
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Case Summary Data #8

November, 2016

OVERVIEW OF THE COMPLAINT

Complainant alleges that he had given a ride to some people, only to discover that they had stolen "money and a watch, money clip and medications" from a bag in the car. The next day, Complainant contends that he went to a nearby precinct to report the theft. However, Complainant asserts that an officer at the front desk told the Complainant that his complaint "made no sense" and that he shouldn't file a report till he had replaced his medications.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(6) - FAILURE TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE OR TIMELY PROTECTION
2. OPCR Ord. § 172.20(2) - INNAPROPRIATE LANGUAGE OR ATTITUDE
3. MPD P&P § 5-105 (E) (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 § 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

The complaint was received via the online system. Upon receipt of the complaint, an intake investigation was conducted and the matter was subsequently brought before the Joint Supervisors for intake review. Upon review of the complaint, the Joint Supervisors sent the matter to coaching.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: Complainant contends that he is a mechanic, and also that he offered his services and a ride to three individuals whose car had broken down. After transporting the individuals, Complainant alleges that he uncovered that they stole money, a watch, a money clip and medications from his backpack, which was resting on a backseat near the individuals.

Complainant asserts that he went to a precinct the next day to report the theft. Upon explaining the theft, Complainant alleges that an officer at the desk began asking "interrogating questions". Further, Complainant asserts that the officer told him that his story "made no sense" and that he did not need to file a report; instead, Complainant asserts that the officer told him to go to his doctor and get his medications.

COACHING

The supervisor failed to find a policy violation for the officer's alleged remarks and failure to file a criminal complaint due to Complainant's inability to comply. In the coaching document, the supervisor noted that he had tried numerous times to contact Complainant through a number he provided but was unsuccessful. The supervisor also emailed Complainant, and he contends that the Complainant provided the same number he had failed to answer previously. The supervisor asserts that when called the number again, Complainant again failed to answer. According to the supervisor, the matter was closed due to the inability to gather more information from Complainant, such as in helping to identify the Focus Officer.