



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-0876

Issued Date: 12/30/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001(9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 6.210 Strip Searches (Policy that was issued 11/19/07)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001(9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 6.210 Strip Searches (Policy that was issued 11/19/07)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #3	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001(9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 6.210 Strip Searches (Policy that was issued 11/19/07)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #4	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001(9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 6.210 Strip Searches (Policy that was issued 11/19/07)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

Named employees #1 and #2 were on bike patrol and recognized the complainant as a wanted subject of a warrant. Named employee #1 checked that the warrant was still outstanding. Named employee #1 and #2 approached the complainant and took him into custody. Named employee #3, a supervisor, screened the arrest at the scene. A patrol unit was requested to transport the complainant and named employee #4 responded to the scene and transported the complainant to a precinct. The complainant informed named employee #4 that he was ill from ingesting narcotics. Medical aid was summoned for the complainant at the precinct. The complainant was then transported by ambulance to a hospital before being booked into jail.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged to the jail staff that the named employees had strip searched him and made fun of him.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The evidence showed that the complainant would not provide any details to SPD as to which or how many officers participated in the alleged misconduct. OPA was not able to reach the complainant by phone or mail at the outset of the investigation. OPA performed a search for public and private sourced video that would document the arrest and processing of the complainant from the arrest location to include transport / detention and then up to the point that the ambulance left the precinct. No video or audio evidence was located that supported the allegations. OPA learned that the complainant had been re-arrested and was being held at the jail. OPA went to the jail and the complainant agreed to speak with investigators regarding his complaint. The complainant stated that he had been under the influence of narcotics and that he had made a false statement. He stated that the events as he alleged did not occur.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1, #2, #3 and #4

Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the named employees did not behave as alleged. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the named employees did not behave as alleged. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Strip Searches*.

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.