

---

**POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION**  
Case Summary Data #1  
May 2017

---

**OVERVIEW OF THE COMPLAINT**

Officers were engaged in a pursuit after a vehicle fled detention. The matter was brought before the Pursuit Review Committee (PRC) who found that the lead pursuit driver failed to air his speed during the course of the pursuit. After PRC's review of the matter, it was then forwarded to the Joint Supervisors for their review, who decided to send the matter to coaching.

**ALLEGED VIOLATIONS**

1. MPD P&P § 7-406.01 ROLE OF OFFICERS IN THE PRIMARY PURSUIT VEHICLE: Officers in the primary pursuit marked squad shall... [n]otify dispatcher by radio of the location, speed, direction of travel, and reason for the pursuit.

**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. Pursuit Review Committee Recommendation
2. VisiNet Report
3. CAPRS Report
4. Videos 1-5

**SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE**

Pursuit Review Committee Recommendation: The committee recommendation form noted that none of the squads in pursuit in this particular incident aired their speeds. It also noted that more than three squads were involved on the call.

VisiNet Report: The report shows documents a vehicle chase.

CAPRS Report: The report includes supplements from officers involved in the chase that documented their routes when participating in the chase, as well as their interactions with the suspect and vehicle passengers. The supplements do include some "average" speeds squads were going.

Videos 1-5: The videos showed squads in pursuit. Audio on the videos did not include officers reporting the speed at which they were traveling during the pursuit.

**COACHING**

The matter was sent to coaching due to the allegations of failing to follow appropriate vehicle pursuit procedure. The Inspector in charge of the appropriate precinct reviewed the CAPRS report and coached the Sergeant, who was the lead on the pursuit himself, and who also supervises the other officers involved.

The Inspector noted that the Sergeant was apologetic for his actions and that of his supervisees. The Sergeant was very receptive to feedback and would continue to be a “great leader and mentor to his officers.”