

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer discharged his firearm without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant learned a dog was shot by an SFPD officer from social media and the news. The complainant believed the officers should have used time and distance to avoid using deadly force.

The named officer first learned of the dog when a pedestrian alerted him to a dog in an overturned shopping cart in the street. The animal appeared calm at first. After a few moments of standing by the dog and waiting for Animal Care and Control, the dog began growling at the named officer and his partner. The named officer and his partner moved away from the dog. The dog barked and the officers took a few more steps back.

The dog then began to walk towards the named officer. The named officer stated the dog was not on a leash and, to him, appeared either agitated or scared. The dog walked directly at the named officer. The named officer stood in place and waited to see if the dog would stop or turn around, but the dog kept approaching. The officer put his hand down to try and block the dog, and the dog lunged at his hand. The named officer stated the dog got within a couple inches of biting his hand. The named officer pulled his hand away. He sidestepped away and fired one time at the dog and the dog immediately fell onto its side. The officer did not consider using any of his other equipment because he believed it would have decreased the distance between him and the dog, angered the dog more, and increased the likelihood that he was going to be bit.

Body-worn camera footage of this incident corroborates the officer's recollection of events. The footage shows the dog barking at officers on scene. The dog was in an overturned shopping cart when the named officer was standing approximately eight to ten feet away. The dog exited the cart and headed directly toward the named officer. When the dog was within two feet of the named officer, the officer drew his pistol and moved to get out of the dog's way. The named officer put his hand out to block the dog's approach, and the dog lunged at the officer. The dog's mouth was within inches of biting the named officer's left hand and wrist. The named officer moved around the dog. The dog continued pursuing the named officer and moved toward him. The named officer then fired his pistol at the dog and the dog rolled onto its side.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** (continued)

The DPA finds that the officer's use of his firearm was likely the result of a training failure. At the instant of the shooting, the officer reasonably believed that the dog was attempting to bite him. However, additional insight into animal behavior could have avoided the entire situation. With better training, the officer could have noticed aggressive behavior before the dog began lunging, and, in addition, known how to defuse or avoid the aggressive behavior while providing enough time for Animal Care and Control to arrive.

The named officer stated that he never received training on how to deal with or de-escalate situations with dangerous animals. Several witness officers corroborated the named officer's testimony, saying that they had not been provided with training on how to handle dangerous dogs or other animals.

The DPA therefore recommends that all patrol officers undergo additional training on canine behavior, so officers are better equipped to understand how to respond to dangerous dogs. This training should include training on animal stress scales, protective and predatory behavior, resource guarding, and how to respond to dogs under stress.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct resulted from inadequate or inappropriate training.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with 5.01, Use of Force.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant learned a dog was shot by an SFPD officer from social media and the news. She believed the officers should have used time and distance to avoid shooting the dog.

The named officer first learned of the dog when a pedestrian alerted him to a dog in an overturned shopping cart in the street. The animal appeared calm at first. After a few moments of standing by the dog and waiting for Animal Care and Control, the dog began growling at the named officer and his

partner. The named officer and his partner moved away from the dog. The dog barked and the officers took a few more steps back.

The dog then began to walk towards the named officer. The named officer stated the dog was not on a leash and, to him, appeared either agitated or scared. The dog walked directly at the named officer. The named officer stood in place and waited to see if the dog would stop or turn around, but the dog kept

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 3 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: (Continued)**

approaching. The officer put his hand down to try and block the dog, and the dog lunged at his hand. The named officer stated the dog got within a couple inches of biting his hand. The named officer pulled his hand away. He sidestepped away from the dog and fired one time at the dog and the dog immediately fell onto its side. The officer did not consider using any of his other equipment because he believed it would have decreased the distance between him and the dog, angered the dog more, and increased the likelihood that he was going to be bit.

Body-worn camera footage of this incident corroborates the officer's recollection of events. The footage shows the dog barking at officers on scene. The dog was in an overturned shopping cart when the named officer was standing approximately eight to ten feet away. The dog exited the cart and headed directly toward the named officer. When the dog was within two feet of the named officer, the officer drew his pistol and moved to get out of the dog's way. The named officer put his hand out to block the dog's approach, and the dog lunged at the officer. The dog's mouth was in inches of biting the named officer's left hand and wrist. The named officer moved around the dog. The dog continued pursuing the named officer and moved toward him. The named officer then fired his pistol at the dog and the dog rolled onto its side.

SFPD Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force, provides several circumstances in which officers can use deadly force. One of those circumstances is, "[t]o kill an animal posing an immediate threat." The officer's use of force was appropriate under this DGO because the dog had attempted to bite him, but the DGO's short attention to the issue is not sufficient to govern the use of deadly force on an animal. The use of deadly force in a crowded city environment poses a substantial risk of harm and the value of animal life requires more thorough analysis than just whether it is an "immediate threat."

First, the policy does not state whether an officer has a duty to de-escalate incidents involving dangerous animals. General Order 5.01, Section C, states that officers should use de-escalation techniques when encountering a "non-compliant subject," but it is not clear if "non-compliant subject" includes a dog or other dangerous animal. The policy should require de-escalation for incidents involving animals. The value of an animal's life warrants the time, energy, and consideration of de-escalation. In addition, the use of deadly force can still harm humans even when directed at an animal. The policy should therefore require de-escalation and articulate the types of de-escalation that are appropriate for situations involving dangerous animals.

Second, the policy is not clear about the degree of harm to an officer that justifies the use of deadly force against an animal. General Order 5.01 states that an officer may use deadly force when an animal poses "an immediate threat." But the phrase "immediate threat" is not defined further. Elsewhere in the policy,

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** (Continued)

officers are justified in using deadly force. As an example, the DPA does not believe that an immediate threat of scratches or other minor injuries would warrant using deadly force on an animal.

Third, the policy should explain for officers if they may use intermediary levels of force with dangerous animals and, if so, what type of intermediary force. In this incident, the named officer avoided intermediary force because he was unsure if it would aggravate the animal. The policy should therefore articulate for officers whether any kind of physical force such as control holds, baton strikes, or OC spray are ever appropriate against a dangerous animal. If intermediate force is not appropriate, the policy should explain how officers should act when deadly force is not yet warranted but they are still facing a threat. Simply leaving officers to choose between nothing and deadly force is not sufficient guidance.

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

**SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to comply with DB 18-256, Activation of Body Worn Camera.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** While investigating this case, the DPA learned the named officer's body worn camera was not in buffering mode when he arrived at the scene.

The named officer stated he had deactivated his body worn camera just before he responded to the scene because he had been using the bathroom. As he left the bathroom, he activated his BWC, but neglected to place it in buffering mode. The named officer also stated that he was not initially aware that he would be responding to a criminal matter. The named officer's body-worn camera showed that he turned it on as the incident started. The camera captured the major event but not the 30 seconds before.

The San Francisco Police Department Bulletin 18-256, Activation of Body Worn Camera, states, in part, "Members shall keep their BWC powered on in Buffering Mode." The named officer stated he mistakenly did not place his BWC in buffering mode after he deactivated it to use the restroom. The officer's privacy concerns while using the restroom were a valid reason for the mistake. The error does not rise to the level of disciplinary misconduct. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/13/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**7FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was pulled over by the named officer for failing to come to a complete stop at a stop sign as she was driving to her job at a nearby school. The complainant does not dispute the driving violation; however, she stated the officer was disrespectful, unprofessional, and argumentative with her during the incident. She recalled the officer making accusations about lying and asking her if she was on bail or on probation, which made her feel like she was a criminal. She did not like the officer's demeanor and he made her feel uncomfortable and unnerved.

The named officer's BWC footage revealed the named officer conducted a routine traffic stop. The named officer spoke to the complainant in a calm, direct and professional manner. The named officer was not disrespectful. The named officer showed the complainant video of the alleged violation when she questioned the validity of the stop because he captured her traffic violation on his cell phone. The complainant can be seen acknowledging her driving violation to the named officer after he shared his video with her at the scene. The named officer subsequently issued the complainant a citation to the complainant.

The named officer's conduct during the traffic stop did not violate any department policies.

However, during the course of the traffic stop, the named officer inexplicably asked complainant if she was on probation or parole. SFPD currently has no policy or guideline for officers about when and if it is appropriate to ask an individual detained for a minor infraction whether they are on probation or parole. In several recent federal cases, evidence of firearms and/or contraband has been ruled inadmissible by federal judges because SFPD officers unnecessarily prolonged a traffic detention by asking whether the detainee was on probation or parole. DPA recommends that SFPD issue a policy, giving its officers guidance to use to determine when it is appropriate to ask detainees about their probation and/or parole status.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 04/08/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/01/21    **PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers detained the complainant without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that San Francisco Police Officers detained him without cause.

The named officers stated the complainant was acting erratically and admitted to them he had ingested methamphetamines. The officers contacted paramedics to evaluate the complainant. Paramedics arrived and determined that the complainant needed medical attention. The officers then helped assist the medical staff by forcing the complainant onto a stretcher.

The officers' body-worn camera footage shows that the paramedics ordered the complainant to go with them so he could be evaluated at a hospital. The named officers helped detain the complainant by holding him down so the medical personnel could strap him to a stretcher and bring him to a hospital for evaluation.

The officers reasonably helped effect the orders of medical staff by helping place the complainant onto the stretcher.

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: 04/08/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-8:** The officers used unnecessary force.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged the named officers used unnecessary force on him.

The named officers stated the complainant was acting erratically and admitted to them he had ingested methamphetamines. The officers contacted paramedics to evaluate the complainant. Paramedics arrived and determined that the complainant needed medical attention. The officers then helped assist the medical staff by forcing the complainant onto a stretcher.

The officers' body-worn camera footage shows the paramedics ordered the complainant to go with them so he could be evaluated at a hospital. The named officers helped detain the complainant by holding him down so the medical personnel could strap him to a stretcher and bring him to a hospital for evaluation.

The officers reasonably followed the directions of medical staff by helping place the complainant onto the stretcher. The named officers' body-worn cameras show that officers used minimal force.

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

**7SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9-12:** The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he asked for the named officers' names and badge numbers. He stated the named officers failed to provide their identification.

The named officers' body-worn camera footage shows that the complainant asked for the named officers' names and badge numbers during a struggle.

The named officers stated they did not hear the complainant's request because they were focused on restraining him. There is insufficient evidence to show that the officers heard but ignored the complainant's request.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/08/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 3 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #12-16:** The officers engaged in inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officers acted in a mocking and smug manner.

