
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
Case Summary Data #6
February, 2017

OVERVIEW OF THE COMPLAINT

Complainant alleges that an officer in a squad, without sirens or other sign of an emergency, sped at 80 miles an hour, improperly switched lanes, and ran a stop light.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. OPCR Ord. § 172.20 (8) – VIOLATION OF THE P&P MANUAL
2. MPD P&P § 7-401 – NORMAL VEHICLE OPERATION: Under normal conditions, personnel will operate police vehicles in the same manner as required for the public. Violations of motor vehicle laws when not authorized, or careless and abusive use of police vehicular equipment may result in disciplinary action.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

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 the appropriate precinct for coaching. After the officer's supervisor completed the coaching investigation, the coaching documentation was received by the Joint Supervisors, who then approved it.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet – Unit Activity

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: Complainant asserted that a driver in a “[m]arked police “S[UV]” was “going over 80 miles an hr,” failed to switch lanes, failed to move over for a Minnesota Department of Transportation vehicle, and ran a stop light “without sirens or emergency lights.”

VisiNet – Unit Activity: The activity data shows that the officer was on a freeway near where the alleged incident occurred.

COACHING

The matter was sent to coaching for a potential violation of MPD P&P 7-401, whereupon the supervisor allegedly spoke with Complainant and reviewed the VisiNet report. After review of this material, and after discussing the matter with the officer, the supervisor asserted that a policy violation did occur and coached the officer regarding the matter. The supervisor noted in support: “Upon review of the circumstances and complainant information, it is likely that [the officer] did violate department policy 7-401 by proceeding through a red semaphore without legal justification.”

