



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0399

Issued Date: 11/2/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Using the In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued February 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee responded to an emergency call.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, the Force Review Board, alleged that the Named Employee did not activate his In-Car Video (ICV) until he arrived on scene.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee did not activate his ICV when he responded to an emergency call as required by SPD policy. The Named Employee explained in his interview that he was in the precinct at the end of his shift performing administrative duties. He had already uploaded his video in anticipation of going home so his ICV was shut off. The Named Employee heard the radio and responded as a supervisor to the emergency call. He attempted to log back into the system but did not delay his response in order to finish logging back into the ICV system. By the time he arrived at the scene he was able to activate the ICV but that was several minutes into the call. Officers are expected to activate the ICV when dispatched to a call, the exception to that is the case of an emergency response prior to fully logging into the ICV system. Life safety is the priority of the Seattle Police Department, response to priority calls should always take precedent over any other tasks. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the OPA Director found that the Named Employee appropriately responded to a priority call as a scene supervisor and that this was a valid exception to the ICV policy.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidenced showed that the Named Employee's response to the priority call was a valid exception to the ICV policy. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *In-Car Video System: Using the In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

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.