



CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

ISSUED DATE: AUGUST 17, 2018

CASE NUMBER: 2018OPA-0190

Allegations of Misconduct & Director’s Findings

Named Employee #1

Allegation(s):		Director’s Findings
# 1	8.200 - Using Force 1. Use of Force: When Authorized	Not Sustained (Unfounded)

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:

The Complainant alleged that he was assaulted by multiple unknown SPD employees at an undefined place and on an undefined date.

ADMINISTRATIVE NOTE:

This case was designated as an Expedited Investigation. This means that OPA, with the OPA Auditor’s review and approval, believed that it could reach and issue recommended findings based solely on its intake investigation and without conducting any officer interviews. Accordingly, no such interviews were conducted.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS:

Named Employee #1 - Allegation #1

8.200 - Using Force 1. Use of Force: When Authorized

The Complainant left two voicemails for OPA in which he alleged “police brutality” and “corruption” against multiple unknown SPD employees. OPA called the Complainant at the number he provided and was connected with the Cascade Behavioral Health Center. OPA was informed that the Complainant was discharged and was not given any other contact information for him. OPA conducted a search of the Department’s Record Management System (RMS) and determined that the Complainant’s last involvement with SPD officers was when he was arrested for misdemeanor harassment on February 20, 2018. OPA reviewed the Department video from that incident and found no evidence that NE#1 was subjected to any force other than that used to handcuff him, let alone that the Complainant was “brutalized” by officers. The Type I force used against the Complainant in that case was documented in a use of force report.

OPA further found contact information for the Complainant in the Department’s Records Management System (RMS); however, OPA was unable to reach the Complainant at that number. Lastly, OPA tried to locate the Complainant through the attorney who appeared to be assigned to the Complainant’s criminal case stemming from his most recent arrest. However, OPA could not find any contact information for that attorney on either the Seattle Municipal Court website or via an internet search.



Based on OPA's investigation, there is no evidence supporting the Complainant's allegations. Given the Department's stringent reporting requirements under both the Consent Decree and policy, had the Complainant been subjected to significant force, that force would have been documented. That no such documentation exists is further evidence that the allegations set forth by the Complainant never occurred. For these reasons, I recommend that this allegation be Not Sustained – Unfounded.

Recommended Finding: **Not Sustained (Unfounded)**