PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS BUREAU

<u>NOTICE</u> 1.13

February 23,2022

TO:

All Department Personnel

FROM:

Commanding Officer, Professional Standards Bureau

SUBJECT:

IMMEDIATE ADJUDICATION OF DEMONSTRABLY FALSE

COMPLAINTS - GUIDANCE

Many complaints are eligible to be adjudicated Demonstrably False (DF) at intake when the evidence clearly proves the alleged conduct did not occur. However, Professional Standards Bureau (PSB) has found commands are not taking advantage of this streamlined process. In addition to saving time and resources, accused employees benefit when their complaints are promptly adjudicated. This Notice provides guidance on the procedure for completing and processing complaints that were eligible to be adjudicated DF at intake but were not. It also affirms that ALL allegation types (including biased policing) may be adjudicated DF as long as they meet the criteria specified in Department Manual (DM) Section 3/818, Non-Disciplinary Complaints.

Note: The classification criteria for Non-Disciplinary complaints and the DF disposition are outlined in Administrative Order No. 6, *Non-Disciplinary Complaints – Revised*, dated May 31, 2016 and DM 3/818. The procedure for completing and processing complaints determined to be DF at intake are detailed in Office of the Chief of Police (OCOP) Notice, *Immediate Adjudication of Complaints Determined to be Demonstrably False at Intake*, dated July 28, 2016.

Processing Demonstrably False Complaints After the Intake Stage

When audio and/or video evidence clearly disprove all allegations, the complaint may be adjudicated as Demonstrably False immediately if the DF was not completed at intake. Follow the procedure outlined in the above referenced OCOP Notice but document the requisite evidence on a Complaint Adjudication Form (LAPD Form No. 01.28.05). A complaint investigation and Letter of Transmittal are not required. Exemplars are attached.

Questions about this Notice should be directed to Review and Evaluation Section, PSB, at (213) 996-2771.

MICHAEL P. RIMKUNAS, Deputy Chief

Commanding Officer

Professional Standards Bureau

DANIEL RANDOLPH, Deputy Chief Chief of Staff

Office of the Chief of Police

DISTRIBUTION "D"

Attachments

SCENARIO A: The incident did not occur as alleged.

EXEMPLAR A1: Closing the complaint as Demonstrably False (DF) at intake through the Complaint Form (CF).

This is the preferred method. When <u>all</u> allegations have been clearly disproven, the complaint can be promptly adjudicated at intake without interviewing accused and witness officers. There is no need to complete a Complaint Adjudication Form (CAF) if the complaint is closed as Demonstrably False with the Complaint Form (CF).

SCENARIO A: INCIDENT DID NOT OCCUR AS ALLEGED EXEMPLAR A1 - CLOSE COMPLAINT AS DF AT INTAKE (PREFERRED METHOD)

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

COMPLAINT FORM

CF No.: 21-000000 **Statute Date: 05/20/2022** Masked: No Investigative Complexity:

No

Complainant(s)

Name: Public, John Q. Masked:

DOB: 07/09/1943 Residential Address: 123 ABC Avenue

Gender/Descent: Male / Black Los Angeles, California 90000

Language: Subj of Incident:

Injury: Source: None **Public-Person Involved** Arrested: Method: No Verbal (in person)

Booking No.: Phone:

Identification: DL A1234567 Email: **Not Provided**

Date and Location of Occurrence

RD / Area Division: 0192 / Central Area Beginning/End Date: 05/20/2021 Begin/End Time: 22:39

Cross Street 1: Cross Street 2:

Address: 8400 South Budlong Avenue Los Angeles California

Accused Employee(s)

Smith, John - 86753, PO 2 CENT Name: Masked: No

PAT W3

Alcohol Involved: DOB: 11/28/1990 **Business Address:**

Gender/Descent: Male / HIS

Length of Service: 5 Years 11 Months 5 Days Assignment:

CAR Injury: **Duty Status:** None On Duty

Arrested: Phone: No Booking No.: Email:

Not Provided

Name: Doe, John - 86757, PO 2 CENT PAT W3 Masked: No

Alcohol Involved:

DOB: 4/16/1995 **Business Address:** Gender/Descent: Male / HIS

Length of Service: 2 Years 6 Months 21 Days Assignment: CAR Injury: None **Duty Status:** On Duty

Arrested: No Phone:

Booking No.: Email: **Not Provided**

Involved Person(s)

Name: Masked: Involved Person Type: Address:

DOB:

Gender/Descent: Subject of Incident: Identification: Phone:

Email: Not Provided

Brief Summary

CP stated that he was profiled due to his age by Officer Smith and Officer Doe and further stated Officer

Smith removed him from the vehicle, handcuffed him and told him to "sit down old man."

