

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/28/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer negligently operated a department vehicle.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF/W **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant withdrew the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/01/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** IO-2 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/01/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** IO-2 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer(s) entered a residence without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant refused to provide an interview for the case and stated he did not want to be contacted again. The complainant provided a date and location for his contact with the police, however, records do not show any police contact with the complainant on or near that date or location. The complainant failed to provide necessary additional requested information needed to investigate the case.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer(s) failed to properly document property

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant refused to be interviewed and stated he did not want to be contacted again. The complainant provided a date and location for his contact with the police, however, records do not show any contact between the police and the complainant on or about the date and location provided. The complainant failed to provide needed and necessary additional requested information

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/15/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he should not have been arrested. The complainant stated he and his daughter were defending themselves from their attacker and used weapons to attack the other party. The officer stated her investigation revealed that the complainant and his daughter attacked the victim and caused bodily injuries. The victim and other witnesses stated the complainant and his daughter assaulted and injured the victim. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation did occur, however said act was lawful and appropriate.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer wrote an inaccurate Incident Report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the Incident Report was not accurate. The officer stated the report she wrote was true and accurate. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/15/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used inappropriate behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer molested him while he was handcuffed. The complainant stated the officer touched his groin area without his permission. The officer denied the allegation. The officer stated he conducted an arrest search of the complainant. Witnesses did not corroborate this allegation. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/31/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:**02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer intentionally damaged the complainant's property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF/W **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/31/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF/W **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The claimant withdrew the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/13/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises issues outside OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** IO-1 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises issues outside OCC's jurisdiction. This complaint has been referred to:

Fairfax Police Department
Attn: Chief of Police
144 Bolinas Road
Fairfax, CA 94930

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/13/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises issues outside OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1

DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT : The complainant raises issues outside OCC's jurisdiction. The case has been heard in an unknown court. There is no referral at this time.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:**

DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT :

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/11/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** IO-1 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complaint raises matters not within the jurisdiction of OCC. The case has been referred to:

Internal Affairs
25 Van Ness
San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** IO-1 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction. The case has been referred to:

Internal Affairs
San Francisco Sheriff's Office
25 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/05/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE# 1 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer searched the complainant, his girlfriend and vehicle without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained the complainant at gunpoint without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/05/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE# 2 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer harassed the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made inappropriate comments and acted in an inappropriate manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/05/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer cited the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/22/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** IO-2 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within OCC's jurisdiction.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/08/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made intimidating and threatening comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer acknowledged he ordered the complainant to back away from his patrol vehicle and to step back onto the sidewalk for officer safety. The officer said he was writing the complainant's citation when the complainant approached at a fast pace towards the side of his door. The witness officer said she did not recall any conversations between the named officer and the complainant. No other witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used profanity

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation, stating he did not use profanity when speaking to the complainant. The witness officer said she did not recall any conversations between the named officer and the complainant. No other witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/08/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer issued a parking citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** TF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the vehicle was purchased from the dealer without plates and had a valid dealer temporary identification affixed to the vehicle. The officer denied the allegation. The officer stated he did not observe a dealer's temporary identification affixed to the vehicle. The officer acknowledged he wrote a parking citation because the vehicle was missing its' license plates. The officer stated he retrieved the license plate number written on the citation from the registration information on the MVT. The officer could not recall if he had been trained to complete a parking citation in this manner. DPT dismissed the citation due to the officer citing for missing plates, when in fact a license plate was indicated on the citation. The witness officer stated she did not observe a dealer temporary identification, yet recalled the vehicle not having license plates. During the OCC investigation, it was also apparent that a misinterpretation of the expiration of the dealer's temporary identification exists. SFPD officers and several DMV investigators believe the expiration to be 90 days, when in fact the dealer's temporary is valid for up to six months. The evidence proved that the action complained of was the result of inadequate or inappropriate training or the absence of needed training when viewed in light of Departmental policy and procedure.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made an inappropriate comment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation, stating she did not make a sarcastic comment to the complainant. The witness officer did not hear the named officer make the comment to the complainant. No other witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/23/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1 - 3: The officers used unnecessary force on the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers pulled up behind his parked car and one of the officers questioned him, and then instructed him to spit something out of his mouth. The complainant had not placed anything inside his mouth. This officer then grabbed the complainant around the neck and yelled at him to spit something out of his mouth. Other officers grabbed the complainant and threw him to the ground. Officers drove the complainant's head against the ground, causing wires in his jaw from recent surgery to snap. Officers placed their weight on the complainant's back and head, preventing him from breathing. An officer pinched the complainant's Adam's apple, and an officer pushed the complainant's head forward, causing intense pain. The complainant-felt objects being forced into his mouth, including what he believes was a gun barrel. The named officers said they saw the complainant place a white object they believed to be cocaine in his mouth. In an attempt to prevent the complainant from swallowing it, one of the named officers grabbed the complainant's head and pushed it to his chest. When the complainant resisted, the other two named officers took him to the ground. The named officers attempted to retrieve the drugs by using a mastoid pain compliance technique without success. The officers denied grabbing the complainant by the throat, banging his head against the ground or inserting any object inside his mouth. A witness officer confirmed the account of the named officers. The complainant's medical records indicate he had dental surgery for jaw fractures thirteen days before this incident. They document his complaint of jaw pain due to the force used during his arrest and describe him having dried blood on his face. The dentist who performed the surgery on the complainant said the complainant's post-arrest medical records do not reveal an injury to his jaw due to this incident, although he had soft tissue swelling. The complainant said a friend of his was present and witnessed this incident but he was unwilling to identify this individual due to fear of retaliation by police. This witness contacted Office of Citizen Complaints once and left a telephone message but never made contact again. No other witnesses were identified. The communications records for this incident document officers reporting that the complainant had placed drugs in his mouth that he was attempting to swallow and record officers telling the complainant to open his mouth. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/23/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made inappropriate comments to the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said an unidentified officer made inappropriate and insulting comments to him during his arrest. All four officers who were present at the time denied that the inappropriate comments described by the complainant were made. The complainant said a friend of his was present and witnessed this incident but he was unwilling to identify this individual due to fear of retaliation by police. This witness contacted Office of Citizen Complaints once and left a telephone message but never made contact again. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to accept a private person's arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer did not accept his request to make a private person's arrest. The officer stated the complainant did make the request but later rescinded the request after the store employees said they would then want to make a private person's arrest of the complainant. No other officer or witnesses heard either of the alleged requests. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer acted inappropriately and made inappropriate remarks.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer made him sign a trespass form. The officer denied the allegation and stated the complainant signed the form of his own free will. A witness corroborated that the complainant signed the trespass form of his own free will and that the officer did not force the complainant to do this. It was further alleged that the officer made an inappropriate comment by saying that he had their license plate. The officer admitted to making the statement in regards to the female friend of the complainant who would not provide ID or CDL when requested, after she got into their drivers seat of their vehicle. The officer stated to her that it would not matter if she provided the information because he had their license plate. This was a statement of fact and does not rise to a level of misconduct. The evidence proved that the alleged actions occurred, however the actions were proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to write an Incident Report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he requested an incident report and a private persons arrest. The officer corroborated that the complainant made the requests but added that the complainant later rescinded these requests when he learned that the store would then press charges against him. No other witness heard either of the requests. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/02/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE #** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer was rude.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer failed to call another department to research a property issue but gave her a phone number, and told her if she were not reasonable, he would terminate a phone call. The evidence proved that the acts that formed the basis of the complaint occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/25/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/13/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly process property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The claimant states in his civil claim form that the officer took possession of his cell phone and did not return it to him. The officer denied the allegation. The claimant did not respond for an interview. The telephone number for the witness listed on the claim form is disconnected. There are no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/08/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence in connection with his complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used force against the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence in connection with his complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/08/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer misrepresented the truth.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence in connection with his complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made threatening and retaliatory comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation, stating he had no idea what the complainant was referring to in regards to threatening and retaliatory comments. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer issued him a citation without cause. The complainant was cited for violating Vehicle Code section 22522, parking a vehicle within three feet of a wheel chair access ramp that is designated by either a sign or red paint. The investigation revealed that the area where complainant's vehicle was parked was not designated by either a sign or red paint as required under the statute; the Department of Parking and Traffic dismissed this citation. However, if the vehicle had been within three feet of the access ramp, an officer could have properly cited for violating Vehicle Code section 22500(1) that does not require the posting of a sign or red paint. The Office of Citizen Complaints recommends that the Department issue a Bulletin and provide roll call training that alerts officers as to the correct Vehicle Code section to use when enforcing parking violations at wheelchair access ramps. The Office of Citizen Complaints also recommends that the Department revise the standard San Francisco Police Department citation form to include the correct violation for parking at a wheelchair access ramp (VC 22500 (1)).

