

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/07/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was riding on his bicycle when a motorist flung open his vehicle door and knocked the complainant down. The complainant stated that he flagged down two officers who advised complainant that he could file a report if he wanted, but that it looked like everything was ok. The complainant did not file a report. Upon arriving home, he reviewed information from the Bicycle Coalition that noted an incident report is required for all bike collisions and that motorists may be cited in these circumstances. The complainant stated that the officers did not follow the proper procedures with respect to his bicycle collision.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the incident occurred. The poll came back with negative results.

The identity of the alleged officers could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/11/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/09/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was involved in a traffic collision in which he was rear ended and that an officer wrote an inaccurate report. The complainant said the report mistakenly alleged that he lacked insurance, omitted any mention of the property damage, and omitted any mention of the witness at the scene.

The named officer stated she wrote the report and that, at one point in the report, she conflated Party 1 and Party 2. The named officer stated that she made a simple drafting mistake and that she did not intend to harm the complainant. The named officer also stated that there was no visible damage to either vehicle and that there were no witnesses at the scene.

The DPA reviewed the incident report and confirmed that the mix up was likely a simple mistake. The DPA also reviewed accident photos and found no visible damages besides minor scratches and scuffs common on older vehicles. Finally, the DPA reviewed the body worn camera footage from the incident and did not see any witnesses on scene.

The named officer made a few simple drafting errors that do not rise to the level of misconduct. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the supervising officer failed to identify and correct the inaccuracies in the report.

The named officer stated he did not notice any mistakes, misrepresentation of facts, incomplete areas or false misrepresentations on the report at the time of his review.

The DPA's review of the incident report found one portion that contains a conflation of Party 1 and Party 2. The mix-up is not sufficiently egregious to be obvious to the reader. Failing to identify and correct the error does not therefore rise to the level of misconduct. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/29/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 5

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was arrested after being assaulted by a subject. He stated that named officer #1 used unnecessary force when he pushed him into a patrol vehicle and also when named officer #2 put him in a police van.

Named officer #1 stated that he did not use force on the complainant. He stated that he guided the complainant into the back seat of a patrol vehicle; however, when he did so, the complainant refused to comply and went completely flat on the back seat. Named officer #1 stated he did not hear the complainant complain of pain at any time during his interaction. Named officer #1 stated that he complied with Department policy.

Named officer #2 stated he did not use force on the complainant. He stated when he attempted to place the complainant in the police van, the complainant went limp and flopped on the floor. He stated he did not hear the complainant complain of pain.

Witness officers stated they did not observe the named officers use unnecessary force on the complainant nor did they hear the complainant complain of pain.

Department records indicated that a third party reported to police dispatch that the complainant was engaged in a physical altercation with a subject. The record stated that although the complainant showed signs of intoxication, he was allowed to leave the scene. The complainant left the scene for a brief period. He then returned and became aggressive and agitated. The complainant was subsequently arrested for public intoxication. The record indicated that when named officer #1 attempted to place the complainant in the back seat of the patrol vehicle, the complainant passively resisted and refused to comply with orders to enter the vehicle. It also indicated that the complainant was then placed into a police van. The record did not document that any force was used on the complainant.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant report to officers that he was assaulted by a subject. The footage documented the complainant's signs of intoxication, such as slurred speech, repetitiveness, and difficulty answering questions and carrying on a conversation. The footage showed that after his initial contact with the officers, he was allowed to leave the scene which he did for a brief period of time

and when he returned, he spoke with a witness officer, using hand gestures in an exaggerated manner which came very close to that officer's face. BWC footage showed the complainant was subsequently

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/29/21 PAGE# 2 of 5

handcuffed and arrested for public intoxication. The footage showed named officer #1 attempt to place the complainant in the back seat of a patrol vehicle; however, the complainant refused to sit on the seat. The footage did not show named officer #1 use force; however, he and other officers used verbal commands ordering the complainant to sit on the seat. After the complainant failed to comply after several minutes, named officer #2 removed the complainant from the floor of the patrol vehicle and escorted him to a police van where he attempted to place the complainant on the van's bench. The footage showed the complainant fall onto the floor of the van, briefly moan, and repeat his own name. He informed the officers that he had a previous injury and was then sat up-right and placed on the bench.

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) states in relevant part that officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search; to overcome resistance or to prevent escape; and to gain compliance with a lawful order. Additionally, officers must use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.

The BWC footage corroborated the named officers' statements that they did not use force on the complainant and therefore did not violate Department policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer improperly used physical control.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when the named officer placed him in handcuffs, the handcuffs were too tight.

The named officer stated he handcuffed the complainant due to his level of intoxication as well as the complainant's placing his hands in his (the named officer) face multiple times. He stated the manner in which he placed the complainant in handcuffs was consistent with his Academy training. He also stated that he did not recall the complainant complain that the handcuffs were too tight.

Witness officers stated they did not hear the complainant complain that his handcuffs were too tight.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer asked the complainant not to put his hands in his face. The complainant was subsequently handcuffed by the named officer and arrested for public intoxication. The complainant never stated that his handcuffs were too tight.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/29/21 PAGE# 3 of 5

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) states in relevant part that officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search; to overcome resistance or to prevent escape; and to gain compliance with a lawful order. Additionally, officers must use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.

The SFPD Field Training Manual states in relevant part that officers are allowed to place handcuffs on any prisoner when their use is deemed necessary by the arresting officer. In addition, it states that officers may handcuff a prisoner for transportation.

There was no evidence to support the complainant's allegation that the named officer applied inappropriately tight handcuffs. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made an arrest without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was arrested without cause because he was the victim of an assault and was not intoxicated.

The named officer stated he arrested the complainant for public intoxication because he showed signs of impairment, such as his emitting the smell of alcohol, his inability to follow a conversation and articulate the details of the reported assault, his repetitiveness, his inability to answer questions and focus on his conversation. He also stated that based on those factors, he felt that the complainant was unable to care for himself.

Witness officers stated the complainant showed signs of intoxication.

BWC corroborated the named officer's justification for arresting the complainant for public intoxication.

California Penal Code section 647f states in part that a person is guilty of disorderly conduct if they are found in any public place under the influence of intoxicating liquor, any drug, controlled substance, toluene, or any combination of any intoxicating liquor, drug, controlled substance, or toluene, in a condition that they are unable to exercise care for their own safety or the safety of others, or by reason of being under the influence of intoxicating liquor, any drug, controlled substance, toluene, or any combination of any intoxicating liquor, drug, or toluene, interferes with or obstructs or prevents the free use of any street, sidewalk, or other public way.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/29/21 **PAGE#** 4 of 5

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers, who transported him to jail, did not protect him from another passenger who spat upon him while he was in the police van.

Named officer #1 stated that while he was transporting the complainant and another passenger to jail in a police van, the complainant reported that he was spat upon by the other passenger. Named officer #1 stated that they were very close to their destination and the only thing he could do was to separate the passenger and the complainant in individual compartments, which was already done. He stated he was not able to place a spit mask on the other passenger because he was not in possession of one and it would violate Department policy to do so. In addition, he stated he did not hear the other passenger spit on the complainant.

Named officer #2 stated the complainant reported that the other passenger in the police van spat upon him during transport to jail. Named officer #2 stated he did not feel comfortable stopping the vehicle and removing the complainant from the van because of the complainant's previous behavior where he refused to enter a patrol vehicle and the police van. He stated the complainant was completely separated in his own compartment, away from the other passenger. In addition, he stated that he did not hear the other passenger spit on the complainant.

Photographs of the police van showed two separate compartments separated by metal panels with an opening covered by heavy-duty mesh.

