



OFFICE OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number 2017OPA-0406

Issued Date: 10/24/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.130 (1) Sick and Injured Persons: Employees Assist Sick & Injured Persons (Policy that was issued October 21, 2016)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Inconclusive)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant approached the Named Employee to ask for medical aid for his injury.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 would not administer minimal first aid to him. The complainant stated that when he approached Named Employee #1 to ask for medical aid for his injury, she responded by telling him, "no." The complainant alleged that Named Employee #1 did not provide him with aid and "chose instead to focus on managing traffic."

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

SPD Policy 16.130(1) requires that “employees assist sick and injured persons.” The policy details that an officer who is aiding a sick or injured person “will attempt to determine the nature and cause of the person’s injury or illness, provide first aid, and initiate emergency medical services (EMS) as needed.” (SPD Policy 16.130(1).)

Here, the complainant alleged that he had a visibly bleeding hand and asked Named Employee #1 for medical attention that she failed to provide. Named Employee #1, to the contrary, claimed that no one approached her with a bloody hand and asked her for medical assistance. There was no evidence, for example a video, that conclusively established which account was true. It was possible, as the complainant admitted, that the officer that he approached for aid simply did not hear him or recognize that he was injured. It was also possible, as Named Employee #1 posited at her OPA interview, that the complainant approached an individual that was not her and asked that person for aid. It was also possible, however, that Named Employee #1 deliberately ignored a request for aid even though she was required by policy to provide it. The OPA Director saw no reason why the complainant would have fabricated this story and, based on a review of his OPA interview, he was a credible witness.

Ultimately, however, there was not sufficient evidence to determine that Named Employee #1’s conduct violated SPD policy.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

There was not a preponderance of the evidence either supporting or refuting the allegation. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Sick and Injured Persons: Employees Assist Sick & Injured Persons*.

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.