



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1622

Issued Date: 04/08/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (5) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee responded to a report of a burglary.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee did not document her incident accurately and that he did not protect her personal information.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Interview of the complainant
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Review of other video
4. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

While the evidence showed that the Named Employee's report contained some inaccuracies, it also is clear those errors were not malicious or intentional. In addition, the Named Employee responded to the complainant's objection to the inaccuracies by immediately correcting them, for which he is to be commended. By returning the complainant's call and quickly correcting the report, the Named Employee complied with the requirement that his report be accurate. The complainant stated that she received a phone call from a female who was related to the Named Employee and did not know why she received the call. The evidence showed that a female relative called the complainant as reported. There is no evidence to suggest that the Named Employee was responsible for this, or that he condoned it.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed the Named Employee immediately corrected the inaccuracies in his report when the complainant brought them to his attention. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Document all Primary Investigations on a General Offense Report*.

Allegation #2

There is no evidence that showed that the Named Employee was responsible for or condoned the phone call to the complainant by his female relative. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.