
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
Case Summary Data #2
December 2013

OVERVIEW

The Complainant witnessed the officer in squad 506 commit several alleged traffic offenses.

THE COMPLAINT

1. Violation of the Policy and Procedure Manual: that Officer 1 violated several traffic offenses.

OPCR AND MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(8) Violation of the MPD Policy and Procedure Manual
2. MPD Policy and Procedure Manual § 7-401 Normal Vehicle Operation: Under normal conditions, personnel will operate police vehicles in the same manner as required for the public.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

OPCR joint supervisors believed that the allegations, if proven true, would constitute an A-level violation. The case was sent to coaching for resolution.

EVIDENCE

In the course of investigating this complaint, the following steps were taken.

1. Complainant filed a complaint online that detailed the alleged violations.
2. No dispatch/Visinet records existed for the identified squad during the time provided by the Complainant.
3. No police report was created during the time of the event.
4. No squad camera recordings were available; the squad is not equipped with an MVR.
5. Coaching documents were prepared and sent to the precinct inspector.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

The Complaint

Complainant alleges that Officer 1 was driving his squad car behind the Complainant's vehicle. Complainant alleges that as they approached in intersection, Officer 1 veered his vehicle into a right turn lane. Complainant alleges that Officer 1 stopped his vehicle $\frac{1}{4}$ of the way through the intersection during the red light, and after the light changed, he proceeded to drive in the right turn lane. Complainant alleges he witnessed Officer 1 tailgate a pickup truck. Complainant alleges Officer 1 moved into the left lane of a two-way street to pass the truck and nearly caused a head-on collision with an oncoming vehicle.

COACHING

Coaching was referred to the appropriate supervisor by the precinct inspector.

Coaching Interview of Officer 1

The supervisor first described the complaint when meeting with Officer 1. The supervisor asked if Officer 1 recalled being in the area at the time described by Complainant. Officer 1 recalled driving in the area.

Officer 1 stated that the previous evening there was a shooting in the area. Witnesses to the shooting provided a description of the vehicle involved in the shooting. On the night of the incident that led to the complaint, another officer stopped a vehicle matching the description of the vehicle involved in the shooting, and Officer 1 was notified to provide backup.

Officer 1 stated that he did not drive code three (lights and sirens activated). Officer 1 did not recall causing a near head-on collision. Officer 1 stated that he did not believe he violated traffic laws or department procedures and “apologized if he caused anyone to feel that way.”

After the interview, the supervisor pulled incident reports related to the shooting and traffic stop. The supervisor confirmed the statements made by Officer 1. The supervisor concluded that because there was no video of Officer 1 driving nor GPS records that showed Officer 1 speeding, there was insufficient independent evidence to conclude that a policy violation occurred. The supervisor reported that she instructed Officer 1 to “make sure he abides by all traffic laws when he is driving a squad car during normal operating procedures.”