

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-52



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-52

ALLEGATIONS

	Policy Implicated	MPD Policy Manual Range	OPCR Outcome	PCRP Finding	MPD Outcome
Officer 1 Allegation 1	4-401.02 Vehicle- Seat Belts	A	Sent to Coaching	NA	Coaching Completed
Officer 1 Allegation 2	4-223 (IV)(A)(6)(a)(i) BWC	A	Sent to Coaching	NA	Coaching Completed
Officer 2 Allegation 1	4-223 (IV)(A)(6)(a)(i) BWC	A	Sent to Coaching	NA	Coaching Completed

REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS

Race: N/A

Gender: N/A

Police Precinct: 2nd

SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT

Complaint alleges that officers were involved in a SQUAD A with a civilian vehicle. It is also alleged that officers failed to activate their BWC appropriately and Officer 1 failed to wear their seatbelt. Officers were responding to a theft call when they were hit by a civilian vehicle.

SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION

1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION

a) VisiNet report

i) The “Problem” is listed as “Personal Injury Accident”. The call log indicates multiple officers, including listed officers, responding. It also indicates a multi-agency response for EMS and FIRE. The report also indicates a squad was involved in an accident.

OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW

CLOSED CASE SUMMARY

OPCR-21-52



b) Police Report

i) Public Section of the report states officers assisted in a squad accident. A state accident completed. Blue card given to the involved party.

c) Other

i) Initial complainant statements

ii) Analysis report

iii) Squad A Visit

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 but only after the accident occurred. No prior footage is known to exist.

b) Squad Video Review

i) Squad video was reported as not running due to a malfunction at the beginning of officers' shift.

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.

4) *ADMIN/PRELIM INVESTIGATION*

NA

CASE OUTCOME

5) *OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW*

a) Officers were referred to precinct for coaching.

6) *POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW PANEL*

N/A

7) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

a) Coaching for both officers was completed.