

**OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINTS REPORT  
August 2011  
OPA Director's Monthly Message**

The Office of Professional Accountability's monthly report provides information about police misconduct complaints. The report includes summaries as to cases closed during August 2011, along with data on the number and classification of complaints filed, with a comparison to 2010. There are charts showing the percentage of cases closed with different types of findings and information about mediation and policy recommendations.

**August 2011 Highlights**

- 10% of cases closed through August 2011 were Sustained, resulting in discipline.
- 23% of cases closed through August 2011 resulted in a finding of Supervisory Intervention, with a referral for training or counseling.

**In-Car Video**

SPD has a policy that officers with In-Car Video (ICV) systems must make every effort to record citizen contacts. As seen in earlier monthly reports, the August report contains examples of cases involving allegations that an officer failed to use ICV. Because OPA continued to observe inconsistent ICV usage, the OPA Director recommended an audit of the ICV system.

Beginning in January 2011, the Director worked with units throughout SPD to sample In-Car Video usage and better understand the issues that impact whether a police incident will be video recorded by an officer. The Director is looking at the SPD policy on ICV, state law on use of video by law enforcement, a variety of technological factors, and the training an officer receives on using ICV. A report summarizing the OPA Director's findings is expected later this fall.

**Office of Professional Accountability (OPA)  
Complaints Report  
August 2011**

**August Closed Cases:**

*Cases involving alleged misconduct of officers and employees in the course of their official public duties are summarized below. Identifying information has been removed.*

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: LAWS**

Synopsis	Action Taken
A clerk in the City Department of Planning and Development (DPD), in the course of her employment, became aware of a matter between the named officer, unrelated to his police employment, and an inspector in the City DPD regarding whether the named officer was in compliance with DPD rules about rental property.	<p>Allegation and Finding:</p> <p>Administrative Violation of Law (failure to comply with DPD rules regarding rental property)</p> <p>Administratively Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer was acting solely in his private capacity as a landlord, not implicating his police employment in any way, and was interacting with the DPD inspector as any other landlord would in similar circumstances.</p>

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: UNBIASED POLICING**

Synopsis	Action Taken
Complainant, the mother of a teenager who was driving a car that was stopped by the named officer, alleged that the named officer stopped her son because of his race, used unnecessary force on her son when arresting him, and was discourteous with the complainant's son when arresting him.	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Biased Policing – Administratively Unfounded</li> <li>2. Unnecessary Use of Force – Administratively Unfounded</li> <li>3. Discourtesy – Administratively Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer had justification to temporarily detain the complainant's son, justification to arrest him, and did not use inappropriate language toward the complainant's son.</p>

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: UNBIASED POLICING**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, the father of a teenager temporarily detained by the named officer for suspicion of carrying illegal drugs in the area of a nearby party late at night, alleged that the named officer temporarily detained his son because of his race. OPA added an allegation that the named officer failed to comply with Department policy regarding use of the in-car video system.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Biased Policing – Not Sustained</li> <li>2. In-Car Video Policy – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated the named officer was confused about the distinction between a social stop and a temporary investigative detention when he temporarily detained the complainant's son and could not clearly articulate his reasoning. Given that there was contradictory evidence from the subject and named officer as to whether the officer made any reference to race during the underlying incident the evidence neither proved nor disproved if biased policing was involved with the stop. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer had not activated the emergency equipment of his patrol car at the time of the temporary detention, thereby not activating the in-car video system, in violation of Department policy.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Discussion with supervisor regarding the distinction between temporary investigative detentions and social contacts, and discussion with supervisor regarding complying with Department policy covering the operation of the in-car video system.</p>

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: PROFESSIONALISM**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, whom the named officer was arresting for Promoting Prostitution of a Minor, alleged that the named officer used unacceptable language when addressing him. The complainant also expressed displeasure at not being able to immediately telephone his mother after his arrest.</p>	<p>Allegation and Finding:</p> <p>Professionalism-Profanity – Not Sustained</p> <p>The evidence did not permit a determination of whether the named officer used the language alleged. The named officer denied using inappropriate language to address the complainant.</p>
<p>Complainant, a by-stander who overheard the named officer interacting with an apparently drug-impaired suspect, alleged that the named officer threatened to extinguish a cigarette in the eye of the suspect.</p>	<p>Allegation and Finding:</p> <p>Professionalism-Courtesy – Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer, while interacting with the suspect, had removed a lit cigarette from the suspect's mouth as a safety precaution and was explaining to the suspect the hazard to the officer of allowing a detained suspect to possess a lit cigarette, and was not threatening or being discourteous to the suspect. The evidence also demonstrated that the complainant did not overhear the entire conversation between the named officer and the suspect.</p>

