



Office of Independent Review

Quarterly Report Second 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 second 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 second 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 April 1, 2016 – June 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:**

Body Camera:

OIR is once again concerned that a reviewed matter revealed, of the three officers present, only one officer initiated his body camera, and it is unknown if the other two MAGEC officers were even equipped with a camera. If not, MAGEC seems like the exact type of unit where the cameras would be of most benefit due to their nearly constant contact with gang members who not only are more violent than the average citizen but are also more prone to file complaints about officer conduct. FPD is requested to ensure that all MAGEC officers are equipped with body cameras at the earliest opportunity possible. The following is from the FPD policy manual on this topic:

Policy 450.3: Activation of the Recorder

Officers shall position their camera to facilitate optimum recording field of view. Officers should activate their camera system as soon as practical upon encountering the below types of events. However, at no time should an officer jeopardize his/her safety, or the safety of any other officer, to activate a recording device.

Policy 450: Page 2 of 2 Effective Date: 01/20/2015

Guidelines for Activation of AXON cameras – Officers are expected to record interactions including, but not limited to, the following:

- a) Arrests and detentions, or situations where an officer reasonably believes they will effect an arrest or detention (to include traffic stops and consensual encounters made with the intent to develop reasonable suspicion to detain);
- b) Officers assisting in an arrest or detention situation;
- c) Confrontational interactions with citizens;
- d) Vehicle and foot pursuits;
- e) Forced entries, search warrants and warrantless searches (including vehicles);
 - 1. When entry is made with or without a warrant, all officers should activate their cameras prior to making entry and continue recording until the scene has been secured. Once the location is secure, and no other circumstances warrant recording, officers may deactivate their cameras.
- f) Suspect interrogations (including Miranda advisement) and witness interviews;
- g) Interviews of victims and witnesses.
- h) Video recording of individuals who are picketing, engaged in peaceful protest or First Amendment protected speech will be avoided unless the officer believes a violation of criminal law is occurring, may occur, or if the officer interacts with a participant or third party to the event.

Officer Involved Shooting (OIS):

It is recommended that the FPD make contact with the DA and Coroner's Office and explain the very real need for all reports related to OISs get moved to the top of their work pile. OISs are the most important death related cases as they involve a public employee taking the life of a citizen. The citizens of every municipality deserve to know that their employees are doing this very dangerous job, correctly. In this case, with the facts such as they are, waiting for toxicology or some other test is not nearly as important as resolving a case wherein two officers acted quickly and decisively, taking a

citizen's life. Test results that may lend insight into the actions of the suspect are not nearly as important as informing the public that FPD officers acted properly.

OIR has closely followed recent events surrounding the well-publicized recent OIS. OIR is monitoring the investigation and will audit it once the DA and IA investigations have been concluded. The FPD has taken the proactive step of also asking for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to review this matter and has/will allow the FBI the same level of access to the information available in this case as they give to OIR and the DA's office. OIR has reviewed the available body camera footage and has been in close and regular contact with senior City officials on this unfolding investigation.

Demographic Data:

The following data was requested on or about May 1, 2016 by the Office of Independent Review to begin an examination of race based policing as many complaints, both formal via actual case related allegations, as well as a result of informal meetings between OIR and Fresno citizens, raises the perception of biased policing, in some cases. On June 1, 2016, the FPD provided the requested data, which was requested to be broken up between the time frame of 7 AM through 7 PM and then 7 PM through 7 AM. The reason the data is time divided is the simple fact that officers are less likely to know the race of the person they see driving a car, or standing in a dark alley way, during the hours of darkness. OIR wanted to see if the tracked data reflected the perceptions of many members of the community. OIR will allow this data, see below, to be interpreted by all, and conclusions drawn by all, without interpretation by this office. Additionally, and a source of concern was identified which was the larger number of times demographics are NOT recorded in the hours of daylight versus at night time, during traffic stops. When the *Traffic Stop* numbers were reviewed, the lack of "demographics" during the hours of daylight were astronomically larger than at night, indicating that this vital data, the collection of which is mandated by Policy, is NOT recorded over 100 times as often as at night. OIR, working with the data provided by the FPD, contacted the FPD and pointed out this significant anomaly, requesting an explanation for this failure to capture demographic data in the *Traffic Stop* category.

