

**OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY**

**OPCR-21-58**



PUBLISH DATE: July 15, 2022

FROM: Office of Police Conduct Review

CASE SUMMARY NUMBER: OPCR-21-58

**ALLEGATIONS**

	<b>Policy Implicated</b>	<b>MPD Policy Manual Range</b>	<b>OPCR Outcome</b>	<b>PCRP Finding</b>	<b>MPD Outcome</b>
<b>Allegation 1</b>	4-401.02 Vehicle- Seat Belts	A-B	Sent for Coaching	NA	No action taken by MPD
<b>Allegation 2</b>	4-401.02 Vehicle- Seat Belts	A	Sent for Coaching	NA	Coaching Completed

**REPORTED DEMOGRAPHICS**

**Race:** N/A

**Gender:** N/A

**Police Precinct:** 1<sup>st</sup>

**SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT**

Complaint alleges that officers were driving around 9<sup>th</sup> Street S approaching Nicollet Mall when officers heard something like a Taser deployment and individuals yelling when they came to a stop in an intersection. The officer put the squad in reverse with emergency lights. While reversing the squad, the squad struck a civilian vehicle. There were no reported injuries and damages to the vehicles were minor.

**SUMMARY OF INVESTIGATION**

*1) INTAKE INVESTIGATION*

a) VisiNet report

i) The “Problem” is listed as “Property Damage Accident”. The call log indicates Officers were partners the day of incident. Report indicates the initial call was due to a Squad A (Squad accident).

**OFFICE OF POLICE CONDUCT REVIEW**

**CLOSED CASE SUMMARY**

**OPCR-21-58**



b) Police Report

i) Public Section of the report states a squad was involved in an accident.

c) Other

i) Initial complainant statements

ii) Accident Review

iii) Crash Report

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. Video analysts reviewed both officers' BWCs. The Squad A occurs within the first 20 seconds and there is no audio. It appears Officer 1 is driving down 9th street (given Nicollet Target is on the left side of screen and is located on 9th street and Nicollet). Officer comes to the intersection of 9th and Nicollet when squad appears to stop and then go in reverse. There is a sudden shake in the video that would align with an impact. Officer 1 is observed getting out of the squad without wearing a seatbelt. He returns to the squad and Officer 2 is visible in BWC and does not appear to be wearing a seat belt either. Officer 1 requests civilian driver to pull up out of the intersection and then he pulls his squad up behind the civilian. Officers speak to civilians who were getting off buses asking what was going on and if people were ok as they heard someone deploying a taser. It is heard from a metro transit worker that he witnessed the accident and saw officers turn on their lights and civilian didn't back up quick enough. Officer 2 takes pictures of the civilian's front bumper and the squad's rear bumper and there does not appear to be major damage. Rest of video is of officers and civilian exchanging information and processing the accident. Officer's ask civilian if they are ok and he responds yes. Civilian also indicates he understands things happen quickly and did not want to make a big deal about the accident. Officers expressed per policy they had to file a report.

b) Squad Video Review

i) Squad video catches impact as officers reversed. Squad Video does not capture officers wearing a seatbelt or not.

*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-21-58**



---

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*

NA

7) *MINNEAPOLIS POLICE DEPARTMENT*

- a) Officer 1 – No action taken by MPD.
- b) Officer 2 – Coaching provided.