

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-29



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-29

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Allegation 1 Officer 1	7-401 (B)(1) Normal and Emergency Vehicle Operation	A	Sent for Coaching	Merit	Coaching - Completed
Allegation 2 Officer 2	7-401 (B)(1) Normal and Emergency Vehicle Operation	A	Sent for Coaching	Merit	Coaching - Completed

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: N/A

Gender: N/A

Police Precinct: N/A

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges that they observed several MPD squads speeding on a Highway without lights and sirens. Alleged going 10 – 15 miles over posted speed limit. Expressed officers were 25 – 30 miles outside of Minneapolis when incident occurred. Complainant assumes officers were attending an out of city training.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

i) No VisiNet for incident. Incident occurred outside of city limits and was not involved in a response to any known call.

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-29



b) Police Report

- i) No police report for incident. Incident occurred outside of city limits and was not involved in a response to any known call.

c) Other

- i) Initial complainant statements
- ii) AVL data (GPS) – Officer 1
- iii) AVL data (GPS) – Officer 2
- iv) Audio Report – Call in of complaint
- v) Drivers Report – 3rd party who took complaint
- vi) Any other documents used to properly identify the officers

2) *VIDEO ANALYST REVIEW*

a) Body Worn Camera (BWC) Review

- i) BWC footage does not exist. Officers were not responding to a police call.

b) Squad Video Review

- i) Squad video does not exist. No lights or sirens were activated. Officers were not responding to a police call.

3) *CASE REVIEW & JOINT SUPERVISOR ROUTING*

- a) After reviewing the relevant and available evidence collected during intake, the Joint Supervisors agreed the complaint warranted coaching for both officers.

4) *ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION*

NA

CASE OUTCOME

5) *OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW*

- a) Both officers were referred for coaching with respective supervisors.

6) *POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL*

NA

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-29



7) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

- a) Coaching was conducted for each officer by their respective supervisors as both officers are of differing rank.