After much review, the FPD reported back that their motorcycle, traffic enforcement officers, use a handheld device called "ticket writer" which has software from a specific vendor installed. The FPD made contact with this vendor and advised them of the systematic omission of racial demographics in the vendor's produced tallies. (These tallies are the basis for the data included in the results report provided to OIR by the FPD. It is speculated that this same data has been used elsewhere by the FPD but it is clear to OIR that they were unaware of the low quality of the data and any use of the data elsewhere was happenstance, not intentional. The vendor acknowledged the problem in written communications they had with the FPD, which were provided to OIR for review.) OIR is concerned that this flawed data was not caught by FPD reviews as the difference between daytime and nighttime failures to record demographics was glaring, to say the least. At the time of this report being produced, the FPD is working with the vendor to reconcile the inaccurate/incomplete data and provide a more detailed, and accurate report, in reference to *Traffic Stops*, to OIR for inclusion in the next Quarterly Report.

This following chart is the demographics of the City as used by Internal Affairs and used in multiple bias based allegations of misconduct:

- Hispanic 46.9%
- White 30.0%
- African American 7.7%

- Asian 12.3%
- Other 3.1%

The areas examined were: 1) FIs: Field Interviews also known as “Field Cards” in other jurisdictions 2) Detentions: these are also known as “Investigative Detentions” and 3) Traffic Stops (As explained above, this data set will be published next quarter when the vendor has provided completely accurate data. The FPD tracks FIs and Detentions primarily in their investigative/case reports and that accounts for the relatively low number of FIs and Detentions. Although this skews the data, in comparison to other similarly sized departments, it is not a flaw in the system in that the FPD has that data but it is included in the underlying “police report” surrounding the underlying incident/crime. It does however better fit OIR’s examination as FIs and Detentions related to underlying crimes is not a discretionary policing action. So to explain this concept of discretionary policing, if while investigating a robbery, an officer were to stop and question a nearby person matching the general description of the suspect, that data would be captured in a supplemental or follow-up report, attached to the robbery. It would not be captured in the chart below as either an FI or Detention as those numbers only reflect such occurrences that are not related to an underlying investigation. The following is the data on demographics, as provided by the FPD to OIR:

FI BY AREA BY RACE

AREA/RACE	0700 - 1859	1900 - 0659	Grand Total	% of District	% City Wide
SW					38.46%
ASIAN	11	3	14	2.24%	
AFRICAN AMERICAN	124	35	159	25.44%	
HISPANIC	192	95	287	45.92%	
AMERICAN INDIAN	3	1	4	0.64%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	3	1	4	0.64%	
WHITE	93	55	148	23.68%	
UNKNOWN		1	1	0.16%	
NO RACE ENTRY	5	3	8	1.28%	
SW Total	431	194	625	100.00%	
NW					13.23%
ASIAN	4		4	1.86%	
AFRICAN AMERICAN	47	11	58	26.98%	
HISPANIC	74	19	93	43.26%	
AMERICAN INDIAN		1	1	0.47%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	2	1	3	1.40%	
WHITE	35	20	55	25.58%	
NO RACE ENTRY	1		1	0.47%	
NW Total	163	52	215	100.00%	
SE					29.05%
ASIAN	26	3	29	6.14%	
AFRICAN AMERICAN	80	18	98	20.76%	
HISPANIC	252	34	286	60.59%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	4		4	0.85%	
WHITE	36	6	42	8.90%	
EASTERN INDIAN	8		8	1.69%	
NO RACE ENTRY	4	1	5	1.06%	
SE Total	410	62	472	100.00%	
NE					11.69%
ASIAN	4		4	2.11%	

AFRICAN AMERICAN	43	10	53	27.89%	
HISPANIC	44	16	60	31.58%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	3		3	1.58%	
WHITE	52	16	68	35.79%	
NO RACE ENTRY	1	1	2	1.05%	
NE Total	147	43	190	100.00%	
NO AREA ENTRY					7.57%
ASIAN	4		4	3.25%	
AFRICAN AMERICAN	20	8	28	22.76%	
HISPANIC	43	15	58	47.15%	
OTHER-UNCLASSIFIED	1	2	3	2.44%	
WHITE	20	8	28	22.76%	
NO RACE ENTRY	1	1	2	1.63%	
NO AREA ENTRY Total	89	34	123	100.00%	
Grand Total	1240	385	1625		

