



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1171

Issued Date: 02/29/2016

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 (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 13.030 (4) Emergency Vehicle Operations: Officers Are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Police Vehicle (Policy that was issued 11/21/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
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 (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 13.030 (4) Emergency Vehicle Operations: Officers Are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Police Vehicle (Policy that was issued 11/21/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
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 (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 13.030 (4) Emergency Vehicle Operations: Officers Are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Police Vehicle (Policy that was issued 11/21/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

Named employee #3 was working patrol with his partner. They both recognized the complainant and conducted a warrant check, which returned with an outstanding arrest warrant. The officers attempted to arrest the complainant, however he ran from them. Several officers responded to the foot pursuit. Named employee #3 pursued the complainant in his patrol car and his partner pursued on foot. Named employee #1 responded to the scene on his police motorcycle and named employee #2 responded in his patrol vehicle. The complainant fell to the ground and was placed under arrest.

COMPLAINT

The complainant alleged that the named employees struck him with their patrol vehicles and police motorcycle.

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. Review of In-Car Videos
4. Interviews of SPD employees

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The OPA investigation carefully reviewed the documentation available and interviewed involved SPD employees. Much of the contact with the complainant and subsequent foot pursuit was captured on In-Car Video (ICV). There was no evidence that showed that the named employees struck the complainant with either the patrol vehicles or police motorcycle. Other than handcuffing the complainant, there was no force used against the complainant by the named employees. A Use of Force report was completed by officers for the complaint of wrist pain from being handcuffed.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1, #2 and #3

Allegation #1

There was no evidence that showed the named employees used force as alleged by the complainant. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Using Force: When Authorized*.

Allegation #2

There was no evidence that showed the named employees struck the complainant with their vehicles. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for *Emergency Vehicle Operations: Officers Are Responsible for the Safe Operation of Their Police Vehicle*.

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.