DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/23/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/11/12 PAGE #1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer entered a residence 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 April 4, 2012.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer searched the residence without cause.

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 April 4, 2012.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/24/1	12 DATE OF COMI	PLETION : 04/11/12	PAGE #1 of
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #	#1: The officer's com	ments and behavior we	ere inappropriate
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N	D FINDING :	M DEPT. AC	TION:
FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual complaint was mediated and resolve			
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #	#:		
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	FINDING:	DEPT. ACT	ΓΙΟΝ:
FINDINGS OF FACT:			

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/23/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/24/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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 stated the officers detained him for public intoxication without justification. The complainant admitted he had 4-5 mixed drinks at a local bar. The complainant further stated that he has a medical condition that can be exacerbated by alcohol consumption. 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: The officer made an inappropriate comment/acted in an inappropriate manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated his handcuffs were applied too tightly. The complainant was uninjured. The complainant further stated an officer made an inappropriate remark, asking him if a dollar bill was the last one he had and threw it into the street. The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/06/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/11/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA FINDING: IO1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Unit/TLO 25 Van Ness Avenue, Room #350 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/14/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer issued him a citation for speeding and for not having current insurance. The complainant denied that he was speeding because the traffic and weather conditions prevented him from speeding. Furthermore the complainant stated that he did provide current insurance information to the officer who ignored the document. The officer stated that he cited the complainant because he observed the complainant speeding, paced the complainant doing 42 miles per hour, which is above the posted 30 mph speed limit. The officer stated that during the traffic stop, the complainant provided an expired insurance card and never presented a valid current insurance card. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2: The complainant alleged the officer's behavior and comments were inappropriate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation and stated that he was cordial throughout the contact with the complainant. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

)/1 T /12 1	DATE OF COM	MPLETION:	04/20/12	PAGE# 2 of 2
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION)N #3: Th	e officer wrote a	an incorrect cit	ation.	
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	: ND	FINDING:	NS	DEPT. ACT	ΓΙΟN:
FINDINGS OF FACT: The of There were no witnesses to this allegation.		_			
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIO)N #:				
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDINGS OF FACT:	:	FINDING:	DF	EPT. ACTIO	N:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/14/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer issued her a citation for speeding. The complainant denied that she was speeding because the traffic and weather conditions prevented her from speeding. The officer stated that he cited the complainant because he observed the complainant speeding and paced the complainant doing 42 miles per hour, which is above the posted 30 mph speed limit. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation and stated that he was cordial throughout the contact with the complainant. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/19/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/12/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer misused his police authority.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The alleged misconduct is outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs 850 Bryant Street, Room 558 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/22/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/05/12 PAGE #1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A FINDING: IO-1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

Municipal Transportation Agency Department of Parking and Traffic 11 South Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/22/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A FINDING: IO-1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Division 25 Van Ness Ave. Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/26/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/02/12 **PAGE** #1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preliminary investigation showed that the complainant provided a star number for the involved officer. The San Francisco Police Department has no officer with that assigned number. Further investigation showed that the person assigned that star number is a San Francisco Main Library security officer and not a sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department. The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Main Library 100 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 94102

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preliminary investigation showed that the complainant provided a star number for the involved officer. The San Francisco Police Department has no officer with that assigned number. Further investigation showed that the person assigned that star number is a San Francisco Main Library security officer and not a sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department. The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Main Library 100 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 94102

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/26/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE #2 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preliminary investigation showed that the complainant provided a star number for the involved officer. The San Francisco Police Department has no officer with that assigned number. Further investigation showed that the person assigned that star number is a San Francisco Main Library security officer and not a sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department. The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Main Library 100 Larkin Street San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/26/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE #1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer issued an invalid order.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preliminary investigation showed that the complainant provided a star number for the involved officer. The San Francisco Police Department has no officer with that assigned number. Further investigation showed that the person assigned that star number is a San Francisco Main Library security officer and not a sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department. The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Main Library 100 Larkin Street San Francisco, Ca 94102

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The preliminary investigation showed that the complainant provided a star number for the involved officer. The San Francisco Police Department has no officer with that assigned number. Further investigation showed that the person assigned that star number is a San Francisco Main Library security officer and not a sworn member of the San Francisco Police Department. The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Main Library 100 Larkin Street San Francisco, Ca 94102

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/26/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used inappropriate, threatening, and bullying comments and displayed inappropriate, threatening, and bullying behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The allegation raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction and has been referred for investigation to:

San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs 850 Bryant Street, 5th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/02/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/30/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called police because a car was parked in his driveway, one of whose occupants were urinating on his property and he heard glass breaking and feared that someone was breaking in. The complainant stated that the car looked like it might be an unmarked police car. The complainant stated that responding officers checked the area where the car had been and determined there had been no attempted break-in. The complainant stated that he gave the named officer the license plate number of the car, but she did not tell him whether the individuals parked in his driveway were police officers and did not prepare a report. Department records established that the named officer checked the license plate number the complainant gave her and determined the car was not a police vehicle. The evidence also established that the named officer was not required to prepare a report because no crime, other than parking in the complainant's driveway and possibly urinating there was reported to her. 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 #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/02/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/06/12 **PAGE** #1 of 1

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

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

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

been referred to:

Internal Affairs San Francisco Police Department 850 Bryant Street, Room 545 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/05/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/13/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA FINDING: IO1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

Complaint-Intake Human Rights Commission 25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 800 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/09/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/26/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA FINDING: IO1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) 1815 Egbert Avenue San Francisco, CA 94124-2519 415-715-3280

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/16/12 DA	TE OF COMPLETI	ON: 04/18/12	PAGE#1 of 1
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: Th jurisdiction.	is complaint raises ma	atters not rationally	within OCC's
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A	FINDING: 10-2	DEPT. ACT	ION:
FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint ra	aises matters not ratio	nally within OCC's	jurisdiction.
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:			
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	FINDING:	DEPT. ACTI	ON:
FINDINGS OF FACT:			

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/23/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE #1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The evidence proved that the acts complained of did not involve a member of the Department. This complaint has been referred to:

US Park Poilce Operations Commander 1217 Ralston Avenue San Francisco, CA 94129

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/24/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/26/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

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

Court Administrator Criminal Operations San Francisco Superior Court Hall of Justice 850 Bryant Street, Room 101 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers used force against the complainant's daughter.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated her daughter told her that the officers hobbled her, pulled her hair, and hit her head against the car door while she was handcuffed. The officers stated the complainant's daughter was hostile, non-compliant and resisting so they used physical control to subdue her. The daughter admitted to resisting handcuffing, being placed into the patrol car, and to kicking out the patrol car window, and spitting. The medical records document multiple contusions left and right wrist, left neck, and right forearm. There were no other witnesses to the daughter's detention. There is insufficient evidence to determine that the complainant's daughter's injuries were a result of her resisting or officers' use of force. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/26/12 PAGE# 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was a professional petition circulator. He wore required Department of Elections identification in a prominent place on his outermost clothing as required. The officer ran the complainant for wants and warrants following the receipt of a complaint by a local retail establishment. During that time, the complainant was not free to leave. The complainant stated he had not committed a crime and that his profession is governed by its own separate governmental authority. The witnesses did not observe this portion of the contact. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made by the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made intimidating, inappropriate comments and acted in an intimidating and inappropriate manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer is unavailable and not subject to discipline.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/26/12 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer made intimidating, inappropriate comments and acted in an intimidating and inappropriate manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was a paid petition circulator, collecting signatures for a ballot initiative that would increase the contribution paid by city employees to their pensions, including police officers. He stood on a public sidewalk, near the curb, in front of a supermarket. The store manager refused to sign a citizen's arrest. There was no evidence the complainant had committed a crime, but shoppers complained to the market manager that the complainant was annoying. The officer had substantive knowledge of the complainant's activities. He told the complainant he would stay and make sure the complainant did not collect another signature.

The complainant was engaged in activity protected by the first amendment of the US Constitution. The officer was a supervisor. He dismissed a supervisee and called another supervisor to the scene. The officer and the supervisor stood very close to the complainant, trying to persuade him to move. The complainant refused to move, and asserted his right to remain, based on his first amendment rights. He felt intimidated by the officer's physical presence. He further stated the officer's attempts to have him move were inappropriate. The witness corroborated the officer's statement. There was additional evidence to support the complainant's allegation. The officer denied the allegation. He had a working knowledge of Department General Orders and the first amendment of the US Constitution. A preponderance of the 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.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer misused police authority.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was a paid petition circulator, engaged in activity protected by the first amendment of the constitution. The complainant had obtained necessary permits to be at the scene and was free of wants and warrants. The evidence indicated that no crime had been committed. The complaining witness declined to pursue a citizen's arrest. The officer was a supervisor at the scene.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/26/12 PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3(cont'd): He wrongfully maintained a police presence at the scene, although there was no reasonable suspicion to believe the complainant was planning or engaged in any criminal activity. The witness and other evidence supported this allegation. The officer denied the allegation. A preponderance of the 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.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to maintain knowledge.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was a paid petition circulator, engaged in activity protected by the First amendment of the US Constitution. The reporting party, a supermarket employee, said the complainant made improper demands of his customers walking in the public way. The officer stated the complainant engaged in aggressive solicitation, within the meaning of a local statute. The officer stated the complainant stood a foot or two away from the store's front door, hounding people with his requests for signatures, for which he would get paid, cornering people as they exited and entered the store. The store surveillance video failed to support the officer's account. The intent of DGO 6.08, Aggressive Solicitation, is to abate aggressive solicitation for something of tangible value, such as money or property.