DETENTIONS

RACE	0700-1859	1900-0659	Total
Asian	2	1	3
African American	6	6	12
Hispanic	12	7	19
White	7	7	14
Total	27	21	48

This “discretionary” policing examination is different from activities that are directly related to a specific crime wherein suspect, or witness descriptions may have been developed. In other words, using the robbery example again, officers investigating a robbery involving multiple adult male/whites and who are thought to be driving a green SUV would naturally result in white people driving a similar car being pulled over as a result of the underlying crime. (This is not perfect as witness descriptions are notoriously inaccurate but it is a good example and it can be expected that green SUVs will be stopped if near the scene of the crime.) OIR wanted to examine data involving enforcement actions not related to underlying crimes that generally have associated descriptors involved. Traffic enforcement (which will be reported on in the next Quarterly Report once the data issues are fixed), Field Interviews and Detentions, unrelated to underlying crimes, fit the criteria for review. As noted in specific cases and earlier Quarterly Reports, the recording of demographic data is required by policy and should become a mandatory review item for front line supervisors when reviewing the police reports of their subordinates.

Policy and Procedure Audit Summary

The Office of Independent Review, (OIR), has been charged with reviewing policies and procedures of individual units with 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 with community values. This process is done by audit of the current policy, directives or new policy development. OIR conducted an audit/review of FPDs Street Violence Section, Felony Assault/Robbery Unit.

FPDs, Street Violence Section is under the command of the Investigative Services Division Deputy Chief. The Street Violence Section Lieutenant has stewardship for the Sergeants within the division, this includes the Assault/Robbery Unit Sergeant who supervises the day to day operations of the Felony Assault /Robbery Unit Detectives. The unit consists of one Sergeant and seven Detectives,

who's regular duty hours are 0700 – 1730, Monday through Friday. The unit is subject to callout on major cases or as needed during off duty hours.

The unit has responsibility to investigate the following crimes:

- All Felony Assaults
- Specific Robbery Cases
 - All commercial robbery cases, with the exception of street vendors and home delivery.
 - Residential robbery cases.
 - Carjacking cases.

These responsibilities include screening cases with the District Attorney's office; crime lab analysis; trial preparations and most importantly keeping the victims of such crimes informed as to the case status. To accomplish these responsibilities, the Assault/Robbery Unit Detectives relies heavily on other resources of FPDs namely the Crime Scene Bureau, (CSB), the Violent Crime Impact Teams, the District DCST Teams, and the Crime Analyst assigned to Street Violent Section.

The Operations Manual for the Street Violence Sections, Felony Assault / Robbery Unit was last revised in October of 2013.

- OIR recommends a detailed review of these operations Manual policies and procedures, all related administrative items, to ensure that changes within the unit's responsibilities are consistent with the Operations Manual, and the needs of FPD and the community.
- OIR recommends that the Operations Manual include Uniform Crime Reporting guidelines definitions to be consistent with National Standards reported to the Federal Bureau of Investigations from the nation's police departments. The case closures need to be approved by the unit Sgt. Based on UCR definitions of Cleared by arrest, and Cleared by exceptional means, or Unfounded. The responsibility of the supervisor of the unit cannot be overstated or under appreciated. The supervisor ensures appropriate follow up investigations are completed in the most professional and timely manner insuring the detectives have all the necessary information, tools, manpower or resources to represent the office of Chief of Police, FPD and the community.
- Assaults / Robbery crimes are a person's crime requiring that all resources be available to investigate these types of crimes, this includes very skilled and experienced detectives be assigned to this unit.

