

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board *Leonard Waites, Chair* *Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair*
Joanne Fine *Dr. William J. Kass* *Valerie St. John*

Chelsea Van Deventer

Edward Harness, Executive Director

POLICE OVERSIGHT BOARD AGENDA

Thursday, November 8, 2018 – 5:00 PM

Vincent E. Griego Chambers

- I. Welcome and call to order.
- II. Pledge of Allegiance – *Leonard Waites, Chair*
- III. Mission Statement – *Leonard Waites, Chair*

*“Advancing Constitutional policing and
accountability for APD and the Albuquerque
Community.”*
- IV. Approval of the Agenda
- V. Public Comments
- VI. Review and Approval of Minutes from October 11, 2018
- VII. Reports from City Staff
 - a. APD
 1. Internal Affairs – Statistical Data Report
 2. Use of Force Policies 2-56 and 2-57
 - b. City Council
 - c. Mayor’s Office
 - d. City Attorney
 - e. CPC
 - f. APOA
 - g. CPOA – *Edward Harness, Executive Director*
 1. Report on Lt. G’s Investigation
 2. IMR-8
- VIII. Reports from Subcommittees
 - a. Community Outreach Subcommittee – *Chantal Galloway*
 - b. Policy and Procedure Review Subcommittee – *Dr. William Kass*
 1. ISR Contract with APD
 - c. Case Review Subcommittee – *Valerie St. John*
 - d. Personnel Subcommittee – *Joanne Fine*
- IX. Discussion
 - a. Police Oversight Boards Policy and Procedure

- b. Officer D overtime issue & audit
- c. New hires Damon Martinez, Leonard Nebretski and Elizabeth Armijo
- d. POB Unfilled positions
- e. Update on APD Academy testing
- f. PPRB – POB recommendations
- g. Dinner breaks

X. Consent Agenda Cases:

a. Administratively Closed Cases

151-18	175-18	205-18	206-18	207-18
211-18	221-18	224-18	227-18	228-18
240-18	242-18	243-18	245-18	250-18
251-18				

XI. Non-Consent Agenda:

a. Administratively Closed Cases

238-18 246-18 228-18

b. Unfounded/Sustained

132-18

c. Exonerated/Sustained not based on original complaint

128-18

d. Not Sustained investigation by IA

144-18

XII. Non-Concurrence Cases:

XIII. Review of Appeals

a. 053-18

XIV. Serious Use of Force/Officer Involved Shooting Cases:

a. C45-2018

XV. POB's Review of Garrity Materials:

XVI. Meeting with Counsel re: Pending Litigation or Personnel Issues:

Closed Discussion and Possible Action re: Pending Litigation or Personnel Issues

a. Matters subject to the attorney-client privilege pertaining to threatened or pending litigation in which the public body is or may become a participant pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 10-15-1(H)(7); and

i. Intervention into pending federal litigation

b. Limited personnel matters pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 10-15-1(H)(2)

i. Executive Director's contract

XVII. Other Business

XVIII. Adjournment- *Next Regularly scheduled POB meeting will be on December 13, 2018 at 5:00 p.m. in the Vincent E. Griego Chambers.*

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8207

RE: CPC 151-18

Dear Mr. E

On June 21, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning Officer F. of the Albuquerque Police Department.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you moved into your home in 2015 and had not been told about a problem neighbor. You believe that your neighbor tried to poison your dog and you had reported that to Animal Control Officials. On April 9, 2018, your neighbor phoned the police and he filed a report that you alleged soiled your name and you alleged that officer lied in his report and failed to conduct a proper investigation into the matter. You wanted the officer suspended for ten days without pay, the removal of the police report from the database, and you wanted your neighbor charged with filing a false police report.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint, the police report for the incident you complained of, as well as the officer's lapel camera video of the contact with your neighbor.

- You complained specifically that the officer spoke to your neighbor but that he never spoke with you but instead the officer file the report and libeled your name. You alleged that your neighbor is a liar, and you submitted many photographs and references to prove your allegation that he tried to poison your dog. You also submitted a photograph that showed lights from your neighbor's home pointing toward your home. You stated that the lie that Officer F. wrote in his report was that you told your neighbor during a confrontation that "You better be prepared" numerous times when in fact you only said it once. You alleged that the officer was too inexperienced to determine whether your neighbor was noticeably upset when the officer contacted the neighbor. You alleged that another piece of misinformation

was that the officer wrote that your neighbor reported "his youngest daughter" when in fact your neighbor has only one daughter. You alleged that the lights in your neighbor's backyard do in fact light up your home and the officer said that the lights don't reach the property line. Lastly, you alleged that the officer never verified the story that your neighbor had given him.

The incident reported to the officer by your neighbor did not warrant a criminal investigation. In fact, the lapel video showed that the officer informed your neighbor that although you made the statement, "You better get prepared" or something to that effect, that those words do not rise to the level of a criminal offense in and of itself and that the matter between the two of you was a civil matter. The officer said that he could document the incident but that was all he could do.

