

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/5/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-#2:** The officers were absent without authorization from a post, assigned area, or duty station.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant alleged that two officers were absent from their assigned post without authorization and visited the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) without permission.

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03.I.A.2.a states that officers assigned patrol duties are shall not leave their assigned area except in the performance of proper police duty, with the permission of a superior officer, or for personal necessity. There is no equivalent policy restricting sergeants from leaving their assigned area.

Both officers denied the allegations. Officer #1 stated that he visited the Department of Emergency Management for a personal necessity and obtained permission from his direct supervisor. Officer #2 explained that, although he was not required to obtain approval due to his rank, he nonetheless informed his commander of his whereabouts and the purpose of the visit. Officer #1's supervisor confirmed that Officer #1's visit was within policy.

Because the anonymous complainant did not provide any evidence to support the allegation, the Department of Police Accountability interviewed Department of Emergency Management employees for clarification. The staff consistently reported a strong working relationship with law enforcement and indicated that officers are encouraged to visit to build rapport. They explained that officers typically visit during their training phase, to express appreciation, or following major incidents. The staff also emphasized that the facility is secured and that management authorization is required to access the dispatch floor. They denied any instance of officers gaining unauthorized access.

The evidence showed that Officer #1 had authorization from the Department of Emergency Management. Officer #2 notified his commander, despite no policy requiring him to do so. Officer visits are common, encouraged, and aligned with standard practice. Although the anonymous complainant alleged unauthorized absence, the evidence strongly contradicts the claim and demonstrates that the officers' actions were consistent with policy and within normal operational practice. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/5/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-#4:** The officers engaged in sexually derogatory behavior or made sexually derogatory comments.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant alleged that the officers acted inappropriately by attempting to hug and touch certain dispatchers based on their appearance during their visit to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM).

The officers denied the allegations. Officer #1 and Officer #2 explained that their visit to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) occurred on the anniversary of a major incident for which they were the primary officers involved. They described dispatchers as the “literal lifeline” to officers in the field, and stated that, during the referenced incident, the dispatchers performed exceptionally well. Their purpose in visiting DEM was to express appreciation to the dispatchers for their efforts.

The complainant did not provide evidence to support the allegation therefore DEM employees were interviewed for clarification. According to DEM employees, there have been no harassment complaints made by dispatchers or staff against any officers. DEM supervisors confirmed that, had they received such a complaint, it would have resulted in an internal investigation. DEM employees further stated they value officer visits and appreciate being acknowledged for their work. They characterized their relationship with officers as strong and professional, and they denied witnessing or hearing about any inappropriate behavior during officer visits.

Department General Order (DGO) 11.07.02.B.4.c defines sexual harassment as any unsolicited and unwelcome sexual advance, request for sexual favors, and other verbal, physical, visual, or written conduct of a sexual nature directed to persons of the same or opposite sex when such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual’s work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

Given the lack of evidence supporting the allegation, the consistent denials by both officers, the unanimous statements from DEM employees refuting any inappropriate conduct and the absence of any reports or observations consistent with DGO 11.07’s definition of sexual harassment, the allegation is unsupported. The evidence demonstrates that the officer’s conduct was professional and consistent with the established and appropriate working relationship between sworn personnel and DEM staff.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/5/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability'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: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 1 of 6**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he had a verbal dispute with his neighbor, who confronted him about filing more than 30 complaints about the neighbor's vehicle allegedly violating street-cleaning rules without receiving citations. The complainant felt the lack of enforcement was unfair to the community, while the neighbor interpreted the repeated complaints as harassment. According to the complainant, the neighbor responded by calling the police and falsely reporting that the complainant had threatened the neighbor and their family. The complainant alleges the named officer failed to conduct a proper investigation.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.04, *Arrests by Private Persons*, requires officers to investigate allegations made by private individuals before deciding whether to cite or book a suspect.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03.03, *Investigative Detentions*, defines probable cause to arrest as a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe a crime has been committed by the suspect. Probable cause is required under the Fourth Amendment.

The named officer denied the allegation, stating that the complainant was arrested based on the neighbor's statements and his assessment that probable cause existed.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that the neighbor reported a serious incident: the complainant allegedly ran up to the neighbor's car in a parking garage, threatened to kill the neighbor and the neighbor's entire family, and then ran toward his apartment. Fearing for their safety, the neighbor retreated inside their residence.