Uninvolved Doe, Jane - 67890, SGT 2 CENT Reported to Uninv Supervisor Name: Supervisor:

05/20/2021 PAT W2 Recorded By: Doe, Jane - 67890, SGT 2 CENT Preliminary Unknown

PAT W2 Investigator 21052000005296 IAG CLASS: Undetermined Cross Reference: **Master Incident**

Number

Supervisor Reviewing Serial No. Area/Division Complaint Type **Entity Investigating** Prima Facie

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29) Page: 1 of 4 Date: 06/23/2021

SCENARIO A: INCIDENT DID <u>NOT</u> OCCUR AS ALLEGED EXEMPLAR A1 - CLOSE COMPLAINT AS DF AT INTAKE (PREFERRED METHOD)

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

COMPLAINT FORM

Statute Date: 05/20/2022 Investigative Complexity: Masked: No CF No.: 21-000000

Disciplinary UNKNOWN

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29)

Page: 2 of 4

Date: 06/23/2021

SCENARIO A: INCIDENT DID <u>NOT</u> OCCUR AS ALLEGED EXEMPLAR A1 - CLOSE COMPLAINT AS DF AT INTAKE (PREFERRED METHOD)

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

Statute Date: 05/20/2022 COMPLAINT FORM Masked: No CF No.: 21-000000

Preliminary Investigative Narrative:

It is recommended that CF No 21-000000 be closed as Non-Disciplinary, Demonstrably False.

On May 20, 2021, Police Officer II John Smith, Serial No. 86753 and his partner, Police Officer II John Doe, Serial No. 86757, initiated a traffic stop on complainant John Q. Public for speed and failure to use a turn signal. Smith cited Public for speed and warned him for the turn signal. On May 20, 2021, Public contacted Central front desk and spoke with Sergeant II Jane Doe, Serial No. 67890. Public told Jane Doe he was stopped by Smith for a traffic violation he did not commit. He further stated Smith removed him from the vehicle, handcuffed him and told him to "sit down old man." Public believed Smith treated Public unprofessionally due to his age.

On May 20, 2021, Public alleged Smith detained him for a traffic violation he did not commit and made a discourteous comment due to his age.

I, Sergeant II Jane Doe, Serial No. 67890, reviewed the continuous BWV/DICV footage for the contact between Smith and Public. The DIVC refutes the allegation that Public was stopped for traffic violations he did not commit. Public was seen driving faster than the flow of traffic, passing multiple vehicles and failing to use his turn signal when negotiating lane changes. Prior to stopping Public, Doe made a comment to Smith that they could not properly pace Public because they were having difficulty keeping up with him. Public was cited for driving 65 mph in a 35 mph zone, (Citation No. Fl23S67).

Additionally, Public was never removed from the vehicle, never handcuffed and at no point did Smith say, "sit down old man," or anything similar to that. Based on the video evidence, it is recommended that this complaint be adjudicated as Non-Disciplinary, Demonstrably False.

Note: No interviews required due to BWV.

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29) Page: 3 of 4 Date: 06/23/2021

SCENARIO A: INCIDENT DID <u>NOT</u> OCCUR AS ALLEGED EXEMPLAR A1 - CLOSE COMPLAINT AS DF AT INTAKE (PREFERRED METHOD)

