



OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number 2017OPA-0444

Issued Date: 11/08/2017

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

During its investigation into a separate complaint, OPA discovered that Named Employee #1 failed to activate his ICV when he engaged in law enforcement activity as required by policy. (See Intake Follow-Up.)

COMPLAINT

Named Employee #1 was alleged to have failed to activate his In-Car Video (ICV) system when engaging in law enforcement activity.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the initial OPA complaint
2. Review of In-Car Videos (ICV)

3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Interview of SPD employee

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

SPD Policy 16.090-POL-1(6) instructs officers to activate their ICV systems and record police activity, including the “response to dispatched calls, starting before the employee arrives on the scene and ending consistent with” the requirements of SPD Policy 16.090-POL-1(8). Here, it was undisputed that Named Employee #1 was engaging in police activity in response to a dispatched call. (See, e.g., Officer Lima ICV, at 14:37:21.) Based on a review of the ICV system, it was further undisputed that Named Employee #1 failed to activate his ICV. (See COBAN Video Search.)

At his OPA interview, Named Employee #1 stated his belief that he was riding in a two-officer car with another officer on that date. However, based on a review of Computer-Aided Dispatch, Records Management System and the ICV system, Named Employee #1’s recollection in this regard was determined to be incorrect. Named Employee #1 was, in fact, riding in another vehicle by himself. Indeed, Named Employee #1 performed a system check for the ICV system associated with that vehicle prior to his response to the incident in question. However, he did not turn on his ICV prior to or during his response to the incident.

ICV use is an important element of police work and a fundamental tool to ensure community trust and confidence in SPD. Moreover, given the City’s and Department’s obligations under the Consent Decree and specifically those concerning the need to properly and accurately report and document incidents, the failure to activate ICV as required is not a minor error.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employee did not turn on his ICV prior to or during his response to the incident. 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.