The named officers stated they were calm with the complainant. The body-worn camera footage of the incident shows that the named officers acted professionally.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #17-20:** The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that officers failed to adequately care for his property.

The named officers stated the complainant's sister was on scene. The officers' body-worn camera footage shows that the complainant agreed his sister would be placed in charge of his property at the hotel.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/08/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21    PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The DPA found that officers did not write an incident report.

The named officer stated that that he did not write a report because the call was medical rather than criminal. The named officer stated that they were there to assist medics rather than take independent law enforcement action.

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

**SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to issue a Certificate of Release.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The DPA found that the officers did not issue a certificate of release.

The named officer stated explained that he did not issue a certificate of release because the complainant was not in their custody and the only restraint was from medical staff's use of their stretcher.

Department General Order 5.03 states that officers should issue certificates of release after taking a person to a police facility or physically restraining the person. The DGO does not describe if officers should issue certificates of release when assisting in restraining a suspect for another city agency or another law enforcement agency. The DPA therefore recommends that the SFPD clarify the policy so officers know whether to issue certificates of release in these types of situations.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 04/23/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/01/21    **PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to properly process property.**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was arrested for auto burglary and officers seized property from him. He stated that officers returned some of the property to owners they identified but failed to return the remainder of the property to him. The complainant stated that the remaining property belonged to him and that he left numerous messages with the burglary unit but never received a return call.

The first named officer stated that he followed and observed the complainant target multiple vehicles and then commit an auto burglary. He stated that he contacted the vehicle owner and reporting victims. Based on his observations, other officers arrested the complainant and recovered the stolen property. The first named officer stated that during the course of his investigation the victims identified and recovered all of their stolen items. Additional items were seized as property for safekeeping pending further investigation.

The first named officer stated that he and the second named officer conducted computer checks of the remaining property to no avail and then booked the items as property for safekeeping. The first named officer stated that he did not recall the complainant telling him he was the owner of the confiscated property, that he had not spoken to the complainant, and was unaware that he wanted property returned.

The first named officer stated that he followed his normal process when finding potentially stolen property in this case.

The second named officer's statements were consistent with the first. He stated that a number of items recovered were identified by the victims of the auto burglary as their stolen property. The second named officer stated that there were additional items, but he believed that they could also be stolen. He stated that there were no identifying markings or information linking the property to the complainant or his companion. The second named officer stated that he processed each item for identifying markings and later conducted various searches to try and locate victims who reported that property as stolen. He stated he did not recall the complainant saying that any of the property was his, that the complainant had not attempted to contact him, and that the complainant had not reached out to him to request any property back. The second named officer stated that he followed his normal process when finding potentially stolen property in this case.

The third named officer's statements were also consistent with those of the other named officers. The third named officer stated that he observed the complainant and an associate double park next to a car, the associate break the car window, the complainant and the associate remove several bags from the victim vehicle. He stated that at the time of arrest he observed several backpacks, suitcases and electronics in the

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/23/19      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/01/21      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: (Continued)**

complainant's vehicle and approved multiple pieces be seized as property for safe keeping because it was believed to be unreported stolen property. The third named officer stated that the complainant did not make any claims to him that he was the rightful owner of any property located in the vehicle and never asked him for any property from the vehicle. The third named officer stated that he did not receive any message from the complainant.

The Incident Report showed that the named officers observed the complainant and his associate casing vehicles. They were seen committing auto burglary, were arrested, and their car was brought back to the police station to be processed due to the high volume of suspected stolen property inside. The first named officer spoke with the victims who identified the stolen items and recovered them from the police station. Remaining property (including a phone and a laptop) was booked. The second named officer sent an email to the email address displayed on the laptop and phone with negative results as well as conducted a search of both names and email addresses, also with negative results. The first named officer retained the laptop and phone for the case file while attempting to locate the rightful owner.

No witnesses came forward.

DGO 6.15 provides that "Property may be returned to its owner if it is not contraband and cannot be connected to a crime." Here, it was not clear to the named officers that the complainant was the owner of the remaining property or that it was not connected to a crime.

The evidence proved that the acts that provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/23/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/02/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was arrested for auto burglary and officers seized property from him. He stated that officers returned some of the property to owners that they identified but failed to return the remainder of the property to him. The complainant stated that the remaining property belonged to him and that he left numerous messages with the burglary unit but never received a return call.

The first named officer stated that he arrested the complainant after he had been identified using a credit card taken from an auto burglary. A search of the complainant's residence led to the recovery of stolen items taken from the victim's car during the auto burglary as well as burglary tools. The first named officer stated that he seized items from the complainant and booked them into the property control division. He stated that he followed his normal practice which is to seize and book potentially stolen property and provide a property receipt to the individual. The first named officer stated that items are retained in the property control division pending identification by the victim and full adjudication of any court proceedings. He stated he spoke with the complainant once by telephone at which time the complainant asked whether it was possible to get stolen and recovered items that were seized during the investigation. The first named officer stated that he explained to the complainant that any stolen and recovered items would not be released to him. At the time of the call, it was the first named officer's understanding that the complainant's criminal case had not been fully adjudicated and other property confiscated could be released later. He stated that now that the complainant's case had been adjudicated if a request was made by him the three confiscated items could be released.

The second named officer stated that he and the first named officer arrested the complainant. During the search of the complainant's room there were several items that the first named officer identified as stolen property. The second named officer stated that he did not remember the complainant making any claim to the confiscated property nor did he remember having any contact with the complainant after the incident.

The Incident Report showed that a number of items were recovered from the complainant's residence for safekeeping and evidence. In addition, at the police station the first named officer seized the complainant's cell phone and a pair of shoes noting that further examination of the phone could reveal additional evidence and that the shoes matched those worn in video footage of the complainant using the credit card. The report showed that the first named officer provided the complainant with a property receipt for three items and later booked the listed stolen/recovered items and evidence into the property control division.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/23/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/02/21    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: (Continued)**

Department records confirmed that a property receipt listing three items was signed by the complainant and that the first named officer booked all property seized and recovered into the property control division.

No witnesses came forward.

Body-worn camera captured no footage relevant to the allegation.

DGO 6.15 provides that “Property may be returned to its owner if it is not contraband and cannot be connected to a crime.” DGO 6.15 further provides that the decision to release the property must be based on a variety of factors including the facts in the case and the jeopardy to prosecution.

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: 04/27/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21 PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers seized a vehicle without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged officers seized a vehicle improperly.

The named officers were investigating a group of suspects for a series of residential burglaries. The officers learned that the suspects were using rental vehicles to commit the burglaries. While executing a search warrant at the home of two of the suspects, the officers noticed a rental vehicle parked across the street that they had seen used in a recent burglary. The officers seized the vehicle.

The seizure of the vehicle was lawful as officers believed the rental vehicle was an instrumentality of the crime and there was a risk that the vehicle would disappear.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer searched a vehicle without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officer unlawfully searched his vehicle.

SFPD records show that the officer searched the vehicle after it was towed from the scene. The evidence shows one of the arrested suspects had a search condition as part of his probation. The officers had information that suspect with the search condition had been operating the vehicle regularly. It was therefore lawful for the officer to search the vehicle due to the suspect's search condition.

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: 04/27/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21 PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that officers seized his vehicle but did not return his clothes that were in the vehicle.

The named officer stated he did not know who did the inventory search of the car. He said the car was placed into impound at the Department's Crime Scene Investigation lot and was secured until about a month after the arrest of the complainant. The named officer stated that he searched the vehicle and seized a pair of jeans and two sweatshirts and booked the clothes as evidence. The named officer also stated that the complainant asked for cash found in the car and that he returned the cash to the complainant through his attorney.

SFPD records do not contain receipts for the property seized from the car described by the complainant. However, the chronological report of investigation prepared by the named officer does document the seizing of clothing from the car.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 05/11/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-5:** The officers intentionally damaged property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers intentionally damaged doorways, a bed and a heater in her residence during the service of a search warrant.

Named officer #1 stated that based on an investigation of one of the occupants he obtained a warrant to search the complainant's residence. He stated that he arrived at the residence after it had already been secured by other officers and that after his arrival was made aware that external and internal doorways were damaged during the execution of the warrant. Named officer #1 stated that based on the nature of the search warrant, officers had to breach locked doors to gain access to the residence to serve the search warrant. He stated that he documented the damage to the doorways in the incident report as well as a memorandum. He stated that he did not document damage to a bed as he was not aware of any such damage. Named officer #1 stated that he spoke with two people who identified themselves as the landlords of the residence and advised them of the claim process through the City.

Named officer #2 stated that he participated in a search warrant execution at the complainant's residence. He stated that he was not the author of the search warrant, but that he was aware that named officer #1 obtained it based on firearms related incidents. Named officer #2 stated that he ensured that known damage was documented in the incident report and that a memorandum regarding the property damage incurred during the incident was forwarded through departmental channels. He stated that he was unaware of any damage to any bed within the residence.

Named officer #3 stated that he assisted in the service of a search warrant that named officer #1 obtained. He stated that officers attempted to locate keys to the residence but were unsuccessful and that no one answered the door when they knocked. Named officer #3 stated that entry was made to the residence and interior bedrooms and that damage was caused to various doors. He stated that due to the severity of the crimes and the possibility that additional suspects could be inside, the exterior and interior doors were breached to clear the residence. Named officer #3 stated that named officer #1 documented the damage and notified the landlord of the property. He stated that he was not aware of damage to any beds in the residence.

Named officer #4 stated that he was present for the execution of the search warrant. He denied being aware of any damage to a bed.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/11/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-5: (Continued)**

Named officer #5 stated that he was present for the execution of the search warrant. He stated he was unaware of any damaged bed.

The incident report showed that named officer #1 obtained search warrant for the complainant's residence and was informed that officers provided knock/notice and waited for someone to answer the door. After waiting an appropriate amount of time with no answer officers breached the front door causing damage to its frame. The incident report showed that named officer #1 was further advised that officers located three locked doors inside the residence which they were forced to breach, causing damage to those doors. No one was located inside the house. The incident report reflects that named officer #1 photographed each of the damaged doors and left a copy of the search warrant as well as a property receipt for items seized inside the residence.

Department records included a memorandum prepared by named officer #1 regarding damage to private property. This memo reflected that during a search warrant service four doors (front and three interior) were breached and damaged. Photos of the doors and frames were attached to the memo.