The incident report documented that your neighbor called the police because he wanted to document your confronting him earlier in the evening. The officer noted that your neighbor was visibly upset and the lapel video from the incident documents that he was. In fact, your neighbor had hired a private security firm and one of the security officers had responded to your neighbor's home as well and the security officer was present at the time the officer took the report. Your neighbor reported to the officer his observation and feeling that after you moved in next door that you developed an infatuation with his daughter. As proof, your neighbor said that you took pictures of his daughter and that you had requested her to come over and play with your dog. Your actions on one occasion reportedly made your neighbor and his wife so uncomfortable that they left your home early when you pulled out your camera to photograph their child. Your neighbor also told the officer and the video confirmed that you often would take pictures of his backyard and your submitted photographs prove that to be true. The officer opined, based on his own observation, that the lights from your neighbor's house don't reach the property line. On 04/09/18, your neighbor and you had a confrontation at the fence line between your homes and the video showed that you did in fact tell your neighbor that he "better be prepared" which he took as an indirect threat. Your neighbor expressed to the officer that he was in fear for his family's safety. The officer asked your neighbor if he wanted the officer to contact you and the neighbor felt that contacting you would only serve to exacerbate the problem. He asked for the report so that he could take it to his lawyer who had already asked you not to contact your neighbor.

III. CONCLUSION

Our agency has no ability to change the police report or to have it expunged. In order for you to do that, you would have to contact your own attorney and take appropriate legal action. WE are also not a police agency and we have no authority to charge anyone with a crime or have charges filed on someone. A review of the lapel video showed that the police report fairly accurately reflected what the officer was told. Furthermore, police reports often contain the officer's observations. This case was a civil matter between you and your neighbor. There is no duty placed upon an officer to fully investigate a civil matter or to determine who is more truthful. Your neighbor's perception and what started the civil dispute was that you made them uncomfortable by repeatedly photographing their daughter. You have not been accused of any criminal offense. The officer reported what he was told. Minor inconsistencies in reporting do not establish that the officer lied in the police report as you alleged. Because there is no duty placed upon the police to investigate civil matters and because we are unable to minimally substantiate your allegation that Officer F. lied in his police report, we are

administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ed Harness', written in a cursive style.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Edward Harness, Executive Director

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8214

Re: CPC #175-18

Dear Mr. P

A Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) Investigator was assigned to investigate your complaint against Officers of the Albuquerque Police Department (APD) on August 1, 2018, regarding an incident that occurred on June 23, 2018.

I. THE COMPLAINT

Mr. P filed his complaint with the CPOA staff over the phone. Mr. P called police and Officer G responded. Mr. P stated in his complaint that when his dog came out of the house, wagging his tail, Officer G's fingers were "real jumpy," but Officer G never pulled his firearm from the holster. Mr. P also alleged Officer G said, "Fuck you" after he left. Mr. P wanted to participate in mediation.

II. INVESTIGATION

The CPOA Investigator spoke with Mr. F who said he had problems with Officer G and if Officer G showed up at his home, "one of them would go to the hospital and one to jail." Mr. P alleged that Officer G almost killed his dog. When it was clarified that Officer G did not pull his weapon according to his complaint Mr. F said Officer G's fingers "came a frog's hair away from pulling it and popping it." Mr. P expressed a great deal of impatience and complained about a variety of other things about APD. He made various threats about contacting individuals.

The case was originally going to be handled as mediation, but after consideration and Mr. P threats, it was decided mediation was not appropriate.

The CPOA Investigator reviewed the two lapel videos of the officers that arrived. The call was that Mr. P called police saying an unknown person may have gained entry to his home. Officers arrived and made contact with Mr. P. Mr. P claimed his dog that was at the door was a service dog. Officer G advised Mr. P to have the dog remain inside. The dog appeared to be a Staffordshire Terrier/Pit bull type breed that came running out of the house towards officers, but not aggressively. Mr. P did not make any accusations that the officers almost shot his dog during the call. He shook each officer's hand and explained when he came

home his side gate was open and his back door was open, but nothing was stolen or damaged. He believed someone accessed his house.

Mr. P then talked about other random things that he did not connect to the gate and door being found open. Officer G asked clarifying questions, but Mr. P continued speaking in disjointed references to other things. Mr. P stated his girlfriend had information so the officers talked briefly to her. While the officers spoke with his girlfriend, Mr. P interrupted and asked for Officer G's man number, which Officer G provided. Officer G offered his sergeant's name, but Mr. P said he had his Captain's name. Mr. P asked the officers if they knew who M L G was, but when asked why he told them he was "just curious." Officer G asked Mr. P if he had anything more to tell him. Mr. P said not to him and Officer G bid him a good night. Mr. P responded in kind. The videos ended once the officers were on the street. Officer G did not use profanity as the complaint alleged.

III. CONCLUSION

The CPOA has made the decision to **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSE** the complaint, as the allegations cannot be minimally substantiated. The available evidence showed Officer G did not use profanity and did not pull his service weapon. If Officer G moved his hand towards his weapon in response to the dog running towards officers, that would not be a violation.

