

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/10/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/13/19    **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:

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 01/28/18 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/24/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5:** The officers behaved inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 02/19/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/19/19      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer pat searched a person without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated during a traffic stop the named officer removed him from the front passenger seat and conducted an illegal pat search.

The named officer stated he responded as a backup officer to a traffic stop in which a loaded firearm was found under the driver's seat. He stated when he arrived on the scene the complainant was in front seat passenger in proximity to the loaded firearm. The named officer stated he conducted a pat search on the complainant for officer safety because he did not know if the complainant had a firearm.

Body Worn Camera footage of the traffic stop showed officers removing the driver from the vehicle and finding the firearm. The footage also showed that when firearm was found the named officer grabbed the complainant by the arm as the complainant was exiting the vehicle and stated, "Nobody reach, nobody reach." The officer then asked the complainant if he had any weapons on his person and the complainant responded that he had a knife and a short time later when asked again if he had any weapons the complainant stated possibly sarcastically, "I got an Uzi in my pocket."

United States v. Paul Johnson, Jr., 16-15690 (11th Cir. 2019) affirms Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) which holds: "Under the Fourth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, a police officer may stop a suspect on the street and frisk him or her without probable cause to arrest, if the police officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a crime and has a reasonable belief that the person "may be armed and presently dangerous."

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:** 02/22/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/09/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 2

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers made rude comments.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that while he was sitting on the bench inside the police station, he felt ill and asked for the paramedics, and the officer watching him said “I hope you die – stop selling drugs.”

The named officers denied saying any such comment or anything that could have been interpreted that way.

Witness officers stated they did not hear anyone one say to the complainant “I hope you die – stop selling drugs”.

No other witnesses were identified.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-5:** The officers failed to properly process property.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that when he was booked at the police station, his belongings, including a diamond earring, were taken. The complainant stated that when he was released from County Jail his earring was not listed on the property receipt and was not among the belongings returned to him.

Named officer #1 stated he processed the complainant’s property at the station. He stated he did not recall placing the earring in the bag, but he said it is his practice to take special care to place earrings in a money envelope because otherwise they can easily fall to the bottom of the property bag and get lost. In this case, because the complainant had a backpack, named officer #1 stated that he would have placed all belongings into a plastic bag. He stated that when an individual is transported to the hospital their property goes with the transporting officer and stays with them until the individual and property are handed off to the sheriff.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/22/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/09/19    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-5: (Continued)**

Named officer #2 and named officer #3 transported the complainant to the hospital but stated they did not recall their involvement in this matter.

SFPD documents showed named officer #1 listed one earring received from the complainant. This same form was signed by the complainant, named officer #1 and the SFSD Deputy returning the property at County Jail.

No evidence suggests that the complainant alerted SFSD of the missing earring at the time of his release. Instead, two separate documents, (1) the San Francisco Sheriff's Department Inmate Property Release Report and (2) the SFSD Inmate Property Inventory Report showed that the complainant signed both forms, certifying that the items listed were correct. While neither of those SFSD forms specifically listed an earring, each noted a sealed clear plastic bag.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/11/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/20/19      **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      CRD      **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:** 02/27/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/10/19      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      CRD      **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 July 11, 2019.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** 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 July 11, 2019.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer engaged in bias policing due to race.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      CRD      **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 July 11, 2019.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 03/20/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/10/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer wrote an inaccurate report.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the station representative, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on July 29, 2019.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction and has been referred to SFPD Internal Affairs Division.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 04/03/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officers, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on July 11, 2019.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 06/03/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/10/19      **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer engaged in retaliatory conduct.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      CRD      **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 July 29, 2019.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on July 29, 2019.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 05/03/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 07/29/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer displayed a rude attitude/demeanor.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**    D    **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 July 29, 2019.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 08/29/17 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/03/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that two officers stopped him for no reason two years prior. He stated that they may have stopped him for jaywalking.

