



SPOKANE POLICE DEPARTMENT

CHIEF OF POLICE

KEVIN HALL

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C24-091 OPO Number: N/A

Date of Complaint: 11/15/2024

Allegation: Making a False or Misleading Statement

Chain of Command Finding: Unfounded

Final Discipline: Not Applicable

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS:

On 03/11/2024 SPD Officers responded to a reported assault involving two suspects who attacked the victim with weapons, including a machete that was used to severely injure the victim's head. When the officers spoke with the victim, an officer recognized the suspects descriptions as two persons the officer spoke with a few hours prior in the area of the assault.

COMPLAINT:

The complainant alleged that on 03/11/2024, they were arrested without probable cause, and the officer created a false narrative. The complainant stated that the officers who were there did not help to set the record straight and they wanted to file a complaint about the overall interaction with the police. The complainant further alleged the officer's false or misleading statement led to court documents being falsified.

INVESTIGATION:

Spokane Police Internal Affairs investigated the complaint. The submitted police reports, a Charging Request, and CAD notes were analyzed. Several body worn camera videos were also reviewed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION:

Based upon the results of this investigation, the allegation of excessive force is considered **Closed - Unfounded** - *When the investigation discloses that the alleged act(s) did not occur or did not involve department personnel.* The complainant's principal concern appeared to be that the arresting officer named them and the co-defendant by name before they were identified, and the invalid identification led to a magistrate authorizing an arrest warrant.



This investigation has determined the arresting officer did not provide a false statement by naming the complainant by using their legal names as the suspects on the Charging Request (Affidavit of Facts) without identifying them first. The officers had, in fact, identified the complainant prior to the incident in question on a separate matter that was addressed by the same officers. Thus, the officers knew the described suspects by name.

