

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/28/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that officers used excessive force when approaching and arresting a black man sitting on the sidewalk.

The incident began when two MUNI inspectors approached a patrol officer and reported that a suspect had assaulted pedestrians. The inspectors identified the suspect by pointing at him. The patrol officer then approached the suspect and attempted to detain him, but the suspect became angry, pushed the officer off and swung his fist without making contact. The suspect quickly walked away.

The patrol officer followed the suspect and called for backup. When the backup officers arrived, they quickly took the suspect to the ground and handcuffed him.

The incident was captured on the body worn camera. The officers surrounded the suspect and used basic control holds to force him to the ground. The officers then turned the suspect over and handcuffed him. The officers did not strike, kick, or otherwise use any other type of force. The body worn camera video also shows the suspect physically resisting by pulling away from the officers, trying to remain standing, and yelling in the officers' faces. The suspect did not suffer any injuries.

Department General Order ("DGO") 5.01 states, in part:

"B. PHYSICAL CONTROLS/PERSONAL BODY WEAPONS. Physical controls, such as control holds, takedowns, strikes with personal body weapons, and other weaponless techniques are designed to gain compliance of and/or control over uncooperative or resistant subjects.

1. PURPOSE. When a subject offers some degree of passive or active resistance to a lawful order, in addition to de-escalation techniques and appropriate communication skills, officers may use physical controls consistent with Department training to gain compliance. A subject's level of resistance and the threat posed by the subject are important factors in determining what type of physical controls or personal body weapons should be used."

Section (I)(B) of DGO 5.01, defines active resistance as physically evasive movements to defeat an officer's attempt at control including bracing, tensing, running away, verbally or physically signaling an intention to avoid or prevent being taken into or retained in custody.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/28/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: (Continued)

The force used was reasonable and lawful. The man physically and verbally resisted multiple attempts to detain him. In response, the officers used basic control holds to take the suspect into custody without injury. Notably, the original officer appropriately avoided a one-on-one altercation and waited for additional officers before initiating any force.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/15/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: Failure to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and a representative of Tenderloin Station, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/15/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer issued a traffic citation but did not properly inform her what she was signing or explain the court process. The complainant also said that during her traffic court appearance, the named officer failed to explain her rights or the traffic court process. The complainant failed to respond to numerous efforts by the DPA to obtain more information in an interview.

The named officer said she observed the complainant make an unlawful turn in violation of California Vehicle Code § 22101(d). The named officer said that she explained the citation to the complainant and her options for court. The named officer said the complainant signed the citation. The named officer said she attended the traffic court appearance and offered to amend the violation to a lesser violation so as not to add a demerit to the complainant's driving record, but the complainant declined.

The named officer's body worn camera video shows that the named officer explained the citation to the complainant and that the complainant signed the Notice to Appear on the officer's cellular phone. The footage also revealed that the complainant did not ask the named officer for any explanation or clarification.

An officer who said he was in traffic court for a separate hearing when he encountered the complainant said that he attempted to explain how amending the citation would result in no points on her license or increase in her insurance rate.

No other witness was identified.

The officer fulfilled her responsibility to explain the citation process to the complainant at the scene of a traffic stop.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that during a traffic court appearance, the named officer aggressively spoke to the complainant and tried to negotiate a “plea deal.” The complainant failed to respond to numerous efforts by the DPA to obtain more information in an interview.

The named officer said that she spoke to the complainant at her traffic court hearing and was calm. The named officer said she and a witness officer were at traffic court on separate matters when they encountered the complainant. The named officer said she offered the complainant an amendment of the citation to a non-moving violation to reduce the impact on her insurance rate, but the complainant became upset. The named officer said the witness officer tried to explain plea options and insurance points to the complainant. The named officer said the complainant said she would talk to her attorney before making any plea in traffic court.

The witness officer said he was in traffic court on a separate matter when he encountered the complainant. The witness officer said he attempted to inform the complainant that amending the violation as the named officer had offered would result in no points on the complainant’s driving record and no increase in her insurance rate. The witness officer said the named officer was calm and relaxed, and the complainant was agitated.

The DPA did not identify any other witnesses.

Based on the officers’ statements, the complainant’s refusal to cooperate with the investigation, and the complainant’s allegations that contradict the body worn camera footage, the DPA finds the officers’ account more credible.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer was with the citation officer in traffic court. The complainant said the named officer aggressively jumped into her conversation with the citing officer, insisting that she take a plea deal offered by the citing officer. The complainant failed to respond to DPA requests for an interview.

The named officer said he was in traffic court on a separate case when he spoke to the complainant outside the courtroom. The named officer said he tried to explain to the complainant that the action the citing officer had offered her – to amend her traffic violation to a lesser charge – would result in no points on the complainant’s driving record and no increase in her insurance rate. The named officer said he and the other officer were calm and not aggressive.

The citation officer said the named officer was calm and not aggressive with complainant, and that the complainant was upset and agitated. The citation officer said the named officer was trying to explain to the complainant the relationship of driving record points to insurance rates and how accepting the lower violation would be advantageous.

The DPA did not identify any other witnesses.

Based on the officers’ statements, the complainant’s refusal to cooperate with the investigation, and the complainant’s allegations that contradict the body worn camera footage, the DPA finds the officers’ account more credible.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/22/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers made an arrest without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was working as a cashier and was arrested without cause. The complainant was walked to the police station and was not allowed to make a telephone call, use the restroom, or to speak with an interpreter while in police custody.

Named officer #1 stated that he and named officer #2 walked into the market that the complainant worked at and observed a display of billy clubs and batons that the complainant stated were for sale, which violated the California Penal Code. Officer #1 saw in plainview a handgun adjacent to the complainant in an open case. Officer #1 detained the complainant and conducted a computer inquiry and discovered the gun was stolen.

The complainant was arrested for the weapons violation and for selling illegal merchandise.

Department records indicated that police contacted the store owner, and he advised that he did not allow billy clubs and batons to be sold in the store. The store owner denied any knowledge of a handgun in the store and stated firearms were also not allowed in his deli.

Department General Order 5.03 Section B says in part, "A police officer may briefly detain a person for questioning or request identification only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person behavior is related to criminal activity. The officer must, however, have specific and articulable facts to support their action."

The investigation showed that the officers had clear and articulate facts that the complainant was involved with selling illegal merchandise and in possession of a firearm.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/22/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/13/20 **PAGE# 2 of 4**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was working as a cashier and was arrested without cause. The complainant was then walked to the police station instead of being placed into a police vehicle. The complainant stated that he was embarrassed because of all the local neighbors observed him in police custody.

Named officer #1 stated that named officer #2 walked the complainant to Tenderloin station due to the proximity from the location of the arrest of less than a city block. The complainant was handcuffed and displayed no signs of physical injury preventing the walk.

DGO 5.18 Section III states in part: "Transporting the prisoner from the place of arrest as soon as practicable using department approved means of transportation. Members shall take all reasonable steps, consistent with Department policy and training, to prevent injury to prisoners for which they are responsible."

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers failed to comply with Department General Order 5.20.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated while in police custody at a police facility, the named officers denied him an interpreter.

Named officer #1 stated that the complainant arrived at approximately 1400 hours at the police station. Officer #1 asked the complainant the medical screening form questions in English, and the complainant responded in English before officer #1 placed the complainant on the holding bench. Officer #1 was relieved by Officer #2 at 1415 hours.

Named officer #1 said he couldn't recall if the complainant requested the use of an interpreter.

Named officer #2 said he took over the duties and responsibilities of the complainant at 1415 hours. At 1630 hours, officer #2 placed the complainant into a holding cell. At 2115 hours, officers transferred the complainant to the county jail facilities.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/22/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: (Continued)

Officer #2 couldn't recall if the complainant requested the use of an interpreter during the detention period at the police station. Officer #2 stated that if the complainant had requested an interpreter, one would have been provided.

Department records showed that an interpreter was provided for the complainant and attended the police station.

There was no video footage available to review for this case or other witnesses.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officers behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was placed under arrest and taken to a police facility. The complainant was not allowed to make a telephone call or use the restroom during the detention.

The named officer stated that the complainant was turned over to him at approximately 1400 hours at the police station. The officer asked the complainant the medical screening questions and placed him on the holding bench. The officer was relieved by another officer at 1415 hours and was off duty.

The named officer couldn't recall if the complainant requested the use the restroom or to make a telephone call during the 15 minutes the complainant was in his custody.

The DPA reviewed department documents that verified the complainant was moved into a holding cell with a restroom facility. The named officers displayed proper conduct in regard to the restroom allegation.

Section 9 Booking Manual (Title 15, Sections 1067, 1068) says in part, "after the booking process is complete, and in no case longer than 3 hours after the arrest, prisoners shall be allowed to make at least 3 completed telephone calls. The station telephone shall be made available for local or collect long-distance calls."