The named officers stated they were driving in a marked patrol vehicle in heavy traffic when they saw the complainant standing in the number 3 lane of traffic, directly in front of their vehicle. They were forced to make a sudden stop in order to avoid hitting him. The officers stated the complainant was in violation of Vehicle Code section 21954(a), jaywalking, and they parked their vehicle and detained him in order to issue a citation.

Department records indicate that the complainant was eventually arrested for resisting officers and for a traffic violation.

No witnesses were identified.

The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the two officers took him to the ground, twisting his arm and kicking him in the head. The complainant also stated the officers sprayed him with pepper spray.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 08/29/17 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/03/19 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

The named officers said that the complainant became resistant as soon as the officers approached him. They said the complainant clenched his fists, yelled profanity at the officers, and screamed that he was a sovereign citizen. The complainant was much larger than the officers, so they attempted to handcuff him

for their safety, at which point he grabbed the arms of one of the named officers and partially pinned him to the wall of a building. The other named officer used a knee strike, advised dispatch that they had a resistor, and pulled the complainant to the ground. The complainant was still grappling with the first officer, so the second named officer deployed his OC pepper spray.

Witness officers reported arriving on the scene and observing the named officers attempting to subdue the complainant, who had been sprayed with pepper spray but was still resisting angrily.

The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was not doing anything wrong at the time he encountered the officers, yet they took him to the ground, used force, and arrested him.

The named officers stated the complainant was jaywalking in the middle of a busy street with heavy traffic, causing them to almost hit him with their patrol vehicle. They exited their patrol car to cite him for a jaywalking violation, but upon their approach the complainant became hostile and aggressive. The complainant yelled profanity and physically attacked the officers, who were eventually able to subdue him with pepper spray and the assistance of backup units. The complainant was then arrested for both the jaywalking violation and for resisting, and taken into custody.

Witness officers who responded to the scene stated that they observed the complainant actively resisting the officers despite having been pepper-sprayed.

The evidence proved that the act, which provided the basis for the allegation, occurred. However, the act was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/05/18    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19    **PAGE# 1 of 5**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** A person who wished to remain anonymous called 911 and reported that he saw two African American males in possession of .38 or .45 Caliber firearms. Uniformed officers were dispatched to the identified location but did not find the suspects. About an hour later, an officer from plainclothes unit responded to the same location and saw two African American males fitting the description of the suspects. One of the suspects was the complainant. The officer observed the suspects talking to two women seated inside a parked vehicle. The officer started conducting surveillance from a concealed location and observed an imprint of a semi-automatic firearm inside the complainant's sweatshirt pocket. The officer advised the arrest team of the possible firearm he observed in complainant's possession and asked that the vehicle be stopped. The arrested team stopped the vehicle approximately half a block away from the housing project and detained its occupants. The complainant alleged that the detention was without justification.

For a detention to be lawful, a police officer must have reasonable suspicion that a crime has been committed. This reasonable suspicion must be based on specific and articulable facts.

The officers had reasonable suspicion to believe the complainant was concealing a firearm on him or in a car because he fit the description provided by the 911-caller and a plainclothes officer observed the imprint of a gun in complainant's sweatshirt pocket shortly before he entered a vehicle. It is illegal to carry a concealed gun or to transport a gun in a vehicle that is not properly stored in a locked container. The named officers, therefore, had reasonable suspicion to stop the vehicle and detain its occupants.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complainant occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/05/18    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19    **PAGE# 2 of 5**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Department records show the officer arrested the complainant for illegal possession of a firearm. The complainant alleged that the arrest was without cause.

As discussed above, the named officer, while conducting surveillance on the complainant, saw an imprint of a firearm on the complainant's sweatshirt pocket. The named officer had enough reason to believe the complainant was involved in criminal activities. During the search of the vehicle, two firearms not registered to the complainant were found in the center console of the vehicle.

The named officer, therefore, had probable cause to arrest the complainant.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer seized a vehicle.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer unlawfully seized the vehicle.

