

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-23



PUBLISH DATE: May 6, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-23

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Ofc. 1 Allegation 1	4-223(IV)(7)(a) Body Worn Cameras (Procedures, Rules and Regulations)	A-D	Referred for Coaching	N/A	Coached
Ofc. 2 Allegation 1	4-223(IV)(7)(a) Body Worn Cameras (Procedures, Rules and Regulations)	A-D	Referred for Coaching	N/A	Coached

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: White

Gender: Female

Police Precinct: 1st

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complainant alleges they observed a vehicle with substantial front-end damage driving on their street. Complainant contends that upon arrival, officers activated their lights, and they could hear them speaking to the driver of the damaged vehicle about the condition of the vehicle. According to the complainant, it was obvious the vehicle and been in a crash.

Complainant is concerned that officers did not conduct any sobriety tests on the driver of the vehicle and that they allowed the driver to move the vehicle (which was blocking the road) to a legal parking spot along the road. From their vantage point, on the balcony overlooking the road, it did not appear to them that the driver was “competent” enough to drive, advising that the driver pulled forward and reversed more than 10 times in small increments and may have struck a parked car in the process.

The complainant expressed concerns for the general safety of themselves and those who live in their community.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

- i) The “Problem” is listed as “Suspicious Vehicle.” This was a call for service that came in from the community and was not self-initiated by officers. The call log indicates officers were on scene with the vehicle for approximately 50 minutes.

Officers included notes stating that officers spoke to the driver and learned that the was driver coming home from work. The driver indicated to the officers that the crash had happened prior to that evening. Officers indicated they checked the surrounding areas for “damage to parked vehicles or structures.” They also checked for, and were unable to locate, any property damage hit and run calls around the City of Minneapolis. According to the notes in the call, the officers advised the driver that the vehicle was unsafe to drive, that it needed to be legally parked, and that it would need to be towed at personal expense.

b) Police Report

- i) A full police report was not generated for this call.

c) Other

- i) Initial complainant statement provided in complaint form
- ii) Cellphone video provided by complainant
- iii) Photographs of the vehicle provided by complainant
- iv) AVL data (GPS) confirming multiple squads responded to the scene

2) VIDEO ANALYST REVIEW

a) Body Worn Camera (BWC) Review

- i) BWC footage exists for this complaint. Video analysts reviewed approximately 45 minutes of video from officers who arrived and remained on scene. It was determined that officers on scene repeatedly deactivated and reactivated their BWC while on scene.

b) Squad Video Review

- i) Squad video was not reviewed as part of this complaint.

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-23



3) CASE REVIEW & JOINT SUPERVISOR ROUTING

- a) After reviewing the relevant and available evidence collected during intake, the Joint Supervisors agreed that the matter should be referred to the precinct and that the officers should be coached regarding the BWC policy.

CASE OUTCOME

4) OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

- a) The matter was referred to 1st Precinct for coaching

5) MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

- a) Completed coaching documents for both officers, indicating officers had been coached, were returned to OPCR and added to the case file.