

**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** May 9, 2025

**TO:** MINDY CASTO, Chief of Police  
Office of the Chief

**THROUGH:** MICHAEL LANDON, Deputy Police Chief  
Administrative Services

STEVE CARD, Lieutenant  
Internal Affairs Commander

**FROM:** MICHAEL MARTIN, Sergeant  
Policy & Procedures Unit

**SUBJECT:** BIAS-BASED PROFILING REVIEW

On March 19, 2025, the Policy & Procedures Unit conducted an audit of all inquiries and complaints related to allegations of bias-based profiling against Department members in 2024. This review was based on information obtained from Internal Affairs records and aimed to identify potential enforcement trends between the Department and the community.

Profiling based on criminal conduct is a valuable tool for law enforcement officers to carry out their duties. However, the Fresno Police Department does not condone bias-based profiling, as it can lead to violations of the constitutional rights of the residents we serve. Bias-based profiling is defined as the selective enforcement of the law based solely on a group's common characteristics, including, but not limited to, race, ethnicity, gender, gender expression, sexual orientation, religion, economic status, age, or culture.

**Methodology**

This audit, which examined all documented bias-based inquiries and complaints received by the Department in 2024, was completed using the IA PRO program. Ten bias-based complaints were handled by the Department in 2024. Eight complaints were investigated by a field-level supervisor and two by our Internal Affairs Bureau.

## **Synopsis of Complaints**

### **Complaint #1:**

On January 4, 2024, officers stopped the complainant for a traffic violation. During the stop, the complainant immediately exited the vehicle and became highly agitated. The complainant eventually returned to his vehicle and requested a supervisor. The on-duty supervisor responded to speak with the complainant. The complainant said he felt harassed and agitated due to prior incidents with law enforcement. However, the complainant stated that the officers were neither disrespectful nor discourteous and acknowledged the traffic violation. The complainant did not make a formal complaint and did not allege race as a factor.

On January 6, 2024, the complainant filed an online complaint alleging racial profiling, believing the officers had stopped him due to his skin color. The complaint was assigned to a field supervisor for an administrative investigation. After reviewing the body-worn camera footage and conducting an investigation there was no evidence to support the complainant's claims. The officers were professional, which was also acknowledged by the complainant when he first spoke to a supervisor at the traffic stop. Consequently, the investigation concluded that the complaint against the officers was unfounded.

### **Complaint #2:**

On February 11, 2024, the complainant contacted the Fresno Police Department Dispatch Center to file a complaint. The complainant alleged that the Department is racist and prejudiced. At the time, the complainant was a suspect in a crime, wanted for assault with a deadly weapon, robbery, and vandalism. After his arrest, he was unable to provide any specific details regarding the alleged racial bias or the name of the officer involved. Ultimately, when speaking to a supervisor, the complainant withdrew his complaint and expressed satisfaction with its closure. No evidence of racial bias was found, and the complaint was deemed unfounded.

### **Complaint #3:**

On March 19, 2024, the complainant contacted the Fresno Police Department Dispatch Center to request a supervisor. He reported that he had been stopped by an officer for a traffic violation and alleged that the stop was racially motivated. A field supervisor contacted the complainant. However, when asked about any comments or statements made by the officer that indicated bias, the complainant stated that there were none. He suggested that if he was not stopped because of his race, it could be because people of his race frequently visit that area. The complainant had nothing further to add but stated he wanted this in the officer's file so he would have to deal with the allegation in his file. After reviewing body-worn camera footage and the statements made during the stop, there was no evidence of racial bias found. Consequently, the complaint was closed as unfounded.

### **Complaint #4:**

On May 31, 2024, the complainant was stopped for vehicle code violations and received a citation. Subsequently, an online complaint was filed concerning allegations of racial and religious discrimination, which the complainant attributed to where he resides. The complaint

was assigned to a field supervisor for an administrative investigation. The supervisor contacted the complainant, who claimed he was stopped because of his race and religious bias due to his last name.

The complainant mentioned that when he was stopped, the officer asked if he had any gang involvement based on his last name. After reviewing the traffic stop records and body-worn camera footage, the supervisor informed the complainant that the stop was legally justified. However, after viewing the complainant's records, the supervisor advised that the officer made an error regarding his vehicle registration. The supervisor corrected the mistake on the citation by completing an amendment. The complainant acknowledged and appreciated the supervisor's effort in correcting the citation.

The entire encounter was captured on body-worn camera, and there was no evidence to support claims of racial or religious discrimination. The officer acted fairly and respectfully during the traffic stop. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest racial bias, and the complaint was closed as unfounded.

