

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/16/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that responding officers failed to properly investigate an assault committed against him. He claimed that the officers did not take sufficient steps to address the seriousness of the incident or to follow up with the suspect.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant visibly upset, stating that his client had “assaulted and nearly kidnapped” him. He explained that their conflict started during a disagreement over dog training methods. He said the client jumped over a couch, grabbed his jacket, and tried to pull him back into the house. The complainant slipped out of his jacket and ran outside, yelling for help. The named officers and backup units tried to contact the client by ringing the doorbell, but the client did not respond. The officers asked the complainant if he was injured; he said he was “physically okay.” After taking his statement, the officers classified the incident as a misdemeanor and explained that they could not enter the home without a warrant. This explanation upset the complainant further. He became emotional and felt the officers were dismissive and unhelpful. Named Officer #2 wrote down the incident report number and tried to give it to him. Named Officer #1 explained that a sergeant could review the report to decide whether it met the criteria for a crime, but the complainant refused to listen. The complainant then requested to speak with a sergeant, and the officers promptly requested one to the scene.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) confirmed that the complainant called emergency services to report being assaulted. The dispatch notes indicated a dispute between the complainant, referred to as the reporting party, and the client, identified as the subject, arising from a business-related disagreement. The complainant told dispatch that the suspect tried to assault him and had placed his hands on the complainant’s neck. The CAD noted that officers responded, queried the VIN number of the suspect’s vehicle, and that the complainant refused to take the case number when the officer attempted to provide it, as the complainant continued to call 9-1-1. Police officers may not force entry into a home to make an arrest for battery without a warrant.

Department General Orders (DGO) 2.01, Section 16 states that officers assigned to an incident are responsible for conducting a thorough and complete investigation at the scene unless relieved by higher authority.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/16/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 5**

The named officers took reasonable steps to investigate the complainant's allegations. They responded promptly to the call, activated their body-worn cameras, interviewed the complainant, documented his account, and made several attempts to contact the suspect. They also escalated the matter appropriately by involving a supervisor when the complainant requested it.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer didn't hand the complainant their follow-up form and instead threw it on the ground.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the officer attempted to hand the form to the complainant; however, the complainant refused to receive it. The officer asked the complainant if he wanted the incident report information, but the complainant (who was on the phone) continued to ignore the officer and her partner. The officer then told the complainant that if he didn't want to receive it, then it would be left on the ground for him. The complainant continued to ignore both officers.

Department General Order 2.01 Rule 8 (b) states that when acting in the performance of their duties, members shall treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/16/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to properly supervise.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officer failed to investigate the complainant's assault/battery after hearing their statement.

Body-worn camera footage showed the sergeant speaking with the complainant and explaining why the officers lacked a basis to force entry into the home. The complainant continued to argue that they should investigate and refused to let the officer respond or explain further regarding the legal limits of entering the residence without a warrant. When it became clear that the complainant would not accept the explanation, the officer firmly told him that he would not continue debating and ended the interaction.

Department General Order 1.04 in the relevant part, that sergeants shall train and lead subordinates in the performance of their duties and set an example of efficiency and deportment. Additionally, sergeants shall have immediate control and supervision of assigned members. This sergeant responded to the scene and attempted to explain the process given that a misdemeanor occurred outside of officers' presence. The complainant refused to listen.

Given that the responding officers had already taken the complainant's statement before the sergeant arrived, and the complainant did not provide any new information at the scene, evidence shows that the alleged conduct did occur; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/16/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** UA

**FINDING:** U

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officer contacted 9-1-1 dispatch and instructed them to stop taking the complainant's calls regarding this incident.

Body-worn camera footage showed a different officer telling the complainant that they would instruct Dispatch to stop communicating with him. However, when the officer radioed dispatch, they simply stated, "Just be advised our victim (the complainant) in the case number is refusing to take it at this particular point."

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) showed that there was no request from the named officer or any officer telling Dispatch not to take the complainant's calls.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged in the complaint did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/16/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 5 of 5**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officer refused to provide their badge number.

Body-worn camera footage contradicts the complainant's account of the incident. The complainant inquired if the officer had his body-worn camera activated and then requested the officer's badge number. The officer confirmed that his body-worn camera was indeed activated, provided his badge number, and ended the discussion.

Department General Order 2.01 Rule 8 (e) states that when requested, the member shall promptly provide their name, star number, and assignment.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/18/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she approached two officers and asked them to assist her with a friend who was experiencing a medical emergency, but the officers continued issuing a citation instead. The complainant described the officers but did not recall names or other identifying information.

A search for Department records failed to reveal officers on duty on the date and time identified by the complainant that matched her description of the two officers. An officer identification poll was sent to the district station where the incident occurred. The poll failed to identify any officers involved.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not reasonably be identified, or the officer is no longer with the Department and therefore is no longer subject to Department discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/26/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 08/18/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer drove a City vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant alleged that two patrol vehicles loudly sped through a school zone as if the officers were drag racing. The complainant stated the exhaust fumes were noticeable based on how hard the officers were accelerating. The complainant also alleged that officers regularly speed along this road, describing their behavior as disgustingly reckless and irresponsible.

DPA reviewed the camera footage of the incident provided by the complainant. The footage shows a patrol vehicle with its lights activated speeding down a residential street. A resident can be seen walking their trash can to the sidewalk, followed by a second patrol vehicle that also speeds down the block. The video does not capture the numbers on the patrol vehicles or provide images of the officers involved. The incident took place in the middle of the night on a well-lit street with no pedestrian or vehicle traffic.

DPA conducted comprehensive computer queries to identify the officers or the call for service they were responding to. DPA found a Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) that matched the time and location of the alleged incident. The CAD revealed that the officers were responding to an A-priority call, which required emergency response.

Department General Order DGO 5.05.02 (A) states that it is the policy of the Department that members respond Code 3 only when an emergency response appears reasonably necessary to prevent serious injury to persons, whether or not a criminal offense is involved. Additionally, the member responding to the call and/or the member's field supervisor shall determine the appropriate response. A "non-emergency" call may require an emergency response.

The complainant lives near a district police station, and officers frequently respond to emergency calls from that district police station. While DPA acknowledges that the officers were speeding, the camera footage does not support the allegations made in the complaint that the officers were drag racing, and that they showed little regard for the school zone. Based on the totality of circumstance, the evidence proves that the conduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant made a police report about being harassed by an officer. The complainant stated that the named officer failed to investigate the reported harassment.

Because the complainant did not identify a specific officer, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an identification poll to the district station. An identification poll asks officers and supervising officers to review an incident description to identify the officers involved in the interaction. There was no officer identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint. A no finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the named officer challenged him physically and portrayed himself as the world's best hitman.

Because the complainant did not identify a specific officer, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an identification poll to the district station. An identification poll asks officers and supervising officers to review an incident description to identify the officers involved in the interaction. There was no officer identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint. A no finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she got off a plane with her boyfriend and was approached by a plainclothes officer who pulled them aside and detained them at the airport. The officer explained to her that the boyfriend had a probation violation, asked if she was a victim of human trafficking, and ultimately arrested the boyfriend for pimping, pandering, and procurement. The complainant admitted that the boyfriend was known for pimping and is a social media activist. She alleged that she was being detained for no reason.

The officer confirmed detaining the complainant and her boyfriend, stating that he believed the complainant was involved in her boyfriend's criminal activities through prostitution and/or could be a victim of human trafficking. He explained that the boyfriend was on federal probation and was subject to search by law enforcement at that time.

The incident report noted that the officer was conducting a probation search on the complainant's boyfriend that day. It mentioned that the complainant was traveling with the boyfriend at the time, and in past cases, the boyfriend has traveled with women he is pimping. The report stated that the complainant was detained so officers could confirm she was not a victim of human trafficking. The DPA contacted the probation officer for the boyfriend, who confirmed that the boyfriend had a search condition on the day of the incident and was in violation of probation.

Since this incident happened in the San Francisco International Airport (SFO), no body-worn camera was activated.

The evidence gathered proves that the named officer was conducting a probation search on the boyfriend while the two were traveling. The officer was able to articulate a reasonable suspicion that the complainant was either engaging in criminal activities or was a victim of human trafficking and therefore detained her. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer applied handcuffs without justification.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that during detention, she was handcuffed and walked all the way to the investigation room on the other side of the airport, which made her feel very humiliated.

The named officer, who is the supervising officer, said he did not personally put handcuffs on the complainant, but he instructed officers on scene that both the complainant and the boyfriend should be handcuffed to prevent them from fleeing. He explained he did not want officers running through the airport chasing after people. The officer confirmed that he walked the complainant to a room for further investigation and stated that he cannot control the plane's terminal and gate location, nor can he control the substation locations.

Additionally, the named officer said he detained the complainant because he believed she was involved in the boyfriend's criminal enterprise through prostitution and/or might be a victim of human trafficking.

Department records show that the two were walked to the nearest substation to ensure their privacy is being protected.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Department General Order (DGO) 5.01 (Use of Force Policy) states that when a subject is compliant and offers no resistance, handcuffing is a possible force option.

The evidence shows that since the officer suspected criminal activities by the complainant and to prevent her from escaping, it was justified for him to put handcuffs on the complainant. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that her personal information, such as her phone number and address, were leaked to the media by officers claiming they were running a brothel. There was no confidentiality. She also complained that officers treated her as if she had done something wrong and did not thoroughly explain what happened, although she said the officer did tell her she was only being detained.

The officer stated that he did not release any information to the media and does not know how they obtained her information. He also denied seeing any press at the airport. The officer said that the complainant was a sex worker at the time of this incident and was actively lying to the police. However, she was still treated with dignity and respect. The officer mentioned that he explained to the complainant that they were investigating several crimes and that he had seen her escort ads, and he told her that if she wanted to talk to the police, they could assist her.

Department records did not show any information related to the press.

Public online searches on the complainant's name showed the complainant's current address, phone number, email address, photographs, and her relationship with her boyfriend.

The news story published by the media did not reveal whether it was the police who leaked her information, but it did publish the boyfriend's address, as his address was searched by police.

The evidence shows that there was insufficient evidence to prove that the police leaked the complainant's information to the media. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 1 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers detained him without cause related to an-going issue between himself and an employee at a neighborhood bar. The complainant stated that on the date in question he was walking near the bar when the named officers abruptly detained and handcuffed him without questioning him about what had occurred. The complainant maintained that it was the bar employee who harassed him and that he was innocent.

The evidence, including incident reports, statements from the parties, officer interviews, and body-worn camera footage showed the following: several days prior to the detention, the complainant and the bar employee had a verbal altercation because the bar employee accused the complainant of selling illegal drugs out of his vehicle in front of the bar. The complainant allegedly threatened the bar employee twice on this date and brandished a knife handle. The bar employee refrained from coming to work due to the threats and the complainant allegedly showed up to the bar during his absence and inquired about the bar employee's whereabouts. Upon returning to work on the date of the incident, the bar employee learned that the complainant had been looking for him and decided to file a police report regarding the threats.