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

PTC: Date of Traffic Collision Blast 5 Years Career	Sta	atute	Date: 05/20/2022	CON	APLAINT FOR	RM Mask	ed: No	CF No.: 21-000000
Court Date Court Case No. ETA History Sustained Only	_ _		DR No.	Date of Traffic Collision	Last 5 Years			s)
FTA: Career Countification Month / Year Reason FTQ History (Sustained Only) Career FTQ: Forgot Shot and Failed Last 5 Years Career Shot and Failed Last 5 Years Career Career POLICY/PROCEDURE - The facts of the case revealed that the complaint relates to Department policy/procedure and not to a specific employee's actions. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING	ш	110.						
Disciplinary			Court Date	Court Case No.				
Disciplinary Non-Disciplinary (Check the applicable box below)		FTA:			Last 5 Years	C	areer	
Disciplinary Non-Disciplinary (Check the applicable box below) POLICY/PROCEDURE - The facts of the case revealed that the complaint relates to Department policy/procedure and not to a specific employee's actions. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING			Qualification Month / Year	Reason		FTQ History (Sus	tained Only)	
Non-Disciplinary (Check the applicable box below) POLICY/PROCEDURE - The facts of the case revealed that the complaint relates to Department policy/procedure and not to a specific employee's actions. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING		FTQ:		Forgot Shot and Faile	d Last 5 Years	c	areer	
POLICY/PROCEDURE - The facts of the case revealed that the complaint relates to Department policy/procedure and not to a specific employee's actions. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING		Disci	iplinary			-	X	
EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING				Non-Disciplinary	(Check the applica	ble box below)	The same of	
revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure. EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING					evealed that the comp	laint relates to Dep	artment po	olicy/procedure and
EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply) COUNSELING		revea	aled that the allegations	did not rise to the level	of misconduct and/o			
☐ TRAINING ☐ COMMENT CARD ☐ NOTICE TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES ☐ REFERRAL ☑ DEMONSTRABLY FALSE - The complaint was demonstrably false, or, demonstrates an irrational thought process and was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. ☐ DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). ☐ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA/DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER ☑ APPROVED ☐ REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION GROUP/BUREAU CO ☐ CONCUR ☐ DO NOT CONCUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) OLORIGE PRINT) RANK AREA/DIV Central Area NAME (PLEASE PRINT) I ARNK GROUP / BUREAU D. Chief Central Bureau SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE		EMF action	PLOYEE'S ACTIONS uns could have been diff	S COULD HAVE BEE ferent. However, the en	IN DIFFERENT - The property of	sion is best address	sed through	
□ COMMENT CARD □ NOTICE TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES □ REFERRAL ☑ DEMONSTRABLY FALSE - The complaint was demonstrably false, or, demonstrates an irrational thought process and was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. □ DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA / DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER ☑ APPROVED □ REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION CROUP/BUREAU CO □ CONCUR □ DO NOT CONCUR □ DO N		□C	OUNSELING		11 1			
□ NOTICE TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES □ REFERRAL ☑ DEMONSTRABLY FALSE - The complaint was demonstrably false, or, demonstrates an irrational thought process and was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. □ DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA / DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER ☑ APPROVED ☐ REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION GROUP/BUREAU CO ☑ CONCUR ☐ DO NOT CONCUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) NAME (PLEASE PRINT) RANK GROUP / BUREAU Central Bureau SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE DATE		□ T]	RAINING		1 1			
□ REFERRAL ☑ DEMONSTRABLY FALSE - The complaint was demonstrably false, or, demonstrates an irrational thought process and was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. □ DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complaint and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complaint and the employee(s) resolved the complaint and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complaint and the employee(s) resolved the complaint and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - THE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - THE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - THE COMPLAINT R		□ C	OMMENT CARD					
■ DEMONSTRABLY FALSE - The complaint was demonstrably false, or, demonstrates an irrational thought process and was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. □ DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). □ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. APPROVED			OTICE TO CORRECT	DEFICIENCIES				
was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s). RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA/DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER APPROVED REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION GROUP/BUREAU CO CONCUR DO NOT CONCUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) RANK GROUP / BUREAU Dolores James Captain I Central Area James Hunt D.Chief Central Bureau SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE		\square R	EFERRAL					
involve Department employee(s). ☐ RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA/DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER APPROVED REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION GROUP/BUREAU CO NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Dolores James Captain I Central Area SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE								I thought process and
employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR. AREA / DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER APPROVED REFERRED FOR DISCIPLINARY CONSIDERATION GROUP/BUREAU CO CONCUR DO NOT CONCUR NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Captain I Central Area SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE					VED - The prelimina	ry investigation re	vealed that	t the complaint did not
NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Dolores James Captain I Central Area DATE NAME (PLEASE PRINT) RANK CROUP / BUREAU DATE RANK CROUP / BUREAU D.Chief Central Bureau DATE DATE					MPLAINT RESOL	UTION (ACR) - 1	The compla	ainant and the
NAME (PLEASE PRINT) Dolores James Captain I Central Area DATE NAME (PLEASE PRINT) RANK CROUP / BUREAU DATE RANK CROUP / BUREAU D.Chief Central Bureau DATE DATE	ADE	A / DR/IC	ION COMMANDING DESIGER	APPROVED DESERBED FOR DISC	IDI INIADV CONCIDEDATION	CROLIBARI IDEALI CO	Mconsun C	DO NOT CONCUE
Dolores James Captain I Central Area James Hunt D.Chief Central Bureau SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO. DATE					IF LINART CUIVOIDERATION	***************************************		***************************************
	Do	lores	James	5207 of 5	ea	James Hunt		
							2	

