CLOSED CASE SUMMARY



ISSUED DATE: June 13, 2024

FROM: DIRECTOR GINO BETTS, JR. And Hard

OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0551

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

| Allegati | on(s): | Director's Findings |
|----------|--|-----------------------------------|
| # 1 | 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will | Not Sustained - Management Action |
| | Strive to be Professional | |

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:

Named Employee #1's (NE#1) girlfriend, Community Member #1 (CM#1), went missing while working out of state. Suspect #1 and Suspect #2 were arrested for kidnapping CM#1. Later, out-of-state police discovered CM#1 deceased. Both suspects were arrested for her murder.

The Complainant alleged that NE#1's lack of assistance with the out-of-state missing person investigation was unprofessional. The Complainant also alleged NE#1 may have tracked CM#1's cellphone without permission.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On June 5, 2024, the Office of Inspector General (OIG) certified this investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

OPA investigated the complaint, reviewing the OPA complaint, prior incidents, and a news article. OPA also interviewed the Complainant, two witness employees, and NE#1.

OPA Complaint

The Complainant's complaint outlined the following:

On December 15, 2023, the Complainant—a lieutenant— met with her subordinates, including NE#1. At the meeting, NE#1 stated that his girlfriend, CM#1, was "missing." He said CM#1 and her friends traveled to Las Vegas, where CM#1 connected with a friend, Suspect #1. NE#1 indicated that CM#1 had been missing for about a week. NE#1 stated that his friend took CM#1 to meet Suspect #1. NE#1 said he tried tracking CM#1's cellphone, but it was turned off. NE#1 stated that Suspect #1 was arrested for kidnapping CM#1, and the FBI was involved. NE#1 indicated that Suspect #1 was involved in sex trafficking. NE#1 stated he did not want to file a missing person report in Seattle. NE#1 stated he was unsure which agency was leading the investigation, but he knew Suspect #1 was booked at Clark County Jail. NE#1 stated he dated CM#1 for about two years. NE#1 said CM#1 was also dating someone who treated her like "crap," but CM#1 continued dating for money. NE#1 stated that CM#1 did not have a family who would have filed a missing person report in Seattle.

Seattle Office of Police Accountability

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPA CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0551

The Complainant reached out to the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD) about the case and learned from SPD colleagues about social media posts concerning CM#1's disappearance and "fake" crowdfunding sites seeking money to help locate her. The Complainant also learned that CM#1 was possibly gang-involved, had suspected involvement in a 2018 shooting in Seattle (2018 Shooting), and was arrested in 2019 for driving a stolen vehicle containing multiple firearms and counterfeit currency (2019 Traffic Stop). The Complainant also learned that a missing person report may have already been filed with LVMPD.

The Complainant relayed her findings to NE#1 and encouraged him to "press his friends for [the LVMPD's] contact information." NE#1 stated another person, Suspect #2, was arrested in connection with CM#1's disappearance. NE#1 "stated he might have information about who the case detective is and their phone number." The Complainant encouraged NE#1 to contact the detective to assist the investigation.

On December 17, 2023, the Complainant met with NE#1. He told the Complainant that CM#1 had been an exotic dancer, and she went to Las Vegas to earn "quick money." NE#1 suggested that he was trying to help CM#1 leave that lifestyle and toxic friends, but CM#1 had "spiraled" since her friend's death. NE#1 stated that Suspect #2 was ganginvolved in California and that Suspect #1—and possibly CM#1—had witnessed a homicide. NE#1 said there was "some kind of beef" between CM#1 and Suspect #1, perhaps related to snitching or one of them having compromising information. The Complainant told NE#1 to call the LVMPD detective that same day and to leave a message if no one answered. Minutes later, NE#1 informed the Complainant that CM#1's father called him, telling him CM#1 was deceased.

Prior Incidents

OPA reviewed reports from two prior incidents.

The investigation into the 2018 Shooting Incident indicated that CM#1 worked at the exotic nightclub where the shooting occurred. Police determined that CM#1 played an "instrumental" role in the incident, noting she was involved in a physical fight shortly before the shooting and associated with multiple involved parties, who were admittedly beefing with a rival gang. However, CM#1 was not a suspected shooter.

The investigation into the 2019 Traffic Stop indicated that CM#1 drove a reported stolen vehicle. CM#1 was arrested, and multiple firearms, counterfeit money, and other items were recovered from the vehicle.