Shortly thereafter, the bar employee observed the complainant driving past the bar in his vehicle. The bar employee stated he made a peace sign gesture, hoping they could move on from their dispute. The bar employee alleged that in return, the complainant made a hand gesture back imitating the shape of a gun and pointing the "barrel" of the gun toward the bar employee. The bar employee believed that the complainant made the gesture with ill intent. The manager of the bar then called the police on behalf of the employee regarding these interactions.

The named officers arrived on scene and spoke with both the bar owner and bar employee. They interviewed the employee who informed them of the history and the bar owner showed the officers video footage of the complainant driving in his car and momentarily slowing down near the bar. Named officer #1 did not necessarily believe that the complainant's conduct in making the hand gesture met the threshold for a criminal charge. However, she did feel that the complainant's behavior was suspicious and that it appeared he had a habit of returning to the bar and harassing the bar employee. She planned to memorialize the incident in a police report in the event further contact ensued.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 2 of 8**

As the officers were about to leave the scene, a male walked towards them. Both the bar owner and employee positively identified the male (the complainant) as the man who had a dispute with the bar employee. Named officer #1 stated that the complainant immediately put his hands up and said, "I did not do anything," and spontaneously said he did not threaten the bar employee. Named officer #1 decided to detain him because he was the suspect of a possible threat incident, involving the threat of harm and potential threats with a knife. Additionally, for safety concerns, they immediately placed him in handcuffs. The officers did not immediately question him regarding the incident and investigated the incident further. The officers ultimately determined after their investigation that they had probable cause to arrest the complainant for several charges, including the threats and unlawful brandishing of the knife that occurred several days prior.

Officers are permitted to detain an individual if they have reasonable suspicion, based on specific and articulable facts, that the person *may* have been involved in criminal activity. Reasonable suspicion is a lower standard than probable cause, which is needed to conduct an arrest. Based on the specific and articulable facts laid out above, the named officers had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant as the facts supported that he *may* have been involved in criminal activity. Additionally, given the conduct at issue- possible threats with a weapon- the officers also had the power to immediately handcuff the complainant without questioning him first.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 3 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. The complainant also alleged that the named officers unfairly targeted him and prevented him from telling his side of the story, leading to an unlawful arrest.

The complainant was arrested for making threats and brandishing the knife. Additionally, after conducting a search incident to a lawful arrest, the officers located contraband, evidence consistent with dealing narcotics, and knives, inside the complainant's belongings. The complainant was ultimately arrested and cited for (1) threats; (2) brandishing; and (3) unlawful possession of narcotics.

The named officer detained the complainant based upon reasonable suspicion of harassment and potentially criminal threats. After subsequent investigation and approval from her superiors, she determined sufficient probable cause existed to arrest the complainant for the above crimes. The subsequent investigation yielded the following evidence: a positive identification of both the complainant and his vehicle; the complainant had been accused of dealing drugs out of his backpack, a backpack which he was wearing at the time of the incident; the complainant was captured in his vehicle driving slowly by the bar on the date in question; the complainant's admitted interactions with the bar employee; the complainant's pattern of continuously showing up on the premises; the bar employee's sustained fear which was severe enough to take a leave from work; and confirmation of the details surrounding the threats and brandishing of the knife several days prior. The named officer believed that based on the totality of the evidence, enough credible evidence existed to show that the complainant had, more likely than not, committed said crimes.

Additionally, DPA's investigation did not show that the complainant was unfairly targeted in any way. DPA finds that based on the above-described evidence, sufficient probable cause existed to arrest the complainant for the above-mentioned crimes. Moreover, the evidence showed that the officers had allowed the complainant the opportunity to tell his side of the story, which the named officer felt added to the probable cause to arrest him. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 4 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to Mirandize.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed that the officers should have Mirandized him when the officers initially detained and handcuffed him.

The evidence showed that the named officer Mirandized the complainant after they made the decision to arrest him and prior to asking him any incriminating questions.

Police officers must advise suspects of their *Miranda* rights before the start of a “custodial interrogation.” Custodial interrogation occurs when a suspect is both in police custody, and under interrogation.

While the complainant was in police custody at the time of his detention, the named officer did not interrogate or otherwise ask the complainant any incriminating questions. Thus, he was not entitled to *Miranda* warnings at that time. Additionally, the complainant made inconsistent statements regarding the named officer’s failure to interview or ask him questions, supporting the fact that *Miranda* warnings were not required earlier. The named officer made sure to Mirandize the complainant prior to asking him incriminating questions and any such delay was proper. The entire interaction with the complainant was recorded on body-worn camera and supported the timing of the *Miranda* warnings.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 5 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6:** The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that after his arrest, the named officers conducted an unlawful search of his vehicle, which was parked several blocks away from the bar and not involved in any of the alleged crimes.

The evidence showed that the named officers conducted a probable cause search of the complainant's vehicle which was parked several blocks away from the bar. The bar advised the officers that the complainant often sold drugs out of the vehicle, and the complainant himself admitted to selling marijuana. As mentioned above, the officers located narcotics and evidence consistent with selling narcotics within his backpack during a search incident to a lawful arrest. Named officer #1 stated that in large part, based on the evidence from the search incident to a lawful arrest, she had probable cause to believe that additional narcotics would be found inside his vehicle and searched his vehicle accordingly. Additionally, she stated that the complainant consented to the search of his vehicle, and that prior to any such search, she consulted- at length- with her superiors who approved the search of the vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the above-mentioned facts and showed the named officer consulting with superiors prior to proceeding with a search.

While the vehicle in question was parked several blocks away, based on the evidence they had at the time, the named officers had probable cause to search said vehicle for narcotics. Additionally, the complainant provided the officers with the vehicle's location.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 6 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers seized his keys and that his keys were never returned upon his release from the County jail. He believed the officer may have intentionally stolen his keys.

The named officer attested that the officers retrieved his car keys from the backpack and utilized the keys to open his vehicle to conduct the probable cause search mentioned above. The named officer denied failing to return his keys to him and produced a property receipt which showed that the keys were sent with his belongings to the County jail.

Per Department policy, the property receipt filled out by one of the officers on-scene showed that the keys were accounted for when the officers transported him to County jail. Any such mishandling of his keys after the fact was not due to any negligence or intentional conduct by any San Francisco Police Officer.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 7 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that when the officers searched his vehicle, they damaged the radiator.

Body-worn camera footage of the incident showed the officers did not look under the hood of the vehicle or otherwise get near the radiator when they conducted the search. The named officer denied damaging the vehicle in any way and attested that they conducted a systematic probable cause search of the vehicle but did not enter the hood of the vehicle at any time.

No evidence exists to suggest that the officers damaged the complainant's vehicle.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025 PAGE# 8 of 8**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed that the named officer, as well as district station officers, unfairly targeted and harassed him.

The named officer denied targeting the complainant in this incident and attested that no officer from her district station asked her to have contact with the complainant. The named officer was unaware of the complainant before the date of this incident.

The evidence does not support the allegation that the named officer or other officers unfairly targeted or harassed the complainant in this incident. The evidence showed that there was a legitimate call for service made by the bar owner and that the named officer responded accordingly. The named officer arrived on scene and conducted a fair and thorough investigation into the matter. The complainant just happened to arrive at the bar's location while the officers were present. The named officer articulated sufficient reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant and established enough probable cause to arrest him. The officers did not damage his vehicle or intentionally lose his keys.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to investigate the vandalism of his vehicle adequately.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records showed that the complainant's roommate reported vandalism on their car. The named officer was dispatched to the scene as the primary officer. The officer noted the visible injuries of a subject who was bleeding from his mouth. The CAD also noted that the backup officer spoke to the reporting party, who stated the vehicle's owner was not present.

The incident report identified the named officer as the primary officer and the sergeant as backup. The officer detained the suspect because he matched the description of the vandalism suspect. The suspect appeared highly intoxicated and had blood on his nose, face, and hands. Lacking identification, he provided a name and date of birth. He reported that multiple individuals had assaulted him, and officers transported him to the hospital for medical treatment. A separate incident report was created to document the assault, listing the subject as the victim. The officer recorded the subject's name and address in this report. The sergeant later contacted the complainant's roommate, who directed him to the complainant's vehicle. The sergeant observed the damage. The complainant later provided video and photo evidence showing the suspect causing minor damage to the car.

The named officer's body-worn camera footage was reviewed for the complaint. The video showed the officer contacting a Spanish-speaking male with dried blood on his face, who reported that four taller males had assaulted him in an alley. The suspect admitted to drinking two beers but appeared more intoxicated than he had stated. The suspect did not have any identification and verbally provided his name and address. The officer called medics, and due to safety concerns, they transported the suspect to the hospital for evaluation. The officer also noted a possible vandalism involving a kicked car. The suspect denied involvement and agreed to file an assault report (to which the officer collected his information before transport to the hospital).

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03 requires patrol officers to thoroughly investigate reported crimes and complete associated reports.

The DPA received and reviewed evidence from the complainant, including video surveillance (without audio) showing a person who appeared to kick a vehicle. Photos showed minor scratches. The DPA requested a repair estimate, but the complainant did not have one at the time of this investigation.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 2 of 3**

The investigation found that the officer followed the rules and made reasonable decisions. While it was understandable that the complainant felt frustrated about the officer not charging the suspect, the officers did investigate by checking the damage, recording what happened, explaining how to follow up, and later adding new evidence the complainant provided.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The sergeant failed to properly supervise and investigate the vandalism.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was not at the scene. The named officer responded as backup while the primary officer interviewed the suspect (who was then transported to the hospital to receive medical treatment). The named officer also spoke to the reporting party, who initially stated that he didn't believe there was any damage and that he viewed the suspect kicking the vehicle. Upon showing the named officer the car, the reporting party and the named officer agreed that there were minor scratches. The named officer provided a case number to the reporting party, as well as provided the next course of action should the complainant want to follow up with further evidence.

California Penal Code section 594(a) (Malicious Mischief), states that every person who maliciously commits any of the following acts with respect to any real or personal property not his or her own, in cases other than those specified by state law, is guilty of vandalism:

- (1) Defaces with graffiti or other inscribed material.
- (2) Damages.
- (3) Destroys.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records showed that the named officer observed minor paint damage on the vehicle, but the owner could not be contacted. It is unclear if the damage existed before the incident. The reporting party requested no further police action at the time. A CAD notice was left on the vehicle for the complainant to follow up or to request further action.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

Department General Order 1.04 requires that sergeants ensure that all assigned personnel comply with department policies and procedures and take appropriate action whenever a violation occurs.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer included multiple inaccuracies in the traffic collision report and improperly found him at fault for a vehicle crash.

Department Notice 23-102, Report Writing Responsibilities, clarifies member's responsibilities as it relates to the preparation of police reports. Preparing factual and thorough incident reports is one of the most important duties of a professional police officer.

