

## INTRADEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

May 19, 2016  
14.2

**TO:** The Honorable Board of Police Commissioners

**FROM:** Chief of Police

**SUBJECT:** VICE COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
(AD NO. 15-039)

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS


1. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Vice Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA).
2. It is recommended that the Board of Police Commissioners REVIEW and APPROVE the attached Executive Summary thereto.

### DISCUSSION

Audit Division conducted the Vice CAPA to evaluate compliance with Department policies and procedures.

If additional information regarding this audit is required, please contact Arif Alikhan, Director, Office of Constitutional Policing and Policy, at (213) 486-8730.

Respectfully,



CHARLIE BECK  
Chief of Police

Attachment

LOS ANGELES POLICE DEPARTMENT

*VICE COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY  
PERFORMANCE AUDIT*

*(AD No. 15-039)*



CHARLIE BECK  
Chief of Police

*May 2016*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Vice Command Accountability Performance Audit

	PAGE NO.
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Purpose</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Prior Audits</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Summary of Findings</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Detailed Findings</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Objective No. 1 Evaluation of Arrest Reports</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Objective No. 1(a) Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Objective No. 1(b) Articulation of Search and Seizure</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Objective No. 1(c) Admonition of Miranda Rights</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Objective No. 2 Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Objective No. 3 Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Objective No. 4 Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Objective No. 5 Evaluation of Vice Units' Documentation of Investigative Activity</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Objective No. 5(a) Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Objective No. 5(b) Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Objective No. 5(c) Adherence to Disrobing Requirements</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Objective No. 6 Adherence to Expenditure of Secret Service Funds</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Other Related Matters</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Actions Taken/Management's Response</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Addendum: Detailed Findings for Objective 5(b) – Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs</b>	

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**  
**VICE**  
**COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT**  
**Conducted by**  
**Audit Division**  
**Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15**

**PURPOSE**

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Vice Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The Vice CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each geographic Area are effective to ensure they are operating within Department policies and procedures, as well as other established criteria set forth by State and federal guidelines.

**BACKGROUND**

This is the first citywide Vice CAPA performed by AD. The audit included an evaluation of Vice Units' operating procedures and work product which included: Arrest Reports, Form 05.02.00, Search/Ramey Warrants, Standards Based Assessments, Lieutenant and Below, Form 01.87.00, Sergeant's Daily Reports (SDRs), Form 15.48.00, Daily Activities Logs (DALs), Daily Field Activity Reports, Form 15.52.00, and Expenditure of Secret Service Funds, Form 15.37.01. The aforementioned documents were examined for accuracy, completeness, timely submission, articulation of reasonable suspicion/probable cause and supervisory oversight.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

The audit consisted of six objectives which addressed ten specific areas. The Department had 100 percent compliance in two of the ten areas;

- Evaluation of Arrest Reports; Articulation of Search and Seizure
- Evaluation of Vice Units' Documentation of Investigative Activities; Adherence to Disrobing Requirements

An 82 percent or higher compliance was achieved in five areas. The specific areas are detailed below.

- Evaluation of Arrest Reports; Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest: 99 percent compliance
- Evaluation of Arrest Reports; Admonition of Miranda Rights: 99 percent compliance
- Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages: 88 percent compliance
- Evaluation of Vice Units' Documentation of Investigative Activities; Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs: 91 percent compliance
- Adherence to Expenditure of Secret Service Funds Requirements: 82 percent compliance

In the remaining two areas the Department had 69 percent or lower compliance. These were administrative in nature and would not impact the successful prosecution of the case.

- Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments: 69 percent compliance
- Evaluation of Vice Units' Documentation of Investigative Activity; Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs: 57 percent compliance

There were no Search/Ramey Warrants associated with the vice reports evaluated for Objective No. 2, Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages.

### **CONCLUSION**

The aforementioned administrative findings pertain to the accurate and thorough completion of Department forms. It appears that with additional supervisory scrutiny these administrative omissions and/or discrepancies would likely be resolved.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

None.

### **ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

Audit Division presented the audit report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, who was in general agreement with the findings.