If you have a computer available, we would greatly appreciate your completing our client survey form at <http://www.cabq.gov/cpoa/survey>.

Thank you for participating in the process of civilian oversight of the police, ensuring officers and personnel of the APD are held accountable, and improving the process.

Sincerely,
The Civilian Police Oversight Agency by



Edward Harness, Esq.
Executive Director

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

October 2, 2018

Via Email

RE: CPC 205-18

Dear Ms. J

On August 11, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning Albuquerque Police Department Officer J..

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on August 11th, 2018, you saw Officer M. operating his vehicle in a construction zone near Rio Bravo and I-25 in an unsafe manner. You wrote that the officer was exceeding the speed limit and driving aggressively and the officer did not have his lights on. You felt that had you been driving in the same manner that you would have been ticketed. You felt that a double standard seems to exist.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint, identified the officer involved, and sent a copy of the complaint to the officer's Commander. The officer's Supervisor contacted you over the phone and discussed your complaint with you. The officer's Supervisor also spoke with Officer M. about your complaint. Officer M. said that he couldn't remember the incident specifically, but the officer was appreciative of your comments. The officer was in fact responding to Civic Plaza to work an overtime event. Officer M. told his Supervisor that he will endeavor to use more caution while he is driving his police vehicle.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the officer's supervisor showed that officer does not have a history of reported bad driving behavior or traffic crashes. The Supervisor cautioned the officer about the driving behavior and the officer was appreciative of the complaint and vowed to drive more cautiously. At this time, we are administratively closing your complaint

and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'EH' with a stylized flourish.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

To the file

RE: CPC 206-18

Dear N

On August 5, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning the Albuquerque Police Department.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you made multiple calls to the police department about a noise problem in your neighborhood. You complained that the noise continued for three hours and that nothing was ever done. You complained that no one ever called you back to let you know what happened. Aside from the time and location, you did not provide any other information.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and sent a copy of the complaint to the APD Commander of the area in which you live. The Commander investigated the matter and determined that there were in fact three calls made about the noise. An officer did respond to the call and later a Sergeant responded. One officer responded at 9:57 PM and the Sergeant responded at 11:20 PM. Neither of the two responders was able to locate any noise or loud music in the area.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation showed that officers did respond to your calls for service. They couldn't locate the loud music you complained of. We were unable to minimally substantiate your allegation that no one responded to your calls for service. We are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ed Harness', written in a cursive style.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8221

RE: CPC 207-18

Dear Mrs. P

On August 15, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning Albuquerque Police Department Officer G..

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on June 18th, 2018, on Unser near Montano, Officer G. was driving really fast and was attempting to pass the vehicle you were riding in on the passenger side. Officer G. struck the passenger side of the vehicle you were in with his police car. You wrote in your complaint that if you would have had your arm outside of the window when the officer passed, he would have taken off your arm. That did not happen, but that is what you wrote. No one was injured in the accident. You submitted evidence that you filed a claim with the City of Albuquerque for damages.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and obtained a copy of the police report in the matter. The police report indicated that Officer G. was responding to a motor vehicle accident that was up ahead and he had his emergency lights on when he attempted to pass on the shoulder. The officer thought he had enough room to pass but the side of his car clipped the side of the vehicle you were riding in. Mr. F P did not want to stay on the scene to wait for photographs to be taken after the accident investigation as completed.

III. CONCLUSION

You did not make any allegation against the officer other than that he was driving fast when he clipped the vehicle in which you were riding. The APD has an Accident Review Board which is responsible for conducting Administrative Investigations into all police vehicle accidents.

The Accident Review Board makes a determination after its investigation as to whether or not the accident was preventable or non-preventable and as to whether or not the officer violated department policy with regard to the operation of his/her assigned police car. If the accident is found to have been preventable, the officer will be appropriately disciplined. APD Personnel assigned to that Board can provide you with the date that your case is going before it.

Because APD and Risk Management are already conducting investigations into the accident, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur.

Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ed Harness', written in a cursive style.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

September 21, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8238

RE: CPC 211-18

Dear Mr. H

On August 17, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning Albuquerque Police Department Officer M..

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on August 17th, 2018, you saw Officer M. pull out in front of other vehicles almost causing an accident. You saw the officer accelerate without turning on his lights and siren and you saw the officer cut off other vehicles just so he could pull over another car. You asked that the officer's training be evaluated because you believe the officer operated his police car in a careless manner.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and sent a copy of the complaint to the officer's Lieutenant. The officer's Lieutenant contacted you and discussed your concerns. The Lieutenant spoke to Officer M. about your complaint. Officer M. said that he couldn't remember the incident specifically, but stated that it was possible that his driving behavior may have occurred as you observed. The officer was appreciative of your comments and he told his Lieutenant that he will endeavor to use more caution while he is trying to catch up to vehicles that he intends to stop.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the officer's supervisor showed that it was possible that the officer may have aggressively driven after the person whom he was trying to pull over. The officer does not have a history of reported bad driving behavior or traffic crashes. The Lieutenant cautioned the officer about the behavior and the officer was appreciative of the

complaint and vowed to drive more cautiously when attempting to stop a suspected traffic violator. At this time, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed Harness', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

