



Office of Independent Review

Quarterly Report Third Quarter 2016

**Richard Rasmussen
Police Auditor**

Purpose of the Office of Independent Review

The Office of Independent Review (OIR) is responsible for ensuring that complaints about the conduct of the Fresno Police Department (FPD) are thoroughly investigated to enhance community trust. The OIR monitors ongoing investigations conducted by the FPD Internal Affairs (IA) unit and, when completed performs a comprehensive audit of the process. Each audit report will focus on evaluating the adequacy, thoroughness, quality and accuracy of the investigative report. The OIR assists in strengthening the relationship between the community and the police department by promoting greater transparency and collaboration.

By design, the OIR is independent from the FPD allowing it to work as a conduit in the community. As such, the OIR meets regularly with members from local groups to listen to the public's interest and perspective.

The OIR is scheduled to release four quarterly reports per year to increase transparency, public awareness and understanding.

Purpose of the Report

The objective of the OIR, in preparing this report is that the constituents of the City of Fresno see transparency by all parties involved in the review of complaints.

The following report is intended to show a detailed summary of all complaints submitted to the FPD during the third quarter of 2016. The OIR does not conduct its own investigation but is given full access, monitors and contributes to the existing IA investigation. Once IA has completed its investigation the file is submitted to the OIR for audit.

The third quarter report reflects all complaints made to the IA Unit of the FPD, along with the recommendations made by the OIR between the dates of July 1, 2016 – September 30, 2016. The report is reflective of complaints that are handled within the Inquiry Complaint Form (ICF) system, as well as those more serious allegations which are immediately assigned within the IA Pro system. Some complaints begin as ICFs and once that investigation is concluded, mutate to become full IA investigations. As the tables within this report reflect, some cases are still pending with the IA Unit and will be audited upon completion of IA's own examination of those cases. Also within this report are separate tables that list pending cases in previous quarters; these tables will detail if the cases have since been audited or continue in a pending status.

Additionally, recommendations are always communicated to the FPD within the audit, regarding the case that generated the recommendation. Other, broader recommendations and/or "trends" are also communicated to the FPD as they are identified weeks prior to the OIR Quarterly Report being published. This is an effort to ensure that the FPD is aware of issues and is able to react, address or consider each item, and is done so in the most time effective manner possible. The FPD has been extremely responsive to these notifications and has offered clarifying information or language, prior to the reports being published.

**Identified Trends/Issues and Relayed to the Fresno Police Department (FPD)
Office of Independent Review Recommendations:**

Dylan Noble OIS:

This matter has generated the single most public interest and the most direct contact with OIR to date. The FPD was unable to complete their review of the matter within this quarter, as recommended in the previous Quarterly Report. Therefore, the results of FPD's Internal Review and the results of the OIR audit, which is not completed as it was only available for review since last week, will not appear in this report. Those results will appear in the next Quarterly Report, if one is produced. Some of the body camera footage has been publicly released in this matter and in it, it was noted that the officer driving the police car had pulled his weapon, pointing it at the fleeing vehicle, through the windshield of his police car, as he was driving. OIR has previously requested any training provided to the officers about firing their weapons through vehicle glass. As previously noted, there is a real issue with "bullet deflection" with rounds fired through glass surfaces, especially the sloped, front facing, vehicle safety glass. The FPD is requested to review their firearms training syllabus and provide OIR with any pertinent training on this topic for review. If none exists, it is requested that the Firearms Training Unit do the necessary research to ensure they are providing sufficient training and guidance about this topic.

Body Camera Activation:

As previously discussed in earlier Quarterly Reports, officers continue to fail to activate their body cameras, in accordance with FPD policy. The cameras are an effective tool in determining most facts in any given interaction, but only if they are activated. Additionally, cameras have been in place for over 2 years and come at a great expense to the citizens of Fresno, an even greater expense if they are not used. As has been shown multiple times, the availability of recordings of an incident can and has allowed all investigative inquiries to arrive at sound findings. OIR believes that the time span for "re-training" or reprimands has lapsed in those cases wherein officers fail to activate their cameras, without a compelling reason. The following factors should be considered when an officer fails to activate their camera and is requesting answers to the questions below.