Department records show the named officer drove the vehicle to a police station.

The named officer stated the vehicle was driven to the police station for them to conduct a more detailed investigation of the vehicle and its occupants. The officer stated the vehicle was stopped near a liquor store where people often congregate, interfere and disrupt police investigations.

The officers reasonably believed the vehicle contains evidence of a crime – the firearms. Initial search of the vehicle at the scene yielded two firearms that resulted to the complainant's arrest.

It was reasonable for the officers to suspect that additional evidence could be found in the vehicle. Therefore, it was lawful for them to impound the vehicle in order to locate additional evidence of a crime that cannot be readily found or removed at the scene.

Additionally, no one was available to drive the vehicle. If left parked at the scene unattended, the vehicle could be a potential hazard or could cause a danger to public safety.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/05/18    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19    **PAGE# 3 of 5**

Impounding the vehicle and storing it in a safe location like a police facility had also minimized the risk of having the vehicle vandalized or stolen.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful and proper.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that after his arrest, officers searched his grandmother's house without cause.

The complainant occasionally stays with his grandmother. During investigation, the officers believed the complainant had additional firearms and related paraphernalia stored in the house. The officers lawfully secured a search warrant to search the house.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #11:** The behaved inappropriately.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer sent him text messages after he was arrested, and after he asserted his right to remain silent. At the time, he was already represented by an

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/05/18    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19    **PAGE# 4 of 5**  
attorney and the named officer did not seek permission from complainant's attorney before speaking with complainant

The 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to counsel of the United States Constitution gives an individual a right to an attorney to all critical stages of criminal proceedings. The right attaches when proceedings have begun against the individual by means of preliminary hearing, indictment, arraignment or formal charging. In the case of *Massiah v. United States*, 377 U.S 201 (1964), the US Supreme Court held it unlawful for the government to obtain statements from a defendant after the defendant's 6<sup>th</sup> Amendment right to counsel had attached.

The complainant was arrested on May 5, 2018. According to the named officer, the complainant was charged on the same day for unlawful possession of a firearm. On May 10, 2018, the complainant was arraigned with assistance of counsel.

In his first DPA interview, the named officer acknowledged communicating with the complainant after his arrest and after judicial proceedings against him had commenced. He stated that he and the complainant talked on the phone a few times and exchanged text messages for over a month. The conversations included incriminating admissions concerning complainant's pending case, as well as implications of additional criminal activity. The named officer stated the complainant provided the information because he agreed to work as an informant for the Department in exchange for leniency and for money.

The named officer initially stated that the complainant signed an informant agreement, which may have been destroyed. In his second DPA interview, however, he stated that the complainant never became an informant, and that he no longer recalled whether complainant signed an informant agreement. No one informed the complainant's criminal defense attorney about any of these occurrences.

DPA requested documentation from the Department regarding complainant's status as an informant and the Department refused to cooperate with DPA. The Department refused to confirm whether complainant ever worked as an informant for the Department and refused to provide DPA with any documents

concerning this issue. As a result, DPA could not complete its investigation.

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

**SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers failed to comply with DGO 5.08, Non-uniformed Officers.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/05/18    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/11/19    **PAGE# 5 of 5**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The officers allegedly failed to comply with DGO 5.08, which states in part that:

C. TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT (also see DGO 9.01, Traffic. Enforcement).

1. TRAFFIC STOPS /CITATIONS. Non-uniformed officers shall not initiate traffic stops, issue traffic citations or make minor traffic arrests except:

a. When the activity is related to an ongoing criminal investigation or regulated vehicle enforcement, e.g., taxi cabs, shuttle buses, limousines.

b. When witnessing an aggravated situation requiring immediate action to protect life or property, e.g., drunk driving.

2. BACKUP UNIT. When making a traffic stop under the circumstances described above (except for regulated vehicle enforcement) non uniformed officers shall immediately request a marked backup unit.