The traffic collision report memorialized the officer's investigation. The complainant, the other involved party, and an independent witness all provided statements for the report. The complainant and a witness acknowledged that the other vehicle was in the intersection before the complainant entered the intersection. The report concluded that based on the statements, the complainant was at fault for the crash because he failed to yield to a vehicle that was already in the intersection.

Although the officer may have made a mistake citing the complainant for violating California Vehicle Code section 21800(e) instead of 21801(b), the mistake was not material because the two provisions are similar except the former does not apply when there are traffic signals at the intersection. Both code sections prohibit the complainant from proceeding into the intersection until the other vehicle completed the indicated left turn as the vehicle was already in the intersection with turn signal on when the light turned green. Moreover, the complainant was properly cited for numerous other Vehicle Code violations. Therefore, any mistake was minor and did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The body-worn camera (BWC) footage confirms that the traffic collision report accurately represented the direction of travel, contrary to the complainant's allegations, and that it properly documented that the complainant was at fault for the vehicle crash.

Therefore, the evidence was insufficient to prove the incident report was materially inaccurate.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that she went to a police station to file a report about her neighbor violating a restraining order by driving his vehicle within five yards of her unoccupied vehicle. Her vehicle was parked in a rental property she owns, opposite the neighbor's residence. The named officer assisted and took the report from the complainant. However, when the officer first approached the complainant, they said something to the effect that the complainant was a habitual report filer. The complainant said this comment was inappropriate as she was a victim of a crime.

The named officer stated that he did make a comment about the complainant filing multiple incident reports about the neighbor. The officer said he told the complainant that the police report system should not be abused as a form of retaliation. The officer explained that the complainant wanted to file a report because the neighbor had driven his car off the neighbor's driveway and past the complainant's vehicle, which was parked in the opposite driveway. The complainant provided a video of the vehicle being driven. The officer said he advised the complainant that the distances on the video footage could only be approximated, and the officer could not, in good faith, say the neighbor violated the restraining order.

The restraining order shows that the neighbor, amongst other restrictions, must "Stay 5 yards away when all parties are at or inside their respective residences." The order also states the neighbor has to stay one hundred yards away from her vehicle.

The incident report records that the named officer took the report from the complainant and checked to confirm the restraining order. The officer notes in the report the contradictory nature of the restraining order about distances. The report records that the complainant believed the neighbor drove within five yards of her unoccupied car, parked on a driveway opposite the neighbor's house.

Department records show that the complainant has filed several similar incident reports.

The video footage of the neighbor's vehicle showed the neighbor pulling out of his driveway, opposite the complainant's driveway, and driving down the road. It should be noted that if the one-hundred-yard exclusion zone were enforceable, the neighbor would be prevented from ever leaving his house while the



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

complainant was at the opposite address. It was not clear from the footage that the neighbor passed within five yards of the complainant's vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage captured most of the interaction between the officer and the complainant at the police station. However, it did not capture the first few moments when they met, and as such, did not capture the "habitual filer" comments made by the officer. The footage does show that the officer was polite toward the complainant and took some time trying to understand the details of her complaint.

Department General Order 2.01.8(b) states that officers shall, "Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public."

The documentation and video evidence show that there are issues with the restraining order that a court will need to resolve. Both the complainant and the officer agree that the officer commented on the complainant filing multiple incident reports. Although this comment may have been ill-advised, it does not rise to the level of discourteous or profane language. As such, there is insufficient evidence to show that misconduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/20/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to receive a private person arrest (citizen arrest).

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he called the police to report an assault by his neighbor. The complainant alleged that police responded several hours later but failed to accept a private person's arrest against his neighbor. The complainant provided DPA with a date range for when the incident occurred.

DPA searched all available records and was unable to positively identify the call for service as described by the complainant. Thus, DPA was unable to identify any named officer and could therefore not make a finding regarding said allegation.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/18/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** A vehicle crash caused several trees to fall in the median of a busy thoroughfare. Some of these trees were blocking the road, creating a danger for traffic. The complainant was disappointed with how the police handled the situation. The officer only moved the trees slightly, leaving them still unsafe. The complainant expected the officer to either move the trees entirely to the shoulder or contact another city agency to have them removed.

DGO 1.3 states that patrol officers shall observe the condition of the streets and sidewalks, signals and signs, and report hazards to health or safety. Ensure that barriers and lights are maintained around holes, excavations, construction sites and other hazards.

The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) indicated that a vehicle crash caused trees to fall onto the roadway, prompting multiple callers to inform dispatch that the trees were obstructing traffic. Several units were dispatched to the scene. Body-worn camera footage showed debris from the crash in the roadway, and a large tree branch was moved to a safe location on the sidewalk, ensuring it did not obstruct either the sidewalk or the roadway. Vehicles were able to pass through the roadway, although they had to drive over some debris.

While the complainant expressed concerns about the officers' response, the road hazard was successfully moved to a safe location. Thus, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she reported to the named officer that a bouncer had hit her in the mouth, causing her tooth to become loose. The named officer then suggested she pull out the loose tooth. The complainant felt this comment was unprofessional.

The co-complainant corroborated the complainant's statement.

Department records indicate officers responded to a call for service regarding a battery, where it was reported that the complainant's teeth were knocked out. Additionally, it was reported that individuals were engaged in an altercation with bar staff. Upon arrival, officers contacted the complainant, who appeared intoxicated, as demonstrated by her slurred speech and unsteadiness on her feet. The complainant reported that her tooth was knocked out, but she wasn't cooperative when asked to show the extent of her injury. Officers' attempts to question her were met with non-cooperation, and she left without providing a statement.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer attempting to obtain a statement from the complainant. The complainant, who appeared heavily intoxicated, reported to the named officer that she was hit in the mouth by a bouncer, causing her teeth to be knocked out. The named officer attempted to look into the complainant's mouth with a flashlight to observe the reported injury; however, due to the complainant's lack of cooperation, he was unable to do so. The named officer informed the complainant that he needed to determine whether the tooth was knocked out or just loose, as this would determine a different criminal charge. The complainant informed the named officer that she was not going to pull her tooth out for him. Another officer spoke with the bouncer, who reported that he had asked the complainant and her party to leave the bar due to their disruptive behavior towards other patrons. He stated the complainant refused to go, and while escorting them outside, the complainant fell down a few stairs. He said someone then threw a punch at him, and when he put his hands up in a defensive manner, the complainant bit him on the finger. The footage showed medics treating the bouncer for a deep laceration on his finger. While officers continued their attempts to obtain a statement from the complainant, she threw water at an officer and used profanity as she and her party walked away. The footage showed the named officer acted professionally and did not ask the complainant to pull out her tooth nor make any inappropriate comment.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 6**

Department General Order 2.01 states in relevant part that officers shall treat members of the public with courtesy and respect.

Evidence shows that the named officer did not make the alleged statement and therefore did not violate Department policy. He maintained composure and professionalism despite the complainant's challenging behavior.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to make an arrest.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that a bouncer punched her in the face, and the named officer did not take action to arrest him.

Department records indicate officers responded to a call for service regarding a battery, where it was reported that the complainant's teeth were knocked out. Additionally, it was reported that individuals were engaged in an altercation with bar staff. Upon arrival, officers contacted the complainant, who appeared intoxicated, as demonstrated by her slurred speech and unsteadiness on her feet. The complainant reported that her tooth was knocked out, but she wasn't cooperative when asked to show the extent of her injury. Officers' attempts to question her were met with non-cooperation, and she left without providing a statement.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer attempting to obtain a statement from the complainant. The complainant, who appeared heavily intoxicated, reported to the named officer that she was hit in the mouth by a bouncer, causing her teeth to be knocked out. The named officer attempted to look into the complainant's mouth with a flashlight to observe the reported injury; however, due to the complainant's lack of cooperation, he was unable to do so. The named officer informed the complainant that he needed to determine whether the tooth was knocked out or just loose, as this would determine a

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 6**

different criminal charge. The complainant informed the named officer that she was not going to pull her tooth out for him. Another officer spoke with the bouncer, who reported that he had asked the

complainant and her party to leave the bar due to their disruptive behavior towards other patrons. He stated the complainant refused to go, and while escorting them outside, the complainant fell down a few stairs. He said someone then threw a punch at him, and when he put his hands up in a defensive manner, the complainant bit him on the finger. The footage showed medics treating the bouncer for a deep laceration on his finger. While officers continued their attempts to obtain a statement from the complainant, she threw water at an officer and used profanity as she and her party walked away. The footage showed the named officer acted professionally and did not ask the complainant to pull out her tooth nor make any inappropriate comment.

Department General Order 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states in the relevant part that officers must have probable cause to make an arrest.

Evidence shows that the named officer did not violate Department policy, as the complainant's refusal to cooperate and leaving the scene prevented him from establishing probable cause for an arrest.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was assaulted by a staff member at a bar and that officers failed to take any action, so she, the co-complainant, and her friend left the scene in an Uber. She stated that they traveled a short distance before the named officer initiated a traffic stop on the Uber vehicle, causing her to be unlawfully detained.

Department records indicate officers responded to a call for service regarding a battery, where it was reported that the complainant's teeth were knocked out. Additionally, it was reported that individuals

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 6**

were engaged in an altercation with bar staff. Upon arrival, officers contacted the complainant, who appeared intoxicated, as demonstrated by her slurred speech and unsteadiness on her feet. The complainant reported that her tooth was knocked out, but she wasn't cooperative when asked to show the

extent of her injury. Officers' attempts to question her were met with non-cooperation, and she left without providing a statement. Shortly after concluding the initial investigation, Department records show that officers responded to a location around the corner involving the bouncer who was found to be violently beaten. Due to the proximity and close timing of both incidents, officers determined the assault was in retaliation against the bouncer for the incident at the bar just moments earlier.

Body-worn camera footage showed officers responding to a bar regarding an assault. The complainant alleged a bouncer hit her in the mouth, causing her teeth to be knocked out. The bouncer reported that he had asked the complainant and her party to leave the bar due to their disruptive behavior towards other patrons. He stated the complainant refused to go, and while escorting them outside, the complainant fell down a few stairs. He said someone then threw a punch at him, and when he put his hands up in a defensive manner, the complainant bit him on the finger. The footage showed medics treating the bouncer for a deep laceration on his finger. While officers continued their attempts to obtain a statement from the complainant, she threw water at an officer and used profanity as she and her party walked away.

Shortly after the above incident concluded, officers reactivated their body-worn cameras, which showed officers responding to a brutal beating that occurred around the corner from the initial incident. The footage showed that the victim of the beating was the bouncer who had previously engaged with the complainant. Officers on the scene discussed the possibility that the two incidents were related. Witnesses provided officers with photos and videos of the suspect, which were visible on the body-worn camera. The named officer entered his patrol vehicle and shortly thereafter effected a traffic stop on a car whose driver shared similar characteristics to the suspect. The footage showed that the passengers of the vehicle were the complainant, co-complainant, and companion. The named officer initially interacted with the driver, who identified himself as an Uber driver. The co-complainant asked why they were detained, and the named officer responded that they were just involved in an incident and would be detained while they conducted their investigation. Other officers immediately informed the named officer that the driver of the vehicle did not match the photograph of the suspect. The footage showed that all parties were free to leave. The duration of the detention was under two minutes.