The officer stated he had a working knowledge of the DGOs. There was little or no evidence that the complainant engaged in aggressive solicitation. The reporting party had declined to prosecute. The officer stated he was accustomed to petitioners in his district and had examined the complainant's ID. While the officer stated he had a working knowledge of the DGOs and the First amendment of the US Constitution, he failed to apply his knowledge to a known, common street situation involving a protected class. A preponderance of the 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.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/26/12 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF OCC ADDED ALLEGATION #1: The officer misrepresented the truth.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. The officer stated that he had a second encounter with the complainant and may have confused the facts of the two encounters. There was insufficient evidence to prove that the officer misrepresented the truth.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/24/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers detained him without justification. The officers did not recall the incident. Department records show that the officers had a contact with the complainant that lasted approximately five minutes and that included a name query of the complainant. Both officers stated that based on department records, their contact with the complainant was not a detention as it lasted less than five minutes for the name query. The officers stated that they constantly contact persons during their shift as consensual encounters and run queries on the persons they contact. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officer engaged in biased policing due to race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer harassed him due to his race. The officers did not recall the contact with the complainant. The officers were questioned relative to the OCC's biased policing protocol and denied the allegation and stated that their policing actions are not based on race. There were no witnesses to this contact. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer entered the complainant's residence without a warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers entered and searched his home. The complainant stated the officers never provided him or his mother with a copy of the search warrant. The officer stated that a copy of the search warrant return of service was provided as the search warrant was ordered sealed by a magistrate for the protection of the witnesses in this homicide case. The investigation proved the existence of evidence of a signed sealed search warrant for the complainant's home. 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 searched the complainant's residence without a warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers entered and searched his home. The complainant stated the officers never provided him or his mother with a copy of the search warrant. The officer stated that a copy of the search warrant return of service was provided as the search warrant was ordered sealed by a magistrate for the protection of the witnesses in this homicide case. The investigation proved the existence of evidence of a signed sealed search warrant for the complainant's home. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The inspector failed to issue a property receipt for seized items.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was never issued a receipt. The officers denied the allegation. The officer stated the receipt was given to the complainants mother. Per the complainant, his mother is out of the country and he does not want her involved. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: For damage to the complainant's property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers damaged the front door, the walls, and furniture. The swat team made entry and documented the damage via a report and video. The officers conducted their duties per department policies. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: For search of the complainant's vehicle without a warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was not given a copy of the warrant. The officers are not obligated to provide a copy of the search warrant. The search was done with a signed and sealed search warrant. The officer conducted his duty per department policies. 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 #6: The complainant's vehicle was towed without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated his car was towed even though he was not shown any warrant. The officers had a signed sealed search warrant to seize the vehicle. The car was going to be processed by CSI. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer failed to issue paperwork for seizure of vehicle.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was not given any paperwork when his car was towed and seized. The inspector stated that this was not a normal tow requiring that the inventory be done prior to towing the vehicle and providing the complainant with a copy of the inventory. The inspector explained that the car was treated as a crime scene that was going to get processed by CSI. The car was to be kept from getting contaminated by his or other officer's prints etc. He explained that CSI would then be responsible for conducting an inventory of the vehicle. The complainant retrieved his vehicle and advised the OCC that a copy of the search warrant was inside of the vehicle. The officers performed their duties per department regulations. 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 #8: The officers made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers told him there was no such thing as a "search warrant" and that they were a myth. The inspectors denied the allegation. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/09/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer issued two citations without cause. The officer stated he issued the first citation for the illegal sale of MUNI transfers and fare evasion. During the initial incident numerous MUNI transfers were found on the complainant's person. The second citation was issued for MUNI fare evasion. The complainant admitted that he boarded the MUNI bus line without paying the fare. 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 searched the complainant without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer searched him without justification. The officer did conduct a search of the complainant incident to arrest. The search of the complainant was necessary for officer safety. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/09/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer practiced biased policing due to race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer arrested him due to his ethnic background. The officer was questioned relative to the OCC's biased policing protocol and denied the allegation. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to return property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer seized and failed to return his property. The officer seized the complainant's property as evidence and provided the complainant with a property receipt. Once the complainant's case was dismissed, his property was returned to him at a later date. The evidence proved that the acts alleged in the complaint did not occur.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/09/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **PAGE#** 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer prepared an inaccurate citation.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer prepared and signed both citations on the date of the incident, but signed his partner's name on one of the citations instead of his own name. The officer denied the allegation and stated he only prepared and signed one of the citations. The officer's partner stated he prepared and signed the other citation. There are no independent witnesses to this incident. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to forward a complaint to the OCC.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he went to a district police station to complain about an officer. The complainant stated that the officer at the district station refused to assist him with his concerns. An officer poll of the district failed to identify the officer that had contact with the complainant. There were no independent witnesses to this incident. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/16/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/27/12 **PAGE** #1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant indicated the officer arrested him for no reason while the complainant was reading a mural at a private park. The CAD printout indicated the officer responded to a call from a private security firm requesting the officer's assistance in handling a mentally disturbed person. The officer said he responded to the incident and determined the complainant was intoxicated, loud, creating a nuisance, disturbing others and non-compliant. Private security guards, who also responded to the scene of this incident, only wanted the complainant off the property, but the complainant continued to refuse. Since the complainant refused the officer's commands to leave, the officer indicated he had no choice but to arrest the complainant. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegations. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly process the complainant's property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant indicated that while he was in jail, five officers entered the room and took his personal belongings. When he was later released from jail, deputies gave him most of his belongings and most of the money he claimed to have had in his possession, but he was missing eighteen dollars and one cent. He also alleged that the five officers he encountered, during his prisoner intake, took his medical marijuana card. The named officer in this allegation said he inventoried the complainant's personal property while he and the complainant were in the sally port of the jail, and the officer recorded the personal property on the appropriate form. The officer then bagged the complainant's personal property and gave it, as well as the property form, to sheriff's deputies. The officer also said he did not recall the complainant having any money or a medical marijuana card in his possession. Additionally, the complainant refused to sign the property form. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE #2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used unnecessary force during the contact.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer pushed him to the other side of the street during the complainant's arrest. While the complainant was at the jail, an officer pushed him against the wall, pushed the complainant down and another officer slapped the complainant while he was still in handcuffs. The named officer said he did not push the complainant down or slap him, and the officer said he did not see any other officer do this. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegations. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: This complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction.

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

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Unit 25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 350 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-2380

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: A Department Bulletin in effect at the time of this incident required the officer to prepare SFPD form 184, (849 (b) PC) for 647 (f) Release When Sober (RWS), pursuant to the complainant's arrest. The officer contended he was not required to prepare this form because he took the complainant directly to the County Jail, and deputies completed a similar version of this form for their records. However, perusal of the applicable Department Bulletin did not disclose any exceptions to the rule for issuing and processing this form. A preponderance of the evidence proved that the named officer failed to take action required by the Department.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/20/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/06/12 **PAGE** #1 of 3

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 the arrest. The officer denied the allegation. The director of the shelter requested the complainant be removed from the premises, due to her verbal threats and physical gestures toward staff members. When the officer attempted to escort the complainant to gather her belongings she became verbally abusive, tried to walk away from the officer and delayed the investigation. He placed the complainant under arrest, attempted to place her hand behind her back and the complainant resisted the officer. While placing the complainant into the patrol car, she tried to spit toward the officer causing the named officer to place his hand near the complainant's face to block the spittle. The complainant then tried to kick the officer, but he used the patrol car door to deflect the kick. The officer stated the force used on the complainant was necessary to place her under arrest. He notified the sergeant at the scene and the force was documented according to Department guidelines. One witness stated the complainant did not resist the officer. However, two other witnesses said the complainant resisted, spit and kicked the officer. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The director of the family shelter requested the complainant be removed from the premises and signed a citizen's arrest form for the trespassing violation. The complainant refused to leave the building and was subsequently arrested. The complainant acknowledged she had a heated argument with the director of the shelter and was told to leave the premises. The complainant also admitted she got in the director's face, was irate and used profanity. A witness corroborated the complainant made verbal threats and physical gestures toward staff members. The evidence proved that the acts which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/20/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE #2 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was placed under arrest for trespassing by the director of the family shelter. The handcuffing of the complainant was incidental to the 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 #4: The officer failed to provide the complainant a copy of the citation.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer denied the allegation. He recalled that he prepared the citation and to the best of his knowledge the complainant was given a copy of the citation. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/20/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE #3 of 3