To File

Anonymous

RE: CPC 221-18

Dear Anonymous:

On August 28, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning an Albuquerque Police Department Telecommunications Operator who allegedly hung up on you three times.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You listed no identifying information but you did list a phone number. You gave the date and time of the incident and your complaint read, "Dispatcher hung up on me 3 times in a row requesting info or assistance. You wanted the operator punished.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint, identified the operator allegedly involved, and sent a copy of the complaint to the Operator's Supervisor. The Supervisor had the number you provided run through the analytics system and the phone number you provided did not come up in the system. The operator did take your call from a different number than you provided to the CPOA Investigator and the call was lost as you evidently were calling from a cellular phone with a bad connection. The recording showed that the Operator tried calling you back three times and each time the connection was lost.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the Operator's supervisor showed that Operator did not violate any Standard Operating Procedure and she did not intentionally hang up on you. The recorded calls show that the calls were simply dropped due to a poor connection. WE are unable to minimally establish the allegations you set forth in your complaint. At this time, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'EH' with a stylized flourish.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board
Joanne Fine
Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair
Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair
Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

RE: CPC 224-18

Dear Ms. A

On August 22, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning an Albuquerque Police Department Police Officer O..

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you called APD officers to your home on 08/20/18 to report a sexual assault incident that occurred at the UNM Mental Hospital Geriatrics Ward on 12/26/17. You wrote in your complaint that after you told the officer what happened, the officer asked you to show him where the man had touched you. You stated that the question deeply humiliated you but you did show the officer how the man drew his hand across your pelvis. You alleged that the officer took a picture of the hospital report with his cell phone. The officer had a back-up officer, Officer T., who arrived about 15 minutes into your contact with Officer O.. You alleged that both officers stated that what was written in the hospital report was probably true. You felt humiliated. You stated that you have the mind of Christ. You asked that both officers be fired for their unprofessional behavior.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint, reviewed the police report on the matter, and reviewed both officer's lapel camera videos of the contact they had with you. The police report filed by Officer O. accurately reflected what you told him. You told the officer and the video showed that you were committed to UNM Mental Health and that while you were there, 6-10 Hispanic male technicians and an Hispanic nurse held you down, restrained you, and sedated you with an injection. When that took place, one of the male technicians passed his hand over your pelvic bone, over your clothing. You told the officer that you the technician's hand never contacted your private area. The officer reviewed the investigative report that UNM had provided to you. He photographed it, the video shows, on his departmental issued lapel camera. The lapel video showed that the officer told you that if what occurred was a criminal

act that the APD would not have jurisdiction to investigate the complaint because the incident occurred on UNM property. He explained to you that he would take a report, which he did, and that you would have to take the report to UNM. The lapel videos showed that Officer T. didn't say a word during the entire encounter.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined that Officer O.'s questioning was appropriate. Often, police officers have to ask victims questions that make them feel uncomfortable. They have legitimate reasons behind asking those questions that include determining if a crime occurred and what type of crime it would be. Asking you to show him where you were touched was an appropriate investigative question. Asking you if you were touched over or under you clothing was also appropriate because that determines the severity of the crime. The lapel videos show that neither officer commented on the veracity of the UNM report and neither of the officers said that the report was "probably true". The lapel videos showed that the officers conducted themselves professionally and appropriately. The available evidence reviewed showed there was no policy violation as you alleged. Because we are unable to minimally establish the allegations you set forth in your complaint, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,



Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Edward Harness, Executive Director

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8252

Re: CPC #227-18

Dear Mr. S J

A Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) Investigator was assigned to investigate your complaint against Officers of the Albuquerque Police Department (APD) on September 18, 2018, regarding an incident that occurred on or about July 12, 2018.

I. THE COMPLAINT

Mr. S J submitted a complaint regarding his arrest on July 12, 2018. Mr. S J wrote an officer rammed his parked car and when he got out of his vehicle, he had guns in his face and officers yelling at him. He was threatened with being shot by several plain-clothes detectives in unmarked vehicles. Eventually the officers told him he had warrants for his arrest. Once he was handcuffed, the officers were disrespectful by making jokes about him. Mr. S J complained about his car being searched. He complained about how his disabled friend, who was also present, was treated by the officers. Mr. S J wanted his car returned since he claimed it was improperly towed.

II. INVESTIGATION

The CPOA Investigator, with the assistance of APD records, located a police report listing Mr. S J as a suspect from an incident on May 12, 2018, but Mr. S J was not apprehended at that time. Further review with APD records was that a BCSO deputy took Mr. S J into custody on July 12, 2018. The actual report is not available through APD records and would have to be obtained from BCSO itself. There is no CAD indicating any APD personnel were involved in this call.

The CPOA Investigator left a message for Mr. S J informing him that he needed to file his complaint with BCSO and provided the BCSO phone number to Internal Affairs.

III. CONCLUSION

The CPOA has made the decision to **ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSE** the complaint, as the available evidence showed APD personnel were not involved in the incident about which Mr. S J filed his complaint.