Body-worn camera footage confirmed the police interviewed the neighbor. The neighbor repeated that the complainant had made explicit death threats toward them and their minor child and stated they remained in sustained fear. The neighbor gave a physical description of the complainant and provided the vehicle's license plate number. Body-worn camera footage also shows officers going to the complainant's residence. After multiple attempts, the complainant eventually came to the door and was detained while the investigation continued. The neighbor participated in a cold show and positively identified the complainant.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 2 of 6**

According to the incident report, the complainant was subsequently arrested for three counts of criminal threats (California Penal Code section 422) and transported to the station. The complainant declined to give a statement and was later booked into county jail.

Police and court records confirmed that the named officer had sufficient probable cause to arrest and charge the complainant for criminal threats.

The evidence showed that the named officer took several investigative steps such as interviewing the neighbor and obtaining detailed information including behavior, explicit threats, the presence of a minor, descriptive identifiers, and vehicle information. The officers detained the complainant and conducted a cold show identification. Furthermore, under DGO 5.03, officers obtained a detailed victim statement with elements consistent with Penal Code Section 422, criminal threats. Although the complainant perceived the officer's actions as a failure to investigate, the investigation showed the named officer complied with Department policy.

The evidence proves the alleged conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-#3:** The officers made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 3 of 6**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that he was wrongfully arrested based on his neighbor's false statement.

The allegation made by the complainant is not supported by evidence. The body-worn camera footage, CAD records, and officer statements confirm that officers followed required investigative procedures before arresting the complainant. The neighbor provided detailed allegations of criminal threats, officers interviewed the neighbor on scene, conducted a cold show identification, and contacted the complainant to obtain his response. The complainant was arrested only after officers developed probable cause based on corroborated victim statements and identification, actions fully consistent with Department General Orders and constitutional requirements. Furthermore, the complainant was provided the opportunity to give a statement but declined and was subsequently transported and booked through standard procedures. These steps show that the complainant was afforded the procedural protections required by law, and due process was not violated. Therefore, the officers conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 4 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-#5:** The officers failed to Mirandize.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that he was never properly advised of his *Miranda* rights during or after his arrest and claimed that officers failed to inform him of the charges or allegations at the scene. According to the complainant, at no point did officers clearly articulate the basis for his arrest, leading him to believe that his due process rights were violated.

The officers' body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was advised he was being detained because of an altercation with his neighbor and that the complainant would be afforded an opportunity to provide a statement. The complainant asked Officer #1 what charges he was being arrested for, but Officer #1 advised that he was not the primary investigating officer. Officer #1 then asked if the complainant wished to provide a statement and if so, explained that he would need to Mirandize the complainant. The complainant declined providing a statement to Officer #1 and stated he wished to speak with his lawyer. Officer #2 transported the complainant from the incident location to the station. The body-worn camera footage showed that Officer #2 attempted to read the complainant his *Miranda* warnings. During this process, the complainant initially answered the first advisement but then repeatedly refused to give the required yes/no acknowledgement for each separate *Miranda* statement. When the officer explained that a clear yes/no response was needed for each line, the complainant stated he would stop responding. After several attempts to proceed, the officer asked whether the complainant was refusing to provide a statement, and the complainant explicitly confirmed that he was refusing.

The evidence establishes that the officers made a proper and lawful attempt to administer *Miranda* warnings, and the process was only halted due to the complainant's refusal to acknowledge each advisement. *Miranda* rights do not need to be fully read if someone voluntarily refuses to engage or declines to provide a statement. Once the complainant affirmatively stated he would not answer questions, Officer #1 confirmed the complainant's refusal and Officer #2 appropriately ceased the advisement and reconfirmed the complainant's refusal. Because the officers followed proper procedure and the complainant's noncooperation prevented completion of the warnings, the allegation that *Miranda* rights were not provided is unsupported. Therefore, the investigation showed the complainant was not deprived of his rights and the officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 5 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer made a racially charged and degrading remark about the complainant's hair that was captured on body-worn camera.

The officer denied the complainant's allegation, stating he acted professionally toward the complainant.

The body-worn camera footage showed no evidence of the named officer making discriminatory remarks about the complainant or otherwise demonstrating bias.

There was no evidence that corroborated the complainant's allegation, thus, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/13/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 6 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer engaged in an unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that his arrest was an act of retaliation by the named officer, based on a previous incident between them.

The officer denied the allegation stating he did not recall any previous contact with the complainant. He stated that the complainant was arrested based on probable cause.