SUMMARY OF OCC ADDED ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to document the transport of a juvenile female.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer failed to document the ending mileage of a courtesy transport provided for the complainant's two-year old daughter. The named officer was the senior parking officer. The officer stated the transport was a "courtesy transport" to reunite the young child with the complainant at the police station. The officer said he was "pretty sure" the ending mileage was provided to dispatch over the air, though he could not be certain. According to the CAD, the starting mileage and destination were provided to dispatch, however, there is no indication that the ending mileage was communicated. Furthermore, the audio recording of the CAD corroborated the officer failed to provide the ending mileage to dispatch. The officer was in violation of Department General Order 2.01 (36), when he failed to properly document the transport of a juvenile female by not ensuring that the ending mileage of the transportation was properly reported to DEM. A preponderance of the evidence proved that the conduct brought forward did occur, and that, using as a standard the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/28/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **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 and co-complainant alleged the officer arrested the complainant without probable cause. The complainant is subject to a civil gang injunction and was properly served with the injunction. The officer arrested the complainant for gambling with dice and for associating with known gang members. Both activities are specifically interdicted by the terms of the injunction. The complainant admitted to gambling with dice. The officer denied the allegation. 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 harassed the complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The co-complainant alleged that the officer's arrest of her boyfriend was making her life impossible and constituted harassment. The officer arrested the co-complainant's boyfriend twice for gambling with dice. He was also arrested for associating with known gang members. The co-complainant was not a witness to the complainant's acts for which he was arrested. There is no dispute that in spite of the gang injunction the complainant admitted that he had violated a court ordered injunction. The officers that the complainant is complaining about are assigned to patrol San Francisco Housing Authority properties (where the complainants live), which is within their assigned sector as well as the enforcement of the gang injunction. As long as the complainant lives in the area and the officers that patrol the area it is inevitable the parties will come into contact with each other.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE # 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer entered the complainant's home without a warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers entered her home without a warrant and with weapons drawn. The officers arrested a friend, who was visiting in her apartment. The officers stated they were on notice of a prior domestic violence and gun threat report involving the suspect. They stated the suspect had attempted to kick down the door of the victim, a neighbor, just moments before (i.e., "hot prowl,") and that there was a "premises notice" for the building. The officers were informed that the suspect had entered the premises, then saw him when the complainant opened her door. The officers' actions were lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer searched the complainant's home without a search warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers entered and searched her home without a warrant. The officers stated they conducted a protective sweep to search and arrest the possibly armed suspect in a "hot prowl" call with a premises warning of domestic violence and a possible firearm. The officer's actions were lawful and proper under current Department policies and procedures.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE # 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained the complainant and family members without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she and her family were detained for no reason. The officers entered and secured the premises in pursuit of a "hot prowl" suspect who was wanted on domestic violence charges and possible in possession of a firearm. The occupants were detained for officer-safety reasons and for their own safety. The officer's actions were lawful and proper under current Department policies and procedures.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION 4: The officer exhibited inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer told her that he was looking for dead bodies, yelled at her, told her he did not want to talk to her, and told her he would take her to jail. The officer denied the allegation. The complainant's witnesses did not come forward. There were no other witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/29/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/30/12 **PAGE** #1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1 and 2: The officers made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers made an inappropriate comment to him. The officers denied making the alleged comments. There were no witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3 and 4: The officers failed to take the required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he wanted to file a complaint against his landlord for trespass. The responding officers denied that the complainant requested a report and said that the complainant specifically requested a CAD number which was provided. The landlord denied entering the complainant's apartment and said that the complainant assaulted him. The CAD documents that the call came in as a fight or dispute requesting a complaint. A supplemental incident report prepared the following day documents, and provides as an attachment, the receipt of a Citizen's Arrest. DGO 5.04 requires that when a person requests a Citizen Arrest, the officers shall... prepare an IR. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/29/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE #2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to properly supervise.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said for a period of almost a year, officers who responded to his calls for service were rude and unaccommodating and he believes that tone was set by the station Captain. The station Captain denied the allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officers interfered with investigations.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that for a period of almost a year, officers who responded to his home were rude and unaccommodating. The complainant believes the station command staff is responsible for setting the tone as well as advising officers not to respond to his calls for service. The complainant identified no officer with specificity. The station Captain denied the allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/01/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer detained her for suspicion of loitering for purposes of prostitution. The officer had no recollection of the documented detention and query of the complainant. A witness on scene gave conflicting statements regarding the basis of the detention. There is no independent witness so there is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer threatened the complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer threatened her based on prior complaints she filed against the officer. The officer denied the allegation and stated he would arrest them for filing an OCC complaint. There was no witness on scene at the time so there is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/11/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/30/12 **PAGE** # 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to conduct a proper investigation.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer failed to properly investigate and has not arrested a suspect. The officer stated he did not have probable cause to make an arrest and added that the witness information was inconsistent. The statements of two family members witnesses support the complainant's statement. Department records support the officer's statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer exhibited inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the inspector was rude, telling him not to call him, that he would call him with status updates, and said he had serious cases, which took priority over his case. The officer stated he did explain he had priority cases and that it was not necessary for the complainant to call him everyday, as he would call very often. A family member stated the inspector was rude when he told the complainant not to call him. The complainant's narrative states that he told the officer he would call everyday until an arrest is made. The San Francisco Police Department documents support the officer's statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/13/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer cited him without cause. The officer stated he cited the complainant for a traffic infraction. There were no independent witnesses to this incident. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer practiced biased policing due to race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer conducted a traffic stop due to the complainant's race. The officer was questioned relative to the OCC's biased policing protocol and denied the allegation. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/15/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/26/12 **PAGE** #1 of 1

