
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #3

November, 2016

OVERVIEW OF THE COMPLAINT

Complainant alleges she had an "email encounter" with an officer regarding an incident and she is now afraid of his retaliation. She claims that the officer knows all about her, including "researching who [she] [is]" after she commented about one of his statements.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(2) - INNAPROPRIATE LANGUAGE OR ATTITUDE
2. MPD P&P § 5-104.01: PROFESSIONAL POLICING: Officers shall use the following practices when contacting any citizen, regardless of the reason for the contact: Be courteous, respectful, polite and professional.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

A complaint was submitted to the Minneapolis Police Department, and the Minneapolis Police Department forwarded the complaint to the Office of Police Conduct Review. Upon receipt of the complaint, an intake investigation and the matter was subsequently brought before the Joint Supervisors for intake review. Upon review of the complaint, the Joint Supervisors sent it to coaching.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. Email exchanges between Complainant and the officer

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: The complaint contains the following:

I would like to talk to someone about an email encounter with an officer about an incident. I am afraid of retaliation. I do not want to have the officer written up but I would like this to be noted somehow. I know I am vague. But I am also concerned because this officer knows all about me, meaning he researched who I am, a citizen, [and] making commentary about his recent statement.

Email exchanges between Complainant and the officer: In the initial email between Complainant and the officer, noted as a "truncated message", Complainant refers to the officer (and other officers) as a "knee[-]jerk" reactor who hired "irresponsible" officers. Further, Complainant referred to the officer and other officers as "old white men" due to the officer's prior statements.

In response, the officer sent an email to Complainant remarking that "'old white men' sounds like a racist, sexist, age discriminatory" comment. Further, the officer wrote Complainant, "If you walked out of your [particular] job no one would care. You don't tell us about police work, we don't tell you about [particular] work. Sound good?"

In ensuing emails, Complainant apologized to the officer and the officer agreed with Complainant's statement that, "[w]e all care about each other deep down."

COACHING

The supervisor failed to find a policy violation both for the officer's remarks and the threat of retaliation. In the coaching document, the supervisor noted that the officer's remarks came from a non-MPD email, and he was also speaking in a role outside that of a police officer. As such the supervisor noted he is "granted more latitude in his response" and subsequently no violation was found. Additionally, the supervisor was told by the officer that Complainant's personal employment information was readily accessible via social media sites; thus, the officer did not violate policy by searching for Complainant's information. Lastly, the supervisor found that the email exchange ended on a "conciliatory" note.