
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #9

January 2015

OVERVIEW

Complainant alleges that he was injured in a car accident and a Minnesota Accident Report and police report needed to be created by the officer who responded to the accident. Complainant alleges that Officer 1 made excuses regarding why the reports were not filed for over a month.

THE COMPLAINT

1. Violation of the P&P Manual: Officer 1 made excuses as to why the police report and Minnesota Accident Report were not filed for over a month.

THE OPCR AND MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(8)— Violation of the P&P Manual
2. MPD P&P § 7-501 TRAFFIC ACCIDENT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURES
3. MPD P&P § 7-501.01 TRAFFIC ACCIDENT REPORTS

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

An online complaint was filed. The complaint underwent intake investigation and was reviewed by the joint supervisors. The joint supervisors determined that the complaint should be sent for coaching. Completed and approved coaching documents were returned to OPCR.

EVIDENCE

1. An online complaint was filed.
2. A Visinet report was obtained.
3. A CAPRS report was obtained.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint

An online complaint was filed indicating that the Complainant had been in an automobile accident, and it alleged that Officer 1 was the responding officer. Complainant alleged that Officer 1 made excuses regarding why the reports were not filed for over a month.

VisiNet

A Visinet report was obtained. The report indicates that the Complainant was in an accident. The Complainant was transported to the hospital for injuries.

CAPRS

The CAPRS report provides more details about the accident. The Complainant was in a vehicle in the middle lane. Another driver merged into the Complainant's lane. The Complainant's vehicle had passenger side damage. Complainant's vehicle was towed, and the Complainant was transported to the hospital for a possible neck injury. The report also indicates that the Complainant was given a blue card, and that a state accident report was completed.

COACHING

Coaching documents were sent to the precinct, and returned to OPCR. The returned documents were completed by the Supervisor. The documents indicate that the Supervisor spoke with Officer 1. Officer 1 told the Supervisor that she was unable to access the statewide accident database, and that test results were sent to the incorrect address. Officer 1 told the Supervisor there were no state accident forms at the precinct at the time, and she now had access to the state database.

The Supervisor determined that a policy violation did occur as the report was not completed in the amount of time required by policy. Officer 1 was coached about alternative methods for completing an accident report, and the timeline for completing an accident report.