- 1) Does the officer(s) have an IA history that includes failure to activate their cameras?
- 2) What is typically the punishment, at this stage, for failure to activate a body camera for a first time oversight and for a multiple incidents?

In many cases, photographs of the suspect are routinely made, revealing any and all injuries that they suffered. However, photographs are rarely made of the officers taken on the day in question to record their condition and the other tools they had available to them when they chose/were forced to use force on the suspect who was, in most cases, reported to be non-compliant and perhaps even physically resistant? However, in at least one reviewed case, the fact that both officers failed to activate their cameras did give pause. In cases of the use of force in the future, it is recommended that pictures should be made of the involved officers, the same as they are of the suspect, so that any officer sustained injuries, or obvious signs of a physical struggle, can be recorded as well as the availability of the tools the officers had at their disposal at the time of the incident. This is a very simple step and one that does not require any real expense.

FPD is requested to provide to OIR any training on the use of force/pain compliance, as the officers in the above referenced case, allege they were doing when they struck him in the face, inadvertently? FPD has already provided their training on the use of strikes, not involving a baton,

and OIR finds that training/guidance to be within the norms used nationwide. Generally, the use of fists being a poor option not only to gain compliance but as it relates to possible officer injuries when they have access to a baton, Taser or OC spray, not to mention various control holds, such as an arm bar etc. OIR recognizes, in this specifically referenced case, that even if the officers had these tools at their disposal, that the situation may have precluded their use due to the “close quarters” encounter that is described. While reviewing the case, OIR did not note any discussion about other options during their interviews, and why they did not use them, if available. Again, without the body camera footage, which both officers had failed to activate or officer photos, OIR is left speculating on what tools they had available. It should be noted that every officer involved in an OIS is routinely photographed, as part of the investigation, and at no significant cost to the citizens of Fresno resulting in OIR recommending that every officer involved in a “use of force incident” also be photographed.

In the previous Quarterly Report, demographic data was requested in a number of areas. During this review, it was observed by OIR that some data provided by the FPD was inaccurate, due to vendor driven issues. So, the FPD was requested to work with the vendor and provide updated and accurate data on Traffic Stops by Race. The following data reflects that updated report:

Demographic Data:

TRAFFIC STOPS BY DISTRICT BY RACE

DISTRICT/RACE	0700-1859	1900-0659	TOTALS	% OF AREA	% OF CITY WIDE
SW					21.17%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	1348	1264	2612	18.64%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	1	0	1	0.01%	
ASIAN	361	284	645	4.60%	
HISPANIC	4740	2912	7652	54.61%	
NO DATA	27	7	34	0.24%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	359	185	544	3.88%	
WHITE	1547	976	2523	18.01%	
SW Total	8383	5628	14011	100.00%	
NW					16.36%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	868	644	1512	13.97%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	5	0	5	0.05%	
ASIAN	223	166	389	3.59%	
HISPANIC	2928	1816	4744	43.83%	
NO DATA	45	5	50	0.46%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	696	213	909	8.40%	
WHITE	2340	875	3215	29.70%	
NW Total	7105	3719	10824	100.00%	
SE					16.04%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	726	452	1178	11.10%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	5	2	7	0.07%	
ASIAN	597	304	901	8.49%	
HISPANIC	4497	2160	6657	62.72%	
NO DATA	24	3	27	0.25%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	265	97	362	3.41%	
WHITE	1145	337	1482	13.96%	
SE Total	7259	3355	10614	100.00%	
NE					19.12%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	729	522	1251	9.89%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	0	2	2	0.02%	
ASIAN	500	268	768	6.07%	
HISPANIC	3013	1901	4914	38.83%	