SCENARIO A: The incident did not occur as alleged.

EXEMPLAR A2: Closing the complaint as Demonstrably False (DF) through the Complaint Adjudication Form (CAF).

This method is used when the Demonstrably False complaint is not closed at intake.

Complaint Adjudication Form CF No.																
	the IAG, ARS Section 3/82		nunicati	ion S	lip, or o	n the chain	of co	mmand inv	estigation				-000	000		
EMPLOYEE:		V	Multiple	e Emp	oloyees											
LAST NAME, FIRST M.I.			SERIAL	NO.	RANK A	T TIME OF INC	IDEN	T AREA/DIV	AT TIME OF IN	ICIDEN	Т [OUTY	STAT	US	ARRES	TEC
Smith, John	KNOWN	86753	3	Police	Officer II		Central				No 🔽	ı 🗌 (OFF [YES	Z 1	
ASSIGNMENT TYPE AT TIME OF						(COMPLAINAN	IT (LAST NAME	, FIRST	, M.I.	.)			DEPARTI	 13M	
PATROL AREA DETECTIV	/E ADMIN/CO	OVETED	SPE	CIALIZ	ED DIV	UNIFORM G	ED	Public, Joh	n Q.							
ADJUDICATION SUMMAR	Y: Enter allega	tion num	ber(s) un	der th	e respect	ive dispositions	. Che	eck Military en	dorsement for t	ne disp	ositio	n reco	mmen	ded.		
PENALI										LTY						
	SUSTAINED	NOT NED RESOLVED UNFOUNDED		EXONERATE	E	SUFFICIENT /IDENCE TO DJUDICATE	OTHER JUDICIAL REVIEW	No Penalty	Admon	SR.	Susp Days	Demotion	Discharge or Term on Probation	101		
Division Commanding Officer																
Area Commanding Officer																
Group Commanding Officer																
Bureau Commanding Officer																Γ
Chief of Police						4										
PENALTY RATIONALE: (Explain, if recor	mmenda	tion devi	iates	from Per	alty Guide.)	_ P1	TC (See attac	hed Form 1.13 f	or findi	ngs a	nd pei	nalty re	ecomn	endation	1.)
CLASSIFICATION:							à.									
It is recommended that CF No 21-0	000000 be closed	as Non-l	Disciplin	ary, l	Demonstr	rably False.	7	4								
SUMMARY:					A.	1										
On May 20, 2021, Police Officer II Public for speed and failure to use spoke with Sergeant II Jane Doe, S him from the vehicle, handcuffed h	a turn signal. Sn Serial No. 67890.	nith cited Public to	Public foold Jane 1	or spe Doe h	ed and wa	arned him for the pped by Smith	ie turi for a t	n signal. On l traffic violatio	May 20, 2021, P on he did not co	ublic c nmit. I	ontac He fu	ted Ce	ntral	front d	esk and	
ALLEGATION:				1	6	4										
On May 20, 2021, Public alleged S	smith detained hi	m for a tr	raffic viol	lation	he did no	t commit and n	nade a	a discourteous	comment due t	o his aş	ge.					
RATIONALE:	4	A			6											
I, Sergeant II Jane Doe, Serial No. was stopped for traffic violations hegotiating lane changes. Prior to him. Public was cited for driving 6	e did not commit stopping Public,	. Public Doe mad	was seen e a comn	driving	ng faster to Smith th	than the flow of	traff	ic, passing mu	iltiple vehicles a	ind fail	ng to	use h	is turn	signa	when	
Additionally, Public was never ren evidence, it is recommended that the									ld man," or anyt	hing si	nilar	to tha	t. Bas	sed on	the video)
Note: No interviews required du	- 4		AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PERSON													
	CENARI															
EXEMPLAR A2	- DF CO	MPL	AIN'	TN	OT (CLOSED	A '	T INTA	KE; DF	AT	AL	JU	DI	CA	LION	I
														Contir	ued on b	oac
DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER DJames	R'S SIGNATURE		ERIAL NO 32111		ATE 22/202		YEE'S	S SIGNATURE	E (ADMONISHM	ENT O	NLY)	SEF	RIAL N	O. D.	ATE	
GROUP/AREA COMMANDING OF	FICER'S SIGNAT	URE S	ERIAL N	О. П	ATE											
MMendoza			15612		23/202	1 X] Coi	ncur	Military End	dorsen	ent	(See l	oack p	age.)		
BUREAU COMMANDING OFFICER	R'S SIGNATURF		ERIAL NO													-
Solunt			24680		23/202	1 X	Со	ncur	Military En	dorsen	nent	(See	back p	age.)		
FINAL DEPARTMENT Internal Affairs Group Use Only																