Body-worn camera footage showed named officer #3 knocked on the front door, waited an appropriate period of time and after receiving no response utilized a ram to breach the front door and repeated the process for 3 interior doors. Footage further showed that named officer #1 photo documented the damaged doorways and spoke to neighbors believed to be the landlords of the property. Footage showed named officer #2 removed the furnace cover and searched the cabinet with a flashlight without touching any of the mechanism, then replaced the cover. Footage showed that items in the residence were moved from their original locations and frequently piled on the beds, but no damage was observed aside from the doors.

No witnesses responded to DPA's request for information.

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: 05/11/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer failed to properly process property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that money and jewelry were missing from her home after the search of her residence.

Officers denied being aware of the money or jewelry described by the complainant inside the complainant's residence and each denied taking possession of the bills or necklace.

The incident report showed that various items related to the search warrant were seized; however, there was no reference to any cash, or a necklace being seized.

Body-worn camera footage did not reveal visible cash or jewelry.

No witnesses responded to DPA's request for information.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established. 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:            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: 06/01/20      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer engaged in inappropriate behavior and made inappropriate comments.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she witnessed a San Francisco Police Department officer laughing at and mocking protestors.

The DPA could not identify the alleged officer. After a careful search, the DPA could not find video footage associated with the incident. The DPA contacted an officer based on the officer's description, but the officer denied any involvement.

The DPA cannot issue a finding because it cannot identify a particular incident or involved officer.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    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 that approximately five years ago, his partner called police after he damaged a laptop after an argument. The complainant stated that the named officer arrested him and his partner for domestic violence and vandalism. The complainant felt that the vandalism arrest was unjustified because the damaged property belonged to them both.

The named officer confirmed responding to a domestic violence call at the complainant's residence. He met with the complainant's partner, who informed him that they were arguing about the complainant's alcohol consumption. The named officer stated that the complainant's partner told him that the complainant smashed a glass table worth \$1,400.00, which the partner had purchased. The partner insisted that the table was not jointly owned, and that the complainant did not have permission to destroy it. Based on this information, the named officer determined that the complainant committed felony vandalism pursuant to 549(b)(1). The partner, in turn, admitted to breaking a \$1,200 laptop belonging to the complainant. Additionally, the named officer stated that complainant's partner picked up a shard of glass from the broken table and said "I am going to slit his throat with this glass . . . I hate him." The named officer perceived the threat as credible and therefore arrested both partners. Finally, the named officer noted that both the complainant and his partner were combative and resisted arrest.

The named officer determined that both the complainant and his partner were dominant aggressors. He stated that based on the parties' statements, their demeanor, and the property damage, probable cause existed to arrest both the complainant and his partner for domestic violence related charges and vandalism to property in violation of 549(b)(1) PC.

549(b)(1) PC, Malicious Mischief, states in relevant part: "Every person who maliciously defaces with graffiti or other inscribed material, damages, or destroys, with respect to any real or personal property not his/her own . . . is guilty of vandalism. If the amount of defacement, damage, or destruction is four hundred (\$400) or more, vandalism is punishable by imprisonment...or in a county jail not exceeding one year."

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: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 2 of 6**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer arrested him out of retaliation for filing a past DPA complaint arising out of a separate domestic violence arrest which had occurred shortly prior to the arrest that led to this investigation.

The named officer confirmed arresting the complainant for the first domestic violence incident. He also recalled attending a scheduled mediation at the DPA office. However, the named officer denied arresting the complainant out of retaliation in the second incident. The named officer stated that his decision was based solely on the probable cause established above.

Additionally, the named officer noted that the complainant and his partner displayed a pattern of ongoing domestic violence, and had he not acted, the domestic violence could have led to serious injury or death.

The named officer stated, and DPA confirmed, that his actions in arresting the complainant and his partner were within Department policy and procedure.

Due to the probable cause established above, and the lack of any evidence to the contrary, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 3 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that when the officers arrived, they engaged in excessive force by immediately grabbing his arms and restraining him.

Named officer #1 denied using excessive or unnecessary force and maintained that he used the least amount of force to safely detain the complainant. Named officer #1 explained that when he initially encountered the complainant at the door to his residence, the complainant disobeyed his lawful commands to not re-enter the dwelling. He stated the complainant looked at him and yelled, "Don't touch me." Named officer #1 said the complainant acted in a "very loud, yet passive resistant manner" by disregarding the officer's direct orders to stop. Named officer #1 confirmed that he physically took control of the complainant and placed him in a position to handcuff him. Named officer #1 stated he learned through his experience and training that in a domestic violence situation such as this it would have been unsafe for him or any other officer to allow the complainant to re-enter his home. The officer also emphasized that domestic violence incidents are among the most violent and dangerous situations for officers and that he feared if he let the complainant back into his home, he could have gained access to a weapon. He therefore felt that his actions in immediately restraining the complainant were in complete compliance with Department policy.

Named officer #2 stated that as the event occurred more than five years ago, and the fact that she was neither the primary officer nor the officer that prepared the police report, she had no independent recollection of the incident.

Named officer #2 referred to the incident report, which stated that the complainant acknowledged he had been in a verbal dispute with his partner and appeared irate and hostile. She noted that, per the report, the complainant turned away from officers and attempted to re-enter his residence despite orders to the contrary. Per the report, the only force used was a minimal control hold to transition the subject into handcuffs.

Per the incident report statement, named officer #2 acknowledged controlling the right wrist of the complainant to place him in handcuffs. Named officer #2 explained that due to the dangerous nature of domestic violence calls, it is very common to handcuff parties to ensure scene safety.

Named officer #2 stated that their actions complied with the Department policy in effect at that time which stated, "Control may be achieved through advice, warnings, persuasion, or using physical force.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 4 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** (Continued)

The Additionally, she stated that circumstances justifying the use of force include, “to effect the lawful arrest/detention of persons resisting or attempting to evade the arrest/detention, and that physical control holds are the lowest level force option after verbal persuasion.”

Body-worn camera footage does not exist because the incident occurred over five years ago. While the named officers admitted to using force, without video evidence or independent witnesses, there is no way to independently confirm the complainant’s behavior.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6:** The officers prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers skewed the incident report to justify his wrongful arrest and falsely portrayed him as irate and hostile.

Named officer #1 denied fabricating the incident report. He stated that he did not fabricate the existence of the shattered glass table, the broken laptop, and the complainant’s partner making credible threats of harm with a shard of glass. The named officer further stated that he observed the residence in disarray after the parties’ argument. Additionally, the named officer stated that he still recalls the complainant’s loud shouting and anger, which caused his entire body to shake.

Named officer #2 confirmed that all information and statements contained in the initial and supplemental reports are true and accurate.

Body-worn camera footage does not exist because the incident occurred over 5 years ago, and no independent witnesses were available.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 5 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer failed to Mirandize.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to read him his Miranda warning as required.

The named officer, citing the incident report authored on the date of incident, admitted that he did not Mirandize the complainant. He explained that he attempted to interview him at the station but was unable to do so because the complainant grew angry and uncooperative. Additionally, he stated that the complainant was still verbally aggressive towards him when he was served with an Emergency Protective Order.

The named officer did, however, note that he was able to Mirandize the complainant's partner prior to interviewing him. As reflected in the incident report, he stated that the complainant's partner understood the admonishment and agreed to speak with him regarding the incident.

The Supreme Court has held that 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.

DPA finds the named officer's statement credible with respect to his unsuccessful attempt to Mirandize the complainant as documented in the incident report. Department records support that the officer properly Mirandized the complainant's partner prior to a custodial interrogation, and nothing in the records suggest that he would not have done the same with the complainant. Moreover, it does not appear that the named officer elicited any incriminating statements from complainant while the complainant was in custody

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: 06/02/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 6 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer failed to provide reasonable disability accommodation.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that his partner was disabled, requiring the assistance of a cane. He stated that the named officer did not let his partner bring the cane to the station incident to his arrest, which was unjustified.

Department Bulletin 15-071, Transporting Persons Who Use Mobility Devices, requires officers to transport a person who uses a mobility device, such as a cane, with said mobility device.

The named officer denied hearing the complainant's partner mention a cane, any mobility device, or need for accommodation due to a disability. Additionally, it was not readily apparent to the named officer that the complainant's partner was disabled or needed mobility assistance. The named officer noted that the partner had the physical ability to snap a laptop over his knee and to kick the patrol wagon's walls multiple times while being transported to the station.

Due to the age of the case, body-worn camera footage does not exist, and there were no independent witnesses. DPA is unable to determine whether such a request was made or otherwise.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9:** The officer failed to provide a reasonable accommodation.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that after his partner arrived at the district station, an unidentified officer used a van to transport the partner from the station to the county jail. He stated this officer failed to accommodate the partner's known disability when he failed to place him in a specialized seat for handicapped passengers. This omission resulted in the partner falling to the floor of the van and sustaining injuries.

Because this incident occurred more than 5 years ago, the responding officers stated they had no recollection of this occurrence or the identity of the transport officer. Therefore, DPA cannot make a finding.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/03/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA received an online complaint stating that while standing in front a district police station during a peaceful protest, the named officer refused to turn his body-worn camera on until a supervisor intervened.

The named officer stated that he was assigned to stand in front of a district police station for security purposes. He further stated that he was wearing his body-worn camera (BWC) but did not activate it because the protest was peaceful. He also explained that he did not recall any interaction with any specific protestor(s), or recall a supervisor instructing him to activate his BWC. The named officer stated that he acted appropriately and in compliance with Department policy as people exercised their First Amendment Rights.

Department records showed that there was a planned protest and organizers alerted the city about the planned, peaceful, and non-violent march. Officers were called for security because the city expected thousands to attend the protest.

There was no BWC footage associated with the named officer from this incident.

Department General Order 8.03 (Crowd Control) states that a primary mission of police at events involving free speech activity is to protect and respect First Amendment rights to freedom of expression and assembly.

Department General Order 10.11, Body Worn Cameras, states that all on-scene members equipped with a BWC shall activate their BWC equipment to record during consensual encounters where the member suspects that the citizen may have knowledge of criminal activity as a suspect, witness, or victim.

Department General Order 10.11 did not require the named officer to activate his BWC for this incident. Additionally, the complainant requested that there be no contact with her regarding this complaint. Therefore, DPA could not gather any more information as to the nature of the complaint.

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: 06/03/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer threatened protesters by having his hand on his firearm and provided DPA with a photograph.

The named officer denied the allegation. He stated he was assigned to secure a district police station and did not have his hand on his firearm to intimidate or threaten anyone.

The photograph provided by the complainant showed the named officer standing in front of a district police station building in a non-threatening manner with his forearm resting on his equipment belt. The named officer did not have his hand on his firearm.