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: PROFESSIONALISM**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, who was driving a large commercial truck passing through a construction area with a limited height restriction, alleged that the named officer, working off-duty as a flagger at the site, exercised poor discretion by not assisting the complainant in backing his truck out of the predicament and did not accurately provide his serial number to the complainant when asked. Subsequently, OPA added allegations that the named officer did not have a secondary employment permit for the job and that he had failed to log on over police radio for that job.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Professionalism-Discretion – Exonerated</li> <li>2. Failure to Identify Self – Exonerated</li> <li>3. Failure to Possess Secondary Employment Permit – Supervisory Intervention</li> <li>4. Failure to Log-on over Police Radio – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the complainant had given the named officer several estimates about the height of the truck that he was driving and that this inability of the complainant to provide an accurate height for the truck created a risk to workers since the truck may not have been able to pass under the structure over the construction site at which the named officer was flagging. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer was reasonable in declining to involve himself in guiding the backing of the commercial truck and that the named officer adequately identified himself to the complainant. The evidence established that the named officer's secondary employment permit had expired and that he had not logged on over police radio when he began his job.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Supervisory counseling regarding compliance with Department policy regarding secondary employment.</p>

**EMPLOYEE CONDUCT: SECONDARY EMPLOYMENT**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>During the investigation of an unrelated OPA-IS case, the investigator discovered that the named officer did not have a secondary employment permit on file with the Department's Human Resources Section.</p>	<p>Allegation and Finding:</p> <p>Failure to Possess a Secondary Employment Permit – Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer did have a secondary employment permit, the apparent absence of it being a result of the original being lost but a copy of the original proving its existence.</p>

**PATROL OPERATIONS: COLLISION INVESTIGATIONS**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, who reported that a hit and run driver had driven over his toes as he was attempting to cross a street, alleged that the responding officer did not complete a pedestrian collision report, as the complainant requested. Subsequently, OPA added an allegation that the named officer did not operate his in-car video system in compliance with Department policy.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Failure to Complete Collision Report – Not Sustained</li> <li>2. Failure to Use In-Car Video System – Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence was inconclusive regarding whether at the time of the collision investigation by the named officer the complainant asked to have a collision report completed. The evidence also showed that the named officer was not in violation of Department policy regarding use of the in-car video system.</p>

**SEARCH & SEIZURE: SEARCHES-GENERAL**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant, a visitor in an apartment unit in which officers were looking for a person wanted under an arrest warrant, alleged that the named officers lacked authority to search her apartment and removed from the scene a glass “dope/crack” pipe without leaving the complainant a receipt for taking the pipe and offered the complainant an opportunity to voluntarily wash down a sink drain a very small quantity of white powder in a line on a glass plate, next to a rolled up \$1 bill, laying on a bed in the apartment.</p>	<p>Same allegations and findings for both named officers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improper Search – Not Sustained</li> <li>2. Mishandling Evidence – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officers possessed an arrest warrant for a person whom they knew lived in the apartment unit a couple of weeks before but that they also knew many other people inhabited the unit at different times, coming and going at different times. The officers also possessed credible information that the apartment unit was a focus of suspected illegal drug activity, according to on-going reports and complaints from neighbors. The evidence demonstrated that the named officers thought that they were entering the apartment unit under exigent circumstances, while the complainant believed the named officers just “bulldozed” their way into the apartment for no apparent reason. The evidence was inconclusive regarding whether the entry was unjustified.</p> <p>Regarding the allegation that the named officers improperly confiscated a glass “dope/crack” pipe, the evidence was inconclusive regarding whether the named officers confiscated the pipe, as alleged. The evidence demonstrated that the named officers did offer the complainant the opportunity to dispose of a very small quantity of white powder, next to a rolled up \$1 bill, that was on a glass plate on a bed in the apartment unit by washing it down a sink drain, which the complainant accepted and did.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Supervisory counseling regarding the importance of strictly adhering to established protocol for handling evidence of illegal drug use.</p>
<p>Complainant alleged that the named officers unlawfully broke down the door to her apartment, accused her and her boyfriend of being involved in illegal drug dealing, threatened to take the complainant and her friends to jail to charge them with “killing my boyfriend,” and improperly searched the complainant’s purse, finding methamphetamine, which the named officers allegedly returned to the complainant.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <p>Named officer #1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improper Search – Exonerated</li> <li>2. Mishandling Evidence – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>Named officer #2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improper Search – Exonerated</li> <li>2. Failure to Supervise – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>Named officer #3 (unknown):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improper Search -- Exonerated</li> <li>2. Communications and Confidentiality – Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that this case was remarkably similar to another OPA case recently initiated by the same complainant involving the same location, similar context, and similar allegations of misconduct, only against different officers. The evidence demonstrated that the complainant’s condo unit was the object of on-going complaints from neighbors regarding continuing illegal narcotics activity, the presence of squatters, and many suspicious visitors to the unit at all hours.</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that police radio had dispatched the</p>

