

OVERVIEW

It is alleged that an officer tossed the complainant's belongings in the trash after the complainant was arrested. It is also alleged that officers on the scene did not wear the necessary PPE required by MPD.

POLICIES

[10-401.1 - Property and Evidence Acquired Or Temporarily Stored At Precincts](#)

[5-105 \(B\)\(4\) - Professional Code of Conduct](#)

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

Upon receiving an internal notification, an intake review was conducted. Following a review by the Joint Supervisors, the case was sent for Coaching.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet Report
3. Body Worn Camera

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: See "Overview" above.

VisiNet Report: The "Problem" is listed as "Disturbance (P)".

Body Worn Cameras: The body worn camera for the focus officer shows the officer detaining an individual and searching their person as well as a bag. The individual notes that the officer can leave the bag as they don't need it and the officer responds that they'll take it with. Other officers in view are not wearing face masks. The focus officer walks the detainee towards the park and sits them on the bench of a table along with another individual who was detained by another officer, before leading them to another area. At one point another detainee says that the officers could put on masks and one officer notes that they are outside and they don't need to wear masks outside. Later in the video, the focus officer speaks with a Sergeant and asks what they want to do with the detainee's bag as they leave to be transported. The Sergeant responds that the detainee said it wasn't theirs and they would not bring it with. The focus officer then throws it in a nearby trash can.

COACHING

The officer was not coached and a policy violation was not found for 10-401.1 - Property and Evidence Acquired Or Temporarily Stored At Precincts. The supervisor found that the officer was professional and asked the individual over 5 times if the backpack belonged to the individual and did not have access to property and evidence during the shift.

OVERVIEW

It is alleged that an officer added inappropriate comments in their PIMS supplement.

POLICIES

[MPD P&P § 5-105 Professional Code of Conduct](#)

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

Upon receiving an internal notification, an intake review was conducted. Following a review by the Joint Supervisors, the case was sent for Coaching.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet Report

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: It is alleged that an officer added unprofessional personal commentary in their non-public PIMS supplement, making statements that were indecorous regarding other individuals.

VisiNet Report: The “Problem” is listed as “Police Event (P)”.

COACHING

The officer was coached and a policy violation was not found for MPD P&P § 5-105 Professional Code of Conduct. Supervisor determined that none of the comments were offensive, impolite, or made with malicious intent.

OVERVIEW

It is alleged that an officer was rude and dismissive towards the complainant who called to report a crime against their partner.

POLICIES

[5-104.01 - Professional Policing](#)

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

Upon receiving an internal notification, an intake review was conducted. Following a review by the Joint Supervisors, dismissed as No Basis.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet Report
3. Body Worn Camera

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: The complainant contacted the precinct to report an assault against their partner. They alleged that the officer they spoke to was dismissive and inappropriate with their comments and demeanor, showing an overall disregard for public safety. They further alleged that the officer intentionally refused to answer further calls.

VisiNet Report: The “Problem” is listed as “Disturbance (P)”.

Body Worn Cameras: Body worn camera for a second officer shows the officer having a phone conversation with the complainant. Only the officer’s side of the conversation is captured and there is no clear discussion of the alleged interaction with the focus officer. There was no indication that the officer was inappropriate or rude in his interactions.

DISMISSAL

Following review by the Joint Supervisors, this case was found to have No Basis and was dismissed.