

POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Public Case Synopses

April 2018

	Outcome	Description
1	Sent to coaching, officers coached, no policy violation	<p>5-105(A)(4) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant alleges that an unknown individual began "banging" on her door repeatedly between the hours 4 and 5 AM, prompting her to call the police. However, Complainant claims that officers did not respond to the scene until about 50 minutes after she called and asserts that they failed to go up to her home to ascertain if she was OK, instead shining a light on her door and then driving away.</p>
2	Probationary employee terminated prior to investigation	<p>5-102.01 Minnesota Law Enforcement Code of Ethics Probationary employee released from duty for HRO.</p>
3	Dismissed, no basis	<p>5-104.01 – Professional Policing Complainant alleges that his car was stolen and he was given the "worst service ever by the Minneapolis [P]olice [D]epartment."</p>
4	Dismissed, no basis	<p>5-105(A)(4) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant alleges that he was close to home when a police cruiser turned around, cut through traffic and initiated a stop of Complainant's vehicle. Complainant claims that he was calm about the situation but that officers "jumped" out of their vehicle and drew their weapons; one officer having a gun so close to his face "as if he was ready" to shoot Complainant. Complainant claims that he told the officer that he is a political activist, to which the officer told Complainant that he didn't care about that. Complainant also asserts that the officer shouted out disturbing comments toward him and his cousin, who was riding with him, such as the officer was going to have to "take" Complainant "out."</p> <p>Complainant also claims that he asked the officer the reason for the pull over but was not given an answer; instead, the officer only told him to put his hands up. Complainant contends that when officers took notice of people watching the detention, they then gave "falsified" reasons for the pull over.</p> <p>Further, Complainant asserts that the manner of the pull over--one in which officers cut through traffic--was dangerous to the general public. Also, he claims that the officers found only weed and no weapons but still treated Complainant and his passenger like "killers." Lastly, Complainant asserts that he felt that he was deprived of his constitutional liberties and robbed of his self-dignity.</p>
5	Sent to coaching, officer coached, no policy violation	<p>5-105(C)(1) – Professional Policing Complainant alleges that, after handcuffing a suspect, Officer stated to the suspect that, "I could have killed you, you stupid mother f*ck*r!"</p>
6	Dismissed, no basis	<p>5-105(A)(4) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant contends that she was stopped by an officer for not having her head lights on and was later asked to do sobriety tests. After the tests, Complainant claims that the officer put her into his squad and threatened to take her to jail. However, Complainant asserts that she requested another officer at the scene, and she was eventually let go after re-doing the tests.</p> <p>Upon being let go, Complainant contends that the officer failed to give her back her license and insurance.</p>
7	Sent to coaching, officers coached and policy violation found	<p>7-501.01 – Traffic Accident Reports It is alleged that an officer failed to write a report at the scene of an accident, telling Complainant that police reports are not made for incidents that don't involve a crime. According to Complainant, the officer told him that he had to merely exchange his insurance information with the other motorist.</p>

POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION

Public Case Synopses

April 2018

8	Employee resigned during investigation	<p>5-102 – Code of Ethics It is alleged that the officer engaged in crimes of sexual misconduct on multiple occasions.</p>
9	Sent to investigation, Panel found merit on four allegations, officers coached and policy violation found.	<p>5-105(2) – Professional Code of Conduct Complainant alleges his landlord threatened them and locked them in a room. Complainant alleges he escaped and called the police. Complainant alleges officers returned with him to the duplex but did not take the incident seriously. Complainant alleges officers were only there for 7 minutes. Complainant alleges his roommate requested an interpreter so the officers could understand what they were saying. Complainant alleges the officers did not investigate, and after they left the landlord attacked them. Complainant alleges he spoke with an officer and was told to go report the incident to the precinct. Complainant alleges the precinct would not help them, and would not use an interpreter.</p>
10	Dismissed, no basis	<p>9-200 – Search and Seizure Complainant alleges that police were called to her home due to an "argument." When the officers arrived, Complainant claims that she didn't know who was at the door and that officers "forcefully" entered her apartment though she was undressed and cooking. Complainant asserts that the officers asked her and her partner about names on the lease and their own identities, but she claims that her partner was uncooperative. According to Complainant, while ascertaining her partner's identity, officers placed their hands on the Complainant and her partner.</p>