OIR recommends a review and update and review on standards nationally on Gun Shot Residue test, (GSR). On page 7 of the manual section II explains in detail the purpose of GSR. "There are two types of forensic GSR examinations. The first is to determine if a particular individual has discharged a weapon and the second is to determine the distance the muzzle of the firearm is from the target. (e.g. victim)" Nationally over several years these test have been found to not give the detectives reliable results and have produce several false positives as to who the actual shooter/suspect is. The manual further states that "Per DOJ the analysis of a shooters hands and clothing is very costly and the information has limited value. For example, if GSR is detected on a person, one could argue they were an innocent bystander merely positioned near the shooter. (This can happen in OIS as well). These are just a couple of reasons that interpretation of results from this type of analysis has always been controversial". OIR recommends that an Operational Manual is not the place for suggesting GSR test be used and then give reasons as to why the GSR test is controversial. Nor should the cost of a test on any person's crime be a consideration listed in an Operations manual that governs the actions of detectives. The cost discussion needs to be address at the administration level, not at the

detective level. Nationally, Law Enforcement is dealing with an out raged public as it relates to Rape Kits, which results are not in dispute, which have not been tested due to cost.

OIR continues to focus on the absolute need for supervisory and agency control through the audit functions and communication within FPD and the community. This can and does lead to lawful and successful outcomes related to person's crimes. OIR recognizes the negative impact on the citizens of Fresno City of crimes against persons. There is no greater responsibility of FPD then to have the citizens feel safe and that police personnel care and have the necessary skills, tools and resources to maintain the trust of the community.

OIR recommends the Operations Manual be reviewed, updated and presented to all detectives within the Assault / Robbery Unit to ensure detectives have all needed information to be successful in this very difficult type of investigations. The last revised Operation Manuel is October 2013, and it is clear that some of the governing principles are older than that. It should be noted that there are currently no policy governing detectives as it relates to Bank Robberies, and notifications to the FBI who can bring needed resources to these types of investigations.

It should be noted that the current Lieutenant was recently transferred to this position.

Richard Rasmussen
Police Auditor

**OFFICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW
CITY OF FRESNO
QUARTERLY REPORT
SECOND QUARTER 2016
April 1, 2016 – June 30, 2016
Report Issued July 25, 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 2015, 3rd 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
15-0100	09/08/2015	Yes	Pending	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved Shooting

**The following cases were pending in the previous 2015, 4th 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
15-0117	10/20/2015	Yes	Pending	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved Shooting

The following cases were pending in the previous 2015, 4th 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
15-0134	12/07/2015	Yes	Exonerated, Not Sustained, Unfounded, Unfounded	Exonerated (All)	AU	Unreasonable Force, Discourteous, Report Prep, Abuse of Authority
15-0145	12/17/2015	No	Unfounded (S,S1,S2)	Exonerated	AU	Racial Profiling
15-0148	12/30/2015	Yes	Within Policy (S,S1)	Within Policy (S,S1)	AU	(S,S1) Officer Involved Shooting

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
16-0001	01/14/2016	Yes	Not Sustained, Not Sustained, Sustained	Sustained, Exonerated, Not Sustained	AU	Unreasonable Force, Conduct Unbecoming
16-0002	01/20/2016	Yes	Exonerated (S, S1)	Exonerated (S,S1)	AU	Unreasonable Force
16-0003	01/29/2016	Yes	Pending	Pending	Pending	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0004	02/12/2016	No	Unfounded	Pending	Pending	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0005	02/17/2016	No	Unfounded, Unfounded, Unfounded	Pending	Pending	Report Preparation, Discretion, Body Camera Issues

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
16-0006	02/17/2016	Yes	(S) Unfounded, (S1,S2) Exonerated, (S1,S2) Not Sustained, (S1,S2) Unfounded	(S,S1,S2) Exonerated, (S1,S2) Unfounded, (S1,S2) Unfounded	AU	Unreasonable Force, Criminal Acts, Discourteous
16-0009	02/22/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Pending	Pending	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0010	02/26/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Pursuit Policy, Supervisory Responsibilities, Report Preparation
16-0011	02/29/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0012	03/01/2016	No	Within Policy	Pending	Pending	In-Custody Death
16-0013	03/09/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Criminal Acts Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0014	03/09/2016	Yes	Unfounded	AD	AD	Unreasonable Force, Criminal Acts
16-0019	03/24/2016	Yes	Within Policy	Pending	Pending	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0020	03/24/2016	No	Sustained, Exonerated, Not Sustained	AD	AD	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey Laws
16-0021	03/25/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Dept. Property
16-0022	03/25/2016	Yes	Exonerated, Unfounded	AD	AD	Unreasonable Force, Search/Seizure, Investigation
16-0023	03/25/2016	No	Unfounded	Unfounded	AU	Racial/Bias Profiling
16-0024	03/25/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Harassment