The evidence showed that the complainant was held in a cell with toilet facilities. Also, the named officer was with the complainant for only 15 minutes before custody was handed to another officer.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/22/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: (Continued)

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was not allowed to make a telephone call or use the restroom during the detention.

The named officer stated that he took over the duties and responsibilities of the complainant from another officer. The officer said the complainant was removed from the bench and placed into a holding cell, which included a restroom facility. The officer said that he could not recall the complainant asking to use the telephone.

The DPA reviewed department documents that verified the complainant was moved into a holding cell with a restroom facility. The named officers displayed proper conduct in regard to the restroom allegation.

Section 9 Booking Manual (Title 15, Sections 1067, 1068) says in part, “after the booking process is complete, and in no case longer than 3 hours after the arrest, prisoners shall be allowed to make at least 3 completed telephone calls. The station telephone shall be made available for local or collect long-distance calls.”

The evidence showed that the complainant was held in a cell with toilet facilities. However, the officer and complainant have provided contradictory testimony regarding the phone calls.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer was disrespectful and rude.

The named officer said he was calm and collected. The named officer said the complainant was initially calm but became agitated and belligerent during the arrest. The named officer admitted he was upset with the complainant because she lacked empathy and understanding for the other party with whom she was in a dispute, who had recently returned from the hospital. The named officer stated, however, that he did not let his demeanor interfere with his actions at the scene.

Witness officers stated the named officer was professional and polite with the complainant.

The Body Worn Camera footage shows the complainant was upset and became uncooperative with the officers when they took her into custody. The footage shows that the officer did not speak inappropriately and was professional with the complainant.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used profanity.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer used profanity during the incident.

The named officer said he did not use profanity and that he was calm while dealing with the complainant.

Witness officers stated they responded as backup and met with the complainant before the named officer arrived on scene. The witness officers also stated that there was no profanity used by officers on scene.

The Body Worn Camera footage shows the complainant was upset and uncooperative. The footage also shows that the officers did not use profanity and were professional with the complainant.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 3

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the named officers attacked her. The complainant also said the officers threw her onto a bed at the scene when she was asking them questions.

The named officers said when they told the complainant that she was being arrested for an outstanding warrant, the complainant became uncooperative, twisted in their grasp and pulled away from them several times. The named officers said they pushed and lowered her onto the couch to prevent her from fleeing the scene and to take her into custody. The named officers said the complainant was not injured and that she refused medical aid.

Witness officers arrived on scene and met with the complainant outside the residence while the named officers investigated the incident and spoke with the parties involved. The witness officers stated they left the scene before the complainant was taken into custody by the named officers.

Body Worn Camera footage shows that the named officers attempted to take the complainant into custody after being notified by dispatch that the complainant had an outstanding warrant. The footage also shows the complainant was agitated, uncooperative and physically resisted the officers during handcuffing by twisting and attempting to pull herself free. The footage shows the officers engaged in physical control of the complainant by pushing and guiding her to a couch to prevent her escape and to handcuff her.

No other witnesses to the handcuffing came forward.

The use of force was a reasonable response to the complainant's resistance.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers arrested the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she was attempting to ask questions and the named officers arrested her without cause.

The named officers stated that, after the complainant's name was checked, dispatch and another officer on scene notified them that the complainant had an outstanding warrant. The named officers said they advised the complainant of her outstanding warrant. The named officers also said the complainant was uncooperative, resisted and attempted to flee from them while taking her into custody. The named officers transported to County Jail where she was booked for the warrant and for resisting arrest.

Witness officers said they left the scene before the incident between the complainant and the named officers.

The Body Worn Camera footage shows the complainant was uncooperative and agitated with the officers when she was told that she was under arrest. The footage shows the complainant twisting and pulling away from the officers as they attempted to place handcuffs on her.

No other witnesses came forward.

The officers were polite and professional with the complainant and arrested her pursuant to an arrest warrant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 5

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was inside of his own storage unit when he was unlawfully detained by an officer.

The named officer stated he and other officers were conducting undercover surveillance for stolen goods at a storage facility where the complainant rented a unit. The named officer knew only the first name of the person they were searching for, a general physical description, and that the suspect rented a unit on the second floor. When police arrived, they discovered that the complainant, who shared that same first name with the suspect, was signed into the facility to visit his second-floor unit. Police responded to the second floor and observed him near that storage unit. The named officer stated the complainant was temporarily detained so he could determine if the complainant was in fact the suspect they were looking for. After an investigation, the named officer and his team determined that the complainant was in fact not the suspect for whom they were searching, and the complainant was then released.

A witness officer stated the complainant shared the first name of the suspect they were looking for and he was therefore detained pending an investigation.

Department records indicated that the complainant's first name was the same name as the person who was under investigation for stolen goods, and that he rented a unit on the same floor as the suspect.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was inside of his own storage unit when he was unlawfully detained by an officer.

The named officer stated he was not the officer who detained the complainant.

Witness officers stated the named officer did not detain the complainant.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: (Continued)

Department records indicated that the named officer did not detain the complainant.

The evidence proved that the named officer did not detain the complainant.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer who detained him conducted a search of his person without legal cause.

The named officer stated he detained the complainant but did not believe he searched him.

No independent witnesses were present. The officers were in plain clothes and thus not required to wear body worn cameras for this incident.

There was insufficient information to either prove or disprove the allegation.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer who detained him searched his person without legal justification.

The named officer stated he did not detain the complainant or search him.

Witness officers stated the named officer did not detain the complainant.

No other witnesses were identified.

Department records indicate that the named officer did not detain the complainant.

The evidence proved that the named officer did not search the complainant.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer applied handcuffs without justification.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 3 of 5

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer who detained him unlawfully placed him in handcuffs.

The named officer stated once he detained the complainant, he was placed in handcuffs for officer safety.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer applied handcuffs without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer who detained him unlawfully placed him in handcuffs.

The named officer stated he did not detain the complainant or place him in handcuffs.

Witness officers stated the named officer did not detain the complainant.

No other witnesses were identified.

Department records indicate that the named officer did not detain the complainant.

The evidence proved that the named officer did not place the complainant in handcuffs.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 4 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-10: The officers searched a building without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when he was detained, he was told by an officer that he wanted to search the complainant's storage unit. The complainant stated he was escorted to a location away from his storage unit and was therefore unable to see if anyone conducted a search.

The named officers stated the complainant's storage unit was not searched and denied telling him that it was going to be searched. A named officer stated the complainant may have been told that his storage unit would be put on a hold pending an investigation. Another named officer stated that he was with the complainant when the alleged search of the unit occurred.

Witness officers stated the complainant's storage unit was not searched.

A witness, who worked for the storage facility, stated he remained with the complainant's storage unit while the named officers conducted their investigation. He stated no one searched the storage unit.

Department records do not indicate that the complainant's storage unit was searched.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 5 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11: The officers behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated two officers laughed at him upon his release from detention. The complainant was unable to provide names of the two officers.

Interviews of all officers involved failed to identify any officer who laughed at the complainant.

The identity of the alleged officers could not be established.

There was insufficient information to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/11/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/22/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/21/20.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/21/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers detained suspects without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that officers detained his tenants without justification.

The named officers responded to the residence to perform a welfare check. The officers had received information from dispatch that a neighbor called and reported seeing unfamiliar people entering the apartment in hooded sweatshirts and a moving van out front at nine o'clock at night. The neighbor confirmed to the DPA that she made this call.

The officers arrived on scene and found an open door. The inside of the residence was in disarray. The officers announced their presence, called out the owner's name and entered to begin looking for the owner. The officers quickly located two individuals inside the residence in hooded sweatshirts. The officers then detained the individuals to identify them and contact the owner.

The detention is recorded on body worn camera footage. The officers were polite and professional during the detention.

Department General Order 5.03, Investigative Detentions, subsection I(B) provides, in part: "A police officer may briefly detain a person for questioning or request identification only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person's behavior is related to criminal activity." The named officer properly conducted an investigative detention pursuant to Department General Order 5.03.

The officers had sufficient basis to detain the individuals based on the witnesses' description of the unfamiliar situation, the disarray of the residence, and the time of night.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5: The officers arrested the suspect without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that officer arrested his tenant without cause.

The named officers responded to the residence to perform a welfare check. The officers had received information from dispatch that a neighbor called and reported seeing unfamiliar people entering the apartment in hooded sweatshirts and a moving van out front at nine o'clock at night. The neighbor confirmed to the DPA that she made this call.

The officers arrived on scene and found an open door. The inside of the residence was in disarray. The officers announced their presence, called out the owner's name and entered to begin looking for the owner. The officers quickly located two individuals inside the residence in hooded sweatshirts. The officers then detained the individuals to identify them and contact the owner.

The named officers said they arrested one of the suspects due to multiple active warrants.

