

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 1 of 9

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated while closing the gate to his apartment building, the officers stopped him, searched him, and told to sit on the wet sidewalk. It was raining. He told the officers several times that he lived in the apartment building. He produced keys to his apartment and asked officers if he could please answer his cell phone, as his sister was calling him from inside the building. A couple minutes later, the landlord arrived and identified him as a tenant, but officers still refused to let him go.

The CAD showed that the landlord called to report that he saw through his surveillance camera a Latino male, about 30 years old, with short hair, entered his building and tampered with the landlord's security cameras and now the alarm system was offline.

The named officers stated the complainant matched the description of the burglary suspect. The complainant was a Latino male, approximately 30 years old. They stated the complainant was stopped in the same location of the alleged burglary, so they believed they had reasonable suspicion to detain him.

BWC footage documented the complainant standing behind a closed gate that led to his apartment. The named officers approached the complainant and told him to open the gate. The named officers subsequently placed him against the wall and escorted him to the sidewalk to detain him. The BWC footage corroborates the complainant's statement. BWC footage captured the named officers discuss the description of the suspect. One officer acknowledged that the description of the suspect given by the reporting party was short hair, but that the complainant had long hair.

San Francisco Department General Order 5.03, Investigative Detentions, dictates:

B. REASONABLE SUSPICION. 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 officer, however, must have specific and articulable facts to support his/her actions; a mere suspicion or "hunch" is not sufficient cause to detain a person or to request identification.

This DGO is in line with Fourth Amendment jurisprudence that to justify an investigative stop or detention, the circumstances known or apparent to the officer must include *specific and articulable facts* which, viewed objectively, would cause a reasonable officer to suspect that (1) some activity relating to crime has taken place or is occurring or about to occur, and that (2) the person the officer intends to stop

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 2 of 9

or detain is involved in that activity. This requirement of specificity “is the central teaching of th[e] Court’s Fourth Amendment jurisprudence.” (*U.S. v. Cortez* (1981) 449 U.S. 411, 418; see also *Terry v. Ohio* (1968) 392 U.S. 1, 21.) A vague description, standing alone, does not provide reasonable grounds to detain — let alone arrest — all persons falling within that description. (*In re Tony C.* (1978) 21 Cal.3d 888, 898; See also *In re Eskiel S.* (1993) 15 Cal.App.4th 1638 (description by race and general area insufficient for detention) and (*People v. Thomas* (2018) 29 Cal.App.5th 1107, 1115 [“A vague description does not provide reasonable suspicion to stop every person falling within that vague description.”].).)

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers entered and search a residence without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants stated the named officers entered their home without their permission looking for a burglary suspect. One of the complainants stated that he left the front door slightly ajar because he thought his roommate, the complainant (who was detained outside), was behind him.

The named officers stated they saw the apartment door open and entered the apartment to clear the premises for a burglary suspect. At that time, the police officers did not know that specific apartment was the detainee’s residence. The named officers also had no information that the suspect referred to by the 911 caller had entered a specific apartment, or even a specific floor of the multi-level apartment building.

A warrantless entry into the home is “presumptively unreasonable” and can be justified in only a few “specifically established and well-delineated exceptions” to the warrant requirement. (*Payton v. New York* (1980) 445 U.S. 573, 587, *Katz v. United States* (1967) 389 U.S. 347, 357.)

The entry into the home could not be justified as a “protective sweep,” which is a “quick and limited search of the premises, incident to arrest and conducted to protect the safety of police officers and others.” (*Maryland v. Buie* (1990) 494 U.S. 325, 327.) No arrest was made here, and no “specific and articulable facts which, taken together with the rational inferences from those facts, reasonably warranted’ the officer in believing, that the area swept harbored an individual posing a danger to the officer or others.” (*Id.* at 327 quoting *Michigan v. Long* (1983) 463 U.S. 1032, 1049-1050 (internal citations omitted, emphasis added).)

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 3 of 9

Additionally, the “emergency aid” and “community caretaking” exceptions did not apply. As *Ovieda* explained, the line demarking constitutional conduct “falls between the mere inchoate possibility that an emergency could exist and the officer’s articulation of facts that make it reasonable, even if uncertain, to believe an emergency does exist.” (*People v. Ovieda* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 1034, 1049.)

Importantly, *Ovieda* expressly overruled *People v. Ray* to the extent the lead opinion in *Ray* authorized warrantless entry into a private home for community caretaking in circumstances short of an emergency. (*Ovieda, supra*, 7 Cal.5th at 1038.) *Ray* also had stronger facts than the police had here. In *Ray*, police officers were responding specifically to a report that the door to defendant’s residence had been open all day and that the residence was in shambles. The officers found the door open and the interior messy, knocked and received no response, and entered the residence without a warrant. While inside, they found in plain view a substance suspected to be cocaine and cash. (*People v. Ray* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 464 disapproved of by *People v. Ovieda* (2019) 7 Cal.5th 1034.)

The police here had no right to enter the complainant’s home. The only information officers had was that a suspect was seen tampering with a security camera somewhere in a large apartment building. No specific facts existed that would lead to a reasonable inference that anyone in the complainant’s home was in need of help, no security cameras where anywhere near his home, and no information suggested that his specific apartment was in any way involved in the call for service.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers entered the residence without cause.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants stated officers entered their home looking for burglary suspect without their permission. One of the complainants stated that he left the front door ajar because he thought his roommate, the complainant detained outside of the building, was behind him.

The named officers stated senior officers told them to enter the residence and watch the complainants while the senior officers conducted a “protective sweep” to clear the premises for the burglary suspect.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct occurred and was the result of inadequate supervision.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 4 of 9

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer detained the occupants of the residence without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants' inside the residence stated officers were inside their home when they called them all out and kept them in the kitchen. They were told that they were looking for someone who broke into the building and that their door was open.

