



# SPOKANE POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

## Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C20-020 OPO Number: 20-08  
Date of Complaint: 3/16/2020  
Allegation: Inadequate Response  
Chain of Command Finding: Unfounded  
Final Discipline: Not Applicable

### INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant lives across from a business and has had noise issues with them for the past two years. The complainant has had multiple interactions with various police officers regarding the issue. The complainant alleged that officers were dismissive of his concerns and said that the business was not in violation of the noise ordinance.

### COMPLAINT

The allegation was Inadequate Response for two involved officers.

### INVESTIGATION

Internal Affairs investigators reviewed the complaint, the 911 calls, officer reports, and video evidence. Investigators interviewed the complainant and involved officers. One involved employee was surprised by the complaint, due to the actions she had taken to resolve the complainant's concerns. She indicated she was aware of the noise complaints that the complainant had made against the business. She also knew the business owner. In the past two years, she had mediated with the business and the neighborhood council president over several meetings. Those individuals and the complainant had come to an agreement months before the complaint was filed. To document those interactions, the employee kept all the emails involving contact with the complainant and turned them over to Internal Affairs. The current Neighborhood Resource Officer (NRO) had put an alert on the business location, requesting an officer response to every noise complaint there and any information forwarded to him.

The chain of command determined that the accused officers, as well as the NRO responsible for the neighborhood, took multiple steps to evaluate and respond to the potential neighborhood issue. Neighbors were contacted in the area to determine if they had experienced any similar issues. The Business Conditions Officer also looked at this issue from the perspective of business/entertainment compliance. Liquor and Cannabis was requested to respond and conduct checks at the location. The neighborhood council was briefed on the issue and asked to assist in a solution. The business owner and

the complainant were also brought together for a meeting. At the conclusion of the investigation, there was not cause to pursue an action against the business for their entertainment or business license, particularly without other complainants. While acknowledging that the complainant was not satisfied that the business continued to have live music and patio seating, the steps taken by the accused officers were logical and appropriate under the circumstances. They acted within their authority and with a balanced perspective of the residential neighborhood and business owner.

#### ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The allegation of Inadequate Response against the two accused officers was Unfounded, per the Assistant Chief of Police.