
POLICE CONDUCT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION
Case Summary Data #1
August 2017

OVERVIEW OF THE COMPLAINT

Complainant, a nurse, claims that an officer was "very rude and unprofessional" with her and three other nurses present. More specifically, Complainant contends that the officer made it difficult for the nurses to make a blood draw by, for instance, not answering nurses' questions and otherwise making it difficult for nurses to fill out paperwork.

ALLEGED VIOLATIONS

1. MPD P&P § 5-104.01 – PROFESSIONAL POLICING: Officers shall use the following practices when contacting any citizen, regardless of the reason for the contact: Be courteous, respectful, polite and professional . . . [and shall] Attempt to answer any relevant questions that the citizen may have regarding the citizen/officer contact, including relevant referrals to other city or county agencies when appropriate . . . [and shall] If asked, provide the procedures for filing a complaint about police services or conduct.

COMPLAINT PROCESSING

Upon receipt of the complaint, an intake investigation was conducted and the matter was subsequently brought before the Joint Supervisors for intake review. Upon review of the complaint, the Joint Supervisors sent the matter to the appropriate precinct for coaching. After the officer's supervisor completed the coaching investigation, the coaching documentation was received by the Joint Supervisors, who then approved it.

EVIDENCE

1. Complaint
2. VisiNet Report
3. CAPRS Report

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Complaint: Complainant contends that the officer was very rude and unprofessional with her and three other nurses present. Complainant claims that the officer made it difficult to do a legal blood draw. Complainant alleges that the officer made it hard for the nurses to fill out paperwork since the officer would not answer the nurses' questions.

VisiNet Report: The report indicates that the focus officer brought an individual for a chemical test at a hospital and subsequently to jail. No notes exist that pertain specifically to Complainant or her interactions with the officer.

CAPRS Report: The report states that the officer saw the listed vehicle within 200 feet of another vehicle with its high beams on. The driver was subsequently stopped and found to be impaired. After an investigation in which the officer believed the arrestee to be impaired, a warrant was signed for a blood test. Importantly, no notes in the CAPRS report relate to the interaction between Complainant and the focus officer.

COACHING—NO POLICY VIOLATION OR COACHING

According to the supervisor, the officer could not recall a time when he refused to answer Complainant's questions or was being rude or disrespectful to Complainant. The officer recalled very little of the visit with the Complainant and it was indistinguishable to him from previous visits. The officer only recalled being asked for a copy of the search warrant by the staff. The officer did not provide a copy since officers have been advised not to do so by the City and County Attorneys. The officer did state that the staff could make their own copy of the warrant once the officer had given a copy to the defendant. The officer arrived with only one copy of the warrant to be given to the defendant, and thus had no way of creating an additional copy for the staff.

The coaching document indicates that the supervisor spoke with the complainant, but there are no notes in the coaching document about the conversation. It does not indicate whether the supervisor spoke with other nurses present.

The supervisor also sought body camera recordings of the officer's interaction with the Complainant, but no recordings existed (note: this instance occurred prior to the body camera policy change).

In essence, the supervisor found no evidence to support a violation of policy or to coach the officer on his behavior.