Letter to Mr. S . Jr
November 9, 2018
Page 2

Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please contact the CPOA in regards to your Civilian Police Complaint if you can provide further details and wish to have the complaint re-opened.

If you have a computer available, we would greatly appreciate your completing our client survey form at <http://www.cabq.gov/cpoa/survey> .

Thank you for participating in the process of civilian oversight of the police, ensuring officers and personnel of the APD are held accountable, and improving the process.

Sincerely,
The Civilian Police Oversight Agency by



Edward Harness, Esq.
Executive Director

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Email

RE: CPC 228-18

Dear Ms. R:

On August 24, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning the Albuquerque Police Department.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you had been trying to get some answers for over a year and that no one will point you in the right direction. You explained that during an incident that occurred more than a year ago, police officers arrested your husband and you were taken to the hospital for treatment. You wrote that you were not allowed to take anything out of the car because the vehicle had some stolen items in it and the police were impounding the vehicle so they could get a search warrant on it. After you got out of the hospital, you had nowhere to go and you endured hardships. You stated in your complaint that that once you were able to address matters, you tried calling around and you tried to locate your vehicle but no one could provide you with any information as to its whereabouts because you did not have the VIN number. You stated that you were sure that your vehicle had probably been sold by now but you wanted to know more information about that. Your complaint did not list the time and location or the date of the incident. You provided no identifying information other than your name.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and attempted to locate records related to your incident by the name you gave on your complaint, but there were none. The Investigator reached out to you via email and you responded to the request for more information. Based on the information you provided, the Investigator was able to locate the incident reports related to the incident and all of the associated records and lapel videos. The police report lists you as A G, the name you gave the police at the time of the incident. Another report lists you as A G. The main report on the incident though indicated that police

officers had been called to the Target store on Montano in reference to your husband sitting in the vehicle, apparently passed out with a syringe in his lap. When the officers arrived your husband was out of the vehicle but the officer saw the syringe on the floorboard. The officer ran the vehicle through the database and the license plate that was on the car did not match the VIN number. The last registered owner was contacted and that woman said that she did not own the car nor had she ever owned it. Officers made contact with your husband and he admitted that he had been in the SUV and that you owned the vehicle. Your husband said that the title to the car was in the back of the car and he looked for the title but was unable to produce it. While he was doing that, the officer noticed paperwork and documents belonging to many other individuals. When the officer checked on one of those items, he found that the items had been stolen after an auto theft. When the stolen items were discovered your husband was handcuffed. The officer found out your husband had an outstanding warrant for his arrest.

About that time, you came out of the store and you were driving one of the store's motorized shopping carts. You complained you were in pain repeatedly. You were questioned about the car and you said that you had recently purchased it and you had the title. The video showed you looked for the title but also could not find it. You later admitted to a Detective that you knew there were stolen items in the car but you and your husband were not responsible for those items being in the car and that they had been left by a known burglar. The SUV was sealed and towed from the scene so officers could later search it pursuant to a search warrant. Your husband was arrested at the scene and you were transported to the hospital for treatment for the pain you were in.

The Search Warrant was executed and stolen property that was taken in two separate auto thefts was recovered. Once the Search warrant had been completed, the car that was seized was no longer in police custody. It would have been the owner's responsibility at that time to pick up the car from where it had been impounded. The records showed that the car was impounded at Randy's Towing located at 11200 Central Avenue SE. The phone number to the establishment is 508-3687. The CPOA Investigator e-mailed you and advised you where the car had been impounded. He also provided you with two related case numbers to your case.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined that the car that you stated that you owned was impounded at the location above on May 27, 2017. You were unable to provide the title at the time and you had not transferred the vehicle into your name. Without proof of ownership, it would have been difficult for you to recover the vehicle from the business where it was located. You asked our office to conduct an investigation and to provide you with information regarding the incident wherein your car was impounded. We hope the information we have provided to you is helpful. At this time, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'EH' with a stylized flourish.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board
Joanne Fine
Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair
Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair
Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018
Via Certified Mail
7017 2680 0000 5951 8269

RE: CPC 240-18

Dear Ms. C:

On August 30, 2018 we received your complaint about APD Officer S..

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on July 31, 2018 Officer S. arrested your partner. You believed that Officer S. took your cell phone from your partner and put it in the front pocket of her uniform. You wrote in your complaint that you wanted to get your phone back and you wanted to make sure that this never happens to anyone else.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint, the police reports related to the incident, and the officer's lapel videos. One of the reports indicated, and one of the lapel videos show that when Officer S. arrested your partner, Officer S. took the cell phone and placed it on top of a police car. That car left the area before the phone could be retrieved. The officers did return to the area and they tried to locate the phone to no avail. Officer S. documented her actions and documented in a report that the phone was lost. The Officer further had a copy of the report forwarded to Risk Management.