The CAD records, body-worn camera footage, and court records confirm that the complainant's arrest was based on probable cause. The named officer responded to the scene in a supervisory capacity because the incident involved a city official. The officer wanted to ensure the investigation was conducted properly. The named officer did not learn the suspect/complainant's identity until later in the investigation. The complainant was ultimately arrested for criminal threats based on probable cause. Although the complainant believes his arrest was retaliatory due to a past contact with the named officer, the evidence shows that there was probable cause for his arrest.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he waited for three hours at Auto Return for an officer to meet him so he could get a release for his recovered stolen vehicle, but the officer never showed up. The complainant was unable to identify the officer, nor could he identify the person who told him that an officer would come to Auto Return.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated no officer was present when his stolen vehicle was towed.

Auto Return records indicate that the SFMTA, not the SFPD, towed the complainant's vehicle. The vehicle was towed for blocking a driveway. SFPD was not involved in towing the complainant's vehicle.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SFMTA**

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

SFMTA/Dept. of Parking & Traffic  
11 South Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/30/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was the victim in a collision and suspected that the person who hit him was intoxicated. The complainant stated that stated that the named officers refused to breathalyze the other drive and refused to investigate whether a DUI had occurred.

The named officers stated that they did not believe that the accused person was showing any signs of intoxication and did not believe they had probable cause to begin a DUI investigation.

Department of Emergency Management documents showed that the complainant and a witness both reported that the other driver was likely intoxicated based on his behavior and the odor of alcohol.

Body-worn camera footage showed the other drive exhibiting clear signs of intoxication. Additionally, the other driver volunteered the information that he was intoxicated to one of the officers. The officers asked both drivers if they were injured, but did not ask if anyone had consumed alcohol, drugs, or medication. They did not interview the witnesses or get their contact information. They did not obtain current contact information or proof of a valid driver's license from the individual who caused the collision. They did not seek surveillance video from a nearby business.

Officers are required to investigate DUI incidents when there is probable cause to believe a DUI occurred and when an involved party requests that a traffic arrest be made. Investigation showed that the officers disregarded clear evidence that a DUI had occurred.

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: 04/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/30/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The officer did not prepare an incident report or traffic crash report. The complainant stated that he needed a report for insurance purposes to show that he was a victim in a DUI collision.

The named officer stated that he did not believe the other driver was intoxicated and, therefore, did not investigate or prepare a report.

Investigation showed that the officer disregarded clear signs that the driver who caused the collision was intoxicated.

Officers are required to prepare a Traffic Crash Report when a DUI collision occurs.

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: 04/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/30/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5:** The officers failed to make an arrest.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers failed to arrest a person for DUI after a vehicle collision.

The named officers stated they did not believe that the accused person was showing any signs of intoxication and did not believe they had probable cause to begin a DUI investigation or arrest the person.

The officers' failure to investigate the DUI likely prevented them from citing or arresting the driver who caused the collision. There is insufficient evidence to prove or disprove the allegation.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officers failed to investigate an allegation of DUI.

The named officer stated he did not see any signs of intoxication but had minimal interaction with any party on scene.

Body camera footage showed that the named officer was a backup officer and had minimal interaction with any of the parties involved.

The named officer was not involved in any potential investigation. 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: 06/05/25      DATE OF COMPLETION: 12/29/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      **ND**

**FINDING:**      **PC**

**DEPT. ACT ION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was present during a verbal altercation between her former and current partners. The situation escalated when her former partner brandished a gun while speaking to the current partner, then sped away in a vehicle. The complainant and her partner called the police but didn't get a response. They then drove to the nearest police station to make a counter-report, but after waiting in the lobby without assistance, the complainant left. The complainant returned a couple of days later to file the report.

There was no available footage from the police station of the complainant's initial visit. However, body-worn camera footage captured an officer investigating the allegation of brandishing when the complainant returned to the station days later. The footage showed an officer interviewing the complainant and conducting background research related to the incident. The officer located call records indicating that the complainant had initially declined to provide suspect information to Dispatch, disconnected the call, and later cancelled a second call. The complainant explained that she had been running at the time and was unable to respond to Dispatch, and that her departure from the station likely caused the call to be marked as cancelled.

Understanding the complainant's need to file a report, the officer listened to her account, confirmed her statement, and completed the appropriate background checks. The officer also documented a long history of prior incidents between the complainant and her former partner. In addition, the officer provided the complainant with information about victim's rights and guidance on obtaining a restraining order.

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03, *Duties of Patrol Officers*, states that officers shall make written reports on crimes observed or brought to their attention that have not been previously reported (DGO 1.03.I.A.5.d).