Body-worn camera footage shows the named officers identifying the active warrants and arresting the suspect once they learn of the warrants.

An active arrest warrant provides good cause for an arrest. As the discovery of the warrant occurred during the course of a lawful detention, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/02/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-8: The officers searched the suspects without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the police searched his tenants without cause.

The named officers responded to the residence to perform a welfare check. The officers had received information from dispatch that a neighbor called and reported seeing unfamiliar people entering the apartment in hooded sweatshirts and a moving van out front at nine o'clock at night. The neighbor confirmed to the DPA that she made this call.

The officers arrived on scene and found an open door. The inside of the residence was in disarray. The officers announced their presence, called out the owner's name and entered to begin looking for the owner. The officers quickly located two individuals inside the residence in hooded sweatshirts. The officers then detained the individuals to identify them and contact the owner.

Body-worn camera footage shows the named officers conducting quick pat down searches of the suspects after finding them in the apartment.

The unusual circumstances, the time of night, and the enclosed space of the apartment provided sufficient grounds to conduct pat down searches for officer safety.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/16/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers conducted an improper search.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officers searched her residence when her juvenile son was home alone. She stated she shared her residence with her older son who was on probation with a search condition at the time of the search. Her older son was not home when the named officers searched the complainant's residence. She stated a search should not have been conducted when she was not present.

The named officers stated they conducted a search at the complainant's residence because her adult son (the "subject") shared his residence with the complainant. The named officers stated the subject was on probation and subject to a warrantless search of his residence. Named officer #2 stated he and named officer #1, along with an agent from another agency, were willingly allowed entry into the complainant's residence by her juvenile son. The named officers stated they did not know the complainant's son was a juvenile. Named officer #2 also stated he did not recall the complainant's son ask for his mother. The named officers stated they were not aware of any policy requiring a parent to be present when a warrantless probation search of a residence is conducted when the only occupant of the residence is a juvenile.

Court records verified that at the time of the search the subject was on probation with a condition that a peace officer could conduct a warrantless search at his residence.

A home surveillance video provided by the complainant showed the complainant's juvenile son allowing the named officers' entry into the residence.

In light of SFPD having no policy addressing officer procedures and duties when entering a residence occupied by only a juvenile, the Department of Police Accountability finds the conduct involved is the result of a policy failure. The Department of Police Accountability recommends that the Department develop written procedures and documentation requirements to address residential searches when the only present occupant is a minor.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/16/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that he contacted the neighborhood police station multiple times to get help finding a radio frequency device so he could prove that his landlord and neighbors were harassing him.

Search of Department records did not reveal an incident in the time and location described by the complainant.

A poll of officers at the station in the district where the complainant alleged the incident occurred failed to identify any officers involved in an incident as the complainant described.

The complainant's allegations were insufficient to establish a specific incident, and the DPA therefore declines to issue any finding.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/17/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 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 stated she visited a police station to report being assaulted, and the officer she spoke to at the station failed to write an incident report. The complainant gave only a rough estimate of the time in which the incident occurred and declined to take part an interview for more details regarding the incident and her identity. The DPA received mail returned from the complainant's listed address marked undeliverable.

Department records contained no incidents that could be matched with the description given by the complainant.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the complainant stated the incident occurred. The poll failed to reveal the identity of an involved officer.

The complainant's allegations were insufficient to establish a specific incident, and the DPA therefore declines to issue any finding.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/22/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer seized the complainant's property without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that he was in Golden Gate Park when six uniformed police officers approached him and told him to move along. The complainant stated the officers took numerous pieces of property from him.

Search of computer records failed to locate any incident involving a subject by the name provided by the complainant. Identification polls were sent to police stations close to the location indicated by the complainant. The polls failed to identify any involved officers.

The DPA was unable to identify any witnesses.

The complainant's allegations were insufficient to establish a specific incident, and the DPA therefore declines to issue any finding.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer took his property without issuing a property receipt.

Search of computer records failed to locate any incident involving a subject by the name provided by the complainant. Identification polls were sent to police stations close to the location indicated by the complainant. The polls failed to identify any involved officers.

The DPA was unable to identify any witnesses.

The complainant's allegations were insufficient to establish a specific incident, and the DPA therefore declines to issue any finding.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant wrote in a letter that she filed a police report against her mother for assault. She never received a follow-up call about the report. Officers failed to protect the complainant against her mother.

The DPA obtained the incident report referenced by the complainant. The report stated that there was a new deadlock on the door where she lived with her mother. The complainant knocked on the door and her mom answered. The mom "lightly" struck the complainant with a cane. The complainant wanted the incident documented.

The complainant did not return multiple phone calls and letters asking for more information regarding her complaint.

The complainant did not provide additional requested evidence.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/25/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer acted inappropriately and made an inappropriate comment.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when she requested that an officer take action regarding ongoing suspected criminal activity occurring in front of her office building, he exhibited an aggressive demeanor and made an inappropriate comment.

Body Worn Camera (BWC) footage showed the complainant briefly requesting the named officer respond to ongoing possible criminal activity in front of her office building. It further showed that the named officer was in the process of making an arrest of a handcuffed suspect in an unrelated matter and politely explained to the complainant that he would be unable to respond due to his involvement in the arrest.

The officer was not observed acting aggressively toward the complainant nor making an inappropriate comment.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct regarding the interaction and the complainant occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper as the officer was NOT acting aggressively towards the complainant during their interaction as displayed in the BWC footage.

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

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

The complainant stated that the officer failed to take appropriate action after she reported ongoing suspected criminal activity in front of her office building.

Body Worn Camera footage showed that at the time the complainant approached, the named officer was maintaining security over a handcuffed suspect. The complainant requested that the named officer walk to her office building and disperse a crowd. The officer, in a polite and non-threatening manner, informed the complainant that he was occupied with a separate investigation.

SFPD records confirm that the officer was making an arrest of a handcuffed suspect which was unrelated to the complainant's issue and unable to respond to the complainant's *non-urgent* (as classified by the complainant that said conduct occurred on a daily basis in the area) request to deal with suspected ongoing criminal activity.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/25/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer was involved in ongoing police matter that precluded him from responding to the complainant's request.

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: 07/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: 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 parked at a fuel pump at a gas station when he was approached and detained by the named officers. The complainant said the officers detained him because he had paper plates but ignored the bill of sale attached to the windshield of the vehicle. The complainant stated the officers detained him without a just cause.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that they initially detained the complainant because the complainant's vehicle did not have a front license plate.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant's vehicle did not have a front license plate.

California Vehicle Code section 5200 states that failure to display a license plate is a violation.

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

Court documents show that the United States District Court, California reviewed the detention issue. The District Judge found that the officers had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant.

The named officers had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 2 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers made an arrest without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that because the officers detained him without reasonable suspicion, his subsequent arrest was illegal.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that after detaining the complainant, they discovered the complainant had a suspended driver's license and had been cited for driving with a suspended license on three previous occasions. The officers arrested the complainant for the suspended license and seized the complainant's vehicle for a tow as per department policy. The officers conducted an inventory search of the car and found a loaded gun under the driver's seat. The officers completed checks on the complainant and discovered he had a felony record. The officers stated they arrested the complainant for possession of the firearm.

Department records and Body-worn camera footage documented the complainant's suspended license and the discovery of the loaded firearm inside the complainant's vehicle.

California Vehicle Code section 14601 prohibits anyone from driving with the knowledge that his or her license has been suspended.

18 U.S. Code § 922(g) states it is a crime for a convicted felon to possess a firearm or ammunition.

Court documents show that the United States District Court, California reviewed the arrest issue. The records showed that the complainant admitted he has a suspended license. The District Judge found that the officers had probable cause to arrest the complainant.

The officers had reasonable suspicion to detain, and probable cause to arrest the complainant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/26/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/22/20 **PAGE#** 3 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers illegally searched his vehicle. Specifically, the complainant said that the officers did not have reasonable suspicion or probable cause to search his car.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that they conducted a vehicle inventory search of the complainant's vehicle after they arrested the complainant for driving with a suspended license [California Vehicle Code sec. 14601] and seized the car to tow. They explained it was department policy to tow a vehicle if the driver had previous citations for driving on a suspended license.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the officers' accounts. Department record showed that the officers completed the correct Vehicle Inventory documentation.

Department Bulletin 15-115 states, in part, "A vehicle shall be towed when: CLETS/DMV records confirm the driver of the vehicle has been cited at least once for a 14601/12500 CVC related violation in the past."

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

Court documents show that the United States District Court, California reviewed the search issue. The District Judge found that the officers had acted lawfully when they conducted an inventory search of the complainant's vehicle to complete a tow.

The officers complied with department policy when they searched.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 4 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers seized a blue folder that contained his vehicle documents but failed to book the materials into evidence. The complainant said that the officers' failure to preserve these documents impeded his defense in court.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that the folder was not seized and was placed inside the vehicle before the vehicle was towed away.