NO DATA	37	3	40	0.32%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	766	274	1040	8.22%	
WHITE	3389	1251	4640	36.67%	
NE Total	8434	4221	12655	100.00%	
INVALID DISTRICT ENTRY					23.55%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	1313	521	1834	11.77%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	15	1	16	0.10%	
ASIAN	520	186	706	4.53%	
HISPANIC	5358	2044	7402	47.49%	
NO DATA	273	117	390	2.50%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	830	255	1085	6.96%	
WHITE	3246	907	4153	26.65%	
INVALID DISTRICT ENTRY TOTAL	11555	4031	15586	100.00%	
OTHER DISTRICT					3.74%
AFRICAN AMERICAN	256	66	322	13.01%	
ASIAN	89	9	98	3.96%	
HISPANIC	955	221	1176	47.52%	
NO DATA	7	1	8	0.32%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	129	44	173	6.99%	
WHITE	610	88	698	28.20%	
OTHER DISTRICT Total	2046	429	2475	100.00%	
CITY WIDE TOTAL	44782	21383	66165		100.0%

APPARENT RACE	0700-1859	1900-0659	Total	% City Wide
AFRICAN AMERICAN	5240	3469	8709	13.16%
AMERICAN INDIAN	26	5	31	0.05%
ASIAN	2290	1217	3507	5.32%
HISPANIC	21491	11054	32545	49.19%
NO DATA	413	136	549	0.83%
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	3045	1068	4113	6.22%
WHITE	12277	4434	16711	25.26%
Total	44782	21383	66165	100.00%

Policy and Procedure Audit Summary

Introduction:

The Office of Independent Review, (OIR), is charged with reviewing policies and procedures of the Fresno Police Department, (FPD), to ensure compliance with policy, the Chief of Police's core values and directives, as well as conforming with national standards within law enforcement and community values. This process is done by audit of policy, directives or new policy development.

As background the current policies, procedures are very detailed, complete, and professional and are maintained in accordance with the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA), which in itself is already a high standard for any law enforcement agency. Nevertheless, and given the evolving nature of law enforcement and the public's expectations related to transparency and accountability, the following recommendations are intended to augment and improve the department's existing use of force policies and training. These recommendations are consistent with best practices that are now being implemented throughout the country and are supported by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), as well as other national police leadership organizations.

OIR believes that FPD should lead the nation by building upon the existing policies in order to clearly describe expectations of its officers, which in turn, will allow the public to be further informed on these very sensitive and critical issues. The men and women of FPD are exceptional, professional and without doubt have the ability to lead the nation in taking policies to a higher standard which is consistent with FPD commitment to transparency, continued improvement and history professional competency.

Therefore, OIR recommends a comprehensive and more detailed approach to implementation of a higher standard regarding the use of force. OIR recognizes the professional and difficult work of the men and women of FPD who serve the community during very stressful situations. Again, any recommendations given or changes made are intended to promote the safety of the both the officer and the public that they serve and must be backed up with thorough, intergraded training or retraining of all officers in a comprehensive manner. OIR recognizes that all officer involved shooting or other uses of force situations will not and cannot be eliminated; however, OIR recognizes that emphasis on using a higher standard for use of force does better protect officers and the public.

Current FPD Vision and Mission Statement:

The Vision of FPD is to serve our community with honesty, compassion and respect.

The mission of the Fresno Police Department is to enhance safety, service, and trust with our community.

- Keep our community safe by preventing citizens from becoming victims of crime or from being injured in traffic collisions. This is our highest priority.
- Provide excellent service to the numerous requests we receive from the community. Our principal duty is to serve.
- Maintain the trust of our community. This trust provides every department member with the foundation required to carry out our duties. Without trust we simply do not have the authority to serve our public.