The complainant requested that there be no contact with her regarding this complaint, thus DPA was unable to obtain further information regarding the incident. However, the photograph provided in support of the complaint proved that the officer did not have his hand on his firearm.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/05/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers unlawfully directed another law enforcement agency to arrest him.

The named officer responded to a call of an assault at a jobsite. The named officer spoke to a victim who said the complainant was a former employee who returned to the jobsite, assaulted him, and destroyed his phone. The named officer then learned that the complainant had been located in a nearby jurisdiction. The named officer then contacted the local law enforcement agency and asked them to detain the complainant for investigation.

The named officer received information that the complainant committed a crime and followed an investigative lead to apprehend the complainant. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

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

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

South San Francisco Police  
P.O. Box 711  
South San Francisco, CA 94083

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/04/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that on the last night of curfew, 10-15 motorcycle officers were yelling and driving up and down her street. She perceived the behavior as threatening and an abuse of power.

Of note, there was a citywide curfew implemented that highlighted the need for residents to stay home at night to protect themselves and their communities.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district police station where the incident occurred. The poll came back with negative results. However, a superior officer stated that the Honda Tactical Team assisted and monitored the city following a planned demonstration. Officers from the Tactical Company, Honda Unit were relieved from the arrest scene and tasked with patrolling the district police station. Prior to midnight all members of the Tactical Company, Honda Unit were relieved of duty and sent home for the end of watch.

While DPA understands the complainant's concerns regarding the noise and the appearance of 10-15 motorcycle officers driving through her neighborhood late at night, the officers were performing law enforcement actions.

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:** 06/15/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer spoke inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he called the police to report a battery from another tenant in his building. He stated that when the named officers arrived, named officer #1 told him that he was acting immature. The complainant stated that the officers were rude and disrespectful.

Named officer #1 stated that she was not rude. She denied telling the complainant that he was immature. She stated the complainant was extremely agitated and unable to express his needs. She told the complainant they needed to speak like adults so she could efficiently provide him with the assistance he needed.

Department records indicate that named officer #1 and her partner responded to the complainant's residence on a different call for service. However, complainant's call for service, which involved a two-week-old battery, was also reported that day by the complainant from the same location. Named officer #1 and her partner were initially dispatched to the location on another matter, causing confusion about the complainant's approach of the officers.

BWC footage showed that the complainant was agitated when named officer #1 attempted to speak with him. The footage showed named officer #1 pragmatically asked the complainant, "Are you ready to speak to me like an adult so I can get your side of the story?" The BWC does not capture the initial conversation with complainant, which named officer #1 admits had occurred. Named officer #1 explained that this conversation was not captured because the complainant approached them while they were wrapping up another incident in the same building and she was unsure about why he was approaching her.

Department General Order 2.01 (General Rules of Conduct) states in relevant part that officers shall treat the public with courtesy and respect.

The comments made by the named officer and heard on the BWC, while unpleasant, would not be considered a violation of Department policy, and any alleged additional comments may have not been captured by the BWC and are in dispute. There were no independent witnesses identified by any parties as being present during any additional conversations between complainant and named officer #1.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/15/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer spoke inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he called the police to report a battery. He stated that when the named officers arrived, named officer #2 told him he was acting like a victim. The complainant stated that this comment was inappropriate. The complainant stated that the officers were rude and disrespectful.

Named officer #2 stated he did not tell the complainant that he was a victim.

Department records indicate that this named officer #2 and his partner responded to the complainant's residence on a different call for service. However, the complainant's call for service, which involved a two-week-old battery, was also reported that day by the complainant from the same location. Named officer #2 and his partner were initially dispatched to the location on another matter, causing confusion about the complainant's approach of the officers.

The BWC of named officer #2 does not capture the comment quoted by complainant. However, his BWC does not capture the initial conversation with the complainant, which named officer #2 admits had occurred. Named officer #2 explained that this conversation was not captured because the complainant approached them while they were wrapping up another incident in the same building and he was unsure about why the complainant was approaching him.

The comments made by the officers and heard on the BWC, while unpleasant, would not be considered a violation of Department policy, and any alleged additional comments may have not been captured by the BWC and are in dispute. There were no independent witnesses identified by any parties as being present during any additional conversations between complainant and named officer #2.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/15/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE# 3 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED-ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to activate a body-worn camera as required.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA discovered during its investigation that the named officers failed to activate their BWC's in a timely manner.

Named officer #1 stated she did not activate her BWC when she was dispatched to the scene because she was already at the building on another call. In addition, she stated she did not activate her BWC upon initial contact with the complainant because the complainant contacted them while they were dealing with another matter and it was unclear to her if law enforcement activity was occurring.

Named officer #2 stated he did not activate his BWC en route to the complainant's residence because he was already at the location on another call for service. In addition, he stated he did not activate his BWC when he made initial contact with any party because he was not sure that complainant was seeking law enforcement action when the complainant first approached the officers. Named officer #2 stated that he viewed building surveillance video that showed the complainant was the victim of a battery. He stated that once the building manager's assistance enabled him to better understand the situation, he activated his BWC as required.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to the complainant's residence on another matter. While the other matter was wrapping up, they were dispatched again to the same building regarding a report of a battery that had occurred two weeks prior to the date of the incident.

BWC showed that named officer #1 did not activate her BWC until she was mid-conversation with the complainant. During that conversation, she referred to a prior conversation with the building manager. In addition, BWC showed that named officer #2 activated his BWC mid-conversation with the building manager and did not capture any interaction with the complainant. The BWC did not record the named officers viewing the building's surveillance video.

Department General Order 10.11, Section III C states, in part, "All on-scene members equipped with a BWC shall activate their BWC equipment to record in the following circumstances: . . . 2. Consensual encounters where the member suspects that the citizen may have knowledge of criminal activity as a suspect, witness, or victim; . . ."

Department Bulletin 18-256 clarifies that "Members shall ensure the entire event is captured during all mandated recording circumstances or their involvement at the incident is completed. . . When responding to calls for service with a potential for law enforcement activity or any of the mandatory recording



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/15/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/03/21    PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED-ALLEGATIONS #1-2: (Continued)**

circumstances, members shall begin recording by pressing the Event button while enroute and prior to arriving on scene. . . .”

The named officers failed to comply with Department policy by not activating their BWC in a timely manner. However, their conduct may have been due to the confusion created by the fact that there were two calls for service coming from the same location at the same time.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/11/20      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant called the police to report a domestic violence incident with her boyfriend. She stated that the responding officers did not listen to her story, arrested her, and failed to tell her the charge. She believed she was the victim of the domestic violence incident.

Body-worn camera (BWC) showed the named officer, his partner and a sergeant obtained statements from the complainant and her boyfriend. The complainant made inconsistent statements and unwittingly admitted that she initiated the physical contact with her boyfriend. Additionally, the BWC captured the named officer explain to the complainant the reason for her arrest and that she would be cited for battery.

Department Records showed that officers obtained statements from both parties, took photographs of all injuries, completed all mandatory forms, and authored an incident report.

Department General Order 6.09 states that it is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department that members treat all acts of domestic violence as criminal conduct. When the elements of a crime exist, members shall make an arrest instead of using dispute mediation or other police intervention techniques.

The named officer conducted a thorough investigation, determined that a crime existed, determined the complainant was the aggressor, and arrested her for battery, in compliance with DGO 6.09.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/01/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officers drove improperly.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she saw SFPD vehicles driving at a reckless pace toward protestors.

The DPA was unable to identify the officers involved in the alleged incident. The DPA canvassed for surveillance video, but the footage was too poor to capture any identifying marks on police vehicles. The DPA also reviewed all body-worn camera footage from the protest and could not identify the incident alleged by the complainant. Department records showed that multiple vehicles responded that day to an emergency violent altercation near the protest, but the DPA could not identify a particular officer in a particular vehicle driving in an unsafe manner.

The DPA therefore issues no finding as it could not identify an individual officer involved in a specific incident.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officers used unnecessary force.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that in SFPD vehicles drove at a high rate of speed toward protestors. She stated she did not see the vehicles harm any of the protestors but believed officers must have hit someone based on how close the vehicle got to the crowd.

The DPA was unable to identify the officers involved in the alleged incident. The DPA canvassed for surveillance video, but the footage was too poor to capture any identifying marks on police vehicles. The DPA also reviewed all body-worn camera footage from the protest and could not identify the incident alleged by the complainant. Department records showed that multiple vehicles responded that day to an emergency violent altercation near the protest, but the DPA could not identify a particular officer in a particular vehicle driving in an unsafe manner.

The DPA therefore issues no finding as it could not identify an individual officer involved in a specific incident.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/26/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/03/21    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to make an arrest.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that 13 years ago he was hit by a drunk driver and the named officer let the driver leave. The complainant believed the driver was released because the driver was the son of an FBI agent.

The named officer did not recall the incident. She authored the incident report and referred to the incident report to defend her investigation. She stated that both parties were interviewed and there was no evidence the other driver was intoxicated or exhibited signs of intoxication.

Department records showed the named officer responded to an injury accident involving a vehicle and pedestrian. The complainant, the driver, and multiple passengers provided statements. The driver and witness statements conflicted with the complainant's statement. There was no evidence to suggest the driver was impaired. The SFPD did not have body-worn cameras when this incident occurred.

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 inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that 10 years ago when he requested a copy of the incident report, a sergeant threatened him with arrest if he requested the report again.

Department records failed to reveal any evidence of this incident or the request.

An officer identification poll was sent to the unit where the incident was alleged to have occurred. The poll was returned with negative results.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/30/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers failed to properly investigate and write reports regarding her reported domestic violence incidents. The complainant did not provide specific dates for her complaint.

Department Records showed that numerous domestic violence incident reports were filed on various dates. Some of the incidents were also investigated beyond the filing of the incident report.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/30/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that while he was on his way to get coffee, he saw the named officer outside of the coffee shop speaking to someone who appeared to be homeless, sitting at a table. The complainant took his cellphone out and recorded the incident as it appeared to him to be an altercation. The named officer told the individual sitting at the table to leave and walked into the coffee shop behind the complainant. While in the coffee shop, the complainant stated the named officer was about two feet away instead of six feet away. The complainant asked the named officer to keep six feet distance and the named officer refused. The complainant also stated the named officer accused him of being racist. The complainant stated that when the named officer walked out of the coffee shop behind him, he asked for the named officer's name and star number. The complainant then stated that they both crossed the street together and the named officer continued to yell at him and told him to work on his racist behavior. The complainant told DPA that he would submit the cellphone video as evidence at a later date.