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

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

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

Office of the City Attorney Attn: Claims Department 1390 Market Street-7th Floor San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer arrested and cited him without cause for driving with a suspended license even though he was merely sitting in his parked car and had not been driving it. The named officer and his partner stated that they arrested and cited the complainant for driving with a suspended license after seeing him driving, determining that his license was suspended and confirming his identity during the traffic stop. Two individuals who were with the complainant, including his brother, stated that the complainant had been driving just before he was stopped by officers. The evidence established that the complainant's driver's license was suspended at the time. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers towed the complainant's vehicle without justification on May 25, 2011.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers cited him for driving with a suspended license and towed his car without justification even though he was merely sitting in his parked car and had not been driving it. The named officer and his partner said they towed the complainant's car after seeing him driving, determining that his license was suspended and confirming his identity during the traffic stop. Two individuals who were with the complainant, including his brother, stated that the complainant had been driving just before he was stopped by officers. The evidence established that the complainant's driver's license was suspended at the time. Department regulations require that vehicles driven by individuals who are driving with suspended driver's licenses be towed. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 4 -5: The officers towed the complainant's vehicle without justification on June 20, 2011.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers cited him for driving with a suspended license and towed his car without justification even though he had not been driving it. The complainant said the officers saw him walking near his home and stopped him after he placed something inside his parked car. The named officer and his partner said they towed the complainant's car after seeing him driving with a suspended license. The complainant's brother said he and a friend were returning home in the friend's car when he saw the complainant walking on the sidewalk and saw officers stop and detain him. The complainant's brother did not see the complainant driving. An acquaintance of the complainant who was parked behind the complainant's car said he saw the complainant exit the driver's seat of his car and saw officers stop the complainant as he was entering his building. This witness said he did not see the complainant walk past his car and did not see the complainant park his car. The OCC was unable to contact and interview another civilian witness. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer cited the complainant without cause on June 20, 2011.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers cited him for driving with a suspended license and towed his car without justification even though he had not been driving it. The complainant said the officers saw him walking near his home and stopped him after he placed something inside his parked car. The named officer and his partner said they cited the complainant after seeing him driving with a suspended license and littering. The complainant admitted littering in front of the officers. The complainant's brother said he and a friend were returning home in the friend's car when he saw the complainant walking on the sidewalk and saw officers stop and detain him. The complainant's brother did not see the complainant driving. An acquaintance of the complainant who was parked behind the complainant's car said he saw the complainant exit the driver's seat of his car and saw officers stop the complainant as he was entering his building. This witness said he did not see the complainant walk past his car and did not see the complainant park his car. The OCC was unable to contact and interview another civilian witness. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/27/12 **PAGE#** 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers engaged in harassing, racially biased behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers engaged in harassing, racially biased behavior by citing him for driving with a suspended driver's license and towing his car on two separate occasions when he had not been driving. The complainant said he believes the officers contacted him on the first occasion because of his race and that they contacted him on the second occasion in order to harass him. The named officers were questioned relative to the OCC's biased policing protocol and denied that any of their actions were based on the complainant's race or that they harassed the complainant. The named officers stated that on the occasion of their first contact with the complainant, they ran the license plate number of his car without knowing the race or identity of the driver. This check indicated the car had recently been towed because its registered owner was driving with a suspended license. They said they contacted the complainant only after determining that the registered owner's driver's license was suspended, and that they confirmed his identity before taking enforcement action. The named officers said they contacted the complainant a month later when they saw him drive by. They followed the complainant's car, contacted him as he was walking away from it after parking and asked if he had taken care of his suspended driver's license. After they ran a check and determined that his license was still suspended, they cited the complainant and towed his car. The complainant's claim that he had not been driving the first time the officers contacted him was contradicted by two passengers in his car, including his brother. Two witnesses to the second contact with the named officers stated that they saw the complainant walking near his car but did not see him driving. The OCC was unable to contact and interview another civilian witness. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF OCC ADDED ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers conducted a search without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officers stopped and cited the complainant for driving with a suspended driver's license. Three passengers in the complainant's car stated that officers searched them at the scene. Two of the passengers stated that the officers instructed them to stand against the wall of a nearby building and that the searching officer reached inside their pants pockets after patting the outside of the pockets. Communications records establish that the named officers ran wants and warrants checks on all three passengers five to seven minutes after initiating the traffic stop. The named officers stated that the passengers were not detained and were free to leave. One of the named officers stated that they checked the identification of one of the passengers, who was the complainant's twin brother, but that he did not recall whether they requested or obtained identification from the other two passengers. He stated that he did not remember whether the passengers were searched. The other named officer stated that he was dealing with the complainant and did not know whether any officer requested or obtained identification from the passengers. He stated he did not search anyone besides the complainant and did not see any of the passengers searched. The witness officers who responded as backup and who recalled this incident stated that they did not observe any of the passengers being searched. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/25/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer harassed the complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer engaged in a pattern of harassment, beginning with a traffic stop. The complainant cited two other contacts with the officer. One contact was a traffic stop where the complainant admitted the violation. The second incident allegedly occurred when the complainant was with his girlfriend and her sister. The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward during the investigation. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer engaged in biased policing based on race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer engaged in biased policing due to the complainant's race. The officer was questioned relative to OCC's biased policing protocol and denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward during the investigation. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/25/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3: The officer conducted a traffic stop without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer stopped his car for two separate traffic violations. The complainant admitted the violations to OCC. 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 #4: The officer towed the complainant's vehicle without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer improperly towed his vehicle. The complainant admitted that he was driving with a suspended license. The SFPD policy requires that officers tow the vehicle of a person driving with a suspended license. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred, however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to follow DGO 5.20.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer was the last to respond to a medical call at a hotel. Paramedics and firefighters were already on scene. The complainant/patient was a hotel guest, whose primary language was Mandarin. The complainant had complained of chest pains to a hotel employee by patting her chest, international body language indicating cardiac arrest. The hotel employee called 911. Firefighters mistakenly identified the complainant's language and summoned a Japanese, then Cantonese speaking officer. Upon arrival, the Cantonese speaking officer identified the complainant's language as Mandarin. Paramedics wanted to transport the complainant immediately. The officer utilized the best technical means available to him to interpret, given the exigency of the ongoing medical emergency. 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 failed to follow DGO 5.20.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer was a supervisor responding to an urgent medical call. The paramedics and firefighters were already at the scene. The firefighters mistakenly identified the complainant's language as Japanese and then Cantonese. A police supervisor responding to the scene contacted a Cantonese officer to provide interpretation. He also rebroadcast the call, describing the complainant as a non-English Asian patient. The officer was assisting the SFFD and when the incorrect language assessments was made he took the appropriate action. The officer's actions were proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: This complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction.

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

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

San Francisco Fire Department 698 - 2nd Street San Francisco, CA 94107

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated an Asian officer who spoke a dialect she did not understand handcuffed and arrested her. The witnesses refuted the allegation. They stated the complainant patted her chest, indicating she was in cardiac distress. The witnesses stated they were concerned for the complainant's health and wellbeing. They sought to immediately transport her to the county hospital, where she could be seen by a physician. The witnesses stated the officer handcuffed the complainant. The witnesses assisted the officers and brought the complainant to a waiting ambulance. The OCC found that the officer detained and handcuffed the complainant because she was unable to care for herself and was uncooperative with those who sought to assist her. The complainant was released to the care of paramedics for the specific purpose of medical transport. The officer denied the allegation. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 0)7/27/11 D .	ATE OF CO	MPLETION:	04/30/12	PAGE# 3	of 3	
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATE complainant.	ION #5: The	e officer used	unnecessary fo	rce during th	he detention	of the	
CATEGORY OF CONDUC	T: UF	FINDING:	U DEPT.	ACTION:			
FINDINGS OF FACT : The complainant stated the officer used unnecessary force in detaining her. The witnesses refuted the allegation. Medical records refuted the allegation. The officer denied the allegation. The evidence proved that the acts alleged in the complaint did not occur.							
SUMMARY OF ALLEGAT	ION #:						
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT	Т:	FINDING:	DEPT.	ACTION:			
FINDINGS OF FACT:							

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 1 of 8

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was alone in his vehicle when the officer stopped him without cause. The officer, incident report and citation all document that the officer initiated the traffic stop because of the complainant's tinted vehicle windows. The complainant admitted that his vehicle had tinted windows. The incident report documents that a tint meter was used and registered the tint to be illegal. The California Vehicle Code prohibits alterations that reduce the light transmittance of the windshield or side or rear windows. Department General Orders declare Traffic enforcement as a major priority of the Department. Based upon the evidence the officer had reasonable suspicion to detain. 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 handcuffed the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer handcuffed him without cause. The officer said he handcuffed the complainant because the complainant had a traffic warrant and was under arrest. The officer documented the warrant in his incident report. The officer had probable cause to place the complainant under arrest and handcuff him as required under the Department General Orders. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 2 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer searched the complainant's vehicle without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer searched his vehicle without permission and without cause. The officer said the complainant was under arrest and there was no legal parking for his vehicle so it was towed. The officer said he conducted an inventory search of the vehicle. The Department General Orders authorize officers to tow a vehicle of a person under arrest if the vehicle cannot be secured, and cannot be released immediately to a person at the scene or where the vehicle is a traffic hazard or is not parked in a place that will be legal for at least 24 hours. The complainant said he had no one to come get his vehicle. The officer said the vehicle could not be legally parked at the location of the traffic stop. 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 #4: The officer seized the complainant's property without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer seized the complainant's property without cause. The officer said he had the complainant's property booked as property for safekeeping due to the type of property involved. Department General Orders permit officers to process property including non-evidentiary property for safekeeping. In this case the complainant was being arrested and his vehicle was towed. It was within the officer's discretion per the Department General Orders to retain the complainant's property for safekeeping and said property was appropriately documented in the incident report. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation occurred; however, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 3 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer towed the complainant's vehicle without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant's vehicle was towed without cause. The officer said the complainant was under arrest for a traffic warrant so his vehicle was towed. The Department General Orders authorize officers to tow a vehicle of a person under arrest if the vehicle cannot be secured, and cannot be released immediately to a person at the scene, or where the vehicle is a traffic hazard or is not parked in a place that will be legal for at least 24 hours. The complainant said he had no one to come get his vehicle. The officer said the vehicle could not be legally parked at the location of the scene. The officer was within his discretion to tow the vehicle. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation occurred; however, said act was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-10: The officers behaved inappropriately and/or made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers made inappropriate comments and behaved in an inappropriate manner. The officers either denied behaving in the alleged manner or making the alleged comments or denied speaking with the complainant. Witness officers denied seeing or hearing the named members behave in or make the alleged inappropriate behavior or comments. Department General Orders require that officers treat the public with courtesy and respect and not use harsh, profane or uncivil language. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 4 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11: The officer searched the complainant's residence without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer searched his residence without cause. The officer said complainant signed a Consent to Search Form. The complainant admitted to signing, and the OCC obtained a copy, of the signed Consent to Search Form. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation occurred; however, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #12 & 13: The officers used unnecessary force.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said while getting into the transporting unit, the door was shut on his leg by different officers at different locations and that he complained of the resulting pain. The named officers and other officers all denied closing the patrol unit door on the complainant's leg or that they heard the complainant complain of pain. Witness officers denied seeing any officer close a patrol unit door on the complainant's leg or hearing the complainant complain of pain. Department General Orders prohibit officers from using unnecessary force. The officers all denied committing the alleged act or hearing any complaint of pain by the complainant. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 5 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #14: The officer drove improperly.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said when being transported the officer driving the patrol car exceeded the speed limit. The named officer denied driving over the speed limit. The officer's partner denied that the named officer exceeded the speed limit. There were no other witnesses. An on duty police officer is required to drive according to the California Vehicle Code except in exigent circumstances. There were no exigent circumstances in this incident at the time of the alleged behavior. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #15 & 16: The officers failed to comply with the Department General Order 9.04.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that while being transported to the jail and later to the hospital he was not strapped into the back seat of the patrol unit. The transporting officers denied the allegation. The Department General Orders require that prisoners be secured by a seatbelt when being transported in a Department vehicle. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 6 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #17 & 18: The officers used profanity.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers used profanity. The officers denied using or hearing the other officer use profanity. The Department General Orders prohibit officers from using profanity. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #19 & 20: The officers provided inaccurate information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers provided him with inaccurate information. The officers either did not recall speaking to the complainant or denied making the alleged comments. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 7 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #21: The officer damaged the complainant's property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that when he got his car out of tow several items of personal property inside the vehicle had been damaged. The named officer admitted to searching the complainant's vehicle but denied damaging any of the complainant's property. There is no evidence as to the condition of the complainant's property prior to the incident. There were no witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #22: The officer failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the named officer did not follow through when required to do so. The officer denied the allegation. The Event Unit History corroborated the named officer's statement. There were no witnesses. The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint did not occur.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 8 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #23: The officer failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said while being detained at the station he became dizzy and disoriented and banged on the cell door to get attention to no avail. The Station Keeper at the time, said he assisted in comforting the complainant and asked him if he required medical attention and the complainant told him he did not. The named officer denied hearing or seeing the complainant bang on the cell door and was unaware of his having become dizzy or disoriented. The SFPD Booking and Detention Manual holds the Station Keeper responsible for custody of prisoners at the district station and the medical condition thereof. According to the complainant, the transporting officers, and the Supplemental Incident Report, the SFSD jail refused to receive the complainant, requiring that he be medically cleared first. The conflicting evidence between the statements of the complainant, Station Keeper and the jail's refusal to accept the complainant prior to a medical clearance prevents a dispositive finding. There were no other witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/05/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