**VICE  
COMMAND ACCOUNTABILITY PERFORMANCE AUDIT  
Conducted by  
Audit Division  
Third Quarter, Fiscal Year 2014/15**

**PURPOSE**

In accordance with the Los Angeles Police Department (Department) Annual Audit Plan for fiscal year 2014/15, Audit Division (AD) conducted the Vice Command Accountability Performance Audit (CAPA). The Vice CAPAs are performed to determine if the internal controls within each geographic Area are effective to ensure they are operating within Department policies and procedures, as well as other established criteria set forth by State and federal guidelines.

Audit Division conducted this performance audit under the guidance of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards,<sup>1</sup> specifically pertaining to performing the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives. Audit Division has determined that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for the findings and conclusions based on the audit objectives.

**BACKGROUND**

Audit Division developed CAPAs to address risk management issues, assess operations, and provide timely information to Department management pertaining to vice units.

**PRIOR AUDITS**

This is the first citywide Vice CAPA performed.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Scope**

The audit included an evaluation of vice units' operating procedures and work product, which included: Arrest Reports, Form 05.02.00, Search/Ramey Warrants, Standards Based Assessments, Lieutenant and Below (SBAs), Form 01.87.00, Sergeant's Daily Reports (SDRs), Form 15.48.00, Daily Activities Logs (DALs), Daily Field Activity Reports (DFARs), Form 15.52.00, and Expenditure of Secret Service Funds, Form 15.37.01. The aforementioned documents were examined for accuracy, completeness, timely submission, articulation of reasonable suspicion/probable cause and supervisory oversight.

The period reviewed was July 1, 2014, to December 31, 2014. The audit procedures employed are further delineated under each audit objective.

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Government Accountability Office, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, December 2011 Revision.

**Fieldwork**

The fieldwork was performed between February 17, 2015, and April 3, 2015.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**Table – Summary of Audit Findings**

<b>Objective No.</b>	<b>Description of Audit Objective</b>	<b>Number Meeting Standards</b>	<b>Number Reviewed</b>	<b>Percentage Meeting Standards</b>
<b>1 Evaluation of Arrest Reports</b>				
1(a)	Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest	170	171	99%
1(b)	Articulation of Search and Seizure	171	171	100%
1(c)	Admonition of Miranda Rights	170	171	99%
<b>2 Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages</b>				
2	Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>3 Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages</b>				
3	Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages	150	171	88%
<b>4 Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments</b>				
4	Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments	105	153	69%
<b>5 Evaluation of Vice Units' Documentation of Investigative Activity</b>				
5(a)	Officers' Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs	154	171	90%
5(b)	Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs	98	171	57%
5(c)	Adherence to Disrobing Requirements	1	1	100%
<b>6 Adherence to Expenditure of Secret Service Funds</b>				
6	Adherence to Expenditure of Secret Service Funds	28	34	82%

**DETAILED FINDINGS**

**Objective No. 1 – Evaluation of Arrest Reports**

This objective included the review of arrest report packages completed by personnel assigned to vice units during the audit period. The arrest report packages were evaluated to determine whether they included articulation and documentation of legal sufficiency for actions taken, and

whether they contained evidence of significant deviations from Department policy and procedures.<sup>2</sup>

Audit Division identified 171 arrest report packages and copies of them were obtained directly from the Areas' Records Units.

### **Objective No. 1(a) – Articulation of Reasonable Suspicion and Probable Cause to Arrest**

#### **Criteria**

Department Manual Section 1/508, Police Action Based on Legal Justification, states, *“What is reasonable in terms of appropriate police action or what constitutes probable cause varies with each situation, and different facts may justify an investigation, a detention, a search, an arrest, or no action at all. The requirement that legal justification be present imposes a limitation on an officer's action. In every case, officers must act reasonably within the limits of their authority as defined by statute and judicial interpretation, thereby ensuring that the rights of both the individual and the public are protected.”*

*“Reasonable suspicion for detention”* was measured by the standards described in the California Peace Officers Legal Sourcebook as *“a set of specific and articulable facts that lead an officer to reasonably believe that a crime is occurring, is about to occur, or has occurred, and that the person detained is connected to that activity which is criminal in nature.”*

*“Probable cause to arrest”* was also measured by the standards described in the California Peace Officers Legal Sourcebook as *“the totality of the circumstances that would lead a person of ordinary care and prudence to entertain an honest and strong suspicion that the person to be arrested is guilty of a crime.”*

#### **Audit Procedures**

Audit Division reviewed the 171 arrest report packages to determine whether they sufficiently articulated the legal basis for all actions taken (i.e., detentions, arrests, and searches). Arrest report packages that articulated the aforementioned criteria met the standards for this objective.

