



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0012

Issued Date: 07/30/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 12.050 Criminal Records (Policy that was issued 05/24/11)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 IV (C)(1) Confidentiality (Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 12.050 Criminal Records (Policy that was issued 05/24/11)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Inconclusive)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 IV (C)(1) Confidentiality (Policy that was issued 08/15/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Inconclusive)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant alleged that the named employees provided confidential information about her status as a crime victim to a relative without her permission.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the named employees provided confidential information about her status as a crime victim to a relative without her permission.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Interview of the complainant
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of witnesses
4. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The investigation demonstrated that named employee #1 was not in possession of the facts nor had the opportunity to reveal the confidential information as the complainant initially alleged. Named employee #2 had run a records inquiry concerning the complainant in a time frame that is consistent with the allegation. However the record does not definitively demonstrate that the specified confidential information was read or shared as alleged. Named employee #2 did not recall why he would have run the information and that he does not know the complainant or her relative.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1

The weight of the evidence showed that the named employee followed proper procedures regarding searching records. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Criminal Records*.

Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the named employee did not have possession of the facts nor had the opportunity to reveal confidential information. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Confidentiality*.

Named Employee #2

Allegation #1

The evidence could not prove nor disprove that the named employee read or shared information that he ran in a records check on the complainant's name. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Criminal Records*.

Allegation #2

The evidence could not prove nor disprove that the named employee provided confidential information as alleged by the complainant. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Inconclusive) was issued for *Confidentiality*.

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.