### **OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY** 

OPCR-21-13



PUBLISH DATE: March 1, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-13

# **ALLEGATIONS**

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Ofc.1 Allegation 1	4-223(IV)(A)(6)(a)(i) Body Worn Camera- Activation Required	A-D	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Coached
Ofc. 1 Allegation 2	9-107 Citizen's Arrest	A-B	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Coached
Ofc. 2 Allegation	9-107 Citizen's Arrest	A-B	Referred to Coaching	N/A	Coached

### **REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS**

Race: Black

Gender: Male

Police Precinct: 2<sup>nd</sup>

# SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complainant alleges that when officers responded to an assault in progress, they broke a door while making entry into the residence. Complainant further alleges that they were not notified of the reason for their arrest until they were removed from the apartment and secured in a squad car. Lastly, the complainant alleges they were unable to complete a citizen's arrest on another involved party.

### **OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY** 



#### OPCR-21-13

## SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

- 1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION
  - a) VisiNet report
    - i) The "Problem" is listed as "Assault in Progress." According to dispatch records, a total of seven (7) officers and a supervisor responded.
  - b) Police Report
    - i) Public Section of the report states that Officers responded to an assault in progress. Upon arrival they were met by the victim who stated their neighbors had assaulted them. After making contact with the suspects, they were placed under arrest and book at HCJ.
  - c) Other
    - i) Initial complainant statements

Complainant stated officers damaged their door upon making entry to the apartment. They further allege that they were not notified of the reason for arrest until they were secured in a squad.

#### 2) VIDEO ANALYST REVIEW

- a) Body Worn Camera (BWC) Review
  - i) BWC footage exists for this complaint. Video analysts/Intake Investigator reviewed 25 videos in-part or in-full totaling 3 hours and 30 minutes. Upon viewing BWC it was noted that complainant used force to prevent officers from entering their apartment. When officers entered the complaint attempted to flee out the back of the apartment before being detained.
- b) Squad Video Review
  - i) Squad video was not active at the time of the incident.

#### 3) CASE REVIEW & JOINT SUPERVISOR ROUTING

a) After reviewing the relevant and available evidence collected during intake, the Joint Supervisors agreed the complaint should be referred to 2<sup>nd</sup> Precinct for coaching.

## **OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY** 

OPCR-21-13



# CASE OUTCOME

# 4) OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

*a)* OPCR Joint Supervisors referred this matter to coaching on April 22, 2021.

## 5) MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

*a)* Supervisors in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Precinct met with the officers and returned the completed coaching documents marked "coached" on April 4, 2021. In the comments section of the coaching documents, officers indicated the reason(s) for not pursuing the citizen arrest paperwork included lack of cooperation by the arrestee and officer safety due to a hostile crowd at the scene. Both were included in written reports.