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 06/05/25      DATE OF COMPLETION: 12/29/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

The evidence shows that the complainant initially left the station before an officer could offer assistance. Days later, an officer returned to the police station to meet with the complainant, who had stayed to file a counter-report. Although officers had not been dispatched previously due to incomplete calls for service, the reporting officer treated the complainant with courtesy and respect, completing the incident report.

Therefore, the evidence establishes that the alleged conduct occurred. However, the officer's actions were justified, lawful, and proper.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 5/22/2025 DATE OF COMPLETION: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      **ND**      **FINDING:**      **PC**      **DEPT. ACTION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant attempted several methods to contact someone in the Department who could take her report. She first used the Anonymous Tip Line but became dissatisfied with waiting for a return call. She then contacted an administrative unit and demanded that her call be transferred to an officer. After speaking with the named officer and providing information, the complainant expected a formal report to be written. However, no report was prepared.

The Department of Police Accountability interviewed the complainant about the incident. The complainant refused to answer follow-up questions regarding their contact attempts at the emergency and non-emergency phone lines to file a report. The complainant also alleged that the named officer provided a fake number that belonged to a restaurant.

The named officer denied the complainant's allegation. He stated that he received a call from the administrative unit requesting assistance for a complainant who had been unable to reach anyone through the Anonymous Tip Line. He provided his contact information for follow-up purposes. According to the officer, the complainant's information was preliminary narcotics-trafficking intelligence regarding one individual who the complainant knew intimately. He also recalled that the complainant made several disjointed and inconsistent statements unrelated to the narcotics activity. When the complainant asked for a police report number, the officer explained that this type of investigation does not immediately generate a report number as through Dispatch, but that he had taken notes. He informed her that she could visit any local police station to file a formal report. He further explained that narcotics-related reports are not generated over the phone—especially in Anonymous Tip situations—to protect the source of information. For the same reason, a computer-aided dispatch record is neither required nor created.

The Department of Police Accountability also interviewed the administrative unit's staff member that was involved. The staff member corroborated the named officer's account. She recalled that the complainant became frustrated with the questions they asked and the information that they provided and said the staff

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 5/22/2025 DATE OF COMPLETION: 12/16/2025 PAGE# 2 of 2**

member was “wasting her time” and did not know how to help her. The staff member recalled, the complainant stated she had left several voicemails on the narcotics tip line but had not waited for a return call because she had “crucial” information. The staff member reported that during the conversation, the complainant made several hostile remarks, including that staff “needed to get their heads out of their asses,” that they were “letting drug dealers get away,” and that they “didn’t care about her putting herself at risk,” despite the staff member’s own efforts to assist. On the day the complainant was transferred to the named officer, she refused to be sent to voicemail, so the staff member personally contacted the officer, briefed him, and then transferred the call.

The Department Manual governing informant file maintenance requires the Narcotics Detail to keep a separate master file and working file. Each must be stored in a secure, locked cabinet and remain under the exclusive control of the Officer-in-Charge or designee. This system allows informant managers to update working files with relevant investigative information without compromising an informant’s identity.

The investigation found that the complainant initially used the Anonymous Tip Line but was unwilling to wait for a return call, so she contacted an administrative unit and demanded to speak with an officer. In response, a staff member attempted to assist by contacting the named officer, who agreed to take the call. Based on his experience and training, the named officer preserved the complainant’s anonymity by creating a separate working file, consistent with Department policy. He also provided instructions on how to file a formal report in person at a district station given the complainant’s request.

The evidence indicates that the complainant’s expectation of a formal police report did not align with the actual scope and procedures of narcotics-related investigations. Despite the efforts of both the staff member and the named officer to assist her, the complainant perceived their actions as neglectful. However, the evidence demonstrates that the conduct of Department personnel was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer contacted him about various social media posts. He stated the officer was upset and engaged in gaslighting and other inappropriate behavior. The complainant stated that some of the harassing behavior occurred while the officer was on duty. The complainant threatened to contact the officer's chain of command if the inappropriate behavior continued.

The named officer acknowledged being acquainted with the complainant, who followed her on social media. The named officer denied threatening or harassing the complainant on any platform or through other means of communication. The named officer asserted that the complainant was harassing her and that she had made efforts to prevent the complainant from contacting her. The officer stated she had no communications with the complainant while on duty.

No evidence indicated that the officer harassed or threatened the complainant. There was no evidence that the officer communicated with the complainant while on duty. There was no evidence that the alleged misconduct occurred.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complainant raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**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: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 6**

**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 the named officer conducted a vehicle stop of her vehicle without reasonable suspicion.

