



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: SEPTEMBER 20, 2024

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

CASE NUMBER: 2024OPA-0151

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director's Findings
# 1	15.180, Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5, Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report	Sustained

Imposed Discipline

Oral Reprimand

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 (NE#1) responded to a burglary at the Complainant's residence. The Complainant alleged NE#1 failed to complete an incident report as required by policy.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

On July 24, 2024, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION:

The Complainant filed a web-based complaint with OPA alleging NE#1 did not file a report. OPA contacted the Complainant, who elaborated that her apartment was burglarized, and NE#1 responded. The Complainant stated she tried to get a copy of the report and discovered one was never written. The Complainant stated, as a result, her landlord charged her for the damage to the unit. The Complainant stated her boyfriend (Community Member #1 or CM#1) interacted with NE#1. CM#1 told the Complainant NE#1 was "bleh" about the incident and that the police would not be able to do anything about it.

OPA investigated the complaint, reviewing the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report and body-worn video (BWV). In addition to the Complainant, OPA interviewed CM#1. OPA searched SPD's computer database and was unable to find a report for this incident.

The CAD call report showed CM#1 called 9-1-1 to report the Complainant's apartment had been burglarized. CM#1 stated the Complainant was not present, but CM#1's property and dog were stolen. NE#1 arrived on scene and, an hour and a half later, cleared the call as a burglary with a "report written (no arrest)."

BWV was consistent with the CAD call report. In summary, NE#1 arrived and spoke with CM#1, who showed NE#1 evidence of a burglary, including a broken window, rocks that were possibly used to break in, items in disarray, and blood at various parts of the apartment. CM#1 reported, among other things, that his dog was stolen. NE#1 told CM#1 he would send him a link to upload pictures of the dog. NE#1 and CM#1 discussed the possibility of follow-up



investigation on the case. NE#1 explained to CM#1 that it was unlikely there would be additional follow-up investigation on a property crime such as this one due to staffing.

OPA interviewed CM#1. CM#1's description of the incident was consistent with BWV. CM#1 denied that any of NE#1's comments were unprofessional but expressed concern at the lack of follow up investigation on burglaries.

OPA interviewed NE#1. NE#1 stated he has been employed by SPD for thirty-three years, including 20 years of experience on patrol. NE#1 recalled responding to this burglary. NE#1 stated his intention was to return to the precinct, determine if there was an additional way to track the dog, and then write his report. NE#1 recalled that he then responded to another call and then "spaced" on writing the reports for this call. NE#1 stated, "I have no excuse," elaborating it "just totally slipped my mind."

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

15.180, Primary Investigations, 15.180-POL-5, Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a Report

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to document his primary investigation on a report.

SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5 requires that officers document all primary investigations on a Report. All reports must be complete, thorough, and accurate. See SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5. Patrol officers are required to submit their reports before the end of their shift. See SPD Policy 5.100(I).

NE#1 candidly acknowledged his failure to write a report for this incident. OPA found no evidence to indicate this failure was intentional and credits NE#1's explanation that he was sidetracked by another call and then simply forgot to write a report for this incident.

Ultimately, police officers are human and will make honest mistakes from time to time. OPA would typically process a mere error as either a Supervisor Action or Training Referral. However, NE#1 received a Supervisor Action on January 26, 2022, in another OPA case (2021OPA-0546) for violating SPD Policy 15.180-POL-5 by failing to document his primary investigation of reported burglaries and alleged human trafficking. Because of the repeated, similar nature of the misconduct, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**