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made inappropriate comments & behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The identity of the officers has not been determined. The complainant gave conflicting information to the initial investigating officer and to the Office of Citizen Complaints. No witnesses were identified by the SFPD during its investigation, as well as the Office of Citizen Complaints' investigation. The complainant has failed to provide additional requested evidence. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used unnecessary force during a detention.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The identity of the officers has not been determined. The complainant gave conflicting information to the initial investigating officer and to the Office of Citizen Complaints. No witnesses were identified by the SFPD during its investigation, as well as the Office of Citizen Complaints' investigation. The complainant has failed to provide additional requested evidence. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to provide medical attention.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The identity of the officers has not been determined. The complainant gave conflicting information to the initial investigating officer and to the Office of Citizen Complaints. No witnesses were identified by the SFPD during its investigation, as well as the Office of Citizen Complaints' investigation. The complainant has failed to provide additional requested evidence. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to report the use of force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The identity of the officers has not been determined. The complainant gave conflicting information to the initial investigating officer and to the Office of Citizen Complaints. No witnesses were identified by the SFPD during its investigation, as well as the Office of Citizen Complaints' investigation. The complainant has failed to provide additional requested evidence. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/08/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly drive a department vehicle.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complaints stated that the officer operated his department issued vehicle in a negligent manner, causing an accident resulting in personal injuries. The complainants both stated the officer failed to activate the siren on his department-issued vehicle during a Code 3 response to an emergency call. The complainant denied use of a cellular phone during the operation of a motor vehicle. The OCC interviewed several witnesses to the accident. The content of the witness statements conflicted. They ranged from not hearing a siren at all, to hearing a siren at some distance, to hearing a brief siren sounded while the officer drove through the intersection. The officer denied the allegation. The investigation failed to disclose sufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/09/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer did not respond to his 911 calls for help, because he appeared in court against her that day. The officer stated she did not receive any call for help from the complainant and did not recall being in court with him that day. The witnesses did not respond to date. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT:05/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers detained the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officers detained her without justification. The officers denied the allegation and said that the complainant's vehicle was stopped for having tinted windows. The complainant admitted that she had tinted windows. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers prolonged the detention of the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officers prolonged her detention for no reason. The officers stated that the amount of time in which the complainant was detained was reasonably necessary to conduct their investigation. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers searched the complainant's residence without a search warrant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officers searched her apartment without a search warrant. The officers stated that the search was conducted under the authority of a duly issued search warrant. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers seized the complainant's property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officers seized her property without justification. The officers stated that they had reasonable cause to believe that the items seized during the execution of a search warrant were stolen. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:**02/23/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9: The officer(s) intentionally damaged the complainant's property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officer(s) ransacked her apartment. The officers questioned regarding this allegation said that the complainant's apartment was already in disarray when they entered the apartment. The complainant was not present during the search. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegations.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #10-11: The officers entered the complainant's residence without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officers stated that the entry was made under the authority of a duly issued search warrant. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #12-13: The officers made inappropriate behavior and/or comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officers denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #14-15: The officers failed to process complainant's property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that several items were seized from her residence. The officers stated that the search was conducted under the authority of a duly issued search warrant and that items seized during the search were booked as evidence and itemized in the incident report. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations occurred. However, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/21/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:**02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained the complainant and his friend without justification

