Civilian Police Oversight Agency

Finding Letters of the CPOA

The CPOA Executive Director's findings in each case are listed below. The following notifications of the findings were provided to the citizen(s) during September 2026. If applicable, these findings will become part of the officer's file.

076-26 **077-26** **078-26** **080-26** **081-26**

086-26 **089-26** **090-26** **097-26** **107-26**

115-26 **118-26**

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 076-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/18/2026, C submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 05/13/2026 at 1957 hours at 1215 3rd Street Northwest, Apartment 319. Mr. C reported that report 260040830 was incorrect, that his statement was not taken, that his rights were not read to him, that he was not allowed to get his medication, and that he did not know if the officer locked his door. He advised that there was a training officer, a recruit officer, a female officer, and a sergeant.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant B

Other Materials: Email Communications and Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 7, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.82.4.C.8.a

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☑
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

2.82.4.C.8.a: After a review of all the evidence and interview statements provided, no attempt, or reasonable attempt, appears to have been made to take or transport Mr. C walker with him to the PTC. Sergeant B directly denied Mr. C request to take his walker. The CPOA recommends a verbal reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 076-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/18/2026, C submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 05/13/2026 at 1957 hours at 1215 3rd Street Northwest, Apartment 319. Mr. C reported that report 260040830 was incorrect, that his statement was not taken, that his rights were not read to him, that he was not allowed to get his medication, and that he did not know if the officer locked his door. He advised that there was a training officer, a recruit officer, a female officer, and a sergeant.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer V

Other Materials: Email Communications and Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 7, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☑
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4- Based on the investigation and evidence reviewed, it was determined that Officer V did not violate the SOP in question, as Officer V closed Mr. C door, attempted to lock it, and although Officer V was not able to get the door locked, Officer V notified a staff member, Ms. Betone , who stated they would lock Mr. C door.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 076-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/18/2026, C submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 05/13/2026 at 1957 hours at 1215 3rd Street Northwest, Apartment 319. Mr. C reported that report 260040830 was incorrect, that his statement was not taken, that his rights were not read to him, that he was not allowed to get his medication, and that he did not know if the officer locked his door. He advised that there was a training officer, a recruit officer, a female officer, and a sergeant.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer S.S.

Other Materials: Email Communications and Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 7, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☑
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: Based on the investigation, Mr. C primary complaint against Officer S.S. was related to the exclusion of his statements related to the incident. A review of the criminal complaint, arrest report, and incident reports included a brief statement made by Mr. C The same information was reported in each report, with no additions or changes to the narratives. Although a detailed narrative of Mr. C statements was not included, his statement was included in the report.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 076-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/18/2026, C submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 05/13/2026 at 1957 hours at 1215 3rd Street Northwest, Apartment 319. Mr. C reported that report 260040830 was incorrect, that his statement was not taken, that his rights were not read to him, that he was not allowed to get his medication, and that he did not know if the officer locked his door. He advised that there was a training officer, a recruit officer, a female officer, and a sergeant.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer KS

Other Materials: Email Communications and Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 7, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.83.5.A.1.a

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4-Based on the investigation and evidence reviewed, it was determined that Officer KS did not violate the SOP in question as he acted in a professional and courteous manner during his interactions with Mr. C OBRD Video review confirmed that Officer KS advised Mr. C when he would get his medication. Based on none of the officers asking Mr. C incriminating questions after the arrest, officers were not required to read the Miranda Warning to Mr. C

2.83.5.A.1.a-Based on the investigation, it was determined that Mr. C requested that officers transport him to Presbyterian Hospital for medical care, but his request was denied and he was taken to Lovelace Hospital instead. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 076-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/18/2026, Chism submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 05/13/2026 at 1957 hours at 1215 3rd Street Northwest, Apartment 319. Mr. C reported that report 260040830 was incorrect, that his statement was not taken, that his rights were not read to him, that he was not allowed to get his medication, and that he did not know if the officer locked his door. He advised that there was a training officer, a recruit officer, a female officer, and a sergeant.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer H

Other Materials: Email Communications and Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 7, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.82.4.C.8.a

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.83.5.A.1.a

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.82.4.C.8.a: It was determined that although Officer H was responsible for transporting Mr. C to the PTC, OBRD Video review confirmed that Sergeant B made the determination not to let Mr. C take his walker with him to the PTC.

2.83.5.A.1.a: Based on the investigation, it was determined that Mr. C requested that officers transport him to Presbyterian Hospital for medical care, but his request was denied and he was taken to Lovelace Hospital instead. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 077-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 05/17/2026, F submitted a complaint to the CPOA for an incident on 05/02/2026 at 0945 hours on *"5th Street a few blocks north of Lomas."* Ms. F ; reported that Sgt. C stopped her for speeding but never told her her speed nor the speed limit. While looking for her paperwork, Sgt. C asked her to step out of the car and said she committed the crime of speeding and she said it was a violation not a crime. She told Sgt. C she would not step out, rolled up her window, but he reached inside her car, grabbed her door handle, and opened her driver door. She wanted Sgt. C and Officer C to be investigated and brought to justice under charges of assault, intimidation, excessive force, property damage, vandalism, and violating her constitutional right repeatedly throughout this incident.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer D

Other Materials: Email communications, nmcourts records, citizen evidence, & LLC audit.

Date Investigation Completed: September 24, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.7.4.B.1.b

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.7.4.B.1.b: It was determined that Officer D damaged Ms. F license plate cover, but there was no indication that Officer D realized what occurred, so she did not complete a supplemental report to document the damage.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 077-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 05/17/2026, F submitted a complaint to the CPOA for an incident on 05/02/2026 at 0945 hours on *"5th Street a few blocks north of Lomas."* Ms. F ; reported that Sgt. C stopped her for speeding but never told her her speed nor the speed limit. While looking for her paperwork, Sgt. C asked her to step out of the car and said she committed the crime of speeding and she said it was a violation not a crime. She told Sgt. C she would not step out, rolled up her window, but he reached inside her car, grabbed her door handle, and opened her driver door. She wanted Sgt. C and Officer C to be investigated and brought to justice under charges of assault, intimidation, excessive force, property damage, vandalism, and violating her constitutional right repeatedly throughout this incident.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer C

Other Materials: Email communications, nmcourts records, citizen evidence, & LLC audit.

Date Investigation Completed: September 24, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.1

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.7.4.B.1.b & 2.52.5.B.3

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☑

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.1: The Evidence showed Officer C did not violate policy in her interaction with Ms. F The reference to "taking one" was to taking a police report.

2.7.4.B.1.b: It was determined that Officer C documented the damage to Ms. F ; property in a supplemental report. This issue was evaluated under the APD's Low Level Control Audit and therefore was reviewed but not duplicated in the CPOA investigation.

2.52.5.B.3: It was determined that Officer C used non-LLC, in the form of empty hand control, and that no use of force occurred during this incident. This issue was evaluated under the APD's Low Level Control Audit and therefore was reviewed but not duplicated in the CPOA investigation.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 077-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 05/17/2026, F submitted a complaint to the CPOA for an incident on 05/02/2026 at 0945 hours on *"5th Street a few blocks north of Lomas."* Ms. F ; reported that Sgt. C stopped her for speeding but never told her her speed nor the speed limit. While looking for her paperwork, Sgt. C asked her to step out of the car and said she committed the crime of speeding and she said it was a violation not a crime. She told Sgt. C she would not step out, rolled up her window, but he reached inside her car, grabbed her door handle, and opened her driver door. She wanted Sgt. C and Officer C to be investigated and brought to justice under charges of assault, intimidation, excessive force, property damage, vandalism, and violating her constitutional right repeatedly throughout this incident.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: PSA P

Other Materials: Email communications, nmcourts records, citizen evidence, & LLC audit.

Date Investigation Completed: September 24, 2026

Albuquerque - Making History 1706-2006

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.48.4.B.1.c

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.48.4.B.1.c: It was determined that PSA P did not inventory the property in Ms. F vehicle, nor did he include the tow truck driver's signature on the Tow-In Report as required by SOP. An inventory search is required when a vehicle is towed. The CPOA recommends a 8 hour suspension.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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

Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 077-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 05/17/2026, F ; submitted a complaint to the CPOA for an incident on 05/02/2026 at 0945 hours on *"5th Street a few blocks north of Lomas."* Ms. F ; reported that Sgt. C stopped her for speeding but never told her her speed nor the speed limit. While looking for her paperwork, Sgt. C asked her to step out of the car and said she committed the crime of speeding and she said it was a violation not a crime. She told Sgt. C she would not step out, rolled up her window, but he reached inside her car, grabbed her door handle, and opened her driver door. She wanted Sgt. C and Officer C to be investigated and brought to justice under charges of assault, intimidation, excessive force, property damage, vandalism, and violating her constitutional right repeatedly throughout this incident.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sgt. C

Other Materials: Email communications, nmcourts records, citizen evidence, & LLC audit.

Date Investigation Completed: September 24, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 2.52.5.B.3

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☑
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☑
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: It was determined that Sgt. C obtained information from Ms. F in a professional, prompt, and courteous manner, and then acted upon it in a proper and judicious manner within the scope of his duties.

2.52.5.B.3: It was determined that Sgt. C did not use any force against Ms. F during this incident. Other officers removed Ms. F from the vehicle, which was examined under APD's Low-Level Control Audit.

Additional issue not under an SOP: Ms. F claim videos did not show what she recalled and therefore alleged the lapel recordings were edited with AI. The videos are a secured closed system and cannot be edited.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 21, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 078-26

COMPLAINT:

Ms. G : reported that the Male Sergeant told her to listen to the female Sergeant and told Ms. G : that she may not like it, but he was going to tell her anyway. Ms. G : reported that the female who slashed her tires had been driving drunk with her kids, and the officers didn't do anything to her.

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant K

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: August 27, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☑
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: It was determined that although Sergeant K made some of the comments to Ms. G : that were reported in her complaint, nothing Sergeant K did or said rose to the level of violating the policy in question. All the officers interviewed confirmed they did not observe the female subject driving a vehicle at any time. Sergeant K's role was limited in the situation.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 21, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 078-26

COMPLAINT:

Ms. G : reported that the female Sergeant with red hair was frustrated with her, telling her, "I'm not just understanding and trying to make sense of this," and that when the dispatcher told Ms. G : to leave, she should have left. Ms. G : reported that she told the female Sergeant that Ms. G : had a video recording of her neighbor's actions, and the female Sergeant told her she didn't care and didn't need it right now. Ms. G : reported that she asked for the Female Sergeant for her information, but was told she didn't need to provide it.

Ms. G : reported that the female who slashed her tires had been driving drunk with her kids, and the officers didn't do anything to her.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant S

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: August 27, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: It was determined that Sergeant S did not deny Ms. G her information, and she did not tell Ms. G : that she didn't care about her video evidence. Sergeant S never saw the female offender driving a vehicle and could not cite her for driving under the influence. Sergeant S did tell Ms. G : that she didn't understand her and was trying to make sense of what she was telling the officers. Although Sergeant S made some of the comments to Ms. G : that were reported in her complaint, nothing Sergeant S did or said rose to the level of violating the policy in question.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 21, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 078-26

COMPLAINT:

Ms. G : called the CPOA office to report officer conduct and statements made by officers regarding a neighbor dispute. Ms. G : reported that the female Native American Officer told Ms. G : that she provoked her neighbors by putting a camera in her bedroom window, telling her she should never have done that. The female officer also told Ms. G that we (the police) can't just press charges; they can't keep knocking on Ms. G 's neighbor's door; Ms. G would have to go to court and handle that herself. Ms. G : reported that the officers did nothing to the people who slashed her tires. She reported that the female who slashed her tires had been driving drunk with her kids, and the officers didn't do anything to her.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer C

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: August 27, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.60.4.C.1.a

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: It was determined that Officer C told Ms. G : that she should have stopped engaging with the other female. Officer C charged the female offender with criminal damage. Officer C never saw the female offender driving a vehicle and could not cite her for driving under the influence. Although Officer C made some of the comments to Ms. G : that were reported in her complaint, nothing Officer C did or said rose to the level of violating the policy in question.

2.60.4.C.1.a: It was determined that Officer C violated the SOP in question as she did not secure the evidence (the knife) used to puncture the complainant's tire as evidence. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 21, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 080-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/19/2026, M filed a complaint with the Civilian Police Oversight Agency regarding her encounter with Officer S at Lakewood Motors on 03/10/2026. Ms. M reported that Officer S interrupted her while she tried to express concerns about S , the owner, who allegedly pushed her and grabbed her arm. Instead of addressing her claims, Officer S focused on speaking with Mr. S for about 15 minutes, giving Ms. M only two minutes. Ms. M felt disrespected when Officer S told her to sit away from the car and instructed her to "keep my mouth shut" when discussing a car refund document. She felt that her account was not documented properly and believed she faced discrimination as a woman. Ultimately, Ms. M left feeling unfairly treated.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer S

Other Materials: Email Communications & Court Materials.

Date Investigation Completed: August 24, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.1 & 1.1.5.A.2

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.16.5.B.5 & 2.16.5.C.1

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☑

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.1 - Officer S obtained information from Ms. M in a professional, prompt, and courteous manner.

2.16.5.B.5 - It was determined that Officer S did not ensure her Uniform Incident Report was completed accurately by failing to document Ms. M ; statement about her interaction with Mr. S in her report. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

1.1.5.A.2 - , It was determined that Officer S did not discriminate against Ms. M based on her gender. No evidence was provided or obtained to support the allegation.

2.16.5.C.1 - It was determined that Officer S did not submit her Incident Report by the end of her shift and did not obtain permission to delay it. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 9, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 081-26

COMPLAINT:

M reported that APD records told him his report was not in the system. He reported that because the tow sheet was inaccurate, the report was wrong. He reported that seventeen days had passed and he had not received a copy of the police report.

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: PSA A

Other Materials: Email Communications & Citizen Evidence.

Date Investigation Completed: July 23, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.6.C.1 (Conduct)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☑
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.6.C.1: PSA A did document inaccurate information in her report, specifically vehicle information and the registered owner's information, that were not involved in the crash. PSA A had provided dispatch with an inaccurate license plate, which led to the inaccuracies. PSA A failed to document Mr. M s statement. She acknowledged not confirming the license plate and vehicle identification number on the vehicles and that she used vehicle information from the CAD in her crash report. Evidence also showed that the report was submitted ten days late by PSA A. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 9, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 081-26

COMPLAINT:

M reported that a copy of a tow report had inconsistencies in the vehicle information. He reported that the tow sheet was inaccurate, and because it was inaccurate, the report was wrong. He reported that the inconsistencies on the tow sheet were the other vehicle's make, year, and license plate number.

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: TSO U

Other Materials: Email Communications & Citizen Evidence.

Date Investigation Completed: July 23, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.6.C.1 (Conduct)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☑
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.6.C.1: TSO U did not inventory the vehicles, verify Vehicle Identification Numbers on the Tow-In Report, or obtain the tow truck drivers' signature on the Tow-In Reports pursuant to APD SOP 2-48. Additionally, TSO U incorrectly listed a vehicle on a Tow-In Report, including the owner's information for a vehicle that was not involved in the crash. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 086-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/28/2026, Anayo (A submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred between 1600 and 1700 hours on 05/27/2026 at 1000 hours. She called APD and asked to speak with a lieutenant, and the lieutenant called her back. She spoke with Lieutenant V, who told her not to call anymore. She said that Lieutenant V told her that he had been doing this for a long time and that his officers were right. He told her that they could not tell her what she wanted to hear and he told her that they were not going to investigate this further because they did not see any foul play.

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: No

APD Employee Involved: Lieutenant V

Other Materials: Email Communications and Office of the Medical Investigator Reports

Date Investigation Completed: August 28, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4; Public Welfare

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☑
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4; It was determined Lieutenant V did not violate APD policy when he told Ms. A that her brother's case would not be assigned to homicide detectives unless otherwise contacted by OMI. Ms. A advised Lieutenant V was nice, but still had complaints because he said APD would not investigate further. Lieutenant V attempted to answer her questions, and tried to explain the procedure for this case, but Ms. A continued to repeated the same allegations over and over about the people who found her brother's body, and why she thought they murdered him. Lieutenant V remained patient and professional with her until she used racial slurs against Sergeant H, at which time he discontinued the phone call. OMI determined her brother's death was accidental and not suspicious, with details provided in the OMI report.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 086-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/28/2026, A (A submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred between 1600 and 1700 hours on 05/27/2026 at 1000 hours. Her brother D A was found deceased near a dumpster behind an AutoZone. She reported that Sergeant H was rude to her, being an ass, and told her not to call his officers anymore, he would not answer and he didn't care. She also said that Sergeant H treated her deceased brother like a tramp, a piece of trash, and a homeless guy simply because he was found next to a dumpster.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant H

Other Materials: Email Communications and Office of the Medical Investigator Reports

Date Investigation Completed: August 28, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.2; Public Welfare

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed:

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.1; Public Welfare

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.1; It was determined that Sergeant H did not violate policy with regards to being rude to Ms. A He was stern and direct, but not rude. However a review of Sergeant H's OBRD footage revealed that he told Officer R that two other citizens were like cockroaches. This was unprofessional and captured on the public record. Sergeant H acknowledged that this was inappropriate, but also said that he meant it in jest. He thought he had a sense of humor, and the two people popped out of the shadows and appeared out of nowhere. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

1.1.5.A.2; It was determined that there was no evidence was submitted or reviewed to support this allegation. Furthermore, it appeared that all APD SOPs were followed regarding notifying CSS and OMI, and Sergeant H offered his condolences to Ms. A There was no evidence which indicated that Sergeant H had knowledge of whether the decedent was unhoused, his economic status, or anything else about him.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 086-26

COMPLAINT:

On 05/28/2026, A (A submitted a telephone complaint to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred between 1600 and 1700 hours on 05/27/2026 at 1000 hours. Her brother A was found deceased near a dumpster behind an AutoZone. She reported that Officer R said that he would call her back, but he never did. She also said that Officer R treated her deceased brother like a tramp, a piece of trash, and a homeless guy simply because he was found next to a dumpster. She also alleged that Officer R did not treat this case like a homicide even though she thought that the people who found her brother's body were the same people who murdered him. She alleged that Officer R did not conduct an investigation, or watch the correct surveillance footage

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer R

Other Materials: Email Communications and Office of the Medical Investigator Reports

Date Investigation Completed: August 28, 2026

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.2; Public Welfare; 2.60.4.C.1.e; Preliminary Investigations

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4; Public Welfare

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4; It was determined that Officer R spoke with Ms. A and told her he would call her back. After speaking with her, Officer R was instructed by Sergeant H not to call her back, and that APD was not going to do anything further to investigate her brother's death unless OMI found that it was suspicious. Officer R followed his supervisor's directive. 1.1.5.A.2; It was determined that Officer R did not violate APD policy. OBRD footage showed that Officer R was professional and sympathized with Ms. A regarding her brother's loss. No evidence was submitted or reviewed indicating that he treated the decedent as a piece of trash, a tramp, or a homeless guy simply because he was found near a dumpster. 2.60.4.C.1.e; It was determined that Officer R completed all appropriate and required steps for a preliminary criminal investigation, including notifying CSS and OMI of a deceased person. Officer R interviewed the individuals who found the decedent and prepared the police report, documenting all required information. The autopsy confirmed that the decedent died from a toxic exposure to methamphetamine and fentanyl, and was not murdered as alleged by Ms. A

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 089-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 6/2/2026, L sent a complaint to the CPOA. Ms. L reported on 6/1/2026 she got a call from someone claiming to be Walmart trying to deliver groceries; they had the wrong address and needed to update it. They asked if she lived on Cromwell; she said *"no"* and gave her correct address. She didn't think anything as her mother always orders Walmart delivery. She got a call saying to go outside, questioned if it was Walmart, looked out her window, and saw no one. She locked her doors and called her boyfriend. She saw APD around her home, they knocked, and rang her doorbell until her boyfriend arrived. Cops surrounded her neighborhood, and she knew she was innocent and they had the wrong person, so she went outside. They pointed guns at her, detained her, got her information, then let her go

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer C

Other Materials: Email communications and ShareBase evidence.

Date Investigation Completed: September 4, 2026

Albuquerque - Making History 1706-2006

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 2.56.4.B.2.a

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☑
2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☐
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

2.56.4.B.2.a: It was determined that Officer C did not use a show of force during this incident.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 089-26

COMPLAINT:

On 6/2/2026, L sent a complaint to the CPOA. Ms. L reported on 6/1/2026 she got a call from someone claiming to be Walmart trying to deliver groceries; they had the wrong address and needed to update it. They asked if she lived on Cromwell; she said *"no"* and gave her correct address. She didn't think anything as her mother always orders Walmart delivery. She got a call saying to go outside, questioned if it was Walmart, looked out her window, and saw no one. She locked her doors and called her boyfriend. She saw APD around her home, they knocked, and rang her doorbell until her boyfriend arrived. Cops surrounded her neighborhood, and she knew she was innocent and they had the wrong person, so she went outside. They pointed guns at her, detained her, got her information, then let her go

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer W

Other Materials: Email communications and ShareBase evidence.

Date Investigation Completed: September 4, 2026

Albuquerque - Making History 1706-2006

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 2.56.4.B.2.a

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.71.4.A.1

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.8.5.A

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.8.5.A: It was determined that Officer W failed to activate his OBRD at the initiation of the investigative encounter with Ms. L : via telephone. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

2.56.4.B.2.a: It was determined that Officer W did not use a show of force during this incident. OBRD showed any weapons drawn were at a low ready position.

2.71.4.A.1: It was determined that Officer W detained Ms. L : based on arrest warrant information for a female with the same name and had reasonable suspicion that Ms. L was the wanted female. Some additional information was showing as the same in both records.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 090-26

COMPLAINT:

On 06/03/2026, G submitted a telephone complaint to the CPOA regarding an incident that occurred between 1400 and 1500 hours on 05/28/2026 at "2nd and I40 Under the bridge near Freeway Liquor Store". Ms. G reported she was arrested for smoking drugs under the bridge near Freeway Liquor Store. Ms. G stated when she was released she was told by her friend that her personal belongings were found in the trash and that a street person had her ID, EBT Card, Cash App Card and her boyfriend's EBT Card. Ms. G complaint is against officer H, that here property was not handled appropriately and does not know how her personal items ended up in the trash. Ms. G believed that Officer H threw her personal items in the trash.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer H

Other Materials: Email Communications & SOP 2.73.

Date Investigation Completed: August 31, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.6.C.1 (Conduct)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☑

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.6.C.1: It was determined that Officer H did not collect all of Ms. G ; personal property, safeguard all of her property, and document and record the disposal of her property, specifically Ms. G black backpack. The red purse was left at the scene, allowing important items and money to be stolen or discarded. Therefore, Officer H did not meet the roles and responsibilities required by his position to maintain the department's functions, objectives, and standards of efficiency. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 23, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 097-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 06/10/2026, · M · submitted a report to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 06/10/2026 at 1330 hours at 734 San Mateo Boulevard Southeast. Mr. M reported, "These officers forced us to give access to our private property to a construction company. When I refused, they threatened to bring someone to cut our locks and move an employee's van off of my private property without a warrant. The matter of property ownership has been questioned by city parking enforcement and found it's not a city easement but my private property. They refused to check.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): No CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer P

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 8, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: The investigation determined that Ofc. P maintained his professionalism while on scene and was respectful during his interactions with Mr. M and his employees. Ofc. P acted in a proper and judicious manner within the scope of his duties. The investigation determined that although Ofc. P did contact Code Enforcement as alleged, he did so to utilize an additional third party to confirm that the property information he observed on the Bernalillo County Assessor's website was correct, and not as an intimidation tactic, and that Mr. M had no authority or right to restrict access. Ofc. P contacted neighbors and learned that before Mr. M obtained the business, they could use the alleyway/easement without restriction. On the Bernalillo County Assessor's website, Mr. M name was not listed as the registered/legal owner of the property at 734 San Mateo Blvd. SE. The allegation that officers and utility employees forced their way onto the property without a court order or warrant was not applicable because Mr. M was not the property owner and did not provide proof.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 23, 2026

Via Certified Mail

[redacted]

Re: CPC # 097-26

COMPLAINT:

On 06/10/2026, [redacted] M [redacted] submitted a report to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 06/10/2026 at 1330 hours at 734 San Mateo Boulevard Southeast. Mr. M [redacted] reported, "These officers forced us to give access to our private property to a construction company. When I refused, they threatened to bring someone to cut our locks and move an employee's van off of my private property without a warrant. The matter of property ownership has been questioned by city parking enforcement and found it's not a city easement but my private property. They refused to check.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): No CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer D

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 8, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

1.1.5.A.4: It was determined that Ofc. D maintained his professionalism while on-scene and was respectful during his interaction with Mr. M When Mr. M spoke to Sergeant J, he commented on Ofc. D's respectfulness. Ofc. D acted in a proper and judicious manner within the scope of his duties. The investigation determined that Ofc. D contacted Code Enforcement to use an additional third party to confirm that the property information he observed on the Bernalillo County Assessor's website was correct, that the alleyway/easement was public property, and that Mr. M had no authority or right to restrict access. Ofc. D contacted neighbors and learned that before Mr. M obtained the business, they could use the alleyway/easement without restriction. On the Bernalillo County Assessor's website, Mr. M name was not listed as the registered/legal owner of the property at 734 San Mateo Blvd. SE. The allegation that officers and utility employees forced their way onto the property without a court order or warrant was not applicable because Mr. M was not the property owner and did not provide proof.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 23, 2026

Via Certified Mail

Re: CPC # 097-26

COMPLAINT:

On 06/10/2026, M submitted a report to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred on 06/10/2026 at 1330 hours at 734 San Mateo Boulevard Southeast. Mr. M reported, "These officers forced us to give access to our private property to a construction company. When I refused, they threatened to bring someone to cut our locks and move an employee's van off of my private property without a warrant. The matter of property ownership has been questioned by city parking enforcement and found it's not a city easement but my private property. They refused to check.

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): No CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: No

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer B

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 8, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.4

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☑

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☐

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

It was determined that Ofc. B maintained his professionalism while on-scene and was respectful during his interaction with Mr. M When Mr. M spoke to Sergeant J, he commented on Ofc. B's respectfulness. Ofc. B acted in a proper and judicious manner within the scope of his duties. The investigation determined that Ofc. B observed his field training officer, Ofc. D contact Code Enforcement to use an additional third party to confirm that the property information he observed on the Bernalillo County Assessor's website was correct, that the alleyway/easement was public property, and that Mr. M had no authority or right to restrict access. Ofc. B contacted neighbors and learned that before Mr. M obtained the business, they could use the alleyway/easement without restriction. On the Bernalillo County Assessor's website, Mr. M name was not listed as the registered/legal owner of the property at 734 San Mateo Blvd. SE. The allegation that officers and utility employees forced their way onto the property without a court order or warrant was not applicable because Mr. M was not the owner of record.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 107-26

COMPLAINT:

On 07/06/2026, V submitted an online complaint to the CPOA regarding an incident that occurred on 05/19/2026 at 1600 hours at 509 Indiana Street Southeast, Apartment C. Ms. V reported that Officer R's report documenting the incident was incorrect because he documented that "S did not make advances to try and grab the child as stepped in front," even though she did try to grab Ms. V child. In addition, Ms. V reported that Officer R failed to appear in court for a trial on 07/06/2026, resulting in the charges being dismissed.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Officer R

Other Materials: Email Communications & Court Documents.

Date Investigation Completed: August 25, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer.	☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.16.5.B.5 (Reports) & 2.76.4.F.1 (Court)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer.	☑
3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur.	☐
4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training.	☐
5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur.	☐
6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile.	☐

Additional Comments:

2.16.5.B.5 - It was determined that Officer R's report did not accurately reflect Ms. V statement. Officer R's OBRD footage showed that Ms. V told Officer R several times that the female tried to take her baby, saying things like, "She came in and literally tried to take my baby out of my apartment." When describing how the female entered the apartment, Ms. V made a motion like a person walking with her hands out, seemingly describing how the female reached for the baby as she entered the apartment. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

2.76.4.F.1 - It was determined that Officer R failed to appear at the trial scheduled for 07/06/2026. Court documents show his failure to appear as the reason for dismissal. During his interview, Officer R admitted he did not appear in court and cited a scheduling error as the reason. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 115-26

COMPLAINT:

On 07/15/2026, M submitted a complaint to the CPOA via US Mail regarding an incident that occurred on 07/06/2026 at 2130 hours at 12826 Dorado Drive Southeast, Apartment 3. Ms. M called to report the theft of her camera from her residence, and Sergeant A responded. Sergeant A lectured Ms. M about having the camera, then dismissed her request for a report and did not file it.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): N/A CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant A

Other Materials: Email Communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 2, 2026

Albuquerque - Making History 1706-2006

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.16.5.B.1 (Reports)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 1.1.5.A.1 (Conduct)

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☑

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.8.5.D.1 (OBRD)

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.16.5.B.1: It was determined that Sgt. A did not create a Uniform Incident Report after Ms. M ı reported the theft of her camera. While Sgt. A said that his failure to create a report was an oversight and not done intentionally, the fact remains that Ms. M ı reported a crime and a Uniform Incident Report was not created to document it after he advised he would. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

2.8.5.D.1: It was determined that Sgt. A's OBRD had died and he did not document the justifiable reason why this mandatory recording event was not captured in its entirety. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

1.1.5.A.1: Insufficient evidence existed to determine the nature of the conversation between Sgt. A and Ms. M ı regarding her camera. They both offered conflicting statements about the conversation. As Sgt. A's OBRD recording did not include the reported interaction, and there were no witnesses present, there appeared to be no independent evidence that indicated which version of events took place.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 118-26

COMPLAINT:

On 07/19/2026, W : submitted an email complaint on behalf of Vincent P : to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency (CPOA) regarding an incident that occurred between 1900 and 1945 hours on 05/22/2026 at 4221 Osuna Road Northeast. Ms. W : reported that a police vehicle lifted their 2016 Lexus off the ground, damaging it and crashing it into another police vehicle. Ms. W : reported that the actions constituted a use of force and an assault. Ms. W later reported by email that she spoke with Mr. P on 07/29/2026, and he provided additional details. She said Mr. Ptold her that when APD Officers arrested him, they threw Mr. P on the hot pavement, causing burns and open wounds on his body. Ms. W : said she believed it was "excessive force/police brutality."

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Detective L

Other Materials: Email communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 4, 2026

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

Albuquerque - Making History 1706-2006

FINDINGS

Policies Reviewed: 2.52.4.D.1 (Use of Force)

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☑

Policies Reviewed: 2.16.5.C.1 (Reports)

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☑

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.8.4.E (OBRD)

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.52.4.D.1 - , it was determined that Detective L did not use force on Mr. P when deploying the grappler. Per APD Standard Operating Procedure 2.101.4.3.c, *"The Grappler device is considered a low-level control tactic and, therefore, is not a reportable Use of Force, unless there is a complaint of pain or injury."* There was no evidence in any reports, OBRD recordings, or testimony that indicated that Mr. P made any complaints of pain or injury.

2.16.5.C.1 - It was determined that Detective L did not submit a police report within the required timeline. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

2.8.4.E - , It was determined that Detective L did not use his Department-issued OBRD to record his interaction with Mr. P While Detective L explained his reasoning, the Standard Operating Procedure allows no exceptions or circumstances in which APD personnel may use an OBRD that is not issued to them. The CPOA recommends a non-disciplinary corrective action.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:

1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

CIVILIAN POLICE OVERSIGHT AGENCY

September 30, 2026

Via Email

Re: CPC # 118-26

COMPLAINT:

PO Box 1293

Albuquerque

NM 87103

www.cabq.gov

On 07/19/2026, W submitted an email complaint on behalf of Vincent P to the Civilian Police Oversight Agency regarding an incident that occurred between 1900 and 1945 hours on 05/22/2026 at 4221 Osuna Road Northeast. Ms. W reported that a police vehicle driven by APD personnel lifted their 2016 Lexus off the ground, damaging it and crashing it into another police vehicle. Ms. W reported that APD deliberately ran into their vehicle. Ms. W reported that the actions constituted a use of force and an assault.

EVIDENCE REVIEWED:

Video(s): Yes APD Report(s): Yes CAD Report(s): Yes

Complainant Interviewed: Yes Witness(es) Interviewed: N/A

APD Employee Interviewed: Yes

APD Employee Involved: Sergeant W

Other Materials: Email communications

Date Investigation Completed: September 4, 2026

FINDINGS

1. **Unfounded**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by clear and convincing evidence, that alleged misconduct did not occur or did not involve the subject officer. ☐

2. **Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, the alleged misconduct did occur by the subject officer. ☐

3. **Not Sustained**. Investigation classification when the investigator(s) is unable to determine one way or the other, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the alleged misconduct either occurred or did not occur. ☐

4. **Exonerated**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, that alleged conduct in the underlying complaint did occur but did not violate APD policies, procedures, or training. ☐

Policies Reviewed: 2.101.4.B.4.b (Use of Grappler)

5. **Sustained Violation Not Based on Original Complaint**. Investigation classification where the investigator(s) determines, by a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct did occur that was not alleged in the original complaint (whether CPC or internal complaint) but that other misconduct was discovered during the investigation, and by a preponderance of the evidence, that misconduct did occur. ☑

6. **Administratively Closed**. Investigation classification where the investigator determines: The policy violations of a minor nature and do not constitute a pattern of misconduct (i.e. a violation subject to a class 7 sanction, -the allegations are duplicative; -the allegations, even if true, do not constitute misconduct; or -the investigation cannot be conducted because of the lack of information in the complaint, and further investigation would be futile. ☐

Additional Comments:

2.101.4.B.4.b - it was determined that Sergeant W did not complete an entry on the Internal Affairs database documenting the deployment of the grappler in this incident. A search of the database yielded no results, and Sergeant W confirmed that he did not create an entry to document it. The CPOA recommends a written reprimand.

You have the right to appeal this decision. If you are not satisfied with the findings and/or recommendations of the CPOA Executive Director within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of this letter, communicate your desire to have an appeal hearing before the CPOA Advisory Board in a signed writing addressed to the CPOA Director. Please send your request to P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103, or by email to CPOA@cabq.gov. Include your CPC number. Upon receipt of the communication, a hearing on the matter will be scheduled at the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting provided there is at least 14 business days between the receipt of the request and the next meeting. In order for the Advisory Board to modify the Director's findings, your appeal must demonstrate one or more of the following:


1) A policy was misapplied in the evaluation of the complaint;
2) That the findings or recommendations were arbitrary, capricious or constituted an abuse of discretion; or
3) that the findings and recommendations were not consistent with the record evidence.

Administratively closed complaints maybe re-opened if additional information becomes available. Please provide your additional information in writing to the CPOA Director as listed above.

If you are not satisfied with the final disciplinary decision of the Office of Police Reform or any matter relating to the Office of Police Reform's handling of the complaint you may request a review of the complaint by the City's Chief Administrative Officer by sending a letter to the Office of the Mayor, P.O. Box 1293, Albuquerque, NM 87103. Your request must be in writing and within 30 calendar days (inclusive of holidays and weekends) of receipt of the Office of Police Reform letter. Include your CPC number. The review by the Chief Administrative Officer is independent of the Advisory Board.

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



Diane McDermott
Executive Director
(505) 924-3770

cc: Albuquerque Police Department Chief of Police