The evidence showed an investigation had been conducted prior to the stop of the complainant's vehicle. An officer in plainclothes responded to a gun call and conducted surveillance on the complainant.

During the officer's investigation, he saw an imprint of a firearm on the complainant's sweatshirt pocket, prompting him to believe that the complainant was in possession of a firearm. When the complainant left

in a vehicle with a firearm in his possession, it was reasonable for the officer to consider the situation aggravated requiring immediate action in order to protect life and people getting harmed.

Additionally, Department records showed that within minutes after the stop, uniformed officers arrived at the scene as back up unit.

The evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint, occurred. However, such act was justified, lawful and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/18    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/17/19    PAGE# 1 of 5**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, the victim of a domestic violence attack, stated that after she was attacked by an ex-boyfriend who then killed himself, she made multiple requests to the named officer for a copy of the incident report documenting the attack. The named officer told her the report could not be released until the completion of the investigation. The complainant further stated that because the investigation took too long, the incident report was not released in a timely manner. The complainant stated further that the report she received was incomplete in its description of the events.

The named officer acknowledged she was responsible for providing and redacting the incident report for the complainant. The named officer stated she provided a copy of the initial incident report to the complainant but did not include any supplemental reports. The named officer stated she did not provide the supplemental reports because the complainant did not request them, and because the investigation was ongoing. The named officer said that as soon as the investigation was complete, she personally handed a photocopy of the incident report to the complainant.

The named officer stated she was assigned the case after she responded to a domestic violence/barricaded subject call. After the Medical Examiner (ME) opined the cause of death of the suspect was possibly suicide, SFPD ran a joint investigation with the ME's office, which took the lead. The named officer stated she was running a parallel homicide investigation – in case the ME investigation returned the case to the Homicide Division. The named officer stated she completed the following steps in her investigation: interviewed the complainant on the scene, ran the complainant's and the deceased's names, re-interviewed the complainant upon the complainant's request, requested social media preservation letters, and received and reviewed the ME's report. The named officer acknowledged she did not conduct the following investigative steps: search the deceased's apartment, immediately send social media preservation letters, search the deceased's and complainant's cellphones, follow-up on threats made to the complainant, interview the two witnesses at the scene.

The lieutenant in charge of the unit where the named officer was assigned stated the named officer was assigned the investigation instead of a Homicide inspector because the case was originally a domestic violence/attempted homicide. Once the ME made a preliminary determination that the cause of death of the suspect was suicide, the investigation was assigned to remain with Special Victims Unit (SVU). The lieutenant stated the case was a Homicide investigation until the ME made a final determination.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/18    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/17/19    PAGE# 2 of 5**  
SFPD documents showed SFPD filed four supplemental reports in addition to the initial incident report. The initial incident report was ten pages in length. The document received by the complainant, who

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

provided it to the DPA, was missing three of the ten pages. The named officer stated she did not know why the complainant received just seven of the ten pages of the initial incident report.

The SFPD investigatory chronological documents the following investigative steps were completed by the named officer: interview of complainant at the scene, records check on complainant and the deceased, preservation request submitted late to social media. In addition, the complainant and the complainant's father contacted the named officer and reported that she has been receiving threats related to the incident. The named officer advised the complainant and the complainant's father to contact their local police department to report the threats. The named officer requested and reviewed the other police departments' reports but did not speak to any officers or investigators to brief them on the situation. The named officer also received additional information that there might be additional evidence in the deceased's apartment, deceased's and complainant's cellphones, and their social media accounts. The documents show SFPD did not search the deceased's house, cellphone, interview witnesses at the scene or the deceased's family members. At the end of the investigation, the named officer did not complete a domestic violence incident report. Rather, the named officer closed the case file due to the suspect's death.

The complainant's personal documents showed that the complainant, on multiple occasions, requested the incident report from the named officer. The documents also show the complainant received a redacted copy of the initial incident report (seven pages) and no supplemental reports.

