



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1099

Issued Date: 01/19/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #4	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #5	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #6	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #7	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.100 (1) Using Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 01/01/14)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employees were dispatched to a disturbance at a homeless shelter. The named employees found the complainant causing a disturbance when they arrived. They provided a trespass warning to the complainant. The complainant refused to leave and struck one of the names employees. The complainant became more aggressive and force was used to make the arrest.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the named employees used excessive and unnecessary force against him when they took him into custody for a mental crisis and assault of the officers.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complainant voicemail message
2. Interview of the complainant
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Review of In-Car Videos
5. Review of the of SPD employees use of force statements

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence showed that the named employees reasonably determined that the complainant should be detained. They formed a plan based on their training and employed proportionate force to restrain the complainant. There are In-Car Video and audio recordings of the event and there is no evidence to substantiate the allegation of excessive force.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1, #2, #3, #4, #5, #6 and #7

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employees used force that was reasonable and proportional to take the complainant into custody. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Using Force: When Authorized*.

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.