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer detained him and his friend in San Francisco in front of a fast food restaurant. The OCC was unable to identify the officer. The witness did not come forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made by the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer searched the complainant's personal property without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer searched inside a bag belonging to him in front of a San Francisco fast food restaurant. The OCC was unable to identify the officer. The witness did not come forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made by the complainant.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/21/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer issued an invalid order.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer ordered him and his friend to leave the area when neither he nor his friend were obliged to do so. The OCC was unable to identify the officer. The witness did not come forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made by the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made inappropriate comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer made inappropriate comments to him and his friend as they stood in front of a San Francisco fast food restaurant. The OCC was unable to identify the officer. The witness did not come forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made by the complainant.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/21/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT : . The complainant stated she walked her dogs off leash in a portion of a park where leashes are required. She admitted she disregarded multiple orders by the officer to stop when he asked her to do so. The witnesses stated that the complainant resisted arrest. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT : . The complainant stated the officer used unnecessary force when he took her into custody. The complainant stated she walked her dogs off leash in a portion of a park where leashes are required. She admitted she disregarded multiple orders by the officer to stop when he asked her to do so. The witnesses stated the officer walked up behind the complainant and grabbed her hand and started to place handcuffs on her. One witness stated the complainant pulled her hand away and resisted. The officer held the complainant's hand but was unable to complete a standing handcuffing. The officer took the complainant to the ground. The witnesses stated the complainant continued to resist. One witness saw the complainant kick and hit the officer in the legs. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/21/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer made an inappropriate comment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT : Witnesses observed the officer walk up behind the complainant and take the complainant into custody, ultimately taking her to the ground. The witnesses observed the complainant screaming. The complainant stated that while she was on the ground, the officer was on top of her and impaired her respiration. The complainant stated that the officer made an inappropriate remark, telling her "Shut up, you can breathe." The complainant said she could not breathe. The witnesses did not overhear the conversation between the officer and the complainant, due to distance. The officer denied the allegation. He responded that he checked the complainant's airway, found no obstructions, and instructed her not to scream. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation stated in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT :

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/15/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1 & #2: The complainant was arrested without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant denied doing the acts for which she was arrested. The officers accepted a private person's arrest, and booked the complainant because the offense was likely to continue if she was only cited. The signed private person's arrest form is part of the physical evidence in this case. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3 and #4: Conduct Reflecting Discredit for inappropriate comments and behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the officers spoke and behaved inappropriately toward her while inside her home. She was unable to provide witness information for this event. The officers denied inappropriate behavior and comments. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/15/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5 & #6: Neglect of Duty for failure to investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers refused to investigate allegations of criminal activity she made but could not provide witness information for this allegation. The officers stated that they did investigate her allegations. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: Neglect of Duty for failure to write an accurate police report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer wrote an inaccurate police report. The officers denied the allegation. A person named in the report provided a statement, but his statement differs from the statement made by the complainant regarding the inaccuracy of the report, and does not give pertinent information regarding the reason for the complainant's arrest. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/20/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officer used unnecessary force during his detention. The officer denied the allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers detained the complainant at gunpoint.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officers detained him and his companion at gunpoint. The officers denied the allegation. The statement of the complainant's companion did not corroborate the complainant's allegation. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/20/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officer used profanity during the contact. The officer denied the allegation. The statement of the complainant's companion did not corroborate the complainant's allegation. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer pat-searched the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer pat-searched him without justification. The officer stated he conducted a narcotics search on complainant because he saw the complainant and his companion engaging a hand-to-hand transaction that he believed to be narcotics. The complainant's companion stated he was not sure if the officer searched the complainant. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/20/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer tightly handcuffed the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officer placed him in tight handcuffs. The officer denied the allegation and stated that he checked the handcuffs' degree of tightness when he placed it on the complainant. The officer's partner stated the complainant did not complain that his handcuffs were tight. The complainant's companion saw the complainant in handcuffs but did not say whether the handcuffs were tight or hear the complainant complain of pain to the officers. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer failed to issue a Certificate of Release.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** S **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: Department General Order 5.04(II)(A)(3) provides that if a person is taken to a police facility or physically restrained, a Certificate of Release must be issued.