DGO 3.16 Release of Police Reports reads, in part:

The Department retains the discretion to withhold incident reports and other documents during the pendency of an investigation. The following information, however, must be released... factual circumstances surrounding the crime or incident and a general description of any injuries, property or weapons involved (3) Diagrams, statements, or the parties involved, statements of all witnesses other than confidential informants.

Section 6228 of the California Family Code "Access to Domestic Violence Reports Act of 1999, reads:

State and local law enforcement agencies shall provide, one copy of all incident report face sheets, one copy of all incident reports...to a victim of a crime that constitutes an act of any of the following: (1) Domestic violence, as defined in Section 6211... A copy of an incident report face

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/18    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/17/19    PAGE# 3 of 5**  
sheet shall be made available during regular business hours to a victim or his or her representative no later than 48 hours after being requested by the victim or his or her representative, unless the

state or local law enforcement agency informs the victim or his or her representative of the reasons why, for good cause, the incident report face sheet is not available, in which case the incident

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

report face sheet shall be made available to the victim or his or her representative no later than five working days after the request is made.

DGO 6.09 states that officers must investigate and write an incident report for any crime that involves domestic violence.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that Sergeant Khuu conducted an inadequate investigation, did not write an incident report, and did not provide complaint with a copy of the incident report in a timely manner.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved inappropriately and made inappropriate comments.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was the victim in a domestic violence incident that led to the complainant's ex-boyfriend killing himself. The complainant stated she did not give the named officer permission to release any information to the press nor did the named officer provide her with a warning that that SFPD would be releasing a statement. The complainant felt the named officer was trying to ensure the public knew that SFPD was not responsible for the death of a black man. The complainant stated the named officer provided just enough information that made it seem like the complainant was under investigation for the deceased's death, even though she had already been informed that the death was ruled a suicide. She also stated the information provided to the press resulted in an article that provided enough details for people to identify her, which resulted in threats against her and accusatory comments suggesting she killed the domestic violence perpetrator.

The named officer stated she wrote the news release based on information provided by the officers on the scene. She stated she released information that SFPD did not shoot the deceased because a news agency

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/18    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/17/19    PAGE# 4 of 5**

specifically asked the question and it was true. The named officer stated she did not release the complainant's name and only provided the name of the street on which the complainant's home stands, and where the incident occurred. She stated she released the street location because officers were on the scene and they wanted to ensure the public was notified to stay clear of the police operation.

The news release, issued by the named officer, documented that the named officer released the name of the street, a summary of the incident and reported the incident was not an officer-involved shooting.

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

In a comment reacting to an online article, a third party identified the complainant by name and accused her of murder.

The officer released information that was true, factual, and important for the public to know. The third party, not the SFPD, alleged that complainant was a murder suspect.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to take required action.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, the victim in a domestic violence incident which resulted in the suicide of her ex-boyfriend, alleged the named officer failed to assure that her identity was shielded when she provided to the media information about the incident. The complainant said the information the named officer released led to her identification, which resulted in public shaming, threats and an accusation that she had murdered her attacker. The complainant also stated she asked SFPD to have a news article containing the identifying information removed by a media outlet. She stated the named officer failed to contact the media outlet and ask it to remove the story.

The named officer stated she released a general summary of the event as per the SFPD's Media Resource Manual (DM-22). She said DM -22, Releasable Information, stated she could provide incident/arrest details including the time, date, location of the arrest, and factual circumstances of the incident's occurrence. She acknowledged that she was not approved to release the identity of the victim or associated information which could lead to the identification of witnesses or jeopardize safety. The named officer stated she only released the location of the incident, date, time. She said she did not release the complainant's name or any identifiable information. The named officer stated she did not contact the officers or the complainant to determine if releasing the information would place the complainant in danger. She stated she was not required to contact the investigating officers or the complainant to determine if it was appropriate to release the information. The named officer stated that officers notified her that the complainant requested that the Department contact the media outlet and ask them to remove

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/28/18    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/17/19    PAGE# 5 of 5**  
the story. The named officer said she spoke to her leadership and they determined that SFPD was not required to contact the media outlet because the news release did not contain any prohibited information.

