



# SPOKANE POLICE DEPARTMENT

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

## Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C20-037 OPO Number: N/A  
Date of Complaint: 5/26/2020  
Allegation: Inadequate Response  
Chain of Command Finding: Inquiry  
Final Discipline: Not Applicable

### INCIDENT SYNOPSIS

The complainant alleged that he has made numerous calls for assistance regarding a street performer who drums and uses an amplifier at the Rotary fountain. The complainant alleged that the performer is breaking the noise ordinance in the case of volume but has been told rudely by a radio supervisor that police will not respond.

### COMPLAINT

The allegation was Inadequate Response.

### INVESTIGATION

The Internal Affairs investigator interviewed various SPD personnel and the Riverfront Park ranger. He found that the complainant is the only person on record of calling in noise complaints regarding the drummer in the park. The times the drummer is performing in the city park is during normal daytime business hours and there is precedent in law that the park is a public space for music performances and freedom of expression. The Downtown Precinct lieutenant and Dispatch lieutenant were both made aware of the subject of these complaints.

The investigator interviewed the complainant and explained that he had researched the calls to his apartment complex since the beginning of this year. In many of those instances, officers had responded and taken some action, to include asking the male drumming in the park to please be considerate and move to another location. Officers had also responded on at least one occasion and removed a transient male who had entered his building. The investigator also explained that he would not expect a dispatcher to just say they were not going to send an officer if some other explanation was not provided. He further explained the policy and laws regarding transient persons being inside or outside of his building. As a result of the conversation, the investigator suggested that the complainant continue to request an officer respond when he thinks it is necessary, and to insist that he expects contact from them if that is what he desires. The complainant was satisfied with the clarification and information provided to him and did not wish to make a further complaint.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

The investigation was closed as an Inquiry, as there was no policy violation for Internal Affairs to investigate. The Ombudsman concurred.