

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-33



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-33

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Officer 1 Allegation 1	3-101 – Personal Appearance Policy	A	Sent for Coaching	N/A	Coaching-Completed
Officer 2 Allegation 1	3-101 – Personal Appearance Policy	A-D	Sent for Coaching	N/A	No Action Taken by MPD
Officer 2 Allegation 2	3-121.05 – Optional Uniform Apparel – Winter Hats	A-D	Sent for Coaching	N/A	No Action Taken by MPD

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: Black

Gender: Female

Police Precinct: 4th

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges officers did not appropriately document property seized during a search warrant. It is further alleged that the search warrant executed on a residence was unlawful. Officers were observed wearing “thin blue line” apparel that was not authorized by policy.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

- i) The “Problem” is listed as “Traffic Law Enforcement”. Report indicates running a vehicle’s information and an individual’s information. Indicates a civilian individual had a warrant from outside of Minneapolis and was detained due to warrant.

b) Police Report

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-33



i) Police report does not include a public narrative. In short it is in relation to an investigation and search warrant.

c) Other

i) Initial complainant statements

ii) Any other documents used to properly identify the officer

2) VIDEO ANALYST REVIEW

a) Body Worn Camera (BWC) Review

i) BWC footage exists for this complaint. Video analysts observed officers executing a search and collection of evidence. It is also observed officers were not wearing masks and had other items with non-MPD markings on them that would be in violation of policy. Gaiters with thin blue line and a patch with a thin blue line can be seen on some of the officers.

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 warranted coaching.

4) ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION

N/A

CASE OUTCOME

5) OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

a) The case was sent to the precinct for coaching.

6) POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL

N/A

7) MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

a) Officer 1 was referred to coaching and completed coaching with their supervisor.

b) Officer 2 was referred to coaching and coaching was not completed. Coaching documents describing officer 2's alleged policy violations indicated that no policy violation occurred for allegation 1 or 2.