Department records show that the officers did not seize the complainant's vehicle documents. Body-worn camera footage showed that Officer #1 placed the blue folder inside the complainant's vehicle before the vehicle was towed.

Court documents showed that the issue of the blue folder was raised during the court case. The District Judge found that the allegation of the missing folder had no bearing on the complainant's suspended license or the subsequent search and discovery of the loaded firearm.

The evidence showed that the officers did not seize the folder. The folder was in the complainant's vehicle when it was towed.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 5 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9-10: The officers failed to comply with DGO 10.11, Body Worn Cameras.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers failed to activate their Body-worn cameras before they approached his vehicle. The complainant said that this was against Department General Order 10.11, Body Worn Cameras, and resulted in impeding his defense in court.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that they did activate their body-worn camera footage in compliance with Department General Order 10.11. The officers admitted they did activate the cameras after the initial approach and conversation with the complainant. However, they explained that the incident occurred before the implementation of Department Bulletin 18-256, which placed a requirement for officers to activate the body-worn camera before arrival at a scene.

Body-worn camera footage showed that officers activated their cameras to capture the detention, arrest, search of the complainant's vehicle, and discover of the loaded gun.

Department General Order 10.11 states, in part, "All on-scene members equipped with a BWC shall activate their BWC equipment to record in the following circumstances: 1. Detentions and arrests 2. Consensual encounters where the member suspects that the citizen may have knowledge of criminal activity as a suspect, witness, or victim 9. Conducting any of the following searches on one's person and/or property."

Department Bulletin 18-256 Activation of Body Worn Cameras states, in part, "For self-initiated activity, such as traffic stops, pedestrian stops and other law enforcement activity, including Mental Health Evaluations (interviews and detentions), members shall begin recording prior to approaching the person, vehicle, location." However, Bulletin 18-256 came into effect on December 18, 2018. The incident in question occurred in May 2018.

The evidence showed that officers complied with the department policies in force at the time of the incident.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/26/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/22/20 **PAGE#** 6 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #11-12: The officers knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers only detained and arrested him because of his racial background.

The named officers, in an interview and court documents, stated that they initially approached and detained the complainant for not having a front license plate. They said they arrested the complainant when they discovered he had a suspended license and seized the vehicle for a tow. They stated that when they completed a vehicle inventory, they found a loaded firearm under the driver's seat and further arrest the complainant for firearms offenses. The officers denied any racial bias.

Department records and body-worn camera footage corroborate the officers' accounts.

Court documents showed that the issue of race discrimination was raised during the court case. The court found that the officers lawfully detained and arrested the complainant, and legally searched the complainant's vehicle.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 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: 08/05/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer detained him for no reason when he was eating a pizza and drinking root beer outside a pizzeria.

Department records showed that members of the public called for police service because a suspect was yelling, throwing food, and spitting at passersby. The records indicated that the suspect was yelling that he had a gun and was threatening people with a coke bottle. The documents described the appearance of the suspect and that he was standing next to a red vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage showed that when the officers arrived, the complainant was holding a glass bottle and a slice of pizza, standing next to a red vehicle. The named officer contacted the complainant and asked him to put down his bottle and attempted to detain the complainant. The footage shows that other officers who came on the scene interviewed witnesses who confirmed that the complainant was throwing food, spitting, and threatening to shoot members of the public.

A witness stated that the complainant was screaming and in a verbal altercation with an older male.

The evidence gathered proved that the complainant matched the description of the suspect who was throwing food, spitting, and threatening passersby. The officer has articulable facts that provide reasonable suspicion for the detention.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to provide the required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when the named officer approached, he did not tell him the reasons for detaining him.

Department records indicated that a member of the public called the police because a mentally disturbed person was throwing food at passersby, yelling that he had a gun and was threatening people with a coke bottle. The records also described the appearance of the suspect.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant matched the description of the suspect. The footage also revealed that the complainant kept yelling and screaming at the officers when they arrived. The complainant was very agitated and was not able to provide a coherent story of what happened. The footage also showed that after officers handcuffed the complainant, he asked the officers what he did wrong, and the named officer explained to him why he was being detained.

A witness stated that he was working inside the pizzeria and was not able to see or hear what happened when the officers came.

The evidence collected proved that the named officer had reasonable cause to detain the complainant, and the officer explained to him why he was detained.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/05/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-6: The officers used unnecessary force.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when the named officers approached, named officer #1 grabbed his right hand and pulled him out of his car. The named officers then threw him the ground, broke his right hand, and stepped on his knees. The complainant said that he had bruises all over his body, and his torso was in pain after the incident.

Department records indicated that a member of the public called the police because a mentally disturbed person was throwing food at passersby, yelling that he had a gun and was threatening people with a coke bottle. The records also described the appearance of the suspect. Department records indicated that the complainant refused the named officers' commands and attempted to strike one of the officers with his left leg. Named officer #2 used the department issued hobble to restrain the complainant's leg until the paramedics arrived. The complainant said he was not injured and refused medical attention on the scene.

Body-worn camera footage showed that when the named officers approached, the complainant was standing beside a vehicle. The complainant ignored the officers' command to drop the bottle in his hand. Instead, he reached into the open window of the car. The footage showed that the officers restrained the complainant's arms to prevent him from entering into the vehicle. The complainant actively resisted when the named officers were attempting to handcuff the complainant. The officers then put the complainant on the ground, and the complainant continued to scream and move his body. Named officer #2 then used department issued hobble to strap the complainant's legs down since the complainant was still resisting. The footage showed that an officer asked the complainant if he needed medical services, and the complainant refused. The complainant was able to walk to the patrol car and did not show any on him.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force states that when a subject is actively resisting, meaning that the subject has physically evasive movements to defeat an officer's attempt at control, an officer can use pain compliance control holds, takedowns and techniques to direct movement or immobilize a subject.

A preponderance of the evidence proved that the complainant was actively resisting detention. Therefore, the named officers were justified to use takedowns and techniques such as department-issued hobbles to immobilize the complainant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/07/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/09/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/07/2020.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/07/2020.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer seized money or property without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/07/2020.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/07/2020.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/13/20 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer intentionally damaged property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **UA** **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: 08/12/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer intentionally damaged property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA 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: 08/12/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 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 he was the victim of an assault and the named officer failed to investigate because she did not speak to a witness and because she did not like his character.

Department records document that the named officer began to investigate the case immediately. The records showed that the named officer spoke with and arranged to meet with the complainant, interviewed the suspect and the witness. In addition, she obtained and reviewed video footage of the assault. The named officer documented in her report that the complainant became uncooperative, resulting in the closure of the investigation.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer treated him in an accusatory manner after she discovered that he withheld information regarding his history of alleged child abuse. He stated the victim of the alleged child abuse was the suspect's sibling.

Department records revealed that the named officer documented that the complainant withheld information. She also noted that the complainant became angry and did not understand why the suspect's allegation of child abuse against the complainant was a necessary part of the investigation into the assault. The named officer informed the complainant that, although uncomfortable, it was necessary for her to discuss the information regarding the alleged child abuse because it could provide insight as to the motive for the assault.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he got into a verbal altercation with a woman in a laundromat. When the other party called the police, the named officer came and restrained the complainant without justification by putting handcuffs on him.

Department records indicated that two members of the public called the police, including the manager of the laundromat, because a mentally disturbed person was talking to himself angrily and stabbing his own shoe with an unknown weapon.

The incident report indicated that the complainant matched the description of the subject. As the named officer arrived on the scene and spoke to the complainant, the complainant began to yell and flail his arms in anger. The document also showed that the named officer observed a small screwdriver in his left hand.

Body-worn camera footage showed that upon the named officer's arrival, the complainant went up to the officer hastily, swinging his arms frantically with a screwdriver in his hand. The footage shows the complainant matched the description of the mentally disturbed subject.

The DPA interviewed two witnesses who both confirmed that the complainant was hostile against the owner of the laundromat and was yelling at customers. A witness said the complainant was holding a screwdriver in his hand and was aggressive and screaming at people.

The evidence proved that the complainant matched the description of the mentally disturbed subject and was harassing customers and the owner of the laundromat while carrying a weapon. The named officer had articulable facts that provide reasonable suspicion to detain the subject by restraining him.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 2 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that once the named officer arrived, he did not give the complainant any warning, talk to him or listen to his side of the story.

Department records indicate that the complainant was reported to be holding an unknown weapon stabbing his own shoe with it and was harassing and yelling at people in a laundromat.

The incident report shows that the named officer attempted to have a dialogue with the complainant upon arrival. However, as the officer spoke to him, he began to yell and flail his arms in anger.