BWC showed that the complainant was seated in his own compartment, in the farthest seat away from the compartment occupied by the other passenger. The footage showed that the other passenger was seated at the seat farthest away from the compartment occupied by the complainant. The footage also showed that the two compartments were separated by metal panels with an opening covered by heavy-duty mesh.

Department General Order 5.18 (Prisoner Handling and Transportation) states in relevant part that officers shall take reasonable steps to prevent injury to prisoners for which they are responsible. It requires that officers secure a prisoner in a way will prevent injury.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/29/21 PAGE# 5 of 5

The named officers did not violate Department policy because they took reasonable steps to prevent injury to the complainant by ensuring he was in a separate compartment and seated as far away as possible from the other passenger in the police van.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-10: The officers knowingly engaged in biased policing.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO FINDING: IE DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officers mistreated him due to his race.

The named officers stated they were aware of the complainant's race when they made contact with him; however, they stated the contact was due to a report from a third party that the complainant was engaged in a physical altercation. The named officers denied mistreating the complainant and stated that the complainant's race did not play a factor in the way he was treated.

Department records indicated that a third party reported to police dispatch that the complainant was engaged in a physical altercation with a subject. It indicated that although the complainant showed signs of intoxication, he was allowed to leave the scene. The record indicated that the complainant left the scene for a brief period of time and when he returned, he became aggressive and agitated. The complainant was subsequently arrested for public intoxication.

Department General Order 5.17 states a guiding principle of the San Francisco Police Department is its commitment to treating all people with dignity, fairness and respect. It is crucial for members to carry out their duties in a manner free from bias and eliminate any perception of policing that appears biased.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/15/21 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the police failed to investigate his report of being shot at while driving.

The named officers said they responded to the call and determined the call was without merit. The officers' body worn camera shows the named officers contacted the complainant, attempted to question him, photographed the alleged damage to the complainant's car, canvassed the area for witnesses, and looked for physical evidence of a shooting. Department records show that officers also provided the complainant with the appropriate paperwork for crime victims.

The evidence proves that the officers reasonably responded to the information available to them. The alleged failure to investigate did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used profanity.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant stated that during the investigation the named officer told him he was not dealing with this "shit."

The named officer stated he was professional and denied he used profanity toward the complainant during the incident.

Body Worn Camera footage did not support the complainant's allegation.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/15/21 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5: The officers failed to provide their names and star numbers.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT The complainant stated that officers deliberately concealed their names and star numbers.

Body Worn Camera footage shows that the named officers provided their name and star number to the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer did not prepare an incident report.

SFPD records show that the named officer drafted an incident report.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/15/21 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer failed to properly process property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers took his knife and never returned it to him.

The officers' body worn cameras show that officers removed the complainant's knife and placed it on the bumper of the complainant's vehicle. The officers then told the complainant that they placed the knife on the bumper. The body worn cameras shows the knife still on the complainant's bumper as officers leave the scene.

The officers acted reasonably by taking the complainant's knife, placing it on his bumper, and telling him that it was there. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/17/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/09/21 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she approached officers who were searching a vehicle. The complainant stated that officers responded with aggression, threats to arrest her, and insults.

Body worn camera footage shows that the complainant approached officers during the search of a stopped vehicle. The complainant began engaging with the vehicle occupants, asking if they had consented to a search, if they had given the officers their registration, or if the officers had a warrant. The complainant is less ten feet of the occupants and officers when asking these questions. The named officer engages in a back and forth with the complainant, eventually ordering her to not interfere. The complainant continues to engage with the occupants and the named officer continually warns her that she will be arrested if she continues to interfere. The officers did not insult the woman and were not inappropriately aggressive.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/17/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/09/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she observed a vehicle search that she believed was unlawful.

The named officers stated they were on patrol when they contacted the occupants of an illegally parked car. During the encounter, the officers learned that the passenger was on parole. The officers confirmed his parole status with dispatch. The officers then conducted a parole search of the passenger and the vehicle, for which the complainant claimed ownership. California Penal Code section 3067(b)(3) provides that every parolee “is subject to search or seizure ... at any time of the day or night, with or without a search warrant or with or without cause.”

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/05/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named sergeant provided factually dubious information to the press and in an incident report.

The named sergeant denied any communication with members of the press or any involvement in a press release. The DPA found no other evidence that the named sergeant provided the press with any information.

The named officer also stated that his report accurately reported that he found evidence of a crime on the defendant's cellphone. After careful review, the DPA found that the report narrative failed to distinguish between evidence on the phone's memory and evidence stored in the cloud accessible through an app on the phone. But in the context of an incident report, those kinds of technical distinctions do not rise to the level of an inaccurate report or inappropriate accounting of facts.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/02/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

San Francisco Office of the Chief Medical Examiner
1 Newhall Street
San Francisco, CA 94124

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to comply with DGO 2.01 Section 57 Conflict of Interest in Investigations.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer should have recused herself from an investigation because she was friends with the victim.

The named officer stated that she did not know the victim before the investigation and that they were not friends.

The DPA interviewed a witness identified by the complainant, but the witness did not provide any evidence of relationship between the officer and victim. The DPA found no other evidence to support the allegation.

A preponderance of evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer spoke inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called the police to report that his relatives were illegally evicting him and had stolen his phone. The named officer told the complainant that he had responded to his relatives' address multiple times, implying that the address had a history of police involvement. The complainant felt this was a smug comment.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to the complainant's relative's residence due to a report of a fight.

Body worn camera footage showed that the named officer mentioned to the complainant, in a professional manner, that he had responded to his relative's residence on a previous occasion.

Department General Order 2.01 states, in relevant part, that officers must treat the public with courtesy and respect.

The named officer did not violate Department policy when he informed the complainant, in a professional manner, that he had previously responded to his relative's residence.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he told the named officer that his relatives stole his phone and refused to return it to him. He stated the named officer did not investigate the theft.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to the complainant's relative's residence due to a report of a fight.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 2 of 3

Body worn camera footage showed that the complainant told the named officer that his relatives took his phone from him, but then returned it. The footage did not show the complainant asking the named officer to investigate the alleged theft.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his mother invited him to stay with her on a temporary basis. He said that other relatives, who live in the flat above his mother's residence, told him to move out. He stated the named officer did not have the authority to tell him to leave because his mother told him he could stay with her.

The named officer stated that he spoke with the owners of the residence, who said the complainant was only a guest and that they wanted him to leave. He stated that the complainant informed him that he had a separate residence of his own and was not claiming the address where he was a guest as his legal residence.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to the complainant's relative's residence due to a report of a fight.

Body worn camera showed that the named officer spoke with the complainant's mother, who informed him that the complainant was no longer welcome to stay with her. The footage also showed that the relatives who owned the home told another officer that they wanted the complainant to leave. The footage showed the named officer informing the complainant that he had to leave the residence, which the complainant then did without incident.

The complainant was a guest at his relative's residence when they asked him to leave. Therefore, he did not have a legal right to remain on the premises.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/11/21 **PAGE# 3 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer told him to leave his mother's residence and go home. He informed the named officer that he could not return to his home because his roommate had threatened to kill him. He stated that the named officer should have investigated the threat.

The named officer denied telling the complainant to go home but stated that he did instruct the complainant to leave the residence where he was a guest. He stated that when the complainant informed him that his roommate threatened him, the complainant told him that he had already filed an earlier police report and that he was not making a threats report to him.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to the complainant's relative's residence due to a report of a fight.

Body worn camera footage showed the named officer telling the complainant to leave the residence and return to his home. The footage then showed the complainant informing the named officer that he could not return home because his roommate had threatened to kill him. The named officer asked the complainant if he called the police regarding this threat, and the complainant confirmed that he had already made a police report. The named officer then informed him that he did not have a solution, but he had to leave. The footage showed that the named officer offered the complainant a phone number for a homeless shelter.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE# 1 of 4**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was awakened by officers who walked into his room. He stated that the named officers entered his residence without his permission.