#### **Findings**

One hundred seventy (99%) of 171 arrest report packages met the standards for this objective. The package that did not meet the standards is detailed below.

#### **Harbor Area**

- Booking No. 4065799 – The elements of the crime 647(b) was not documented in the arrest report narrative.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>For the purposes of this report an arrest report package included the Arrest Report, Property Report, Form 10.01.00, Receipt for Property Taken into Custody, Form 10.10.00, Booking Approval, Form 12.31.00, and Non-Traffic Notice to Appear, Form 05.02.02.



### **Objective No. 1(b) – Articulation of Search and Seizure**

#### **Criteria**

Department Manual Section 4/217, Searches of Suspects and Arrestees, states, “*When the rules of search and seizure permit, an arrestee shall be thoroughly searched as soon as practicable.*”

The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution protects people against unreasonable searches. As such, Department personnel are required to document the legal basis for conducting searches which includes the following: search warrants, probable cause, incident to arrest, consent, or exigent circumstances.

#### **Audit Procedures**

Each arrest report was assessed to evaluate the legality of the search, including booking searches involving strip and visual body cavity searches. Arrest reports that articulated the search authority met the standards for this objective.<sup>4</sup>

#### **Findings**

Each (100%) of 171 arrest reports met the standards for this objective.

### **Objective No. 1(c) – Admonition of Miranda Rights**

#### **Criteria**

Department Manual Section 4/202.10, Interrogation of Suspects – Admonition of Miranda Rights, states, “*When officers are conducting a custodial interrogation, the following procedures shall be followed*”:

- “*Officers shall read the Miranda admonition verbatim as delineated in the Officer’s Notebook, Form 15.03.00*”;
- “*Officers shall document the suspect’s responses to the Miranda admonition in the appropriate report*”;

#### **Audit Procedures**

Each arrest report was reviewed for the overall chronology of arrest events, specifically examining whether a detainee was interrogated regarding his/her participation in criminal activity. Arrest reports were also reviewed for evidence of Miranda Rights procedures adherence. Arrest reports that contained no evidence of Miranda Rights Admonition violations met the standards for this objective.

---

<sup>3</sup>Penal Code 647(b) means to engage in a sexual act in exchange for money or other consideration.

<sup>4</sup>Searches incident to arrest were not considered for this objective.

## **Findings**

One hundred seventy (99%) of 171 arrest reports met the standards for this objective. The arrest report that did not meet the standard is detailed below.

### North Hollywood Area

- Booking No. 4073226 – The arrest report narrative indicated the arrestee was read the Miranda admonition; however, the responses were not documented.

## **Objective No. 2 – Evaluation of Search/Ramey Warrant Packages**

### **Criteria**

Department Manual Section 4/742.10, Search Warrant and Probable Cause Arrest Warrant Procedures, states, *“All Department personnel involved in the service (including the planning and debriefing) of a search or Ramey warrant shall comply with the instructions set forth in the Search Warrant Service Procedures Guide, prepared by Investigative Analysis Section, Detective Bureau. Each commanding officer shall be responsible for maintaining the Search Warrant Service Procedures Guide and ensuring that such procedures are made available to Department personnel. Department personnel shall follow these guidelines when preparing, obtaining, serving, and returning a search warrant.”*

### **Audit Procedures**

There were no Search/Ramey warrants served which involved a vice officer as the affiant during the audit period.

