



SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

CRAIG N. MEIDL
CHIEF OF POLICE

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C18-026 OPO Number: N/A

Date of Complaint: 4/29/2018

Allegation: Unlawful - Improper Search/Seizure and Policy/Standard Violation

Chain of Command Finding: Not Sustained

Final Discipline: Not Applicable

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant was stopped by an officer for a traffic infraction. The officer checked the complainant's driver's license, asked for proof of insurance, and checked the temporary vehicle license permit posted in the rear window of the complainant's vehicle. The officer did not cite the complainant for any violations.

COMPLAINT

The complainant disputed the reason for the traffic stop and alleged the officer stopped him without legal justification.

INVESTIGATION

The complainant and officer were interviewed. The video from the officer's body-worn camera was reviewed. The complainant contended he did not commit the alleged violation of the traffic law. The officer stated he clearly saw the complainant commit the traffic law violation and conducted a lawful traffic stop. The video did not capture the alleged traffic law violation, but it did capture the interaction between the officer and complainant once the traffic stop was initiated.

The video depicts the following:

- The officer told the complainant the reason for the traffic stop and then asked for a driver's license, proof of vehicle insurance, and a vehicle registration.
- The driver argued with the officer about the reason for the traffic stop, but handed the officer a driver's license and paperwork from the recent vehicle purchase. The driver had no proof of vehicle insurance.
- The officer asked to see the temporary vehicle license in the rear window and the complainant complied.

- The officer checked the complainant's information through dispatch.
- The officer chose to allow the complainant to leave without being cited for the traffic law violations.
- There were no witnesses to the infraction.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The complainant's interview, the accused officer's interview, and the examination of the video from the officer's body-worn camera provided no evidence of misconduct on the part of the accused officer.