Named officer #1 stated she was dispatched to a high priority call for a burglary in progress. She stated that she and other officers knocked on the complainant's front door several times and announced themselves as police officers. She stated that after no one responded, named officer #3 discovered the front door was unlocked. Named officer #1 stated that the lack of response caused her to believe there was a burglary in progress, so she and the other named officers entered the residence. She stated that she announced herself again while entering. Named officer #1 stated she searched the hallway and the kitchen, but found no one; however, the other named officers discovered the complainant in a bedroom. Named officer #1 stated her actions were consistent with her Academy training.

Named officer #2 stated she was assisting in a building search for a subject who illegally entered a residence. She stated she had legal justification to enter the residence because a 911 caller reported that he observed a person opening a gate into the residence with a coat hanger. She stated that officers on-scene found the door open and requested additional units to check the residence.

Named officer #3 stated that she and named officer #1 responded to a high priority call for a burglary in progress. She stated that she and the other named officers made loud, verbal announcements upon discovering that the complainant's door was unlocked. She stated there was no response which led her to believe that no one was inside the apartment. Named officer #3 stated that once she made entry, she saw the complainant in a bedroom.

Department records indicate that the named officers were dispatched to a high priority call for a burglary. The records demonstrate that the named officers announced themselves and made entry into the residence after not receiving a response from inside. During their search, the named officers located the complainant inside a bedroom where he was subsequently handcuffed, questioned, and released. The named officers determined that the complainant was a resident of the premises and he was released with a Certificate of Release Form.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers approached the complainant's front door, which was unlocked. Named officer #1 loudly and repeatedly announced herself as a police officer and ordered anyone inside to come out and show their hands. The footage showed that when no one responded, the named officers made entry and began walking up the stairs. Named officer #1 again announced herself

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE# 2 of 4**

several more times, with no response. While the named officers were clearing the residence, they discovered the complainant lying on the floor of a bedroom. Named officers #2 and #3 placed the complainant in handcuffs, where he was subsequently determined to be a tenant in the building and released.

Department Bulletin 18-131 allows officers to enter a residence when there are exigent circumstances that justify entry, such as the need to respond to an imminent threat to the safety. The entry into the home in this case was justified because officers responded to a call for a burglary in progress which allowed them to enter the complainant's residence in accordance with Department Bulletin 18-131.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5: The officers used unnecessary force.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers used excessive force when they placed him in handcuffs, causing him pain.

Named officer #1 stated she did not believe she used unnecessary force when placing the complainant in handcuffs because she used the Academy-taught technique of checking the proper degree of tightness and double locking them, as she was trained to do. She stated the complainant complained of pain from a prior injury, but he did not complain of pain that persisted beyond placing him into handcuffs. She also stated that she did not observe any injuries on the complainant.

Named officer #2 stated she did not apply handcuffs to the complainant. She stated that the complainant made a comment about a prior injury which made it difficult to place his hands behind his back. She stated that in an effort to prevent the complainant from any undue or unnecessary pain or discomfort, he was allowed to place his shoulder and arm into a position of comfort before being placed into handcuffs. She also stated she did not observe any injuries on the complainant.

A witness officer stated that by the time she first observed the complainant, he was already in handcuffs. However, she stated she did not hear the complainant complain of pain, nor did she observe him to be injured.

Department records indicate that the named officers were dispatched to a high priority call regarding a burglary. The records indicate that the named officers announced themselves and made entry into the

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/22/21 PAGE# 3 of 4

residence after receiving no response to their repeated knocking. During their search, the named officers located the complainant inside a bedroom where he was subsequently handcuffed, questioned, and released. The named officers determined that the complainant was a tenant of the residence and released him with a Certificate of Release Form.

Body worn camera footage showed the named officers awakened the complainant, who was sleeping on the floor. The officers identified themselves as police and moved the complainant to a position where his hands were placed together, after which named officer #1 placed the complainant in handcuffs. The footage showed this event took place without incident. When the named officers attempted to pull the complainant to a seated position, he informed them that he had an injured arm. The named officers then allowed the complainant to move without their assistance in order to get to a more comfortable position. The complainant did not complain of pain at any time after he was placed in handcuffs.

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) states, in relevant part, that officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties to effect a lawful detention and to overcome resistance. Additionally, officers must use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.

The evidence supports the that the named officers did not use unnecessary force and acted within Department policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after the named officer entered his residence without his permission, she unlawfully detained him.

The named officer stated she assisted in a building search for a possible burglary suspect. She stated she detained the complainant, who was found inside the residence, until she and the other officers were able to determine that he was not the suspect in the incident.

Witness officers stated they responded to the complainant's residence to investigate a burglary in progress. They stated that they entered the residence after repeatedly announcing themselves without response from inside. They stated that they discovered the complainant in a bedroom, where he was

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/22/21 PAGE# 4 of 4

lawfully detained during their investigation. They stated that, following their determination that the complainant was not the suspect they sought, he was subsequently released.

Department records indicate that the officers were dispatched to a high priority call for a burglary. It indicates that officers announced themselves and made entry into the residence after not receiving a response from inside. During their search, the named officer located the complainant inside a bedroom, where he was subsequently handcuffed, questioned, and released. The officers determined that the complainant was a tenant of the residence and he was released with a Certificate of Release Form.

Body-worn camera footage showed officers approached the complainant's front door, which was unlocked. Officers announced themselves repeatedly prior to making entry; however, they received no response from inside. The footage showed that when no one responded, officers entered and began walking up the stairs, at which point the officers again announced their presence with no response. While officers were clearing the residence, the named officer discovered the complainant on the floor of a bedroom. She detained the complainant by placing him in handcuffs; he was subsequently determined to be a tenant in the building and released.

Department General Order 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states, in relevant part, "A police officer may briefly detain a person for questioning . . . only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person's behavior is related to criminal activity."

The named officer was justified, per Department policy, when she briefly detained the complainant after responding to a report of a burglary at his residence. Because the complainant did not respond to other officers' announcements and orders to come out of the house prior to their making their entry, they had reasonable suspicion to believe, upon finding him in a bedroom, that he may have been involved with the burglary.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made an arrest without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he reported to his work site and then drove to pick up food at a nearby restaurant. While driving back to work, he was stopped by police officers and falsely arrested.

Department records revealed that the named officer was the arresting officer and has since resigned from the department. Accordingly, DPA was unable to interview him.

A witness officer, a supervisor, stated that there was probable cause to arrest the complainant based on the statement the victim provided regarding the incident where he positively identified the complainant as the suspect who had committed the alleged crime.

A second witness officer stated that he spoke with the victim in this incident through a translator and based on the victim's statement regarding the incident and the complainant's proximity to the crime, there was probable cause to arrest him.

Department records documented that the named officer arrested the complainant. Records showed that the named officer spoke with the victim who identified the complainant as the suspect and his vehicle as the suspect vehicle. Records also documented that the named officer spoke with a reporting party who stated that he had heard gunshots in the area and called to report the incident. Records further revealed a 911 call in which the reporting party provided a description of the suspect and the suspect's vehicle. Department records also showed that the second witness officer spoke with the victim through a translator and that the victim identified the complainant as the suspect who had committed the crime.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was stopped in his vehicle, placed into handcuffs and transported to a police station. Footage also showed that the victim told the named officer that the complainant was the suspect who had committed the crime and identified his vehicle as the suspect vehicle.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct, occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 2 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to Mirandize.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was stopped, arrested, and brought to a police station and was not Mirandized until he spoke with an officer at the station.

Department records revealed that the named officer was the arresting officer and has since resigned from the department. Accordingly, DPA was unable to interview him.