The CPOA Investigator contacted you to get a statement from you regarding your complaint. You told the CPOA Investigator that you were aware of what happened to the phone and that you had already filed a claim with Risk Management. You stated that Risk Management had accepted the claim and they were working on replacing your phone. You told the CPOA Investigator that the officer just made a mistake and that you didn't want anything bad to happen to her. You asked that your complaint against Officer S. be withdrawn.

officer's immediate supervisor had counseled Officer S. on the importance of safeguarding people's property until it is returned to them or placed in evidence.

The CPOA Investigator contacted the officer's supervisor, Sgt. V.. Sergeant V. was made aware of your complaint and Sergeant V. counseled Officer S. and reminded her of the importance of properly safeguarding property.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined that Officer S. made a regrettable mistake by leaving the phone on top of the car. Officer S. followed procedure by reporting the loss of your phone and notifying Risk Management about the ordeal. You told the Investigator that you were in contact and working with Risk Management to resolve this matter to your satisfaction and that you wanted to withdraw the complaint. Sergeant V. has counseled the officer and hopefully this will not happen again to anyone else. Because it appears that the matter is being resolved to your satisfaction, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,



Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8276

RE: CPC 242-18

Dear Ms. F

On September 27, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning the Albuquerque Police Department.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you “Have Message. Many break ins @appt complex, Broken Car Windows, stolen Items, on a regular basis.” You turned in your complaint in person and a CPOA Investigator tried to get more information from you. You provided the Investigator with a message recording of someone who you believed was rude to you. You alleged the person worked for APD.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and listened to the provided recording. The person who left the message on your phone never identified themselves. You did not give any specific information as to when the message was left on your phone except that it was left about three weeks ago.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined that there is simply not enough information provided in your complaint. There is no way to determine who the person was who left you the message or if they even work for APD. Because of the lack of information in the complaint, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ed Harness', written in a cursive style.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

To File

Unknown

RE: CPC 243-18

Dear Unknown:

On September 16, 2018 we received your written complaint concerning the Albuquerque Police Department.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that you called 242-COPS on a possible Domestic Violence incident involving kids. An hour went by and no one from APD showed up to check out the situation. You stated in your complaint that the guy was arrested last week.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint. You provided no information that would be helpful to the investigator. While you did list a date a date and time of incident, you did not list where the incident took place, what number you called from, or any other information that would be helpful.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined that there is simply not enough information provided in your complaint to continue the investigation any further. Because of the lack of information in the complaint, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Certified Mail

7017 2680 0000 5951 8283

RE: CPC 245-18

Dear Ms. P

On September 11, 2018 our agency received your written complaint concerning the Albuquerque Police Department and Telecommunications Operator T. You filed your complaint with the City and the City Legal Department forwarded your complaint to us. Your original complaint was dated September 3, 2018.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your original complaint that you were mocked by the Telecommunications Operator when you called 911 and that you were told not to call 911 next time but to call 242-COPS instead because your situation was not an emergency. You explained in your complaint that on a previous occasion, you had left your house for a short period of time and returned to find your backdoor wide open. You suspected that you had possibly interrupted a break in and you suspected that the intruder may have entered through the doggy door and then unlocked your dead bolted door. Nothing appeared to be out of place or missing on that occasion.

Six days later around 5:30 PM, you returned to your residence after a short outing and you again found your back door open. This time you were terrified that someone may still be inside the residence so you called 911 and you got your dogs and left the home.

The first operator you spoke with told you not to go in the house and to wait for the police. The operator told you that the police were backed up on calls. You waited 15-20 minutes and you called the police again and again you were told not to go inside your house and they would send the police as soon as they could.

At about 7:30 PM, a neighbor went into your house and checked it out and determined no one was in the home. You went in and noticed nothing was out of place. At that time, you called 911 again to tell the police that you were in the house but you were fearful that the intruder would return. You alleged that the 911 Operator said something to the effect of, "Ah, Ms.

P again.” You reported that you told the operator that you were inside your house but you did not feel safe. Operator T. allegedly told you that you were safe now. When you asked him how he knew you were safe he told you that you were talking to him and that nothing had happened to you. You asked for his name and told him that you were going to write a letter. You alleged that the Operator told you that the next time this happens to call 242-COPS since there was no emergency. You disagreed and stated it was an emergency. At about 8:30 PM, two female officers arrived and you had a positive interaction with them.

You asked in your letter for someone to explain to you how this situation did not qualify as an emergency. You stated you were angry with what Operator T said to you about this not being an emergency, and that APD took over three hours to respond to your call. You stated you were considering legal representation in the matter.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and the three recorded calls that you placed to the APD on the date this incident took place.

The first call you placed to the police was answered by a Telecommunications Operator who asked you specific questions about what you were reporting. You told the Operator that you just got home, you were in your garage and the back door was wide open. You stated that you thought someone was in the house. The operator instructed you to get away from the house and you stated that you would do that as soon as you put your dogs in the car. The operator asked you “What makes you think people are inside?” You replied that just the past Sunday it happened to you. The Operator asked you if there were any suspicious vehicles outside of your house and you replied that there were not. The operator obtained your phone number and name. The operator clarified with you that you would be waiting outside in a vehicle and you described the vehicle to the operator. The operator told you that she had the call set up, for you to not enter the house before officer got there, and if you ended up seeing movement or somebody leave the house or anything like that for you to call immediately. The recording showed that the operator did not mention the police were backed up on calls. You made that call at 5:12 PM.

