

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-48



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-48

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Allegation 1 Officer 1	5-103 Use of Discretion	A-D	Dismissed – No Basis	N/A	N/A
Allegation 2 Officer 2	5-103 Use of Discretion	A-D	Dismissed – No Basis	N/A	N/A

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: Black

Gender: Male

Police Precinct: 1st

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges that officers stopped the complainant in a gas station and asked for his ID and personal information. The officers stated the complainant may have been involved in a crime and released them after collecting their information.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

i) The “Problem” is listed as “Suspicious Person.” The call log indicates officers were the only ones on scene for this incident.

b) Police Report

i) There is no known police report for this incident.

c) Other

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-48



- 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. Officer 2's BWC starts in the store. Officers see the complainant at the cash register and wait for him to finish paying before approaching him. Officer 2 pulled him aside and stated he believed complainant may or may not have been involved in a crime and asked for his ID. Officer 1 took complainant's ID to the squad to run it while Officer 2 continued speaking with complainant. Officer 2 explains that complainant was not in trouble and that he was just gathering information. Complainant does state it is random. Officer 2 indicates a couple of times the photo officers have of the person they are looking for looks very similar to complainant. Complainant was released after Officer 1 returned. The entire interaction lasted less than 3 minutes. Officer 2 was observed being cordial and even apologized for the stop but expressed again complainant looked very similar to the photo officers had.

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 dismissal.

4) ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION

NA

CASE OUTCOME

5) OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

- a) Case was dismissed with no basis.

6) POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL

NA

7) MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT

NA