Department records showed that the named officer arrested the complainant. Records also showed that the complainant was not interviewed or questioned by any officers regarding the incident prior to being taken to a station and being Mirandized by an investigating officer. Records further showed that the complainant was Mirandized at a station and agreed to speak with the officer who Mirandized him.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer did not ask the complainant any questions regarding the incident while he was under arrest, or otherwise in police custody; nor did any other officers on scene.

Pursuant to the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution, police officers must advise suspects of their Miranda rights prior to the start of a “custodial interrogation.” Custodial interrogation occurs when a suspect is both in police custody, and under interrogation.

The evidence proves that named officer’s actions were justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 3 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was not provided with any specific information regarding why he was arrested until he was brought to police station and he spoke with an officer who provided him with information regarding the incident and his alleged involvement. He stated that while on scene he was only informed that he matched the description of someone who had committed a crime. He spoke with the named officers on scene and they failed to tell him what was going on.

The first named officer stated that he conducted a transportation search of the complainant and assisted in transporting the complainant to a station during this incident. He stated that he told the complainant that an investigation was being conducted and that someone would be coming to speak to him at the station. The first named officer stated that he was not the investigating officer for this incident and did not have further information regarding the investigation. The first named officer stated that he was not required to provide the complainant with further information.

The second named officer stated that he assisted with transporting the complainant to a station during this incident. The second named officer did not recall any conversation with the complainant during this incident. The second named officer stated that he was not required to provide the complainant with any information during this incident as he was not the officer in charge of the investigation.

Body-worn camera footage showed that an on-scene officer told the complainant that he matched the description of someone who had committed a crime. Footage showed that the complainant asked the named officers whether he was still detained, and the named officers told him that he was. Footage also showed that the first named officer told the complainant that it was an ongoing investigation, and someone would be coming to speak with him.

The evidence proves that the underlying events occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 4 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was not provided with any specific information regarding why he was arrested until he was brought to police station and he spoke with an officer who provided him with information regarding the incident and his alleged involvement.

Department records revealed that the named officer was the arresting officer and has since resigned from the department. Accordingly, DPA was unable to interview him.

Body-worn camera footage did not show the named officer communicating with the complainant regarding the arrest.

Penal Code 841 provides that, with some exceptions, the person making the arrest must inform the person to be arrested of the intention to arrest, the cause of arrest, and the authority to do so.

The named officer as he is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 5 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he reported to his work site, was initially instructed by his manager to go home, but shortly thereafter was told to stay for his shift. He stated he left briefly to pick up food at a nearby restaurant and while driving back to work he was stopped by police officers and falsely arrested. He stated he spoke with the named officer and informed him that he had been working, had gone to pick up food at a restaurant and had no involvement in the alleged crime. The complainant stated he told the named officer to check with his employer or with the restaurant regarding his whereabouts which would reveal that he was not the suspect. The complainant stated the named officer did not investigate his alibi properly which resulted in his being in custody for a prolonged period of time.

The named officer stated he was the lead investigator assigned to the case. He stated he spoke with the complainant who denied being involved in the incident and who noted that he had been working. The named officer stated he spoke with the victim in the incident who identified the complainant as the suspect. The named officer stated he traveled to the complainant's work site and spoke first with an employee who stated that he didn't know the complainant. The named officer then spoke with an employee who identified himself as a supervisor. The supervisor confirmed that the complainant was an employee but stated that he had failed to show for his shift that night. The named officer stated through further investigation he obtained still images of the incident that showed the victim and the suspect. He stated that after reviewing the still images the suspect did not appear to be the complainant. The named officer stated he submitted the case to the Assistant District Attorney (ADA) assigned to the case, which included his opinion that the suspect in the still images did not appear to be the complainant, as soon as he was ready and able to do so. He stated that further investigation ultimately showed that the complainant was not the suspect in this incident. The named officer stated he apprised the ADA of this information, she agreed with him and updated the discharge code to exonerate the complainant. The named officer stated he felt he investigated the complainant's alibi properly and did not feel it carried weight after speaking with the complainant's supervisor. The named officer stated he followed his normal procedure when investigating this case.

Department records showed that the named officer spoke with both the complainant and the victim in this incident. Records also showed that the named officer went to the complainant's workplace and spoke with a supervising employee who advised that the complainant did work for the company but was a "no show" that day for his shift. Department records reflected that the named officer obtained still photos and later video footage of the incident. Records also showed that the named officer opined that the suspect in the still images did not appear to be the complainant. Department records documented that the named officer

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 6 of 6

submitted the case to the Assistant District Attorney (ADA) who in return provided a case disposition detailing that further investigation was necessary. Records showed that through further investigation the named officer identified and located the suspect in this incident, apprised the ADA of the results of his investigation and that the complainant was not the suspect.

Body-worn camera footage did not capture the named officer's investigative steps or process.

The evidence proves that named officer's actions were justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/04/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/29/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that over the last four years, she made numerous calls to district police stations regarding trespassing and disturbances on her property and officers neglected to investigate the calls.

Department records showed that officers took many reports from the complainant regarding an ongoing issue with her neighbor, as well as noise complaints.

The complainant made conflicting statements.

The evidence proves that the acts alleged in the complaint did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/04/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/29/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer made unannounced visits to the complainant's home multiple times and the complainant wanted the named officer to stop. The complainant believed the named officer was harassing him and wanted to send him back to jail.

The named officer denied that he was harassing the complainant. The name officer stated he conducted a number of compliance checks to verify that the complainant was living at his registered address and in compliance with his parole conditions.

Department records showed that the named officer conducted compliance checks at the complainant's address to verify the complainant was living there. Records also showed that the complainant had conditions of his parole that required compliance checks.

DPA found that the contacts between the complainant and the named officer were reasonable and did not constitute harassment.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/27/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/15/21 **PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he called the police to report a home invasion. He stated that the named officer called him and told him to leave town.

The named officer stated he was advised by dispatch that the complainant had called the police to report a home invasion. He stated the complainant was known to the police because of his prior law enforcement history, his access to weapons, and his history of delusional and paranoid behavior. He stated the complainant had exhibited unpredictable and aggressive behavior toward officers in the past, and as a result a premise warning and precaution were placed on the complainant and his address. The named officer stated he and fellow officers were instructed, for officer safety reasons, to contact the SFPD's psychiatric liaison any time they were dispatched to a call involving the complainant.

The named officer stated that after police dispatch notified him of the alleged home invasion, he called the complainant, left a message, and then contacted the psychiatric liaison. He stated the psychiatric liaison informed him that she was aware that the complainant was actively delusional and that she was in the process of removing firearms from his possession. Shortly thereafter, the complainant returned the named officer's phone call and the named officer attempted to ascertain if there was any merit to the complainant's report of a home invasion. The named officer stated he found no merit to the report because the complainant was making delusional and incoherent statements. The named officer also offered to meet the complainant at his residence, but the complainant stated he was not at home and refused to provide the named officer his current location. Once the named officer concluded his call with the complainant, he again called the psychiatric liaison, who stated that she would follow up with the complainant if he were located.

Department records indicate that the complainant called dispatch to report that three suspects entered his home and stole property. The records also included an officer safety alert advising officers that the complainant was a former police officer suffering from PTSD and paranoia.

Other Department records indicate that the complainant had multiple prior contacts with the police which resulted in the complainant being placed on mental health holds.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/27/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/15/21 **PAGE# 2 of 3**

SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he called the police to report a home invasion. The named officer responded to the call for service but failed to prepare an incident report.

The named officer stated that, due to the complainant's history of mental illness and erratic behavior, coupled with complainant's law enforcement experience and access to weapons, a premise warning and precaution are associated with the complainant and his address. The named officer stated he and fellow officers are instructed, for officer safety reasons, to contact the SFPD psychiatric liaison any time they are dispatched to a call involving the complainant.