Twenty one minutes later you called 911 again and spoke with a different Telecommunications Operator. The CPOA Investigator reviewed that recording as well. During that phone call, you identified yourself and said that you had called earlier and no one had arrived. The Operator looked up the call on the system and asked you if you had been inside the house. You told the operator that you were waiting outside as you had been previously instructed to do. You told that Operator that you believed there was someone in your house. The Operator asked you if there were any suspicious vehicles parked nearby and you said there were not. You stated that you had driven around and looked down the alley and that you didn’t see anything in the alley either. You said that you believed that someone had been in the house because your dogs were acting weird and there were lights on in the home that you did not leave on. You said that it was possible that whoever may have left the back door open may have already been gone. You said that you expected the police to be there. The operator said that he would try to see if there was any way to get the officers out there quicker. The operator asked you if you had seen any movement from within the house since

you first called the police and you replied that you had not seen any movement from inside the house. The Operator told you that he was updating the call and he would try to get officers out there a little quicker but that the officers were busy on other calls. You said that you understood that but your call was a robbery in progress. The Operator again asked you if you had seen any movement or anyone inside the house and you said that you had not seen any movement or anyone inside the house. You then told the Operator that you were going to go into your house because you did not like the fact that it was taking a long time for the officers to respond. The Operator asked you if you wanted him to stay on the phone with you and you said that you didn't know. The Operator told you he would stay on the line with you. The Operator told you not to go into the house if you didn't feel safe doing so. You said, "It's too bad that we don't have enough officers on duty to get here, because on TV they come within two minutes. The Operator told you that he did not want you to go in the house if you didn't feel safe and that he updated the call and they would get officers out to you just as soon as they could but he wasn't sure how long that would take.

The third time you called 911 was at 7:39 PM. It was Operator T. who answered your call. The call was recorded and the CPOA Investigator reviewed the recording. You identified yourself and said that you had an emergency at your house two hours ago and that an officer still had not responded to your call. The Operator asked you if the call you made was for a residential burglary and you said that it was. The Operator said, "Okay so you need to contact the non-emergency line for this okay? That number is 242-COPS." You said, "No. Absolutely not. There was someone in my house when I came home." The Operator said, "Okay. Well, we do have the call set up and we are still working on getting officers out that way. For future reference, anytime you call to check for an estimated time, you need to contact the non-emergency line at 242-COPS."

You explained that your situation was an emergency and the Operator told you "Okay. Not at this time it's not. You're safe at this time. It's not an emergency right now okay? So, future reference, when it's a non-emergency use the line at 242-COPS." You asked, "And how do you know I'm safe?" The operator answered by saying, "Because you called to ask where the officers were." You said, "Uh huh. That doesn't mean I'm safe." He asked you, "Are you safe right now?" You responded with, "What is your name?" The operator gave you his identifying number. You repeated the number and said, "Yeah, okay. 'Cause I'm already gonna write a letter but this is unacceptable too telling me that I'm safe whenever I was actually calling 911 to see where the officer was. It's not right. There's something gravely wrong." The Operator asked, "Ms. Penny, has anything changed since the original call?" You answered, "Well, my neighbor across the way said he would come in and check my house because I was sitting in the car out front for almost two hours. So he did. And I came in after him. He said that everything, there was nobody in the house. That was our biggest fear. And, uh, so I just came in like about ten minutes ago. But yeah, I was sitting out in my car in the rain with my two dogs in the back seat for almost two hours." The Operator told you that as soon as they had an officer available they would get them out to you. You then concluded the phone call.

III. CONCLUSION

The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator determined your call for service was correctly coded as a non-life threatening call for service. We understand your frustration in

there not being enough police officers on duty to immediately respond to calls such as yours and we understand that the APD is working hard to hire more police officers so they can provide better service and cut down on their response time. Non-life threatening calls for service are dispatched as officers become available. Unfortunately, none were immediately available to respond to your call.

The recorded phone calls that you made to APD showed that the first Operator did not tell you that the police were backed up on calls and that it would be a while as you reported. It was the second operator who told you that and you were told that there was going to be a delay.

With respect to your allegation against Operator T. you alleged that you were calling back to tell the police that you were in the house but you were fearful that the intruder would return. The recording showed that you called to ask where the officers were as it had been two hours since you called. You never mentioned you were fearful the intruder would return. You alleged that the Operator said something to the effect of, "Ah, Ms. P again." Nowhere on the recording did Operator T. say that.

You alleged that you were mocked by the Telecommunications Operator T. when you called 911 and that you were told not to call 911 next time but to call 242-COPS instead because your situation was not an emergency.

The recorded phone call showed that you were not mocked as you reported and that Operator T. told you that the call had been set up and they were trying to get officers to you, but "for future reference, anytime you call to **check for an estimated time**, you need to contact the non-emergency line at 242-COPS."