#### **Complaint #5:**

On June 14, 2024, the Department received a handwritten complaint that appeared to be written in the third person. The complaint alleged that an officer told the complainant he resembled someone who sells and uses methamphetamine due to his skin color. The complainant felt discriminated against. The complaint was assigned to a field supervisor to conduct an administrative investigation. The supervisor attempted to contact the complainant but was unable to locate him for a statement. Additionally, there were no recorded calls for service involving the complainant. The supervisor also checked the history of the accused officer, who was not on duty on the day in question. Therefore, this complaint was closed as unfounded.

#### **Complaint #6:**

On August 21, 2024, the Department received an online complaint alleging racial bias during a traffic stop. The complainant expressed dissatisfaction with the length of the stop, which he believed lasted one hour, and claimed that he was stopped due to his race. The complaint was assigned to a field supervisor for an administrative investigation. The supervisor reviewed the traffic stop records and body-worn camera footage.

The supervisor discovered that the stop was extended because the officer in training made an error on the citation. Approximately eleven minutes into the stop, the training officer informed the complainant of the issue and offered to issue a warning. However, the complainant refused the warning and insisted on receiving a citation. The citation was ultimately completed, and the complainant was allowed to leave. The officers acted professionally throughout the stop, and the body camera footage confirmed the traffic violation. The supervisor also spoke with the complainant, who remained unhappy with the explanation. He was advised the stop was under 28 minutes and not an hour, as he stated. The complainant could only state it felt longer. There was no evidence of racial bias during the incident, and the complaint was ultimately closed as unfounded.

### **Complaint #7:**

On April 18, 2024, the Department received an online complaint regarding racial discrimination. The complainant felt she was treated poorly during a call for service due to her race. The complaint was assigned to a field supervisor for an administrative investigation. The supervisor reviewed body-worn camera footage and reports related to the incident. The complainant expressed frustration that the officers did not take her statement about what had occurred. In response, the supervisor explained that the officers were unaware she needed to file a report at the time of the incident. Considering the new information, the supervisor assured her that an officer would take her statement. The complainant was satisfied with the supervisor's response and decided not to pursue the complaint further. There was no evidence to support claims of racial bias, and the complaint was ultimately closed as unfounded.

### **Complaint #8:**

On July 31, 2024, the Department received an online complaint regarding an incident that occurred on May 11, 2024. The complainant felt her boyfriend was targeted due to race. The complaint was assigned to a field supervisor to conduct an administrative investigation. The supervisor was familiar with the incident and had worked at the event. The complainant who attended the event was heavily intoxicated. Officers on the scene attempted to secure medical attention for her due to her high level of intoxication. The complainant's boyfriend intervened and was subsequently arrested for assaulting an officer.

During a discussion with the supervisor, the complainant clarified that her complaint was more of a venting session and was intended to understand what had happened that day. The complainant stated her relationship ended due to the incident. After their conversation, she did not believe racial bias played a role in the incident and felt the officers acted respectfully. Body camera footage from the event did not provide any evidence that racial bias influenced the officers' actions. Additionally, the complainant's boyfriend did not file a complaint. The complaint was closed as unfounded.

### **Complaint #9:**

On August 22, 2024, the Department received an online complaint involving several allegations including racial and religious discrimination. Internal Affairs investigated the incident. While searching for a wanted subject, detectives encountered a locked alley gate. They learned that one of the nearby businesses had changed its locks and possessed the key. Upon contacting the business, detectives discovered illegal contraband and a firearm in plain view. The individual working at the location was also a convicted felon and was prohibited from possessing a firearm.

The actions taken by the detectives were justified and carried out legally. Their actions were thoroughly documented and captured on body camera footage. There was no evidence to support the racial or religious discrimination allegations, and the complaint was subsequently closed as unfounded.

**Complaint #10:**

On November 8, 2024, the Department initiated an internal complaint regarding an online video posted by a citizen. This complaint was assigned to Internal Affairs for investigation. The citizen was stopped for a traffic violation; however, the complainant did not file an official complaint. During the investigation there was no evidence to suggest racial bias. However, other policy violations by the Department were identified and investigated due to this complaint. The allegation of racial bias was ultimately unfounded.

**Analysis:**

In 2024, Fresno Police officers responded to 373,838 calls for service. Out of these, approximately 0.002% led to a complaint regarding possible bias-based profiling. A thorough investigation was conducted into all ten complaints, concluding no evidence of bias-based profiling.

**Areas of Concern**

Based on the specifics of the reported complaints and the relatively low number of complaints compared to the total number of police interactions with the community, no evidence of bias-based profiling or areas of concern were identified.

**Recommendation**

The Fresno Police Department's policy prohibiting bias-based policing remains sufficient. The Policy & Procedures Unit will continue to monitor complaints of bias-based policing and submit an annual report.