The named officer denied the complainant's allegations stating that when he entered the coffee shop to pick up a cup of coffee, an employee requested his assistance regarding an issue outside. While addressing the issue outside, the named officer noticed the complainant yelling at him and filming his contact with an individual outside. The named officer ignored the complainant's behavior and waited for him to enter the coffee shop, before entering. The named officer stated that while the complainant was at the register and he was at the other counter retrieving his coffee, the complainant looked at him and stated, "can you get six feet back?" The named officer said he replied, "I am more than six feet away from you." The complainant then said, "No, I am a photographer, I know what six feet is." The named officer stated the complainant then began to yell at him; however, he remained professional while the complainant continued to be hostile, loud, and confrontational. The named officer further stated the complainant created a loud scene and jumped between him and the front door, the complainant got within one foot of the named officer and had his cell phone out. The named officer believed the complainant was trying to create a designed perception on the video. The named officer stated he attempted to defuse the situation; however, the complainant continued to yell. The named officer further stated that he remained inside the coffee shop until the complainant was across the street and then the named officer walked to his vehicle.

DPA spoke to the owner of the coffee shop. The owner contradicted the complainant's statement. He stated that the complainant was rude and harassed the named officer, while the named officer remained professional. The owner also stated that the coffee shop was not using surveillance cameras at the time of the incident so there was no footage available.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/30/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: (Continued)**

DPA made several attempts to obtain a copy of the cellphone video from the complainant; however, the complainant never responded to DPA's requests.

Based on the unwillingness of the complainant to respond to DPAs requests for the cellphone footage, the complainant's inconsistent statement, and the witness statement, it is more likely than not that the allegations made in the complaint did not occur.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/07/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-5:** The officers failed to take required action.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she reported a crime and the officers failed to fully investigate the incident.

The complainant reported an ongoing sexual assault occurring in neighbor's apartment. The named officers' body-worn camera footage shows that officers investigated the alleged crime, looked in the apartment, and found no merit to the allegations.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-7:** The officers behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers harassed her by making fun of her and otherwise acted inappropriately when they arrived on scene.

The named officers' body-worn camera footage shows that officers did not make fun of the complainant and did not ask any inappropriate questions. Both named officers acted calmly and professionally during the contact.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/07/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/04/21    **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: 06/30/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant visited a district police station to get advice about an incident. A female officer initially told her to wait outside and when she entered the station again, she was told by another officer to leave immediately or she would be handcuffed and arrested.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the incident occurred. The poll failed to identify any officers involved.

DPA was unable to obtain surveillance footage from the district police station, because the complaint was filed over a month after the incident. No footage was available for review.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/09/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 1 of 4**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was not present when her son was arrested but was informed about it by the son's attorney. She said that as her son and the attorney exited the courthouse for another case, officers showed up and arrested her son without warrants. She said the officers targeted her son.

The named officer stated she was the primary officer investigating the new cases in which the son was involved in several new shoplifting with force and provided the incident report numbers. The complainant's son's ankle monitor indicated that he was at the location when the crimes happened, and the security camera footage and witnesses confirmed him as the suspect. The named officer then contacted another officer regarding the cases and was told that the son had a court case near the officer. She then asked the officer to arrest the son if he showed up at court.

The other officer confirmed that he spoke with the named officer regarding the complainant's son's recent crime involvement and court case. He confirmed the named officer asked him to arrest the son. The other officer conducted a probable cause arrest on the son.

Department records showed that there were at least four pending shoplifting cases where the complainant's son was either seen by a witness or recorded on tape during the crime. Photos and surveillance videos were captured, and several officers and witnesses identified the son. The documents also recorded that the named officer requested the other officer to arrest the son on his court day.

Department records confirmed the named officer was not present.

The evidence collected proves that the accused officer was not involved.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/09/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was not present when her son was arrested but was informed about it by the son's attorney. She said that as her son and the attorney were exiting the courthouse for another case, officers showed up and arrested her son without an arrest warrant. She said the officers targeted her son.

The complainant's son failed to participate in the investigation.

The named officer confirmed that he spoke with another officer regarding the complainant's son's recent crime involvement and court case. He confirmed the officer asked him to arrest the son. The named officer conducted a probable cause arrest on the son.

Another officer stated she was the primary officer investigating the new cases in which the son was involved in several new shoplifting with force and provided the incident report numbers. The complainant's son's ankle monitor indicated that he was at the location when the crimes happened, and the security camera footage and witnesses confirmed him as the suspect. The officer then contacted the named officer regarding the cases and was told that the son had a court case near the officer. She then asked the named officer to arrest the son if he showed up at court.

Department records showed that there were at least four pending shoplifting cases where the complainant's son was either seen by a witness or recorded on tape during the crime. Photos and surveillance videos were captured, and several officers and witnesses identified the son. The documents also recorded that the officer requested the named officer to arrest the son on his court day.

A witness described walking out of court with the complainant's son when the named officer handcuffed the son and took him away. The witness did not know why the son was arrested and stated the named officer said, "You just can't help yourself. You can't stop." The witness said this statement could mean that the son had another shoplifting case.

The evidence shows that the named officer had sufficient probable cause for the complainant's son to be involved in multiple shoplifting cases. 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: 07/09/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 3 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officers failed to provide required information.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the attorney told her that while her son was being arrested, the officers did not tell him the reasons for the arrest.

The complainant's son failed to participate in the investigation.

The named officer confirmed that he was the arresting officer and that he told the son that he was under arrest for some new cases involving the pharmacy store, and an investigator would go and talk to him.

The attorney stated he heard the named officer tell the son, "You just can't help yourself. You can't stop," which could imply that there was another shoplifting case against the son.

Department records did not record the conversations between the named officer and the son.

The evidence collected is insufficient to prove on the balance of probabilities that the named officer did not tell the son why he was arrested.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officers failed to provide required information.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the attorney told her that while her son was being arrested, the officers did not tell the son the reasons for the arrest.

The named officer stated that she was not on scene when the son was placed under arrest and confirmed that another officer executed the arrest.

The other officer confirmed that he was the arresting officer. Department records confirmed the named officer was not present. The evidence collected proves that the accused officer was not involved.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/09/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/04/21    PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6:** The officers behaved inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers questioned her son without legal representation.

The complainant's son failed to participate in the investigation.

Named officer #1 stated that she was not on the scene during the arrest. However, she conducted a recorded interview later and Mirandized the son before and during the questioning. The son did not request an attorney.

Named officer #2 confirmed that named officer #1 Mirandized the son before the interview. Officer #2 said the son refused an attorney and answered their questions.

Department records, including an audio recording of the interview, showed that named officer #1 did Mirandize the son and told him about his rights to an attorney before officers started questioning. It indicated that the son understood his rights, refused an attorney, and answered the officer's questions regarding the cases.

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:** 07/09/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/04/21    **PAGE# 1 of 4**

**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 that he was walking outside of his house when the named officers detained him without reason.

Named officer #1 confirmed that he detained the complainant because he was the resident of the home they were investigating regarding a stolen bicycle. The geolocation tracking device of the bicycle connected it to the complainant's residence. Named officer #2 confirmed that the complainant was detained during a search warrant service, and a stolen bicycle was tracked to the dwelling.

Witness officers #1, 2, and 3 confirmed the complainant was detained by named officer #1 because the complainant was located at the premise at the time of a search being conducted to prevent the destruction of evidence and officer safety.

Department records show that the complainant's residence was linked to a stolen bicycle case where the bicycle's geotracking device showed the complainant's address. The records also show that named officer #1 was the primary officer of the case and named officer #2 was the investigating officer. The officers had a search warrant signed by the judge to search the address for the bicycle.

Body-worn camera showed that the complainant was physically detained by named officer #1.

No other witnesses were identified.

The evidence gathered indicated that the officers had probable cause showing the stolen bicycle was at the complainant's residence and had a signed search warrant to the residence. Therefore, officers could detain anyone present at the location to preserve evidence and ensure officer safety.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/09/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/04/21    **PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3-5:** The officers detained the complainant without reasonable suspicion.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was walking outside of his house when the named officers detained him without reason.

Named officer #1, 2, and 3 denied detaining the complainant personally and confirmed that another officer detained the complainant.

Department records indicate that the named officers were not the primary or investigating officers who detained the complainant.

The evidence proves that the officers did not detain the complainant. The evidence proves that the accused officer was not involved.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-10:** The officers entered the complainant's residence without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officers entered his residence while keeping him outside of his residence.

All named officers stated that they had a search warrant signed by a judge to enter and search the complainant's residence to locate a stolen bicycle. Named officer #2 stated that he obtained the search warrant before entering the residence.

Department records indicate that named officer #2 obtained a search warrant signed by a judge before entering the complainant's residence. The address and description of the targeted location match the complainant's residence. The evidence gathered shows that the officers did have a search warrant allowing them to enter the residence. 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:** 07/09/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/04/21    **PAGE#** 3 of 4

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #11-15:** The officers searched the complainant's residence without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said after he went back into his house, he noticed that the officers searched his residence.

All named officers stated that they searched the complainant's residence per the search warrant.

The evidence proves that the officers had a valid search warrant to locate the bicycle inside the residence.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #16-18:** The officers spoke or behaved inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said officers were inches away from his face asking him questions during the detention. He felt that his rights were violated, and the officers were trying to intimidate him and treated him like a criminal.

Named officer #1 stated that he was arm distance from the complainant when he spoke with the complainant. He was not aware of other officers who spoke with him. He said that the complainant's statement was an exaggerated statement of facts. He was there to serve a duly authorized search warrant and investigate a crime that led to his residence. Named officer #2 said he was about 15 feet away when he spoke with the complainant and named officer #1 was approximately 5 feet away. He said they were respectful during the conversation. Named officer #3 denied speaking with the complainant in an intimidating way and said he tried to maintain his distance from him.

Witness officers said the officers who spoke to the complainant were respectful and professional and did not see any officers put their faces inches away from him.

Body-worn camera footage shows that when the officers spoke with the complainant, they were not "inches away." The officers explained to the complainant the reason for the investigation calmly and professionally. The evidence shows that the officers on the scene kept their distance, spoke with him calmly and professionally. 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:** 07/09/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/04/21    **PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #19:** The officer did not properly supervise.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he wanted the supervisor of the primary officer of this case held accountable for their action.

The named officer said he was not on duty on or around the search dates, and another officer took over his duties around those dates.

Department records indicate that the named officer was out of the office on or around the dates.