Body-worn camera footage shows that when the named officer arrived on the scene, the complainant walked briskly towards the officer with a tool in his hand and immediately started swinging his arms. The officer asked the complainant to stop walking twice. However, it took the complainant a while to comply with the commands. The footage shows that the named officer asked the complainant what the issue was, and the complainant talked over the officer about unrelated matters.

Witness #1 stated that the named officer civilly talked to the complainant and asked the complainant to relax and sit down. Witness #2 said that the officer attempted to calm the complainant down to de-escalate the situation and asked if he could help the complainant.

The evidence gathered proved that the named officer did attempt to speak with the complainant upon arrival and ask him what happened. However, the complainant was erratic and did not listen to the officer.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 3 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer beat the complainant to the ground and restrained him by handcuffs. The complainant stated that he had a hard time breathing. The complainant also provided photos of injuries, including a bite mark on his shoulder bite, a burn mark on his torso, and substantial cuts on his head and legs.

Department records indicated that the named officer attempted to talk with the complainant. However, the complainant began to yell and flail his arms with a small screwdriver in his hand. The officer ordered the complainant to drop his screwdriver, and the complainant complied. The officer asked the complainant to sit down on the sidewalk. The complainant refused and took a fighting stance and balled his fists close to his face. The officer then grabbed the complainant's hands as self-defense. The record documented that the complainant continued to resist. The officer grabbed the complainant's upper body and used his body weight and took him to the pavement using a department-issued armbar takedown. The complainant continued to resist actively. The reporting party and another unknown citizen then assisted the officer to restrain the complainant. The records showed that the named officer used a physical control hold to take down the complainant to effect a lawful detention, to overcome resistance, in defense of other or self-defense, and to gain compliance with a lawful order.

Body-worn camera footage confirmed that the complainant was holding a small screwdriver when he approached the named officer. It showed that the officer commanded the complainant to drop the screwdriver, and the complainant did. The officer then asked the complainant to sit down on the sidewalk, which the complainant first complied, but then he turned around, agitated, and started yelling and swinging his arms at the named officer. The footage then captured the officer's attempt to restrain the complainant. The footage showed that two citizens assisted the officer in holding down the complainant's legs because he was actively resisting when the officer was attempting to place handcuffs on him. More police officers came on the scene and assisted in the handcuffing. Video footage of the complainant after his detention clearly showed that he did not have any cuts, bite marks, or burns that matched the photographs he provided.

Witness #1 stated that when the named officer asked the complainant to relax and sit down, the complainant became irritated, violent, and attacked the officer. He said he then intervened because the complainant was a much taller person. The three of them wrestled on the ground, attempting to contain the complainant because the complainant was trying to fight the named officer. Witness #2 stated that the complainant struck the officer and pushed him while he still had the screwdriver with him. The officer

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/19/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: (Continued)

The started going down with the complainant attacking him from above, and that was when witness #1 went up and assisted by grabbing the complainant's legs. He said the complainant then fell on the ground and the named officer to handcuff him.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force states that when a subject is actively resisting, an officer could use personal body weapons to gain an advantage over the subject or use pain compliance control holds, takedowns, and techniques to direct movement or immobilize a subject.

The evidence proved the complainant was carrying a weapon and was acting erratically. The complainant actively resisted the named officer, who was justified to use personal body weapons and control holds to take down and immobilize the complainant. Video footage showed that the injuries the complainant said he sustained during the incident were not a result of police use of force as the complainant alleged.

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

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/20/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was riding his bicycle naked at the SF Sunday Streets event. The named officer issued the complainant a citation for public nudity without cause. The complainant stated he had the right to be naked outside of the permitted nudity zone.

BWC footage showed the named officer detained the complainant outside of the permitted nudity zone. The complainant refused to cover his exposed genitals and anal region. The complainant was naked in violation of the law and issued a citation for public nudity.

Section 154 Municipal Police Code says that a person may not expose his or her genitals or anal region on a public street, sidewalk, street median, or public right-of-way.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was tackled to the ground by the police without cause.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant throw a bicycle at a police vehicle. The complainant then walked backward in the middle of the street and yelled profanities at the officers. The named officers advised the complainant he was under arrest and to comply with their orders. The complainant refused to obey the officer's commands, continued backward and lost his balance, at which time the officers placed the complainant on the ground. The complainant actively resisted the officers' attempt to handcuff him.

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force III A states, in part, "Officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances: 1. To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search. 2. To overcome resistance or to prevent escape."

Department General Order 5.01 Use of Force VI B states, in part, "Physical controls, such as control holds, takedowns, strikes with personal body weapons, and other weaponless techniques are designed to gain compliance of and/or control over uncooperative or resistant subjects."

The complainant had actively resisted the officers, and the officers utilized reasonable low-level force techniques.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his limousine overheated, so he parked his unauthorized vehicle at the authorized limousine area in the San Francisco International Airport (SFO) to cool down. He said he then left the zone approximately 10 minutes later and was pulled over and detained by the named officers. The complainant said he told officers he was not driving a licensed limousine. He alleged that the named officers detained him for no reason because they did not have probable cause to stop him.

Named officer #1 stated that they were conducting passing calls in the area and observed the complainant's vehicle parked at the limousine stand without any authorized limousine number or SFO permit. As she walked up to the car, the complainant sped off at high speed. She then radioed named officer #2, who was in a patrol vehicle to stop the complainant. Officer #1 stated that, on investigation, the complainant's limousine license expired eight years ago.

Named officer #2, who was driving the patrol vehicle, confirmed that he also observed the complainant's car parked at the limo stand without a permit. He saw that the complainant sped off as named officer #1 approached him, and so he followed and pulled over the vehicle. He stated he detained the complainant for the parking violation SFIA 4.6 - *Improper Use of a Color Curb Zone*. Officer #2 also provided photos of the stand where the incident happened, and it shows a sign that reads, "No stopping except authorized limousines."

Named officer #3 said he responded to the scene as a back up when named officer #1 and #2 detained the complainant. He stated that the complainant's vehicle is not a licensed limousine and is not allowed to park in the area.

Department records indicate that named officer #1 and #2 detained the complainant at the location. The documents show that the description of the vehicle matched the complainant's limousine. Photos of the limousine zone show a sign that reads, "No stopping except authorized limousines" and a yellow curb right next to the sign.

San Francisco International Airport 4.6 Curb Marking (B) Yellow Zone states, "As authorized by the Director, only limousines, including those commercially-chartered sport utility vehicles of standard or extended length, or Airport-approved vans equipped with aftermarket accessories to provide luxury

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: Continued)

appointments similar to those found in luxury limousines operating with valid Airport limousine decals, are allowed to use the yellow zones posted for limousine parking on an active loading basis only."

Department General Order 5.01 Investigative Detentions, Section I B states, in part, "A police officer may briefly detain a person for questioning or request identification only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person's behavior is related to criminal activity."

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the complainant did stop his unauthorized limousine at the authorized limousine zone at the airport. The officer had reasonable suspicion for the detention.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer engaged in retaliatory behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he is not complaining about the citations, but that named officer #1 retaliated against him by stopping him and issuing him a citation because he had filed a complaint against the officer before. He said that officer recognized him and issued the citation in retaliation.

The named officer stated her reason for stopped and detained the complainant was that he parked illegally in a licensed limousine zone. She said she also noticed that the complainant's vehicle did not display a CA license plate, which is a violation of California Vehicle Code (CVC) 5200. Therefore, she issued the complainant a citation in addition to the SFIA 4.6 violation. She denied that the vehicle stop was retaliation because the complainant had no permits and is a known illegal limo operator whose vehicle has been recorded on SFO's license plate reader 2848 times. She believed that the complaint wants them to avoid making contact with him as he continues to conduct illegal activities in SFO.

Witness officer #1 stated that the complainant had committed more than one violation and confirmed that the named officer issued a citation to the complainant for not having a front license plate. He added that he knew the complainant before this incident and said that the complainant is one of the known illegal limo drivers or solicitors at the airport.

Witness officer #2 state that he had previously detained and issued the complainant a citation for parking

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/23/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: (Continued)

his limousine at an authorized limousine zone.

Department records indicate that the named officer issued the complainant a citation for violating CVC 5200 after witness officer #2 issued him a citation on SFIA 4.6.

California Vehicle Code 5200(a) states, "when two license plates are issued by the department for use upon a vehicle, they shall be attached to the vehicle for which they were issued, one in the front and the other in the rear."

Department General Order 2.01 General Rules of Conduct Rule 1 states, "The basic mission of the San Francisco Police Department and its officers is to protect life and property, preserve the peace, prevent crime, enforce criminal laws and ordinances, and regulate non-criminal conduct as provided by law. While on duty, officers shall devote their entire time to the achievement of this mission within the context of their respective assignments."

