



# SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

**CRAIG N. MEIDL**  
**CHIEF OF POLICE**

## Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C17-005 OPO Number: N/A  
Date of Complaint: 1/31/2017  
Allegation: Inadequate Response and Demeanor  
Chain of Command Finding: Exonerated  
Final Discipline: Additional Training

### INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant contacted SPD to make a complaint about an officer's response to a call at her home.

### COMPLAINT

The complainant felt that the officer was arrogant and showed a lack of service in response to her situation where she was the victim of Harassment.

### INVESTIGATION

The Internal Affairs investigators reviewed the complaint and bodyworn camera video from the incident. They interviewed the complainant, officer, and officer's supervisor. The complainant was unhappy with the response she received from SPD and from Crime Check. There was confusion about who was taking the report, whether it was Crime Check or the officer, and she felt the confusion was unprofessional. The issue was outside the officer's control. He played no part in the previous juggling of the call and confusion created. The officer's supervisor explained that there was a "system failure" in the new CAD system. It appeared that Crime Check was taking the report over the phone, but the Crime Check call takers mistakenly sent the call back into the patrol waiting call list. The officer saw the call on the screen and self-dispatched. Investigators explained this failure to the complainant during the interview.

The complainant took issue with a comment the officer made where she called him a gentleman and he joked that he was not a gentleman. Bodyworn camera video showed this exchange. Sometimes humor is effective when dealing with a frustrated citizen as it can be an icebreaker. It seemed his attempt at humor did not have the desired effect, but was not a violation of policy.

Bodyworn camera footage showed the officer asking questions and explaining the process to obtain an anti-harassment order. He also recommends she change her phone numbers. At this point, the complainant is obviously frustrated that an arrest is not going to occur and that the suggested alternatives are based on her taking additional actions. The investigator noted that a reasonable officer in the same

circumstance would likely not find probable cause for an arrest and would provide advice to get an order. At that point, the complainant tells the officer to leave. The officer leaves. In interviews, the complainant explained she was frustrated that he left, but the officer said that he felt he should respect her wish for him to leave.

The investigation revealed that the officer was incorrect in his assessment about what constituted a “true threat.” His mistake did not change the reality of whether an arrest could be made in that situation, however. Due to the identified need for additional training, reviewers recommended that the officer receive training on Harassment and Felony Harassment.

#### ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

A chain of command review determined that there were no specific inappropriate statements or actions violating policy. Thus, the officer’s behavior did not rise to a sustained Demeanor or Inadequate Response allegation. The allegations against the officer were determined to be Exonerated. The officer received additional training regarding Harassment and Felony Harassment.