The evidence shows that the named officer was not supervising the case and was not involved.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #20:** The officer did not properly supervise.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he wanted the supervisor of the primary officer of this case held accountable for their action.

The named officer confirmed that he was the primary officer's supervisor around the time of the incident. He said the primary officer called and informed him of a possible search warrant service due to a stolen bicycle's geolocation device at the said location. The primary officer called the named officer again at a later time regarding the execution of the search. He said the search was correctly conducted because the primary officer was investigating stolen property and had probable cause to enter and search the location.

The witness officer said he contacted his supervisor regarding the search, and the search was approved.

Department records show a valid search warrant and that the primary officer contacted his supervisor during the investigation.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the primary officer contacted his supervisor regarding the search. The search was executed correctly because a search warrant was obtained before the search.

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:** 07/21/20      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/05/21      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer ordered her off a bus for wearing a mask improperly and yelled at her.

The named officer stated they responded to a call for service on a Muni coach for a passenger that was not wearing a mask. When they arrived on scene, the bus driver advised them that the complainant was not wearing her mask properly and asked that the complainant be removed from the bus. The named officer stated she raised her voice at the complainant to gain control as the complainant was screaming and yelling incoherently.

The named officer's body worn camera footage showed the named officer and a witness officer initially calmly advising the complainant to get off the bus. The complainant proceeded to yell about the situation. The named officer then raised her voice and ordered the complainant off the bus. The complainant was not properly wearing her mask over her nose during the interaction.

The evidence shows that the named officer had to raise her voice to gain compliance as the complainant was being argumentative and was ignoring their commands. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to provide their name or star number.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer failed to provide her star number upon request.

The named officer stated that she provided her star number to the complainant multiple times during the incident by showing her star number and name.

The named officer's body worn camera footage corroborates the named officer's statement.

The evidence showed that the named officer provided her star number multiple times to the complainant during the incident. 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:** 07/22/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/09/21    **PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was the victim of a burglary. The complainant stated the named officers failed to investigate the alleged crime properly and refused to stop or arrest the alleged offender after the complainant pointed him out to the officers.

Department documents showed that the named officers completed and recorded a burglary investigation, including photographs of the damage and the residence.

Body Worn Camera footage showed the named officers interviewed the complainant and recorded items taken in the burglary. The footage also showed the complainant did not point out or name any person as a potential suspect for the burglary.

The named officers stated that an incident report was written documenting the investigation. The officers stated that the complainant did not point out a suspect to them and that a proper investigation was completed, including photographs.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/22/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/09/21    **PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer arrested her husband without cause.

Department records showed that the complainant's husband was arrested. The records detailed an allegation filed by a victim against the husband for an offense. The documents also detail the officer's investigation and subsequent arrest of the complainant's husband.

Body Worn Camera footage showed the named officer attended a crime report and completed an investigation, including the search of a residence and seizure of evidence. The footage also showed the complainant's husband being detained and arrested for the alleged offense in accordance with Department policy.

At the time of arrest, documents and camera footage showed that officers had probable cause to arrest.

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:** 07/22/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/09/21    **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 her husband could not have committed the crime he was arrested for as he was with her when it happened. The complainant stated that SFPD officers failed to investigate this.

Department documents detailed that officers responding to a report of a crime and recorded the investigation conducted into the allegation. The investigation included a search of a property, seizure of possible evidence, and the account of an alleged witness. A full timeline of the named officer investigation detailed the steps taken to investigate the alleged crime.

Body Worn Camera footage showed the named officer attended a crime report and completed an investigation, including the search of a residence and seizure of evidence. The footage also showed the complainant's husband being detained and arrested for the alleged offense in accordance with Department policy.

The named officer stated the complainant's husband invoked his Miranda rights and did not speak to investigators about the incident at the time of the arrest. Therefore, at the time of arrest the named officer was not aware of the husband allegedly being with his wife at the time of the incident.

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:** 07/24/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/09/21    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer arrested a person without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers arrested her daughter for throwing chemicals on a neighbor. The complainant denied that her daughter threw chemicals on anyone.

The named officer and his partner responded to a call of a dispute between two neighboring families. The named officer observed members of the family engage in a fight, including striking one another and throwing a plastic container containing a liquid substance that caused burning on the officers' lips and eyes.

The officers observed the criminal activity and were therefore entitled to arrest complainant's daughter.

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

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers were untruthful when they told her why they arrested her daughter.

The named officer stated he did not believe he told the complainant the charges for the arrestee and that he was not required to do so. The named officer stated he went back to the station after the fight, continued the investigation, and met with his sergeant to determine the correct charge. The named officer's partner, also a witness officer, stated he never heard the named officer talk about the charges with the complainant.

The named officer's body-worn camera does not show the complainant asking about the charges or the officer providing information about the charges for the arrestee.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/07/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/10/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that officers arrested him without cause while he was sleeping in his car.

Officers responded to a call of a burglary in progress. When the officers were on scene, a woman suddenly walked out the side door of the building at issue and approached a black vehicle parked nearby. The officers detained the woman and found a man sleeping in the vehicle. Officers obtained the woman's consent to search the car and found items from the burglary inside.

The officers had probable cause to arrest the woman and complainant based on the discovery of the stolen goods in the vehicle where the complainant was sleeping.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer towed a vehicle without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that his vehicle was towed for no reason.

Officers responded to a call of a burglary in progress. When the officers were on scene, a woman suddenly walked out the side door of the building at issue and approached a black vehicle parked nearby. The officers detained the woman and found a man sleeping in the vehicle. Officers obtained the woman's consent to search the car and found items from the burglary inside.

The officers conducted a query on the vehicle and determined that the registered owner was a third party, not present at the scene.

The named officer was authorized to tow the vehicle due to the complainant's arrest and the vehicle's registration showing ownership by a third party.

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: 07/31/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/10/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer has repeatedly harassed the complainant.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer harassed him by trying to serve him with papers for no reason at a location where he did not reside.

Department records show that the named officer served a restraining order on the complainant following allegations that the complainant had engaged in harassment and stalking of a physician. Despite multiple attempts to contact the complainant, he refused to provide any factual basis to contradict the grounds for the restraining order.

The evidence proves that the actions of the officer occurred and that those actions were legal, proper and justified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 08/04/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/10/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. The complainant stated that officers failed to respond to the scene of her hit and run collision. After waiting hours, dispatch called the complainant to instruct her to go to the station to file a report. This complaint was forwarded 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:** 08/05/2020      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/10/21      **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**                      **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: 08/06/2020    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/10/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers failed to effectively investigate his verbal report to them that a taxi driver appeared to be under the influence of alcohol.

The first named officer stated that the complainant felt the taxi driver was drunk and requested that the officer speak with the driver. She approached the driver to determine whether he was impaired. The first named officer stated that she did not observe any signs of intoxication during her conversation with the driver such as slurred speech, watery eyes, red face or the smell of alcohol, therefore she did not perform any additional steps in a DUI investigation as she did not want to unnecessarily detain the taxi driver. She did not believe the driver was impaired and felt he was able to safely operate his vehicle.

The second named officer stated he did not have a clear memory of the contact or incident. He did not believe that he spoke with the complainant at all, but instead remained in the patrol car gathering information regarding a high priority call for service. The second named officer stated that the first named officer returned to the vehicle and advised that the taxi driver did not display any symptoms of being under the influence of alcohol or in any way impaired.

There were no witnesses that came forward with relevant information.

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:** 08/09/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/10/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/22/2021.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/22/2021.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/31/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/11/21    PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer towed a vehicle without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer pulled him over and towed his car for no reason.

The named officer stated he conducted the traffic stop because the vehicle had no visible license plates. The metal license plate was covered with a non-legally issued temporary paper license. The named officer stated the plates were found inside the vehicle, seized and booked as evidence. The named officer stated the vehicle was approved for towing pursuant to displaying a license plate that did not belong to the vehicle with a hold for traffic enforcement investigation.

Body-worn camera footage from named and witness officers showed the front and back license plates were covered with a blank, white piece of paper. The legal license plates for the vehicle were found inside the vehicle.

The named officer observed that the complainant was illegally driving a vehicle with its license plates concealed and acted accordingly.

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: 07/31/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/11/21    PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer engaged in biased policing due to race.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer detained him and towed his car due to racial bias.

The named officer stated that he did not conduct the traffic stop based on the driver's race. He stated he was not aware of the driver's race prior to meeting the driver. The detention was based on the complainant driving with illegal license plates.

Both witness officers stated that false plates on the vehicle was the reason for the stop and that there was no evidence that the named officer engaged in biased policing.

Body-worn camera confirmed that the complainant was driving with illegally concealed license plates. There was no evidence in the footage that the named officer engaged in biased policing.

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: 07/31/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/11/21    PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was pulled over for no reason.

The named officer stated that he observed the complainant's vehicle with a blank piece of paper covering the area where the license plate should have been. He pulled the complainant over to investigate and found that the complainant had concealed his license plates.

In the body-worn camera footage, the named officer told the complainant he was being detained for a concealed license plate, which is a misdemeanor. The footage also showed that a blank piece of paper was in the license plate holder.

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: 08/24/20      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/11/21      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was walking down the street when a plainclothes officer stopped him and accused him of buying drugs. The complainant denied having any drugs. The complainant was released after another officer interrupted and told the detaining officers that they had another call. The detention lasted less than 5 minutes, the complainant was not placed in handcuffs, but he did not feel free to leave until he was formally released. The complainant did not obtain the names or star numbers of the officers.

Department records failed to identify the alleged incident.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district police station where the incident occurred, as well as other possible district stations and units. The polls were returned with negative results.

No witnesses were identified. The officers could not reasonably be identified.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer never responded to an email that was sent regarding his detention.

The named officer stated that the email he received was addressed to the complainant; however, he was included on the email to notify him of the incident. The named officer stated that the email did not require any action by him. Nevertheless, the named officer stated he called and left a voicemail message for the complainant providing his direct line and asked the complainant to call him so that he could discuss the incident and the complaint process, but the complainant did not respond to his voicemail. The named officer stated he also checked with plainclothes officers, who told him that there were no drug operations in that area on the incident date and time.

Department records documented that phone calls were made to the the complainant and a city official.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/26/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/12/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in a written complaint that unknown officers failed to investigate a neighbor dispute.

The complainant failed to participate further in the investigation or provide additional information.

No witnesses came forward to assist the investigation.

Department records revealed no incidents as described by the complainant.

The district station was canvassed to try and identify any involved officers with negative results.

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.