Body worn camera footage showed the named officer inside the complainants' apartment asking them to verify the identity of the complainant that was detained outside the building. The complainants looked confused and startled by the named officer's presence in the apartment. Multiple officers remained in the home, and one officer was placed at each kitchen exit. The occupants were detained for approximately 25 minutes, without cause, while officers searched the home.

San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.03 (Ex. FF) provides:

B. REASONABLE SUSPICION. 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 officer, however, must have specific and articulable facts to support his/her actions; a mere suspicion or "hunch" is not sufficient cause to detain a person or to request identification.

...

The named officer had no right to enter the home or search it, and therefore no right to detain the occupants. No independent reasonable suspicion existed to suggest that any occupant of the apartment was reasonable suspected of any criminal activity.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 5 of 9

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, upon being detained by the named officer for appearing to be a 30-year old Latin male at the address where a burglary was reported, objected that he lived in the building where police detained him. The officers knew that they were responding to a burglary call from the owner of the building, who saw the intruder on camera, and presumably knew his own tenants. Nonetheless, the named officer did nothing to verify the complainant's identity or status as a tenant, even when the complainant offered the named officer his keys and begged to answer his cell phone because his sister was calling from inside the apartment. The named officer also would not allow one of the complainant's roommates to leave the apartment to verify his identity.

Body worn camera footage captured the entire detention. The named officer told the complainant that he would be free to leave once his identity was verified; however the named officer did not relay to the other officers that the complainant was identified by the landlord as a tenant of the building. Additionally, the named officer never attempted to verify the complainant's identity.

The landlord arrived at the scene and identified the complainant as a tenant, not the suspect. However, the named officer still refused to let the complainant leave.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9-11: The officers failed to comply with DGO 5.03 Investigative Detentions.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants stated that the officers did not provide them with any paperwork or report.

The landlord corroborated that when he arrived on scene, he identified the complainant as his tenant and not the suspect. A tenant that witnessed the detention also informed the named officers that the complainant was a tenant in the building and not the suspect. Additionally, the named officers stated that the complainant was detained longer for a second investigation. Named officer #2 ordered that the complainant remained detained after it was clear that he was not the burglary suspect.

San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.03 (Ex. FF) provides:

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 6 of 9

...

1. If, however you release a person after he ... has been detained a significant length of time, you must issue the person a Certificate of Release and prepare an incident report justifying ... the length of detention. Title the incident report "Investigative Detention," list the person as "D" detained, and include the reasons) the subject was detained such a long time ...

...

5. QUESTIONABLE SITUATIONS. If there is doubt as to whether you should issue a Certificate of Release, always resolve the doubt by issuing the form.

Due to the length of the detention, the named officers were also required to issue Certificates of Release and write an incident report, which they failed to do.

The named officers stated they did not issue a certificate of release to any of the detainees, because they were not handcuffed or detained long.

Police records showed that the occupant complainants (inside) were detained for approximately 25 minutes, while the complainant detained outside was detained for approximately 28 minutes, and long after the reporting party verified that he was a tenant and not the suspect. A detention is unduly prolonged if it becomes so intrusive that it can no longer be characterized as a minimal intrusion designed quickly to confirm or dispel the suspicion that supported the detention. (*U.S. v. Sharpe* (1985) 470 U.S. 675, 683-686.) The California Supreme Court recognized, "[T]here is no hard and fast line to distinguish permissible investigative detentions from impermissible de facto arrests. Instead, the issue is decided on the facts of each case, with focus on whether the police diligently pursued a means of investigation

reasonably designed to dispel or confirm their suspicions quickly, using the least intrusive means reasonably available under the circumstances." (*People v. Celis* (2004) 33 Cal.4th 667, 674-756, quoting *In re Carlos M.* (1990) 220 Cal.App.3d 372, 384-385.) Therefore, the complainant (outside) was subjected to an unlawfully prolonged detention and was not issued proper paperwork.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE#** 7 of 9

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #12: The officer failed to comply with DGO 5.20.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: A complainant stated that she did not speak English and was not able to ask for an officer's name and badge number. She stated that there were no Spanish speaking officers.

The named officer stated that the complainants did not ask for any language assistance. He also stated that they seemed to understand him from the little bit he spoke to the occupants.

The witness officer who was with the detained complainants stated that there was a male among the group who spoke English.

BWC footage documented that there was a bilingual co-complainant at one point during the detention in the kitchen. Several occupants spoke only Spanish on the BWC footage.

Per DGO 5.20, officers are required to identify LEP persons especially when conducting general interviews and formal interviews except for exigent circumstances.

In this case there were no formal interviews of the occupants inside the home. Furthermore, the initial questions put to the occupants to determine whether they had been victims of a burglary, and whether they knew the person detained outside, while ideally should have been asked by a Spanish-speaking officer, had to be asked quickly. None of the many officers on scene were certified Spanish speakers. The outside detainee spoke English well and did not request assistance. Though it is unclear that the situation inside the kitchen constituted a true exigency, the failure to use the Language Line in this specific situation does not clearly rise to the level of misconduct.

Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/16/21 PAGE# 8 of 9

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #13: The officer behaved inappropriately

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: A complainant stated an officer followed her and her son to the bathroom and that the officers did not allow her to comfort crying child.

The officers denied the allegation.

The BWC footage contradicted the complainant's statement. The footage showed the complainant and her child walk off alone and no officer followed. The complainant was also allowed to speak to a child.

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

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers failed to comply with Department Bulleting 18-256 Activation of Body Worn Cameras.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND FINDING: IC (Sustained) DEPT. ACTION:

FINDINGS OF FACT: During DPA's investigation of the incident, it was discovered the named officers activated their body worn cameras after they entered and searched the complainant's residence. Additionally, the cameras were muted for long periods of time.

The named officers admitted to not activating their cameras while enroute to the scene as required by DGO 10.11 and DB 18-256.