The complainant alleged the officer failed to issue him a Certificate of Release. The evidence shows that the complainant was handcuffed during his detention. A preponderance of evidence proved that the conduct complained of did occur, and that using as a standard the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/20/08 **PAGE#** 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer failed to write an Incident Report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The officer allegedly failed to write an Incident Report. The officer denied the allegation and stated that he did not prepare an Incident Report because no formal action was taken during the contact. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9: The officer failed to report the use of force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer allegedly failed to report the use of force. Record shows no sufficient evidence that force was used during the contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/20/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/06/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used a derogatory term.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** S **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer used a derogatory term towards her during the incident. The officer denied the allegation. One witness corroborated the complainant's version of events. Per a preponderance of evidence, the officer violated DGO 2.01 Rule 14. Public Courtesy.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/03/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complainant stated the San Francisco Police Department failed to even handedly enforce traffic laws against bicyclists as it does against motorists during Critical Mass Fridays.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The OCC conducted its own inquiry regarding the enforcement actions of the San Francisco Police Department regarding both stakeholders. Critical Mass Fridays are an unplanned event, without a specific route. Participants are not issued a permit by the City of San Francisco. The San Francisco Police Department does not facilitate the event, nor does it give preference to riders. At times, it may appear that the San Francisco Police Department may, on verified occasions, appear to favor one stakeholder over another. However, the mission of the San Francisco Police Department is to protect life. Based on this mission, motorists may at times feel inconvenienced. Based on current San Francisco Police Department policies and procedures, members of the San Francisco Police Department acted appropriately and lawfully.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer used profanity. The officer stated he did not use profanity toward the complainant. There were no witnesses to the incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2: The officer used force on the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer grabbed, jerked, and shoved him. The complainant said the officer forced him to the ground. The officer stated he did not use force on the complainant. There were no witnesses to the incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer issued a citation to him without cause. The complainant stated he did not challenge the officer nor did he resist the officer. The officer stated the complainant was issued a citation for challenging to fight in public and for resisting arrest. There were no witnesses to the incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer handcuffed the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was handcuffed without any reason. The complainant stated he was not fighting or resisting at the scene. The officer stated he handcuffed the complainant because he was arrested for challenging to fight in public. There were no witnesses to the incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer arrested him without cause. The complainant stated he was not challenging or resisting the officer. The officer stated the complainant was hostile and verbally abusive. There were no witnesses to the incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/11/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS 1-4: The officers made inappropriate comments and behaved inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officers denied all the allegations. The complainant refused to provide witness identification and contact information. There is insufficient evidence to reach a definitive finding.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/10/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used inappropriate behavior and comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers did not listen to his side of the incident, had already made up their minds against him, sided with the other driver and determined the complainant to be the instigator in this alleged road rage incident. The complainant stated one of the officers was hostile towards him. The officers said they did not act inappropriately or make inappropriate comments and that they were calm and professional. The witnesses were seated in their car at the scene and did not hear the entire contact between the officers and the complainant. There were no witnesses at the hospital to the contact between the officer and the complainant. There was insufficient evidence to disprove or prove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to supervise the writing of an accurate Incident Report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the supervising officer made no effort to talk to him while he was at the hospital. The complainant further stated that the supervising officer signed off on a biased report submitted by the officer. The supervising officer denied the allegation. The supervising officer stated he reviewed the Incident Report with the officer before the Incident Report was completed. The supervising officer stated that per his request, the officer completed a complete, accurate and factual incident report based on the officer's investigation of the incident including interviews of the involved parties. There were no witnesses to the incident. There was insufficient evidence to disprove or prove the allegation made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/10/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE #** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to write an accurate report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he felt the Incident Report was not objective but prejudicial and that the officer “twisted” his words and determined his statements to be dubious. The complainant further stated he was not the instigator of the incident nor did he have road rage as reported by the officer. The officer stated he wrote an accurate Incident Report based on his investigation of the incident including the interviews of all parties. The officer stated he interviewed all parties involved and noted no property damage to the vehicle and no injuries were initially reported to him. The complainant later stated his shoulder was injured and he walked to a nearby hospital for emergency room treatment. The witness stated she heard the complainant tell the officer he was not injured. The witness further stated her car did not sustain any visible damages and disputed her car made any physical contact with the complainant. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she drove to the scene where her husband, an unlicensed driver, had been arrested and her vehicle was being towed. The complainant said the officer asked if she had a driver's license and then pulled her purse as she reached into it to pull her license out. The officer denied asking for a driver's license and stated the complainant suddenly reached into her purse after she had unsuccessfully appealed to him to have the vehicle released to her; and refusing to stay inside her car until she would be given an opportunity to retrieve any personal items. The preponderance of the evidence established that under state law there was no reason for the officer to ask or for the complainant to produce a California driver's license under the circumstances. The evidence further established that the complainant's sudden reach into her purse during their verbal altercation presented a reasonable threat to the officer's safety and the safety of all persons on the scene during this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove that the officer use of force was appropriate.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer's comments and behavior were inappropriate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer told her in Spanish, "You are not going to tell me about laws, and shut up if you don't want me to arrest you" and "Be quiet, or do you want me to put you in the car together with your husband?." Another witness on scene did not understand Spanish and was therefore unable to verify or deny the allegation. Two other witnesses on scene failed to respond to OCC requests for an interview. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE #** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to promptly and politely provide his name and star number.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she asked the officer for his star number but the officer covered it, and questioned why she needed such information. The complainant also said the officer eventually provided the requested information with an attitude. The officer denied the allegation. A witness on scene who does not understand Spanish stated she believed she heard the officer say his name, star number, but definitely saw the officer display his star to the complainant. Two other witnesses on scene failed to respond to OCC requests for an interview. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/06/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer failed to take required action, in that he told her to call 911 when she asked for his assistance by telephone rather than helping her. The officer stated that the complainant did not tell him what assistance she needed or who she was, and he asked her to call the regular police number as he was on an urgent call at the time of their conversation. Ironically, the subject of the officer's urgent call was the very assistance that the complainant wanted, and the officer provided the assistance that the complainant needed. However, it is not known what the complainant said to the officer by phone, as there were no witnesses to what the complainant said to the officer. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer failed to provide required information during a traffic stop. The officer and his partner stated that the named officer did explain what the complainant was required to do regarding the citation. There were no independent witnesses to the contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made inappropriate and threatening comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer and a witness officer denied the allegation. There were no independent witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/22/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained the complainant's client without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant's client stated he was standing in the street between two controlled intersections, about five feet from the curb, when he saw the officer. The complainant's client stated he walked away when the officer approached him. The officer stated the complainant's client refused orders to stay in place. The officer stated he detained the complainant's client to cite him for violating California Vehicle Code section 21954(a) (failing to yield the right-of-way to vehicles while standing outside of a marked crosswalk.) There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove that the complainant's client was in fact in violation of the California Vehicle Code section that he was cited for.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers used unnecessary force to take custody of the complainant's client

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant's client stated Officer #1 punched his left eye with a closed fist. The complainant's client displayed a swollen right eye in the photograph documenting his arrest. The complainant's client further alleged that Officer #2 slammed his face onto the pavement. A witness officer stated he did not see Officers #1 or #2 use any force on the complainant's client. Officer #1 stated he employed a Department-approved bar-arm takedown to take the complainant to the ground after the complainant pushed him. Officer #1 also denied striking the complainant's client in the eye. Officer #2 stated he observed the complainant's client push Officer #1 and then observed Officer #1 employ a bar-arm takedown to take the complainant's client to the ground. Officer #2 further stated he and Officer #1 employed a "prone handcuffing" technique to handcuff the complainant's client. Officer #2 denied pushing the complainant's client's face into the ground. Officer #2 stated he was attempting to position the complainant's client's head and face to avoid injury to the complainant's client and to allow the complainant's client to breathe freely. A video provided by the complainant does not show any improper or unnecessary force by the officers, and shows the complainant's client resisting arrest. The complainant's client failed to provide contact information for his only witness. There were no other available witnesses and no additional evidence to further prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/25/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-6: The officers used unnecessary force to subdue the complainant at the scene.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers used various types of force on him without cause. The complainant further said he was taken to the ground and pinned by the officers. The officers stated they used an escalation of force upon the complainant because he was not cooperative, combative, and violent. The officers said the complainant was in a dangerous location pinned outside a building above the sidewalk and the complainant injured other officers during the contact. The officers stated the complainant was a danger to himself and others. Witnesses stated the complainant was not cooperative, was yelling, threatening, violent, and fought the police. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7-12: The officers failed to properly assess and respond to a mental health crisis.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers should have subdued him by talking to him and not using any force. The officers stated they responded by talking to the complainant initially, but he was non-cooperative, failed to listen to verbal commands, and became combative and violent. The officers further stated the complainant was a danger to himself, the officers, and others. Witnesses said the complainant was non-cooperative, screaming, threatening, and became combative with the officers at the scene who were trying to save him from falling to the ground. Witnesses further stated that several officers did attempt to speak to the complainant in an effort to end the contact, however the complainant was non-complaint. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/29/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. The complainant did not respond to the OCC's requests for an interview. There is insufficient evidence to reach a definitive finding.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/29/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged the officers used unnecessary force during her arrest. The officers denied the allegation. The officers stated they used physical control techniques in taking the complainant into custody. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer displayed inappropriate behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer displayed inappropriate behavior during the contact. The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/29/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer intentionally damaged the complainant's property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant alleged one of the officers at the scene intentionally destroyed her property. The officers questioned concerning this allegation denied destroying any of the complainant's property. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer misrepresented the truth.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer misrepresented the truth when he testified in court. The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/14/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer used inappropriate behavior and comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. No witness heard or observed the actions alleged by the complainant. There was insufficient evidence to either disprove or prove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained the complainant without justification