The named officer stated that he observed a person known to him from prior contacts and who was on parole for a “robbery-homicide” and was on probation for a recent firearm arrest that the named officer was involved in. For the previous arrest, the individual had discarded a loaded handgun in a vehicle in which he was a passenger. In this instance, the person was a passenger in a silver car driven by the complainant. As the officer began following the vehicle, they observed the passenger moving suspiciously inside the car. The officer decided to conduct a vehicle stop for a parole and probation search, as the passenger had previously been arrested for possession of a firearm in a vehicle.

The Incident Report records that the named officer was part of the Crime Gun Investigation Center (CGIC) and observed a male known to the CGIC congregating with a group of males in a high-crime area. This male was known to CGIC officers for previous firearm offences and had current parole and probation conditions, including a full search condition. The named officer confirmed that the parole and probation conditions were up to date. The male was later seen as a passenger in a silver vehicle (the complainant’s vehicle). The named officer conducted a traffic stop to exercise the parole and probation status to confirm compliance. As the complainant’s vehicle was coming to a halt, the named officer observed the male passenger make furtive movements towards the complainant, who was driving. The complainant was later found to have a loaded, unlicensed firearm in her purse, which was worn around her shoulder. Further DNA analysis of the gun showed considerably more of the passenger’s DNA was found on the firearm grip and ammunition than the complainant’s DNA. Charges were later filed against the passenger.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer explained that he had stopped her to conduct a search of the vehicle under the passenger’s parole and probation conditions. The named officer explained that the complainant’s vehicle and person would also be searched.

Department and court records confirm that the male passenger was on parole and probation for firearm-related offenses at the time of the traffic stop.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 6**

The Court of Appeals of California, *In re William J.* (1985) 171 CA3 72, 77, states that officers may stop a car to conduct a parole or probation search, even if the person on parole or probation was only a passenger.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03 Investigative Detentions, Section 3D states that reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts 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 evidence shows that the officers had cause to affect a traffic stop on the complainant's vehicle based on the passenger's current parole and probation conditions for firearm offences. The action of the passenger and complainant as the traffic stop was occurring gave reasonable suspicion to the named officer that the passenger had passed a gun to the complainant. This reasonable suspicion gave the named officer grounds to detain the complainant as well as the passenger for further investigation.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-4:** The officers failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UOF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was illegally pulled from her vehicle by officers. She noted that this force caused her upper left arm pain and bruising, and some minor abrasions on her left hand. The complainant admitted that officers ordered her out of the vehicle and that she refused these orders. The complainant also admitted to arguing and screaming at the officers. She also stated she had a loaded and unregistered gun in her purse, which she said belonged to her and was used for protection.

As per Allegation #1, Department records and BWC showed that the complainant was lawfully detained by Named Officer #1.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 6**

Named Officer #1 stated that he spoke with the complainant and explained that the officers were going to conduct a parole and probation search of the vehicle. He observed that the complainant had a large purse strapped across her body, which was clearly weighed down. Based on the passenger's previous history of possessing firearms in vehicles, the suspicious movements from the passenger just before the traffic stop, and the proximity between the passenger and the complainant, the officer believed the passenger had handed off a firearm to the complainant, and she was concealing it in her purse.

Officer #1 said he issued multiple lawful orders for the complainant to remove the purse and exit the vehicle. The complainant refused. Officer #1 said he opened the driver's door, grabbed one of the complainant's arms, and removed her from the vehicle with the assistance of other officers. The officer said the complainant resisted, turning her body away and pulling away from officers. Officer #3 removed the purse and found it to contain a loaded handgun inside. The complainant continued to resist, flailing her body and dropping her body weight so she would fall to the ground. Officer #1 stated he used control holds to keep the complainant from pulling away, preventing her from flailing and falling to the ground. The complainant continued to resist officers as they walked her to a patrol car, where they were able to secure her.

BWC, Department records (including the Incident Report, Use of Force Logs, and Supervisor Use of Force evaluation), as well as the accounts of Named officers #2 and #3, corroborated Officer #1's account. It should be noted that on the BWC, the complainant alleged that Officer #1 bit her and deliberately scratched her arm. The footage shows that this did not occur.

DGO 5.01 (Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, Section 4A) states that an officer may use objectively reasonable force to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search. Also, to overcome resistance and to gain compliance with a lawful order.

DGO 5.01 Section 3D states that, as per Cal. Penal Code section 835a(a)(4), reasonable force is defined as from the perspective of a reasonable officer in the same situation, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time.

