



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0287

Issued Date: 02/17/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (IV) (C) Standard & Duties/Confidentiality (Policy issued prior to 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (VII) (2) Professionalism/Courtesy (Policy issued prior to 07/16/14)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The complainant had become embroiled in a protracted dispute with the owner and some patrons of a café he frequented. The issue was the behavior of the café patrons' dogs that allegedly disturbed the complainant who lived nearby. In an effort to deal with the situation, the complainant spoke to several people including City officials involved in Animal Control and supervision of Animal Control. The many statements made by the complainant and his behavior resulted in those City officials consulting with the Seattle Police Department (SPD). As a result two SPD employees became involved.

## **COMPLAINT**

The complainant alleged that named employee #1 divulged confidential information about him to third parties and that named employee #2 was rude to him.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Interview of witnesses
3. Interview of SPD employees

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

SPD policy requires that officers maintain the confidentiality of private information, such as criminal history. The complainant alleged that named employee #1 told various people about his criminal history but could not provide the names of anyone with whom this information was shared. In addition, the complainant's criminal history had been revealed in numerous news articles readily available on-line. A café patron stated that he did search for the complainant's name on the internet. SPD policy also requires that department employees be courteous. The complainant had a history of repeatedly calling city employees in numerous departments and often expressed his frustration and anger with city employees in these phone calls. The conversation between the complainant and named employee #2 was contentious, but there was no evidence that the employee was discourteous under the circumstances.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

The evidence supports the conclusion that named employee #1 did not divulge private information about the complainant; therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Confidentiality*.

### **Named Employee #2**

The evidence supports the conclusion that named employee #2 was not discourteous, therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Professionalism/Courtesy*.

*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.*