Department General Order 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states in the relevant part that an officer must have reasonable suspicion to detain an individual lawfully. "Reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 5 of 6**

that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime is, was, or is about to occur and the person under suspicion is reasonably connected to the crime . . .”

The named officer lawfully initiated a traffic stop on the vehicle the complainant and co-complainant were traveling in because the traffic stop occurred soon after the assault, and the driver’s appearance was similar to that of the suspect. It was reasonable for the named officer to lawfully detain the occupants and

driver of the vehicle due to the named officer’s belief that the driver and/or occupants were reasonably connected to the battery that had just occurred. Furthermore, the occupants of the vehicle were reportedly linked to the battery.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was assaulted by a staff member at a bar and that officers failed to take any action, so she, the co-complainant, and her friend left the scene in an Uber. She stated that they traveled a short distance before the named officers initiated a traffic stop on the Uber vehicle, causing her to be unlawfully detained.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officers did not conduct a traffic stop on the Uber vehicle in which the complainant and co-complainant were passengers.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officers were not involved.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 6 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The co-complainant stated that after being detained in an Uber, an officer threatened her and the complainant with pepper spray.

Body-worn camera footage did not show any officer threatening anyone with pepper spray.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The co-complainant stated that after being detained in an Uber, an officer shoved her.

Body-worn camera footage did not show any officer shoving anyone.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 3/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he is involved in an ongoing dispute with a neighboring grocery store. An incident occurred, and police responded to the scene. The complainant said he could not recall if he requested the officers to write an incident report. However, he went to the police station the next day to file a report about the incident. The officer at the police station refused to take a report, explaining that the elements of a crime had not taken place.

The complainant said he had video footage that would substantiate his allegation. He failed to provide this video evidence.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/24/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer drove a City vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IE**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, a bicyclist, was traveling down a bus lane on a busy street when an officer driving a patrol vehicle in the opposing direction suddenly swerved into the complainant's path. The sudden movement by the officer required the complainant to affect an evasive maneuver to avoid a vehicle collision. The near-miss incident left the complainant shocked and upset. In response, the complainant followed the officer's patrol vehicle until they were able to acquire a description of the vehicle and officer involved.

The named officer was interviewed but was unable to recall the incident. The officer was only able to recall an interaction with a bicyclist, assumingly the complainant, that yelled incoherent statements toward the officer as he was driving. The officer denied the allegation stating he maintained control of the patrol vehicle the entire time by observing the roadway, current traffic conditions, and driving at a safe speed for conditions.

There was no independent evidence nor computer-aided dispatch record of the incident.

The investigation showed that there was a lack of evidence to substantiate the incident coupled with the officer's limited recollection. Therefore, the evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer tackled him to the ground causing him to hit his head and shoulder.

The named officer stated that he saw the complainant committing an offense. When he tried to stop the complainant, the complainant ran from the named officer. The named officer said he took the complainant to the ground to prevent his escape.

SFPD documents state that the complainant was tackled to the floor as he was fleeing officers. The documents detailed that the force was reported to supervisors and the complainant provided with medical care.

Body camera footage shows the named officer trying to stop the complainant. The complainant, on seeing the named officer in front of him, turns and runs in the opposite direction. The named officer chases the complainant and takes him to the floor. The named officer then restrains the complainant and places him in handcuffs.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to provide medical treatment.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was not provided medical aid by the named officer after hitting his head while being restrained.

The named officer stated that he called for medics who attended and treated the complainant on scene.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

SFPD documents showed that an ambulance was called and responded to the scene.

Body worn camera footage shows that the named officer requested an ambulance. Medics arrived on scene and provided the complainant with medical care.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3** The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer took his ID and never gave it back to him.

The named officer stated that he took the complainant's ID to confirm his identity. After the incident the named officer found that he had left the complainant's ID in his own pocket. The named officer said he returned to the location of the arrest the next day and gave the ID to the complainant's wife.

There is no record of the ID or where it went in any SFPD document.

Body camera footage showed that the named officer took the ID and after checking it placed it in his pocket. The ID is not seen again on footage.

The complainant did not respond for follow up requests for information to see if he did or did not get the ID back from the named officer.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-#2:** The officers failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant went out for the evening and when they returned home found human waste on the bed. The complainant maintained that for some time unidentified people have been entering the complainant's residence without her permission and leaving human waste in the apartment. The complainant stated officers are aware of the issues involving people gaining access into her home because she frequently reports them. The complainant stated that although officers responded to the scene for this incident, they failed to properly investigate the incident.

The computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records showed that the complainant called emergency services twice in the same day regarding someone being inside the home leaving human waste. The record showed that officers found no merit to any of the calls for service. The dispatcher noted that the complainant made disjointed statements and requested officers respond to the complainant's unit for a well-being check. The body-worn camera footage showed when the named officers arrived, they greeted the complainant and asked the complainant what happened. The complainant stated that she believed people had entered her home and left baby waste on her bed. The complainant gave permission to Officer #1 to look around the residence and bedroom. As Officer #1 looked around the unit with a flashlight Officer #2 continued to listen to the complainant. Once Officer #1 finished looking around the unit, he advised the complainant that the incident would be documented and provided the complainant with a CAD number.

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03, *Duties of Patrol Officers*, states officers are to make reports on crimes observed or brought to their attention that have not been previously reported and to obtain information on witnesses and promptly furnish descriptions of suspects to the Communications Division.

The investigation determined that the identified officers responded promptly to the complainant's request for service. Although the complainant contacted authorities a second time to report an individual entering her residence, the dispatcher, concerned for the complainant's well-being, requested that officers conduct a welfare check to ensure her safety. The evidence showed that the officers successfully did both. Therefore, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred, and the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the responding officer was dismissive towards her and thinks that the complainant has a mental health problem.

The body-worn camera did not corroborate the complainant's allegations regarding the officer's behavior toward her. On the contrary, the footage showed that the officer's demeanor toward the complainant was courteous and professional. The officer acknowledged the complainant by name and inquired as to how he could help.

Department General Order 2.01, *General Rules of Conduct*, Public Courtesy states the following (DGO 2.01.8.):

8. Public Courtesy – Members/employees shall understand and follow the principles of Procedural Justice and incorporate them into their professional work environment. These principles include giving members of the community a voice (opportunity to speak), fair/impartial treatment, respect, and providing a trustworthy process. When acting in the performance of their duties, members/employees shall:

b. Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public.

d. Not demean or degrade individuals referencing their race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or socioeconomic status.

Although the complainant perceived the officer's behavior as dismissive and unprofessional, the evidence did not support this perception. The investigation concluded that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that at the beginning of the year an officer failed to investigate an incident. The complainant's recollection of the incident was vague and she was unable to recall specific information such as the date of the incident, location, and report number.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) conducted additional computer research to attempt to identify any incidents that involved the officer named in the complaint, but the search yielded negative results.

The DPA was unable to conduct a thorough investigation due to the vague nature of the complaint and the inability of the complainant to identify an incident involving the named officers. However, a search of all available records did not produce any evidence that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding the complainant. As a result, the evidence proved that the accused officers were not involved.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 8/14/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant observed a person being disruptive while inside of a neighborhood park. The person was yelling incoherent statements at people, recording several Urban Alchemy employees on their cell phone while yelling at them and intentionally threw a jar of spaghetti sauce on the ground, shattering it. To avoid further confrontation, the complainant physically pushed the person out of the park while they continued to yell incoherent and nonsensical statements. Although the police were called out to the scene to investigate, the complainant alleged that the named officer told the complainant that he was doing her a favor by issuing her a citation for three misdemeanors.

According to the computer-aided dispatch records police responded to a call regarding an alleged battery. The body-worn camera and incident report showed that the person who called for police services alleged that the complainant along with two other individuals punched him in the face, damaged his glasses, and broke his cell phone. The named officer investigated the incident by interviewing all the parties involved, reviewed video evidence at the scene, searched for additional surveillance footage and for additional witnesses. Notably, the complainant admitted to the named officer that she had forcefully removed the individual from the park based on his disruptive and rude behavior toward Urban Alchemy employees. Additionally, the complainant stated the person's cell phone became damaged because the complainant had taken it and threw it to the ground to prevent him from taking more videos. The named officer conducted a very thorough preliminary investigation at the scene, which included consultation and approval from a supervisor before issuing the citation to the complainant.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03.03.G, *Investigative Detention*, states that probable cause to arrest is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to objectively believe and strongly suspect that a crime was committed by the person to be arrested. Furthermore, Department General Order (DGO) 5.06.03.A, *Citation Release*, states that if the person is eligible for citation release, to cite and release them at the location of arrest for misdemeanor and infraction offenses.

The complainant's allegation that the named officer issued her a citation for three misdemeanors was confirmed. The citation was supported by the named officer's preliminary investigation, which included

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 8/14/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

the complainant's own admission that she took and damaged the individual's cell phone. The other charge was based upon the other evidence provided at the scene as outlined in the incident report. The investigation supports the officer had probable cause to issue the citation. The evidence did not show that the named officer told the complainant that he was doing her a favor by charging her with three misdemeanors and may have been misheard by the complainant. The named officer conducted a thorough investigation and was thoughtful in consideration of the allegations made against the complainant. The named officer not only consulted with other officers at the scene but also sought and obtained supervisor approval on the charges. Thus, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred, and the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer racially profiled her.

The body-worn camera showed that all the officers that responded to the scene, including the named officer, acted professionally and courteously toward the complainant. The complainant was identified by the reported victim, who pointed out the complainant at the scene, and asserted that the complainant punched him in the face and intentionally took his cell phone and threw it on the ground to damage it. The evidence showed the incident within close proximity to a police station, so the named officer responded within minutes. Furthermore, the body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant admitted to taking and damaging the cell phone. At one point, the complainant acknowledged her actions by recounting her decision to assume responsibility to prevent the others from going back to jail. In response, one of the officers suggested that next time the complainant should call for police services in lieu of taking matters into her own hands to prevent a situation like this from reoccurring.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.17, *Bias-Free Policing Policy*, states that except as part of a specific individual description, members may not use, to any degree, race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity, or expression sexual orientation mental or physical disability or socio-economic

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 8/14/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 4**

status as a basis for establishing either reasonable suspicion or probable cause. Members seeking one or more specific persons who have been identified or described in part by any of the above listed characteristics may rely on them only when the characteristic is part of a specific description based upon relevant information that links a specific person to a particular unlawful incident or a call for service. (DGO 5.17.III.A.2-3.)