DGO 5.01 Section 5C describes passive non-compliance as not responding to verbal commands. Possible force options for non-compliance include the officer's strength to take control, including lifting or carrying. Also, pain compliance control holds, takedown techniques, and techniques to direct movement or immobilize the subject.

DGO 5.01 Section 5D describes active resistance as physically evasive movements to defeat an officer's attempt at control, including bracing, tensing, running away, verbal or physical signaling an attempt to

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 6**

avoid or prevent being taken into custody. Possible force options include the use of personal body weapons to gain an advantage over the subject. Also, pain compliance control holds, takedown techniques, and techniques to direct movement or immobilize the subject.

The evidence shows that the named officers used force against the complainant. The officers used control holds to effect a lawful detention and search, overcome resistance, and gain compliance with lawful orders. The complainant admits to offering passive non-compliance toward the officers, and BWC footage shows that the complainant escalated to active resistance. The control holds employed by the officers caused pain and minimal injury to the complainant. However, the use of the control holds was within policy and was correctly reported, recorded, and documented.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer improperly used physical control.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer put her in handcuffs, and the cuffs were too tight.

The named officer said that he handcuffed the complainant after she was removed from the vehicle for failing to comply with lawful orders. He said the complainant resisted being handcuffed.

BWC shows the complainant resisting the officer's attempts to handcuff her. Once the complainant was placed in a patrol vehicle, she told the officer her handcuffs were too tight. The officer immediately checked and readjusted the handcuffs at the complainant's request.

The Department Arrest and Control Manual 2005 states that an officer may use handcuffs on any prisoner when deemed necessary.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 5 of 6**

The evidence shows that the complainant was lawfully detained and suspected of having a gun. The complainant refused to obey orders and resisted officers.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-8:** The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers conducted an improper search of her vehicle and her purse.

BWC showed that Officer #1 searched the complainant's vehicle. Officer #2 drove the complainant's vehicle to the police station yard to facilitate a full search of the car. Officer #3 searched the complainant's handbag.

The Supreme Court of California, *P v Schmitz* (2012) 55 C4 909, 926 allows an officer to search property belonging to another vehicle passenger if they reasonably believed that the probationer or parolee could have stowed his personal belongings in the property of the other person when they became aware of police interest in the vehicle.

DGO 5.03 Section 4B allows an officer to make a cursory search when a person is lawfully detained, and the officer has specific and articulable facts causing them to believe the suspect is armed and dangerous.

Based on the documentary and video evidence outlined above, the officers had grounds to search the vehicle and the complainant's purse under parole and probation conditions as they had reason to believe the passenger had stowed a firearm in the complainant's purse. Furthermore, the officers were justified in a cursory search of the complainant's purse as they suspected she was armed and dangerous. Indeed, she was found to have a loaded and unlicensed firearm in her purse.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 6 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: PC**

**FINDING: CUO**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer threatened multiple times to take the complainant to jail.

BWC shows that the named officer tried to explain to the complainant the consequences of failing to follow his lawful orders. The complainant refused to listen, shouting and screaming over the officer's attempts at explanation. The footage also captures the officer having conversations outside the complainant's earshot, in which the officers try to manage circumstances that would allow the complainant to be released from the police station without going to jail.

The evidence shows that the officer warned the complainant that one course of action could result in jail time. However, this was not inappropriate.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #10:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: PC**

**FINDING: ND**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that the named officer was the only female officer on scene and took no action to help the complainant against the actions of the male officers.

The documentary and video evidence above show that the allegations against the male officers were justified, lawful, and proper. As such, the named officer was under no obligation to intervene.

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: 10/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: M**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement between the complainant and a representative for SFPD, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 12/9/25.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2:** 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 partially forwarded to:

San Francisco DEM  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was doing housework on the sidewalk outside her home when her neighbor - whom she has issues with - photographed her and called the police. The named officers responded. The complainant believed that the officers should not have responded because the call for service was low level and frivolous.

The evidence, such as the Computer Aided Dispatch report (CAD), showed that the neighbor called the police alleging that she and the complainant were in a verbal dispute and that the complainant called her racial slurs. The body-worn camera footage (BWC) showed that the named officers responded and spoke to the neighbor, who informed them of what occurred. The officers informed her that what she reported to them was not a crime. The complainant confronted the officers and expressed frustration that the neighbor had taken pictures of her.

The officers tried to explain to the complainant that it was a public sidewalk. The complainant, unhappy with the officers' response, walked back inside.

