



SPOKANE POLICE DEPARTMENT

CRAIG N. MEIDL
CHIEF OF POLICE

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C20-022 OPO Number: N/A
Date of Complaint: 3/2/2020
Allegation: Standard Violation
Chain of Command Finding: Unfounded
Final Discipline: Not Applicable

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

This internal investigation was initiated from an officer coming forward with circumstances to him that appeared suspicious. The reporting officer was offered a free pair of shoes by a fellow officer. When he received the shoes, he noticed there were some receipts inside the bag they came in that indicated they were from a Midwest shoe store. The cost of the shoes was over \$200.00, so he offered to pay his fellow officer for them. The reporting officer thought the explanation from the fellow officer on how he obtained the shoes in the first place was suspicious, so it concerned him that he may be receiving stolen goods. The officer contacted Internal Affairs to report the circumstances.

COMPLAINT

The allegation was a violation of Standard 4.8: Members of the Spokane Police Department shall not engage in any activity which would create a conflict of interest or would be in violation of any law.

INVESTIGATION

Internal Affairs investigators reviewed receipts and interviewed the complainant who explained the circumstances surrounding the transaction with the shoes. When interviewing the accused officer, he stated he wanted to get something for the reporting officer (complainant) because he appreciated him as his FTO. He wanted to get him some particular shoes but couldn't find them locally, so he asked his friend who lives in the Midwest who also works at a Footaction shoe store. He gave the friend his debit card number and paid for the shoes with the discount applied by him. The officer said the friend brought them out to the west coast where they met up for a wedding of another mutual friend. The shoes were in the wrong size, so he took them to a local Footaction store and exchanged them for the proper size. He told the reporting officer that he didn't pay for the shoes and then admitted he actually did. He explained that he didn't want the officer to feel obligated to pay him for them. It was an act of kindness that was misinterpreted as a potential criminal act.

The chain of command determined that the investigation indicated no evidence of wrongdoing on the part of the accused officer. Under the unusual circumstances, it was understandable why the reporting officer became uncomfortable accepting the gift and reported the incident.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The allegation was Unfounded, per the Chief of Police.