



## OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

### Closed Case Summary

Complaint Number OPA#2015-1828

Issued Date: 05/31/2016

Named Employee #1	
Allegation #1	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (9) Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Training Referral)
Allegation #2	<u>Seattle Police Department Manual</u> 5.001 (2) Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy (Policy that was issued 04/01/2015)
OPA Finding	<b>Not Sustained</b> (Training Referral)
Final Discipline	N/A

#### **INCIDENT SYNOPSIS**

The Named Employee operated a personal vehicle while off duty.

#### **COMPLAINT**

The anonymous complainant alleged that the Named Employee, while in uniform, operated a personal vehicle without a front license plate in violation of the law.

#### **INVESTIGATION**

The OPA investigation included the following actions:

1. Review of the anonymous complaint
2. Search for and review of all relevant records and other evidence
3. Interview of SPD employee

## **ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION**

The allegation was that, by operating a motor vehicle without a front license plate attached as required by State law, the Named Employee engaged in behavior that “undermines public trust in the Department, the officer, or other officers.” The preponderance of the evidence supports the conclusion that the Named Employee drove a friend’s car without a front license plate to a secondary employment assignment and was seated in that car in uniform. It is also established by evidence that, once aware of the complaint and the problem with the absent license plate, the Named Employee took action to make certain the license plate was attached to the front of the friend’s car. State law prohibits anyone from operating a front license plate (except in certain circumstances, none of which applied in this instance.) Given the relatively minor nature of this infraction, the apparently limited scope of public notice given to this infraction, the specific circumstances of the ownership of the vehicle, and the immediate affirmative steps taken by the Named Employee, the OPA Director recommended a finding of Not Sustained (Training Referral) for each allegation.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Named Employee #1**

#### Allegation #1

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Employees Shall Strive to be Professional at all Times*.

#### Allegation #2

The evidence showed that the Named Employee would benefit from additional training. Therefore a finding of **Not Sustained** (Training Referral) was issued for *Employees Must Adhere to Laws, City Policy and Department Policy*.

**Required Training:** The Named Employee’s OPA interview makes it clear that the Named Employee now understands the importance of making certain any private vehicle she operates, regardless of ownership and registration, must conform to all requirements of State law, a simple reminder by her supervisor should be made.

*NOTE: The Seattle Police Department Manual policies cited for the allegation(s) made for this OPA Investigation are policies that were in effect during the time of the incident. The issued date of the policy is listed.*