
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #2

August 2015

OVERVIEW

Complainant alleges a group of officers came to her residence to breathalyze an individual. Shortly after arriving, Complainant states a male officer made a comment about "hitting the jackpot." The Complainant alleges that three male officers laughed about the comment. Complainant states she asked several times what "hitting the jackpot meant," and was finally told by a female officer that it was nothing personal.

THE COMPLAINT

1. Professional Code of Conduct: Complainant alleges an officer made a comment about "hitting the jackpot," and other officers laughed.

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. The complaint underwent intake investigation and was reviewed by the joint supervisors. The complaint was sent to the precinct for coaching. Completed and approved coaching documents were returned to OPCR.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet report

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint

The Complainant alleged that a male and female officer came to her residence to breathalyze a male. Complainant alleged shortly thereafter, two male officers came into her home. The Complainant alleged the initial male officer made a comment that they "hit the jackpot". Complainant alleged the other officers laughed at the comment. Complainant alleged she asked the officer about the comment, and the female officer stated it had nothing to do with her.

Complainant alleged she found the “jackpot” comment and laughter to be “very offensive, unprofessional, and did not consider the human dignity” of the male.

VisiNet

The VisiNet indicates that officer was conducting a parole check at the Complainant’s residence. Officer was backed up by additional MPD officers.

COACHING

The complaint was sent to the precinct for coaching. The supervisor completed the coaching documents. The supervisor stated the Complainant had contacted the precinct right after the incident. The Complainant requested to speak with a supervisor. The supervisor indicated he spoke with the Complainant. The supervisor stated the Complainant was upset about the “hit the jackpot” comment. The supervisor told the Complainant that he would follow up on the incident.

The supervisor determined that officer had been doing a probation check with a probation officer at the Complainant’s apartment. The supervisor spoke with the officer. The officer stated that the back-up officers had nothing to do with his comment. The officer stated he had made the comment when they determined the male was not in compliance with his probation. The officer stated there had been several individuals not in compliance during the probation checks. The officer stated he normally did not make comments like that, but he had just returned from a Vegas trip. The officer stated he tried to explain the comment to the Complainant, but she refused to accept the explanation. The supervisor contacted the Complainant to explain the situation. The Complainant stated she would be filing a complaint. The supervisor indicated he provided information on the complaint process.

The supervisor spoke with the officer after receiving the OPCR coaching documents. The officer stated again that it is not a comment he normally makes, and it was not meant to demean anyone. The officer stated he attempted to apologize to the Complainant. The officer stated the comment was just to the probation officer. Therefore, the supervisor did not speak to the other officers on the call.

The supervisor determined there was no policy violation, and the officer was coached when the Complainant initially contacted the precinct.