The investigation showed that officers responded to the scene within minutes after the initial call for service was made. When officers contacted the reporting party, the reporting party pointed out the complainant who remained at the scene, as one of the individuals involved. When the named officers interviewed the complainant, the complainant provided a statement which established and confirmed her involvement in the altercation. The decision to cite the complainant was not based on bias or racial profiling but was based on the thorough preliminary investigation conducted by the named officer. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed that the named officer was shortsighted in their investigation. Specifically, the complainant suspected that the individual who called the police was also a person in crisis who required additional services and should have been cited for trespassing.

Body-worn camera footage showed the officer responded to the location, a public park, and kept the involved parties separated to prevent further confrontation. While they were separated, the officer asked the individual who appeared injured if medical assistance was needed, but the individual declined. The officer observed that the individual exhibited erratic behavior and documented those observations in the incident report.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 8/14/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

While on scene, the officer asked the individual to calm down due to the presence of children. The individual complied by sitting on the ground and stopping his yelling. The officer did not observe any behavior suggesting that the individual was a danger to himself, a danger to others, or gravely disabled. Each time the officer asked the individual to lower his voice, he complied and spoke more calmly.

At no point did the complainant notify the officer of a trespassing concern, nor did she ask whether the individual would be cited for trespassing.

According to Department General Order 6.14, *Psychological Evaluation of Adults*, if an individual has not committed a crime and is not, due to a mental disorder, a danger to self or others, or gravely disabled, the officer should abate the incident and recommend that the individual contact a mental health professional.

The evidence showed that the individual's behavior—intermittent yelling of incoherent statements—was erratic but non-violent. He complied with the officer's instructions, as documented in the incident report. Although the complainant believed the person was in crisis, the officer's observations did not support that the individual posed a danger to himself or others, nor that he was gravely disabled.

The complainant later informed the Department of Police Accountability that she wanted the individual cited for trespassing. However, she did not raise this issue with the officer at the time of the incident. As a result, no investigation into the alleged trespassing was conducted.

In conclusion, the evidence supports that the officer's actions occurred as described and were justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant had a close friend that recently went missing. After a certain period of time, the family of the complainant's friend filed a missing person report at a district police station. The complainant stated that he, together with the missing person's parents and other concerned individuals, made a series of follow-ups, but no concrete information was provided about the case's status. They were told that the authorities could not do anything but wait for her body to wash up on shore. The complainant believed the case was not being investigated properly.

The corresponding incident report showed that the missing person's family member called the police regarding her disappearance. Officers responded to her house and took the report. In their investigation, the officers asked for her picture and contacted various hospitals and jails in an attempt to locate her. They contacted the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for the video footage of the complainant's car, which was found on the San Mateo Bridge and asked the Traffic Management Center to review the footage. They also notified the United States Coast Guard about the incident.

The named officer stated that the family of the missing person reported her missing after she failed to show up at her workplace. Her vehicle was found abandoned on a local bridge. He said that various pieces of surveillance footage were collected and reviewed. The footage showed her leaving her home early in the morning and driving her vehicle, where CHP later found it abandoned on the bridge. The named officer said he coordinated with other agencies to search for the missing person, but with negative results. He collected familial Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA) and connected the family with an advocate from the Community Youth Center (CYC). He also checked the coroner's offices around the Bay Area and the various law enforcement databases for new information or leads. The named officer continued that he had thoroughly investigated the case with transparency and had shared all relevant information with the victim's family and concerned individuals. He had also kept CYC posted on the situation. He said that at some point, he became aware that the information he was giving was being shared with the media, prompting him to be selective about what information to share to avoid compromising the investigation of the case. He was eventually instructed to give only updates on the case.

The chronological investigation report associated with the incident appeared consistent with the named officer's statement to the Department of Police Accountability. Aside from documenting the details and

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/2025    PAGE# 2 of 2**

specifics of his investigation, it showed that he was in contact with the missing person's family and other individuals. It showed that he provided them with updates on his work and the search for the missing

person up to the moment when her deceased body was ultimately found and identified. The record also showed that he referred the matter to CYC and provided them with constant updates.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to make an arrest.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was involved in a road rage incident with another driver, and the named officer failed to arrest the suspect despite having video evidence, and the suspect's name and address.

The body-worn camera and incident report confirmed that the reporting officers conducted a thorough investigation. They took that complainant's statement and interviewed a witness who corroborated the complainant's statement. The complainant's dash camera video of the incident was booked as evidence. The dash camera video confirmed the complainant's statement and showed there was probable cause to arrest the suspect for vandalism. The records also showed that the case was later assigned for investigation to the named officer. The named officer reviewed all of the available evidence. In subsequent incidents at the complainant's home, the suspect's face was not captured on video.

Other department records showed that the complainant emailed the named officer advising him that he had a successful remediation with the suspect and the suspect agreed not to vandalize and harass him and his family again. The complainant requested to pause the investigation, and the named officer agreed. There is no record of the complainant sending a follow-up email requesting the investigation to continue.

Based on the evidence, the complainant informed the named officer that the incident had been mediated. The named officer did not arrest the suspect because the complainant was no longer interested in pressing charges. Therefore, the named officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and appropriate.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to properly investigate.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the named officer has not contacted him regarding the road rage incident or conducted an investigation. He believes that the lack of an arrest or any action taken against the suspect has encouraged the suspect to continue harassing him, especially since he filed a small claims case against this individual.

Department records showed that the case was assigned for investigation two weeks after the complainant filed his complaint. The assigned officer noted that the complainant requested to pause the investigation for the time being, as he had reached a peaceful resolution with the suspect. The named officer and the complainant were in contact via email during the investigation.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was driving his car and completed a U-turn where there was a break in the double yellow lines that were on the roadway. Shortly thereafter, the named officer pulled over his vehicle. The complainant alleged the named officer had no cause to pull him over.

The complainant provided a photograph of the area where he had allegedly made the U-turn. The photograph showed a portion of a roadway where the dividing double yellow lines stopped at an intersection.

The named officer said he was conducting traffic enforcement in a business district when he saw the complainant's vehicle make an illegal U-turn crossing two double yellow lines in violation of California Vehicle Code (CVC) 22102 in front of a truck that was proceeding in the opposite direction, which was also a violation, as the complainant failed to yield to oncoming traffic. The named officer activated his red lights and siren and conducted a traffic stop on the complainant's vehicle for moving violations.

Department records showed that the named officer completed a traffic stop of the complainant's vehicle.

Section 22102 of the CVC states in part that "No person in a business district shall make a U-turn, except at an intersection, or on a divided highway where an opening has been provided in accordance with Section 21651."

Department General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement states in part that "Members should act on moving violations of all applicable laws, regulations, and policies, while considering the totality of the circumstances in any of the following circumstances, except any violations deprioritized in DGO 9.07.04, Restricting the Use of Pretext Stops: a. After witnessing a moving violation."

The evidence showed the named officer stopped the complainant's vehicle after witnessing a moving violation. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was driving his car and completed a U-turn where there was a break in the double yellow lines on the roadway. Shortly thereafter, the named officer pulled over his vehicle and issued him a citation. The complainant alleged the named officer cited him without cause.

The complainant provided a copy of the citation he received from the named officer. The cited vehicle code was not readable on his citation copy.

The named officer stated he witnessed the complainant simultaneously commit two traffic violations when he made a U-turn in a business district. First, the U-turn was illegal because the complainant crossed double yellow lines and because the U-turn was made in a business district. Second, by making the u-turn, the complainant failed to yield to an oncoming truck. The officer cited the complainant for only one moving violation, which was making an illegal U-turn in a business district in violation of California Vehicle Code Section 22102. Additionally, the officer used discretion by choosing not to cite the complainant for failing to provide proof of insurance. Because the complainant seemed upset about receiving the citation, and the officer explained to the complainant that the city's goal is to reduce traffic fatalities and injuries.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to obtain a copy of the citation without success.

Section 22102 of the California Vehicle Code states in part that “No person in a business district shall make a U-turn, except at an intersection, or on a divided highway where an opening has been provided in accordance with Section 21651.”

Department General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement states in part, “Traffic enforcement is a responsibility of the San Francisco Police Department and is an important assignment for uniformed personnel. In partnership with the City and County of San Francisco’s Vision Zero efforts, the goal of the Department’s traffic enforcement program is to make San Francisco streets safer for all by reducing traffic crashes.”

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 4**

The evidence showed that the named officer had cause to issue the traffic citation as he had witnessed a moving violation.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to check his vehicle registration and insurance during the traffic stop. The complainant said his insurance was expiring, and the named officer would have said something about it had he checked it.

The named officer asserted that during the traffic stop, he asked the complainant for his registration and insurance information. The named officer stated that the complainant had valid vehicle registration but was unable to provide current proof of insurance and only had an old policy. The named officer said he used discretion in deciding not to cite the complainant for an absence of current proof of insurance.

Department records showed that the named officer completed a traffic stop of the complainant's vehicle.

Department General Order 9.01.02, Traffic Enforcement, Policy, states in part: Members enforcing traffic and parking laws should use discretion when enforcing violations.

There was no body-worn camera footage for this incident.

The evidence showed that the named officer checked into the vehicle's insurance and registration status. He used discretion in choosing not to cite the complainant for not having current proof of insurance.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer was inattentive to duty.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer made spelling mistakes and inaccurately documented his race and his vehicle's paint color on a traffic citation.

The complainant provided a carbon copy of the citation he received from the named officer. The copy was not of good legible quality. The complainant's first name was difficult to read, and the city address for the complainant appeared to be missing one letter.

The named officer stated that he documented what he perceived the complainant's race to be, and that he input the address and contact information correctly. He also said the complainant's vehicle appeared to be light tan or grey. He said that oxidation of the paint made it difficult to discern the color.

While the named officer incorrectly entered the complainant's identified race on the citation, it was based on his perception, as is required by Department protocol. The officer completed the traffic citation and issued it to the complainant. The minor spelling inaccuracies and vehicle paint color discrepancy do not rise to the level of officer misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant made various statements that were not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction. However, she did say she was unlawfully subjected to a mental health detention when she was actually a victim of a stabbing.

Computer-aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that the named officers responded to a call for service at a single-room occupancy (SRO) hotel following reports of a stabbing.

The incident report showed that the named officers spoke with the complainant on arrival at the scene. The complainant alleged she had an altercation with another resident about loud music. She told officers that the other resident had cut her head with a pocketknife. The officers noted a two-inch laceration on top of the complainant's forehead.

The incident report records that two independent witnesses approached the officers. The witnesses told officers that the complainant attacked the other party, hitting and kicking the other subject multiple times. Both fell to the ground, and the complainant's head struck the wall and began to bleed.

The incident report showed that the officers reviewed video footage at the scene. The footage showed the complainant hitting and kicking the other party from behind. A struggle ensues, and both parties fall to the ground. No knife was seen. The footage showed that the complainant sustained her injury from the fall and not from a knife.