The officer investigating the domestic violence incident stated she was notified by the complainant that she wanted SFPD/the named officer to contact the news outlet and ask for the article's removal from publication. That officer relayed the request to the named officer. The investigating officer stated that the named officer did not ask her if releasing any information would place the complainant at risk.

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

The SVU commanding officer stated he was notified by the complainant that she wanted the named officer to contact the news outlet and ask it to remove the article. He said he contacted an officer from the SFPD Media Relations Unit, who called and left a message at the media outlet. The media outlet did not return the call. The SVU commanding officer stated the named officer should have contacted the investigating officer and asked her if releasing any information would place the complainant at risk.

The news release issued by the named officer documented that the named officer released the name of the street where the complainant lived, a summary of the incident and reported the incident was not an officer-involved shooting.

In an online article, referring to the information released by the Department, an independent party identified the complainant by name and accused her of murder.

SFPD DM-22's Releasable Information Guidelines states that SFPD can release to the media incident/arrest details including: "time, date, location of arrest," and "[f]actual circumstances, general description of how the incident occurred." The guidelines prohibit the release of any information about the identity of the victim or associated information which could lead to the identification of witnesses or jeopardize safety. Under "Identity of Special Victims," the manual states that, "the name of a victim of certain crimes such as ... domestic violence ... may be withheld at the victim's request."

These two paragraphs in SFPD DM-22 conflict and the SFPD has not provided tools for officers to know how to resolve the conflict. For example, information regarding the "time, date, or location of arrest," can often disclose the identity of a victim. In these cases, the SFPD needs to provide officers with a way of knowing which is more important, disclosing the time, date, and location of arrest, or, on the other hand, keeping the name of a victim confidential.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 09/29/18 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/27/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer failed to follow procedures and place a recovered stolen item on a 90-Day hold.

The named officer stated he was not trained in a 90-day hold procedure.

The witness officers stated they were not trained on a 90-day hold procedure.

SFPD documents show procedures for a 90 Day hold are located in SFPD Pawn Shop Investigations Procedures, dated April 2014. DPA was unable to locate any recent Department Bulletins or Department General Orders containing instructions on Pawn shop 90-day hold procedures.

The evidence proved that the action complained of was the result of inadequate or inappropriate training or the absence of needed training when viewed in light of Departmental policy and procedure.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, the owner of a Pawn shop, stated the named officer made inappropriate comments about him to his employees.

A witness stated he did not think the comments were inappropriate; he just thought the named officer was not very nice and didn't want to talk to the owner even though it was his property.

The named officer stated he did not recall making any inappropriate comments to/or about the complainant. When asked why he would have made an inappropriate comment, he stated "...If anything, it probably had to come after I was being threatened with my job or threatened -I don't know."

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 09/29/18 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/27/19 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

The witness officer stated he did not hear the named officer make any inappropriate statements.

Surveillance video footage shows the named officer responding to a witness and stating, "This should tell you I am the right person. I don't care about any fucking procedure, and I don't care about what your boss says. You're in possession of stolen property. Depending on the value of that it could be a felony or a misdemeanor, and I don't care what your boss says." This statement was in response to the witness insisting on the proper 90-day hold procedures under state law.

A preponderance of the evidence proved that the conduct complained of did occur, and that, using as a standard the applicable regulations of the Department, the conduct was improper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/18/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/27/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said the named officers failed to provide their names or star numbers.

The named officers said they provided their names and star numbers to the complainant. Named officer #1 said the complainant requested the names and star numbers for every officer on the scene but Named Officer #1 did not know all the officers' names and badge numbers.

Body worn video footage shows the named officers provided their name and badge numbers to the complainant.

DGO 2.01 (14) said, "When requested, members shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number, and assignment."

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to take required action.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said the named officer failed to provide his name and star number. The complainant also said he asked the named officer for an incident report.