The following cases did have or are in the process of formal IA investigations. Each of these cases occurred during the 2016, 2nd 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
16-0025	04/05/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Search/Seizure
16-0026	04/06/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Discretion
16-0027	04/06/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Dept. Property
16-0028	04/06/2016	No	Not Sustained	AD	AD	Vehicle Collisions
16-0029	04/11/2016	Yes	Pending	Pending	Pending	Officer Involved Shooting
16-0030	04/12/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	False/Misleading Statements
16-0031	04/13/2016	No	Sustained, Sustained	AD	AD	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey Laws, Discretion
16-0032	04/19/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Vehicle Operations
16-0033	04/22/2016	No	Unfounded	AD	AD	Discretion
16-0034	04/04/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Conduct Unbecoming On/Off Duty Performance & Conduct, Performance
16-0035	05/04/2016	No	Not Sustained	AD	AD	Discourteous
16-0036	05/12/2016	No	Sustained	AD	AD	Vehicle Collisions
16-0037	05/19/2016	No	(S) Not Sustained, (S1), Unfounded (S2), Sustained (S3)Not Sustained	AD	AD	Lost/Damaged/Return of Property, Discretion
16-0038	05/19/2016	No	Unfounded	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0039	05/24/2016	No	Within Policy	Within Policy	AU	Officer Involved in Shooting Dog
16-0040	06/01/2016	No	(S) Unfounded, (S1) Unfounded	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey all Laws

The following cases did have or are in the process of formal IA investigations. Each of these cases occurred during the 2016, 2nd 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
16-0041	06/08/2016	No	Exonerated, Not Sustained	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force, Discourteous
16-0042	06/08/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws
16-0043	06/13/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	Dept. Property Care/Usage/Lost /Damaged
16-0043	06/13/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0044	06/13/2016	No	(S, S1, S2) Exonerated, (S2) Unfounded	Pending	Pending	(S,S1,S2) Unreasonable Force, (S2) Discrimination
16-0045	06/22/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	Performance
16-0046	06/22/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0047	06/23/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	(S,S1,S2) Conflicting Relationships
16-0048	06/24/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Search/Seizure Issues, False/Misleading
16-0049	06/24/2016	No	Pending	AD	AD	Conduct Unbecoming On/Off Duty
16-0050	06/24/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Unreasonable Force
16-0051	06/27/2016	Yes	Pending	Pending	Pending	(S,S1) Officer Involved Shooting
16-0052	06/30/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Integrity, Force Reporting, Unreasonable Force, Failure to Notify Supervisor
16-0053	06/30/2016	No	Pending	Pending	Pending	Criminal Acts/Failure to Obey All Laws

AUDIT REPORTS PERFORMED IN THE SECOND QUARTER OF 2016

C15-0134

Allegation: Unreasonable Force, Discourteous, Report Prep, Abuse of Authority

Audit Finding: Exonerated (All)

FPD Finding: Exonerated, Not sustained, Unfounded, Unfounded

C15-0145

Allegation: Racial Profiling

Audit Finding: (S,S1,S2) Exonerated

FPD Finding: (S,S1,S2)Unfounded

C15-0148

Allegation: Officer Involved Shooting

Audit Finding: (S,S1) Within Policy

FPD Finding: (S,S1) Within Policy

C16-0001

Allegation: Unreasonable Force, Conduct Unbecoming

Audit Finding: Sustained, Exonerated, Not Sustained

FPD Finding: Not Sustained, Not Sustained, Sustained

C16-0002

Allegation: Unreasonable Force

Audit Finding: (S,S1) Exonerated

FPD Finding: (S,S1) Exonerated

C16-0006

Allegation: Unreasonable Force, Criminal Acts, Discourteous

Audit Finding: (S,S1,S2) Exonerated, (S1,S2) Unfounded, (S1,S2) Unfounded

FPD Finding: (S) Unfounded, (S1,S2) Exonerated, (S1,S2) Not Sustained, (S1,S2) Unfounded