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 that he was a passenger in a van involved in a collision. The complainant stated that the named officer did not inquire whether anyone in the van was injured, took no action when occupants of the van requested an ambulance and failed to investigate the collision. The named officer stated that he and his partner responded to a report of a vehicle collision with no injuries. He stated that no one at the scene complained of pain or an injury when he asked about this and that no one requested medical attention. The named officer stated that because there were no injuries, he facilitated an exchange of information between the drivers but took no further action because none was required by law or by department regulations. The named officer's partner stated that she contacted the driver of the second vehicle and had no contact with the occupants of the van. She stated that no one at the scene reported being injured or requested medical attention. Other occupants of the van identified by the complainant failed to respond to OCC requests for an interview. A supervisor at the residential treatment facility the complainant and the others in the van were returning to stated that he responded to the scene of the collision and arrived as the two officers were leaving. He asked whether anyone was injured and the complainant and two other individuals said they were, although he did not see any visible injuries. No one at the scene told the supervisor about their contact with the officers or said they had asked the officers for medical attention. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made inappropriate statements.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer made inappropriate statements when he responded to the scene of a vehicle collision. The named officer denied the allegation. The named officer's partner stated that she contacted the driver of the other vehicle and did not observe the named officer's interaction with the complainant or others in his vehicle. Other occupants of the vehicle the complainant was riding in identified by the complainant failed to respond to OCC requests for an interview. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/05/12 **PAGE#** 2 of 2 **DATE OF COMPLAINT**: 08/02/11 **SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION** #3: The officer used profanity. **CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING:** NS **DEPT. ACTION:** D **FINDINGS OF FACT**: The complainant stated that the officer used profanity when he responded to the scene of a vehicle collision. The named officer denied the allegation. The named officer's partner stated that she contacted the driver of the other vehicle and did not observe the named officer's interaction with the complainant or others in his vehicle. Other occupants of the vehicle the complainant was riding in identified by the complainant failed to respond to OCC requests for an interview. No other witnesses were identified. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation. **SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:**

FINDING:

DEPT. ACTION:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/10/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE #1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer denied the allegation, saying she listened to both the reporting party, witnesses and the complainant, who was detained. A witness officer did not recall the incident. One witness said the officer investigated the incident thoroughly, and said she heard the officer speaking to the complainant, asking him about the incident, and then said she saw the complainant decline to speak to the officers. No other witnesses came forward. The evidence proved that the acts that provided the basis for the complaint occurred, however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer confirmed she detained the complainant but denied the allegation, saying that the complainant was a danger to others and was delusional. One witness officer did not recall the incident. One witness confirmed that the named officer was responding to reports of fearful reporting parties. Department records indicted that the reporting party reported "a large man yelling and screaming." Medical records indicated the complainant was deemed not "clearly delusional," and that the mental health detention was discontinued. No other witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT : 08/10/11	DATE OF COMPLE	ETION: 04/06/12	PAGE #2 of 2					
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer behaved inappropriately.								
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CRD	FINDING: NS	DEPT. ACTION:	:					
FINDINGS OF FACT : The named of present. No other witnesses came forwallegation.								
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:								
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	FINDING:	DEPT. ACTION:						

FINDINGS OF FACT:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/11/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 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 an officer she could not identify failed to allow an ambulance crew to treat her and her sister, but she acknowledged that neither she nor her sister told either of the officers present they needed an ambulance or were injured. Two officers denied the allegation, stating that someone else called an ambulance but they were present when the complainant and her sister told a responding ambulance crew that they were not injured and to leave. Two witnesses at the scene stated that the complainant and her sister told a responding ambulance crew they were unneeded and to leave. No other witness came forward. There was insufficient evidence to identify an officer involved or to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved and spoke inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer denied the allegation. No other witness came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/17/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/11/12 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 complation The officer denied the allegation. No prove or disprove the allegation.		-							
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #	: :								
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	F	INDING:	DE	EPT. ACTION:					
FINDINGS OF FACT:									

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported to a male officer that a stranger had just threatened him with a handgun during a confrontation inside a park. The complainant stated the officers made a negligible attempt to locate the suspect. The officers stated they broadcast the suspect's description, sought assistance from other district units, and searched for the suspect themselves to no avail. One officer stated he asked the complainant to assist him further in order to locate the suspect, but the complainant became uncooperative. DEM recordings and broadcasts confirmed the officers' unsuccessful attempts to locate the suspect. The officers' actions were lawful and proper given the circumstances.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that a stranger threatened him with a handgun during a confrontation inside a park and alleged the officer failed to report it. The complainant was also dissatisfied with the police after they could not locate the suspect, and declined repeated offers to file the report with the officers on scene. The complainant filed a report with other officers the following day. The officer stated the complainant left the scene, and was uncooperative with additional efforts to locate the suspect or to provide any information in order to file a report. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5: The officers' behavior and comments were inappropriate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers laughed at him and that one of the officers mistreated him after the police could not locate the suspect. The officers denied they laughed about such a serious report with potentially deadly consequences. The officer denied he mistreated the complainant and said the other officer was present during their interactions. However, the other officer denied being present when the officer interacted with the complainant. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/02/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved inappropriately and/or made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was at San Francisco Airport with his 10-pound Chihuahua when he was approached by a K-9 officer. The complainant alleged that the officer's dog was out of control, attempting to jump on the complainant while the complainant was holding his Chihuahua. Additionally, the complainant stated that the officer behaved inappropriately towards him. The officer denied the complainant's allegations. No witnesses were identified. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/22/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs Division (Administrative) 850 Bryant Street, Room 558 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1 - 5: The officers behaved inappropriately and made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officers displayed inappropriate behavior, made inappropriate comments, and threatened him with bodily harm or injury. The officers denied the allegation. The witness did not provide a statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer placed tight handcuffs on the complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer placed tight handcuffs on him. The complainant said he sustained bruises on his wrists from the tight handcuffs. The officer denied the allegation. The officer stated the handcuffs were doubled-locked and checked for the proper degree of tightness. The officer further said he did not recall the complainant complaining about his handcuffs or that he needed or wanted any medical attention or aid. The officer stated there were no visible injuries on the complainant. The witness did not provide a statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer did not provide medical aid to him regarding his panic and anxiety attack exacerbated by the officer. The complainant stated the officer did not read to him his Miranda Rights. The officer denied the allegation and said the complainant did not request for any medical aid or complained about his medical condition. The officer further said the complainant was not interrogated or questioned by him or the other officers, therefore his Miranda Rights were not read to him. The witness did not provide a statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #8 - 11: The officers engaged in bias policing due to the complainant's sexual orientation.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he felt the officers discriminated against him. The officers denied the allegation. The officers responded to a Domestic Violence Assault call from dispatch. The primary officers are the only unit assigned to the Treasure Island area and the back up officers responded to assist. The witness did not provide a statement. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/26/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **PAGE** #1 of 1