The named officer stated that he left a message at the complainant's number and then spoke with the Department's psychiatric liaison, who informed him that the complainant was actively delusional and that she was in the process of removing firearms from his possession. The complainant then returned the named officer's phone call but made delusional statements and was incoherent. The named officer offered to meet the complainant at his residence, but the complainant stated he was not home and refused to provide his current location. The named officer stated he did not prepare an incident report because the complainant would not disclose his location, and he was not able to inspect the complainant's home where the alleged crime occurred. Therefore, he could not determine that a crime had been committed.

Department records indicate that the complainant reported to police dispatch that three suspects entered his home and stole property. The records also include an officer safety alert advising officers that the complainant was a former police officer suffering from PTSD and paranoia.

Other Department records indicate that the complainant has had multiple contacts with the police resulting in him being placed on mental health holds.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred but was justified by Department policy or procedures; however, DPA recommends that the policy or procedure be changed or modified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/27/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/15/21 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: This partial complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/27/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to properly process property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers took her property after arresting her and did not return it when she was released from jail.

One of the named officers stated that she handcuffed the complainant and removed several pieces of jewelry from the complainant's person. The named officer stated that she placed this jewelry in a sealed property envelope. The second named officer stated that he transported the complainant to county jail with the property envelope and provided the envelope to Sheriff's deputies.

The body worn camera footage corroborates the officers' accounts. The footage shows the officers placing the complainant's personal property into a sealed envelope and transporting it with the complainant to the county jail.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer placed tight handcuffs on her during her arrest and later tightened the handcuffs, causing pain and scratches on her wrists.

The named officer acknowledged handcuffing the complainant. She stated she assessed the degree of tightness by placing her finger between the cuff and the complainant's wrist. The named officer stated she later tightened the handcuffs because the complainant kept twisting her hands and moving around.

The body worn camera footage corroborates the officer's account. The footage shows that the named officer checked, adjusted, and double-locked the complainant's handcuffs. The footage also shows the named officer told the complainant that there was room in the handcuffs. The footage also shows that the complainant repeatedly moved and twisted her body while handcuffed.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/27/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/20/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5: The officers failed to Mirandize the complainant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers did not Mirandize her.

The first named officer stated that he was a cover officer for the second named officer. The second named officer stated that he did not issue a Miranda warning because he did not interrogate the complainant. The officer stated he asked the complainant only preliminary DUI questions that could be asked without a Miranda warning.

The body worn camera footage corroborates the officers' accounts. Based on the nature and timing of his questions, the officer reasonably concluded that the complainant was not subjected to custodial interrogation and therefore not entitled to a Miranda warning.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/28/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer refused to take appropriate action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in a written statement that he reported a burglary from his housing unit. Before police arrived, another tenant had returned some of the complainant's property. The police refused to take any action on the remaining missing property.

The complainant failed to provide further information and did not participate further in the investigation.

Department records showed no calls for police service as described by the complainant.

Inquiries at the local police station failed to identify any officers, and no witnesses were identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/15/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was unlawfully detained.

The named officers were on patrol when they recognized the complainant from previous contacts. One of the named officers said that he is familiar with the complainant, and that the complainant regularly engages in illicit drug sales and is the subject of an active stay away order from the location where they found him. The officers detained the complainant based on a violation of the stay away order.

Department and court records show the complainant was in violation of an active stay away order.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers applied handcuffs without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was handcuffed by officers without justification.

The named officers stated that they handcuffed the complainant because they were arresting him for violating a stay away order and preparing to transport him to county jail. In addition, the complainant was verbally aggressive and yelling during the incident.

Officers are permitted to handcuff suspects when conducting an arrest and preparing for a transport. In addition, the complainant's demeanor warranted handcuffing to control the situation.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers displayed threatening, intimidating and harassing behavior.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/15/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/11/21 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers harassed him and threatened to arrest him every time they see him in the area. The complainant stated he has done nothing wrong and is not breaking any laws.

The named officers stated that they detained the complainant for a violation of a stay away order and repeatedly told him that his stay away order prohibited him from being in that location. One of the named officers told the complainant that he would be arrested again if he did not remain away from the prohibited area.

SFPD records show that the complainant had an active court stay away order that prohibited him from being 150 yards from the subject area.

The officer's statement to the complainant that they would arrest him in the future was an accurate warning about future violations, and, without more, does not rise to the level of harassment.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/19/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/28/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/18/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/20/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to write an incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer failed to document her complaint that her neighbor had hacked her phone, email, and social media accounts.

The named officer stated she spoke with the complainant. The named officer stated she asked follow up questions to understand the nature of the alleged crime, but the complainant was unable to provide a clear response to those questions. The complainant admitted to ending the conversation by hanging up the phone.

The named officer stated she needed more information from the complainant to draft an accurate and complete incident report. The officer reasonably concluded that she was not required to write an incident report without more information of criminal activity.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO FINDING: IE DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer was rude to her during their phone conversation.

The named officer stated that she was calm and professional while speaking with the complainant.

The DPA was unable to review a recording or documentation of the conversation and unable to identify any witnesses.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/23/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/25/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers drove improperly.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she witnessed an officer in a marked patrol vehicle speeding, illegally crossing over yellow traffic lines, and temporarily activating his lights without justification in order to get through a red light. The complainant positively identified the vehicle number.

Both named officers confirmed that their unit utilized the vehicle in question; however, neither officer recalled who drove the vehicle on the date and time of the incident. Additionally, neither officer recalled speeding, illegally crossing any traffic lines, improperly using the emergency lights to get through a red light, or otherwise driving improperly.

No surveillance footage reflecting the incident exists.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/01/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/04/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer towed the complainant's vehicle without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was driving his vehicle and was stopped by the named officer. The officer did not tell him why and only informed him that they needed to do an investigation and towed his vehicle.

Department records indicate that in a previous incident, the complainant drove recklessly and evaded police officers. The records showed that the complainant was stopped because his vehicle was missing a front license plate. The officer recognized the vehicle's rear license plate number as the vehicle that took off previously and contacted her supervisor regarding the tow. She then towed the vehicle and issued him a citation.

Body-worn camera footage shows the named officer confirmed with the previously involved officer that the vehicle was the one that was driving recklessly. She subsequently contacted her supervisor, who approved the towing and explained the reason for the tow to the complainant.

Department General Order 9.06 Vehicle Tow states that "it is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department that officers tow vehicles only when authorized pursuant to Division 11, Chapter 10, Article 1 of the California Vehicle Code (Section 22650, et seq.)..."

California Vehicle Code Section 22650 states, "a removal pursuant to an authority...is only reasonable if the removal is necessary to achieve the community caretaking need, such as ensuring the safe flow of traffic..."

California Vehicle Code Section 23109.2 (a) states, "Whenever a peace officer determines that a person was engaged in any of the activities set forth in paragraph (2), the peace officer may immediately arrest and take into custody that person and may cause the removal and seizure of the motor vehicle used in that offense in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 22650). Paragraph 2 lists reckless driving on a highway as one of the activities that will cause arrest and seizure of vehicle.)

No witnesses came forward. The evidence collected proved that the complainant was engaged in reckless driving and evaded police officers with his vehicle in a previous incident. The named officer recognized the vehicle and received approval for the tow from her supervisor. The vehicle tow complied with the California Vehicle Code 22650 and 23109.2. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/01/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers searched the complainant's vehicle without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that before his vehicle was towed, the officers searched his vehicle even though he said they could not search it.

Department records indicate that named officer #2 conducted an inventory search of the vehicle before the tow.

Body-worn camera confirmed that named officer #2 conducted the inventory search of the vehicle.

