



SPOKANE POLICE DIVISION

CRAIG N. MEIDL
CHIEF OF POLICE

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C18-099 OPO Number: N/A

Date of Complaint: 11/29/2018

Allegation: Multiple Policy Violations, Body Worn Camera Violation and Improper Supervision

Chain of Command Finding: Multiple

Final Discipline: Written Reprimand

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The involved officer volunteered to assist with an in-progress stolen vehicle and eluding investigation. He was on his way to the Academy when he heard the call come in on the radio. He assisted with the call unprepared and deployed his K9.

COMPLAINT

Internal Affairs opened an internal complaint against the officer for various policy violations. It was alleged that when the officer assisted with the call and deployed his K9, he was not equipped with proper equipment, including body armor, control devices, his body worn camera (BWC), and his duty pistol. He was wearing civilian clothes without any markings or badges identifying him as an officer. The allegation against a sergeant present at the incident was failure to supervise.

INVESTIGATION

The Internal Affairs investigation included a review of incident reports and BWC, as well as interviews of the involved officer and supervisor. The officer deployed his K9 during the incident to help track the suspect, and his K9 apprehended the suspect. BWC video from other officers showed the level of danger in the incident. The suspect was not compliant and he assaulted the officer.

The officer advised Internal Affairs that he wanted to arrive as soon as possible to the incident to limit the opportunity of the suspect escaping apprehension. However, deploying a K9 without the proper equipment was clearly outside of policy. The chain of command determined the officer violated the policies as alleged.

The investigation also reviewed the actions of the supervisor on scene, who was not part of the officer's chain of command and was actively engaged in the incident. The investigation did not show a failure to supervise. The sergeant addressed the lack of equipment with the officer after the suspect was in custody.

The chain of command review stated the supervisor would not be expected to need to verify that a witness officer offering to assist with his department K9 was equipped with basic police equipment while operating a patrol vehicle.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

All allegations against the officer were sustained and he received a letter of reprimand as a sanction:

Policy 706.4:	Enforcement Actions Policy
Policy 1024.3.1:	Body Armor Policy
Policy 308.5.3:	Control Devices Policy
Policy 703.4:	Body Camera Policy

The allegation against the sergeant for Improper Supervision was Exonerated.