DB 18-256 states that when responding to calls for service with a potential for law enforcement activity or any of the mandatory recording circumstances, members shall begin recording by pressing the Event button while enroute and prior to arriving on scene.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/04/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE# 9 of 9**

SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATIONS #4: The officer failed to comply with Department Bulletin 18-256 Activation of Body Worn Cameras.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: DB 18-256 states that when responding to calls for service with a potential for law enforcement activity or any of the mandatory recording circumstances, members shall begin recording by pressing the Event button while enroute and prior to arriving on scene.

The named officer did not activate his BWC. However, he had a specific recollection of double tapping the camera to start recording at the appropriate time. As soon as he realized that he had not in fact activated his BWC, he again double tapped the camera and began recording. DPA found that his failure to activate his BWC was therefore not willful and did not rise to the level of misconduct.

Therefore, there was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove the allegation.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE# 1 of 4**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer violated a person's fourth amendment rights when he executed a search warrant without knocking or announcing his presence.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer improperly forced entry during a search warrant by attempting to break open an exterior gate.

The named officer admitted that he forced entry at the exterior gate. The named officer said he was attempting to get past the gate to knock and announce himself at the front door to the residence. Pictures of the front gate show an inoperable doorbell and a note stating the doorbell is broken.

The Fourth Amendment's reasonableness standard governs an officer's failure to knock and announce himself during the execution of a search warrant. Officers are excused from knocking and announcing when there are exigent circumstances like a threat of physical violence or when evidence would be destroyed. In addition, officers need not knock and announce when doing so would be futile.

California Penal Code 153's "substantial compliance" standard governs an officer's failure to knock and announce himself during the execution of a search warrant. Officers are excused from the requirement if the invasion was minimal, the officers could be reasonably certain that defendant was aware of their authority and purpose, or because knocking and announcing would be a useless gesture.

The officer's conduct was reasonable because the doorbell was broken and the officers reasonably concluded notice would be best effected by knocking on the door to the residence. The evidence proved that the acts that provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2: The officer seized property without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers seized property without justification.

The DPA found that the property was seized pursuant to a judicial order.

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: 05/10/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE# 2 of 4**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer improperly used handcuffs.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers unnecessarily handcuffed a subject during a search of the subject's home.

The named officer stated the subject was handcuffed because the subject owned several firearms and they needed to ensure evidence was not destroyed.

The DPA finds that fear of firearms and the need to prevent the destruction of evidence warranted the handcuffing. There was no evidence the handcuffs caused injury. The evidence proved that the acts that provided the basis for the allegations occurred; however, such acts were justified, lawful, and proper.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4-5: The officers violated the California Shield Law.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers violated a journalist's rights.

The DPA was not provided with sufficient evidence during its investigation to determine if officers violated a journalist's rights.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6-7: The officers violated the California Shield Law.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers violated a journalist's rights.

The named officers did not have sufficient information about the subject to require further action. The officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE# 3 of 4**

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATION #1-2: The officers failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The DPA found during an investigation that the named officers failed to properly investigate.

The named officers failed to reasonably respond to evidence that a subject was a journalist and therefore protected under Evidence Code § 1070. As a result, the named officers directed the drafting of search warrants that failed to properly address the issue.

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATION #3: The officers failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The DPA found during an investigation that the named officer may have failed to investigate properly.

The named officer failed to reasonably respond to evidence that a subject was a journalist and therefore protected under Evidence Code § 1070. The officer however reasonably relied on the direction of his superior officers. His misconduct does not therefore support any disciplinary charges.

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATION #4-5: The officers failed to properly investigate.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The DPA found during an investigation that the named officer may have failed to investigate properly.

The named officers did not have sufficient information about the subject to require further action. The officers' conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/16/21 **PAGE# 4 of 4**

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATION #6-7: The officers failed to properly supervise.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The DPA found during an investigation that the named officer failed to properly investigate.

The named officers failed to reasonably respond to evidence that a subject was a journalist and therefore protected under Evidence Code § 1070. As a result, the named officers directed the drafting of search warrants that failed to properly address the issue.

SUMMARY OF DPA ADDED ALLEGATION #8: The officer wrote an inaccurate search warrant.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: During the investigation, the DPA found the named officer failed to include information in a search warrant.

The named officer was acting at the direction of his supervising officers.

The evidence proved that the actions complained of were the result of inadequate supervision when viewed in light of applicable law, training, and Department policies and procedures.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/23/18 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/24/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer seized property without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants stated that a female officer that responded to their home for an incident stole \$380.00, which was inside their home on the stairs. The complainants stated they own a restaurant and the money was left by one sibling, to be picked up by another sibling, to buy produce.

The named officer stated that she responded to a call of a fight at the complainant's house. She said that while she and her partner were walking up a set of stairs, her partner pointed towards some cash on the stairs. She said, when she realized it was cash, she felt that it should not be left there; it was not safe there and should be with someone who could take care of it. The named officer said she picked up the money with her left hand and put it in the front left pocket of her jacket. She said that she heard shouting and had to continue up the stairs to deal with the situation. She said that she was then focused on the call and did not think about the money again. The named officer said that she wore the jacket the next day, but then not again up to the time she was notified about an investigation into the missing cash. At that point, she remembered about the money in her jacket, and she arranged to return it. The named officer said that she had a lot on her mind during that time, both personally and professionally. The officer said she was sorry and should have given the cash to a responsible person in the home. She simply forgot she had it.

The named officer's partner stated he pointed to the money on the stairs, just to alert the named officer to its presence. He said, at the time, a member of the family who let them into the house, was also behind him; and he was also directing his attention to the money. He said that, later during the call, he noticed the money was no longer on the stairs. The officer stated that when he and the named officer returned to their patrol car, he wondered out loud what had happened to the cash. He said he did not know if the named officer heard him. He also said that the named officer had confided in him about a health issue, and other personal issues.

