
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #7

October 2015

OVERVIEW

Complainant alleges her daughter was sexually harassed at the school. Complainant alleges she insisted the police were called. An officer responded and said he would take care of it. Complainant alleges it took 15 days to get a police report. Complainant alleges the police report is inaccurate; it depicts the incident as a game and not inappropriate touching. Complainant alleges the report depicts the contact as pinching, not grabbing. Complainant alleges no action has been taken, and the number given to her by the officer no longer works. The Complainant alleges she has not been updated by the officer. Complainant states she wants an accurate police report.

THE COMPLAINT

1. Professional Code of Conduct- Complainant alleges the police report was delayed.
2. Quality Report Review- Complainant alleges the report written by the officer is inaccurate.

OPCR AND MPD POLICIES

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(6)–FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE AND TIMELY PROTECTION
2. OPCR § 172.20(8) – VIOLATION OF THE P&P MANUAL
3. MPD P&P § 4-606(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. MPD P&P § 4-606 – QUALITY REPORT REVIEW: It is the responsibility of officers, supervisors, case managers, investigators and Watch Commanders to ensure that offense reports are complete and accurate.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

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

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet Report
3. CAPRS Report and Supplements

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint

Complainant alleges her daughter was sexually harassed at the school. Complainant alleges she insisted the police were called. An officer responded and said he would take care of it. Complainant alleges it took 15 days to get a police report. Complainant alleges the police report is inaccurate; it depicts the incident as a game and not inappropriate touching. Complainant alleges the report depicts the contact as pinching, not grabbing. Complainant alleges no action has been taken, and the number given to her by the officer no longer works. The Complainant alleges she has not been updated by the officer. Complainant states she wants an accurate police report.

VisiNet Report

The VisiNet report demonstrates that the alleged officer responded to the school at the alleged date and time of the alleged sexual harassment issue but provides not narrative of the incident.

CAPRS Report and Supplements

The CAPRS report shows that the alleged officer responded to the incident and that a student pinched Complainant's daughter's buttocks. It also notes that school staff requested they handle the incident. One of the supplements notes that the school vice principal prepared the Complainant's daughter's new school for her arrival and that the student who pinched her was disciplined at the school level. Another supplement notes that the officer is aware of Complainant's unhappiness with his report writing, that he contacted MPD supervisors and a County Attorney in regard to the issue and is confident in his documentation of the event. It also notes that the officer will encourage the Complainant to file a formal complaint with the officer's supervisor.

COACHING

The Complaint was sent to the precinct for coaching. The coaching officer reviewed the evidence and spoke with the officer in question. The officer in question explained the reason for the delay in writing the police report was in response believing originally that the incident would be handled by the school. As such, the coaching officer determined there was no policy violation in regard to the Professional Code of Conduct. The coaching officer did determine that the report was not written with due care based on coding error, late and irrelevant report supplements and a lack of detail and completion. As such, the coaching officer determined a policy violation had taken place in regard to Quality Report Review and the officer was coached on proper reporting. Coaching documents were signed and returned to the OPCR.