BOR - GUILTY (Counts:

)

BOR - NOT GUILTY (Counts:

CSC OVERULE

NAMED EMPLOYEE (LAST NAME, FIRST, MI)	UNKNOWN	CF No.
Smith, John		21-000000
EMPLOYEE	INTERVIEW	
EMPLOYEE INVESTIGATION REVIEW	NOTICE OF PROPOSED D	ISCIPLINARY ACTION
Other than Sustained, Admonishments, or Official Reprimand	Notice of Proposed	Disciplinary Action
This complaint investigation has been completed. A review of the investigation has resulted in the proposed findings listed on the front of this form. You have the opportunity to review the completed investigation, including the letter of transmittal, and to make a written response. Any such response must be in writing and submitted to the commanding officer listed on the front of this form with 30 calendar days of this service. Thirty days from that date will be:	This complaint investigation has be investigation has resulted in the proof this form. You are hereby notif of Police that you receive the pena form for the allegations sustained to this form You have an opport writing by:	oposed findings listed on the from ied that I am proposing to the Ch Ity specified on the front of this in the findings, which are attache
	Your response will be reviewed by prior to adjudication of this matter.	the Chief of Police for evaluation
The employee shall initial the boxes that apply:		
o		•
X I have received a copy of the investigation materials.	I intend to submit a response.	
I have waived my right to receive a copy of the investigative material.	I do not intend to submit a respo	nse.
I was informed of my right to respresentation prior to discussing this matter.	I have received documentation re to perform the duties of my positi	egarding my fitness and suitability on (civilian employee).
I have discussed this matter with the employee.	Your signature acknowledges receipt of matericoncurence with my recommendations.	als, but does not indicate
DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE SERIAL NO. DATE	EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE	SERIAL NO. DATE
DJames 32111 5/22/2021	John Smith	867 53 5/25/2021
C/O'S RESPONSE TO EMPLOYEE: Date res	sponse received:	
No employee response was submitted by the date specified. After reviewing the employee's no new information to cause me recommended findings and/or page 1.	to change my me to take	of the employee's response has caused the following actions: (See below).
SCENADIO A. INCIDENTE DI		
SCENARIO A: INCIDENT DII		
EXEMPLAR A2 - DF COMPLAINT NOT CLO	USED AT INTAKE; DF A	ADJUDICATION
		See continuation page
MILITARY ENDORSEMENT RATIONALE:		

SCENARIO B: The incident occurred; however, the allegation is still Demonstrably False as evidence clearly proves that no misconduct was committed.

EXEMPLAR B1: Closing the complaint as Demonstrably False (DF) at intake through the Complaint Form (CF).

This is the preferred method. When <u>all</u> allegations have been clearly disproven, the complaint can be promptly adjudicated at intake without interviewing accused and witness officers. There is no need to complete a Complaint Adjudication Form (CAF) if the complaint is closed as Demonstrably False with the Complaint Form (CF).