Policy Recommendations:

1. The sanctity of human life should be at the heart of everything FPD does. The current vision and mission statements are excellent. OIR recommends that the mission statement, policies, and training curricula should emphasize the sanctity of all human life. The police officers, the general public and criminal suspects, further emphasizing the importance of treating all persons with dignity and respect. This will enhance officer's safety, while giving the most honorable service which will increases the trust of the public under very difficult circumstances.
2. OIR recommends that FPD adopt policies that hold themselves to a higher standard than the legal requirements of Graham v. Connor.

FPD use of force policies should go beyond the legal standard of "objective reasonableness" spelled out in the U.S. Supreme Court decision of Graham v. Connor. This landmark decision should be seen as "necessary but not sufficient." OIR suggest this ruling does not provide police with sufficient guidance on the use of force. As a result, prosecutors, or grand juries often find that a fatal shooting by an officer is not a crime, even though they may not consider the use of force proportional or necessary. Such decisions leave, first the officer, and second the agency in a very difficult situation. FPD should adopt policies and training to hold themselves to an even higher standard, based on sound tactics, considerations of whether the

use of force was proportional to the threat, and the sanctity of human life. Many police agencies already have policies that go beyond legal requirements as they should. For example: many agencies have adopted pursuit policies, and rules barring officers from shooting at or from moving vehicles, that go beyond current legal precedents.

3. FPD officer's use of force must meet the test of proportionality. In assessing whether a response is proportional, officers must ask themselves, "How would the general public view the actions taken?" Would they think it was appropriate to the situation and to the severity of the threat posed to the officer or to the public? This does not further jeopardize officer safety and OIR believes this increases the safety of officers, physically and professionally.
4. OIR recommends that FPD adopt de-escalation as a formal agency policy. In creating General Orders and/or a policy statement making it clear that de-escalation is the preferred, tactically sound approach in most incidents. General orders should mandate officers to receive training on key de-escalation principles. Any de-escalation policy should also include discussion of proportionality, using distance and cover, tactical repositioning, "Slowing Down" situations that do not pose an immediate threat, calling for supervisory and other resources, crisis intervention personal, etc. Officers must be trained in these principles, and their supervisors should hold them accountable for adhering to them.
5. OIR recommends policy requiring officers to intervene to prevent other officers from using excessive force. FPD officers should be obligated to intervene when they believe another officer is about to use excessive or unnecessary force, or when they witness colleagues using excessive or unnecessary force, or engaging in any misconduct. OIR recognizes the sensitivity of such a policy. OIR believes that a policy does protect officers both physically and professionally. FPD should create training for officers to detect warning signs of another officer's, or in themselves, who might be moving toward excessive or unnecessary use of force and to intervene or have a supervisor intervene before the situation escalates, jeopardizing safety or integrity of the involved officer and the integrity of FPD.
6. OIR recommends that FPD policy prohibit use of deadly force against individuals who pose a danger only to themselves. Prohibiting the use of deadly force allows for careful consideration for the use of many less-lethal options, only against individuals who pose a danger only to themselves and not to other members of the public or to officers. Officers should be prepared to exercise considerable discretion to wait as long as necessary so that the situation can be resolved peacefully, again emphasizing the sanctity of all human life.
7. OIR recommends that FPD document use of force incidents, and review data and enforcement practices to ensure that they are fair and non-discriminatory. This documentation should include all hand or leg restraints, the use of a deadly weapon, less-lethal weapon, or weapon of opportunity; or any instances where injury is observed or even alleged by the subject. In addition, FPD should capture and review reports on the pointing of a firearm or an electronic control device at an individual as a threat of force. This information is critical both for external reporting and internal improvements to policy and training. FPD should seek out stakeholders and interested communities and consult with such to ensure that use of force and enforcement practices are not discriminatory. FPD should develop strong policies and protocols for reviewing all use of force reports to ensure accuracy and completeness, including comparing written reports with video footage from body-worn cameras, or dashboard cameras as well as other sources. Attention should be paid to ensure that reports provide clear and specific details about the incident and avoid generic, "boilerplate" language.