## **Objective No. 3 – Consistency of Arrest Report and Search/Ramey Warrant Packages**

### **Criteria**

Department Manual Section 4/216.01, Advice/Approval on Felony Bookings, states, *“Arrest Reports. Consistent with current procedure, the watch commander or a supervisor designated by the watch commander shall review all reports related to the arrest for appropriateness, legality, and conformance with Department policy and procedure taking into account the booking recommendation. Additionally, the watch commander or supervisor shall examine the reports for authenticity by ensuring that the reports do not contain any “canned” language, inconsistent information, or fail to articulate the legal basis for the action, or any indication that the information in the report(s) is not authentic or correct. Subsequent to review, the watch commander or his/her designee shall indicate approval by signing (including serial number) the report(s).”*

## **Audit Procedures**

Each arrest report package was assessed for consistency of information among the various documents. Arrest report packages that did not contain inconsistent information met the standards for this objective.

## **Findings**

One hundred fifty (88%) of 171 arrest report packages reviewed met the standards for this objective. The arrest report packages that did not meet the standards are detailed below.<sup>5</sup>

### Central Area

- Divisional Record (DR) No. 14-01-18968 – The time of arrest on the Notice to Appear indicated 7:55 PM; however, the arrest report indicated 1815 hours.

### Rampart Area

- Booking No. 4131607 – The arrest report indicated condoms were recovered; however, the disposition of the condoms was not noted.

### Southwest Area

- DR No. 14-03-17489 – The Evidence section of the arrest report indicated there was no evidence recovered; however, the Additional section indicated currency was recovered but the disposition of the currency was not noted.
- DR Nos. 14-03-22481 and 14-20-16830 – The Evidence and Photographs section of the arrest reports were combined.
- DR No. 14-03-23603 – The arrest report indicated currency was recovered from the suspect; however, the disposition of the currency was not noted.

### Hollywood Area

- Booking Nos. 4061000 and 4101986 – The arrest report indicated condoms were recovered from the arrestee and photographed; however, the disposition of the condoms was not noted.
- Booking No. 4078243 – The arrest report face sheet indicated the arrestee was not read the Miranda admonition; although, the arrest report indicated it was read.
- Booking No. 4083880 – The arrest report indicated a cell phone was recovered; however, the disposition of the cell phone was not noted.

---

<sup>5</sup>Detective Support and Vice Division was advised of the lack of documentation for the disposition of condoms recovered during vice arrests.

Van Nuys Area

- Booking Nos. 4161421, 4072375, 4108283, and 4079168 - The arrest report indicated condoms were recovered from the arrestee; however, the disposition of the condoms was not noted.

Pacific Area

- Booking No. 4077937 – The arrest report indicated condoms were recovered; however, the disposition of the condoms was not noted.

North Hollywood Area

- Booking No. 4163371 – The arrest report indicated currency was recovered from the arrestee; however, the disposition of the currency was not noted.
- Booking No. 4073226 - The arrest report indicated condoms were recovered from the arrestee; however, the disposition of the condoms was not noted.

Foothill Area

- DR Nos. 14-16-12557 and 14-16-12479 - The arrest report indicated currency was recovered from the arrestee; however, the disposition of the currency was not noted.

Olympic Area

- DR Nos. 14-20-18969 and 14-20-18967 – The arrest report indicated currency was recovered and booked with the suspect’s property. The suspect was issued a Notice to Appear and released from custody. The disposition of the currency was not noted.

**Objective No. 4 – Timely and Accurate Completion of Standards Based Assessments**

**Criteria**

Department Manual Section 3/760.20, Standards Based Assessment - Lieutenant and Below, states, Supervisor’s Responsibilities. *“Supervisors who receive a PERAI shall”*:

- *“Complete the Standards Based Assessments, Lieutenant and Below, Form 01.87.00; and,*
- *Serve the employee with the final paper copy of the SBA, and complete the PERAI no later than 90-calendar days after the date it was issued.”*

According to the Standards Based Assessment, Lieutenant and Below, Guidelines for Completing the Report, a Risk Management Information System Action Item number, which corresponds with the Training and Evaluation Management System (TEAMS) II Action Item number, is required in the Administrative Section of the SBA. The SBA must also contain

signatures and dates of the employee, Department/unit assessor, reviewing supervisor, and commanding officer.