Body Worn Camera (BWC) recordings document that there was something on the stairs resembling bills. Although the recordings do not show the named officer taking the bills, they do show her partner pointing to them, and then the named officer pausing and bending down at the location of the bills. The recordings also show that the cash did not appear on the steps later. The recordings show that the officers were dealing with a family dispute, including one individual who was intoxicated and belligerent. They show that two other officers eventually arrived and took over the investigation.

An SFPD internal affairs investigation documented that the named officer returned the money with the assistance of her attorney.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/23/18 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/24/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

The named officer picked up the money while her BWC was activated, after her partner acknowledged the money, and with a family member in the vicinity. Without knowing that the family operated a business and use the stairs to leave important items for each other, the money would have seemed out of place. It is more likely than not that the named officer seized the money for safe keeping, rather than with the intent to deprive the complainants. However, she still should have properly processed the property either by giving it to the family at the time or booking it as property for safe keeping. Even as a mistake, it was a significant one.

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: 08/02/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officers searched his client's hotel room without a search warrant.

The named officers responded to a burglary call at a hotel and conducted a search of a suspect's hotel room without a warrant after being advised to do so by a superior officer. As the superior officer is not longer employed by the Department, the violation for the named officers is a supervision failure.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and was the result of inadequate supervision.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer authorized an improper search or seizure.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers searched his client's hotel room without a search warrant.

The officers responded to a burglary call at a hotel and conducted a search of a suspect's hotel room without a warrant after being advised to do so by the named officer. The named officer incorrectly advised the officers that they did not need a warrant to search the hotel room.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/02/19 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4: The officer misrepresented the truth.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer knowingly lied in the police report to justify the search of his client's hotel room.

The named officer stated he wrote the supplemental incident report at the station about an hour after the incident. The named officer stated he believes what he wrote in the supplemental incident report was accurate based on his memory and his review of his body worn camera footage. The named officer could not recall how he received the information that the suspects were staying at the hotel prior to searching the room. The named officer stated that prior to the search of the hotel room the hotel staff had not provided him with any sort of registry or documentation that confirmed the room was registered to the two suspects, and that there was some general confusion about whether they were registered guests.

The officer's report was confusing but did not rise to the level of dishonesty. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

SUMMARY OF DPA-ADDED ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to properly supervise.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer improperly instructed two subordinate officers to search a hotel room without obtaining a search warrant.

The officers responded to a burglary call at a hotel and conducted a search of a suspect's hotel room without a warrant after being advised to do so by the named officer. The named officer incorrectly advised the officers that they did not need a warrant to search the hotel room.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/20/20 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/29/21 PAGE# 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers entered and searched her residence and seized some of her personal property. The complainant stated that officers improperly seized her landscaping tools, unrelated to the search warrant, which pertained to property owned by a family member.

The named officers stated they entered the complainant's residence and seized property because they were following judicial orders on a search warrant. Officers documented all items seized and provided the complainant with documentation listing the items taken from her residence. The named officers stated that they seized items listed in the warrant, including construction tools, a large tool chest, and other items.

Department records indicated that the named officers were overseeing a burglary investigation and were executing a search warrant at the complainant's residence. The search warrant was approved by a judge and the items seized matched the items described on the warrant.

The named officers' body camera video footage showed several officers seizing evidence consistent with the search warrant parameters, including construction tools, a construction rack, a box, and a jacket.

The named officers conducted a proper search and seizure of evidence from the complainant's property consistent with SFPD policy, Department General Order 6.15, Property Processing.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/20/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE# 2 of 4**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-13: The officers failed to take required action.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers participating in the search of her home did not wear face masks. She said that some officers put on masks at her request. She stated the officers should not have forced their way into her home without wearing required face masks.

The named officers stated they were executing a search warrant at the complainant's property and that their goal was to locate a suspect and evidence related to an ongoing burglary investigation. Some named officers stated that they recalled wearing their masks during the incident, while other named officers stated they took off their masks during parts of the operation. One named officer stated he was not wearing a mask when he and other officers initially served the search warrant. He stated when the complainant in her residence became upset about officers not wearing their masks, he placed his mask on because it helped to deescalate the situation. Other named officers further stated they wore their masks most of the time but that they took off their masks intermittently to clearly communicate and give verbal commands to one another and the residents during the incident, in support of officer safety.

Body worn camera footage of the incident showed the named officers executed a search warrant at the complainant's property. The footage revealed that multiple officers on scene were not wearing masks or wore masks intermittently when they encountered the complainant and other residents. The footage revealed that the complainant yelled at the officers that they did not have masks on while she was escorted from her residence and when she was detained outside with other residents. The footage further showed the majority of officers placed their masks on after the complainant from inside the main residence became upset and yelled at them to put their masks on.

Department Bulletin 20-094 states, "... in order to stay ahead of the curve, a mask or respirator must be worn at all times in the workplace and in the community as we engage with each other or while providing service to the community."

The evidence showed that several named officers entered the complainant's residence without wearing face masks while others improperly removed their masks intermittently throughout the incident.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/20/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE# 3 of 4**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #14-21: The officers displayed a weapon without justification.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers entered her residence with their guns drawn.

The named officers stated they served a search warrant at the complainant's residence to arrest a burglary suspect and seized evidence related to a burglary investigation. One of the named officers stated he pointed his firearm at one resident after an officer in charge directed him to the rear of the main residence. The named officer notified a sergeant regarding his use of force.

Body worn camera video footage of the incident showed that the entry team that conducted a protected sweep of the complainant's main residence and adjacent buildings had their guns drawn while searching for a burglary suspect, who was subsequently determined not to be at the scene.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/20/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE# 4 of 4**

SUMMARY OF DPA ALLEGATION #22: The officer intentionally damaged property.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that, after officers searched her residence, she noticed the words “San Francisco Police” in reverse white lettering on one of her walls. The complainant stated the police did not inform her or explain to her why they had “spray painted” her property. She provided a photo of the lettering, which is apparent on a wooden wall in her home.