	<p>named officers to this location at about 0130 hours to investigate a possible disturbance inside the unit with a woman crying/screaming. Officers, upon arriving, heard a moaning sound coming from inside the condo unit, indicating someone possibly in pain, and alternating male and female voices. No one answered the repeated knocks of the officers at the door. The evidence demonstrated that the named officers forcibly entered the condo unit under their community care taking authority to check on the welfare of someone possibly needing prompt medical care or other assistance. Named officer #1 removed a bag of sugar from the unit and disposed of it, thinking it to be contraband, i.e., illegal drugs.</p> <p>Corrective Action:                  Supervisory counseling regarding the importance of handling property or evidence in accordance with Department policy.                  Counseling of the acting sergeant at the scene regarding the importance of assuming supervisory responsibility at the scene to ensure proper handling and processing of property or evidence.</p>
--	--

**SEARCH & SEIZURE: USE OF FORCE**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant phoned 911 to report her daughter had possibly overdosed on drugs and was hallucinating at their residence and expressed concern that her daughter had access to knives and posed a threat to the complainant and her grandchildren. Complainant, 13 months after the incident, alleged the named officers used unnecessary force when controlling the complainant's daughter. OPA subsequently added allegation of failure to report a use of force when the Use of Force Report was initially not found filed with the incident report.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:                  Named officer #1:                  1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated                  2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded                  Named officer #2:                  1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated                  2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded                  Unknown officer #3:                  1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated                  2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded                  Named officer #4:                  1. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officers used reasonable and necessary force when attempting to control the complainant's daughter who repeatedly bit and attempted to bite the named officers, including puncturing the skin of one of the named officers. The evidence demonstrated that the named officers had completed the required Use of Force Report but that it had simply become separated from the incident report during administrative processing.</p>
<p>Complainant alleged that unknown officer(s) entered his apartment without justification, beat him, and involuntarily committed him at a local hospital for a mental health evaluation.</p>	<p>Allegation and Finding:                  Unnecessary Use of Force – Administratively Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the complainant suffered from extreme mental health issues and that officers did assist him in obtaining the mental health care that he needed. However, the documentation of the incident, the exemplary service provided by the officers, and the complainant's confused state, when evaluated under the totality of the circumstances, did not warrant bringing allegations of misconduct against named officers.</p>

**SEARCH & SEIZURE: USE OF FORCE**

Synopsis	Action Taken
Complainant, who had offered to sell an undercover police officer cocaine, alleged that named officer used unnecessary force when arresting him.	<p>Allegation and Finding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Unfounded</li> <li>2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence, including considerable medical and mental health evidence, demonstrated that the misconduct alleged did not occur.</p>
Complainant, whom the named officer was arresting for DUI, alleged that, for no reason, the named officer opened the door of complainant's car, forcefully pulled him from the car, and slammed him to the ground. Complainant also alleged that the named officer failed to report the force that he used.	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated</li> <li>2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer had stopped the complainant's car as he operated it at about 2:45 AM on a city street without the headlights turned on. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer, upon stopping the complainant, smelled the odors of both alcohol and marijuana wafting from the passenger compartment of the car. The evidence demonstrated that the complainant's self-induced condition likely contributed or caused the complainant to tumble to the pavement upon attempting to exit his car at the direction of the named officer. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer actually attempted to steady the complainant as the complainant literally fell out of his car onto the street. The evidence demonstrated that the "force" used by the named officer consisted only of his attempt to steady the complainant and assist him out of his car safely.</p>
The complainant, a passer-by not involved with the incident, alleged that he saw the named officers roughly handling a person on a city sidewalk who was doing nothing wrong and that one of the named officers inappropriately interfered with another by-stander who was attempting to video tape the officers with a cell phone.	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <p>Named officer #1: Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated</p> <p>Named officer #2: Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated</p> <p>Named officer #3: Citizen Observation of Officers – Exonerated</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that named officers #1 and #2 were arresting a suspect in a street-level illegal narcotics transaction and that they used necessary and reasonable force to overcome his resistance and take custody of him. The evidence demonstrated that this arrest and use of force was thoroughly reported and the incident screened by a patrol supervisor at the scene. The evidence also demonstrated that named officer #3 did not inappropriately interfere with a by-stander desiring to videotape the arrest but appropriately asked the by-stander to move away from the immediate area of the arrest to a nearby area from which the by-stander would still be able to clearly videotape the action but not be involved in it.</p>

