

CPC 27-14 - A citizen alleged that an APD employee was rude on several occasions. When citizen called the substation requesting to speak to the officer that was dispatched to her traffic accident, the employee did not allow the citizen to speak to the officer. The lieutenant spoke to the employee. The citizen was satisfied with the resolution of her complaint. Therefore, the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 49-14 - A citizen stated that she was involved in an auto accident. The responding officer seemed to have listened more to the other driver than to her. The other driver accused the citizen of being on her cell phone at the time of the accident. The citizen alleged that the other driver did not have insurance. A review of the lapel video indicated that the officer spoke to both drivers, and the other driver did present an insurance card. An officer is not required to call the insurance company to verify that a vehicle is presently covered. The officer did not violate any SOP. The IA sergeant reviewed this case. Because there were no SOP violations, this complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 50-14 - A citizen stated that intoxicated individuals at Wal-Mart verbally and physical assaulted her. An officer arrested the citizen and she did not understand why she was arrested. The citizen canceled her interview various times, and then informed the investigator that she wanted to drop her complaint. This complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 52-14 - A citizen stated that an officer was driving erratically, almost causing an accident. Citizen was stopped at an intersection when the officer came up behind her vehicle with his emergency lights on. The officer pulled the citizen over and told her she should yield to emergency vehicles. The officer then left the scene with his emergency lights on. A lieutenant could not determine which officer was involved in this incident, but did inform the citizen that he would address the issue with all officers in briefing. The citizen was satisfied with the resolution of her complaint, and the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 54-14 - A citizen alleged that officers left his belongings at his current address, and stated that the officers were immature and lackluster. Citizen claimed that he was being harassed and threatened before the officers arrived on scene, and that the officers mistook the citizen for a criminal. No CAD report could be located for this incident, and the citizen was unable to provide a name. The IRO is unable to proceed without information on which officers were allegedly involved in this incident. This case will be inactivated.

CPC 55-14 - A citizen observed an officer on his cell phone while driving his police vehicle, and the officer was driving recklessly, speeding, swerving, and tailgating. The officer admitted that he was on his cell phone due to a family emergency. The officer's supervisor spoke to the officer, and the officer apologized. The citizen was satisfied with the resolution of her complaint. The complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 56-14 - A nurse at a hospital alleged that an officer threw away a battery to a cell phone which belonged to a mentally disabled individual. The nurse alleged that the officer treated the individual badly. The nurse was unable to provide an officer's name, and the CAD search did not show any APD officer being dispatched to the hospital on the alleged date of incident. The complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 70-14 - A citizen alleged that he was arrested at a library and officers had their guns drawn when they entered the library. Citizen alleged that officers also searched his vehicle. This complaint was received a year after the alleged incident, well beyond the 90-day time frame for filing a complaint. Therefore, the IRO has no legal authority to investigate this complaint. Therefore, the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 71-14 - A citizen alleged that he was arrested for no reason, and he was not given his Miranda warnings. The citizen stated that the officers committed perjury. This incident happened nine months ago. The citizen alleged that on another incident, officers told him that he could not be in the parking lot. This incident happened over a year and four months ago. This complaint was received well beyond the 90-day time frame for filing a complaint. Therefore, the IRO has no legal authority to investigate this complaint. Therefore, the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 74-14 - A soccer coach complained that while at a park with young players, APD officers had surrounded a nearby residence with guns drawn. The coach stated that APD did not clear the park before they drew their guns. The sergeant spoke to the officers about the incident and their conduct in future incidents. The citizen was satisfied with the outcome of his complaint, and the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 75-14 - A citizen alleged misconduct by an officer who was not an APD employee. The IRO informed the citizen that the officer worked for another agency. The IRO has no jurisdiction to investigate this complaint. Therefore, the complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 79-14 - A citizen's brother was killed by an APD officer. The incident happened over nine months ago. The complaint was not filed within the 90-day time frame for filing a complaint. However, the IRO informed the citizen that she will send a letter of her finding once it has been completed. This complaint will be inactivated.