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the complainant parked in an authorized limousine zone did not have a front license plate on his vehicle and was therefore stopped and cited by named officer. In doing so, the officer was enforcing criminal laws and ordinances as per the primary mission of the Department. There's no evidence linking the stopping, citation with previous incidents or complaints against named officer.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/25/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/21/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that a police vehicle parked in the street next to his, preventing him from moving his car. The complainant stated the officers returned after thirty minutes without apologizing, and that their vehicle would not start. The complainant stated the officers could have been more polite and not arrogant.

The named officers were responding to a possible burglary call. The officers double parked nearby and spent approximately 30 minutes investigating the incident. When the officers returned, their vehicle's battery was dead, and the officers had to wait approximately 20 more minutes for a service vehicle to arrive. One of the named officers stated that he attempted to contact the complainant to apologize for the delay, but the complainant ignored him, remaining in his vehicle on his cell phone with the windows rolled up.

The officers were engaged in an emergency, responding to a high priority call. Given the nature of the call, it was reasonable to double-park their vehicle. That their vehicle battery died was beyond their control. Although waiting for approximately fifty minutes is an inconvenience, the officers were not required to apologize, and the actions alleged by the complainant, even if true, do not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was stopped by SFPD Officer(s) and warned for a broken brake light. The complainant opined that his African American race was the only reason he was stopped.

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

No department records were found related to the traffic stop described by the complainant.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/09/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he walked past an area every day and saw people openly dealing drugs. He said he saw a male holding a bag of what the complainant believed was drugs and so he called the police. Three days later, he saw multiple males selling drugs at the location, so he called the police a second time. The complainant admitted that he did not see any money exchange for both incidents. He stated the police failed to contact him and did not do anything regarding the drug dealing activities.

Named officer #1 stated he responded to the complainant's first phone call. The officer said he could only observe a large crowd of individuals standing on the sidewalk. The complainant did not attempt to approach or identify himself to the officer, and no witnesses presented themselves. Officer #1 said that during the call, the complainant told Dispatch that he did not want to meet the officers. Therefore, Officer #1 did not contact the complainant.

Named officers #2 and 3 stated they responded to the complainant's second call, and the complainant was not there when they arrived. They said that no one was present matching the description of the suspects. The complainant had not requested with Dispatch to be contacted and was only available by telephone. The officers said they searched the area to try and identify the described suspect but could not find them.

Department records indicate that the call the complainant made shows that named officer #1 arrived on the scene and noted that there was a crowd gathering at the location. The records also indicate that the complainant did not want to be interviewed by any officers. Department records of the second police report confirmed that both named officers #2 and #3 arrived at the location after the complainant called and also confirmed that the complainant told Dispatch that he only wanted to be contacted over the phone. Both documents did not show witnesses other than the complainant.

A preponderance of the evidence proved that the named officers did respond to the location of the potential drug dealing activities after the calls. However, they could not locate the suspects described. The complainant was not on the scene to provide further information both times and did not request to be contacted for interviews. The evidence shows that the named officers did take the required action to investigate the call for service with the limited information they had.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/16/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated as she walked down the street, she passed a scene where the named officers were ordering subjects to exit their vehicle. She stated the officers pointed their weapons at her.

The named officers stated they were involved in a felony car stop and were ordering subjects to exit the vehicle. They stated they had their weapons out but they never pointed their weapons at anyone, including the subjects.

The incident involved juveniles and a court order was required to obtain copies of police documents, including body-worn camera. DPA investigations are subject to three separate deadlines, one of which has already passed. Due to the current court closures and shelter in place orders, DPA does not anticipate receiving the requested records before the next pertinent deadlines. Additionally, due to the Court's extraordinary delay in considering DPA's motion for records, there was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation made in the complaint.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was the victim of a hit-and-run. He stated that the responding officers failed to obtain surveillance footage from cameras at the intersection and failed to follow up with him at the hospital.

Named Officer #1 stated that he and Named Officer #2 responded to a call for service regarding a hit-and-run. While on scene, Named Officer #1 obtained statements from two witnesses and canvassed the area for surveillance cameras with negative results. Named Officer #2 interviewed the complainant while Named Officer #1 spoke to witnesses and canvassed for cameras. They followed the ambulance transporting the complainant to the hospital, and Named Officer #2 continued her interview with the complainant at the hospital.

Named Officer #2 stated that she interviewed the complainant on scene while Named Officer #1 interviewed witnesses and looked for cameras. She could not recall if she continued her interview with the complainant while at the hospital but remembered standing by while medical professionals provided care.

The DPA obtained the named officers' body-worn camera footage. The footage shows Named Officer #1 speaking with witnesses on scene while Named Officer #2 interviewed the complainant. The footage also shows Named Officer #1 walking around the area looking for cameras. The DPA was unable to locate body-worn camera footage of the officers at the hospital.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) records indicate that the named officers documented their investigative steps and notified hit-and-run investigators in a timely manner. Records indicate that the named officers responded to the hospital.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/26/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to prepare an incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that no incident report was generated regarding the incident.

The DPA obtained a copy of the incident report.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers failed to provide him with a case number.

Named Officer #1 stated that Named Officer #2 was the contact officer during this incident and would have been the one to provide the complainant with the case number. Named Officer #1 believed that Name Officer #2 most likely provided the complainant with the case number since she called dispatch to obtain the number while at the hospital.

Named Officer #2 confirmed that she requested the case number from dispatch while she was at the hospital. She stated that it is her policy and practice to provide victims at the hospital with the case number and follow-up form by handing the forms to the victim, if lucid, or placing the forms inside the bag with the victim's belongings. She believed she provided the forms to the complainant based on her policy and practice but had no independent recollection.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/07/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she was being trafficked by a known male from Mexico to San Francisco 6 years ago, and the man forced her into prostitution. The complainant provided two dates that she filed incident reports documenting the trafficking crime with the named officers. The complainant said the officers did not do anything to arrest the human trafficker.

Department records and body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant did file incident reports, five years apart, on the dates described to the named officers. However, the complainant did not report being trafficked. In both instances, the complainant was assaulted by a person who was unknown to the complainant.

There are no records of the complainant making a complaint of trafficking to the department.

The complainant has not responded to requests for communication.

The complainant has failed to provide further information.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/05/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/20/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer coerced her into making a false statement regarding a domestic violence incident.

The BWC footage contradicted the complainant's statement. The complainant voluntarily provided a statement. The named officer acted professionally.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) records indicated that the named officer followed the protocol for investigating domestic violence incidents.

The complainant filed her complaint online. DPA made several attempts to obtain a recorded statement from the complainant, but the complainant was unresponsive to those requests.

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that her domestic violence case was not investigated properly. She stated the incident report included irrelevant information and nothing was done after she tried to recant her statement.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) records indicated that the named officer thoroughly investigated the case and prepared a detailed chronology of his investigative steps. The named officer also worked with the department's subject matter expert and at the completion the investigation the case was forwarded to the District Attorney's Office.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/10/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer was unprofessional on the phone when he hung up on the complainant and continually refused to pick the phone up when the complainant attempted to call back. In addition, the complainant stated the named officer placed him on hold and left him there.

An ID poll submitted to the Department indicated that the named officer did not remember any contact with the complainant.

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the name officer refused to provide his name and badge number upon request.

An ID poll submitted to the Department identified the named officer. The named officer did not remember any contact with the complainant.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/07/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/21/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in a written complaint that she was leaving the SF Main Library with her son when she saw an officer place his hand on his gun and another officer look at her bags. The complainant stated further that when she was out of the library on a different occasion, an officer approached her at a trash bin, and asked her what she was looking for. The complainant stated the officer's actions were harassing, and she was concerned the officer may have tried to plant evidence. The complainant stated this was an example of her many sightings of officers in numerous different locations that illustrate police harassment and intimidation of her and her son. The complainant did not respond to numerous requests for an interview to obtain information on dates and times marking the alleged harassment.

The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: This complaint raised matters outside DPA jurisdiction.

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

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Investigative Services Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite #300
San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/20/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that a security officer didn't allow her to enter a homeless shelter through the disability door and forced her to enter via the main entrance. The complainant was upset and called SFPD to resolve the issue. The complainant stated that the named officer failed to investigate and resolve the situation correctly. However, the complainant did state that the officer assisted her in entering the shelter through the main entrance.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer conducted an investigation with the security staff and supervisor. The shelter staff advised the officer that the complainant had to obtain a physician's note to use the special entrance. The officer explained the policy to the complainant. The complainant stated she understood the policy and advised the named officer she would obtain the physician's note. The footage showed the officer helped the complainant enter the shelter's main entrance.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/23/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/29/20 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer detained him for littering, which led to his subsequent arrest for an outstanding warrant. The complainant alleged that the named officers seized his property worth over \$1,000, but the officers failed to properly process the property and many items were missing upon its return.

The named officers stated that they were unaware of the value of the complainant's property, which included clothing, toiletries, and bulky items. The named officers also stated that the items were not seized, but rather "bagged and tagged" pursuant to Department protocol for processing homeless property in cooperation with the Department of Public Works (DPW). The complainant was then provided with a property receipt to retrieve his belongings.