The incident report states that the complainant was taken to the hospital for a head injury. While at the hospital, a medical doctor placed the complainant under a 72-hour mental health evaluation.

Medical records were obtained and showed that the decision to detain the complainant was made by doctors at the hospital, and not the police officers.

Body-worn camera footage showed that officers did not detain the complainant. Instead, they took the complainant's statement and called medical personnel to treat the complainant's injuries and transport her to the hospital.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that the officers did not investigate the stabbing incident properly.

The incident report showed that the named officers spoke with the complainant on arrival at the scene. The complainant alleged she had an altercation with another resident about loud music. She told officers that the other resident had cut her head with a pocketknife. The officers noted a two-inch laceration on top of the complainant's forehead.

The incident report records that two independent witnesses approached the officers. The witnesses told officers that the complainant attacked the other party, hitting and kicking the other subject multiple times. Both fell to the ground, and the complainant's head struck the wall and began to bleed.

The incident report showed that the officers reviewed video footage at the scene. The footage showed the complainant hitting and kicking the other party from behind. A struggle ensues, and both parties fall to the ground. No knife was seen. The footage showed that the complainant sustained her injury from the fall and not from a knife.

The incident report showed that officers tried and failed to locate the other party in the altercation. Based on the video footage and the statements by people at the scene, the officer concluded the incident was a mutual combat between the complainant and the other party. The laceration to the complainant's head was sustained when both fell to the ground.

Body-worn camera footage showed the officers responding to the scene, taking statements from the complainant and other witnesses, locating and viewing security footage, and making attempts to locate and interview the other party in the incident. The evidence shows that the officer completed a thorough investigation of the incident.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said she was a victim of a stabbing ten days before the mental health detention and that the named officers failed to investigate the earlier incident properly.

CAD records showed that the complainant had called 9-1-1 ten days earlier, asking for police attendance, as an unknown person had threatened her with a knife.

An incident report showed that the named officers responded to a 9-1-1 call from the complainant regarding a person with a knife. The officers interviewed the complainant, who stated she was confronted by an unknown person who threatened her while holding a knife. The suspect was no longer at the scene, having left in an unknown direction. The incident report recorded that the complainant said she would send video footage of the incident to the officers, but failed to do so.

BWC shows that during the interview with the named officers, the complainant alleged that the person who threatened her was sent by an ex-District supervisor due to, amongst other claims, issues with audio technology and sound waves. The complainant informs the officers that the front desk footage from the SRO hotel is currently unavailable, but she will obtain and forward it to them.

The evidence shows that the officer completed a thorough investigation of the incident.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** M

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 8/20/25.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she approached a bus stop and saw the same officer with his police dog (noted in prior DPA complaint). She alleged that when she walked by the dog, it lunged at her, and the officer had to hold the dog back. The officer then walked around the bus stop looking at her. The officer entered the bus, so waited for another bus.

After a search of department records, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to locate any evidence of the event described in the complaint.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officer based solely on information provided by the complainant. DPA sent an identification poll to the specialized unit asking for assistance identifying the officer based on a description of the incident. No officers were identified through the poll. Therefore, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

A no finding outcome occurs when the Department of Police Accountability cannot complete an investigation because the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/26/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer engaged in other unequal treatment.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that SFPD background investigators unfairly disqualify candidates after they have invested significant effort in the hiring process. According to the complaint, investigators base disqualifications on personal beliefs rather than verified evidence, providing little or no justification to candidates. The complainant was unable to offer further details or examples.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) Lieutenant of Staff Services, who serves as a general reviewer of non-selected applicants, explained the official background investigation process. This includes record checks, interviews, questionnaires, and social media reviews. After a conditional offer, applicants undergo a polygraph, psychological, and medical exams. Disqualification decisions are based on California POST standards and SFPD eligibility criteria, with documentation reviewed at multiple supervisory levels. Investigators must rely on verified facts, and negative information must be corroborated. While candidates do not receive detailed reasons for disqualification and have no formal appeal process, they can raise concerns via email. The Lieutenant of Staff Services emphasized that the process is thorough, evidence-based, and fair, and noted that no disqualification decisions have been formally challenged.

Overall, SFPD's process is structured to ensure fairness, consistency, and multiple layers of oversight. The anonymous complaint raises concerns about bias and lack of transparency, but documented procedures highlight reliance on standards and supervisory review. The absence of a formal appeals process, however, may contribute to perceptions of unfairness. Without direct knowledge of the perceived bias the complainant perceived in SFPD's disqualification decisions, we cannot confirm that the alleged allegations occurred.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025    COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: U F**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant watched a YouTube video of an officer beating up a suspect who he believed had a gun, but the suspect did not. The complainant believes the suspect was no threat to the officer.

The complainant did not provide DPA with YouTube video link or enough information to investigate the complaint.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not be reasonably identified, or the officer has left the Department and therefore the investigation cannot be completed.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2:** The officer failed to comply with DGO 10.11.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: N D**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the YouTube video shows the officer turned off his body-worn camera during the incident so he could beat up the suspect.

The complainant did not provide DPA with the YouTube video link or enough information to investigate the complaint.

No finding outcomes occur under four circumstances: the complainant did not provide additional requested evidence, the complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, the officer could not be reasonably identified, or the officer has left the Department and therefore the investigation cannot be completed.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in her complaint that the officer refused to write a report regarding a neighbor pouring bleach outside her door.

According to DGO 2.01, officers are required to complete written reports for crimes or incidents that require police attention.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant reported to the officer that her neighbor spilled bleach on the floor between their doors. She requested that the officer follow her to her door to witness the bleach smell because it was a hazard. She also wanted the named officer to tell the neighbor to clean it up. The neighbor explained that the garbage had leaked and he cleaned it up. The complainant then requested an incident report, and the officer informed her that there was no crime to report.

Although bleach is caustic, it is also a cleaning agent. The named officer followed the complainant to inspect the area and talked to her neighbor. Based on the evidence, the officer's actions were justified, as the incident represented a civil dispute between neighbors. Furthermore, the incident was documented in the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system and recorded on body-worn camera (BWC) footage, which either party could use in court if necessary.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/27/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/22/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers did not properly investigate.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that his daughters, who were with their mother at the grandparents' home, called him and said they wanted to go home to him. The daughters, the mother, and the complainant all called 9-1-1 for police help. He stated that the officers failed to separate the daughters from their mother and did not consider the entire situation, which would have allowed him to pick up the daughters. The complainant provided an Emergency Protective Order (EPO) that shows it expired two days before the incident.

Officer #1 confirmed that they responded to a welfare check call on that date and spoke with the mother and daughters separately to verify if there was any child abuse, and did not observe any signs of physical abuse. He stated that the mother said she was a victim of domestic violence related to her husband, and they were in the process of filing for divorce. She also confirmed one of her daughters wanted to go with her father, and she was willing to go with both girls. The daughter mentioned that she and her sister were yelled at by their grandparents, so they wanted to go home. The officer also said they attempted to assist the complainant pick up his children if possible. However, the father did not have car seats in his car to legally transport his children home.

Officer #2 confirmed checking the status of the protective order and verified that no active order was in place. The officer spoke with the complainant, over the phone and tried to arrange the pickup after school the next day because the complainant did not have a car seat in his vehicle at the time. The officer explained that he listened to both parties as thoroughly as possible and worked to find a solution that prioritized the safety of the girls.

Department records show that the daughters, the mother, and the complainant all called the police, and officers on the scene separated them and spoke to each party. It shows that there was no active emergency protective order. The EPO resulted from a previous incident where the mother and daughters had been protected from the father, but this protection had already expired when the incident occurred.

Body-worn camera footage captured that the officers spoke to all three parties separately and listened to their statements. Named officer #2 checked with dispatch on the status of any existing EPO and found

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 2 of 4**

that it had already expired. Both officers attempted to arrange for the father to pick up the daughters but were unable to do so because the father lacked car seats, and the mother was not required to provide them.

The evidence showed that both named officers listened to each party involved separately, checked existing legal documents, and arranged for a reasonable pickup for the children, though it did not happen eventually.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers only believed the person who spoke English, which is his wife, and would not let him pick up his daughters.

Officer #1 stated he did not speak to the complainant and, therefore, could not take anyone's side. Officer #2 said he listened to both parties as best he could and tried to find a solution that was safest for the girls.

Department records indicate that officers spoke to all the parties involved.

Body-worn camera footage shows that officers listened to all parties and concluded that it was not against any orders for the complainant to pick up the daughters. However, since the complainant admitted over the phone that his car was not equipped with car seats, he was legally barred from transporting children in the vehicle. They eventually agreed that the mother would drop the daughters off at the father's address after school the next day.

The evidence collected shows that the officers on the scene did not just believe the person who spoke English. The officer would not let the complainant pick up the daughters by car because he did not have car seats.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 3 of 4**

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.20.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** When the officer called the complainant on speakerphone, the complainant first asked if the officer spoke Cantonese, then told him that he could not speak English and requested a translator. However, the officer continued to speak very slowly in English, and the complainant struggled to respond due to limited English skills. The officer attempted to use Google Translate for communication but was unsuccessful. No qualified civilian interpreters were called, nor were any qualified bilingual officers requested on scene.

The officer confirmed that the complainant admitted his English was very ‘weak.’ He then tried to speak slowly with the complainant. He explained that he did not hear the initial request for a translator and did not ask for a qualified civilian interpreter or bilingual officer to interpret for the complainant. He confirmed that there were no exigent circumstances that prevented him from requesting a qualified bilingual interpreter.

Department records did not show that any qualified civilian interpreter or bilingual member was requested during the incident.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant told the officer upfront that he could not speak English and asked for a translator. The named officer continued to talk with the complainant in “slow” English while the complainant responded with limited English proficiency. It was noted that the officer tried to use Google Translate to communicate with the complainant but was unable to get it to work. All parties remained calm on the scene and on the phone. There were no exigent circumstances that prevented the officer from obtaining a qualified interpreter or bilingual member for the incident.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.20 (Section III. Procedures) states, “SFPD members are to follow these procedures in all encounters absent exigent circumstances; however, exigent circumstances may



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 4 of 4**

require some deviation. In such situations, SFPD members shall use the most reliable, temporary interpreter available.”

The same DGO (Section F. General Interview) states, “when conducting general interviews, members should seek the assistance of a Qualified Bilingual Member, Qualified Civilian Interpreter, or other professional interpreter, or the language line whenever the member encounters an LEP person who requests an interpreter or is unable to communicate with or is experiencing difficulty communicating with the member.”

The evidence shows that the officer failed to make any reasonable effort to request a qualified bilingual officer or civilian interpreter to communicate with the complainant, despite the fact that the complainant stated he could not speak English. There were no exigent circumstances that prevented the officer from doing so.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/29/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer was racially biased towards him, and he knew this by just looking at the officer. The complainant did not provide a name or number for the officer.

