



# SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

## CRAIG N. MEIDL CHIEF OF POLICE

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C18-025 OPO Number: N/A

Date of Complaint: 4/18/2018

Allegation: Inadequate Response, Bias Policing and Policy/Standard Violation

Chain of Command Finding: Multiple

Final Discipline: Multiple

#### INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

Officers to investigate a reported DV Assault. Officers interviewed both of the involved parties and subsequently arrested the complainant for DV Assault.

#### COMPLAINT

The complainant alleges the officers arrested the wrong person and they did not have photographs taken of her injuries. The complainant also alleges that during the arrest process, a group of officers at her vehicle window were laughing and commenting that she reminded them of a character from the movie "Diary of a Mad Black Woman". The complainant alleges the officers had a predetermined idea of black women and would not have made the remark had she been white.

#### INVESTIGATION

The complainant, officers, and witnesses were interviewed. The video from the accused officers' body-worn cameras, the witness officers body-worn cameras, and police reports were reviewed.

The officers established probable cause to arrest the complainant for DV Assault by interviewing both parties and observing visible injuries on both parties. The complainant's injuries were photographed by a corporal. The body camera videos did not capture any officer making a comment about the complainant reminding them of a character from the movie "Diary of a Mad Black Woman". No witnesses or officers at the scene heard any officer make that statement. There was no evidence to support the allegation of bias policing.

During the review of the body camera videos it was discovered that one of the accused officers had temporarily deactivated their body camera while on the call. This occurred after the arrest and the complainant was already secured in a patrol vehicle.

#### ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant's interview, the accused officers' interviews, the interviews of the witnesses, and the examination of the videos from all responding officers' body-worn cameras provided no evidence of misconduct on the part of one accused officer. The other accused officer was found to have temporarily deactivated their body camera in violation of department policy.

One officer was accused of Inadequate Response and the finding was unfounded. The other officer was accused of Inadequate Response, Bias Policing, and a Policy Violation. The respective findings to these accusations were Unfounded, Not Sustained, and Sustained. The officer receiving the Sustained finding received a document of counseling for violating Policy 703(4d), Activation of Body Worn Camera.