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer made a 5150 detention upon him without justification. The officer and other officers stated they were dispatched to a call of a man walking in and out of traffic. When the officers arrived on scene, the complainant matched the description provided by dispatch and an unidentified passerby pointed out the complainant to the officers. There is sufficient evidence to justify detaining the complainant for a "5150" hold was proper and lawful based on the complainants admission to the officers and his medical provider and officers and witness statements and observations of the incident.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/14/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE #** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer placed tight handcuffs on the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer caused injuries to the complainant by placing the handcuffs on the complainant in an overly tight manner. Medical records show the complainant sustained abrasions around his wrists. The officer stated the complainant was trying to escape his handcuffs and was twisting and turning his wrists while handcuffed implying that the complainant caused his own injuries. No witness provided information regarding tight handcuffs. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer used excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer used excessive force that caused the complainant to sustain injuries to his neck and chest. Medical records show that the complainant sustained abrasions to his neck, chest and wrists. The named officer and other officers denied the allegation. Officers and witnesses stated the complainant was moving around, acting crazy, yelling and screaming, and trying to get up and run away from the officers. One independent witness stated they observed the officer holding the complainant on the ground. Another independent witness stated the officers did not use excessive force but only the force necessary to control the complainant, as the complainant was acting crazy. The evidence showed that the officers acted in a proper and lawful manner.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/17/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: Neglect of Duty for not taking required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** U **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants wanted the officer to call a Filipino officer although they both have no problems communicating in English. There is no duty for any officer to call another officer not a supervisor if there is not a language problem. The evidence proved that a neglect of duty did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: Conduct Reflecting Discredit for inappropriate behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** U **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants alleged that the personnel at Park Station were inappropriate because no one let them talk with a specific officer they requested to see. They were informed that this officer was not available, and there is no duty to call a specific officer not a supervisor to speak with the public. The complainants also felt “terrorized” because they were told to move their car out of the police parking lot driveway. This is a requirement of proper police business. The complainants also stated that they felt it was inappropriate that no one invited them into the station when they were outside for 6 hours. There is no need for an invitation to be extended by the police and not doing so is not inappropriate. The evidence proved that conduct reflecting discredit did not occur.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/17/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: Conduct Reflecting Discredit for inappropriate behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** U **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants alleged that the personnel at Taraval Station were inappropriate because one officer told one of the complainants not to walk on the freeway, and the complainant ran into traffic on the free way, causing the officer to stop him. This was appropriate behavior by the officer. The complainant also alleged that officers he could not identify acted inappropriately, but he was unable to provide any evidence of this. The evidence proved that conduct reflecting discredit did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/13/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** M **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the accused member, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on February 12, 2008.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/30/05 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/19/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer stopped the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer stopped him for no apparent reason. The named member stated that he stopped the complainant for a “cracked windshield” in his vehicle. In his statement to the OCC, the complainant acknowledged that there was a crack in the windshield of his car. The Department Tow inventory record showed that, at the time of this incident, the windshield of the complainant’s car was broken. The State Vehicle Code prohibits driving with the front or rear window of the car in such condition that might impair the vision of the driver. The evidence proved that the act which provided the basis for the allegation occurred. However, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to exercise proper care of the arrestee.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer purposefully kept him in a locked police car for over “two and a half hours” on a hot day despite the complainant’s frail health. The officer stated that he did not keep the complainant in the patrol car longer than it was necessary to accomplish the search and tow inventory of his car. The Department records (CAD) showed that the incident lasted less than an hour and thirty minutes. An officer, who responded to the scene as a backup and spoke with the complainant during the traffic stop, stated that the complainant appeared calm and did not seem inconvenienced or harmed by being detained in the squad car. Two other officers interviewed in connection with this complaint did not recall this aspect of the incident. The complainant’s girlfriend, who was present during the incident, did not respond to the OCC’s requests for her statement. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/30/05 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/19/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer searched the complainant and his vehicle without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer subjected him and his car to extensive and excessive searches without any apparent reason. The officer denied searching the complainant in the alleged manner. The officer stated that while conducting an inventory of the complainant's car before the tow, he discovered a small amount of marijuana and he called for a narcotics dog to determine that there were no other drugs in the car. The statements from three other officers involved in the event were inconclusive. The complainant's girlfriend, who was present at the scene at the time of the incident, did not respond to the OCC's requests for an interview. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer searched the complainant's girlfriend without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his girlfriend, who was a passenger in his car at the time of the traffic stop, was searched by the officers and by narcotics dogs. The named member did not recall whether he or the female dog handler searched the complainant's girlfriend and whether a narcotics dog also searched her. The statements from three other officers involved in this incident were inconclusive regarding this aspect of the incident. The complainant's girlfriend did not respond to the OCC's requests for an interview. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/30/05 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/19/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to follow the Department policy on Vehicle Tow.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer did not give him any paperwork concerning the tow of his car and that the car should not have been towed because the complainant's license was suspended under the State Family Code Section prohibiting such police action. The named member stated that he did not give the complainant a Tow Hearing form, as required, because he did not have it with him at the time and he reflected this fact in the related report. The officer also stated that he towed the complainant's car because it was mandatory under the existing Department policy. OCC found that SFPD General Order on Vehicles Tow requires officers to tow all vehicles driven by persons with suspended licenses. At the time of this incident, the complainant's license was suspended under the State Family Code Section 17520, which only prohibits "impoundment" of the licensee's vehicle. After the tow, the complainant's vehicle was never impounded. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to properly document the incident.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named member stated that he did not reflect the complainant's admission of possession of small amounts of marijuana and the search of the complainant's car with the help of narcotics dog because he decided not to cite the complainant for this violation. The statements from four officers involved in this incident were inconclusive regarding this aspect of the occurrence. The complainant's girlfriend did not respond to the OCC's requests for an interview. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/30/05 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/19/08 **PAGE#** 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers exhibited an inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named members denied acting at the scene in the alleged manner and making comments attributed to them by the complainant. The statements from three other officers involved in this incident were inconclusive regarding this aspect of the occurrence. The complainant's girlfriend did not respond to the OCC's requests for an interview. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/02/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/11/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer spoke and behaved inappropriately with the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer said and did inappropriate things during this event. The officer denied the allegation, and told OCC that he behaved appropriately. There were no witnesses to the entire event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/05 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant claimed that he was arrested without any legitimate reason. Department records show that the officer took the complainant into police custody because a witness to a crime positively identified him as a suspect. Under these circumstances, the officer had probable cause to place the complainant under arrest.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/04/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/29/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take the required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** M **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the accused member, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on February 20, 2008.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer's manner and behavior were inappropriate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** M **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the accused member, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on February 20, 2008.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/05/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/13/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** M **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the accused member, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on February 08, 2008.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/13/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: Unwarranted Action for citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The complainant stated he had an item affixed to his front windshield in his complaint narrative. This is an admission of a California Vehicle Code violation for which the officer had probable cause to cite. The complainant also stated he had a brake light non-functioning, for which the officer also had cause to cite. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegation occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: Discourtesy for profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer used profanity while speaking with him. The officer denied this allegation. The officer's partner stated she did not hear the officer use profanity. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/13/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3 and #4: Conduct Reflecting Discredit for inappropriate behavior and comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers behaved and spoke inappropriately during this event. The officers denied this allegation. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to prepare a complete and accurate Incident Report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the named officer falsely stated in the Incident Report that he was the arresting officer. The named officer's partner stated he and the named officer arrested the complainant. Two witness officers stated the named officer and his partner arrested the complainant. There was no additional evidence to further prove or disprove this allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer misrepresented the truth.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer falsely stated at the complainant's preliminary hearing that the two victims identified the complainant as their assailant. One of the victims stated he did identify the complainant as his assailant. The second victim did not respond to contact attempts. The officers who conducted the cold shows stated both victims identified the complainant as their assailant. The named officer stated he did not participate in the cold shows. There was no additional evidence to further prove or disprove this allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/23/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** IO(1) **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction. This complaint has been referred to:

SFPD Management Control Division
850 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly file a report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. There were no witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to reach a definitive finding.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/23/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant admittedly refused to cooperate with the officers. By the complainant's own statement, as well as the responding officers statements, the officers went out of their way to remedy this incident in a professional and cordial manner. The complainant's continued refusal to cooperate resulted in his citation and arrest. By a preponderance of the evidence the officer used reasonable and necessary force to abate the situation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said when he requested medical treatment at the station he was ignored. The named officer and witness officer said they both offered the complainant medical attention and he refused. The other witness officer said he did not hear the complainant request medical attention at the station nor hear any officer offer medical attention. There is insufficient evidence to reach a definitive finding.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/23/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer caused a citation to be issued without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant admitted to parking in a private parking garage and refusing to pay. The parking attendant signed a Citizen's Arrest form. The evidence proved that that acts which provided the basis for the allegation occurred, however such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/31/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers stopped and detained the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The involved officers stated that the complainant was stopped and detained because her motorized scooter did not have rear license plate required as by law. In her OCC statement, the complainant acknowledged that at the time of the incident, she indeed did not have a license plate. The evidence indicated that the officers' actions were justified and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer searched the complainant's property without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: According to the complainant, one of the officers involved in the traffic stop searched through the luggage compartment of her scooter without her consent. The named officer and other officers denied the allegation. There were no other witnesses to this traffic stop. The available evidence was insufficient to prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/31/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: According to the complainant, one of the officers involved in the traffic stop, “grabbed” and “shoved” her towards the sidewalk without any apparent reason. All three officers involved denied the allegation. There were no other witnesses to this police contact. The complainant could not provide sufficient descriptive information necessary to identify the officer. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer made inappropriate comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: According to the complainant, the officer was “mocking” her intention to file an OCC complaint in connection with this incident. The named officer and the other officers denied the allegation. There were no other witnesses to this police contact. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/31/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 3

