

---

# POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #5

May 2015

---

## OVERVIEW

Complainant alleges he went to a precinct to report "sexual harassment" at a store downtown. Complainant alleges that when the female with him explained the situation, Officer 1 "insulted her [] accent." Complainant alleges that when he attempted to explain the issue, he was cut off by Officer 1 and insulted. Complainant alleges that Officer 1 told her that it was "not her problem" and asked Complainant to leave. Complainant alleges that when asked, Officer 1 would not provide her badge number but eventually "muttered it very quickly then insulted me when I asked her to repeat again."

## THE COMPLAINT

1. Professional Code of Conduct: Officer 1 "insulted her [] accent." Complainant alleges that when he attempted to explain the issue, he was cut off by Officer 1 and insulted. Complainant alleges that Officer 1 told her that it was "not her problem" and asked Complainant to leave.

## OPCR AND MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(2) – Inappropriate Attitude
2. MPD P&P § 5-105(14) Professional Code Of Conduct: Employees shall not use any derogatory language or actions which are intended to embarrass, humiliate, or shame a person, or do anything intended to incite another to violence.

## COMPLAINT PROCESSING

An online complaint was filed detailing the allegations. The complaint underwent intake investigation, and was reviewed by the joint supervisors. The complaint was assigned for a preliminary investigation. The complaint was reviewed again by the joint supervisors. The complaint was then sent to the precinct for coaching. Completed and approved coaching documents were returned to OPCR.

## EVIDENCE

1. Online Complaint

## SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

### Online Complaint

According to the complaint, the Complainant and his wife went to the precinct to report sexual harassment at a store. Officer 1 insulted the companion's Spanish accent, told the Complainant the sexual harassment was not her problem, would not file a report, and insulted the

Complainant and his wife. The Complainant alleged that he asked for Officer 1's name and badge, but she would not provide them.

## **INVESTIGATION**

The complaint was assigned to a civilian investigator. The Complainant gave his statement. According to the Complainant, he and his wife went to the precinct to report an incident that occurred at a store. Complainant states Officer 1 interrupted his wife. Complainant stated he asked for Officer 1's badge number. According to the Complainant, at this point Officer 1 was shouting. Officer 1 quickly yelled the number at the Complainant. The Complainant states that Officer 1 did not help them with their issue.

The Complainant's wife provided a statement. She was at a store with the Complainant. She went into the fitting room and noticed a security camera. The Complainant's wife was upset that a security camera was pointed into the dressing room. She stated they went to the precinct to complain. They encountered Officer 1 working the desk. The wife stated that she started to speak with Officer 1 about the incident. Officer 1 stopped the wife. The wife stated Officer 1 seemed angry that she did not speak English well. The wife stated Complainant began to speak with Officer 1. Officer 1 stated she did not know what occurred. The wife stated Officer 1 did not provide steps to address the issue or help them.

After a review of the preliminary investigation, the joint supervisors determined this matter should be coached. Coaching documents were sent to the precinct. The supervisor spoke with both the Complainant and his wife. The supervisor spoke with Officer 1. Officer 1 recalled the couple. She stated that there were communication difficulties due to the woman's strong accent. Officer 1 stated she advised the couple to contact store management or the City of Minneapolis Licensing Department. Officer 1 stated the couple were not accepting how to proceed, and she told them to leave because there was nothing else Officer 1 could do. The supervisor determined there was no policy violation, and Officer 1 was not coached.