An officer was identified as working in the vicinity of the alleged incident. The officer denied having any interaction or knowledge of an interaction with the complainant.

No other evidence was provided by the complainant.

There was no evidence found to corroborate the complainant's allegation or that the named officer was involved.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was issued a citation while parked in a parking lot. The complainant believes there was no cause to issue the citation. The complainant did not provide any identification for the officer involved.

An officer was identified as working in the vicinity of the alleged incident. The officer denied any knowledge of the incident. The officer did not recognize the complainant and stated he did not issue any citations.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/29/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

The complainant did not provide a copy of the citation or any other evidence indicating that he had contact with the officer or received a citation. The complainant provided a business card for a different police department. That police department denied any knowledge of the incident and stated their officers do not cover that parking lot.

There is no other evidence for this incident. There is no evidence that a citation was issued or that the named officer was involved in any interaction with the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer failed to provide their name and badge number while issuing them a citation. The complainant did not provide any description or other details of the officer.

An officer was identified as working in the vicinity of the alleged incident. This officer denied having any interaction with the complainant.

There is no footage or other evidence to show that the complainant had any interaction with an officer.

The complainant did not provide any further information. The complainant did not provide a copy of the citation or any other paperwork indicating that they received or paid a citation.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he was smoking cannabis on the sidewalk when the named officer pulled up in his patrol vehicle and told him to leave. When the complainant refused, the officer exited his vehicle, knocked the cannabis from his hand, threw him to the ground, placed his hands behind his back, and lay on top of him. Afterward, the officer got back in his patrol vehicle and left. The complainant believed that the officer knew who he was and was aware that he possessed evidence implicating multiple officers in the wrongful kidnapping of individuals under the false pretenses of mental health detentions.

Department records indicated that the officer was assigned to a hotel located a quarter of a mile away from where the complainant alleged the incident occurred. The officer denied the allegation, stating that he was not familiar with the complainant and did not respond to any calls for service at the alleged location. The officer was not assigned to the area where the incident reportedly took place.

The complainant made inconsistent statements, and records confirm that the officer did not respond to the location mentioned in the complaint. Thus, the evidence shows that the alleged conduct did not occur as described by the complainant.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the San Francisco Police Department's response to a protest event was unacceptable.

The complainant declined to be contacted. The Department of Police Accountability was therefore unable to identify specific involved officers or complained of conduct. There was inadequate information to complete an investigation.

A no finding outcome occurs when the DPA cannot complete an investigation because the officers cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that two private vehicles were parked on the sidewalk, obstructing the protected bike lane outside Mission Station. Both vehicles had unofficial printed signs in the windshield that read, "Official Police Business." The complainant provided the make, model, and license plate number of one of the vehicles but declined to be interviewed or provide any additional information to the DPA.

Since the complainant was unable to identify the specific officers who parked the vehicles there, the DPA sent an ID Poll to the Mission Station. An ID poll describes the incident and requests that the commanding officer review the incident details and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned with negative results.

The DPA also submitted another request to the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) to locate the vehicle, and the returning record indicates no matches in the SFPD fleet for that specific vehicle. There was insufficient information to identify the officer, thus preventing the DPA from conducting further investigation.

There were no witnesses at the time of the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/12/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he later went into the station and spoke with one of the officers who was standing in a circle having a conversation. He asked the officer to move the vehicles, and the officer responded, “When we’re done,” but refused to explain why it was necessary to block the lane or tell the complainant when he would move. The complainant provided the make, model, and license plate number of one of the vehicles but declined to be interviewed or give any additional information to the DPA.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officer who spoke with him, the DPA sent an ID Poll to the Mission Station. An ID poll describes the incident and requests that the commanding officer review the incident description and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned negative results. There was not enough information to identify the officer, preventing the DPA from conducting further investigation.

There were no witnesses at the time of the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: M**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 8/12/25.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/18/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/11/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: M**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and a representative for San Francisco Police Department, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 8/6/25.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officers engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed a complaint about an incident she observed where several officers responded to a scene to detain one male. She believed that a disproportionate number of officers arrived at the scene to deal with one individual.

The evidence such as the Computer Aided Dispatch report (CAD), the Incident Report, and Body-worn camera footage (BWC) showed that several officers responded to a call for service regarding a male who was seen openly swinging a metal pipe and screaming obscenities. When the officers arrived, they spoke with a reporting party who informed them that the male was screaming obscenities and swinging the pipe towards individuals as though he was going to strike them. An officer observed the male walking with the metal pipe in hand. Because a pipe could be used as a deadly weapon, one of the officers quickly exited their patrol vehicle, drew their department issued firearm and placed it in a low ready position. The officers ordered the male to drop the pipe which he did, without further incident. The officers attempted to detain and handcuff him, however, the male verbally and actively resisted. Officers eventually handcuffed the male.

The BWC showed the male yelling and making incoherent statements. The officers had determined that based on the call for service, the fact he had a weapon, and his behavior on-scene, he met the criteria to be placed on a mental health hold. Accordingly, the male was transported to the hospital for further evaluation.

The evidence showed that several officers responded to the scene to deal with a male who had a metal pipe and was acting aggressively towards random individuals on the street. However, the officers' response, in its entirety, was appropriate given the circumstances.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also stated that she observed the officers laugh at the male and mock him.

The above facts from the previous section are hereby incorporated by reference. The evidence did not show that the responding officers laughed or mocked the male. The evidence showed the officers trying to help the male and get him the proper care.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to enforce a restraining order she had obtained against her housemate, who attempted to enter her bedroom. Although the complainant was not present at the time of the incident, she stated that she observed the behavior through video surveillance.

Department records show that the complainant contacted police to report a restraining order violation by her housemate.

Court documents show that the complainant obtained a restraining order against her housemate, which required the housemate to stay three yards away from the complainant and forbade contact and harassment.

Body-worn camera footage captured the named officer speaking with the complainant, who reported that her housemate approached her bedroom door and attempted to enter. The complainant presented video footage to the officer, which she claimed supported her allegation. The body-worn camera footage also recorded the complainant's video, which showed the housemate walking down the hallway, a common area, toward the complainant's door, then immediately turning around and returning to her bedroom. The video did not depict the housemate attempting to open the complainant's door.

The named officer did not violate Department policy by not enforcing the restraining order because the complainant did not present evidence that a violation occurred.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer told her that the police had responded to her residence several times.

Department records show that the complainant contacted police to report a restraining order violation by her housemate. Additionally, records indicate that officers have responded to the complainant's residence approximately 50 times in the five months preceding this call, primarily for incidents related to restraining order violations.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant reporting to the named officer that the complainant had violated a restraining order by attempting to enter her room. The footage showed that the named officer mentioned to the complainant that police had been called to her residence multiple times.

Department General Order 2.01 (General Rules of Conduct) states in relevant part that officers must treat members of the public with courtesy and respect.

The named officer did not violate Department policy by making a factual statement to the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 3 of 3**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer made a face at her.

Department records show that the complainant contacted police to report a restraining order violation by her housemate.

Body-worn camera footage does not show the named officer making a face at the complainant or behaving inappropriately.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/26/25      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said in a voice message that she was issued a citation even before the meter had expired. However, the complainant failed to respond to multiple calls and emails with requests for additional information.

Based on the date, time, and location of the incident, the DPA was unable to locate any citations or parking issues conducted by the SFPD.

Department records did not retain any relevant citations during the time and location of the incident.

Due to the limited information and evidence provided by the complainant, the DPA is unable to identify the specific incident or citation or to ascertain whether the SFPD or other agencies issued a citation.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/02/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was involved in a road rage incident on a freeway with another driver who was in a personal vehicle. The complainant believed the driver was an SFPD officer because he claimed to be a police officer. However, the driver did not identify himself as an SFPD member and was not wearing a uniform. The complainant stated he had photos and video, but did not provide them to the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). The complainant did not respond to DPA's request for additional information.

DMV records identified the registered owner of the vehicle. Department personnel records do not match the name of the registered owner.

There was inadequate information to complete an investigation.

A no-finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because involved officers cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer used profanity.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was involved in a road rage incident on a freeway with another driver who was in a personal vehicle. The complainant believed the driver was an SFPD officer because he claimed to be a police officer. However, the driver did not identify himself as an SFPD



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/02/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

member and was not wearing a uniform. The complainant stated he had photos and video, but did not provide them to the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). The complainant did not respond to DPA's request for additional information.

DMV records identified the registered owner of the vehicle. Department personnel and Fleet Management records do not match the name of the registered owner.

There was inadequate information to complete an investigation.

A no-finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because involved officers cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that unknown SFPD officers in different vehicles are harassing him by driving by his place of employment daily for the past 4 months, looking at him, and then driving away. The complainant was unable to identify the officers or the vehicles involved. The complainant stated he had photos and video, but did not provide them to the Department of Police Accountability (DPA). The complainant did not respond to DPA's request for additional information.

There was inadequate information to complete an investigation.

A no-finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because involved officers cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/27/2025    PAGE 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he had been harassed by a female tenant in his apartment building, prompting him to call for police assistance. The named officer and his partner responded to his location to investigate. The complainant alleged that the named officer failed to prepare an incident report.

Department records showed that the officers prepared an incident report, adequately documenting their investigation.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer failed to properly investigate the incident by not talking to the suspect.

The incident report showed the named officer went up to the suspect's apartment unit and repeatedly knocked on her door, but nobody answered. He talked to the tenant next door, who said that the suspect had left the building. He contacted a staff member in the building for surveillance videos. There were cameras in the building, but the staff member did not have access to them. The officers also reviewed the complainant's cell phone recording of his interaction with the suspect. The officers found no evidence of threats in the recording. Based on the information gathered, the officers were unable to determine if a crime had occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/27/2025    PAGE# 2 of 2**

The Department of Police Accountability obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos were consistent with the incident report.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that during the contact, the named officer mentioned his probation or parole status, which had nothing to do with him reporting a crime. He found it inappropriate and unnecessary. He further stated that the named officer yelled at him.

The BWC footage of the incident showed that, towards the end of the contact, the complainant was frustrated that the officers were unable to talk to the suspect. He believed the suspect was still around, and the officers made no effort to speak to her. As the officers explained that the suspect was no longer in the building, the complainant became agitated, accused the officers of collecting their paychecks without doing their job, and used profanity. When the named officer attempted to calm him down to prevent committing acts that would violate his parole or probation, the complainant became belligerent and started yelling at the officers, prompting the named officer to yell back and end the contact to avoid escalation.

The comments did not rise to the level of misconduct. Instead, it was conveyed in a manner to preempt the complainant from committing acts that would escalate the situation and result in his arrest or detention.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/04/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DEM**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Division of Emergency Communications  
Department of Emergency Management  
1011 Turk Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/05/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/2025    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** Policy or procedure complaint

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: POL**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant observed a uniformed officer outside of a department store. The complainant spoke with the officer, who advised that he was working for the store. The complainant stated that uniformed officers employed by the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) should not work for private businesses.