CPC 82-14 - A citizen complained that two APD officers obtained the citizen's medical records and shared it with other people. The citizen provided names of witnesses who could support citizen's allegations. The IA investigator contacted four witnesses listed by the citizen. All four witnesses denied they were given any medical records of citizen. In addition, this complaint was filed well beyond the 90-day time frame for filing a complaint. Therefore, the complaint will be inactivated.

Chair Peterson moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Passed.
For: 3 – Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 110-12 – A citizen contacted police regarding a subject who was living or staying at her residence, and citizen wanted the subject to leave her residence. Officer L. responded to the scene. Citizen alleged that Officer L. made false statements and acted unprofessionally. Officer L. denied these allegations. There was no recording of this incident. Officer L. did note her issue with the recorder in her police report, and did inform her sergeant, as required by the SOP. Because there is not enough evidence either way, I find Officer L.'s conduct to be not sustained

on use of recorder, inaccurate report, and inappropriate conduct. The citizen also complained about Officer B., who was dispatched on a separate incident to assist the subject who was living or staying with the citizen to remove his property from the residence. The citizen alleged that Officer B. acted inappropriately, entered her residence without permission, and conducted an illegal search. Officer B.'s lapel video indicates that Officer B.'s conduct was appropriate, that the citizen allowed Officer B. entry into her home, and that Officer B. did look at a computer that may have been reported stolen. The computer was in plain sight, and Officer B. did not conduct an illegal search. I find Officer B.'s conduct to be exonerated.

Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 2 - Peterson, Foster

Against: 1 – Barker

CPC 125-12 – A citizen who is a frequent visitor to downtown Albuquerque during nighttime hours alleged that Officer D. had an inappropriate attitude, and that Officer D. instills fear and intimidation. On the first alleged incident, Officer D. was not the primary officer, and did not record any contact with the citizen. On the second alleged incident, Officer D. had no direct contact with the citizen. Officer D. was backup and was not required to record either incident. Therefore, there is not enough evidence one way or the other. I find Officer D.'s conduct to be not sustained. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 214-12 – Officer D. was dispatched to a day care in Rio Rancho regarding alleged child abuse by a citizen. The citizen alleges that Officer D. forced her to give up custody of her child to the child's father. Because there were allegations of abuse by the day care and the father, Officer D. informed citizen that the child would either be placed in CYFD custody or the father could take the child from the day care. The citizen alleged that Officer D. displayed improper conduct and did not follow procedure in removing her child from her custody. The lapel video supports that Officer D. acted appropriately, and that he did follow SOP regarding removing the child from the mother's custody. I find Officer D.'s conduct to be exonerated. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC- 244-12 – A citizen stated that he and his brother were at a bus stop, and that he was beaten by an officer who approached him at the bus stop. The citizen also alleged that he was unlawfully arrested and denied medical attention. The video recording indicated that Officer G. and Officer H. approached the bus stop after observing the citizen and his brother loitering at the bus stop. The citizen had been injured several days prior when he was involved in a fight. After the citizen was transported to the Prisoner Transport Unit, he refused to let rescue check his alleged injuries. Rescue saw no visible injuries. Officer H. conducted a legal arrest of citizen. I find the allegations of wrongful arrest and improper conduct against Officer H. to be exonerated. I find the allegation of failure to take photographs of injuries against Officer H. to be unfounded. A sergeant went to the hospital and took photographs of citizen, as set forth in the SOP. I find the allegation of failure to render medical aid to be not sustained against Officer H. I find the