8. OIR recommends that the FPD build upon and maintain understanding and trust with the public and issue regular reports to the public on use of force incidents, above and beyond what OIR currently reports in the Quarterly Report. This should include Officer Involved shootings, deployments of less-lethal options, and use of canines. Such a report should include discussion of racial issues and efforts to prevent all types of bias and discrimination. These reports should be published annually at a minimum and should be widely available through FPD webpage as well as hard copies. In this way FPD can have trust from the community by being completely transparent in providing this information to an informed public. By releasing as much information as possible to the public, as quickly as possible, acknowledging that the information is preliminary and may change as more detail unfold. OIR recognizes the sensitive nature of OIS situations; however the trust of the community and the support of the community are paramount in keeping and building this trust and support necessary for successful modern policing.

Richard Rasmussen and Mark Scharman
Police Auditors

**OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW
CITY OF FRESNO
QUARTERLY REPORT
THIRD QUARTER 2016
July 1, 2016 – September 30, 2016
Report Issued October 24, 2016**

Glossary	
Unfounded	The reported incident did not occur.
Exonerated	The employee's actions were reasonable under the circumstances.
Not Sustained	There is insufficient evidence to support a conclusion as to whether or not the employee violated policy.
Sustained	The employee's action(s) are in violation of the policy or procedure of the Police department.
AU	The case has been audited by the Office of Independent Review
AD	The Office of Independent Review has declined to review the case due to the subject; for example an interdepartmental complaint or a case where the OIR cannot add value to the investigation.
Pending	The case is still in the process of being investigated
"S"	"S" defines the Subject Officer, when there are multiple officers, the letter "S" is followed by a number (S, S1, S2).
Blue Category	Firearm Discharge
Yellow Category	Unreasonable Use of Force
Green Category	Vehicle Accident

**The following cases were pending in the previous 2016, 1st quarter.
The pending incidents are in the process of formal IA investigations.
Once the investigations are completed they will be sent to the OIR for review.**

IA PRO CASE #	DATE ASSIGNED	USE OF FORCE	FPD FINDING	OIR DISPOSITION	STATUS	SUMMARY
16-0003	01/29/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Within Policy	AU	(S,S1)Officer Involved Shooting
16-0004	02/12/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0005	02/17/2016	No	Unfounded, Unfounded, Unfounded	AD	AD	Report Preparation, Discretion, Body Camera Issues
16-0009	02/22/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0012	03/01/2016	No	Within Policy	AD	AD	In-Custody Death
16-0019	03/24/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved Shooting

**The following cases were pending in the previous 2016, 2nd quarter.
The pending incidents are in the process of formal IA investigations.
Once the investigations are completed they will be sent to the OIR for review.**

IA PRO CASE #	DATE ASSIGNED	USE OF FORCE	FPD FINDING	OIR DISPOSITION	STATUS	SUMMARY
16-0029	04/11/2016	Yes	(S,S1) Within Policy	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Officer Involved Shooting
16-0038	05/19/2016	No	Unfounded	Unfounded	AU	Unreasonable Force
16-0040	06/01/2016	No	(S) Unfounded, (S1) Unfounded	(S,S1) Unfounded	AU	(S,S1) Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey all Laws
16-0041	06/08/2016	No	Exonerated, Not Sustained	Not Sustained, Exonerated	AU	Unreasonable Force, Discourteous
16-0042	06/08/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0043	06/13/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Vehicle Operations & Equipment
16-0044	06/13/2016	No	(S, S1, S2) Exonerated, (S2) Unfounded	Unfounded, Exonerated	AU	(S,S1,S2) Unreasonable Force, (S2) Discrimination
16-0046	06/22/2016	No	Sustained	Sustained	AU	Unreasonable Force
16-0048	06/24/2016	No	Unfounded, Unfounded	AD	AD	Search/Seizure Issues, False/Misleading
16-0050	06/24/2016	No	Unfounded	Exonerated	AU	Unreasonable Force
16-0051	06/27/2016	Yes	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Officer Involved Shooting
16-0052	06/30/2016	No	Unfounded (All)	AD	AD	Integrity, Force Reporting, Unreasonable Force, Failure to Notify Supervisor
16-0053	06/30/2016	No	Sustained (All)	AD	AD	Integrity, Performance, Conduct Unbecoming On/Off Duty

