



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-1321

Issued Date: 06/14/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 09/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (6) Standards and Duties: Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 09/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (6) Standards and Duties: Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 09/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (6) Standards and Duties: Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employees responded to an incident at a bar.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that he was pushed down by Unknown SPD Employees outside a bar. The complainant in a 911 call said both the bar security and SPD Officers were involved in an assault against him and the officers refused to provide him their identification. OPA was able to identify three Named Employees who responded to an incident at the bar involving the complainant.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complaint
2. Review of 911 audio files
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation showed that Named Employees #1, #2, and #3 used no force on the complainant.

The preponderance of the evidence from the OPA investigation showed that Named Employee #1 provided his name and identification to the complainant when asked, and that Named Employees #2 and #3 were not asked by the complainant for their identification.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #1 did not use force on the complainant. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Using Force: When Authorized*.

Allegation #2

The preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #1 provided his name and identification to the complainant when asked. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested*.

Named Employees #2 and #3

Allegation #1

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employees did not use force on the complainant. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Using Force: When Authorized*.

Allegation #2

The preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employees were not asked by the complainant for their identification. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Standards and Duties: Employees Engaged in Department-Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested*.

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.