Body camera footage did not show any officer spray painting or marking the complainant’s property with the reversed letters. The numerous officers at the scene all denied painting a logo on the complainant’s property. One officer stated that he had leaned against a wall for an extended period as he guarded a door to a room containing the complainant’s dog to prevent its escape. The named officer stated that the logo printed on the back of his raid jacket may have transferred onto the complainant’s wall due to the humidity. The named officer stated that he did not see any damage to the complainant’s wall, that he did not intend to mark the complainant’s wall, and that any transfer of ink from his clothing was inadvertent.

The evidence showed that the named officer likely left a mark on the complainant’s wall inadvertently and that his actions did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/13/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/29/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that plainclothes officers, possibly members of the narcotics unit, have been making threats against his daughter.

Based on the limited amount of information the complainant provided to the DPA, the identity of the alleged officers could not be established, and it is more likely than not that the conduct did not occur.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/17/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/09/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 3

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant and co-complainant stated that a search warrant was executed on their residence. During the execution of the search warrant, the main gate to their building, their residence door, and their neighbor's door were broken down and damaged. The co-complainants felt the damage was excessive.

The named officer stated that a search warrant, signed by a judge, was obtained to search the complainant and co-complainant's residence related to a child pornography case. The named officer stated that they gave knock notices at the gate of the building, and to the unmarked doors on the lower and upper levels. There was no response. Due to that factor, they had to use force to enter those areas. The named officer stated when he was conducting his investigation prior to the execution of the search warrant, the complainant and co-complainant's residence appeared to be a single-family dwelling. This was determined during a surveillance operation where they did not observe multiple people leaving the residence. Additionally, the named officer conducted an Accurint search on the residence that did not show any information showing separate units inside the building. The named officer also stated that upon entry into the building, they did not see any numbers or letters on the unit doors showing separate units. Officers spoke to the upstairs resident who told officers that there was no relation to the downstairs residents except that they were neighbors. Officers then found items in the downstairs unit that confirmed the downstairs residents were the suspected targets. Upon determining that the lower-level unit belonged to the complainant and co-complainant, they stopped their search on the upper-level unit. The named officer stated that if they knew that there were two separate units, he would've focused his team's attention on the unit the complainant and co-complainant resided in. The named officer stated that the warrant he was granted allowed forceable entry into the entire building and complainant and co-complainant's residence.

The DPA obtained a copy of the search warrant. The search warrant shows that it granted the search of the building the complainant and co-complainant resided in. The search warrant was signed by a judge. It granted entry into, "All rooms, attics, basements and other parts therein, any garages, storage rooms, and trash containers." While the DPA received a copy of the search warrant in which the address of the building was redacted, the co-complainants provided a search warrant cover sheet that confirmed the address was for the whole building and did not include a unit designation.

The DPA also obtained a copy of the incident report related to the incident. The report detailed the named officer's knock-and-notice attempts as well as the damaged caused to the doors and gate of the building.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/17/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/09/21 PAGE# 2 of 3

The DPA also obtained the named officer's body-worn camera footage of the incident. The named officer's body-worn camera footage was consistent with his statements provided in his incident report and in his DPA interview.

A witness was interviewed regarding this incident. The witness stated that he heard the officers banging on his door. The witness was on the phone with his father who advised him not to do anything. The officers then knocked the door down to enter his residence.

No additional witnesses were identified.

The named officer obtained a signed search warrant to enter and search the complainant's residence. Forceable entry was used inside of the building upon not getting any response that there were individuals inside of the building.

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant and co-complainant stated that they felt items may have been taken from their residence that weren't noted on the documents provided by SFPD. When asked what items they felt might have been taken from the residence that weren't documented, they did not know.

The named officer stated that all items that were seized from the complainant and co-complainant's residence were documented in the incident report, property receipt, and return for the search warrant. The named officer denied that any additional items were taken from the complainant and co-complainant's residence.

The DPA obtained a copy of the incident report, property receipt, and property release. The items that were taken from the residence are consistent on all three documents.

No other witnesses were identified.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/17/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/09/21 **PAGE# 3 of 3**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 7.01.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant and co-complainant stated that SFPD officers interrogated a minor during the search of their residence which they felt was inappropriate.

The named officer acknowledged there was a child he interacted with during the incident. The named officer stated that the only questions he asked the minor were what his name and date of birth was. He informed the child that he needed to speak to his parents. The named officer spoke with the child's father who advised the named officer to release custody of the child to his uncle. The named officer denied interrogating the child and added that the child was not a suspect in this incident.

The DPA obtained the incident reporting pertaining to the incident. The named officer's statement regarding his interaction with the child are consistent with his statement he provided in his DPA interview.

A witness was interviewed regarding this incident. The witness stated that officers knocked his door down, came into his home, and asked him if he knew his neighbor downstairs. The witness stated that officers on scene did not ask him any other questions. The witness stated that an officer talked to his father on the phone about why they were at their residence. The witness stated that his uncle came by to get him a short while later.

No other witnesses were identified.

Department General Order 7.01, Section B, "Temporary Detention" states, "Take immediate steps to notify the juvenile's parent, guardian, or a responsible person that the juvenile is in custody and the place where he or she is being held."

The named officer did not interrogate the child as confirmed by a witness statement. The named officer notified the child's parent who then helped facilitate the custody exchange with a relative in accordance with Department policy.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated there was an incident on his block that involved multiple police and fire units. The complainant stated he approached officers to move a vehicle that was blocking his driveway and the officers refused. The complainant was unable to identify any of the officers.