**SEARCH & SEIZURE: USE OF FORCE**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant began using his cell phone to videotape the named officer, who was working secondary employment as a security guard at the Pike Place Market shortly after the named officer had assisted Pike Place Market Security with a disturbance involving an intoxicated man. The complainant alleged that the named officer approached him about being videotaped, slapped complainant's cell phone from his hand (breaking it), and pushed him backward several times, including slamming him into a wall as he attempted to pick up his cell phone. During the OPA investigation, information came to light that the named officer may not have possessed a secondary employment permit, may not have logged on over police radio for the secondary employment, and may not have reported the force that he used on the complainant.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Unfounded</li> <li>2. Citizen Observation of Officers – Exonerated</li> <li>3. Failure to Possess Secondary Employment Permit – Unfounded</li> <li>4. Failure to Log-on over Police Radio to Secondary Employment – Supervisory Intervention</li> <li>5. Failure to Report Use of Force – Supervisory Intervention</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the complainant grossly exaggerated the force used against him by the named officer and that the force used by the named officer consisted primarily of waving away the complainant's hands as the complainant persisted in attempting to approach close to the named officer, despite repeated directions to stay back, and point the cell phone at the officer's face, which posed a threat to the named officer's safety. The evidence demonstrated that the named officer did not attempt to interfere with the complainant's attempt to videotape at the scene but only reacted to the complainant approaching too close to him while pointing the apparent cell phone at his face.</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officer had renewed his secondary employment permit but that he had not logged-on over police radio to announce that he was working it. The evidence demonstrated that while the minimal force that the named officer used was reasonable and necessary, he should have completed a Use of Force Report on the incident.</p> <p>Corrective Action: Supervisory counseling regarding compliance with Department policy addressing secondary employment and reporting use of force.</p>
<p>Complainants, to whose residence the named officers had been dispatched in response to 911 calls from neighbors about loud banging against the walls of the house and concerns of a disturbance, alleged the named officers refused to identify themselves; without reason, grabbed one of the complainants, threw the complainant to the ground, and kned him in the back; and, for no reason, shoved another complainant into an umbrella stand, causing pain to the complainant's back.</p>	<p>Two named officers, same allegations and findings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated</li> <li>2. Failure to Report Use of Force – Unfounded</li> <li>3. Failure to Identify Self – Unfounded</li> </ol> <p>The evidence demonstrated that it was the second response of police officers within one hour to the complainant's residence to address a 911 disturbance call; that the named officers used only minimal (non-reportable), necessary, and reasonable force to control the complainants; that the complainants made no complaint at the time about the actions of the named officers; and that the named officers were in the midst of writing their names on a notepad, with a pencil provided by one of the complainants, when the named officers had to promptly discontinue that effort to immediately confront the other complainant, standing nearby, who had raised his hand, holding another pencil, into a stabbing position pointed toward the officers.</p>