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

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

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Division 25 Van Ness Ave. Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/06/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE # 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1 & 2: The officers used force against the co-complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The co-complainant (complainant's son) stated that the officers took him down and beat him with a baton causing injuries including a fractured wrist. The officers stated the co-complainant was actively resisting and fighting with them so one officer used his baton to subdue him. A witness stated that the co-complainant ran away from police twice and she observed baton strikes to the hand and upper body when officers caught the co-complainant. Medical records document a fractured right wrist and a laceration to the knee. In the medical records, a statement attributed to the co-complainant stated that he ran from police because he lost consciousness from a previous fight and did not realize they were police. There is insufficient evidence to establish the level of force necessary to control the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3 & 4: The officers failed to take the co-complainant's report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The co-complainant stated he told the officers that he wanted to make a report for being assaulted by gang members but the officers ignored him. The officers denied the allegation. There were no witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/06/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE # 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5 & 6: The officers exhibited inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The co-complainant stated that the officers who were with him at the hospital joked and laughed at him. The officers denied the allegation. There were no witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT:

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer(s) arrested the complainant without cause				
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:	UA	FINDING:	NF	DEPT. ACTION:
FINDINGS OF FACT: The comp	olainant fa	ailed to reply to 1	equests	for an interview.
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION	#:			
CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:		FINDING:	D	EPT. ACTION:
FINDINGS OF FACT:				

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/16/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the incident occurred during a routine traffic stop. The officer pulled the complainant over for failure to come to a complete stop at a stop sign. The complainant stated the stop occurred on a busy street and she could not find a proper place to pull over. She traveled two blocks and turned right into a smaller street. She stated the officer screamed at her and made inappropriate remarks. The officer denied the allegation. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly identify himself.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated a traffic officer pulled her over for failure to stop at a stop sign. During the citation process, the complainant stated she found the officer's hostility "earth-shattering." She asked the officer to identify himself. The officer pointed to his star number on the citation, but failed to provide his full name, star number and assignment as required. The officer stated that he provided his name and star number to the complainant. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 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 April 13, 2012.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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 April 13, 2012.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/22/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

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. The complainant stated the officer refused to call a sergeant to the scene when asked. The officer stated that she notified a sergeant who was familiar with the complainant and aware of the situation. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made inappropriate comments and/or behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer made inappropriate comments and/or behavior. The complainant stated that the officer threatened to arrest him, made derogatory statements and was disrespectful to him. The officer denied the allegation. The officer stated that her demeanor and tone of voice during the contact was calm and professional. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/22/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 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 that the officer issued him an invalid order. He stated that the officer ordered him to leave his residence or get arrested. The officer stated that she could not recall telling the complainant to leave. She could not recall if she gave orders to the complainant during the contact. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1 - 3: The officers detained the complainant without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was riding an unlicensed mini-motorbike, which he claimed was not required to have a license plate displayed. He first saw the officers sitting in a parked patrol car. He did not pay them any attention since he was obeying all traffic laws while riding the motorbike. After he parked the motorbike and walked into a residence he was visiting, the officers entered the residence with the residents permission and arrested him. He stated the officers told him that he "evaded" the police. The officers said they saw the complainant riding the motorbike without a helmet. The motorbike should have had, but did not have, a license plate displayed. They also saw the complainant fail to stop for a stop sign. One of the officers yelled for the complainant to stop, but the complainant continued riding the motorbike. The officers followed the complainant and saw him fail to stop for other stop signs. The complainant rode the motorbike onto public sidewalks, across private lawns, through a basketball court and attempted to hide from the officers. The officers finally caught up with the complainant, arrested him and cited him for reckless driving. The officers later discovered the complainant had an outstanding arrest warrant and was riding a stolen motorbike. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4 - 6: The officers arrested the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he was obeying all traffic laws while riding a minimotorbike and indicated the officers had no reason to arrest him. The officers produced the following evidence: the complainant was riding the motorbike without a helmet; the motorbike did not have any license plate displayed; the complainant had an outstanding arrest warrant and the motorbike was reported stolen. The officers initially detained the complainant for reckless driving and subsequently determined the complainant had an outstanding arrest warrant. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7 & 8: The officers used unnecessary force during the detention.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said he was arrested and taken to the police station's holding cell. While he was being held in the holding cell, an officer told him that he had to take the complainant's photograph. The complainant said he told the officer that he did not want his picture taken. The complainant said the officers "rushed" him and stood him up against a wall, while one of the officers grabbed him by the neck and drove his head into the wall. The complainant said the officer then took his photograph. The officers denied standing the complainant upright, grabbing him by the neck and slamming his head into the wall. The officers said the complainant was handcuffed to the wall of the holding cell and they did not have to stand the complainant up in order to take his photograph. The officers produced photographs of the complainant seated in the holding cell while he was handcuffed to the wall. However, there were no independent witnesses to either support or refute the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9 - 11: The officers made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that while he was being detained at the police station, the officers made inappropriate jokes about him and laughed at him. The complainant said he told the officers he did not do what the officers accused him of doing. One of the above officers allegedly said to the complainant words to the effect of, "Who cares if you didn't do it! That's what my report is going to say." No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/22/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE #1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters outside of the OCC's jurisdiction.

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

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

San Francisco Police Department Internal Affairs 850 Bryant Street, Room 558 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer and other members of his team entered an apartment without cause. The complainant stated the officers had no right to enter and search the apartment because he lived in another address. The evidence shows that the officers had a search warrant. The evidence further discloses that the complainant lived in the apartment. The evidence therefore proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained the mother of the complainant's children.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The law allows police officers to detain occupants of a residence subject to the search warrant. The evidence shows that the officer and his team detained the subject during the service of the search warrant. The evidence therefore proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer placed the mother of the complainant's children in handcuffs.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The evidence shows that the subject was placed in handcuffs during the service of the search warrant. For officer safety reason, an officer may detain a subject in handcuffs. The officer stated the subject was placed in handcuffs because the subject was extremely uncooperative, belligerent, and angry. The complainant's wife was never interviewed as she failed to respond to OCC requests to provide a statement. No witnesses came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer searched a residence without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The evidence shows that the officer and his team had a search warrant to search the apartment. The evidence therefore proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful, and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer damaged properties without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The evidence shows damage to the front door of the apartment. A safe was also forcibly opened. The evidence shows that there was a need for the officers to breach the front door and to force open the safe. The damaged properties were duly photographed and documented pursuant to Department policies. The evidence therefore proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/11/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained the complainant 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 9, 2012.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to provide his name and badge number when requested.

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 9, 2012.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/11/12 PAGE #2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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 9, 2012.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer threatened and harassed the complainant.

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 9, 2012.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/06/12 PAGE #1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant acknowledged the violations for which he was detained. The named officer denied the allegation, stating that he detained the complainant for the violations for which he cited the complainant. No witness came forward. The evidence proved the acts that provided the basis for the allegation occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer engaged in biased policing, based on race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer denied the allegation, stating he did not make the comments or implications alleged by the complainant. No witness came forward. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved inappropriately and made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer yelled at her and threatened to add more violations to the citation. The complainant said the officer asked if she was willing to jump off a bridge if she saw someone else do that. The officer denied the allegation. The witnesses did not provide their statements. There is insufficient evidence to 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: PC DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer should not have issued a citation to her husband. The complainant admitted her husband drove their vehicle onto the sidewalk in order to park it in front of their residence. The officer observed the complainant's vehicle being driven onto the sidewalk and park in front of their residence. The officer issued a citation to the complainant's husband, who was in violation of 21663cvc for driving on the sidewalk. The witnesses did not provide their statements. The evidence proved that the acts, which provided the basis for the allegations occurred, however, such acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/19/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer lied in traffic court regarding her citation. The complainant said the officer accused them of making a u-turn in the middle of the street. However, the complainant admitted her husband drove their vehicle onto the sidewalk and parked it in front of their residence. The officer stated he observed the complainant's vehicle drive onto the sidewalk, back up, and park in violation of 21663cvc. The officer said the complainant was rightfully convicted in traffic court. The witnesses did not provide their statements. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/10 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #1 of 4

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF FINDING: PF DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer responded to a noise complaint at a residential hotel. The named officer directed hotel staff to open the hotel room that was the subject of the noise complaint. Hotel staff opened the door, entered the room, and turned down the stereo. The named officer also entered the room. Inside the room the named officer removed a gun that was within reach of the resident who was lying on his bed. The resident became agitated, made furtive gestures with his hands, and refused to comply with the named officer's orders. The resident regained control of the gun the named officer had seized and pointed it at the named officer. The named officer fatally shot the resident. When the resident regained control of his gun and pointed it at the named officer, the named officer's decision to use lethal force was objectively reasonable and consistent with Department policy.

