



OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2016-0809

Issued Date: 02/24/2017

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (1) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Final Discipline	N/A

Named Employee #2	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 15.180 (1) Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence (Policy that was issued April 1, 2015)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Lawful and Proper)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 16.090 (6) In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity (Policy that was issued March 1, 2016)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)

Final Discipline	N/A
------------------	-----

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The Named Employees responded to a residential alarm at the complainants' home.

COMPLAINT

The complainants alleged an incomplete investigation by the Named Employees when they responded to an alarm at their residence.

During the course of the investigation into the above allegations, it was discovered that the Named Employees failed to activate ICV when the alarm call was re-opened.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

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

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant alleged the two responding officers (Named Employee #1 and Named Employee #2) should have done more to investigate the alarm and examine more of the exterior of the residence. Both Named Employees told OPA they tried several different tactics to gain a better view of the exterior of the house. Named Employee #1 even climbed up on a roof to look over the high gate. Both Named Employee #1 and Named Employee #2 told OPA they were concerned about climbing over the high (8 feet) gate and dropping into the yard, then not being able to get back out. The officers also attempted two different ways to contact the owners of the house by phone but were unsuccessful.

The second allegation was added because the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) history appeared to show that the two officers returned to the location of the alarm and then closed the incident in CAD. However, the OPA investigation showed that Named Employee #1 and Named Employee #2 did not return to the scene, but merely updated the record from a different location.

FINDINGS

Named Employees #1 and #2

Allegation #1

A preponderance of the evidence showed that Named Employee #1 and Named Employee #2 took reasonable steps to search the accessible exterior of the house for evidence of a break-in. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Lawful and Proper) was issued for *Primary Investigations: Officers Shall Conduct a Thorough and Complete Search for Evidence*.

Allegation #2

A preponderance of the evidence showed that the Named Employees were not obligated to activate ICV when the CAD was updated. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Unfounded) was issued for) *In-Car Video System: Employees Will Record Police Activity*.

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.