**SEARCH & SEIZURE: USE OF FORCE**

Synopsis	Action Taken
<p>Complainant alleged that the named officers arrested her husband without justification, failed to conduct a proper investigation of the circumstances surrounding the stop of both her and her husband, and used unnecessary force when grabbing her, causing the zipper on her coat to break.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:            Named officer #1:            1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated            2. Unjustified Temporary Detention – Exonerated            Named officer #2:            1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Unfounded            2. Unjustified Temporary Detention – Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the named officers had justification to temporarily detain the complainant and her husband for reasonably suspecting that they were involved in a domestic violence situation. The evidence also demonstrated that named officer #1 used necessary and reasonable force to control the complainants.</p>
<p>Complainant alleged that the named officers tackled a jaywalker who refused their commands to stop and punched the jaywalker in the face after they had handcuffed him.</p>	<p>Allegations and Findings:            Named officer #1:            Unnecessary Use of Force – Supervisory Intervention            Named officer #2:            Unnecessary Use of Force – Exonerated</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that named officer #1 could have used less force than tackling the jaywalker to temporarily detain him to address the pedestrian violation and could have used other measures to prevent the jaywalker from spitting on him other than slapping him in the face.</p> <p>Corrective Action:            Supervisory counseling regarding using force proportionate to the threat or resistance being countered.</p>
<p>Complainant, whom the named officers arrested while he was in the act of committing a forcible sexual assault against the victim, alleged that the named officers used unnecessary force to take him into custody and refused to identify themselves to him when asked.</p>	<p>Five named officers.            Same allegations and findings for each named officer:            1. Unnecessary Use of Force – Administratively Exonerated            2. Failure to Identify Self – Administratively Unfounded</p> <p>The evidence demonstrated that the complainant had returned to the residence of a woman who had a domestic violence no contact order against him (which he had violated earlier in the day) and was in the process of attempting to rape her when the named officers, in response to a 911 call of a woman screaming for help inside the residence, responded, forcibly entered the residence, and found the complainant laying on top of the victim, tearing off her clothing. The named officers used necessary and reasonable force to subdue the complainant and take him into custody. The evidence also demonstrated that though the complainant repeatedly demanded that the named officers provide him their names, the circumstances made the satisfaction of such a request impractical.</p>

## Definitions of Findings:

**“Sustained”** means the allegation of misconduct is supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

**“Not Sustained”** means the allegation of misconduct was neither proved nor disproved by a preponderance of the evidence.

**“Unfounded”** means a preponderance of evidence indicates the alleged act did not occur as reported or classified, or is false.

**“Exonerated”** means a preponderance of evidence indicates the conduct alleged did occur, but that the conduct was justified, lawful and proper.

**“Supervisory Intervention”** means while there may have been a violation of policy, it was not a willful violation, and/or the violation did not amount to misconduct. The employee’s chain of command is to provide appropriate training, counseling and/or to review for deficient policies or inadequate training.

**“Administratively Unfounded/Exonerated”** is a discretionary finding which may be made prior to the completion that the complaint was determined to be significantly flawed procedurally or legally; or without merit, i.e., complaint is false or subject recants allegations, preliminary investigation reveals mistaken/wrongful employee identification, etc, or the employee’s actions were found to be justified, lawful and proper and according to training.

**“Administratively Inactivated”** means that the investigation cannot proceed forward, usually due to insufficient information or the pendency of other investigations. The investigation may be reactivated upon the discovery of new, substantive information or evidence. Inactivated cases will be included in statistics but may not be summarized in this report if publication may jeopardize a subsequent investigation.

## Mediation Program:

The OPA Director selected 3 cases to be resolved through the Mediation Program during August of 2011.

Of the 3 cases selected for the Mediation Program, 2 complainants declined to participate and in 1 case, the officer declined to participate.

## Cases Opened (2010/2011 by Month Comparison)

Date	PIR		SR		LI		IS		TOTAL	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
1/1-1/31	8	9	8	8	1	1	12	19	29	37
2/1-2/28	18	19	9	5	1	1	16	17	44	42
3/1-3/31	30	12	6	7	1	3	16	10	53	32
4/1-4/30	31	17	9	14	3	6	13	17	56	54
5/1-5/31	15	25	10	12	3	2	23	17	51	56
6/1-6/30	25	16	14	13	1	1	13	14	53	44
7/1-7/31	23	17	10	9	1	2	18	7	52	35
8/1-8/31	20	23	6	16	3	1	12	15	41	55
9/1-9/30	16		9		4		17		46	0
10/1-10/31	13		9		5		17		44	0
11/1-11/30	12		16		8		19		55	0
12/1-12/31	18		13		2		13		46	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>229</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>570</b>	<b>355</b>

## Complaint Classification

**Preliminary Investigation Report (PIR)** complaints involve conduct that would not constitute misconduct and are referred to the employee's supervisor for follow up.

**Supervisory Referral (SR)** complaints are those that, even if events occurred as described, signify minor misconduct and/or a training gap. The complaint is referred to the employee's supervisor for review, counseling, and training as necessary.

**Line Investigations (LI)** complaints involving minor misconduct are investigated by the officer's chain of command.

**Investigation Section (IS)** complaints are more complex and involve more serious allegations and are investigated by OPA-IS.