When an alleged crime is reported to Dispatch and Dispatch assigns an officer, officers are required to respond and investigate the incident. The officers here were notified of an alleged fight between the two parties and responded to the scene to investigate. The officers learned through their investigation that a crime had not been committed and informed the reporting party of such. The officers thereafter did not take any enforcement action. While the complainant knew her actions in doing household work on the sidewalk did not amount to a crime, the officers were only equipped with the facts reported by Dispatch prior to responding. The officers were within policy when they responded to the call - regardless of the severity of the crime.

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: 12/2/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also alleged that the named officer was rude to her and threatened to arrest her.

The evidence showed that the complainant became increasingly upset with the officers when they informed her that the other woman taking pictures of her in public did not commit a crime. The named officer tried to mediate the situation between the parties and emphasized that if they did not mediate the situation and stay away from each other the incident would likely escalate and that someone would end up in jail. The named officer was not rude to the complainant and did not threaten to arrest her.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 2.09, Personal Use of Social Media.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant said that the named officer posted on an alias Instagram account memes that violate the Department's social media policy.

The named officer stated that he does not own or operate the Instagram account in question and therefore did not post any of the content found on the account. The officer provided additional pictures and memes from the account that specifically target the named officer for insult and ridicule. The named officer stated that he believed the complaint filed with the Department of Police Accountability was part of an ongoing pattern of harassment against him.

The complaint was made anonymously, and no evidence was provided that the named officer owned the Instagram account as alleged. The named officer denied involvement with the account and has provided evidence, in the form of memes posted to the account, that the account owner has targeted the named officer for online harassment.

As such, on the balance of probabilities, 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: 06/30/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer touched him without his permission.

The named officer stated that he lightly touched the complainant to get his attention while explaining a citation.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant leaning out of the driver side window taunting another officer at the end of the traffic stop as the named officer was attempting obtain the complainant's signature. The named officer stepped between the complainant and the other officer and lightly tapped the complainant with the same hand that was holding the complainant's driver license. The complainant objected to the contact and the officer explained that he was trying to diffuse the situation and explain the citation.

The contact was incidental to the officer's efforts to deescalate a tense exchange between the complainant and another officer by redirecting the complainant to the task of signing the citation.

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**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer was rude and aggressive during a traffic stop.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/30/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 2 of 3**

The named officer denied being rude or aggressive to the complainant, stating that the complainant had a combative attitude.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer and the complainant bantering. The complainant leaned out of his window while making aggressive and provocative statements. The named officer appeared to have been easily baited by the complainant, but his behavior did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The named officer was also accused of shining his flashlight in the complainant's face. In interview, the named officer stated he placed a flashlight onto a holder on his vest and was not deliberately shining it in the complainant's face. Body-worn camera footage showed the officer affixing a flashlight to his vest and the complainant adjusting his position so that the light was not shining directly into his eyes. It is appropriate for officers to use flashlights during a traffic stop for safety purposes.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order or Department Bulletin 9.01

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The named officer is accused of failing to comply with DGO 9.01, by issuing a citation based on a person's attitude.

The named officer stated he did not issue a citation based on attitude and that he was not trying to advise the driver about his attitude leading to a citation.

Body worn camera footage showed the named officer telling the driver that he had an attitude and that his demeanor would determine if he got a citation. However, the footage also showed that the named officer did not issue a citation to the driver or attempt to influence the issuing officer in anyway. The citation

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/30/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 3 of 3**

issuing officer was on the other side of the vehicle and did not interact with the named officer before writing the citation.

The officer who wrote the citation stated that he did not speak to the named officer about issuing a citation and did not use the driver's attitude as a reason for issuing the citation.

Even though the comments made by the named officer were not advisable, he did not issue a citation or cause a citation to be issued. Therefore, his comments did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** 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 the named officer refused to give his name and star number.

The named officer stated that he did provide his name and star number.

Body camera footage showed that the named officer provided his name and star number to the complainant upon request.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/25/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer made a gesture towards him using her middle finger by rubbing her finger along the side of her face near her eye/temple area.

The named officer stated that she did not recall this specific encounter but that she does not, and would not, make an obscene or disrespectful gesture toward any member of the public.

No evidence is available to rebut or confirm either account.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/01/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The named officer served a search warrant at the complainant's workplace, requesting copies of her employment records. The complainant felt the officer had harassed her because obtaining her records was no longer necessary, as the District Attorney's Office had already received them. The complainant said the warrant had something to do with the arrest of her friend at the San Francisco International Airport for a crime related to prostitution.

