

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2014-0421

Issued Date: 02/11/2015

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	Seattle Police Department Manual 5.140 (2) – Bias-Free Policing (Policy that was issued prior to 1/1/15)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Unfounded)
Allegation #2	Seattle Police Department Manual 5.001 (9) – Professionalism (Policy that was issued 7/16/14)
OPA Finding	Sustained
Allegation #3	Seattle Police Department Manual 16.090 – In-Car Video System – Record Enforcement Activity (Policy that was issued 11/21/12)
OPA Finding	Not Sustained (Training)
Final Discipline	Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The named employee (a field training officer) and the witness (a student officer) responded to investigate a traffic collision. The responding officers were not able to determine who was at fault for the collision and therefore no citations were issued. During the investigation, the named employee made a comment which was heard by the complainant. The named employee stated that it was not directed at anyone and was not meant to be heard. The complainant did hear the comment and took offense.

COMPLAINT

On July 31, 2014, the complainant alleged that the named employee made biased and derogatory remarks toward him while investigating a traffic collision.

INVESTIGATION

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

- 1. Interviews of witnesses
- 2. Interview of the named employee
- 3. Review of the In-Car Video

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

After thoroughly evaluating the evidence available in this case, it was determined that there is no evidence to support the allegation that the named employee expressed remarks regarding the complainant's ethnicity or national origin. The evidence did show, however, that the named employee referred to the complainant as an "idiot" as he was on the scene. This was insulting and disrespectful.

FINDINGS

Named Employee #1

Allegation #1: The evidence showed that the named employee made no statements to indicate a bias against the complainant and/or his national origin. Therefore the allegation of bias is <u>Not Sustained</u> for *Bias-Free Policing*.

Allegation #2: The evidence showed that the named employee did direct a derogatory term at the complainant. This was unprofessional. Therefore the allegation was <u>Sustained</u> for *Professionalism*.

Allegation #3: The allegation of the use of the In-Car Video will be addressed with training and therefore a finding of Not Sustained (Training) was issued for *In-Car Video System – Record Enforcement 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.