Department General Order 9.06 Vehicle Tow states that "when towing a vehicle, officers shall inventory the contents of the vehicle. The purpose of the inventory is to locate and secure any valuable property, to guard against false claims, and to protect officers and others from dangerous objects. When conducting an inventory, officers may search anywhere inside the vehicle, including consoles, glove boxes, under the seats, inside the trunk and inside any container of the vehicle."

No witnesses came forward.

The evidence gathered proved that the inventory search was required by policy to secure the vehicle owner's belongings before the tow was also justified.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/20/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/11/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer refused to let him bring a medical device with him to jail.

Department records indicate that the complainant was arrested and transported to County Jail.

Body-worn camera footage did not show the complainant asking any officer to take a medical device with him to jail.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly care for a person in custody.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer failed to securely fasten his seatbelt in the rear of a police van, causing him to hit his head when the van came to an abrupt stop. The complainant also stated that he (the complainant) unlatched his seatbelt during his transport to the jail.

Department records indicate that the complainant was arrested and transported to County Jail.

Body worn camera footage showed the named officer fasten the seatbelt snugly over the complainant's lap. After doing so, the named officer tugged on the seatbelt which did not loosen or become unlatched.

Department General Order 5.18 (Prisoner Handling and Transportation) states that officers must take all reasonable steps to prevent injury to prisoners by securing them in a way that prevents injury.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/20/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when he was arrested, a bracelet was removed from his wrist and was not returned to him upon his release from jail. He stated he was unsure whether the bracelet was removed before he was transferred to the custody of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department.

Department records indicate that the complainant was arrested and transported to County Jail.

Department property inventory records do not show a bracelet as part of the complainant's inventoried property.

Body worn camera footage showed the complainant wearing his bracelet while in the jail intake waiting area.

San Francisco Sheriff's Department camera footage did not show the named officers removing the complainant's bracelet before he was transferred to the custody of the sheriff's department.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Investigative Services Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/23/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer displayed threatening, intimidating or harassing behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an officer he was unable to identify by name had been following him since 2014 (approximately 6 years). On the date in question the complainant stated that the officer was a passenger in a marked patrol vehicle identified by a specific number. As the vehicle passed by the complainant, he heard the officer make a comment about the complainant's attitude.

A request was made to the San Francisco Police Department to identify the unit that the vehicle was assigned to based on the vehicle number provided by the complainant.

The Department responded that their records indicated that there was no patrol vehicle with that assigned number.

No witnesses were identified.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to promptly respond to a scene.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant and co-complainant stated that their vehicle was parked, broken into and numerous items were stolen. They stated they called 911 to report the crime and waited over two hours for police to respond to the scene, periodically calling back to check on the status. They stated that finally they canceled the call for service and elected to make a report over the phone.

DPA conducted a search of department records and was unable to identify any officers dispatched to the scene.

Department records showed a report documenting the theft and detailing that the co-complainant called 311 and made a report over the phone that his parked vehicle was broken into and various items were taken from the inside of the vehicle.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant and co-complainant stated that a patrol vehicle drove by them and another member of their group attempted to flag it down. They stated that it appeared that the officer driving the vehicle looked in their direction but did not stop the vehicle and continued driving.

The first named officer stated he was driving the patrol vehicle and the second named officer was in the passenger seat. The first named officer stated he did not recall patrolling the area the complainants identified. He stated that if he were in that area it would have been related to a call for service they were assigned to. The first named officer stated he did not recall anyone attempting to flag down his patrol vehicle for assistance. He stated that due to the serious nature of the call he was assigned to at that time, it would not have made sense for him not to stop and talk to a citizen who could potentially provide information.

The second named officer stated that he was the passenger officer in the patrol vehicle. He stated that he may have been in the area the complainants identified but did not remember. He stated that he did not

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

recall anyone flagging them down or calling for help. He stated that if he or his partner had seen the person attempting to flag them down, they would have alerted the other and stopped the patrol vehicle. He denied that he and his partner failed to take any required action.

Department records showed that the named officers were assigned to the patrol vehicle identified by the complainants. Records also showed that the named officers were assigned to a call for service near the area of the alleged incident.

No witnesses came forward.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

Division of Emergency Communications
Department of Emergency Management
1011 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: In a written complaint, the complainant stated they observed a standoff between Police Officers and a male armed with a metal bar. The complainant stated the named officers failed to de-escalate the situation and opined the officers should have bought the male a coffee and walked him home. The complainant said that instead, the officers' actions increased the tension and length of the incident.

The complainant failed to participate further with the investigation.

Department documents showed that the named officers were called to a report of a suspicious male holding a metal pipe. The officers encountered the male who alleged he was armed to defend himself and attack his assailant. The documents showed the officers tried to get the male to drop the pipe by issuing commands, but the male did not comply. More officers arrived on the scene and attempted to de-escalate the situation by developing a rapport with the male. Other tactical units, trained in negotiation, arrived on the scene. The officers spent several hours in an attempt to de-escalate the situation. After hours of negotiating with the male, the officers used sound waves to get the male to comply, but this failed. The officers then used pepper balls fired at the ground in front of the male, but this too had no effect. Finally, officers moved in with metal poles to press the male against a wall while officers safely detained the male. The male was then taken to an ambulance to be assessed by medics before being taken to the hospital.

Body Worn Camera footage confirmed and corroborated the Department documents. The footage showed the named officers arrived on the scene, maintained distance, and tried to develop a rapport with the male while trying to get him to place the pipe on the ground. The footage showed specialized negotiators arrived and continued to talk to the male for many hours. The footage showed that officers performed a safe detention of the male who was placed into an ambulance.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force, Section C De-Escalation states, "When encountering a non-compliant subject or a subject armed with a weapon other than a firearm, officers shall when feasible, use the following de-escalation tactics in an effort to reduce the need or degree of force: 1. Attempt to isolate and contain the subject; 2. Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone (reactionary gap) and utilize cover to avoid creating an immediate threat that may require the use of force; 3. Request additional resources, such as Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) trained officers, Crisis/Hostage Negotiation Team, or Extended Range Impact Weapon; 4. Designate an officer to establish rapport and engage in communication with the subject; 5. Tactically re-position as often as necessary to maintain the reactionary gap, protect the public, and preserve officer safety; and 6. Continue de-escalation techniques

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/20/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

and take as much time as reasonably necessary to resolve the incident, without having to use force, if feasible."

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was assaulted at his residence. He stated that the named officers responded to the scene but did not properly investigate the incident. He stated that the named officers did not take a statement from him.

Department records showed that the named officers responded to this call for service and the first named officer documented the incident in an incident report. Records detailed that the first named officer spoke with the complainant regarding the incident and another officer spoke with another resident. Department records showed that the named officers located the suspect and spoke with him. Records also revealed that that the first named officer took photographs related to the incident and seized the suspect's boots as evidence. Department records showed that the first named officer detained the suspect and conducted a cold show of the suspect with the complainant. Records further revealed that the second named officer spoke with an employee of the building regarding the incident who stated that he heard some noise but did not see anything when he checked the building's security cameras. Department records documented that the second named officer obtained contact details for the individual who could provide access to the security camera footage for the building.

Body-worn camera footage for this incident corroborated Department records. Footage showed that the first named officer spoke with the complainant who appeared to be injured and upset. Footage also showed that the first named officer obtained information from the complainant regarding the incident and the suspect. Body-worn camera footage showed that the second named officer spoke with an employee of the building who stated that he heard some noise during the incident but did not see anything when he looked at the building security cameras. Footage showed that the second named officer asked to review the security camera footage and the employee stated that his manager would need to be contacted in order to access the video footage. Body-worn camera footage showed that the second named officer obtained the manager's contact details and hours of availability. Footage showed that the first named officer and another officer spoke with another resident and that the named officers located the suspect and spoke with him. Body-worn camera footage showed that first named officer detained the suspect and conducted a cold show of the suspect with the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to make an arrest.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was assaulted at his residence. He stated that the named officer brought the suspect to his location and he identified the suspect as the person who assaulted him. The complainant stated that the named officer did not arrest the suspect he identified.

