused. The Complainant wrote, "[NE#1] asked officers and colleagues to keep the accident and details quiet[,] which resulted in no [significant incident report] going out[,] which would have been standard protocol."

OPA investigated the complaint, reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, police traffic collision report (PTCR), written statements, in-car video (ICV), photos, body-worn video (BWV), and 9-1-1 recording. The Complainant provided no contact information for an interview.

On November 22, 2023, at 11:26 PM, a motor vehicle collision report was coded into CAD.

Witness Officer #2's (WO#2) PTCR documented that NE#1, operating a fully marked Seattle Police patrol vehicle with Witness Officer #1 (WO#1) seated in the passenger seat, was responding to a fast back where officers were actively struggling with an assaultive suspect.¹ NE#1 responded with her vehicle's emergency equipment activated. WO#2

¹ See 2023-337842.



wrote that NE#1 approached the intersection, decelerated, and entered it.² Furthermore, WO#2 documented that NE#1 was at the center of that intersection when a vehicle struck the passenger side of their patrol vehicle. WO#2 wrote that NE#1 passed the intersection, stopped, and broadcast the collision.³



NE#1 and WO#1's SPD Patrol Vehicle Damage to the Passenger Side - Near the Front Quarter Panel

WO#2 documented other officers responded to the scene and the SFD was requested. The SFD arrived at the scene and examined the involved occupants. WO#2 reported, vehicle #2 remained in the center of the intersection and the driver of vehicle #2 exited the vehicle and walked to the sidewalk on the SE corner of the intersection. The driver of vehicle #2 stated, "she did not need medical attention and that only her foot had pain." Furthermore, that "... she was not driving too fast and was driving at approximately 45 MPH." When questioned by WO#2 as to what she thought the speed limit was, she indicated "30 MPH" however, the actual speed limit was 25 MPH. Additionally, WO#2 documented that the driver of vehicle #2 stated, her music volume was up and that she could not hear anything when her music is up loud. Two other civilian witnesses, who were on electric scooters on the eastside of the street when they witnessed the collision stated, "they heard and saw the overhead lights and sirens of the patrol car prior to the collision [...] and that vehicle 2 was traveling at a very high rate of speed and traveled through the intersection striking the patrol vehicle." WO#2 documented that photos were taken of the collision and both vehicles were towed. WS#1 a sergeant, was on scene and screened the incident.

WO#1 wrote in his witness statement that both NE#1 and himself were responding to a fast back call. NE#1 was driving and he was in the front passenger seat of the marked patrol car with lights and sirens activated. WO#1 observed NE#1, "dramatically slow the patrol vehicle speed to clear the intersection prior to crossing 6th Ave. ..." WO#1 stated he looked to the right and did not observe any vehicles traveling north that would have impeded their patrol vehicle from safely crossing the intersection. WO#1 stated, "I did not observe the other involved vehicle until directly before being struck by it." WO#1 stated, "our patrol vehicle was struck on the passenger side near the front

² NE#1's written statement noted, "I paused to check the intersection. Seeing no cars, I began to pull into the intersection."

³ BWV captured the passenger officer, not NE#1, broadcasting the collision.



quarter panel.” Furthermore, that SFD evaluated him on scene and he did not see an immediate reason for further medical attention.

NE#1 documented in her witness statement that she was working patrol in full uniform in a fully marked patrol car with WO#1 at approximately 11:26 PM, in response to a fast back to officers struggling with an assaultive suspect. NE#1 reported her emergency lights and sirens were activated. NE#1 stated her light was red and the light for cross-traffic on 6th Avenue was green. She paused to check the intersection. Furthermore, she stated, “seeing no cars I began to pull into the intersection.” NE#1 recalled vehicle #2, “struck our patrol vehicle at the right front wheel well/passenger door.” NE#1 checked on WO#1 and then exited the patrol car to check on the driver of vehicle #2. NE#1 stated in her report that the driver of vehicle #2 did not appear seriously injured, was ambulatory and appeared to have full cognitive function. NE#1 and WO#1 requested additional units and the SFD to the scene.⁴ NE#1 reported she issued a written statement and screened this incident with WS#1.

NE#1’s written statement, ICV, and BWV were consistent with WO#2’s PTCR and WO#1’s written statement. Additionally, BWV captured NE#1 screening the collision with a sergeant, WS#1, who responded to the scene. OPA was unable to locate a significant incident report documenting the collision.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

5.001 – Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL-11. Employees Will Be Truthful and Complete in All Communication

The Complainant alleged NE#1 attempted to conceal a vehicular collision.

Department employees must be truthful and complete in all communications. SPD Policy 5.001-POL-11.

NE#1’s written statement and her statements to the responding sergeant WS#1 at the scene of the collision refute this allegation. BWV did not capture NE#1 asking, “officers and colleagues to keep the accident and details quiet.” While no significant incident report (SIR) was written, whether that report was required under the circumstances was debatable and subjective.⁵ Here, NE#1 provided a written statement and screened the incident with WS#1. Additionally, the incident had minor injuries. Ultimately, the decision to request a SIR was not with NE#1. Based on the evidence provided, by a preponderance of the evidence, no evidence suggested NE#1 was attempting to conceal this vehicular collision.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded (Expedited).

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

⁴ All parties had minor injuries.

⁵ 15.350. Significant Incident Reports (SIRs).