The DPA was provided with a photo by the complainant of the SFPD vehicle's license plate number that was blocking his driveway. The DPA confirmed via correspondence with SFPD's legal department that the vehicle in question was associated with a specific police station. DPA reviewed the equipment log from the day of the incident and the corresponding CAD but could not identify who was using the vehicle that day. The DPA also sent an ID Poll to the corresponding police station, but it produced negative results as well.

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

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when he approached an officer about moving the vehicle that was blocking his driveway, he was told to go talk to somebody else. The complainant was unable to identify any of the officers.

The DPA was provided with a photo by the complainant of the SFPD vehicle's license plate number that was blocking his driveway. The DPA confirmed via correspondence with SFPD's legal department that the vehicle in question was associated with a specific police station. DPA reviewed the equipment log from the day of the incident and the corresponding CAD but could not identify who was using the vehicle that day. The DPA also sent an ID Poll to the corresponding police station, but it produced negative results as well.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/01/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/02/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he went to his neighborhood police station and filed a report regarding package thefts within his apartment building. He stated that the officer told him that a detective would be assigned to the case, but weeks went by and there was no follow up.

The named officer took the complainant's report. He denied telling the complainant that a detective would be assigned to the case. He did not recall the exact conversation he had with the complainant but stated that he possibly advised him of the procedure; namely, that cases are forwarded to an investigative unit for review and/or follow up and that the investigative unit would be responsible for follow up if applicable. The named officer was unaware whether any further action was taken regarding the complainant's report of package thefts.

Department records showed that the complainant made a report of package theft and that the named officer provided him with forms and information. The case was not assigned for follow up and there was no associated Chronological of Investigation Report.

There was no body-worn camera footage available.

Department Notice 20-107 provides that the Department must "manage its resources in a reasonable, effective and efficient manner" and, as such, the Investigations Bureau Lieutenants and the Station Investigation Team Lieutenants shall review and evaluate incident reports and consider staffing levels and other factors in determining whether to assign cases to Investigators. Cases that are not assigned are administratively filed as open/inactive and may be activated when new information is presented.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 04/04/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/09/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/05/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer did not issue citations to the African American and Latino vendors, but cited the complainant, who is Asian.

Department General Order 5.17, Bias-Free Policing, states that a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States is equal protection under the law. Along with this right is the fundamental right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures by government agents as guaranteed by the Fourth Amendment. Department members are charged with protecting these rights for all people, regardless of race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or socio-economic status. Police action that is biased is illegal and violates these rights. Biased policing is unsafe, unjust and ineffective.

Body-worn camera for this incident documented that the named officer observed the complainant's van parked on the sidewalk and blocking a handicap ramp. When the named officer approached the complainant and informed him that he was blocking the handicap ramp, the complainant accused the named officer of discrimination. The body-worn camera did not capture other vendors and did not show any evidence of biased policing.

The incident report documented that the named officer contacted the complainant twice that day. He initially encountered the complainant in the morning during a passing call and issued the vehicle a citation for parking on the sidewalk and blocking a handicap access ramp. When the named officer noticed that the vehicle was occupied, he told the complainant to move his vehicle. The named officer, believing the complainant would comply with his lawful order, subsequently left the area. The named officer returned to the area two hours later and the complainant's vehicle was still blocking the handicap ramp. At that time, the named officer ran a record check on the complainant and his vehicle. The record check revealed the complainant had an outstanding warrant.

Department records and body-worn camera footage documented there was no evidence of a violation of Department policy.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/05/21 **PAGE# 2 of 4**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he did nothing wrong and was arrested for no reason.

Department records and body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer conducted a record check of the vehicle and the complainant, which revealed the complainant had an outstanding warrant. The named officer informed the complainant that after he confirmed the warrant, the complainant would be arrested. The named officer confirmed the warrant and arrested the complainant.

Department General Order 6.18, Warrant Arrests, officers are required to make a warrant check prior to completing a citation for a misdemeanor, infraction, or traffic violations, provided it could be completed in the time reasonably necessary to issue the citation. Additionally, whenever a person is detained as the subject of a warrant (whether traffic or non-traffic, foreign or local) the detaining officer shall personally contact the Warrant Section and verify that the warrant is valid before acting on the directions of the warrant. When a warrant has been verified and the identity of the subject is confirmed, the subject shall be taken into custody.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/05/21 PAGE# 3 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer twisted his arm and took him down.

Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force, states that officers shall strive to use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose. The order also allows handcuffing and control holds as possible force options even when a subject offers no resistance and allows takedowns and techniques to direct movement or immobilize when a subject does not respond to verbal commands but also offers no physical form of resistance.

The body-worn camera footage did not corroborate the complainant's claim that the named officer took him down and twisted his arm. In contrast, the body-worn camera showed that the named officer used reasonable force to arrest the complainant.

Based on the Department records there was no violation of Department policy.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/10/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/05/21 **PAGE#** 4 of 4

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer took his cash, his credit cards, and driver's license, while other property valued at over \$50,000 was left at the scene at the tie he was arrested.

Department General Order 6.15, Property Processing, stated in parts that when taking or receiving Property for Identification from a person (Including an arrestee), complete a Property Receipt (SFPD 315) in duplicate. Give the person the original and keep the copy. If the form is not issued, stated the reason in your incident report.

Department records and body-worn camera showed that the complainant had a large collection of property that was hidden under a tarp directly under a Port of San Francisco sign prohibiting items left on the sidewalk overnight. An ambulance was summoned, and the complainant received medical attention that was unrelated to the arrest. The named officer gave the medics the complainant's personal property. With approval of a lieutenant, the complainant was released to seek medical aid and issued a certificate of release. Subsequently, Port of San Francisco personnel was on scene bagging and tagging the complainant's merchandise.

