

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-38



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-38

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Allegation 1	4-223 BWC (IV)(A)(6)(a)(vi)	A-D	Dismissed	N/A	N/A
Allegation 2	5-104.01 Professional Policing	A-D	Dismissed	N/A	N/A

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: White

Gender: Male

Police Precinct: 1st

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges that an officer at the 1st precinct desk was rude and dismissive. It further alleges that the officer failed to activate their BWC appropriately. It is alleged that an individual was scammed out of money and the description of how it happened was confusing, which led to the officer not being helpful or friendly.

It is also alleged that the officer escalated the interaction with the citizen resulting in allegedly becoming aggressive and confrontational.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

i) The “Problem” is listed as “Theft – Report Only”. The call log notes officer was the one taking the report.

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-38



b) Police Report

i) Police report indicates that while working the front desk of a precinct, the victim walked in for a report because victim took a check from a friend of friend, cashed the check and gave friend some of the money.

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 was reviewed and indicated there were roughly 3 seconds of video with notable audio before abruptly turning off. It was noted to be unclear what the conversation consisted when the audio was turned on.

b) Squad Video Review

i) Incident occurred at a precinct desk. Officer was not driving a squad.

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 dismissed. The officer left the department.

4) *ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION*

N/A

CASE OUTCOME

5) *OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW*

a) The case was dismissed because the officer left the department.

6) *POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL*

a) N/A

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-38



7) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

a) NA