



SPOKANE POLICE DEPARTMENT

CHIEF OF POLICE

KEVIN HALL

Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number: C24-097 OPO Number: N/A

Date of Complaint: 12/12/2024

Allegations: Standard Violation

Chain of Command Findings: Unfounded

Final Discipline: Not Applicable

INCIDENT SYNOPSIS:

Two SPD officers went to a residence where a homeowner wanted turn in a firearm because they no longer wanted it. The officers cleared the call with notes of, "Comp advised he will sell the firearm instead of surrendering."

A few weeks later, it was later determined that one of the responding officers purchased the revolver from the call for service complainant. During the purchase and transfer process of the revolver, a local gun shop (FFL dealer) ran a serial number check and the revolver serial number returned as stolen. The purchaser was listed as a Spokane Police Officer. The revolver was later determined to **not** be stolen but was listed as such due to a clerical error involving the serial number. Further research showed the officer negotiated the purchase of the firearm during the call for service and paid less than market value for it.

COMPLAINT:

An internal complaint was initiated as the circumstances leading to the purchase of the firearm possibly violated the following relevant SPD Policies:

Standard 8.1: Members of the Spokane Police Department shall refuse to offer, give, or receive gifts, favors, or gratuities, either large or small, which can be reasonably interpreted as capable of influencing official acts or judgments.

Standard 8.2: Officers of the Spokane Police Department shall not consider their badge of office as a license designated to provide them with special favor or consideration.

INVESTIGATION:

This investigation was assigned to SPD Internal Affairs. Police CAD records and BWC video were reviewed. The officer involved was interviewed, and the homeowner was interviewed.



ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION:

While the officer received a reduction in price for the purchase of the item during their negotiation, whether this was a result of his official capacity was unclear. This price reduction could be construed as a “favor”, but it appeared to be unintentional by the owner. The investigation determined the financial part of the transaction occurred when the officer was off-duty, and the transaction was completed lawfully through a local gun dealer.

As a result, the officer’s chain of command spoke with the officer regarding Canons of Ethics 8.1 and 8.2, how this incident ran afoul of the standards, and the perception this type of transaction can have for the public can degrade the professional reputation of SPD.