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

COMPLAINT FORM

Masked: No **Statute Date: 02/05/2022 Investigative Complexity:** CF No.: 21-XXXXXX

Complainant(s)

Name: Doe, Jane

DOB: Unknown Female / WHITE

Gender/Descent:

Cross Street 1:

Injury:

Language:

None

Arrested: No Booking No.:

Identification: DL A1234567 Masked: No

Residential Address: 123 ABC Avenue

Los Angeles, California 90000

Subj of Incident: Source: **Public-Person Involved**

Method:

Verbal (in person)

Phone:

Email:

Not Provided

Date and Location of Occurrence

Beginning/End Date:

02/05/2021

RD / Area Division:

0192 / Central Area 22:39

No

Begin/End Time: Cross Street 2:

Address: 8400 South Budlong Avenue Los Angeles California

Accused Employee(s)

Name: Smith, John - 86753, PO 2 CENT

PAT W3

DOB: 11/28/1990

Gender/Descent: Male / HIS

Length of Service: 5 Years 11 Months 5 Days

Injury: Arrested:

Booking No.:

None No

Assignment: **Duty Status:**

Alcohol Involved:

Business Address:

Alcohol Involved:

Business Address:

Phone:

Masked:

Email:

CAR On Duty

No

CAR

Not Provided

Doe, John - 86757, PO 2 CENT PAT W3 Masked: Name:

DOB: 4/16/1995

Gender/Descent: Male / HIS 2 Years 6 Months 21 Days

Length of Service: Injury:

None No

Arrested: Booking No.: Assignment:

Duty Status:

Phone: Email:

On Duty

Not Provided

Involved Person(s)

Name: Involved Person Type:

DOB:

Gender/Descent: Identification:

Masked: Address:

Subject of Incident:

Phone: Email:

Not Provided

Brief Summary

CP stated that she was profiled due to her gender by Officer Smith and Officer Doe.

Reported to Uninv

Recorded By:

IAG CLASS:

Supervisor: 02/05/2021

> Williams, Jane - 67890, SGT 2 CENT PAT W2

> > Undetermined

Uninvolved Supervisor Name:

PAT W2 Unknown

Preliminary Investigator

Cross Reference:

21052000005296

Master Incident Number

Williams, Jane - 67890, SGT 2 CENT

Supervisor Reviewing Serial No. Area/Division Complaint Type **Entity Investigating** Prima Facie

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29)

Page: 1 of 4

Date: 06/23/2021

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

COMPLAINT FORM

Statute Date: 02/05/2022 Investigative Complexity: Masked: No CF No.: 21-XXXXXX

Disciplinary UNKNOWN

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29)

Page: 2 of 4

Date: 06/23/2021

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

Statute Date: 02/05/2022 COMPLAINT FORM Masked: No CF No.: 21-XXXXXX

Preliminary Investigative Narrative:

It is recommended that CF No. 21-XXXXXX be closed as Non-Disciplinary, Demonstrably False.

On February 4, 2021, Police Officer II John Smith, Serial No. 86753 and his partner, Police Officer II John Doe, Serial No. 86757, initiated a traffic stop on complainant Jane Doe for speed. Smith cited Doe for speed. On February 5, 2021, Doe contacted Central front desk and spoke with Sergeant II Jane Williams, Serial No. 67890. Doe agreed that she was speeding; however, she alleged officers did not cite other speeding drivers and they only stopped her because of her gender.

On February 4, 2021, Jane Doe alleged John Smith and John Doe initiated a traffic stop due to her gender.

I, Sergeant II Jane Williams, Serial No. 67890, reviewed the officers' continuous BWV footage which captured the entire incident. The video confirmed the officers used LIDAR and clocked the complainant's car going 60mph in a 35mph. Doe was also seen driving faster than the flow of traffic and passing multiple vehicles. Doe's car windows were tinted, and the occupant could not be seen close enough to determine any characteristics. Officer Smith cited Doe for speeding. Continuous BWV footage shows that similar vehicles clocked going over the speed limit were stopped. Citation history review shows that Smith and/or Doe cited every car they stopped for speeding.

Based on the video evidence, it is recommended that this complaint be adjudicated as Non-Disciplinary, Demonstrably False. Note: No interviews required due to BWV.