In this instance, the officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 08/26/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/15/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take a prepare an incident report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she went to a police station to file a police report but could not recall specifically the date and time when she went to the station.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/26/20      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer drove improperly.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in a written complaint that he observed a white Mercedes speeding down the city of San Francisco streets. The complainant provided the license plate number of the vehicle that he observed.

The complainant refused to be interviewed for this investigation.

A records check revealed that the license plate provided by the complainant did not belong to an SFPD vehicle or personnel.

No witnesses were identified.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/05/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complaint alleged that officers failed to properly investigate his report of burglary.

The named officer explained that he forwarded the complainant's report to the General Crimes Unit. The commanding officer of that unit stated that the case was not assigned for investigation pursuant to Department Bulletin 17-256 and Department Notice 20-107, Case Assignments for Investigation. The officer explained that the complainant reported the crime sixteen months after it allegedly occurred, and that the probability of recovering evidence was therefore too low to justify assigning the case for investigation.

DB 17-256 and DN 20-107 provide for the use of discretion in assigning cases based on the availability of evidence and the probability of an arrest or prosecution.

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: 09/21/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1, 2:** The officers behaved and spoke inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that officers verbally harassed her after she saw the officers make an illegal u-turn. The complainant could not provide the officers' identification but could identify the vehicle number.

The two named officers were assigned to the vehicle identified by the complainant. The named officers stated that they were not involved in the incident and could not recall who was driving the patrol car.

The DPA was unable to locate any other witnesses.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/23/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to prepare an incident report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers failed to prepare an incident report.

The named officers stated that they responded to a call for service regarding a verbal argument between two residents. The named officers' body-worn camera footage shows the officers responded to the scene, briefly admonished everyone, and left. The officers did not find any criminal activity to require an incident report.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers bullied her.

The named officers both stated they acted professional towards the complainant during the incident.

The body-worn camera footage showed the named officers acting calm and professional towards the complainant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/23/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer entered a residence without cause.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that during her interaction with the named officer, the named officer placed her foot in the door preventing her from closing it.

The named officer stated that she attempted to speak with the complainant at the request of hostel staff. The named officer stated that she was not aware where her foot was because she was in a narrow corridor. The complainant attempted to slam the door to her residence in the named officer's face. The door contacted the named officer's foot once and the complainant closed the door a second time, which resulted in the named officer's foot being struck a second time. After that, the named officer stepped back and the door completely shut.

The DPA obtained the named officer's body-worn camera footage of the incident. The body-worn camera footage showed the named officer attempting to admonish the complainant who was yelling and speaking over her. The named officer was standing outside the doorway in a narrow corridor. The complainant attempted to shut the door and it came in contact with the named officer's foot. The complainant stated, "Your foot's in my door!" The complainant attempted to close the door again and it again came in contact with the named officer's foot. The complainant stated, "Get your foot out of my door!" The named officer removed her foot and the door slammed shut. The named officer and her partner both left the scene.

The body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer did not enter the complainant's residence at any point during the incident. While the named officer's foot came in contact with the complainant's door, it was an unintentional and minor entry.

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



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 09/24/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/15/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

San Francisco Department of Public Health  
Attn: Noise Prevention and Control Officer  
101 Grove Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/30/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in a written complaint that he reported to unknown officers that drug dealers were selling narcotics on the street corner. The unknown officer driving the police vehicle stated, "There is nothing we can do-vote for a new DA."

The complainant refused to participate in the investigation.

The district station was canvassed to try and identify the involved officers with negative results.

A record check of the vehicle number provided by the complainant also came back with negative results.

No witnesses were identified.

The identity of the alleged officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 10/24/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/15/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer was assigned to reopen his relative's homicide case, but the named officer failed to look at new evidence.

The named officer is no longer available to be interviewed.

Department records showed that the named officer's investigation regarding the complainant's relative's homicide had not been updated in 21 years.

The named officer retired and is no longer subject to Department discipline.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer violated his Marcy's rights, was biased, disrespectful, and refused to speak to him about the case.

The officer is no longer available to be interviewed.

The named officer retired and is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 10/14/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/15/21    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant called the police to report her neighbors for having guests over and not social distancing, in violation of the Shelter in Place order regarding COVID-19, as well as violating their lease agreement. She felt the incident was poorly handled and the named officer did not enforce the law in a satisfactory manner.

Body-worn camera (BWC) showed that the responding officers obtained statements from the complainants and her neighbor. The named officer warned the neighbor that he was in violation of the Shelter in Place Ordinance. The named officer’s partner informed the complainant that violations of contracts and/or lease agreements were civil matters and not within SFPDs jurisdiction.

Department Bulletin 20-083, Enforcement of Public Health Order stated that members may educate, admonish, seek voluntarily compliance, and use enforcement for violations of the SIP Order (“progressive enforcement”).

Police records and BWC confirmed that the named officer’s actions were within policy.

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:** 10/15/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/15/21    **PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was staying at a hotel and made a reservation to extend his stay, but the hotel chose not to honor the extension. The complainant stated the hotel's management called the police to have him removed. The complainant stated the named officers arrived and inappropriately placed him on a mental health detention.

The first named officer stated she was advised by dispatch that the complainant was refusing to leave a hotel room and was impersonating a law enforcement officer when interacting with hotel staff. She stated that prior to arriving on scene she reviewed a records check which revealed the complainant's history of mental health detentions as well as a flag requesting that the Psychiatric Liaison Unit be contacted. A reporting party on scene stated that the complainant refused to leave the property and had represented himself as a law enforcement officer. The first named officer stated that the complainant appeared manic and delusional and refused to leave the hotel.

The second named officer placed the complainant on an emergency mental health detention and the first named officer advised that there was probable cause for doing so as the complainant advised he had not been taking his medication, and he was experiencing auditory hallucinations and delusions. She stated that the complainant was a danger to himself and was gravely disabled due to a mental health disorder. She stated that they reached out to the psychiatric liaison as a resource and left a voicemail regarding the complainant's detention.

The second named officer's statements regarding the information he received prior to arriving on scene were consistent with those of the first named officer. He stated that a reporting party on scene advised that the complainant's reservation had expired, that he was told he needed to leave, but he refused and represented himself as a law enforcement officer. The second named officer stated that he spoke with the complainant to evaluate his mental health and determined that he appeared paranoid and delusional, was not taking his medications, and was displaying erratic and manic behavior. He stated that he and his partner attempted to reach the behavioral health contact for assistance or further information. He stated there was probable cause to detain the complainant due to him not taking his medication, his delusional thinking, the state of his disheveled room, and prior similar mental health detentions. The complainant appeared incapable of properly caring for himself and in an altered mental state.

The incident report documented that the complainant was determined to be a danger to himself and others and was transported to a hospital for psychiatric emergency services.

The mental health hold form completed by the second named officer documented that the complainant was a known subject to the Behavior Science Unit and was a danger to himself and others. It detailed that

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/15/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** (Continued)

he had claimed to be a law enforcement officer, had not taken his medications for multiple days and had stated that everyone would be executed by other agencies.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborated the named officers' statements. The complainant spoke about various irrelevant topics, appeared manic, stated that he would die on the street if he left the hotel and that his job was to tell the San Francisco Police Department what to do. He made statements related to execution and expressed that he had left his medication at another hotel multiple days prior to this incident. He also stated that he had been placed on numerous mental health holds in the past. Body-worn camera footage also showed that medics arrived on scene and transported him to a hospital in an ambulance.

Department General Order 6.14 (Psychological Evaluation for Adults), states in relevant part that an officer may detain an individual for psychiatric evaluation when the officer believes, that as a result of mental illness, the individual is a danger to himself, a danger to others or gravely disabled and unable to care for themselves.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer grabbed and twisted his wrist.

The named officer stated that she made physical contact with the complainant's wrist but denied twisting his wrist during this incident. She stated that she made contact with his wrist because the complainant was being placed on a mental health detention, was refusing to leave the hotel, was manic, expressed desire to go into the bathroom where he could potentially barricade himself and escape and was not following instructions and complying with lawful orders. She stated that contact was made to assist in moving the complainant to a gurney so he could receive medical attention. She stated that she used the least amount of force possible to overcome the complainant's non-compliance.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer contacted the complainant's wrist when assisting another officer who was instructing the complainant to stop picking items up and when escorting him out of the hotel room and to a gurney. Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant commented that he wanted to go into the bathroom prior to being escorted out of the hotel room. Body-

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/15/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/15/21    PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: (Continued)**

worn camera footage also showed that the complainant did not appear to be listening to instructions and did not actively leave the hotel room when instructed to move to the gurney outside of the room.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force, Section III states, in part, that officers may use reasonable force options to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search; to overcome resistance or to prevent escape; and to gain compliance with a lawful order.

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: 10/14/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/16/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer used profanity.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he flagged down a police vehicle and an officer in the vehicle yelled profanities at him. The complainant identified the police vehicle with a set of identifying vehicle numbers.

The named officer stated he did not recall the call to the location, recognize the complainant, or recall the incident. The named officer also stated that he would not use offensive language with a citizen. The officer stated he reviewed the CAD, and he was not on the call that responded to the complainant.

A vehicle sign-out sheet identified the named officer; however, dispatch records showed that the unit assigned to the vehicle reported that the party was gone on arrival.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he called to report a crime. He waited for 20 minutes and no officer showed up.

Dispatch records showed the complainant called twice within seven minutes to report the same incident. The call was given a low priority of C. The CAD showed that complainant declined to speak further to the dispatcher.

The named officer stated he did not recall the call to the location, recognize the complainant nor recall the incident.

Records show that an officer responded to the scene hours later and reported that the reporting party was already gone.

Priority C calls are the lowest priority for officer response and often take more than 20 minutes to respond to. The complainant admitted that he left after 20 minutes, and he was unable to provide evidence that a crime had actually occurred. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/14/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/16/21    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer's discourteous behavior or statements were related to gender.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated an officer made a derogatory comment related to his gender.

The named officer assigned to the vehicle stated he did not recall the call to the location, recognize the complainant, or recall the incident. The named officer also stated that he would not use such offensive language with a citizen. The officer stated he reviewed the CAD, and he was not on the call that responded to the complainant.

The complainant was unable to provide any evidence that the derogatory term was used and the named officer was not near the complainant at the time alleged. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION 1:** The officer intentionally failed to report misconduct by another sworn or non-sworn employee.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated there were two officers in the police vehicle when one officer yelled out discourteous statements.

DPA added an allegation for failure to report a misconduct by the officer's partner.