### **Audit Procedures**

The Watch Assignment and Timekeeping Sheets for vice units were reviewed for the audit period, it was determined that there were a total of 153 vice personnel, two lieutenants, 30 sergeants and 121 officers. The corresponding Division Employee Folders were reviewed to determine if the following Department policy and procedures were followed:

- The SBA was completed for the current rating period;
- The SBA was signed by the employee, all Department/unit assessor reviewing supervisors, and the Commanding Officer (CO); and,
- The PERAI was closed within 90 calendar days of the date opened.

### **Findings**

One hundred five (69%) of 153 SBAs met the standards for this objective.<sup>6</sup> The following SBAs did not meet the standards for the following reasons:

Twenty-three SBAs were signed by the CO more than 90 calendar days after being issued.

- Central Area (2), Rampart Area (2), Hollenbeck Area (1), Hollywood Area (3), Wilshire Area (4), Van Nuys Area (1), Northeast Area (2), Newton Area (1), Pacific Area (1), Devonshire Area (2), Mission Area (2), and Topanga Area (2)

Six Division Employee Folders did not contain a current SBA.

- Rampart Area (1), Hollenbeck Area (2), Northeast Area (1), Pacific Area (1), and Mission Area (1)

Twenty-one Risk Management Information System Nos. were not recorded or incorrectly recorded.

- Central Area (1), Rampart Area (1), Hollenbeck Area (2), Hollywood Area (3), Wilshire Area (1), Van Nuys Area (1), Northeast Area (2), Newton Area (2), Pacific Area (2), Foothill Area (3), Devonshire Area (1), Olympic Area (1), and Topanga Area (1)

One SBA was not signed by the Department Assessor.

- West Los Angeles Area (1)

---

<sup>6</sup>When an SBA had multiple findings, it was only counted once.

Two SBAs were not signed and dated by the employee.

- North Hollywood Area (1) and Foothill Area (1)

One SBA could not be located.

- Pacific Area (1)

### **Objective No. 5 – Evaluation of Vice Units’ Documentation of Investigative Activity**

This objective included the evaluation of vice units and their adherence to the Vice Procedures Manual, Volume 1, Section 020, Area Vice Units.

### **Objective No. 5(a) – Officers’ Thorough and Accurate Completion of DALs**

#### **Criteria**

Vice Procedures Manual, Volume 1, Section 100, Vice Officers’ Daily Logbook Requirements, states, *“The undercover vice officers are not required to maintain a DFAR. However, the Area vice OIC shall have the option of having their undercover vice personnel record their daily activities in a Department approved logbook or as a unit on a daily log sheet. This shall include, at a minimum, the following information:*

- *Date and Time (Start of Watch and End of Watch for each officer)*
- *Officers’ name and unit number*
- *Vehicle used for the day (Shop Number or Make, Model, and color for rentals)*
- *Field Investigations*
- *All Arrests, including the location, name of the individual, charge and booking, RFC or citation number*
- *3.18 investigations conducted during the day, both administrative and Field.*
- *Secret Service expenditures, including vehicle rentals.*
- *Each officer’s initials at the end of the daily log sheet.”*

#### **Audit Procedures**

On the dates an arrest was made by either a vice or Prostitution Enforcement Detail officer, AD collected the corresponding DALs or DFARs. The documents were reviewed to determine if the required information was accurate and complete.

#### **Findings**

One hundred fifty-four (90%) of 171 DALs/DFARs reviewed met the standards for this objective. The following DALs/DFARs, which had findings, are detailed below.

Rampart Area

- The DAL for 12/10/14 did not indicate the color of the rental vehicle.

Hollywood Area

- The DFARs for 8/1/14, 11/13/14, and 12/5/14 did not indicate the vehicle information.
- The DALs for 8/22/14 and 9/19/14 were missing the Secret Service funds information.

Van Nuys Area

- The DFAR for 8/22/14 did not indicate the arrestee's information.

77<sup>th</sup> Street Area

- The DALs for 7/16/14, 8/2/14, 9/3/14, and 10/24/14 did not indicate the vehicle information.

North Hollywood Area

- The DAL for 11/21/14 did not indicate the arresting officer's name.

Foothill Area

- The DALs for 8/27/14 and 9/17/14 did not indicate the vehicle information.
- The DALs for 7/3/14 and 8/18/14 could not be located.

