

---

**Issued Date:** November 7, 2025

**From:** Director Bonnie Glenn  
Office of Police Accountability



**Case Number:** 2025OPA-0178

---

**Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings**

**Named Employee #1**

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Inconclusive
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Lawful and Proper
- 

**Named Employee #2**

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
- 

**Named Employee #3**

- 1. Allegation #1:** 5.001 - Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
  - 2. Allegation #2:** 16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity  
**Finding:** Not Sustained - Unfounded
-

**This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.**

**Executive Summary:**

The Complainant was arrested for Promoting Loitering for the Purpose of Prostitution and his vehicle was seized pending a search warrant. During his arrest, he asked officers to collect his sunglasses from his vehicle because he did not want officers to steal them. After he picked up his vehicle, the Complainant alleged officers stole his sunglasses and an expensive bottle of cologne. Named Employees #1 - #3 (NE#1 – NE#3) participated in processing the Complainant's arrest. It was also alleged the named employees failed to record body-worn video when required.

**Administrative Note:**

On September 16, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

**Summary of the Investigation:**

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the written complaint and interviewing the Complainant. OPA reviewed the computer-aided dispatch (CAD) call report, incident report and supplements, body-worn video (BWV), in-car video (ICV), and photographs. Finally, OPA interviewed the named employees.

It is undisputed that, on May 9, 2025, SPD officers arrested the Complainant for Promoting Loitering for the Purpose of Prostitution, and his vehicle was seized pending a search warrant. NE#1 and NE#3 were present at the arrest scene; NE#2 was not. BWV recorded the Complainant asking officers to collect his glasses out of his vehicle and stating that he did not want the police to steal his glasses. BWV and ICV recorded officers searching the Complainant and placing his property—which did not include sunglasses or cologne—into a paper bag. BWV and ICV did not depict any officer searching the Complainant's vehicle at that time. The Complainant was transported to the North Precinct and the Complainant's vehicle was impounded for the purpose of executing a search warrant. NE#2 documented the "Evidence recovered from suspect during time of arrest" on a report. These items included credit cards bearing names that were not the Complainant, an insurance card, two cell phones, and \$100.

A warrant was issued on May 13, 2025, and executed the next day by NE#1 and was assisted by another officer. NE#1 documented recovering perfume, a rental car agreement, a purse and wallet with California identification for a female, a Ziploc bag full of condoms, women's thong-style underwear, and other women's shoes and clothing. NE#1 took pictures of the items and their location inside the vehicle. Neither NE#1 nor the other officer recorded the warrant execution on BWV. A photograph taken during the search warrant execution appeared to show an item that was consistent with a sunglasses case located in the driver's side door panel.

During his interview, the Complainant alleged his items were stolen, specifically noting the sunglasses (that he valued at \$3,495) and an expensive bottle of perfume. The Complainant stated NE#2 was possibly not involved and was unsure how he got NE#2's name. The Complainant stated he has memory issues due to a head injury. The Complainant stated he had a long criminal history.

OPA interviewed all three named employees. NE#1 stated he was the uniformed arresting officer for the Complainant and stated he searched the Complainant after his arrest. NE#1 recalled recovering keys, a hat, and cash from the Complainant during his arrest. NE#1 denied seeing the Complainant's sunglasses at this time. NE#1 also stated he and another officer executed the search warrant on the Complainant's vehicle. NE#1 stated he was on duty at the time but working in plain clothes, so he was not required to wear BWV. NE#1 reviewed a search warrant photograph provided by OPA. NE#1 acknowledged seeing a black box depicted in the photograph but denied knowing what the object was and did not recall searching that door pocket. NE#1 denied stealing any of the Complainant's property and stated he did not violate the BWV policy because he was not in uniform when he conducted the search.

NE#2 and NE#3 both denied stealing any of the Complainant's property. NE#2 did not recall being present for the Complainant's arrest and believed he only catalogued the Complainant's property at the North Precinct to assist with paperwork. NE#2 said he did not need to activate BWV at that time because he was in plain clothes. NE#2 denied seeing the Complainant's sunglasses or interacting with the Complainant's vehicle. NE#3 stated he was involved with arresting the Complainant, held the Complainant while he was searched, and transported him to the North Precinct. NE#3 denied seeing the Complainant's sunglasses or participating in the search.

---

## **Analysis and Conclusions:**

### **Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1**

#### **5.001 – Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 stole his property, including his sunglasses and cologne.

SPD Policy 5.001-POL-2 requires that employees adhere to laws, City policy, and Department policy.

There is insufficient evidence for OPA to conclude whether NE#1 stole—or otherwise mishandled—the Complainant's sunglasses. No evidence definitively proved or disproved that any sunglasses were present in the Complainant's vehicle at the time the vehicle was impounded. NE#1 denied seeing any sunglasses and denied stealing any of the Complainant's property. Conversely, the Complainant specifically mentioned the sunglasses during his arrest and a

photograph potentially depicting a closed sunglasses container was taken during the search warrant execution. The search warrant execution was not recorded. As such, the evidence in this investigation is insufficient to prove whether any sunglasses or cologne was in the vehicle at all or—if so—whether it was returned to the Complainant with his vehicle.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Inconclusive.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Inconclusive**

**Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2**

**16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity**

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 failed to record the search warrant execution.

SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(2) outlines the categories of police activity sworn employees are expected to record. When safe and feasible, sworn employees must record all dispatched calls, traffic and Terry stops, on-view infractions and criminal activity, and arrests and seizures, among other things. SPD Policy 16.090-POL-2(2). Sworn employees are required to record even if the event is out of view of the camera. Id.

NE#1 was wearing plain clothes when he executed the search warrant and so was not required to operate a BWV. See SPD Policy 16.090-POL-1(3) (“All sworn employees operating ICV and/or BWV will be in uniform.”). OPA has previously issued SPD a Management Action Recommendation concerning whether it should require plain clothes officers to wear BWV in certain circumstances, such as when executing a search warrant. See 2023OPA 0552 / 2025COMP-0004. Instead, OPA finds that the allegation occurred as alleged—NE#1 was not wearing BWV during the search—but this was in line with law and policy as it exited on the date of the search.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Lawful and Proper**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #1**

**5.001 – Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy**

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 stole his property, including his sunglasses and cologne.

OPA finds that, more likely than not, NE#2 was not involved the Complainant’s arrest or the execution of the search warrant. Instead, his only involvement appeared to be cataloguing the evidence recovered from the Complainant after his arrest. None of these items were alleged to

have been stolen. To the contrary, the Complainant alleged the stolen items were in his vehicle and a photograph from the search warrant at least possibly corroborated the presence of the sunglasses at the time of the search warrant execution.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #2 – Allegation #2**

**16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity**

The Complainant alleged that NE#2 failed to record the search warrant execution.

Documentation from the search warrant and statement from NE#1 and NE#2 showed NE#2 was not involved with searching the Complainant's vehicle. This allegation did not occur as alleged.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #1**

**5.001 – Standards and Duties POL-2. Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy, and Department Policy**

The Complainant alleged that NE#3 stole his property, including his sunglasses and cologne.

As with NE#2, the evidence showed that NE#3 was not involved in searching the Complainant's vehicle.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**

**Named Employee #3 – Allegation #2**

**16.090 – In-Car and Body-Worn Video, 16.090-POL-2 Sworn Employees Recording Police Activity, 2. When Sworn Employees Record Activity**

The Complainant alleged that NE#3 failed to record the search warrant execution.

As with NE#2, the evidence showed that NE#3 was not involved in searching the Complainant's vehicle.

Accordingly, OPA recommends that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained – Unfounded**