



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1419

Issued Date: 03/24/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (6) Employees Engaged in Department Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Inconclusive)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 09/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (6) Employees Engaged in Department Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Inconclusive)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 8.200 (1) Use of Force: When Authorized (Policy that was issued 09/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

## **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The named employees were working off-duty as uniformed security at a sporting event.

## **COMPLAINT**

The complainant alleged that the named employees assaulted him and refused to identify themselves.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the complainant statement
2. Interview of witnesses
3. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
4. Review of security video
5. Interview of SPD employees

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The OPA Investigation documented the events that occurred as the named employees were working off-duty as uniformed security at a sporting event. The investigator interviewed a civilian witness and an off-duty uniformed officer from another law enforcement agency who was working at the sporting event. Security video was reviewed as part of the investigation.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1 and #2**

#### **Allegation #1**

The evidence could not prove or disprove the allegation that the named employees failed to identify themselves. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Employees Engaged in Department Related Activities Identify Themselves When Requested*.

#### **Allegation #2**

The preponderance of evidence established that the alleged excessive force did not occur. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Use of 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.*