Department records showed that the complainant identified the suspect as the person who attacked him. Department records showed that the named officer placed the suspect under arrest and transported him to a station.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer transported a detained suspect to the complainant's location. Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant identified the suspect as the person who attacked him during a cold show. Footage showed that the named officer transported the suspect to a police station.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer was the investigator assigned to the case. The complainant stated that the named officer failed to properly investigate the case.

The named officer stated that he was the investigator assigned to the case. He stated that an arrest had been made and the arresting officer provided him with a brief summary of the incident. He stated that after being briefed by the arresting officer he attempted to re-interview both the suspect and the victim. He stated the suspect requested an attorney so he could not interview him, and the victim was not initially available and never responded to his voice message. He stated there were no witnesses to the incident. The named officer stated he made a request to a video retrieval officer to obtain any video surveillance footage that captured the incident. He stated he called the contact person who had access to the building's security video system and left her a voice message requesting that she save a copy of the video from the incident and that a video retrieval officer would be contacting her. The named officer stated the video retrieval officer later contacted him and informed him that the incident was not captured on video. The named officer stated he reviewed the incident report, all evidence, noted no new evidence, and submitted all items pertaining to the case to the District Attorney's Office. The named officer stated that the assigned Assistant District Attorney provided a case disposition which detailed that there was a lack of corroboration and the case was closed. The named officer stated that he followed his normal procedure when investigating this case and took all necessary steps during his investigation. He stated that the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case decided to not move forward with the case and did not request further investigation. He stated that he investigated this case properly.

Department records showed that the named officer was the investigator assigned to this case. Department records showed that the named officer attempted to speak with both the suspect and the victim. Department records showed that the named officer submitted a video retrieval request to a video retrieval officer and left a voice message with the contact person for the video footage. Department records showed that the named officer submitted the case to the District Attorney's Office and the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case later discharged the case and provided a case disposition detailing a lack of corroboration.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called a police station on multiple occasions and spoke with officer who was rude, unhelpful and did not assist him with his case.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the incident occurred. The poll came back with negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

No witnesses were identified.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/29/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/14/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers seized property or money without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that officers stole property from his residence during a well being check.

The officers' body camera videos show the officers entering and leaving the apartment. The videos show that neither officer took property from the apartment.

The evidence proves that the act alleged in the complaint did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/02/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she reported to the named officers that she was threatened with a gun. She stated the named officers did not investigate the threat because they did not request building video surveillance footage.

Department records indicate the complainant reported to the named officers that she believed a suspect was possibly going to threaten her with a gun. The named officers interviewed the complainant and other witnesses. The records indicate that officers were unable to obtain video footage from the housing management company at that time because it was after hours.

A document provided by the housing management company, dated the next business day after the incident, documents that SFPD contacted them with a request to review camera footage.

Body worn camera showed that the complainant instructed the named officers to check the building's cameras, which would provide evidence of the alleged gun threat. The footage also showed that named officer #2 asked the complainant for the emergency phone number for her housing development so they could look at video footage.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/20/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she made a criminal complaint to the San Francisco Police Department for them to investigate. The complainant stated that named officers did not give regular contact, failed to contact witnesses, and did not conduct a proper investigation. The complainant also stated that the officers failed to tell her that the matter was past the statute of limitations.

San Francisco Police Department documents showed the complainant filed a report with SFPD that was assigned to be investigated. The documents also detail the investigative steps taken by the named officers and their contact with the complainant. There is a gap of 2-3 months in the investigation. The documents also showed the District Attorney's office confirmed the statute of limitations expired before the complainant made her report to SFPD.

The named officers stated they did perform their duty and investigate this case. One of the named officers confirmed that there were gaps in the investigation caused due to medical leave. The officer stated that due to being new to the role, she was unaware of the statute of limitations for the alleged offense and was informed by the DA's office that the statute had passed before the complainant filed the complaint.

The evidence shows that the named officers conducted investigative steps on the complainant's case, even though the complaint was outside the statute of limitations. There are gaps in the investigation, but the gaps were caused by medical leave issues.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove a City vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she observed several San Francisco Police Officers driving their jet skis in a dangerous manner without a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

An officer identification poll sent to the district station where the incident occurred yielded negative results. Additionally, the poll indicated that San Francisco police officers were not stationed at the named location on the date of incident.

The complainant also did not respond to requests for additional evidence necessary to conduct the investigation.

The identify of the alleged officers could not established.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/17/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/29/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated someone told her that her son was kidnapped by the FBI and the Police Department. She provided DPA the name of an officer she believed was involved in the kidnapping of her son. She stated the SFPD officer was from a district police station that busted her son for accepting hush money from her ex-boyfriend.

The complainant made inconsistent and conflicting statements.

The identity of the officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/23/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/27/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she had a verbal dispute with a family member after which the family member called 911 and reported that the complainant was speaking loudly. She stated the named officers arrived at her residence and made comments regarding the complainant having a bad temper and attitude and acting violently. The complainant also stated the first named officer tried to psychologically analyze her during their conversation and that the second named officer interrupted her and wouldn't let her finish her sentences.

Department records revealed that the named officers responded to a call for service for a well-being check at the complainant's address.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the first named officer spoke with the complainant, asked her when she had last eaten and inquired whether she wanted to hurt herself or anyone else. Footage also showed that the named officers told the complainant she was being hostile after she interrupted the family member who was attempting to speak. Footage further showed that the second named officer told the complainant to let her family member speak after the complainant interrupted.

The evidence proves that the underlying actions occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer attempted to detain her by telling her that it was her turn to listen.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer told the complainant to let her family member speak after the complainant interrupted her. Footage also showed that the complainant stated she did not need to listen to her family member although the named officer and another officer on scene told her that they wanted to listen. Footage showed that another officer on scene told the complainant that no one was making her listen to her family member, that she could leave, and that she was never detained. Footage showed that the complainant returned to her residence. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/18/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/14/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer engaged in conduct unbecoming an officer.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that a named officer regularly visits the same liquor store because he is engaged in illegal activities.

The complainant provided no evidence of illegal activity, and the DPA found none.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/06/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/28/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an officer pulled him over and they began to argue about the basis for the traffic stop. The complainant stated that the officer became agitated, raised his voice and called the complainant a derogatory name. The complainant identified the officer by last name and physical description. A witness stated that she believed the officer was wearing a jumpsuit type uniform on which the officer's name was visible within the badge.

DPA was unable to locate any record of the traffic stop. DPA identified two officers with the name provided by the complainant. Neither matched the physical description provided by the complainant. The first officer was on duty at the time of the alleged incident, but assigned to a different location. He denied having been involved in this incident. The second officer was not on duty at the time of the alleged incident. SFPD jumpsuit uniforms do not include the type of badge described by the witness. The officer could not reasonably be identified.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after he challenged the officer with respect to the validity of the traffic stop, the officer retaliated by advising the complainant that he would be referring him for a driving re-examination. The complainant identified the officer by last name and physical description. A witness stated that she believed the officer was wearing a jumpsuit type uniform on which the officer's name was visible within the badge

DPA was unable to locate any record of the traffic stop. DPA identified two officers with the name provided by the complainant. Neither matched the physical description provided by the complainant. The first officer was on duty at the time of the alleged incident, but assigned to a different location. He denied having been involved in this incident. The second officer was not on duty at the time of the alleged incident. SFPD jumpsuit uniforms do not include the type of badge described by the witness..

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/17/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/11/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated a person was unlawfully detained for filming at an airport.