Per the department policy, the named officer detailed in the incident report that the complainant was cited and release for the outstanding warrant to receive medical care. The named officer therefore did not book any property that belonged to the complainant. Additionally, the named officer did not take control of the complainant's property that was under the Port of San Francisco's authority.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/18/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in an online complaint that people were blocking the roads while motorcycling and setting off fireworks in his neighborhood.

The DPA contacted the complainant for further information, but the complainant did not respond. The complainant did not provide sufficient information to investigate.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/22/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/30/21 **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 his friend was sitting on a park bench when a uniformed officer told him to leave because he did not belong in the area. Shocked by what the officer had just said and in fear for his life, his friend hurriedly left the park. The complainant did not identify his friend and had no other information about the officer's identity. The complainant was not present during the incident and did not respond to DPA efforts to reach him for additional information.

An identification poll sent to the district station failed to identify an involved officer. The complainant failed to provide additional requested evidence necessary to complete the investigation.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 05/19/20 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/01/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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 10/06/2021.

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: No findings because the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/12/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE#1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 11/3/21.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3: The officers engaged in unwarranted action.

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 11/3/21.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/04/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer inappropriately cursed at him, verbally harassed him, and made hand gestures motioning for him to leave the station when he was seeking his assistance at the district station's front desk.

The named officer confirmed working the front desk on said date. However, he does not recall interacting with the complainant or having any knowledge of the complainant. He indicated that he otherwise would not behave in the manner as described by the complainant.

The complainant has a documented history of frequent complaints of a similar nature that lacked merit. DPA has taken this history into account when assessing the complainant's credibility in this matter.

Taking this into account, DPA has determined that the officer more likely than not did not engage with the complainant in the accused manner.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: 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 also refused to provide the complainant with assistance in generating and following-up on police reports.

The named officer denied the allegation stating that in general, he does not refuse to generate reports or otherwise refuse to assist anyone who requires assistance.

The complainant has a documented history of frequent complaints of a similar nature that lacked merit. DPA has taken this history into account when assessing the complainant's credibility in this matter.

Taking this into account, DPA has determined that the officer more likely than not did not engage in the alleged conduct.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/19/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/04/21 **PAGE#** 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer engaged in retaliatory behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer retaliates against him for attempting to generate police reports at the district station.

The named officer denied the allegation, stating that he would never retaliate against an individual for trying to report an incident as it is his duty as a police officer to accept reports.

The complainant has a documented history of frequent complaints of a similar nature that lacked merit. DPA has taken this history into account when assessing the complainant's credibility in this matter.

Taking this into account, DPA has determined that the officer more likely than not did not engage in the alleged conduct.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/16/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/19/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant visited a district police station to report a financial crime committed against her by her former spouse. The officer behind the glass refused to take her report and referred her to an investigation unit that did not investigate financial crimes. The complainant did know the name or star number of the officer, but provided DPA a description 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.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer has left the Department and therefore the investigation cannot be completed.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/29/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/29/21 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was assaulted at his residence. He called police and officers responded, but the complainant stated that they failed to identify the suspect and investigate the matter further. He stated he felt the officer had not taken the matter seriously, that he had called the station and learned that the case had not been assigned at that time, and that the suspect remained at the residence.

The named officer stated that he met with the complainant and took his statement, offered medical attention, and conducted a thorough investigation to the best of his ability with the information that was provided. He stated that the complainant explained he had gotten into a verbal altercation that turned physical in the residence. His partner spoke with the residence staff, but they did not provide information regarding the other party involved. The named officer stated that he was unable to identify the suspect because the complainant did not know where the suspect's room was located, and the staff did not provide that information. Once the report was completed, the named officer forwarded it to the station investigation team. He stated that he does not assign cases and is not made aware when cases are assigned. The named officer stated that he always took the incident seriously and advised the complainant not to engage with hostile individuals for his own safety.

A witness officer who oversees the station investigation team, but was not involved in this case, stated that case assignment criteria include factors such as severity and solvability of the crime reported as well as the unit staffing level. He stated that based on review of the incident report, this type of case would not typically be assigned as there were no witnesses, no injuries reported, and no video surveillance cameras noted. In addition, he noted that the reporting victim was documented as having instigated a confrontation with a suspect.

The incident report documented that the complainant recounted the interaction with the suspect, did not have visible injuries and refused medical attention. The report also showed that the complainant had never seen the subject prior to this incident and that there were no cameras that would have captured the incident. The report showed that the named officer took a photo of the complainant and provided follow up forms and that his partner asked staff whether they were familiar with the suspect, but they refused to provide information. Department records showed that the case was not assigned for follow up and there was no associated Chronological of Investigation Report.

Body-worn camera footage was consistent with the named officer's account.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 07/29/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/29/21 PAGE# 2 of 2

Department Notice 20-107 provides that the Department must “manage its resources in a reasonable, effective and efficient manner” and, as such, the Investigations Bureau Lieutenants and the Station Investigation Team Lieutenants shall review and evaluate incident reports and consider staffing levels and other factors in determining whether to assign cases to Investigators. Cases that are not assigned are administratively filed as open/inactive and may be activated when new information is presented.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/22/21 **PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: Police were called to intervene in a domestic dispute between the complainant's son and his partner. The named officer arrived and ordered the complainant to step away so he could talk to the involved parties. The complainant refused to step back, and the officer pulled her away and had her son placed in handcuffs for no reason.

Body-worn camera video showed that the complainant's son was initially uncooperative and refused to answer questions about the domestic dispute. The officer ordered the complainant and her son to separate for questioning and they both refused. When the officer tried to separate them, the complainant's son started yelling, made sudden movements, and held the complainant's arm, prompting officers to put him in handcuffs.

An officer may detain a person in handcuffs for protection and safety, if necessary. In this situation, using handcuffs was appropriate because the complainant's son physically resisted officers who were investigating whether a domestic violence incident had occurred.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/12/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/22/21 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer was pushy and threatened to arrest her if she did not move away from her son, who was being detained while officers investigated a domestic dispute. She stated the officer inappropriately grabbed her arm to separate her from her son.

