

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-39



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-39

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCR Finding	MPD Outcome
Officer 1 Allegation 1	7-314 Domestic Abuse	B	Sent to Review Panel	Merit	Discipline - Suspension
Officer 2 Allegation 1	7-314 Domestic Abuse	B	Sent to Review Panel	Merit	Discipline - Suspension
Officer 2 Allegation 2	10-401 Responsible for Inventory of Property and Evidence	B	Sent to Review Panel	Merit	Discipline - Suspension
Officer 3 Allegation 1	7-314 Domestic Abuse	B	Sent to Review Panel	Merit	Discipline - Suspension

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: N/A

Gender: N/A

Police Precinct: 1st

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges that officers failed to follow the domestic abuse protocol, failed to turn on their body worn cameras, and improperly handled evidence while responding to a call.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) *INTAKE INVESTIGATION*

a) VisiNet report

- i) The “Problem” is listed as “Domestic”. The call log indicates five officers responded to incident. Two of the officers listed with allegations were partners the day of incident and the other was working by themselves.

b) Police Report

There are 2 police reports for incident:

Report One: The public narrative states that officers responded to the listed address on a domestic abuse report. Officers spoke with the victim, and she stated she was pulled off the bed by the hair and dragged by the shirt into the kitchen. She was then pushed outside where it was below zero degrees, and she was barefoot. The victim was also threatened with a machete and a wire. The victim was given a blue card with the case number on it. Evidence was collected and property inventoried at the property room in City Hall and at the 4th Precinct.

Report Two: The public narrative states that the arrestee was transported and booked at HCJ for a gross misdemeanor warrant.

c) Other

- i) Initial complainant statements
- ii) Work schedule
- iii) AVL data (GPS)
- iv) 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. Officers on the scene all activated their BWC appropriately.

Officer Three advised Officer Two when they arrived on scene that the suspect had a warrant for their arrest. Offices contacted the suspect and took the suspect into custody. Officers announced that the basis of the arrest was due to a warrant from a prior charge. While viewing the BWC, the domestic assault was never addressed by the officers on the scene. Officer Two was seen on BWC to hold up the machete and told the victim to just, “Throw it away.” Officer One was seen assisting the suspect in putting on their shoes and locating a coat.

b) Squad Video Review

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-39



- 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 an administrative investigation.
- b) The case was assigned to a Sworn investigator.

4) ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION

Summary of the following:

- a) Complainant Statement
- b) Focus Officer(s) Statement
- c) Additional Evidence (i.e., digital media, employee awards, etc.)

CASE OUTCOME

5) OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

- a) An administrative investigation was completed and forwarded to panel.

6) POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL

- a) Review panel found merit on Allegation 1: Domestic Abuse (Officer 1)
- b) Review panel found merit on Allegation 2: Domestic Abuse (Officer 2)
- c) Review panel found merit on Allegation 3: Responsibility for Inventory or Property (Officer 2)
- d) Review panel found merit on Allegation 4: Domestic Abuse (Officer 3)

7) MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

- a) The Chief of Police agreed with the panelists and suspended the officers for 20 hours without pay.
- b) As a result of a settlement agreement, the officers received 10 hours of unpaid suspension.