Department records indicate that the named officer did not detain anyone during the broad time period provided by the complainant.

The complainant was non-responsive to multiple requests from DPA for more information about his allegation. DPA was therefore unable to further investigate this matter.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/21/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was crossing an intersection and saw that the officers who were directing traffic were not wearing their masks. The complainant stated he did not stop to admonish the officers but wanted to remind the officers to wear masks like everyone else for the safety and health of others.

The named officers stated they were conducting traffic control at the intersection. The named officers acknowledged that Department rules require a mask or respirator to always be worn in the workplace and in public while engaging with each other or the community. The named officers also stated they always wore their masks while on duty except when eating, smoking, or drinking. The named officers denied removing their masks for any extended period. The named officers further stated they did not contact any drivers nor were they within 10 feet of any pedestrian during that assignment.

Department Notice #20-066, states in pertinent part: "Masks are required and worn continuously throughout a shift, except when eating, drinking, or etc."

No witnesses were identified.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/01/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01//11/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to comply with Department Notice 20-094.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he passed the named officer in a store's doorway and he noticed that the officer was wearing his face mask incorrectly by not completely covering his nose.

The named officer stated he wore his mask in compliance with Department policies. He stated that he only lowered his mask below his nose when he was drinking a beverage. He stated when he did so, he was not engaging with anyone and only did it at a safe social distance.

Store video footage showed the named officer lower his mask only when he took a sip of his beverage. When he did so, he was not engaging with anyone.

Department Notice 20-094 states that officers must wear masks at all times in the workplace and in the community. The notice further states that masks may be removed for eating and drinking.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer spoke inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated when he passed the named officer, he told the officer to cover his nose with his mask. He stated that the officer responded with a snide remark.

The named officer stated he did not make an inappropriate comment to the complainant.

There is no body worn camera footage because Department policy does not require officers to activate their body worn cameras for comments made in passing.

Store surveillance video of the incident contains no audio.

Department General Order 2.01 states that all officers must treat the public with courtesy and respect.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/03/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/25/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPAs jurisdiction. This complaint has been referred to:

SFPD Internal Affairs Administrative Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/02/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was trying to shop at a grocery store when he was assaulted by the store security guards as well as the named officers, who almost broke his wrist.

The named officers stated that when they arrived on scene, the complainant was already detained in handcuffs by the store security guards. The security guards reported that the complainant had refused to wear a mask upon entering the store and had spat on one of them. The named officers stated that the only physical contact they had with the complainant was when they assisted him up from the ground while handcuffed and assisted in removing the handcuffs.

Department records indicate that the complainant was detained and handcuffed by store security guards because he spit on one of them after they asked him to wear a face mask. The records indicated that the complainant was already detained and handcuffed by the security guards prior to the officers' arrival on scene. The records documented the complainant's admission that he spat on one of the security guards. After the victim security guard signed a citizen's arrest form, named officer #1 cited and released the complainant. The signed citizen's arrest form alleges battery.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was handcuffed and on the ground by the time the officers arrived on scene. A security guard informed named officer #1 that the complainant had attempted to enter the store without a mask, and when the guard denied him entry the complainant became aggressive and spat on him. The footage showed the complainant admitted to the named officers that he spat on one of the security guards. Named officer #1 assisted the handcuffed complainant off the ground without incident. The footage showed that the security guard signed a citizen's arrest form against the complainant. The complainant was subsequently cited and released.

The evidence corroborates the named officers' statements that no force was used.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/02/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE# 2 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers knowingly engaged in biased policing.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers mistreated him because he was white.

The named officers denied that their treatment of the complainant was influenced by race and store security guards had already detained and handcuffed him prior to their arrival. The security guards took these actions after the complainant refused to wear a mask upon entering, and subsequently spat on one of the guards.

Department records indicate that the complainant was detained and handcuffed by store security guards after he refused to wear a face mask and spat on one of them. The records indicated that the detention and handcuffing occurred prior to the officers' arrival on scene. The records documented the complainant's admission that he spat on one of the security guards. After the victim security guard signed a citizen's arrest form alleging assault by the complainant, named officer #1 cited and released the complainant.

Body worn camera footage confirms that the complainant was handcuffed and on the ground before the officers arrived. A security guard informed named officer #1 that the complainant, after being refused entry to the store without a mask, became aggressive and spat on him. The footage showed the complainant admitting to the named officers that he spit on one of the guards. Named officer #1 assisted the complainant, who was still handcuffed, off the ground without incident. The footage showed the security guard sign a citizen's arrest form against the complainant. The complainant was subsequently cited and released.

The complainant was already detained by security guards prior to the named officers' arrival on-scene. BWC corroborates the named officers' statements that they did no use force on the complainant. He was issued a citation because the victim security guard signed a citizen's arrest form alleging that he was battered by the complainant, all of which was corroborated by the second security guard. There is no evidence to suggest that the named officers engaged in biased policing.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/02/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/22/21 **PAGE# 3 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

SAFEWAY CUSTOMER SUPPORT CENTER
M.S. 10501
PO BOX 29093
PHOENIX, AZ 85038

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/05/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/15/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant states that he felt intimidated after officers shined a spotlight into his car while he was sleeping inside. The complainant had no other information to identify the officers.

The DPA performed a search for a CAD in connection to this incident. No CAD was created in relation to this incident.

The DPA sent two identification polls to the SFPD stations bordering where the complainant was parked. Both polls did not result in any identification.

The DPA could not identify a specific officer or incident to investigate further.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/21/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/25/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/21/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/04/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that another tenant at his residence harasses, threatens and menaces other residents and it has become an ongoing issue. The complainant stated that he believed at some point he called 911 and made a report of the problematic behavior but could not provide specific details regarding his report. The complainant stated that he was unaware whether officers responded or not regarding his report but stated that the other tenant's behavior has not changed and the problems with this tenant still persist.

Department records failed to identify the alleged incident.

No witnesses were identified.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/30/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/01/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/28/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/08/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/15/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he saw a video about a woman making a report at a police station.

The complainant stated that the named officer, whom the woman was speaking with, exhibited rude and dismissive behavior, and was rushing the woman in making her report.

The officer is no longer available and subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer made an arrest without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she was arrested for domestic violence without cause in 2010 and the charges were dismissed.

The DPA could not identify a specific incident or involved officer to investigate further.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer wrote an inaccurate incident report in 2010.

The DPA could not identify a specific incident or involved officer to investigate further.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer detained an individual without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in an online complaint that he was on his way to his employer when he was stopped and arrested by police officers. The complainant stated the officers had no justification for this stop and arrest.

The complainant failed to provide officer names and badge numbers or a time, date, and year the incident occurred. The complainant failed to respond to requests for further information.

Department documents failed to show any incident related to the complainant that fit the description of the complaint.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated police officers tackled him to the ground and placed their knee on the complainant's head. The officers then threw the complainant's property on the floor.

The complainant failed to provide officer names and badge numbers or a time, date, and year the incident occurred. The complainant failed to respond to requests for further information.

Department documents failed to show any incident related to the complainant that fit the description of the complaint.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/15/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/15/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Department of Human Resources
Equal Employment Opportunities Investigations
DHR-EEO@sfgov.org

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/19/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/27/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
211 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/21/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/20/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers generally are not wearing masks. The complainant did not provide any further information.

No witnesses were identified.

The officers could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/26/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/05/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/26/2020 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/15/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA FINDING: IO-1/Santa Ana PD DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Santa Ana Police Department
60 Civic Center Plaza
Santa Ana, CA 92701

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/26/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/05/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Project Homeless Connect
1031 Franklin Street, Second Floor
San Francisco, CA 94109

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/28/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 01/05/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/08/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/08/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/14/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 01/16/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Hemet Police Department
450 East Latham Avenue
Hemet, CA 92543