The following cases did have or are in the process of formal IA investigations. Each of these cases occurred during the 2016, 3rd quarter. Once the investigation is completed it is sent to the OIR for review

IA PRO CASE #	DATE ASSIGNED	USE OF FORCE	FPD FINDING	OIR DISPOSITION	STATUS	SUMMARY
16-0054	07/07/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Performance, Discretion
16-0055	07/07/2016	No	(S) Unfounded, (S1) Unfounded	AD	AD	(S) Discrimination, Discretion; (S1) Discrimination, Abuse of Authority, Discretion
16-0056	07/07/2016	No	(S,S1) Sustained	(S,S1) Sustained	AU	(S,S1) Unreasonable Force
16-0057	07/07/2016	No	Unfounded	Pending	Pending	Racial/Bias Based on Profiling
16-0058	07/15/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Discretion
16-0059	07/28/2016	No	Unfounded, Exonerated	AD	AD	(S,S1) Unreasonable Force, Report Preparation – False/Misleading
16-0060	07/28/2016	No	(S,S1) Unfounded	AD	AD	(S,S1) Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey all Laws
16-0061	07/29/2016	No	Exonerated, Exonerated, Not Sustained	Pending	Pending	Abuse of Authority, Integrity, Discretion
16-0062	08/02/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Vehicle Collisions
16-0063	08/03/2016	No	Within Policy	AD	AD	Officer Involved Shooting –Dog
16-0064	08/03/2016	No	Exonerated	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0065	08/03/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0066	08/17/2016	Yes	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S,S1,S2) In Custody Death
16-0067	08/19/2016	No	(S,S1) Exonerated	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Unreasonable Force

The following cases did have or are in the process of formal IA investigations. Each of these cases occurred during the 2016, 3rd quarter. Once the investigation is completed it is sent to the OIR for review

IA PRO CASE #	DATE ASSIGNED	USE OF FORCE	FPD FINDING	OIR DISPOSITION	STATUS	SUMMARY
16-0068	08/19/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S, S1, S2) Unreasonable Force
16-0071	08/25/2016	No	Not Sustained, Sustained	AD	AD	Unwelcome Solicitation, Discretion
16-0072	08/25/2016	No	Exonerated, Sustained	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0073	08/25/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S, S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7) Criminal Acts/ Failure to Obey All Laws, Discourteous
16-0074	09/12/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Vehicle Collisions
16-0075	09/12/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Sexual Harassment
16-0076	09/15/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0077	09/15/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	Performance
16-0078	09/15/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Unreasonable Force, Arrest Authority/Procedures

AUDIT REPORTS PERFORMED IN THE THIRD QUARTER OF 2016

C16-0003	Allegation:	Officer Involved In Shooting
	Audit Findings	Within Policy
	FPD Findings	Within Policy
C16-0009	Allegation:	Officer Involved In Shooting
	Audit Findings	Within Policy
	FPD Findings	Within Policy
C16-0019	Allegation:	Officer Involved In Shooting
	Audit Findings	Within Policy
	FPD Findings	Within Policy
C16-0038	Allegation:	Unreasonable Force
	Audit Findings	Unfounded (S,S1)
	FPD Findings	Unfounded (S,S1)
C16-0040	Allegation:	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
	Audit Findings	Unfounded (S,S1)
	FPD Findings	Unfounded (S,S1)
C16-0041	Allegation:	Unreasonable Force, Discourteous
	Audit Findings	Exonerated, Not Sustained
	FPD Findings	Exonerated, Not Sustained
C16-0044	Allegation:	Unreasonable Force, Discrimination
	Audit Findings	Exonerated (S,S1,S2), Unfounded (S2)
	FPD Findings	Exonerated, Unfounded (S,S1,S2)
C16-0046	Allegation:	Unreasonable Force
	Audit Findings	Sustained
	FPD Findings	Sustained
C16-0050	Allegation:	Unreasonable Force
	Audit Findings	Unfounded
	FPD Findings	Exonerated

