

**OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY**

**OPCR-21-46**



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-46

**ALLEGATIONS**

	<b>Policy Implicated</b>	<b>MPD Policy Manual Range</b>	<b>OPCR Outcome</b>	<b>PCRP Finding</b>	<b>MPD Outcome</b>
<b>Officer 1 Allegation 1</b>	7-402 (IV)(A)(3) – Pursuit Policy	A	Sent to Coaching	N/A	Coaching Completed
<b>Officer 2 Allegation 1</b>	7-402 (IV)(A)(3) – Pursuit Policy	A	Sent to Coaching	N/A	Coaching Completed
<b>Officer 3 Allegation 1</b>	7-402 (III)(C)(1)– Pursuit Policy	A	Sent to Coaching	N/A	Coaching Completed

**REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Race:** N/A

**Gender:** N/A

**Police Precinct:** 5<sup>th</sup>

**SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT**

Complaint alleges that officers were involved in a pursuit following a suspect vehicle fleeing after officers attempted to approach. The pursuit was brief and terminated by a Sergeant.

It specifically alleges further that Officers 1 and 2 had no information the vehicle met the criteria to initiate pursuit, only stolen with keys. Officer 2 purposefully drove in front of fleeing vehicle to block its escape. Information known at the time did not meet criteria for a roadblock or intentional contact. Officer 3 was alleged not properly documenting reason for ending pursuit.

---

**SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION**

*1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION*

a) VisiNet report

- i) The “Problem” is listed as “Suspicious Vehicle”. The call log indicates only 3 officers responded to the call, however, one responding officer never arrived. Report indicates the pursuit lasted roughly 16 minutes before being called off.

b) Police Report

- i) Public Section of the report states an officer dispatched to the above location in reference to a parked, suspicious vehicle. Vehicle was reported to Minneapolis as stolen. The suspect fled and took evasive action and after a short pursuit officers terminated the pursuit under the direction of a supervisor.

c) Other

- i) Initial complainant statements
- ii) Supervisor pursuit review
- iii) 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. BWC shows the pursuit was short in duration and 2 squads responded. Officers attempted to contact the occupants in the vehicle and activated their lights. The vehicle backs away from officers and makes a U-turn. It then accelerates away from the officers. Officers initiate the pursuit. Officer 2 attempts to block the vehicle with their squad. The vehicle gets around officer and continues to drive away. Officer 2 is heard clarifying information with dispatch and dispatch replies no carjacking. Supervisor terminates pursuit with both squads terminating the pursuit.

b) Squad Video Review

- i) Squad video shows officers in pursuit of a vehicle and ends with termination of pursuit.

*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.

**OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY**

**OPCR-21-46**



---

4) *ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION*

N/A

**CASE OUTCOME**

5) *OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW*

a) All officers were referred to precincts for coaching.

6) *POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL*

N/A

7) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

a) All 3 officers received coaching.