Department Bulletin 18-089 directs officers to contact the DPW if officers arrest an individual in possession of an impractical amount of personal property. The DPW will respond and assess the material for health and safety risks, take charge of the property, and tag the items to log the property. This property will then be stored at the DPW Maintenance Yard.

Department records for this incident indicate that the complainant's property was inventoried and consisted of miscellaneous clothing, bedding, medical supplies, and toiletries. The DPW Bag and Tag Log shows that the complainant's property was transferred to DPW on the same day the complainant was arrested. The complainant then picked up his property from DPW Works three days later.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/23/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/29/20 **PAGE# 2 of 2**
SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers engaged in biased policing.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was detained because the named officers were biased against his race or gender affiliation.

The named officers stated that they did not know the race, ethnicity, color, national origin, gender, age, sexual orientation, or gender identity of the complainant prior to the detention and those characteristics were not a factor in his detention.

The complainant did not respond to requests for additional information.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/28/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he had been human trafficked, abused, tortured, and assaulted outside of San Francisco. He stated almost a year later the attacks resumed in San Francisco. He stated that he has tried to file a report for the past 18 months about the attacks, but officers refuse to take his report. The most recent attempt to file a criminal complaint was with a sergeant who was entering a district station. The sergeant laughed and no one took his complaint.

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

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/26/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/17/20 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove a city vehicle in a negligent manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/15/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/20/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers made an arrest without cause

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that one of the named officers claimed his vehicle had struck the complainant's garage door and asked the complainant to come outside of his residence to exchange information. The complainant complied and the named officers arrested him without cause.

The named officers stated that the complainant was identified as a suspect in a felony threats case. The named officers responded to the complainant's residence in order to apprehend him as an outstanding suspect. The named officers stated that a ruse was utilized during this incident in order to safely arrest the complainant outside of his residence as the complainant had a history of being violent and unstable at times. The complainant came outside of his residence and the officers identified themselves. The complainant was detained, placed in handcuffs, and with supervisory approval, was arrested for two violations.

Department records revealed a call for threats and harassment. Department records further revealed a report related to threatening and harassing phone calls in which the victim identified the complainant as the suspect who made the calls. Department records showed that the victim made a recording of one of the phone calls which included threatening remarks. Department records also documented that the victim stated that she was fearful for her well-being after receiving the phone call from the complainant. Additionally, records showed that the named officers responded to the complainant's residence in plainclothes in order to apprehend him as the outstanding suspect. The named officers arrested the complainant for two violations after receiving approval from a supervisor. Department records also revealed that the complainant went through a jury trial for a felony violation related to this incident and a guilty verdict was rendered.

Body-worn camera footage related to this incident documented the audio recording made by the victim and revealed violent threatening remarks made by the suspect to the victim.

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: 12/20/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-8: The officers behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers behaved in a manner unbecoming an officer and exhibited “nonprocedural” behavior when arresting him outside his residence.

The named officers denied that they behaved in an unbecoming manner. They stated that they were polite and professional with the complainant throughout the incident. Additionally, the named officers stated that they utilized a ruse during this incident because the complainant had been known to be unpredictable and had been involved in violent interactions with officers in the past. They stated a ruse was utilized to safely arrest the complainant outside of his residence and that it provided a tactical advantage. One of the named officers also stated that the use of a ruse is discussed in academy training and that it is a common technique law enforcement officers use in order to maintain safety when making contact with wanted subjects that are unstable.

Because the named officers were working in a plain clothes capacity, there was no body-worn camera footage available.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 12/31/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated an officer at SFO racially profiled him. The complainant did not provide any details regarding the contact and did not respond to the DPA's request for an interview.

The complainant did not provide sufficient evidence of any particular contact and the DPA could not reasonably identify any officer.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/02/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer engaged in retaliatory behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CU **FINDING:** PC **DEPT. ACTION:** N/A

FINDINGS OF FACT:

The complainant stated she was ejected from a restaurant for no reason and her money was not refunded. She tried to make a report to police, but the named officer was rude and ignored her. The complainant shouted at the officer and called him a sociopath. The complainant stated that the named officer arrested the complainant in retaliation for this comment.

The named officer stated that he interacted with the complainant who was belligerent, uncooperative, and was generally exhibiting signs of intoxication. The officer stated that he tried to deescalate the situation by calmly informing her that restaurants have the right to ask people to leave the premises. The officer stated that when the complainant continued to scream abuse, he arrested her because he determined that she was too intoxicated to care for herself.

A witness officer stated that the complainant smelled of alcohol and was physically aggressive. He stated that her angry and insulting conduct was so troubling that it seemed she was not in appropriate mental or physical state to care for herself due to her inebriation.

Department records indicated that the complainant was arrested for being intoxicated in public in violation of section 647(F) of the penal code.

Body worn camera footage shows the complainant screaming at officers in a hostile and abusive manner as they transport her.

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: 01/10/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that as he was exiting his parked vehicle the named officer stopped him and told him that he was being stopped for driving a vehicle that resembles a police vehicle. The named officer also informed the complainant that he observed the complainant driving the same vehicle the day prior but was unable to complete a traffic stop at that time due to traffic in the area and because the complainant ran from him. The complainant stated that the named officer came to work thinking of him and with the intention of stopping him, since the named officer failed to conduct the stop the day prior. The complainant stated that the named officer was harassing him.

The named officer stated he was on patrol when he encountered the complainant and conducted a traffic stop. The named officer stated he stopped the complainant because he was driving a vehicle that was in violation of the California Vehicle Code. The named officer stated he informed the complainant that he saw him driving the day prior but due to heavy traffic he could not make a u-turn and stop him. The named officer stated the complainant told him he was unlicensed which he confirmed via DMV. The named officer issued the complainant a citation for driving on a suspended license and for operating a vehicle that resembles a traffic officer's vehicle. The named officer denied that he had harassed the complainant or that it was his intention to wait for and then stop the complainant after not being able to stop him the prior day.

Department records showed that the named officer was on patrol when he observed the complainant operating a vehicle that resembles a police vehicle. Department records showed that the named officer stopped the complainant and issued him a citation for two violations of the California Vehicle Code. Department records also noted that that the named officer had seen the same vehicle and what appeared to be the same person operating the vehicle the day prior, but due to heavy traffic conditions he was unable to conduct an enforcement stop.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer tell the complainant that the paint on his vehicle wasn't legal as it resembled a police vehicle. The named officer asked the complainant for his license and the complainant informed the named officer that he did not have one. The footage also showed the named officer tell the complainant that he saw him the prior day but due to heavy traffic he couldn't make a u-turn and stop him for the violation. Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer issued the complainant a citation. The evidence proved that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/28/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he had been human trafficked, abused, tortured, and assaulted outside of San Francisco. He stated almost a year later the attacks resumed in San Francisco. He stated that he has tried to file a report for the past 18 months about the attacks, but officers refuse to take his report. The most recent attempt to file a criminal complaint was with a sergeant who was entering a district station. The sergeant laughed and no one took his complaint.

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

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 01/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer detained him without cause.

Department of Emergency Management (DEM) records indicated that officers were dispatched to the scene following a call to police regarding a man grilling in the street behind his parked van and throwing garbage in a nearby yard.

Body Worn Cameras (BWC) worn by the responding officers captured the entire six-minute interaction between officers and the complainant. The named officer explained that SFPD received a call that he was cooking and littering. The complainant immediately became agitated and yelled accusations at officers before telling them he was going to leave. The named officer informed the complainant he was not detained and free to go. The complainant got in his van and left the scene.

The named officer did not ask for the complainant's identification card, run a warrants check, handcuff the complainant, or take any other action that would reasonably lead someone to believe they were not free to leave.

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer threatened him by suggesting he may need to be taken to the hospital for a psychiatric evaluation.

The named officer's BWC footage showed that the complainant immediately became agitated and launched into a barrage of bizarre accusations against the named officer after the officer told him why they were called to the scene. The officer asked orientation questions to ascertain mental status. The complainant appropriately answered the questions.

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: 01/30/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 PAGE# 2 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer made false accusations.

The named officer's BWC footage showed him explain why SFPD had been called to the scene in a calm and professional manner. At no time did the officer accuse the complainant of committing a crime.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 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 the named officer stopped by his residence in an attempt to make contact with him. The named officer left his business card and advised the front desk clerk to ask the complainant to call him. The complainant called and left numerous messages for the named officer who did not return his calls.

The named officer stated that he went to the complainant's residence to speak to him about emails he sent to an SFPD officer. The front desk clerk called the complainant, but there was no answer. The named officer left his business card with the front desk clerk with instructions to ask the complainant to call him. The named officer provided specific dates and times when the complainant left messages at his office. He also provided specific dates and times when he attempted to call the complainant with negative results. The named officer eventually established contact with the complainant via email and closed the investigation.