Southeast Area

- The DAL for 7/21/14 did not indicate the arrestee's information.

**Objective No. 5(b) – Supervisors' Thorough and Accurate Completion of SDRs**

**Criteria**

Department Manual Section 5/18.49.00, Sergeant's Daily Report – Field Notebook Divider, Form 18.49.00, states, "*General Rules. The Sergeant's Daily Report (SDR) is used to capture oversight activities completed by a field supervisor on a daily basis.*"

Operations Order No. 1, 2012, Check-In Procedures for Area Specialized Units, states, "*Procedure: I. Area Specialized Unit Supervisor's Responsibilities. The supervisor of each Area specialized unit shall report to the on-duty patrol watch commander at the unit's start of watch (SOW) and end of watch (EOW).*"

*"That supervisor shall document the time and the name of the on-duty watch commander that was provided the DPS printout and the SOW check-in briefing in his/her Sergeant's Daily Report, Form 15.48.00."*

*“The supervisor shall document the time and the name of the on-duty watch commander that was provided the EOW briefing in his/her Sergeant’s Daily Report.”*

### **Audit Procedures**

On the dates when arrests were made by a vice unit, AD collected the corresponding SDRs. Forty-six SDRs, at a minimum, were required to be completed. Audit Division reviewed the SDRs to determine if one was submitted to the watch commander (WC) by the vice supervisor who had oversight of the vice unit on the arrest date.

### **Findings**

Ninety-eight (57%) of 171 SDRs reviewed met the standards for this objective. The 73 SDRs that did not meet the standards are detailed in the Addendum.

### **Objective No. 5(c) – Adherence to Disrobing Requirements**

#### **Criteria**

Vice Procedures Manual, Volume 1, Section 040, Disrobing for Vice Investigations, states,

*“The increased prostitution activity encountered at massage parlors and other sexually oriented business fronts, which operate as houses of prostitution, has presented vice officers with additional enforcement burdens. These locations have become highly sophisticated in their individual operations, making it difficult for officers to obtain prostitution violations and related offenses without disrobing.*

**NOTE:** *For purposes of this manual, to disrobe means to remove one’s clothing exposing the upper and/or lower torso.*

*Area vice enforcement officers may disrobe during a vice investigation of **major concern** only after exhausting all other investigative techniques, and after obtaining prior approval. **Blanket** approval for disrobing shall not be permitted, therefore, each investigation requires prior written approval by the concerned bureau commanding officer.”*

B. *“Requests for disrobing shall be submitted to the concerned bureau commanding officer and shall include*

*\*When feasible, personnel from Detective Support and Vice Division will monitor the operation.*

*\*When feasible, personnel from Detective Support and Vice Division will review the Arrest Report and debrief the vice unit for training concerns.”*

D. *“Written after-action reports shall recapitulate all resulting enforcement activity and shall be forwarded to the concerned bureau commanding officer as soon as possible after the conclusion of the investigation.”*



### **Audit Procedures**

Each arrest report was reviewed to determine if there was any physical contact between the officer and the suspect. Physical contact should be avoided; however, in cases where physical contact was attempted or completed; officers shall immediately cause the activity to cease. If during the physical contact auditors learned that disrobing took place, they contacted the concerned bureau CO to ensure a disrobing request had been approved and the vice unit supervisor completed an After-Action Report and forwarded it to the concerned bureau CO. Arrest reports that contained evidence of prior written approval, as well as an After-Action Report, met the standards for this objective.

### **Findings**

A review of arrest reports showed there was one incident where an officer disrobed. The officer was assigned to Detective Support and Vice Division and had prior bureau approval and an After-Action Report was completed for the incident; therefore, (100%) met the standards for this objective.