Department records showed that the involved officer was working a voluntary overtime assignment at a department store.

The San Francisco Administrative Code (Chapter 10B) allows for businesses to request personnel services from the SFPD for law enforcement purposes within the City and County of San Francisco. It states in part that, "Any person, corporation, firm or organization desiring additional personnel, equipment, or materials of the Department, for law enforcement purposes within the City and County of San Francisco, may request the Department to provide such personnel to perform such services." It also details that if the Chief of Police (or the Chief's designee) approves the request for police services, "the Chief may detail such personnel for such services in the number he or she determines to be necessary to perform the services."

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant interacted with the named officer at a retail store. The complainant alleged she initially spoke with the named officer outside of the store and again, when she was leaving. The complainant said the officer was rude and condescending when speaking to her.

The named officer was working an overtime assignment at a retail store. He was initially approached by the complainant, who told him to get back to work, and he told her that he was working. She later approached him when she was leaving the store and told him that he was a nasty and mean person. He described his demeanor as calm and professional. He said he was not rude, condescending, or discourteous during the interaction.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage did not capture what the complainant identified as the initial interaction as she entered the store. The footage captured the named officer and complainant briefly interacting as the complainant was leaving the store. The complainant told the named officer he was rude, nasty, and hostile, and the named officer replied that the complainant was rude and that she had a problem with him talking to another person. The named officer did not yell or use any profane or uncivil language.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Chief's Office**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Chief's Office  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to remove her hat and salute during the playing of the National Anthem at a baseball game.

The named officer stated she did not salute or remove her hat during the National Anthem because she was responsible for providing support and protective security for the Chief of Police. She stated that due to officer safety concerns, she must maintain constant situational awareness and vigilance, which requires her to keep her hands free and continuously scan for potential threats. The named officer further stated that she is not aware of any policy or procedure requiring her to salute and/or remove her hat during ceremonies, including when the National Anthem is played.

The named officer did not violate Department policy, as the San Francisco Police Department does not have a policy that governs whether officers should salute or remove their hats during the playing of the National Anthem.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1**

**FINDING: Referral/OCEIA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

San Francisco Office of Civic Engagement and Immigrant Affairs  
1145 Market Street, Suite 100  
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/10/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in a voicemail that a police car used its emergency lights to cut through traffic on a bridge. The complainant declined further contact during the investigation. The complainant provided the license plate number, make, and model of the vehicle.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, an ID Poll was sent to District Stations. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Commanding Officer review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID polls came back with negative results.

Fleet Management records show that no vehicle in the Department with the listed license plate number. The car is not owned or operated by the Department.

There was insufficient information to identify the officer or to conduct further investigation. However, the evidence shows that the Department does not own the vehicle.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: NF/W**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, a therapist, reported that his client reported that during her mental health detention, an officer beat her with a stick after she was handcuffed, and the paramedic placed a bag over her head. The complainant was not present during the incident and did not wish to file a formal complaint.

DPA attempted to contact the client's parent, but the parent did not call back.

The Department records did not indicate a use of a force. The paramedics did use a spit mask, as the client was spitting at officers and paramedics. Given the lack of information and the complainants desire not to file a formal complaint, DPA is unable to conduct a complete investigation and issue findings.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 1 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant filed an online complaint in which they said they witnessed an officer wrongfully detain an individual in a grocery store parking lot.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records showed that the named officers responded to the grocery store parking lot following a 9-1-1 call. The caller stated that a driver was blocking their vehicle and making threats.

The incident report, authored by named officer #1, states that the named officer attended the scene and spoke with the manager of the store. The manager noted that the person and vehicle involved in the 9-1-1 call were still on the scene and needed to be escorted off the premises. The manager confirmed he would be willing to press charges of trespass and pointed out the subject vehicle. The named officer approached the car and informed the driver that they were parked in a fire lane and needed to leave, as the grocery store manager had requested that the individual be removed from the store property. The subject continued to refuse to comply, arguing with officers about leaving.

Body-worn camera footage captured and verified the information from the CAD and incident report.

The evidence shows that the named officers did not detain the subject of the vehicle. In fact, the officers were actively asking the subject to leave the area on behalf of the store manager.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 2 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant stated that when the officer spoke to the driver, they used threatening language towards them.

The named officers stated that they spoke to the driver multiple times and told them they were not welcome at the store. The officers warned the driver that if they failed to leave, they could be subject to arrest for trespassing.

Body-worn camera footage recorded the officers speaking to the driver, informing the driver of their need to leave, and warning that failure to do so could result in arrest. The driver refused to listen or leave. The footage showed that the officers were firm, calm, and reasonable in their communication with the driver.

The evidence showed that the officers informed the driver of the outcome if the driver remained on the store's property. The result could be the driver's arrest for trespassing. These comments do not amount to threats, intimidation, or harassing behavior.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 3 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said that the named officer arrested the driver for no reason.

The named officer stated that the driver had continued to refuse to leave the parking lot, so he walked in front of the vehicle to attempt to complete a traffic stop and deal with the driver for trespassing. The driver then accelerated the car forward, striking the officer and throwing the officer up onto the hood of the vehicle. The officer stated that the driver was then arrested for felony assault on a peace officer with a deadly weapon, misdemeanor willfully committing a harmful or offensive physical contact against a peace officer, and trespassing.

A witness officer stated that he observed the driver of the vehicle accelerating and striking the named officer with the car.

Body-worn camera footage and store security footage captured the driver accelerating and hitting the officer with the vehicle.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, it was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer towed a vehicle without justification.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant stated that the named officer towed the vehicle without justification.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 4 of 6**

The named officer stated that he observed dents on the front passenger side of the vehicle's hood. These dents were consistent with where he had landed on the car after being struck. The officer spoke with investigators assigned to investigate the assault on the named officer, and they advised the officer to seize the vehicle as evidence in the crime.

California Vehicle Code section 22655.5 states, in part:

"A Peace officer may remove a vehicle from the highway or from public or private property when the officer has probable cause to believe that the vehicle was used as the means of committing a public offense and/or that the vehicle is itself evidence which tends to show that a crime has been committed or that the vehicle contains evidence, which cannot be readily removed, which tends to show that a crime has been committed."

The evidence showed that the vehicle was used as a weapon in a criminal act.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said that the named officer illegally searched the driver's vehicle.

The named officer stated that he observed dents on the front passenger side of the vehicle's hood. These dents were consistent with where he had landed on the car after being struck. The officer spoke with detectives assigned to investigate the assault on the named officer, and they advised the officer to seize the vehicle as evidence in the crime.

Department records show an SFPD Tow Inventory slip was completed for the vehicle.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 5 of 6**

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer made a quick, cursory inventory search of the vehicle before it was towed.

Department Notice 23-014 (Towing Vehicles for CSI Procession) states that, "Officer shall conduct an inventory search of all vehicles that are towed."

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, it was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said that the named officer illegally searched the driver's vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer did not conduct a search of the vehicle.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #9-10:** The officers failed to activate a body-worn camera as required.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25    PAGE# 6 of 6**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said the named officer did not activate their body-worn cameras.

Body-worn camera footage shows that the officers did, in fact, activate their body-worn cameras. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officers laughed at her and stalked her.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to contact the complainant for additional information with negative results. There was inadequate information to complete an investigation.

A no finding outcome occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because involved officers cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/23/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Airport Bureau**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Airport Bureau Administration  
780 McDonnell Road  
San Francisco, CA 94128

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 8/11/2025 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 3.16

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF/W**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was employed at a dog grooming business equipped with interior surveillance cameras. She said that she had become aware she had been recorded while cleaning the premises after business hours. During that time, she made personal phone calls and disclosed private information. She later went to the police station, believing she had filed a police report; however, she subsequently learned that only a Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) number had been issued, and no formal incident report was prepared. She alleged that the named officer failed to write an incident report.

The CAD indicates that the complainant reported to the named officer that her employer filmed her at her place of business. In addition, it was documented that the complainant needed the CAD number only.

The named officer stated that he did not write an incident report because the complainant mentioned she had retained an attorney. He believed she agreed to postpone filing a report until after consulting with her attorney. He further stated that she appeared to agree with this course of action.

Department General Order 2.01.03(9) states in relevant part, "While on duty, members shall make all required written reports of crimes or incidents requiring police attention."

California Labor Code section 435(a) states, "No employer may cause an audio or video recording to be made of an employee in a restroom, locker room, or room designated by an employer for changing clothes, unless authorized by court order."

The complainant's report of being recorded at her workplace, outside of a restroom or changing area, does not constitute a violation of the law. Per Department policy, the named officer was not required to write an incident report because the complainant's concerns did not involve a criminal matter. Additionally, the CAD indicates that the complainant only requested the CAD number.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/04/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/ San Francisco Sheriff Department**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
Internal Affairs Unit  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/04/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/05/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/ San Francisco Sheriff Department**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
Internal Affairs Unit  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/14/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/13/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Daly City Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
333 90th Street  
Daly City, CA 94015

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/15/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said an online video showed a person physically contacting another person filming in public and throwing the cameraman's property in a trash can. The complainant alleged that the named officers failed to take any action regarding the physical contact and the property being thrown away.

The online video clip submitted shows a person filming a group exercising in a park. A reportee to police said the cameraman filming was making people uncomfortable. A bystander told the cameraman to go away, appeared to make physical contact with him, and threw part of the camera in a trash can.

The video shows that the named officers arrived at the scene and spoke with the parties involved. The named officers explained that since it was a public location, the man was allowed to film. The cameraman asked the named officers to tell the other person to not touch him and to retrieve the property from the trash can. Named officer #1 told one party to refrain from being physical, not to touch the cameraperson's property, and that charges could be pressed. Named officer #2 retrieved the property from the trash can and gave it to the cameraperson. The cameraperson did not request an arrest of the other party. The Body Worn Camera footage for the call had been deleted.

Dispatch records showed a call for service regarding someone in a mask filming women exercising in a park.

Department General Order 5.04, Arrests by Private Persons states in part that "A private person may arrest for public offenses not committed in the member's presence, and the member is required to receive a person so arrested."

The evidence showed that the named officers were not obligated to take any further action against the other party, as no request for a private person's arrest was made. The officers fulfilled their duties and responsibilities for this call for service. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/18/2025**

**DATE OF COMPLETION: 08/25/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING:**

**IO-2**

**DEPT. ACTION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/19/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/21/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING:** IO-1/ San Francisco Sheriff Department

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
Internal Affairs Unit  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102



**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 08/21/2025**

**DATE OF COMPLETION:08/21/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING:**

**IO-1/SFSO**

**DEPT. ACTION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
Internal Affairs Unit  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 08/25/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/27/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 08/28/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/CHP**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

California Highway Patrol- Golden Gate Division  
1551 Benicia Road  
Vallejo, CA 94591