allegation of improper conduct against Officer G. to be exonerated. I find the allegation of failure to render medical aid against Officer G. to be not sustained. The memory card on Officer G.'s lapel camera was full and Officer G. did not record the incident. I find the allegation of failure to record the incident against Officer G. to be sustained. I find the allegation of excessive force against Officer G. to be not sustained. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 22-13 – A citizen was arrested at a DWI roadblock. Citizen alleged that Lt. M. improperly administered a breath test. Citizen alleged that the transporting Officer M. slammed on the brakes of the police vehicle in an attempt to make citizen fall into the seat. Citizen alleged that Officer M. played loud music while en route to MDC. The evidence indicated that Lt. M. did properly perform the breath test. I find Lt. M.'s conduct to be exonerated. Officer M. did not record the incident when transporting the citizen to MDC. Therefore, there is not enough evidence one way or the other regarding Officer M.'s conduct. I find Officer M.'s conduct to be not sustained on the issue of inappropriate conduct, and sustained regarding use of recorder. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 29-13 – This case was remanded due to a previous tie vote. The IRO changed the finding on use of recorder to sustained, but the Chief disagreed on the sustained finding. This case will be placed on the June 12, 2014, agenda.

CPC 151-13 – A citizen was involved in a motor vehicle accident. Citizen alleged that a motorcyclist who had consumed alcohol struck citizen's vehicle. Citizen stated that Officer O. did not arrest the motorcyclist. The evidence indicated that a DWI officer was dispatched and conducted field sobriety tests on the motorcyclist and determined that he was not intoxicated. I find Officer O.'s conduct to be exonerated. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 178-13 – A citizen stated that he was wrongfully arrested. The citizen was stopped for a traffic violation. Officer O. arrested citizen after NCIC Operator H. informed Officer O. that the citizen had warrants. Soon after, the mistake was realized, and the citizen was released from MDC. The evidence indicated that NCIC Operator H. made an error when entering the citizen's date of birth, and the operator informed Officer O. that citizen had warrants. I find Officer O.'s conduct regarding the arrest to be exonerated. Officer O. should have noted the warrant number on citizen's booking form, but failed to do so. I find Officer O.'s conduct to be sustained regarding this SOP. An SOP regarding the requirement for Officer O. to fax a copy of the warrant is outdated because the fax is not utilized, so I find Officer O.'s conduct to be exonerated. I find NCIC Operator H.'s conduct for failing to direct her best efforts to be sustained. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 189-13 – A citizen stated that her daughter was taken by the grandmother without the citizen's permission and the grandmother refused to return the child. Officer M. went to the grandmother's workplace and made contact. The grandmother alleged that Officer M. was rude, aggressive, accusatory, and officious. The lapel video indicated that Officer M.'s conduct was improper. I find a violation of this SOP to be sustained regarding Officer M.'s conduct. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 243-13 - A bank employee residing in Kentucky alleged that Officer M. contacted her by telephone and was rude. Officer M. denied that he was rude. The bank employee did not record the phone call, and Officer M. did not run his lapel camera during this phone call. There is not enough evidence one way or the other to prove or disprove the allegation. The allegation of a violation of misconduct against Officer M. was not sustained. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 251-13 – A citizen called APD to have her daughter's boyfriend removed from citizen's residence. The boyfriend was 32 years old and the daughter was 16. The citizen alleged that Officer V. was rude and inappropriate during his discussions with citizen. After the boyfriend was arrested and removed from the residence, Officer V. spoke to citizen and her daughter in a direct and forthright manner, informing them of the dangers of daughter's lifestyle. Officer V. informed citizen that she could be charged for child abuse for allowing daughter to work as a prostitute, and allowing a 32-year-old gang member to live at her residence. The allegation of a violation of misconduct against Officer V. was exonerated. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

CPC 05-14 – A citizen stated she was involved in a motor vehicle accident. Officers L. and S. arrived on scene. Citizen alleged that because of her young age, the officers were biased against her and did not write the police report until two months after the accident. I find the allegation of bias against Officer L. to be unfounded. Officer L. did not record the incident, and I find the allegation of not recording to be sustained against Officer L. I find the allegation of bias against Officer S. to be unfounded. Officer S. should have written the accident report, but he forgot to do so. I find the allegation of report writing against Officer S. to be sustained. Officer S. did not record the incident. I find the allegation of not recording against Officer S. to be sustained. Chair Peterson moved to approve the findings of the IRO. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster

IRO Hammer requested approval of the Consent Agenda. Chair Peterson moved to approve the consent agenda. Passed.

For: 3 - Peterson, Barker, Foster