### **Objective No. 6 – Adherence to Expenditure of Secret Service Funds**

#### **Criteria**

Vice Procedures Manual, Volume 1, Section 75, Secret Service Funds (Chit), states,

#### **“Officer’s Responsibility**

- A. An officer shall complete an expenditure chit, Form 15.37.1 (original and one copy) for all expenditures occurring during an investigation. The form is to be completed in black ink or computer generated.*
- B. Corrections are not permitted in the date and time or amount spaces.*
- C. Print the entire month, (i.e., July 19, 2008, numerical abbreviations are not acceptable), and enter the beginning and ending time in the location, (i.e., 2200/2300 hours).*
- D. Enter the concerned Area/unit reporting.”*
- E. “List exact address and business name.”*
- F. “Enter the total amount expended.*

**NOTE:** *If the expenditure occurs at a vehicle rental agency, enter the total sum in the “amount” box. Explain the expenditure in the narrative section as follows:*

*\*Dates vehicles were rented, (i.e., July 1-25, 2008);*

*\*Amount per vehicle (Chevy, \$15.00);*

*\*Rental Agency receipt number;*

*\*Rental agreements shall be filed with chits; and,*

*\*Results: (1) number of arrests (2) booking RFC/DR numbers.*

*G. Enter the concerned 3.18 DR number relative to the investigation.”*

*H. “Place a mark (“x or check mark) in the 3.18 box provided the expenditure is in the furtherance of a 3.18 investigation.*

*I. Record only one investigative activity in the space provided regardless of the violations observed.”*

“Supervisor’s Responsibility”

*D. “Commanding Officer approval is needed for an investigative expenditure over \$100.00 and vehicle expenditure over \$200.00.”*

### **Audit Procedures**

On the dates when an Expenditure of Secret Service Funds form was used, as documented in the vice officer’s DAL, AD reviewed the form for accuracy and completeness. Thirty-four Expenditure of Secret Service Funds forms were applicable for review. The forms that were accurate and complete met the standards for this objective.<sup>7</sup>

### **Findings**

Twenty-eight (82%) of 34 Expenditure of Secret Service Funds forms reviewed met the standards for this objective. The Expenditure of Secret Service forms that did not meet the standards are detailed below:

#### Southwest Area

- DR Nos. 14-03-17489 and 14-03-19396 – The expenditure chits for 8/1/14 and 9/4/14 were missing the CO’s signature, which is required of \$100 or more. In addition, they were missing the certifying officer’s signature.

#### Harbor Area

- DR No. 14-05-15270 – The expenditure chits were missing the handwritten amount.

---

<sup>7</sup>Expenditure of Secret Service Funds Form are commonly referred to as expenditure chits.

Hollywood Area

- Booking No. 4128586 – The expenditure chit was missing the certifying officer's signature.

77<sup>th</sup> Street Area

- DR No. 14-12-23311 – The expenditure chit for 10/24/14 could not be located.

Pacific Area

- DR No. 14-14-22120 – The expenditure chit was missing the CO's signature, which is required of \$100 or more.

**OTHER RELATED MATTERS**

**Area Watch Commanders**

Although Area WCs serve as a level of oversight for vice units, findings pertaining exclusively to Area WCs (i.e., approval of the arrest report, booking approval process, and detention logs) were not quantified or attributed to the vice units' overall performance. Area WCs' findings identified are indicated below.

Southwest Area

- The Adult Detention Log for 9/3/14 could not be located.

Harbor Area

- The Adult Detention Log for 8/15/14 could not be located at 77th Street Area.<sup>8</sup>

Van Nuys Area

- Booking No. 4050264 – Auditors were unable to locate an SDR for the sergeant who signed the Booking Approval on 8/2/14 to verify if he/she was the designated WC.
- Booking No. 4042558 – Auditors were unable to locate an SDR for the sergeant who signed the Adult Detention Log on 7/25/14 to verify if he/she was the designated WC.

77<sup>th</sup> Street Area

- The Adult Detention Logs for 7/6/14, 7/9/14, 7/10/14, 7/19/14, 8/2/14, 8/8/14, 9/3/14, 9/24/14, 12/3/14, could not be located.

---

<sup>8</sup>Harbor Area officers made the arrest; however, the arrestee was booked at 77<sup>th</sup> Street Area.

North Hollywood Area

- Booking No. 4188943 – Auditors were unable to locate an SDR for the sergeant who signed the Adult Detention Log on 12/20/14 to verify if he/she was the designated WC.