FORM 70-01.28.0 (R 29) Page: 3 of 4 Date: 06/23/2021

Los Angeles Police Department

Complaint Review Report

Sta	tute	Date: 02/05/2022	COMI	PLAINT FOR	RM Mask	ed: N	-XXXXXX				
_		DD N	Data of Traffic Callinian	1	Floor Coffor I line	(D-i	DT/	C-)			
		DR No.	Date of Traffic Collision	Last 5 Years	Fleet Safety Hist	ory (Prid Career	orPIC	CS)			
Ш	PTC:										
								,			
_		Court Date	Court Case No.	Last 5 Years	FTA History (St	<u>ustained</u> Career	Only	()			
니	FTA:			Last 5 Tears		carcer					
\Box											
		Qualification Month / Year	Reason Forgot Shot and Failed	Last 5 Years	FTQ History (St	ustained Career	Only	()			
	FTQ:		Forgot Shot and Failed	Last 5 fears		Career		"			
						1		Contract of the last			
	Disci	plinary	Non-Disciplinary (Check the applica	ble box below)	7					
		ICY/PROCEDURE - a specific employee's	The facts of the case reveactions.	aled that the comp	laint relates to De	partm	ent j	policy/proc	edure and		
EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS DID NOT RISE TO THE LEVEL OF MISCONDUCT - A preliminary investigation revealed that the allegations did not rise to the level of misconduct and/or the named employee's actions were protected by law or found to be consistent with Department policy or procedure.											
EMPLOYEE'S ACTIONS COULD HAVE BEEN DIFFERENT - The facts in the complaint revealed the employee's actions could have been different. However, the employee's act or omission is best addressed through corrective action by the employee's commanding officer. The corrective action(s) taken was: (Check all that apply)											
	□ COUNSELING □ TRAINING □ COMMENT CARD □ NOTICE TO CORRECT DEFICIENCIES										
X	— DEM		E - The complaint was deplainant's established patt					al thought p	process and		
was consistent with the complainant's established pattern of making chronic or crank complaints. DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE(S) NOT INVOLVED - The preliminary investigation revealed that the complaint did not involve Department employee(s).											
RESOLVED THROUGH ALTERNATIVE COMPLAINT RESOLUTION (ACR) - The complainant and the employee(s) resolved the complaint through ACR.											
AREA	A / DIVIS	ION COMMANDING OFFICER	APPROVED REFERRED FOR DISCIPLI	NARY CONSIDERATION	GROUP/BUREAU CO	X con	ICUR [DO NOT CONCL	UR		
		SE PRINT)	RANK AREA / DIV		NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	γ	RANK	GROUP / BUREA	•••••		
		James	Captain I Central Area		James Hunt		Chie		•		
		SERIAL NO.	DATE		SIGNATURE / SERIAL NO.			DATE			
D	Jan	tes 32111	2/7/2021		Hunt			24680	2/9/2021		
					0						

SCENARIO B: The incident occurred; however, the allegation is still Demonstrably False as evidence clearly proves that no misconduct was committed.

EXEMPLAR B2: Closing the complaint as Demonstrably False (DF) through the Complaint Adjudication Form (CAF).

This method is used when the Demonstrably False complaint is not closed at intake.