Although the evidence proved that the named officer's actions were consistent with Department policy, the OCC recommends a change in Department's policy, procedure and training to address factors that contributed to this deadly force situation. The OCC recommends that the Department issue a Department Bulletin that explicitly identifies the lawful circumstances in which an officer may gain entry to a hotel, motel or other domicile by relying upon a landlord's or management's key. The OCC also recommends that the Department in conjunction with Department of Emergency Management develop a comprehensive system that enables officers responding to calls for service to obtain information about prior 5150 contacts of the involved parties and the prior presence, seizure and/or return of guns.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/10 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #2 of 4

SUMMARY OF OCC-ADDED ALLEGATION #1: The officer entered a residence without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA FINDING: S DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer entered a residential hotel room after the named officer instructed hotel staff to open the door of an occupied hotel room that was the source of a noise complaint. The investigation established that the named officer did not have consent, an exigency, or a warrant to enter the hotel room. A preponderance of the evidence proved that the conduct complained of occurred and, using as a standard the Fourth Amendment, federal and state case law, and the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

SUMMARY OF OCC-ADDED ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to maintain required equipment.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer acknowledged responding to the call for service without first retrieving a department issued baton or other impact weapon from the named officer's patrol vehicle. The failure to carry an impact weapon was a violation of Department regulations and limited the named officer's use of force options. A preponderance of the evidence proved that the conduct complained of occurred and, using as a standard the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/10 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #3 of 4

SUMMARY OF OCC-ADDED ALLEGATION #3: The officer contacted a witness during an investigation.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA FINDING: S DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer denied the allegation, stating that the civilian witness requested the contact with the named officer and that the named officer agreed only with the approval of a sergeant who was acting as part of a peer-counseling program mandated by the Department. The named officer denied talking about the facts of the shooting incident or the shooting victim with the civilian witness. The named officer also denied knowing that an OCC investigation was being conducted and believed that the Department's investigations had concluded. A witness officer said he had arranged the meeting between the named officer and the civilian witness, but was not present during the discussion and did not know the contents of the conversation. The civilian witness denied making any request to speak with the named officer. The civilian witness stated that during the meeting with the named officer, the named officer provided him personal information about the shooting victim. The evidence established that within eleven days of the shooting incident and while both criminal and administrative investigations into the shooting were being conducted, the named officer met with a civilian witness and provided the civilian witness information about the shooting incident and the shooting victim. A preponderance of the evidence proved that the conduct complained of occurred and, using as a standard the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/27/10 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #4 of 4

SUMMARY OF OCC-ADDED ALLEGATION #4: The officer contacted a witness during an investigation.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer was a critical incident response team (CIRT) representative for an officer involved in a fatal shooting incident. The named officer arranged a meeting between the officer involved in the shooting and a civilian witness who had been at the scene of the shooting. This meeting occurred approximately eleven days after the officer-involved shooting incident and during the time that the Department was conducting its criminal investigation and both the Department and the Office of Citizen Complaints were conducting their administrative investigations of the officer-involved shooting. The named officer denied the impropriety of the meeting, stating that he had arranged the meeting for the purpose of helping the officer involved in the shooting and the civilian witness deal with the emotional fallout of the incident. The named officer said he was not present during the meeting between the civilian witness and the officer involved in the shooting, and did not know the contents of the conversation. The investigation proved that the act by the named officer is not explicitly addressed in the Department's policy, procedures or regulations concerning officer-involved shootings and the critical incident response team's roles. The OCC recommends that the Department amends its officer-involved shooting and critical incident response team protocols to clarify the role, responsibilities, and activities of CIRT members, especially when providing support services to officers who are subject of a criminal and/or administrative investigation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/24/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE # 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF FINDING: U DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer hit her chest with a flashlight and tried to break her wrist and fingers. The officer denied the allegation. The medical records document that the complainant complained that her wrist was in pain but refused x-rays. The complainant had also reported that she had been raped two days before this incident but refused treatment and the last time she was admitted she also reported being raped and again refused treatment. The records document that the complainant has credibility issues, as the assaults she reports are not associated with the symptoms she is reporting and she is more interested in getting pain medications. The complainant has numerous mental health conditions and credibility is an issue.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant admitted to walking down the street yelling about the military but not harming anyone. The officer stated the complainant met the criteria for a mental health detention. The medical records document that the complainant is known at PES and has many mental health disorders and polysubstance dependence. The records document that on date of incident the complainant was agitated, paranoid, internally preoccupied, carrying out loud conversations with imaginary people, had extensive persecutory & grandiose delusions re the government, SFPD, the system, and the VA. The officer had the authority to detain the complainant per DGO 6.14.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/24/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/12/12 PAGE #2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer exhibited inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer threatened to cut her up into pieces and throw her body parts all over the place. The officer denied the allegation. The medical records document that the complainant has many mental health issues and extensive persecutory and grandiose delusions re government, SFPD, the system, and the VA. It is more likely than not, that the officer did not make the comment she is claiming given her condition and lack of credibility.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that her mother was alone in her house when a burglar tried to break in through a skylight. The burglar ran away when the complainant's mother saw him. The mother called the police. The complainant stated the police officer did not perform a thorough investigation. The officers stated that they searched the interior and exterior of the house. They took pictures of the skylight and the immediate area. They interviewed the reporting party and neighbors. The primary officer filed a report. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation occurred, however, such an act was justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer engaged in inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant's mother called police about a burglar breaking into her home. The complainant stated that when the officer arrived, he made inappropriate comments about the complainant's mother's home and laughed while talking to a neighbor about the burglary. The officer called Adult Protective Services to check on the mother. The officer stated that he inquired about the mother's well being. The neighbor stated that the officers never laughed while interviewing the neighbor, but had treated the case seriously. The officer stated he called Adult Protective Services because he thought the mother might benefit from their services. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation occurred, however, such an act was justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was eating ice cream on the roof of the building where he lived when two officers approached and told him the president of the United States was holding an event nearby and the complainant needed to get off the rooftop. The complainant at first refused. The officers then looked at the complainant's recently issued identification, which had a different address listed. The officers stated that because of the security issues involved, they detained the complainant to get him off the rooftop and to confirm that he lived in the building. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegations did in fact occur; however, the acts were justified, lawful and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers handcuffed the complainant without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was being questioned by officers when he attempted to put his wallet back in his back pocket and then reach into his front pocket and get his smart phone in order to record what the officers were saying and doing. The officers suddenly grabbed his arms and handcuffed him. The officers stated that the complainant reaching into his pockets was an officer safety issue because they didn't know if he had a weapon. They handcuffed him in order to restrain the complainant. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegations did in fact occur; however, the acts were justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/27/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers failed to properly identify themselves.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he asked two officers multiple times for their identification but that the officers failed to promptly and courteously provide their names and star numbers. The officers stated that they did provide their identification upon request. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegations made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers engaged in inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was humiliated when officers took him outside of his building so that many people could see him handcuffed in public. The officers stated they needed to take him outside until they confirmed his residency with the building management. The complainant stated that the officers confirmed his residency with security before he was taken outside. Surveillance video shows officers consulting with security before going outside but there is no audio to prove what was said. The security guard refused to provide an interview and there were no more independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegations made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/28/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/06/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer had the complainant arrested.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer had him arrested without cause. OCC's investigation established that the complainant was arrested on an arrest warrant. 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 #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/02/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/30/12 **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 reported to an officer that he was being followed by two vehicles at a high rate of speed and feared for his safety. The complainant stated the officer did nothing to investigate the incident. The information provided by the complainant is insufficient to identify the officer. A poll sent to the police station also resulted in no identification. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove this allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/05/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/20/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that her mother and ex-husband had been continually harassing her. She repeatedly asked officers to investigate those charges but they refused to do so. The officer told her the statute of limitations had run out on the charges. The officer stated that he reviewed a police report regarding the harassment claims. In that report the complainant stated that she did not want to press charges but only wanted to document the occurrence. By the time the complainant followed up on the report to say she did want to press charges, the statute of limitations had run out and the District Attorney would not proceed to prosecute the 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 #2: The officer made inappropriate comments and engaged in inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer laughed at her when she asked him to look into charges of harassment against her. The officer also failed to return phone calls to the complainant. The officer stated that he never laughed at the complainant and that he had spoken to the complainant between five to eight times, always returning her phone calls. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/05/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer made inappropriate comments and engaged in inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that during her arrest for an illegal substance, the officer made inappropriate comments to her. The officer stated that he did not make the comments and that he had not spoken with the complainant at all. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made inappropriate comments and engaged in inappropriate behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she has had several contacts with the officer over the span of multiple years. During those contacts, the officer has made sexually inappropriate comments to her and also visited the complainant at her home. The officer stated that he never made sexually inappropriate comments to the complainant and never visited her home. The officer stated that it is, in fact, the complainant who is harassing the officer. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/28/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/12 PAGE #1 of 1

