



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1087

Issued Date: 02/06/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employee was on scene while officers attempted to take a warrant suspect into custody.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the Named Employee may have violated SPD Policy when he did not activate his In-Car Video (ICV) during an incident / arrest. The complainant stated that the Named Employee may have been exempted as he is part of a specialized unit.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged that the Named Employee responded to assist with a warrant suspect and did not activate his ICV. The Named Employee said that he responded as a K9 unit to the scene in order to assist with a warrant suspect. It turned into a SWAT callout. The Named Employee assisted with the inner perimeter until SWAT arrived. The Named Employee was in uniform and driving a marked patrol vehicle. The Named Employee said that he did not use his ICV system because there were undercover agents in the area looking for the suspect. It was the Named Employee's understanding that he was not supposed to record undercover officers. He also did not believe that SWAT recorded the inner perimeter with the ICV system so he did not either. The Named Employee stated that K9 did not have an exemption from using the ICV system. While the Named Employee may have had a valid concern regarding video recording of undercover agents, no such exception to the requirement to activate ICV was approved by the Chief of Police as required by SPD policy.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed there was an absence of ICV from the Named Employee of his involvement in this incident, and there was no exemption was in place. Therefore a **Sustained** finding was issued for *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

Discipline Imposed: Written Reprimand

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.