You reported that you told the operator that you were inside your house but you did not feel safe. You did report you were inside your home but you did not say that you did not feel safe. Operator T. did tell you that you were safe. You alleged that you asked him how he knew you were safe he told you that you were taking to him and that nothing had happened to you. That was not what Operator T. said. He said that he felt you were safe because you had called to check the status of the responding officers. The Operator then asked you if you were safe and you did not answer the question. Instead, you asked for his name and told him you were going to write a letter. You alleged that the Operator told you that the next time this happens to call 242-COPS since there was no emergency. The Operator told you that the next time you call to check on the status of the officers responding to the scene to call the non-emergency line. He did not tell you not to call 911 the next time this type of incident happens.

It appears from the evidence that you may have misunderstood what Operator T. told you during your conversation with him. Based on the available evidence reviewed, we are unable to minimally substantiate your allegation that Telecommunications Operator T. violated Standard Operating Procedures of APD. Because of that we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,



Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board
Joanne Fine
Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair
Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair
Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018
Via Certified Mail
7017 2680 0000 5951 8290

RE: CPC 250-18

Dear Mr. S. Jr.

On September 10, 2018 we received your complaint about APD Officer G. and an unnamed Police Service Aide. The incident you complaint of took place on August 28, 2018.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on August 28, 2018 you were driving and noticed your tires seemed low so you pulled over to check them. You parked at the end of a cul de sac and you noticed that down the street there was PSA putting a parking ticket on a car. The PSA passed your vehicle and then parked down the street. Shortly after that, Officer G. arrived and pulled up behind your vehicle and put his lights on. The officer contacted you and you told him that you were just checking the air in your tires. The next thing you knew, the officer was writing you all kinds of tickets. You wrote that you were not driving when the officer came in contact with you and you were not illegally parked. You believed that you were wrongfully singled out for being a man of color. You believed you were profiled, the officer engaged in racist police misconduct and he violated your civil rights. You asked that the tickets be dismissed at once.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and the Officer's lapel video of the contact with you. The lapel video showed and you admitted that you were operating a vehicle without a license and you told the officer that you had not had a license for over a year. The trailer you were towing behind your car was not displaying a license plate. The license plate on your car was expired by two years. You did not have insurance on your vehicle either. The lapel video showed the officer querying the APD database, and the database showed similar violations only a month before this contact. The video showed Officer G. speaking with you when he

gave you the citations. Officer G. told you that if you got the violations corrected before the court date that he would work with you and dismiss the citations. He even told you that if you were unable to get your driver's license by then that he would work with you as long as you had made some progress in trying to get it. The interaction between the two of you at the time was cordial.

III. CONCLUSION

New Mexico State law and Albuquerque City Ordinance require that you have a license to operate a motor vehicle on the streets or highways. Your vehicle and any trailer towed behind it is required by law to be currently registered and the proper license plates must be displayed. City Ordinance prohibits anyone from parking a vehicle on a street when it does not have a valid license plate displayed on it. Furthermore, an officer may summarily impound any vehicle that is being operated on the streets when the officer knows the vehicle being operated is not insured. Officer G. did not impound your car and trailer. The investigation conducted by the CPOA Investigator showed that Officer G. had probable cause to approach and contact you even if you were not driving. The contact was based on probable cause in accordance with the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution. There is no evidence to prove that the contact was a result of racial profiling or that the officer is guilty of any misconduct. In fact, the lapel camera video showed that the officer was willing to work with you to dismiss the tickets he gave you and that he could have taken more severe action which he did not do. Our office has no ability to dismiss the citations as you requested. There was no evidence of racial profiling.

Because we are unable to minimally substantiate your allegations, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,



Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

Police Oversight Board

Joanne Fine

Chelsea Van Deventer

Leonard Waites, Chair

Dr. William J. Kass

Chantal M. Galloway, Vice Chair

Valerie St. John

Edward Harness, Executive Director

November 9, 2018

Via Email

RE: CPC 251-18

Dear Ms. C

On September 7, 2018 we received your complaint about an incident that occurred at the National Guard Armory in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Your complaint did not contain any allegations against any APD Officers or APD Personnel.

I. THE COMPLAINT

You wrote in your complaint that on June 2, 2017 you were held hostage by two men at the National Guard Armory in Santa Fe, NM. You said you were intimidated and you begged to be released but the men would not release you until you were forced to sign paperwork. As a result, you unjustly lost your military career. You have suffered emotional distress and homelessness.

II. THE INVESTIGATION

In an effort to assist you, a CPOA Investigator was assigned to your complaint. The CPOA Investigator reviewed your complaint and determined that we have no jurisdiction to investigate your complaint.

III. CONCLUSION

We have no jurisdiction to investigate the matter that you reported to us. Because of that, we are administratively closing your complaint and no further investigation by our office will occur. Administratively closed complaints may be re-opened if additional information becomes available.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ed Harness', written over a horizontal line.

Ed Harness
Executive Director
(505) 924-3774

CC: Albuquerque Police Department, Chief of Police