



SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

CRAIG N. MEIDL
CHIEF OF POLICE

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C18-014 OPO Number: None
Date of Complaint: 2/15/2018
Allegation: Policy Violation, Body Worn Camera Violation, Property Mishandling
Chain of Command Finding: Sustained
Final Discipline: Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

Two officers responded to an assault call at the Intermodal. They contacted the victim and then the witness to the assault. Officers searched for the suspect. At one point, they were notified about a bag that possibly belonged to the suspect. Officers improperly disposed of the bag at the Intermodal.

COMPLAINT

A detective investigated the assault. As part of her investigation, she accessed surveillance video at the Intermodal, which showed that the suspect had stolen the witness's hat (not mentioned in the officers' reports), and that the officers disposed of the suspect's bag (potential evidence, and not mentioned in officer reports). Her investigation also showed a conversation with the victim that was not recorded on their body worn cameras. The detective reported the issues to her chain of command. The unit's lieutenant initiated an Internal Affairs complaint with allegations against both officers of policy violations in reference to report preparation, property handling, and body worn camera responsibilities.

INVESTIGATION

Internal Affairs reviewed officer reports and body worn camera footage and conducted interviews with the involved officers and witness detective. Officers readily admitted to searching the bag for identification and then disposing of it, classifying it as "not relevant." In this situation, it would have been best to document the search and return the item back to the victim or place it in Police Property as evidence. The information about the bag should have been in their reports and the search should have been captured on body worn camera. Investigators also noted that one of the officers failed to activate his body worn camera while following up on the incident, looking for the suspect.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The allegations (listed below) against the first officer were determined to be Sustained and he received a letter of reprimand.

Policy Violation 344.1.1- Report Preparation
Policy Violation 804.3- Property Handling
Policy Violation 703.4- BWC Responsibilities

The allegations against the second officer (listed below) were determined to be Sustained and he received a letter of reprimand.

Policy Violation 344.1.1- Report Preparation

Policy Violation 804.3- Property Handling

The policy violation about Body Worn Camera Responsibilities was withdrawn for the second officer.