News Article

The Complainant provided a link to a December 19, 2023, news article. The article covered Suspect #1 and Suspect #2 being investigated for CM#1's murder. It suggested that the suspects were motivated by a feud between CM#1 and Suspect #1, reportedly stemming from CM#1 accusing Suspect #1 of implicating Suspect #1's jailed boyfriend in a double murder.

Complainant

OPA interviewed the Complainant. The Complainant's interview was consistent with the information provided in her OPA complaint.

Seattle Office of Police Accountability

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPA CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0551

Additionally, the Complainant noted that NE#1's prior OPA case for associating with gang members¹ and apparent reluctance to assist with LVMPD's investigation made her suspicious.

Witness Employees

OPA interviewed two witness employees. Both were present at the December 15, 2023, meeting. Witness Employee #1 recalled the meeting but no further relevant information. Witness Employee #2 (WE#2) recalled NE#1 stating that LVMPD and the FBI were investigating CM#1's disappearance. WE#2 recalled that someone suggested that NE#1 reach out to LVMPD, but NE#1 indicated that someone else was already assisting LVMPD. WE#2 recalled a discussion about whether a missing person report should be made in Seattle and uncertainty as to whether that was done.

Named Employee #1

OPA interviewed NE#1, who stated his girlfriend, CM#1, went to Las Vegas with friends but kept in contact with him. After a weekend, NE#1 lost contact with CM#1 because her phone seemed to be off. NE#1 contacted a friend to see what happened and was told that CM#1 was missing and that LVMPD had been contacted. NE#1 said he was waiting for more information and getting information from friends and social media. NE#1's friend also told him that the FBI was involved.

NE#1 did not file a missing person report because he believed CM#1's disappearance had already been reported and did not want to "muddy the waters." NE#1 said he repeatedly attempted to contact the LVMPD detectives, but they did not answer his calls.

NE#1 admitted tracking CM#1's phone using an Apple iPhone feature called "Find Friends," which tracks a phone's location. NE#1 said that CM#1 activated this feature so he could track her whereabouts.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1 5.001 - Standards and Duties, 5.001-POL 10. Employees Will Strive to be Professional

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was unprofessional following CM#1's disappearance.

SPD employees must "strive to be professional." SPD Policy 5.001-POL-10. Further, "employees may not engage in behavior that undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers," whether on or off duty. *Id.*

The Complainant suggested that NE#1 should have done more following CM#1's disappearance and questioned NE#1's tracking of CM#1's phone when OPA found no evidence suggesting that CM#1 did not allow it.

While CM#1 was in Las Vegas with friends, she purportedly allowed NE#1, her boyfriend, to track her whereabouts. NE#1 told OPA that when he could not track her phone, he assumed it was turned off. NE#1 said he later learned through friends and social media that CM#1 was missing and that Suspect #1—and later Suspect #2—was arrested for

¹ OPA issued NE#1 two training referrals in 2021OPA-0508, involving a traffic stop where NE#1 and Suspect #1 were passengers in a vehicle driven by CM#1. CM#1 allegedly drove without a license and gave officers a false name. The director's certification memorandum cautioned, "NE#1 is on notice that any future association with, or off-duty intervention on behalf of, people still involved in criminal activity could place him in a compromising position or constitute a separate violation of law or policy."



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPA CASE NUMBER: 2023OPA-0551

kidnapping her. Accordingly, NE#1 surmised that CM#1's disappearance was under investigation. While the Complainant questioned why NE#1 had not filed a missing person report in Seattle, there is no indication that she ordered him to do so. However, the Complainant did direct NE#1 to call the LVMPD. NE#1 told OPA that he called LVMPD several times, but his calls were not returned. Despite the Complainant's suspicions, no law enforcement agency appeared to suspect that NE#1 was involved in CM#1's disappearance or murder. Further, LVMPD arrest reports and the article the Complainant provided suggested that NE#1 provided LVMPD with information concerning CM#1's reason for going to Las Vegas and her activities preceding her disappearance.

That said, SPD should consider whether and to what extent employees must assist with criminal investigations and report suspected criminal activity.

Therefore, OPA recommends the below Management Action:

• Management Action: SPD should consider clarifying what obligation, if any, its employees have for reporting suspected criminal activity and assisting with criminal investigations.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained—Management Action.

Recommended Finding: Not Sustained - Management Action