



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0507

Issued Date: 10/19/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Professionalism (Policy that was issued 07/16/2014)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee was one of several officers responding to a report of a robbery in which a relative of the victim was chasing after the suspect vehicle. Officers initiated a stop of the suspect vehicle. The named employee ordered the driver and two passengers out of the vehicle and directed them to place their hands onto the vehicle. The suspects were not compliant and the named employee had to convey the order to place their hands on the vehicle several times. The named employee told the suspects that this was a robbery investigation and told the male suspect that he was not under arrest but that he was going to place him in handcuffs. The suspect approached the named employee and told him that he was not going to let himself be put in handcuffs. The named employee attempted to place handcuffs on the male suspect but the suspect pushed the named employee. The named employee took the suspect to the ground and handcuffed the suspect with the help of another officer.

COMPLAINT

The complainant, a supervisor within the Department, alleged that the named employee's words and actions escalated the situation and increased the likelihood of a Use of Force incident when he made initial contact with the subject.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint memo
2. Review of In-Car Video
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interview of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

SPD employees shall strive to be professional at all times and will avoid unnecessary escalation of events even if those events do not end in reportable uses of force. The evidence did not identify a violation of department policy by the named employee. The analysis of the incident identified several areas where the named employee would benefit from additional training.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The evidence supports that the named did not violate policy but would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Professionalism*.

Required Training: The supervisor of the named employee should ensure that the named employee receives and completes the training listed in the mentoring plan created for this employee.

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.