Complaint Adjudication Form																
	the IAG, ARS-C	ommi	unicati	ion Sli	p, or o	n the chain o	of co	mmand inv	estigation				-XXX	XXX		
(Manual Section 3/824). EMPLOYEE: Multiple Employees																
LAST NAME, FIRST M.I.			SERIAL		<u> </u>	T TIME OF INC	IDEN	NT AREA/DIV.	AT TIME OF IN	CIDEN	IT (DUTY	STAT	้นร	ARRES	ΓFΓ
Smith, John	LINICALONAL										YES					
ASSIGNMENT TYPE AT TIME OF	INCIDENT							COMPLAINAN	T (LAST NAME,	FIRST	Г, М.І.	.)			DEPART	MEI
PATROL AREA DETECTIV	VE ADMIN/COVET	LED [SPEC	CIALIZE	ן אם ס	UNIFORM GE	ED	Doe, Jane								
ADJUDICATION SUMMARY: Enter allegation number(s) under the respective dispositions. Check Military endorsement for the disposition recommended.																
PENALTY																
	SUSTAINED R	NOT ESOL\		UNFOUNDED EXC		EXONERATE	E	ISUFFICIENT VIDENCE TO ADJUDICATE	OTHER JUDICIAL REVIEW	No Penalty	Admon	OR	Susp Days	Demotion	Discharge or Term on Probation	1
Division Commanding Officer																
Area Commanding Officer																Ε
Group Commanding Officer								-		0						
Bureau Commanding Officer						•										
Chief of Police						•										
PENALTY RATIONALE:	(Explain, if recomme	endatio	on devi	iates fro	om Pen	alty Guide.)	P	TC (See attach	ed Form 1.13 fo	r findi	ngs a	nd pe	nalty r	ecomn	nendation	1.)
CLASSIFICATION:																
It is recommended that CF No 21-	XXXXXX be closed	as Noi	n-Discip	plinary.	Demo	nstrably False.										
SUMMARY:																
On February 4, 2021, Police Office Doe for speed. Smith cited Doe for Williams she was stopped by Smither gender.	r speed. On February	y 5, 20	21, Doc	contac	ted Cen	tral front desk a	ind s	poke with Serg	eant II Jane Wil	lliams,	Seria	al No.	67890). Doe	told	
ALLEGATION:						₹										
On February 4, 2021, Jane Doe all	eged John Smith and	John L	Joe initi	iated a t	traffic st	op due to her go	ende	r.								
RATIONALE:	4	W		1	•											
I, Sergeant II Jane Williams, Seria clocked the complainant's car goir and the occupant could not be seer clocked going over the speed limit	ng 60mph in a 35mph n close enough to dete	. Doe vermine	was also any cha	seen d	lriving fa stics. Of	aster than the fl Ticer Smith cite	ow c	of traffic and pa oe for speeding	ussing multiple v . Continuous B	ehicle WV fo	s. Do otage	e's ca	r wind	lows v	vere tinte	d.
Based on the video evidence, it is	recommended that thi	is com	plaint be	e adjudi	icated as	s Non-Disciplir	ary,	, Demonstrabl	y False.							
Note: No interviews required du	ie to BWV.															
	S	CE	NAR	SIO.	B: II	NCIDEN	T	OCCUR	ED							
EXEMPLAR B2										AT	AD	JU	DIC	CAI	TION	
														Conti	nued on I	oac
DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICE	R'S SIGNATURE		RIAL NO		TE	EMPLO	YEE'	S SIGNATURE	(ADMONISHM	ENT O	NLY)	SEF	RIAL N	0. D	ATE	
DJames			2111		/2021											
GROUP/AREA COMMANDING OF MMENdoza	FICER'S SIGNATURE		RIAL NO 5612		TE 2021	X] Co	oncur [Military End	lorsen	nent	(See l	oack p	age.)		
BUREAU COMMANDING OFFICER	R'S SIGNATURE	SE	RIAL NO	O. DA	TE	_										_
Hunt		24	1680	2/9/	2021	X	Co	oncur [Military End	lorser	nent	(See	back p	age.)		
FINAL DEPARTMENT	rs Group Use Only															
ACTION	CSC OVERULE			BOR	R - GUILT	ΓΥ (Counts:)	Вог	R - NOT	r GUII	LTY (C	ounts	:)	

NAMED EMPLOYEE (LAST NAME, FIRST, MI)		UNKNOWN	CF No.				
Smith, John			21-XXXXXX				
	EMPLOYEE	INTERVIEW					
EMPLOYEE INVESTIGATION REVIE	=========== EW	NOTICE OF PROP	OSED DISCIPLINARY ACTION				
Other than Sustained, Admonishments, or Official Research This complaint investigation has been completed. A revinvestigation has resulted in the proposed findings listed of this form. You have the opportunity to review the cor investigation, including the letter of transmittal, and to make the commanding officer listed on the front of this form we calendar days of this service. Thirty days from that date The employee shall initial the boxes that apply: I have received a copy of the investigation material. I have waived my right to receive a copy of the investigation priodiscussing this matter.	eprimand iew of the on the front impleted ake a written ubmitted to vith 30 e will be:	Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action This complaint investigation has been completed. A review investigation has resulted in the proposed findings listed on of this form. You are hereby notified that I am proposing to of Police that you receive the penalty specified on the front form for the allegations sustained in the findings, which are to this form. You have an opportunity to respond orally writing by: Your response will be reviewed by the Chief of Police for exprior to adjudication of this matter. I intend to submit a response. I do not intend to submit a response.					
I have discussed this matter with the employee.	A	Your signature acknowledges recei	pt of materials, but does not indicate				
DIVISION COMMANDING OFFICER'S SIGNATURE SERIAL NO	DATE	EMPLOYEE'S SIGNATURE	SERIAL NO. DATE				
DJames 32111	2/7/2021	John Smith	867 53 2/10/2021				
submitted by the date specified. no new recomm	viewing the employee's information to cause mended findings and/or	e to change my penalty.					
MILITARY ENDORSEMENT RATIONALE:			See continuation page				