

## POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

## Public Case Synopses

December 2017

Outcome		Description
1	Sent to investigation, Panel found merit, letter of reprimand issued	<p>5-103 Use of Discretion</p> <p>Officer 1 responded to a police call during which he deployed his squad shotgun. After completing his duties at the call, Officer 1 was returning the shotgun to the squad ready condition when he accidentally discharged the shotgun. There were no injuries or damage to property as a result of the accidental discharge.</p>
2	Dismissed – no basis	<p>5-316 Maximal Restraint Technique</p> <p>It is alleged that Complainant--a vulnerable adult--was snatched from his vehicle by a family member and otherwise harmed, yet Complainant claims that officers who responded failed to believe her claim. Instead, Complainant asserts that officers believed the family member who accused Complainant of trying to run him over. Resultantly, Complainant asserts that she was pulled from her car by "[f]ive white [sic] men," who then "hog-tied" her. The report notes that the family member told officers that Complainant has been off of her medications for "2 or 3 weeks and was combative." The incident was capture on body camera recording.</p>
3	Sent to investigation, dismissed – no basis	<p>5-102 Code of Ethics</p> <p>It is alleged that an officer responded to a superior, "Dr. Spock will be sending you a slip. He's to[p] notch," after being asked by his supervisor to provide a doctor slip for asking to be marked "sick." Further, it is alleged that the officer had admitted to his supervisor previously that he had been trying to get another officer to cover his shift due to a planned vacation. When no other officer would cover the focus officer's shift, the supervisor claims that he believed the officer would return from his vacation with enough time to cover his shift, which was over the weekend. When he did not, the supervising officer claims he requested a doctor's note for the focus officer's absence. Lastly, it is alleged that the focus officer's time, which had been marked as AWOL due to the supervisor's suspicion of the focus officer's malfeasance, had been changed to "regular" work time absent the supervisor's approval.</p>
4	Sent to investigation, dismissed – failure to cooperate	<p>5-104 Impartial Policing</p> <p>Complainant alleges that he went to a precinct to report a "sexual assault" in private but was instead told by Officer 1--who was at the front desk--that there were "no officers available" to speak to him in that manner. Complainant claims that he witnessed "several" officers go into the main room and even saw an officer "standing near [Officer 1] eating and watching television," listening to him as he told his story regarding the sexual assault. Complainant states that he felt "miserable and embarrassed" during the whole experience.</p> <p>Later, upon arriving home, Complainant asserts that he called Officer 1 several times regarding the status of his case and instead was hung up on. Next, Complainant contends that he tested the officer by calling from a different number using a "texting app on [his] phone" and the officer this time answered.</p> <p>Lastly, Complainant believes that he was discriminated against because he is a "black man."</p>
5	Dismissed, failure to cooperate	<p>5-105(E)(2) Professional Code of Conduct</p> <p>Complainant alleges that officers responding to a call for an assault on a woman focused attention on "females who were drinking" and never stopped or followed the male suspect who was walking away. Complainant states officers just "tried to get [the] females to leave."</p>

## POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

## Public Case Synopses

December 2017

6	Dismissed – no basis	5-107 (A)(1) – Procedural Code of Conduct Complainant contends that an officer told him that she was "gonna make up extra charges on" him. Further, Complainant states that a sergeant who also responded to the scene told the officer to let Complainant go. However, Complainant claims that the officer was "unsatisfied" with that response and instead called another sergeant who then told her to take Complainant to jail. Complainant contends that he was arrested for "[d]isorderly conduct."
7	Sent to investigation, dismissed – failure to cooperate	5-107 (3) – Procedural Code of Conduct It is alleged that an officer "sexually assaulted" an arrestee during the course of a search.
8	Dismissed – no basis	5-105 (E)(2) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant states that she was "attacked" by her cousin and her cousin's boyfriend while trying to retrieve her belongings. Complainant contends that she called the police twice and they failed to help her. Instead, Complainant asserts that officers' arrested her, called her a liar and belittled her in the process. Complainant claims that she told the officers that she had been kicked in the head and that she has a history of epilepsy, and requested an ambulance. She also states that she requested her jacket and backpack, which contained all of her information, but was ignored. Complainant also states that she believes the officers' used "excessive force" and that she was mistreated because she is a "lesbian."
9	Sent to investigation, Panel found merit, one officer terminated, second officer 40 hour suspension	5-305 Use of Deadly Force It is alleged that Officer 1-who arrived at the scene to assist other officers who were attempting to place the suspect in custody--kicked the suspect in the face while the suspect was "pushing off of the ground," knocking the suspect unconscious. Upon collapsing to the floor, the suspect's head struck "the pavement," leading to a "pool" of "[b]lood." Prior to Officer 1's alleged use of force, it also alleged that Officer 2 kicked the suspect in the "abdomen" while he was slowly moving towards the ground after exiting a vehicle.
10	Dismissed – no basis	5-105(3) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant alleges that MPD officers allowed an ex-spouse to enter their apartment and remove property while they were not home. They contend that there was no documentation of the items removed, and that there was no court order allowing the ex-spouse to enter the apartment.