OCC ADDED ALLEGATION

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly document the complainant's traffic stop.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The information entered by the officers into the Department database after the traffic stop indicated that there were no searches although the complainant maintained that the luggage compartment of her scooter was, in fact, searched by one of the involved officers. All three officers involved in this police contact insisted no searches were conducted during their contact with the complainant and that the computer record accurately reflected the specifics of the traffic stop. There were no other witnesses to this incident. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/05/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation and said that the complainant was detained because the complainant was a danger to himself and/or others. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to loosen handcuffs upon request.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer and another officer denied the allegation. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/05/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer placed the complainant in tight handcuffs.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer and another officer denied the allegation. No other witnesses came forward. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/06/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 1-3: The officers used force against the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers twisted his arm behind his back, tried to trip him to the ground, and pushed and shoved him into the police vehicle. The complainant stated two unknown officers grabbed, pushed and choked him while at the station. The officers that have been identified denied the allegation. The witnesses' recollections were inconsistent of the event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 4-6: The officers used racially demeaning language.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: RS **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers directed racial slurs toward him at the scene and an unknown officer used a racial slur against him while at the station. The identified officers stated they did not use any racially demeaning language against the complainant. The witnesses' recollections were inconsistent of the event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/06/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 7-9: The officers used inappropriate behavior and comments against him.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers at the scene used inappropriate behavior and comments against him. The complainant further stated a few hours later another unknown officer made an inappropriate comment. The Station Duty Officer stated he had no contact with the complainant. The identified officers denied the allegation. The witnesses' recollections were inconsistent of the event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 10-11: The officers arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he should not have been arrested. SFPD records indicated the complainant at the time was on parole and an outstanding warrant existed. The officers stated the complainant was arrested for committing a burglary, had a warrant and was on parole. Two witnesses and a video revealed that the complainant was in fact committing a burglary of a restaurant with forcible entry. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/06/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 12-14: The officers made sexually derogatory comments at the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: SS **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers used sexually derogatory comments at the scene and at the station. The officers at the scene and the Station Duty officer stated they did not use any sexually derogatory comments toward the complainant. The officers identified denied the allegation. The witnesses' recollections were inconsistent of the event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/13/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer used unnecessary force during the contact.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer used excessive and unnecessary force when he stepped on her foot, grabbed her around the throat and pushed and held her against a wall. The officer stated the complainant ignored his advisements and orders not to jaywalk. The officer further stated that the complainant resisted his efforts to speak to him by continuing to walk by him so in order to gain physical control, he tried to grab her arm to guide her to the sidewalk but instead grabbed her purse. When the officer told the complainant she was to be cited, the officer stated that the complainant became violent by kicking and punching him, screaming and yelling. The officer stated he tried to apply a mastoid control hold and admitted holding her against a wall because she was trying to walk away. The officer stated he did step on the complainant's foot to hold it down since she was kicking him. No independent witnesses came forward who observed the contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation that excessive force was used during this contact.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer handcuffed the complainant without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer stated that that he handcuffed the complainant because of her violent and combative nature. No independent witnesses were identified or came forward who observed the contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/13/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer stated that the complainant was jaywalking against a red light and resisted/delayed the arrest. No independent witnesses were identified or came forward during the investigation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4-5: The officers acted inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers acted inappropriately by laughing at her and accusing her of being insubordinate. No independent witnesses were identified nor came forward during the investigation. All officers on scene denied the allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/23/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer neglected the complainant's safety.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer acted inappropriately towards the co-complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The co-complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The co-complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made inappropriate comments to the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used unnecessary force during the complainant's arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** IO/1 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant raised issues outside the jurisdiction of the OCC. The allegation was referred to the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/18/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1 and #2: The officers filed false charges against the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant states that the officers planted drugs on his person in order to file false charges against him. The officers deny this allegation. The complainant pled guilty in court to this charge, but says his lawyer forced him to so plead against his will. The pleas was accepted by the court. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove that the officers planted drugs on the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer threatened the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant states that the officers threatened to send the complainant to jail every time he sees him. The officer denies this allegation. There were no witnesses to this event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/18/06 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer behaved inappropriately toward the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant states that the officer behaved inappropriately against him. The officer denies this allegation. There were no witnesses to this event. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer damaged property without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint arises from a claim filed with the City Attorney's office. The complainant did not respond with needed information.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers used force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The claimant failed to provide requested information.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/12/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The complainant alleged she was wrongfully detained and sent to a local hospital against her will.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.
This complaint arises from a claim filed with the office of the City Attorney.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officers used selective enforcement.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer acted in an inappropriate manner and made inappropriate comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she was taking a shower when her daughter and nephew knocked on the bathroom door and notified her that the police were inside her residence. The complainant stated she rushed out of the bathroom without any clothes on and the officer told her to put her hands up and not to move. The complainant stated she was standing in the hallway naked for about five minutes. The officer stated he was conducting a Protective Sweep of the residence after following a wanted person into the home. The officer stated the complainant exited the bathroom naked and that he did not force or take the complainant out of the shower or the bathroom. The officer stated the complainant asked him to get a towel and he immediately gave it to the complainant to cover herself. The officer stated he provided the complainant the blanket within seconds of her request and that she stood naked for less than ten seconds. There were no independent witnesses to the contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 2-4: The officers harassed the complainant.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** U **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she was harassed in her home on a holiday, because of her nephew's activities. The investigation show the officers had a legitimate law enforcement purpose for contacting the complainant's nephew on that holiday due to the complainant's nephew being in the prohibited area pursuant the Gang Injunction. The alleged act of the officers' harassment of the complainant in her home on a holiday did not occur as the officers conducted a lawful arrest of the complainant's nephew. The evidence proved that the acts alleged in the complaint did not occur, or that the named members were not involved in the alleged acts.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 5-6: The officers used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: D **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers used profanity toward her nephew when they were taking him into custody. The complainant stated she only heard the use of profanity by the officers because a stairwell blocked her view and she could not identify the officer who used profanity. A witness stated that officers used profanity but the witness could not identify the officer who used the profanity. The officers stated they did not use any profanity toward the complainant or her family. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegations made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 7-9: The officers entered a residence without justification or cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers had no right to enter her home. The complainant stated she was aware her nephew had a Gang Injunction Order against him and that she was aware that her nephew was not supposed to be in or around Oakdale area. The complainant stated she has advised her nephew not to be in the area or the police will make contact with him. The complainant stated her nephew was inside the residence and not outside, however prior to the police entering her residence, the complainant admitted to being inside a bathroom taking a shower. The complainant was under the assumption that her nephew's Gang Injunction did not apply as long as he was inside her residence. The Gang Injunction documents the complainant's nephew as a gang member and there is an active Stay-Away Order imposed on the complainant's nephew from the complainant. The officers stated they witnessed the complainant's nephew in the gang injunction area with known gang members. The officers further witnessed the complainant's nephew run from them and enter the complainant's residence. The witnesses confirmed the complainant's nephew was in and around the residence at the time of the incident. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, proper, and lawful.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 10-11: The officers used force during an arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers should not have used any force on her nephew. The complainant stated her nephew was kicking at the officers as they tried to take him into custody. The complainant stated the officers were dragging him down the stairs and used their fists to strike her nephew. The complainant initially stated she saw her nephew's head strike a pole outside the kitchen door area, as she stood on the main level of her residence. The complainant later stated she observed from her second story bathroom window, the officers tussling with her nephew as his head struck a pole outside the kitchen door area. The complainant gave conflicting statements to how her nephew sustained the alleged head injury. The complainant stated her nephew tried to go up the stairs and get to her for help. The complainant's nephew stated he resisted the officers by grabbing onto the kitchen door area and placed his head against the wall to prevent from being taken outside the residence. The complainant's nephew stated he panicked when the officers pulled his sweatshirt over his head/eye areas. The officers stated the complainant's nephew was agitated, combative and uncooperative. The officers stated the complainant's nephew did not struggle with them at the stairwell while he was being handcuffed. The officers stated the complainant's nephew resisted and tried to trip one of them as they were exiting the residence. A witness stated the officers were beating and hitting her cousin. There were no independent witnesses to this incident. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation. The physical evidence does not support the allegation of excessive and unnecessary force.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 12: The officer searched personal property without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated an officer searched her daughter's room next to the bathroom by the stair railing area on the second floor. The complainant stated the officer should not have entered and looked into her daughter's room, specifically her makeup bag. The officer admitted he searched the room and may have looked into a makeup bag. The officer stated he was conducting a Protective Sweep of the second floor as he made entry into the complainant's residence. The officer stated he searched within "arms reach" of his location on the second floor with the complainant due to officer safety and search for others, weapons or narcotics. The officer stated his search did not continue once the sweep was completed. There were no witnesses during this incident. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/26/08 **PAGE#** 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 13-15: The officers failed to provide required information.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she wanted information as to why the police were inside her residence and why they were arresting her nephew. The complainant stated there was no documentation left by the police regarding what happened at her residence. One of the officers stated he spoke with the complainant for a few minutes and advised her on why her nephew was arrested and the circumstances that led to the arrest and the complainant's residence. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 16-18: The officers arrested the complainant's nephew without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated her nephew should not have been arrested. The complainant stated she was aware her nephew was not supposed to be in or around the Oakdale area due to prior arrests and contacts with the police as well as the Gang Injunction against him. The complainant admitted that she constantly reminds her nephew not to be in or around the neighborhood of Oakdale area. The complainant stated she thought that the Stay Away Order had expired and that the Gang Injunction only applied to her nephew if he was outside her residence. The complainant stated the Felony Bench Warrant was a case of mistaken identity with her nephew's father. The officers stated the complainant's nephew was at the location area and was in violation again of the Gang Injunction as well as a Stay Away Order and had an outstanding Felony Bench Warrant. The officers stated they witnessed the complainant's nephew run from them and into the complainant's residence. The witnesses stated the complainant's nephew was in or around their residence on a holiday visit. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, proper, and lawful.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/04/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer inappropriately released confidential information.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer stated that for safety reasons, she was required to pass information along to the complainant's employer regarding the complainant's admissions of working while impaired. There are no current department regulations, policies or procedures preventing the release of the information, particularly if there is a public safety issue. The employer stated that the complainant was released from employment for reasons other than the information forwarded by the officer. The conduct alleged of did occur, however said conduct was proper under current department general orders.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/17/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/14/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-2: The officers exhibited inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING DEPT.** NF/W **ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant withdrew her complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/18/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used unnecessary force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant's attorney filed a civil claim with the City of San Francisco. The complainant's contact information was not on the claim form. The complainant's attorney failed to respond to contact attempts made by this agency.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/26/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to obey traffic laws.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. The officer's partner stated she could not recall the officer's driving maneuvers that day. There were no witnesses. There was no additional evidence to further prove or disprove this allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/27/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer exhibited an inappropriate manner and behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that, while speaking with her on the phone the officer began inappropriately questioning her instead of answering her question. The officer stated that he was acting professionally and indeed asked the complainant's name, address and phone number in order to "fill out the form and to address [her] concern," after which the complainant hung up the phone. The existing Department policy does not contain specific protocol for answering telephone inquiries from the public. The available evidence was insufficient to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: Information Only 1.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1 **FINDING:** IO-1 **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The portion of this complaint was outside of the OCC's jurisdiction and it was referred for further investigation to:

Commanding Officer
SFPD Management Control Division
850 Bryant Street,
San Francisco, CA 94103

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/07/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/22/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers comments and behavior were inappropriate

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD **FINDING DEPT.** NS **ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers laughed about him, and the officer attending him at the station window was disrespectful while he attempted to file a police report. The officers denied the allegation. There were no witnesses to either prove or disprove the allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer initially refused to prepare an Incident Report and upon his demand, he believed, a report was prepared for he was provided an SFPD 105 form. The evidence established that although there were conflicting statements between the officer and a witness officer about why no incident or courtesy report was prepared, the facts reported by the complainant did not constitute a crime and the incident was documented in department records via a CAD report. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/11/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/08/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters outside OCC jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** IO-1/MCD **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction. The complaint has been referred to:

Management Control Division
San Francisco Police Department
850 Bryant Street, Rm. 545
San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/16/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE #** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-2: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers arrested him for a warrant from a different county and believes it is a civil matter. The evidence shows that the complainant had an outstanding warrant at the time of the arrest and that the officers conducted the arrest lawfully.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/17/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/12/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preponderance of the evidence established that the complainant agreed to engage in an act of prostitution, negotiated the price, and demonstrated a specific intent to so, engage in the illicit act by transporting the undercover officer a short distance away. The officer's actions were lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/16/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/19/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer issued the complainant a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING DEPT.** PC **ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant admitted the infraction for which he was cited. The officer's conduct was proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/02/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/29/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** M **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the accused member, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on February 28, 2008.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer resigned from the force. The officer is no longer subject to department discipline.

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/27/07 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/09/08 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to take a required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND **FINDING:** NF/W **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant withdrew the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT:

**OFFICE OF CITIZEN COMPLAINTS
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/16/08 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 02/17/08 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer placed a 30-day hold on the complainant's vehicle without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA **FINDING:** NF **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint stems from a claim filed by the complainant with the Office of the City Attorney. The complainant failed to respond to OCC's contact attempts.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **DEPT. ACTION:**

FINDINGS OF FACT: