
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
Case Summary Data #2
May 2014

OVERVIEW

On the date of the incident, there were six separate Visinet reports created regarding the Complainant's address. Complainant alleges that when she called for police service, and the officers that arrived became "verbally abusive." Complainant alleges that an officer yelled at her, stating "your[sic] the idiot that that brings these ppl[sic.] into your home and then call us repeatedly to remove them." Complainant alleges that when she called to have her son removed from the home (he is an adult and not allowed in the house), one of the officers stated, "watch how I handle this. . . [to the son] if you can't get back in you can break a window or door." Complainant alleges that when she told the officer that her son "is going to abuse [drugs] and will return and abuse complainant] and could kill [complainant]" the officer replied, "you bring it on yourself. Complainant alleges that she asked for his badge number and "he laughed and walked out slamming my door."

THE COMPLAINT

1. Failure to Provide Adequate protection: That officers did not provide Complainant with service and instead told Complainant that she was the cause of the issues that led to the 911 call.
2. Failure to Provide Adequate protection: That an officer told Complainant's son that he could break into her home if Complainant would not allow him to enter.
3. Inappropriate Language: That an officer called Complainant an idiot, laughed at her, and was verbally abusive.

OPCR AND MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(6) Failure to Provide Adequate Protection
2. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(2) Inappropriate Language
3. 5-105(2) PROFESSIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT: On-duty officers shall, at all times, take appropriate action within their jurisdiction, to protect life and property, preserve the peace, prevent crime, detect and arrest violators of the law, and enforce all federal, state and local laws and ordinances.
4. 5-105 PROFESSIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT: Employees shall not use indecent, profane or unnecessarily harsh language in the performance of official duties or in the presence of the public.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

After taking into consideration the complaint, CAPRS reports, and Visinet logs, the joint supervisors concluded that the case should be submitted to coaching.

EVIDENCE

1. Complainant submitted a written complaint.
2. Visinet/Dispatch logs were obtained.
3. Police reports were obtained.
4. Coaching documents were prepared and sent to the precinct inspector.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint

Complainant stated that she called for police services several times and the same two police officers responded, becoming “more and more verbally abusive.” Complainant alleges that someone disconnected her 911 call, and officers did not do anything about it. Complainant stated that officers allowed a person “to remove items that weren’t not[sic.] theirs” and when Complainant told an officer this, he stated, “What they hell do you want, you want them out or what?” Complainant stated that the officer stated that she is at fault for repeatedly allowing the individuals into her home and then later calling for police to remove them.

Complainant stated that her son has mental health issues and abuses Adderall. Complainant stated that when she wouldn’t allow him to enter her home, the officer stated, “Watch how I handle this” and told Complainant’s son to break into the house. Complainant stated that the officer allowed her son access to a full bottle of his Adderall. Complainant stated that the officer walked out of her house and slammed her door.

Complainant ended her Complaint by stating that the people who she wanted removed from her house called the police repeatedly and the police took it out on Complainant. Complainant stated that she will never call the police again.

Visinet Reports

Six separate incident reports exist from the date in question.

Visinet 1

The first Visinet report indicates that Complainant called for police services around 3:00 AM because Complainant’s son and female friend were bothering her in her bedroom. Complainant stated that this was an ongoing issue. Officers arrived and completed the call in approximately 30 minutes.

Visinet 2

The second Visinet report indicates that another person in Complainant’s home called for police services approximately five hours after Complainant’s call. The call indicates that Caller 2 accused Complainant of assaulting a neighbor. Further information was retrieved which revealed that the call was actually regarding a retrieval of property. Caller 2 accused Complainant of taking her property and keeping it in her apartment.

Officers 3 and 4 arrived and stated that Caller 1 exaggerated the call to get a faster police response. They stated that no assault occurred, there were no injuries, and that parties were not being truthful. Officers stated that Complainant is a heavy repeat caller. They stated that Complainant invited Caller 1 to stay at the house and had an argument about a car key. Caller 1 wanted to leave but Complainant would not return Caller 1's car key.

Officers cleared the call after approximately 45 minutes.

Visinet 3

A new caller, Caller 2, requested service stating that the officers who responded in Visinet 2 refused to deal with an argument over ownership of a ring. Officers 3 and 4 again responded and advised the parties that this was a civil issue. The call was cleared after approximately 20 minutes.

Visinet 4

Complainant's daughter called for police service approximately 1 hour after the last call ended. The daughter stated that she was locked out and her mother (complainant) wouldn't let her into the home. Officer 5 responded to the call. The daughter indicated that his mother has mental health issues and provided a phone number for her social worker. Complainant called for police service while her daughter was on the phone with dispatch and stated that her daughter is a male-to-female transgender individual but "physically a male" with a history of mental health issues. Complainant could not provide dispatch with information regarding the mental health issues.

Officer 5 reported that no one was at the house when he arrived. A short while later, he returned to the house, reported Code 4, and stated that he attempted to advise Complainant.

Visinet 5

Caller 3, who is likely the same individual listed as Caller 1 in the second Visinet report, called to request police service to retrieve additional stolen property that Complainant would not release. Caller 3 stated that Complainant's boyfriend was sending harassing text messages. Officers 3 and 4 responded to the call and completed the incident after approximately 90 minutes.

Visinet 6

Complainant called for police service eight hours after the last incident ended, alleging that her son was attempting to break into her home. Complainant stated that her son has "borderline personality disorder" and "gender dysphoria." Complainant stated that her son carries knives. Officers 6, 7, and 8 responded and spoke with Complainant and her daughter. Officer 8 reported that Complainant just wanted officers to remove her daughter.

CAPRS Report

A CAPRS report exists for an incident that occurred the following day. Complainant's daughter called police to report that Complainant's abusive boyfriend was in her home. Complainant has an OFP against the abusive boyfriend. Officers checked the home and found the boyfriend hiding in her closet. He was arrested.

COACHING

Allegations of inappropriate language and failure to provide adequate protection were sent to the precinct for coaching. In her Complaint, Complainant stated "it was the same 2 police officers every time and each time they returned they became more and more verbally abusive."

Officers 3 and 4 were the only officers who responded to the home multiple times, so they were assigned as the focus officers of the coaching document.

Officer's Response

Officers 3 and 4 appear to have provided responses, but they are documented together as one narrative. The officers stated that they acted professionally, never dealt with Complainant's daughter, and that Complainant requested that they "do things that they are not allowed to do."

Supervisor Recommendation

The supervisor concluded the coaching document by stating that he is very familiar with the Complainant and her constant requests for service. As an example, he stated that Complainant constantly wants her daughter locked out of her home, but her daughter is a resident. The supervisor noted that Complainant is confusing multiple officers who dealt with each call. The supervisor stated that the officers acted professionally and no policy violations occurred. The supervisor indicated that he followed up with Complainant via email. No email was included in the returned documents.