C-16-0056 Allegation: Unreasonable Force (S,S1)

Audit Findings Sustained (S,S1)

FPD Findings Sustained (S,S1)

FRESNO POLICE DEPARTMENT

INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

2016 3rd QUARTER INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

The following complaints were reviewed and it was determined, by the FPD they did not warrant a full Internal Affairs investigation.

TYPE	INFORMAL COMPLAINT #	DATE CLOSED	FINDINGS	ALLEGATIONS
IC	16-0096	7/8/16	NOT SUSTAINED	PROPERTY LOST/DAMAGED
IC	16-0097	7/21/21	UNFOUNDED	REPORT PREPARATION
IC	16-0098	7/21/21	EXONERATED	FAILURE TO OBEY ALL LAWS
IC	16-0099	7/21/21	NOT SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
				GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0100	7/21/21	UNFOUNDED	SEARCH/SEIZURE ISSUES
IC	16-0101	7/21/21	NOT SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0102	7/21/21	NOT SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
			SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0103	7/21/21	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0104	7/27/16	EXONERATED	INVESTIGATION HANDLING
IC	16-0105	7/27/16	EXONERATED	INFORMATION RELEASES
IC	16-0106	7/27/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING

IC	16-0107	8/12/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0108	8/12/16	SUSTAINED	INVESTIGATION HANDLING
IC	16-0109	8/12/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
IC	16-0110	8/12/16	EXONERATED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0111	8/12/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0112	8/12/16	EXONERATED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0113	8/12/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0114	8/12/16	SUSTAINED	INTEGRITY
IC	16-0115	8/12/16	NOT SUSTAINED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
				REPORT PREPARATION
IC	16-0116	8/12/16	EXONERATED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0117	8/25/16	EXONERATED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0118	8/25/16	EXONERATED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
IC	16-0119	8/25/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0120	9/12/16	SUSTAINED	PROPERTY LOST/DAMAGED
IC	16-0121	9/12/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
			UNFOUNDED	INVESTIGATION HANDLING
IC	16-0122	9/12/16	UNFOUNDED	REPORT PREPARATION

IC	16-0123	9/12/16	EXONERATED	PROPERTY LOST/DAMAGED
IC	16-0124	9/12/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0125	9/12/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
				GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0126	9/30/16	UNFOUNDED	REPORT PREPARATION
IC	16-0127	9/30/16	EXONERATED	ARREST AUTHORITY/PROCEDURES
				ARREST AUTHORITY/PROCEDURES
IC	16-0128	9/30/16	UNFOUNDED	MEDICAL ATTENTION-FAILURE TO PROVIDE
IC	16-0129	9/30/16	EXONERATED	REPORT PREPARATION
IC	16-0130	9/30/16	SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
IC	16-0131	9/30/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS TREATMENT
IC	16-0132	9/30/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
IC	16-0133	9/30/16	SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING

2016 QUARTERLY REPORT FOR AUDITOR

TYPE OF INCIDENT	1/1/16 TO 3/31/16	4/1/16 TO 6/30/16	7/1/16 TO 9/30/16	10/1/16 TO 12/31/16	TOTALS
ACCIDENTAL DISCHARGE	0	0	0	n/a	0
OIS - ANIMAL	1	1	0	n/a	2
OIS - PERSON	4	2	1	n/a	7
VEHICLE COLLISIONS	35	25	21	n/a	81
VEHICLE PURSUITS	25	23	24	n/a	72