C16-0011

Allegation: Officer Involved Shooting

Audit Finding: Within Policy

FPD Finding: Within Policy

C16-0039

Allegation: Officer Involved In Shoot Dog

Audit Finding: Within Policy

FPD Finding: Within Policy

FRESNO POLICE DEPARTMENT

INTERNAL AFFAIRS BUREAU

2016 2nd QUARTER INFORMAL COMPLAINTS

The following complaints were reviewed and determined they did not warrant a full Internal Affairs investigation.

#	TYPE	INFORMAL COMPLAINT #	DATE CLOSED	FINDINGS	ALLEGATIONS
1	IC	16-0054	4/7/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS
2	IC	16-0055	4/13/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
3	IC	16-0056	4/19/16	SUSTAINED	PERFORMANCE
4	IC	16-0057	4/29/16	NOT SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
5	IC	16-0058	4/29/16	UNFOUNDED	REPORT PREPARATION
6	IC	16-0059	4/29/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
7	IC	16-0060	5/9/16	EXONERATED	SEARCH/SEIZURE ISSUES
					SEARCH/SEIZURE ISSUES
8	IC	16-0061	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	FAILURE TO PROVIDE BADGE/INFO
9	IC	16-0062	5/9/16	SUSTAINED	REPORT PREPARATION
10	IC	16-0063	5/9/16	SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
11	IC	16-0064	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
12	IC	16-0065	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
13	IC	16-0066	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
14	IC	16-0067	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
15	IC	16-0068	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING

16	IC	16-0069	5/9/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
17	IC	16-0070	5/19/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
18	IC	16-0071	5/19/16	UNFOUNDED	FAILURE TO OBEY ALL LAWS
19	IC	16-0072	5/19/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
20	IC	16-0073	5/19/16	NOT SUSTAINED	OFF DUTY CONDUCT
					DISCOURTEOUS
21	IC	16-0074	5/23/16	EXONERATED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
22	IC	16-0075	5/23/16	SUSTAINED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
23	IC	16-0076	5/23/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
					DISCOURTEOUS
24	IC	16-0077	5/23/16	EXONERATED	GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES
25	IC	16-0078	5/23/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
26	IC	16-0079	5/23/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS
27	IC	16-0080	5/31/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS
28	IC	16-0081	5/31/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
29	IC	16-0082	6/14/16	EXONERATED	SEARCH/SEIZURE ISSUES

30	IC	16-0083	6/14/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
31	IC	16-0084	6/14/16	EXONERATED	DISCOURTEOUS
32	IC	16-0085	6/14/16	UNFOUNDED	CRIMINAL ACTS
33	IC	16-0086	6/14/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
34	IC	16-0087	6/14/16	NOT SUSTAINED	INVESTIGATION HANDLING
					GENERAL CALL HANDLING
35	IC	16-0088	6/20/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
36	IC	16-0089	6/20/16	UNFOUNDED	GENERAL CALL HANDLING
37	IC	16-0090	6/20/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
					GENERAL CALL HANDLING
38	IC	16-0091	6/20/16	UNFOUNDED	DISCOURTEOUS
39	IC	16-0092	6/20/16	SUSTAINED	PERFORMANCE
40	IC	16-0093	6/29/16	UNFOUNDED	FAILURE TO PROVIDE BADGE/INFO
					INVESTIGATION HANDLING
41	IC	16-0094	6/29/16	NOT SUSTAINED	REPORT PREPARATION
				SUSTAINED	DISCOURTEOUS
				SUSTAINED	FAILURE TO NOTIFY SUPERVISOR
42	IC	16-0095	6/30/16	NOT SUSTAINED	DISCRIMINATION

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	n/a	n/a	0
OIS - ANIMAL	0	1	n/a	n/a	1
OIS - PERSON	4	2	n/a	n/a	6
VEHICLE COLLISIONS	34	27	n/a	n/a	61
VEHICLE PURSUITS	25	21	n/a	n/a	46