The DPA obtained a copy of the incident report related to this incident. The incident report indicated that the complainant sent several unsolicited and concerning emails to an SFPD officer, and the investigation was assigned to the named officer.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint did not occur or that the named officer was not involved in the act alleged.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/12/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/17/20 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: Failure to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and a representative of Tenderloin Station, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/15/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/14/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove a city vehicle in a reckless manner.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he observed a police cruiser with sirens activated, going about 55-70 miles per hour southbound on Market Street. He felt the officer exposed the public to great danger by driving recklessly.

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

The identity of the alleged officer could not established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/14/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he observed a bicyclist run a red light in front of him and an officer and the officer did nothing. The complainant approached the officer and asked why he did not enforce the law and the officer told the complainant that he was there to direct traffic through the intersection. The complainant did not get the name or star number of the officer.

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.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/14/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/24/20 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/17/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/2020 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers failed to take required actions.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant submitted an online complaint form in which he stated that he was experiencing painful emotions, severe disappointment, mental harm, and severe disappointment from unfair treatment related to an incident at a fast-food restaurant. However, the complainant did not provide details of the event or articulate any allegation against police officers' actions.

Department records showed that the named officers attended an altercation at the fast-food restaurant. The documents stated that no parties involved wanted police to take any action. The involved people were restaurant staff and a customer. The individuals' details were not included in the documents.

The DPA has attempted to contact the complainant multiple times without success.

The complainant's online form is unclear about who he is making a complaint. No finding is made as the complainant has failed to participate in the investigation and failed to reply to requests for additional evidence to clarify any allegations against police officers.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/18/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to handle an assigned radio call.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she reported a crime to 911 and police didn't do anything.

The complainant did not respond to repeated requests for additional information.

The identity of the officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 2/19/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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 he saw two officers interacting with a homeless individual. He stopped about five feet away and began observing the interaction because he was unsure whether the officers' actions were appropriate. After the situation was resolved, the named officer asked the complainant, "Did you enjoy the show?" The complainant asked the named officer if he had done anything wrong. The complainant stated that the named officer then intentionally bumped into him and told him, "No, you're just lame."

Body-worn camera footage shows two officers interacting with a homeless individual, with the complainant arriving and briefly observing. As the situation is resolved, the named officer neither touches the complainant nor calls him lame.

The evidence proved that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/19/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, a transgendered woman, stated that she was arrested without cause and that being in jail is exposing her to gang members. The complainant stated that she is despondent about her situation. The complainant provided no identifying information about either her arrest or the officers involved in this incident.

A search of department records yielded no information about the complainant or her arrest.

The complainant did not respond to multiple attempts to contact her for further information.

The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/26/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/17/20 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 a representative of Tenderloin Station, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/15/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

\DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/26/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his car was stolen. He went to a local police station where an employee at the desk was able to locate the vehicle. The complainant later found his vehicle where thieves had left it, damaged and with valuables gone. A nearby security guard informed the complainant that two police officers had been examining the car. The next day, he returned to the station to file a report regarding the incident, the officer assisting him did not file a report because she stated that she first needed to speak with the two officers who examined the car. This officer never followed up with the complainant. The complainant was unable to identify the officer.

An identification poll sent to the district station was returned with negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he subsequently called the station to follow up on the incident report, but an officer instructed him that he would have to physically return to the station to complete the report. The complainant informed the officer that he was from out of town and was unable to return to the station. The officer responded, "Everything is possible," and abruptly hung up on him.

An officer identification poll was returned with negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/26/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that police arrived at his residence and wanted to speak with him. After speaking with officers, the complainant requested a CAD number. The named officer did not provide the requested number.

The named officer initially did not recall the complainant requesting a CAD number, but upon reviewing his body worn camera footage he saw that the complainant did request one. The named officer did not recall whether or not he actually provided the number.

Body-worn camera footage from the incident shows the complainant requesting a CAD number from the named officer. The request occurs at the end of the encounter, and the footage ends before the officer responds to it.

Department records reveal officers were conducting a civil standby for adult protective services while they contacted complainant. There is no Department policy mandating that officers provide CAD number under the circumstances in this incident.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/27/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/17/20 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer engaged in biased policing due to race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/17/20.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/17/20.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer arrested the complainant without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/17/20.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer prepared an inaccurate incident report.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 04/17/20.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/04/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 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 SFPD officers failed to respond to the scene when vehicles were performing automotive stunts (“sideshow”) in an intersection near his home.

Department records showed a high volume of calls to dispatch to report an illegal sideshow. Callers reported a large crowd gathered, vehicles doing donuts, drifting, and blocking the intersection. Department records showed that numerous police units responded to the incident and surrounded the area. Department records also reflected that a sergeant responded to the area and directed units to observe, not go into the crowd, and to provide any license plate numbers they were able to identify. Department records also reflected that officers assisted with traffic flow during the incident.

Body-worn camera footage showed a large crowd and a vehicle doing donuts, officers at the scene of the incident, and one of the responding officers directing the crowd to disperse through his vehicle radio.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/04/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/24/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: IO-1/Port of San Francisco DEPT. ACTION:

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

Port of San Francisco – Maritime Division
Pier 1, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/03/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/22/20 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: 02/28/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/22/20 **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 stated that an officer told her that he was holding her hostage and laughed at her.

Department records showed that the complainant was detained, transported to a station for identification purposes, and later cited.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant interacted with multiple officers. Body-worn camera footage did not reveal the alleged behavior.

The complainant did not provide any identifying information for the alleged officer or any additional evidence related to the alleged behavior. The complainant could not be contacted for further information or clarification as she did not provide any contact information for herself. The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/09/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 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: 03/09/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she visited a district station to file a report. After she completed a written account of the incident, she requested a CAD number from the named officer, but he refused to provide it. Additionally, the complainant stated that she accidentally wrote the incorrect date on her written statement, told the officer it was incorrect, but the officer purposely failed to correct it.

The named officer stated that he was not on duty and that he did not interact with the complainant on the date in question.

Department records confirm that the named officer was not on duty when the complainant visited the district station. The evidence proved that the accused officer was not involved.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to provide required information.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she visited a district station to file a report. After she completed a written account of the incident, she requested a CAD number from the named officer, but he refused to provide it. Additionally, the complainant stated that she accidentally wrote the incorrect date on her written statement, told the officer it was incorrect, but the officer purposely failed to correct it.

The named officer confirmed that the complainant came to the station and wanted to file a report, and he assisted her in doing so. He stated that he provided the complainant with the case number but did not provide her with a CAD number because she did not request one. He stated that CAD numbers are usually only provided upon request. He further stated that he has no knowledge as to whether the date the complainant wrote in her statement was correct, and he is unable to make changes to someone's written statement.

Department records indicate that the named officer assisted the complainant in filing her written report at the district station.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/11/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/14/20 **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 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: 03/16/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 04/13/20 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **IO-1/SF Rec. & Parks** **DEPT. ACTION:**

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

San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department
SF Park Patrol Rangers
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/18/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/23/20 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, a student, stated that officers were using amplified sound to instruct the public to shelter in place. The complainant stated that the continuous noise was disruptive to his studies and that the officers should have found a less intrusive method to inform the public.

An officer identification poll sent to the district station yielded negative results. The poll was returned with a comment stating that, pursuant to the City and County’s public health order requiring residents to shelter in place, “The district station’s officers and officers from outside units were directed to give admonishments educating people about the order with an emphasis on high traffic areas where large crowds gather.” The commanding officer was therefore unable to identify the officers involved.

While the identity of the alleged officers could not be established, the method alleged was reasonable and appropriate under the circumstances.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/19/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: **FINDING:** **IO-1/SF Rec. & Parks DEPT. ACTION:**

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

San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department
SF Park Patrol Rangers
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/19/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: FINDING: IO-1/SF Rec. & Parks DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department
SF Park Patrol Rangers
501 Stanyan Street
San Francisco, CA 94117

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer retired and is no longer subject to Department discipline.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer's discourteous behavior or statements were related to ethnicity or race.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The officer retired and is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 3/31/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 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: 04/03/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: f04/13/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/03/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/13/20 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:

Killeen Police Department – Internal Affairs Unit
3304 Community Boulevard
Killeen, TX 76541

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/08/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/17/20 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:

Arlington Police Department Internal Affairs
620 W. Division Street
Arlington, TX, 76011

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/10/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer behaved inappropriately.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that her complaint was against a security guard and not a SFPD officer. The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/13/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/14/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

Grocery Outlet
Corporate Office
5650 Hollis Street
Emeryville, CA 94608

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/16/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 04/17/20 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

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

Long Beach Police Department Headquarters
400 W. Broadway
Long Beach, CA 90802