Body-worn camera video showed the officer acted appropriately. He did not threaten to arrest the complainant. The complainant disobeyed several orders to step away to allow officers the space they needed to interview the involved parties. The complainant and her son were talking over each other and the officers, preventing the officers from conducting interviews. The named officer held onto the complainant's upper left arm and guided her to a spot a few feet away from her son. The separation allowed officers to privately interview each party and conduct a thorough investigation. Once the parties were separated, the named officer spent time helping the complainant and her son calm down and listening to what they had to say. The named officer determined that the complainant's son was in crisis and deescalated the situation.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/24/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/05/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 11/3/21.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/30/21 DATE OF COMPLETION: 11/11/21 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated her luggage was stolen from the San Francisco Airport baggage claim carousel. The complainant provided a report number to the DPA and some details about the missing bag, but she was unclear about any complaint against an officer. The DPA reached out to the complainant ten times via phone call, text and email and requested an interview and to identify the named officer. Interview questions were sent to the complainant via email in lieu of a verbal interview. Once the DPA reached the complainant, the complainant did not provide any further information about a complaint against an officer and suggested that she did not want to file a complaint in the first place. The DPA sent a ten-day notice to the complainant for follow up and the complainant did not reply.

A report number was provided by the complainant, but the report number did not have the correct number of digits to be a police report. The DPA could not locate any further documentation related to the missing bag.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 09/22/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/11/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated a truck had been double parked for six hours across the street from his house and the named officers refused to move it.

The named officers stated they received a call that a parking control officer needed assistance. When they arrived at the location, they saw a moving truck and the complainant. The complainant was aggressively posturing and was yelling at people near the moving truck. The named officers stated they spoke with all parties and determined that the truck was not blocking the complainant's driveway and that there was plenty of room for other vehicles to pass. Additionally, the named officers stated they found the complainant's request unreasonable and, per DGO 9.01, officers are allowed to use discretion when enforcing traffic laws.

Dispatch records showed the named officers responded to a call to meet with a parking control officer. The parking control officer was on their route when a resident came out and began to aggressively yell at the employee and other passersby.

According to DGO 9.01, I. A. 3:

“DISCRETION. Members enforcing traffic and parking laws must also use discretion; however, members shall not let the attitude of a violator influence their enforcement action.”

The named officers' BWC showed they explained to the complainant their decision. The BWC showed the complainant was not happy with the decision and threatened to file a complaint against the officers.

The YouTube link provided by the complainant showed the named officers engaging professionally with the complainant, furnishing their name and badge number, telling the complainant goodbye and disengaging by walking away.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/04/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer harassed him by arresting him while he was receiving medical treatment at a medical facility and inappropriately transported him to County jail where his injuries worsened.

Department records reflected that while such an arrest and transportation occurred, the accused officer was not involved.

The evidence proves that the accused officer was not involved.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 03/04/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an officer harassed him by arresting him while he was receiving medical treatment at a medical facility and inappropriately transported him to County jail where his injuries worsened.

Department records showed that the complainant was the subject of an ongoing criminal investigation. Pursuant to the criminal investigation, the named officer instructed several officers to respond to the medical facility to arrest and transport the complainant to the County jail. The officers did so accordingly, and the complainant was booked into County jail.

Medical records showed that the facility medically cleared the complainant for discharge. Additionally, before being booked into the County jail, the jail also conducts a medical evaluation and clearance to determine whether any existing injury or illness can be properly managed within the jail. The County jail facility will not accept any person who is not medically cleared.

Thus, while DPA understands the complainant believed he was being harassed by the officers, the evidence showed that the named officer issued such orders pursuant to legitimate law enforcement purposes and that because the complainant was medically cleared, the subsequent transfer was proper. Moreover, any culpability for worsened injuries thereafter can neither be attributed to the named officer, nor the San Francisco Police Department.

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/20/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA **FINDING:** IO-1/SFSO **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: 10/20/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/19/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CU **FINDING:** IO-1 **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

San Francisco Public Library
Chief of Main
100 Larkin Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/22/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/22/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

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

CHP-Office of Internal Affairs
601 North 7th Street
P.O. Box 942898
Sacramento, CA 94298

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/27/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/08/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

BART Police Department
101 8th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Office of the Independent Police Auditor
300 Lakeside Drive
Oakland, CA 94612

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 10/29/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/22/21 **PAGE#** 1 of 1

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

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

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

SFMTA
1 S. Van Ness Avenue, 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA **FINDING:** IO-1/SFSO **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: 11/09/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/11/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA **FINDING:** IO-1/SFSO **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: 11/10/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/19/21 **PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was driving on a street when he saw a double-parked vehicle ahead of him. The complainant stated he swerved to avoid the vehicle. The complainant stated the named officer pulled him over, cited him, and then argued with the complainant about the citation.

The named officer is no longer with the Department.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was in court to contest the citation he was issued when the named officer approached him. The complainant stated the named officer said he was a military veteran who fought in the Middle East. The complainant stated that although he is not of Middle Eastern descent, he nevertheless perceived the comment by the named officer as odd and discriminatory because of his brown skin.

The named officer is no longer with the Department.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/10/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/19/21 **PAGE# 2 of 2**

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer engaged in retaliatory behavior.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer discovered the complainant's government employer. The complainant stated the named officer falsely filed a complaint against him which resulted in the termination of the complainant's employment.

The named officer is no longer with the Department.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

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

Lalganji Police Station Mirzapur
C/O Chief of Police
Lalganji
Uttar Pradesh
231211
India

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

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

SFMTA Department of Parking & Traffic
11 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
United States

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

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

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

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

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

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/29/21 **DATE OF COMPLETION:** 11/30/21 **PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

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

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

Nigerian Police Department
Adesuwa Sapele Road
Oka 300102
Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria