

Appendix B Table for Paragraphs 60 – 77.

* Cases completed by IAFD personnel who are EFIT Graduates are indicated with an Asterix.

Para.	Paragraph Provision	IMR-18-11	IMR-18-12	IMR-18-13	IMR-18-14	IMR-18-15	*IMR-18-16	IMR-18-17	*IMR-18-18	*IMR-18-19	*IMR-18-20	*IMR-18-21	*IMR-18-22	*IMR-18-23	*IMR-18-24	IMR-18-25	IMR-18-26	IMR-18-27	IMR-18-28	IMR-18-29	IMR-18-30	IMR-18-31	
60	IAFD investigations - L2/L2, UoF - criminal, above Sgt, as reassigned	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹	Y	Y	Y	Y	
60	Reassignment of criminal invest. to another investigator	N/A	Y ²	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y ³	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y ⁴	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
60	Criminal invest. - separate & independent of any admin. invest.	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	
60 ⁵	If MATF handle criminal invest, IAFD conducts admin. invest.	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
63	L2/L3 UoF investigated fully & fairly by appropriate staff	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N ⁶	Y
63	Deficiencies related to the use of force are identified & corrected	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N	Y ⁷	
63	Quality invests. are conducted so officers can be held accountable	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

¹ This case was not identified as a use of force case at the time of the incident. APD became aware of the incident two months after its occurrence when they received an IPRA request from the subject alleging excessive force. An IAFD investigation was initiated along with an IA investigation for failing to report a UoF and for an OBRD violation. Existing OBRD video does not strongly support a Level 2 takedown. IA investigation sustained a written reprimand for an OBRD violation, but officers were exonerated for not reporting a UoF.

² This officer-involved shooting was handled by the MATF and IAFD handled the administrative investigation.

³ This officer-involved shooting was handled by the MATF and IAFD handled the administrative investigation.

⁴ This case involved a criminal trespass that was observed by an APD lieutenant, where a suspect ran to evade detention. A civilian was detained by two assisting officers who they believed matched the description of the person broadcast over the police radio. The original lieutenant confirmed that the subject was not the person that fled from him earlier. At that point the subject should have been released, but instead the lieutenant continued to detain the subject. The civilian eventually ran and force was used during a takedown by one officer. The force investigation concluded that there was no a legal justification for the detention of the civilian at the time the force was used, therefore the force was deemed to be out of policy. The case was referred to the MATF and forwarded to the DA office for review. Discipline was given to the lieutenant following an internal affairs investigation. No charges were levied against the civilian on whom force was used.

⁵ Paragraphs 61 and 62 are not evaluated on a case-by-case basis and are not included in the chart.

⁶ This case involved an officer who took a shoplifting subject into custody with the assistance of another officer after a short foot pursuit. The originating officer lost professional demeanor and failed to utilize de-escalation to his advantage during the arrest. The officer's use of profanity and screaming at the subject was not addressed in any manner during the use of force investigation. The failure to acknowledge and address the officer's demeanor, and how it may have impacted the need to use or continue to use force, impacted several CASA requirements. Statements included, "Put your hands behind your fucking back asshole."

⁷ This case involved numerous officers making an apprehension of two suspects in a stolen vehicle. When one of the suspects who resisted arrest was being taken into custody, one officer used a closed hand and struck the suspect three times and used a knee strike after the suspect stopped resisting. The knee strike was found to be out of policy by IAFD, and an ensuing internal affairs investigation sustained a policy violation against the officer.

63	Chief's / Bureau of Police Reform discretion on hiring and retaining staff for IAFD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
64	IAFD staff trained prior to conducting UoF invests.	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
64 ⁸	IAFD staff shall receive annual UoF in-service training	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69	All investigators of L2/L3 UoF shall:																						
69a	Respond to scene; consult with on-scene supervisor to ensure:	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69a	All personnel & subject(s) of UoF have been examined for injuries	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69a	The UoF has been classified according to APD's procedures	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69a	Subject has opportunity to indicate pain or injury	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69a	Officers/subject(s) have received medical attention, if applicable	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69b	Review OBRD	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ⁹	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁰	Y	Y	Y
69c	Collect all evidence to establish material facts related to the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69d	A canvass for, and interview of, witnesses is conducted	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A ¹¹	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹²	Y ¹³	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y ¹⁴	Y	Y	Y
69d	Witnesses should be requested to provide written or video recorded statements	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
69e	Ensure all officers witnessing a L2/L3 UoF provide a UoF narrative	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
69f	Provide written admonishments to officer(s) not to speak about UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

⁸ Paragraphs 65 – 68 are in self-assessment status.

⁹ An officer received a written reprimand for an OBRD violation.

¹⁰ The IAFD Investigation Form indicates in two parts of the report (page 2) that the officer who used force captured the force on their OBRD. This is not accurate as the OBRD fell off the officer. This fact is noted in other locations throughout the report.

¹¹ MATF handles canvassing on officer-involved shootings.

¹² The location of this event was a well-traveled convenience store and gas station. Patrons enter and leave the establishment quickly. Attempts were made to obtain surveillance footage of the event and identify witnesses, with negative results.

¹³ The area where the subject was taken into custody was remote and out of sight of potential witnesses.

¹⁴ This event occurred inside the bedroom of a residence. The occupants of the house (the subject's parents) were interviewed, and one refused to give a written statement.

71d	Tactical/Training assessment & if de-escalation could avoid UoF	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y ¹⁵	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
71e	If officer's cert. & training for a weapon used in UoF was current	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
71f	Complete disciplinary history of target officers involved in the UoF	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
72	Forward the investigation to the Commander	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
72	Commander to ensure complete and PoE	Y	N ¹⁶	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	
72	Commander shall order additional invest when appropriate	N/A	N ¹⁷	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y ¹⁸	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
73	Commander action when an invest. isn't supported by PoE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
73	Commander action on deficient invests.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N	N/A	
73	Commanders responsible for the accuracy/completeness of invests	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
74	Appropriate intervention for repeated deficient invests	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
75 ¹⁹	Complete UoF review - file shall be forwarded to FRB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	

¹⁵ The officer was verbally counseled for leaving the subject seated and handcuffed on a sidewalk next to the business establishment.

¹⁶ The IAFD investigator and first line of supervision made findings that the use of deadly force by two officers at a minimum violated APD policy. These findings were changed at the IAFD Deputy Command level. It is the collective finding of the IMT that the preponderance of evidence does not support a finding that the use of deadly force by these officers was within the parameters of APD policy. It should be noted here that EFIT also found the use of deadly force to be out of policy. This case is more particularly discussed in Paragraph 78.

¹⁷ No additional investigation was ordered to document additional relevant evidence to resolve inconsistencies or to support the investigative findings made by the IAFD deputy commander that directly contradicted the findings of the investigator and first-line supervisor.

¹⁸ In this case the commander believed there may have been an OBRD violation and referred the concern to the proper investigating entity.

¹⁹ Paragraph 76 is in self-assessment status.

77	Bureau of Police Reform shall ensure appropriate action for policy violations	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	Y ²⁰	N/A	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N/A	Y ²¹	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N ²²	Y ²³
77	Bureau of Police Reform ensures IAFD/MATF consults with DA/USAO on crim. matters	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
77	Bureau of Police Reform need not delay imposition of discipline until crim. invest. closed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N	Y
77	Chief or Bureau of Police Reform ensures necessary training is delivered & concerns resolved	Y	N/A	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	Y ²⁴	Y	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	Y	N/A	N/A	N	Y

²⁰ An internal affairs investigation was initiated against two officers. One violation was for failing to properly activate their OBRD, and the other was for failing to secure an item of evidence that was related to the underlying legal justification for the arrest.

²¹ An IAR was generated for a potential violation of policy. The officer placed the subject in the back seat of his patrol vehicle handcuffed and face down, which was investigated as a violation of policy. The ensuing internal affairs investigation did not sustain the violation.

²² APD referred this investigation for a policy violation due to an assisting officer failing to double-lock handcuffs. However, no referral was made regarding the officer failing to maintain a professional demeanor or de-escalation concerns during the arrest.

²³ The investigation determined that one officer's use of a knee strike at the end of the apprehension of a suspect was out of policy. The violation was referred for an internal affairs investigation and a sustained finding was the result.

²⁴ An officer was referred to the academy for tactical / officer safety concerns.