Albuquerque Civilian Police Oversight Advisory Board

Ad Hoc Audit Committee Report

Quality Assurance Audit Report

Case Number: CPC 239-25
Case Investigator: Erin McKay
Audit Period: Q1/Q2 2026
Audit Conducted by CPOAB Audit Committee Members: Aaron Calderon and Georgia Duncan.

Purpose

This audit was conducted pursuant to the Civilian Police Oversight Advisory Board's audit responsibilities to evaluate the quality and completeness of the Civilian Police Oversight Agency's investigation into Case CPC 239-25. The purpose of this audit was to determine whether established investigative procedures were followed, whether the investigative file contained sufficient documentation, and whether the evidence supported the investigative findings. This audit was limited to evaluating investigative quality and was not intended to reinvestigate the underlying complaint.

Audit Summary

Audit Element	Assessment
Complaint Intake & Classification	✔ Compliant
Timeliness of Investigation	✔ Compliant
Evidence Collection	✔ Compliant
Review of Body-Worn Camera Evidence	✔ Compliant
Investigative Interviews	✔ Compliant
Findings Supported by Evidence	✔ Compliant
Supervisory Review	✔ Compliant
Case Closure & Communication	✔ Compliant
Documentation Quality	✔ Compliant
Overall Audit Opinion	✔ **Compliant**

Audit Opinion

Audit Opinion: COMPLIANT

Based upon our review of the investigative file, we conclude that Case CPC 239-25 is compliant with applicable Civilian Police Oversight Agency investigative standards and quality assurance expectations.

The investigation substantially complied with established investigative procedures. The investigative file contained sufficient documentation, relevant evidence, appropriate investigative steps, supervisory review, and supporting documentation to substantiate the findings reached by the assigned investigator.

We identified no material investigative deficiencies, procedural omissions, or unexplained delays that would have affected the integrity, completeness, or reliability of the investigation. Accordingly, no corrective action or additional investigative measures are recommended as a result of this audit.

Audit Findings

1. Complaint Intake and Initial Review

The complaint was appropriately classified under the applicable Albuquerque Police Department standard operating procedures, including the personnel code of conduct and use of force policies at the time.

The complainant, Ms. M, alleged that while at a store located at Indiana and Central, she observed an officer and a security guard making inappropriate comments. She further reported that after a disagreement with a cashier, she was directed to leave the store. As she exited, she alleged that the officer approached her, grabbed and yanked her arm, used profanity, and threatened her with arrest. Ms. M also stated that she requested a supervisor, contacted APD dispatch, and later spoke with a sergeant who advised her that, after reviewing lapel camera footage, the officer's actions were appropriate.

The allegations identified during intake accurately reflected these concerns, including potential inappropriate language, use of force, and unprofessional conduct. The investigation remained focused on those allegations throughout the investigative process.

2. Investigation Process

The investigation was conducted in accordance with established investigative procedures.

Subject of Investigation letters were issued to both involved employees within the contractual fifteen-day notification requirement following receipt of the complaint. Relevant investigative materials were collected and included in the case file, including CAD reports, Officer Body-Worn Camera (OBRD) footage, Mark43 reports, Executive Director recommendation forms, signed findings letters, email correspondence, and the associated APD police report.

A review of the available body-worn camera recordings confirmed that the footage had been reviewed by the investigator and accurately summarized within the investigative report. Our review found the video evidence to be consistent with the investigator's written findings and conclusions.

The complainant and both involved employees were interviewed. No additional witnesses were identified during the investigation requiring an interview. Interview summaries were complete, appropriately documented, and consistent with investigative reports previously reviewed by the CPOAB. We identified no additional investigative steps or follow-up actions that were necessary under the circumstances.

3. Findings and Conclusions

The investigative findings were supported by the available evidence.

The investigator appropriately relied upon documentary evidence, officer body-worn camera recordings, and witness interviews when evaluating each allegation. The findings letters clearly explained the rationale supporting each determination.

The evidence demonstrated that Officer R's interactions with the complainant remained within APD policy and that the allegations regarding inappropriate language, unnecessary force, and unprofessional conduct were not supported by the evidence. Likewise, the investigation determined that Sergeant C acted appropriately, professionally, and within the scope of his supervisory responsibilities after reviewing the incident and advising the complainant of the complaint process. Our review found these conclusions to be supported by the investigative record.

Because no policy violations were identified, no sustained findings or disciplinary recommendations were applicable.

4. Internal Review and Quality Control

The investigative file documented supervisory review through Executive Director recommendation forms for both involved employees. This documentation demonstrated appropriate internal review prior to case closure.

5. Case Closure

The complainant was notified of the investigative findings through findings letters transmitted via email on March 9, 2026. The case file appropriately documented the notification process. Since there was no disagreement between the CPOA findings and APD, documentation regarding non-concurrence was not applicable.

6. Additional Observations

Based upon our review, we identified no unexplained delays during the investigative process. The investigation demonstrated neutrality, professionalism, and objectivity throughout the investigation. The file was well organized, properly labeled, dated, and presented in a logical manner that allowed the investigation to be readily followed and independently reviewed.

Recommendations

Following this audit, no recommendations for corrective action are made.

The investigation complied with established investigative procedures, the evidence collected was sufficient, and the investigative findings were supported by the totality of the evidence contained within the file.

Conclusion

After conducting an independent quality assurance review of Case CPC 239-25, we conclude that the investigation was completed in accordance with established Civilian Police Oversight Agency investigative standards and applicable Albuquerque Police Department policies. The investigative process was timely, objective, and thoroughly documented. The evidence collected was sufficient to support the findings reached by the assigned investigator, and no material deficiencies were identified.

Final Audit Determination: Compliant