



SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

CRAIG N. MEIDL
CHIEF OF POLICE

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C16-012 OPO Number: 16-06
Date of Complaint: 2/16/2016
Allegation: Inadequate Response
Chain of Command Finding: Inquiry
Final Discipline: Not Applicable

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant sent an email to the Office of the Police Ombudsman's Office stating that she was in a collision Ruby and Indiana. While she was turning left from Indiana to northbound onto Ruby she was involved in a T-bone collision with a westbound vehicle. Both drivers claimed to have the green light. The officer that responded to the collision did not issue an infraction because there were no independent witnesses. The complainant makes the following complaints:

1. She called police twice before an officer responded.
2. The officer did not issue a citation because witnesses did not view the light.
3. The officer did not view the light cycle to determine fault.
4. The officer refused to get surveillance video from a bank on the corner of the intersection and told her it would be her responsibility.
5. Sullivan wants additional investigation to determine fault.

INVESTIGATION

Internal Affairs reviewed the officer's reports.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The CAD history shows that the other driver called 911 at 1457 hours. The other party was the caller, not the complainant. She said she was stuck in her vehicle and could not get to her child. She said there were no injuries.

Spokane Fire Department was notified and spoke to both parties involved and no injuries were reported. The other party told fire that she was able to get out of the vehicle. Therefore the fire department did not respond.

1. The complainant called 911 at 1500 hours and 1515 hours. The officer arrived on scene at 1526 hours, which was immediately after being dispatched.
2. The officer did not have an independent witness. The complainant was turning in front of the oncoming vehicle. She alleges the oncoming vehicle was at a high rate of speed. The speed of a vehicle can be determined by a slide to stop formula. However, in a case where a slide terminates in a collision, it can't be determined without advanced crush calculations. There is no indication of skid marks in this case, and if there were, it would be beyond the capabilities of a patrol response. Furthermore the fact that no injuries resulted, indicates that reckless driving as the complainant alleges, is not likely.
3. The officer did describe how the lights work in his report. A determination of fault could not be made from observing the light cycle.
4. This was a non-injury collision and a non criminal investigation. Officers would not request video in a civil matter. It is not reasonable to believe that the bank would have a view of the light and this is confirmed by the complainant's own request to the bank.
5. The officer completed a reasonable investigation and no further determination of fault can be made.