The named officer stated he did not recall the call to the location, recognize the complainant, or recall the incident. The DPA found that the complainant's allegations were unfounded. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 10/28/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant visited a district police station and spoke to a sergeant to report teens being trafficked in the district. He stated that the sergeant failed to make a report.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the incident occurred. The poll failed to identify any officers involved.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant called a district station and asked to speak with a supervisor. The female who answered the phone threatened to arrest the complainant if he called again.

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

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 11/19/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The SFPD improperly or unsafely used Department of City equipment.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/10/21.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 11/19/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/10/21.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/05/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside DPA jurisdiction.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated someone threw a rock at her window. The complainant stated she went to a police station to report the incident and came in contact with a female officer. The complainant stated the officer refused to take her report.

The evidence shows the officer is a police service aide.

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

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer refused to take a report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that while she was meditating inside her room, somebody threw a rock at her window again. The complainant stated she went to the same police station the following day and reported the incident, but the two male officers whom she spoke with refused to take her report.

No witnesses were identified.

A request to identify the officers was made, but the officers remain unidentified.

There is insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/06/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21    **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 in an online complaint that an officer refused to act on her noise complaint.

The complainant did not respond to numerous attempts by the DPA for additional information necessary to investigate the allegation.

The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/11/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/16/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to make an arrest.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he had been attacked and injured by a coworker causing lasting damage to his eye. The named officer informed the complainant that the suspect had been charged and was wanted on a warrant. The complainant stated that the named officer did not make any efforts to arrest the suspect.

Department documents were obtained and reviewed. The documents detail the investigation steps taken in the complainant's case. The documents detail the officer's attempts to contact the suspect and the subsequent refusal to be interviewed. The documents also show that San Francisco Police Officers were made aware of the open arrest warrant.

The named officer stated he investigated the case step by step, interviewing the complainant and witnesses and collecting evidence. The officer said he spoke with the suspect's attorney and the suspect refused to be interviewed. The officer stated he authored an arrest warrant that the DA's office approved and released a bulletin to SFPD officers detailing the warrant. The officer also contacted the police department of the city the suspect resided in and detailed their attempts to arrest the suspect.

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:** 11/19/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/17/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The SFPD behaved inappropriately or made inappropriate comments.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/10/21.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The SFPD improperly or unsafely used Department or City equipment.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 3/10/21.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/17/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/17/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-8:** The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officers conducted an unreasonable search and seizure. He believed the officers did not have the right to search his entire house and take his registered weapons.

Police records indicated that a judge signed a search warrant that included the complainant's house. There was probable cause for the search and seizure of the complainant's registered weapons.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed officers arriving at the complainant's house and executing the search warrant.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9:** The SFPD failed to release the complainant's property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he has been trying to retrieve his seized firearms; however, he has been given the run around. He stated that SFPD told him to seek the release of his firearms from the Department of Justice (DOJ). However, when he submitted a request to DOJ and went to retrieve his weapon, he was told the office was closed due to COVID 19 and now he had to do the DOJ process all over again.

The complainant provided a letter to DPA from Attorney General Firearms Clearance Section Bureau of Firearms that provided information on the timeline and how to claim his firearms. The laws and regulations surrounding the return of firearms is complex and generally handled by SFPD Legal. The complainant was provided instructions on how to legally retrieve the firearms that were properly seized.

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: 12/11/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/17/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that police failed to respond to his emergency call.

The named officers spoke to the complainant by phone within five minutes of the complainant's 911 call. The named officers stated that the complainant told them there was an ongoing rodent issue in his apartment. The named officers explained to the complainant that he should contact his landlord or Animal Care and Control.

The named officers reasonably concluded that the call did not involve criminal activity or an emergency.

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:** 12/18/20    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/18/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was driving on the Bay Bridge on her way to San Francisco when she noticed a police vehicle driving too close to her. She stated the driver had his cell phone on his ear and was talking, while the passenger officer saw the behavior and did nothing.

Department records failed to identify the alleged incident.

An officer identification poll was sent to the unit where the vehicle was assigned. The poll was returned with negative results.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/18/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/19/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to respond to the scene.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was walking across the street when two unknown girls pushed her down on the ground. She injured her wrist, and it was bleeding. Strangers assisted her and she subsequently called 911. The complainant waited between 40-45 minutes before leaving the scene on her own and seeking medical treatment, because no officers showed up.

The incident occurred six years ago and a records search for the incident was requested from Department of Emergency Management. However, the custodian of records told the DPA that records were only maintained for three years from the date of occurrence and are then purged, so they were no longer available.

The officer could not be identified in this case.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was 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: 12/19/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/19/21    PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to stop his neighbor from continuing construction without a permit.

San Francisco Police documents were obtained and reviewed. The documents stated that this incident was a neighbor dispute over construction on the property line. The documents showed that advice was given to both parties involved.

Body Worn Camera footage was obtained and reviewed. The footage showed the named officer spoke to both parties involved. Both parties were arguing over the construction of a fence along the property line and the location of the property line. The officer advised both parties to go through the city council to resolve the dispute. The officer warned the complainant that he cannot damage the installed fence post as that would be a citable crime. The officer also advised the other party not to continue construction until the matter was dealt with by the city.

The camera footage showed that the named officer did not advise the other party they could continue constructing without a permit.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**Officer Mark Lustenberger #1562**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer threatened to cite him if he intervened with the construction.

San Francisco Police documents were obtained and reviewed. The documents stated that this incident was a neighbor dispute over construction on the property line. The documents showed that advice was given to both parties involved.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/19/20      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/19/21      PAGE# 2 of 2**

Body Worn Camera footage was obtained and reviewed. The footage showed the named officer spoke to both parties involved. Both parties were arguing over the construction of a fence along the property line and where the property line was. The officer told both parties to go through the city council to resolve the dispute. The officer warned the complainant that he cannot damage the installed fence post as that would be a citable crime. No citation was issued. The officer also advised the other party not to continue construction until the matter was dealt with by the city.

The camera footage showed that the named officer correctly warned that any damage to the installed fence could be a citable crime.

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: 12/17/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged the officer behaved and spoke inappropriately by improperly disclosing a confidential informant's information.

The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 01/12/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded 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:** 01/21/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

**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: 01/18/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer displayed harassing behavior.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the police harassed her by following her and verbally threatening her.

In her online complaint, the complainant did not provide specific identifying information regarding the incident or any officer. She did not provide a date of occurrence, a place of occurrence, or any information that would assist DPA in identifying any officers that may be involved. The complainant failed to respond to several requests from DPA for an interview, which DPA intended to conduct in order to obtain additional information.

The identity of the alleged officer(s) could not be established. Therefore, there is no finding in this case.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant failed to 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:** 01/20/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated an officer assaulted him while in police custody.

The complainant, who made the complaint anonymously, did not provide sufficient information to identify the incident or any officer. The complainant also did not provide DPA with contact information.

The identity of the alleged officer(s) could not be established. No witnesses were identified. DPA cannot make a finding.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant failed to 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:** 01/20/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21 **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 an officer detained him without reasonable suspicion.

The complainant, who made the complaint anonymously, did not provide sufficient information to identify the incident or any officer. The incident allegedly occurred 20 years ago and complainant could not provide more concrete facts about it.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established. No witnesses were identified. DPA could not make a finding.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant failed to 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: 01/25/20    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1:** The officers failed to comply with Department Bulletin 20-082.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she saw two officers walking side by side without masks on. The complainant saw two other officers near their patrol vehicle, also without masks, and one of the officers was smoking.

Requests were made for the surveillance footage from the location of the alleged allegation. No footage was found for this incident.

The local Police Station was canvassed to identify the officers involved with negative results.

The complainant was unable to obtain the names or star numbers of the officers involved and could only provide brief descriptions of them.

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:** 01/25/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he saw a violent altercation happening. The complainant ran to get help and came across a San Francisco Police Officer. The complainant tried to ask the officer for help. The officer refused to listen and told the complainant to leave the area or risk being arrested. The complainant was unable to provide any more than a limited description of the officer and was unsure of the date the incident occurred.

Department documents were checked, but no reference was found to an incident as described by the complainant. The local stations were canvassed to try to identify the officer involved in this incident but to no avail.

No witnesses were identified.

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.

In this instance, the officer subject to the complaint could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/02/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**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 he called the non-emergency number to report loud music on the street in front of his home and no officers responded.

Department records showed that the named officer was dispatched and responded to the noise complaint. He informed dispatch that the incident was handled.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/04/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/2 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was pulled over and an officer used force to take him out of the vehicle.

DPA attempted to reach the complainant for further information but the complainant was not responsive.

The complainant did not provide additional requested evidence.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer searched his vehicle without cause.

DPA attempted to reach the complainant for further information but the complainant was not responsive.

The complainant did not provide additional requested evidence.



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/06/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

AKRON OFFICE OF THE POLICE AUDITOR  
146 SOUTH HIGH STREET, Rm 615  
AKRON, OH 44308

330-375-2705

330-375-2924

Fax. [policeauditor@akronohio.gov](mailto:policeauditor@akronohio.gov)

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/12/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Marin County Sheriff's Department  
1600 Los Gamos Dr. #200  
San Rafael, CA 94903

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/12/21      DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/22/21      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:      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:** 02/16/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

San Francisco Department of Public Health  
Attn: Noise Prevention and Control Officer  
101 Grove Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/19/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/22/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated officers failed to respond to a request for service.

The complainant withdrew the complaint.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/19/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/25/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**    **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:** 02/22/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/25/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**    **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:** 02/23/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/25/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Rochester Police Department  
185 Exchange Boulevard  
Rochester, NY 14614



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/27/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/25/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

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

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 03/03/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/25/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Irvine Police Department  
101 Chestnut Street  
Irvine KY, 40336  
Attn: Internal Affairs

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/04/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/26/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was 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: 03/06/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/26/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Maury County Sheriff's Office  
1300 Lawson White Drive  
Columbia, TN 38401

browland@maurycounty-tn.gov

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 03/06/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/26/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

San Bernardino Co. Sheriff's Department  
Phelan Substation  
4050 Phelan Road  
P.O. Box 292000  
Phelan, CA 92329

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/12/21    DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/26/21    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

School of Dentistry-University of the Pacific  
155 5<sup>th</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 03/17/21      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/30/21      **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Chico Police Department  
1460 Humboldt Rd  
Chico, CA 95928



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/17/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 03/30/21 PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: 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:** 03/22/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/30/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** **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:** 03/29/21    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 03/31/21    **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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