
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #8

September 2014

OVERVIEW

Complainant called to report a suspected burglary in progress. Officers did not arrive at the scene to address the report until 30 minutes later. Homeowner, upon returning home soon thereafter, reported that a burglary had taken place at the residence. Units quickly responded to the homeowner call.

THE COMPLAINT

1. Failure to provide adequate or timely police protection: Complainant called to report a suspected burglary, and officers did not respond for over 30 minutes.

OPCR and MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(8) –Failure to Provide adequate or timely police protection
2. MPD P&P § 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.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

Complainant filed an online complaint detailing the allegations. Reports were obtained. The case was referred to the precinct for coaching by the joint supervisors. Upon return of the coaching documents, it was determined that MECC relayed the original call as low priority. Hence, officers responded to the original call in a timely manner. The complaint was referred to MECC supervisors to address the issue.

EVIDENCE

1. Complainant filed an online complaint.
2. VisiNet reports were obtained.
3. CAPRS report was obtained.
4. Coaching documentation submitted to precinct supervisor.
5. Final approved coaching documents were returned to OPCR.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint

The Complainant states he called 911 to report two males on bicycles acting suspicious and trying to open the door of a neighboring residence. Complainant states it took officers over 30 minutes to arrive. Complainant states that shortly after he called 911, he saw activity in the

neighbors' home. Complainant states he went to see if his neighbors were home. Neighbors told Complainant that they were burglarized.

VisiNet 1

The first VisiNet report indicates that Complainant called 911 reporting 2 males suspiciously knocking on the doors of a neighboring residence. The request for service was not broadcasted until fifteen minutes later, and the squad did not arrive until fifteen minutes after it was assigned. The call was a level 2 priority.

VisiNet 2

A second VisiNet report indicates that the homeowner called 911 to report a burglary forty minutes after Complainant called for service. The first squad arrived minutes after being assigned. Additional squads were sent to the residence.

CAPRS

The CAPRS report indicates that some electronics had been stolen from the home. Officers spoke with Complainant. The report indicates that Complainant stated he called 911 to report seeing two males at the door of the residence.

COACHING

Coaching Documents

Coaching document contains a handwritten and typed section. The handwritten section indicates that the supervisor spoke with the Complainant and reviewed the VisiNet reports. The document indicates that the supervisor determined there was no policy violation, and the complaint is with the Minneapolis Emergency Communication Center (MECC).

The typed section of the coaching document elaborates on details included in the handwritten section. The supervisor determined the length of time between dispatch and arrival was reasonable for level 2 priority calls, and therefore no policy violation occurred. Officers checked the area for suspicious individuals and found none. The supervisor detailed his conversation with the Complainant. Supervisor spoke with the Complainant about the timeliness of the response and how the MECC system works. Complainant apologized for making the complaint against the officers and agreed it should be filed with MECC.