Body Worn Camera footage shows the named officer provided the complainant with his name and badge number immediately on request. The footage does not show the complainant requesting an incident report.

The credibility of the complainant was compromised by the fact that other allegations brought by the complainant proved by objective evidence to be unfounded.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 12/31/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/04/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer made an inappropriate comment.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers arrived on scene, made brief contact with him and called him “grinch” upon their departure.

Department records indicated that officers were on scene with the complainant.

Officers questioned by the DPA denied calling the complainant a “grinch” or knowing who did.

Body worn camera (BWC) footage worn by one of the responding officers was reviewed. The BWC footage revealed an unknown male voice in the background yelled “grinch.” The unknown male could not be identified.

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

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/02/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/04/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant created a Facebook post in which he described how SFPD officers violently grabbed his co-worker, slammed him onto a car hood and handcuffed him because the co-worker fit the description of a black man with dreadlocks. The complainant did not witness this incident.

The co-worker stated that no incident took place and he had no complaint to make against the SFPD.

SFPD records show no documentation of the incident described by the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer detained a person without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant created a Facebook post in which he described how SFPD officers violently grabbed his co-worker, slammed him onto a car hood and handcuffed him because the co-worker fit the description of a black man with dreadlocks. The complainant did not witness this incident.

The co-worker stated that no incident took place and he had no complaint to make against the SFPD.

SFPD records show no documentation of the incident described by the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/02/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/04/19    **PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer applied handcuffs without justification.

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant created a Facebook post in which he described how SFPD officers violently grabbed his co-worker, slammed him onto a car hood and handcuffed him because the co-worker fit the description of a black man with dreadlocks. The complainant did not witness this incident.

The co-worker stated that no incident took place and he had no complaint to make against the SFPD.

SFPD records show no documentation of the incident described by the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant created a Facebook post in which he described how SFPD officers violently grabbed his co-worker, slammed him onto a car hood and handcuffed him because the co-worker fit the description of a black man with dreadlocks. The complainant did not witness this incident.

The co-worker stated that no incident took place and he had no complaint to make against the SFPD.

SFPD records show no documentation of the incident described by the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/12/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/23/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 07/31/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/20/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer did not investigate his case.

SFPD documents show the complainant reported he dropped his wallet while walking on the street.

Per department records, the officer does not have a duty to investigate this case as it is a “Lost Property” report which requires no investigation.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA’s jurisdiction.

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he witnessed an argument between two men at a local coffee shop. The complainant stated that the named officer responded to the scene and was rude to him. The complainant did not provide any further details about his exchange with the officer.

The complainant did not respond to additional interview requests over the course of multiple weeks.

Department records show that the incident occurred; however, the parties had left the scene by the time officers responded.

A witness who works at the coffee shop stated that she spoke to the named officer when he responded, but he departed without speaking to anyone else at the shop.

The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 08/14/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/20/19 **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 3<sup>rd</sup> Street,  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 09/03/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/10/19 **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:** The complainant stated that a PSA would not take her report. This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT:** 09/16/19    **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/30/19    **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that he visited a police station to file a report. The officer at the desk told the complainant that he needed his identification to do so. The complainant provided no contact information to the DPA.

An officer identification poll was sent to the district station the complainant visited. No officer was identified.

The identity of the involved officer could not be established.

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant visited a police station to obtain store surveillance video. The desk officer told complainant that he needed his identification to do so. The complainant provided no contact information to the DPA.

An officer identification poll sent to the district station to which the complainant reported failed to identify an officer.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/12/19      DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/23/19      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A      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:** 09/13/19      **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/23/19      **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** N/A      **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: 09/13/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/23/19    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A    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: 09/17/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/23/19    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A    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: 09/12/19    DATE OF COMPLETION: 09/23/19    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N/A    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:** 09/19/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 09/23/19 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** NA **FINDING:** IO2 **DEPT. ACTION:**

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