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

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

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Division 25 Van Ness Ave. Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/09/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/13/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was walking around the Marina area when he was stopped by a police officer. When the complainant asked why the officer stopped him, the officer told the complainant that he was walking in a suspicious manner and trying to avoid the officer. The complainant denied that he was acting suspiciously or trying to avoid the officer. The officer also stated that the complainant walked into traffic. There were no independent witnesses. There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer searched the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an officer searched him and his backpack without cause. The complainant does have a warrantless search condition due to his parole status and told the officer he had such a status when the officer asked him about it. The officer then conducted the search. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such an act was justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/09/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/12 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-6: The officers detained the complainant without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was resting on the stairs of a private residence near Park Presidio when four officers approached him and began asking him questions. The complainant stated that he was doing nothing wrong and the officers had no justification for detaining him. The officers stated they were called to the area by dispatch due to a call from a concerned neighbor. The complainant fit the description and they detained him briefly to investigate criminal activity. 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 #7-10: The officers searched the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers searched him and his backpack without cause. The complainant does have a warrantless search condition due to his parole status and told the officers he had such a status when the officers asked him about it. The officers then conducted the search. The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegations, occurred; however, such an act was justified, lawful and proper.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/09/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/12 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11: This complaint raises matters outside OCC's jurisdiction.

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

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Unit 25 Van Ness Avenue - Room 350 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-2380

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant admitted to being illegally parked in a No Parking bus zone, but said he was waiting for the driver of the car immediately in front of him to move the vehicle so that the complainant could move into the vacated parking space. The complainant argued that even though he was parked in the bus zone, his vehicle occupied about 10% of the bus zone. The complainant denied that 100% of his vehicle was parked in the bus zone as the officer indicated on the citation he subsequently gave to the complainant. The complainant said the driver of the parked vehicle failed to move his vehicle. A Muni bus suddenly arrived and stopped alongside the complainant's vehicle. The bus stopped in a traffic lane to pick up/drop off passengers, and some entering or exiting passengers thumped the side and trunk of the complainant's car with their hands. The complainant could not move his vehicle out of the bus zone due to the stopped Muni bus, which prevented the complainant from entering the traffic lane. The officer stated he cited the complainant because the complainant had 100% of his vehicle parked in the bus zone, and the complainant was texting on his cell phone while sitting in the parked vehicle. The officer said it was irrelevant whether the complainant had 10% or 100% of the vehicle parked in the bus zone. 10% of the vehicle parked in the bus zone was still a violation. 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: The officer threatened the complainant, displayed inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer refused to listen to his explanation of why the complainant's vehicle was parked in a No Parking bus zone. The officer allegedly told the complainant that he (complainant) was probably a "drunk," and called the complainant a "big mouth." The complainant said the officer admonished him by yelling at him and placing his face within one inch of the complainant's face, as though the officer were a drill sergeant admonishing a recruit. Additionally, the officer threatened to tow the complainant's vehicle. The officer denied calling the complainant a drunk or big mouth. The officer stated it was the complainant who got within inches of the officer's face. Consequently, the officer raised his voice and told the complainant to step back away, off the street and back on the sidewalk. The officer denied threatening the complainant with a vehicle tow, but explained to him the circumstances under which the vehicle could be towed. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she was illegally detained during a large demonstration, but she could not identify the officer. The SFPD ordered officers to encircle the crowd of demonstrators and arrest the group for vehicle code violations as well as violating lawful orders from police officers. The complainant acknowledged that she voluntarily joined the crowd of demonstrators. Her actions led to her detention and arrest. The complainant's detention and release were properly documented in the Incident Report. The report concerns the arrests of the protestors and indicates officers gave the protestors a chance to move out of the public thoroughfares they were blocking; however, the protestors ignored the order and were subsequently detained. The complainant's detention was proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to receive a Citizen's Arrest.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she attended a street protest because she was interested in connecting with people who could help her with her medical problems. While at this demonstration, she requested an unknown officer to arrest some of the demonstrators because they were making too much noise. However, the complainant could not identify or describe the officer to whom she made this request. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 2 of 3

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

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

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

U.S. Park Police Attn: Field Office Commander 1217 Ralston Avenue San Francisco, CA 94128 (415) 561-3000

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer engaged in biased policing due to race/gender/disability.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the Department as a whole has historically perpetrated a series of hate crimes against her because of her gender, race and disability. The complainant described the most recent event as being a large street demonstration that she voluntarily attended and was detained when officers commanded the crowd to disperse. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/23/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/16/12 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer used unnecessary force during the complainant's detention.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she voluntarily attended a large street demonstration. Officers commanded the large crowd of people to disperse because the protesters were blocking public thoroughfares. However, the crowd refused these orders. Officers encircled the crowd and began making arrests. The complainant said an unidentified civilian dragged her into the crowd of people being encircled by police; an unknown person hit her in the head; and police began arresting the protesters. No independent witnesses were developed to corroborate the complainant's allegation. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6 - 8: Unnecessary force was used during the complainant's detention.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The allegations raised matters outside OCC's jurisdiction. Accordingly, this complaint has also been referred to:

Kaiser Medical Center 2241 Geary Blvd. San Francisco, CA 94115 Attn: Security Department (415) 833-3518 San Francisco Fire Dept. 1415 Evans Ave. San Francisco, CA 94124 (415) 920-2956 San Francisco Sheriff's Dept. Investigative Services Unit 25 Van Ness Ave., Suite 350 San Francisco, CA 94102 (415) 554-2392

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/27/11 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **PAGE** #1 of 1

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

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

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

San Francisco District Attorney's Office 850 Bryant Street, Rm. 322 San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/06/12 **DATE OF COMPLETION**: 04/20/12 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA FINDING: IO1 DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department Investigative Services Unit/TLO 25 Van Ness Avenue, Room #350 San Francisco, CA 94102

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/28/11 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/27/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

Internal Affairs Bureau/Admin. Div. San Francisco Police Department 850 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94103

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/11/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/30/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was not jaywalking when he crossed the street with a friend. The officer stated he observed the complainant walking in the middle of the crosswalk against the red light pedestrian signal along with another person. The OCC requests for an interview with the person walking with the complainant were unsuccessful. A friend of the complainant stated he did not see the act for which the complainant was cited. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: 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 also issue a citation to the person who crossed the street with him. The officer stated he exercised discretion by advising the other party for a minor traffic infraction and stated the complainant was uncooperative, making him feel unsafe and prompting a request for additional units. The Department General Order 9.01 mandates officers to use discretion when enforcing traffic and parking laws, but at the same time requires them not to let the attitude of a violator influence their enforcement actions. Witness statements were inconclusive. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/09/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was at a protest and admitted that he used a sexual slur. A woman then put her hand on his arm. The complainant approached the officer and said that he wanted the woman arrested for touching him. The officer did not observe the contact. The officer stated that he investigated this incident by speaking to both parties and to unidentified witnesses who told him that no assault or any other crime had occurred. The other party stated she did not strike or attack the complainant but simply touched his arm with her fingers to talk to him about his slurs and statements. She stated the complainant touched her as well. Other unidentified parties corroborated that the woman had done nothing wrong but the complainant was in the wrong for making his statements. The officer stated that he determined through his investigation that there was no reasonable suspicion or probable cause for an arrest because no crime had occurred. The officer stated he advised both parties of this and neither party wanted any further action and both parties walked away. The complainant did not respond to OCC requests for an interview to clarify his statements. There were no identifiable witnesses. There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: DEPT. ACTION:

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/18/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complainant alleged the officer made an inappropriate remark.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer advised her that it was a violation of California Penal Code section 415 to make statements or utterances that would provoke a violent reaction. The complainant admitted she used racial epithets when contacting the witness. The witness stated the complainant called her a racial epithet. 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 issued an invalid order.

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

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

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/18/12 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/12 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers failed to properly investigate a malicious mischief complaint. The OCC found that the officers responded within five minutes of the complainant's 911 call. The officers spoke to the complainant. The complainant provided the officers with a description of the suspect. The officers searched the area, provided the complainant with a follow-up form, and wrote a report of their actions. The officers did not locate the suspect. The officers denied the allegation. 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 #:

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