Foothill Area

- DR No. 14-16-12342 – Auditors were unable to locate an SDR to verify if the sergeant who signed the Adult Detention Log on 8/7/14 was the designated WC, but it could not be located.

Olympic Area

- Booking No. 4133980 – Auditors were unable to locate an SDR for the sergeant who signed the Booking Approval on 10/23/14 to verify if he/she was the designated WC.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

None.

**ACTIONS TAKEN/MANAGEMENT'S RESPONSE**

Audit Division presented the audit report to the Assistant to the Director, Office of Operations, who was in general agreement with the findings.

**ADDENDUM: Detailed Findings for Objective 5(b)**

Area/Division	Date	Booking/DR No.	Objective 5(b) - Description of the Finding
Southwest	9/3/2014	14-12-19765	The Supervisor did not document the officers' overtime in the SDR.
Southwest	9/19/2014	14-03-20785	The SDR did not indicate the check-out time with the WC.
Southwest	9/25/2014	14-03-20785	
Southwest	9/30/2014	14-03-20785	
Southwest	10/1/2014	14-03-20813	
Southwest	10/8/2014	14-03-21344	
Southwest	10/17/2014	14-03-22305	
Southwest	10/24/2014	14-03-22481	
Southwest	12/19/2014	14-20-21117	
Southwest	12/11/2014	14-20-20744	
Hollywood	10/15/2014	4124878	
Hollywood	11/6/2014	4146297	The SDR did not indicate the Start of Watch and there was no indication of checking out with WC.
Hollywood	8/27/2014	4030530	
Hollywood	8/28/2014	4078109	
Hollywood	8/29/2014	4079374	
Hollywood	9/5/2014	4084930	
Hollywood	9/6/2014	4086136	
Hollywood	9/18/2014	4100822	
Hollywood	10/18/2014	4130186	
Hollywood	11/14/2014	4156701	
Hollywood	7/30/2014	4047487	
Hollywood	8/1/2014	4049758	
Hollywood	8/2/2014	4049858	
Hollywood	8/8/2014	4056498	
Hollywood	8/16/2014	4066309	
Hollywood	9/3/2014	4083745	
Hollywood	9/4/2014	4084806	
Hollywood	9/20/2014	4102803	
Hollywood	10/11/2014	4120933	
Hollywood	10/24/2014	14-06-21342	
Hollywood	11/13/2014	4156684	The SDR did not indicate the check-in time with the WC.
Hollywood	11/18/2014	14-06-22956	
Hollywood	7/11/2014	4029571	
Hollywood	8/22/2014	4072477	
Hollywood	9/11/2014	4091247	
Hollywood	12/3/2014	4171630	One SDR was completed for multiple supervisors.
Hollywood	12/6/2014	4173562	
Hollywood	11/7/2014	4147594	
Wilshire	7/19/2014	14-07-00995	The SDR did not indicate the check-in or check-out time with the WC and it wasn't signed.
Van Nuys	8/22/2014	4072375	The SDR did not show CO approval for PED officers working in plain clothes.
North Hollywood	7/23/2014	4040459	The SDR was not signed by the WC.
North Hollywood	8/23/2014	4073226	
North Hollywood	11/21/2014	4163366	
North Hollywood	12/20/2014	4188943	

Area/Division	Date	Booking/DR No.	Description of the Finding
77th Street	7/9/2014	4027564	The supervisor did not document the officers' overtime in the SDR.
77th Street	10/24/2014	14-12-23310	
77th Street	7/10/2014	4028532	The SDR was not signed by the WC.
77th Street	8/2/2014	14-12-17679	
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	The SDR was not signed by the WC
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	The SDR did not indicate Start of Work and was not signed by the WC.
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	
Foothill	8/15/2014	14-16-12480	
Foothill	8/18/2014	4068588	The Area was unable to locate the SDR.
Olympic	10/23/2014	4133980	The SDRs did not indicate the check-out time with the WC.
Olympic	11/4/2014	14-20-18969	
Olympic	12/22/2014	4190129	
Glendale	8/15/2014	4068588	The SDR did not indicate the check-in or check-out times with the WC.
Glendale	8/15/2014	4068588	
Glendale	8/15/2014	4068588	