Department records show that the friend was under police investigation. The named officer arrested him upon arrival at the airport following a flight together with the complainant. During the investigation, the named officer learned that the two lived together in the same house. He searched the home and seized evidence of prostitution, including a large amount of money that allegedly belonged to the complainant.

The named officer stated that the warrant was for the complainant's employment and pay history, which he needed for his investigation involving a large sum of money. He stated that he prepared the warrant pursuant to the instructions of the prosecutor assigned to the case.

The Department of Police Accountability obtained the named officer's record of investigation. The record shows that a judge of the San Francisco Superior Court signed the search warrant commanding the named officer to search the complainant's workplace.

The search warrant required the complainant's employer to furnish any and all information related to her employment, that included her employment history and paycheck records, among others.

An officer investigating a crime may lawfully conduct a search and seizure to obtain records or evidence needed. The named officer obtained the complainant's records pursuant to a valid search warrant.

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: 12/2/25**

**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 stated her juvenile daughter was sexually assaulted on a bus and that the named officer said she would collect evidence at the complainant's home, which she failed to do.

The named officer stated that she responded to a call for service involving the sexual assault of a juvenile on a bus. She reported deactivating her body-worn camera early in the interaction, in accordance with Department policy, due to the sensitive nature of the incident. While she did not recall her specific statements to the complainant at the scene, she explained that her role as the responding officer included conducting an initial investigation and completing a report. As part of that investigation, she requested video surveillance footage from the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority. She further stated that she completed a report, which was numerically coded for referral to the appropriate investigative unit for follow-up.

A witness officer overseeing the investigations unit stated that the case was received; however, because it involved a misdemeanor arrest, it was referred to the District Attorney's Office for further investigation. The witness officer explained that all misdemeanor arrests handled by the unit are referred to the District Attorney's Office.

A witness from the San Francisco District Attorney's Office confirmed that they received the case from the San Francisco Police Department.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to a call for service involving the sexual assault of a juvenile on a bus. The suspect, who exhibited signs of developmental disabilities, was arrested at the scene and was later released from the station with a misdemeanor citation. The record noted that although video surveillance footage was requested, it had not been received at the time the report was completed. The report also indicated that body-worn cameras were deactivated due to the sensitive nature of the incident.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

The named officer did not violate Department policy, as her responsibilities were limited to conducting the initial on-scene investigation. She was not required to visit the victim's residence later to collect evidence.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Referral/SFDA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred in full to:

San Francisco District Attorney's Office  
350 Rhode Island Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/15/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      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 lodged a complaint about an unknown officer who was rude towards her on a specific date. The complainant did not provide the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) with additional information regarding the alleged occurrence.

Despite all reasonable attempts, DPA could not identify the officer or locate any evidence to show that the complainant had an interaction with an officer on the specified date.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant also alleged that the unknown officer prepared an inaccurate incident report.

As mentioned above, with the limited information provided, DPA was unable to identify an officer or the incident that the complainant complained about.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/18//2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was a victim in a battery incident. The complainant said that the named officer failed to follow up with him regarding the status of his investigation.

The named officer stated that the case was assigned to him for further follow-up after initially being investigated by a part-time officer. The named officer contacted the complainant, who provided a statement on events that occurred, describing injuries sustained during the incident and admitted to being drunk. The officer obtained medical records and reviewed surveillance video. He attempted to follow-up with the complainant several times but was unable to reach him. He was then transferred to another unit and did not receive any messages about the complainant trying to contact him. He explained that investigating officers are not required to provide investigative steps to victims, as it can affect the integrity of the investigation.

Department Records indicated that the complainant went to a local district station and filed a report regarding the incident. Department records also corroborated the named officer's statement and showed that he conducted a thorough 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: 07/31/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      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 stated that the named officers were involved in the investigation of an incident in which she was the victim of a sexual assault. She said that she provided substantial evidence, including more than 50 potential witnesses, none of whom were contacted. Additionally, she noted that named officer #2 communicated with her only twice during the six months the case remained open. The complainant further stated that she was informed the case was open but inactive and alleged that it was not adequately investigated.

Named officer #1 stated he was named officer #2's supervisor and found that he reviewed the case file and believed he conducted a proper investigation. In addition, Officer #1 stated that, in addition to the assigned investigator conducting a proper investigation, he also reviewed police reports and a large volume of submitted materials and followed up with several witnesses provided by the complainant. He stated he kept the case open because there was a related investigation involving the other party, and that evidence from both cases showed that the complainant had contradicted herself in several statements and appeared to be stalking/harassing the other party. He noted that the other party had recently obtained a five-year restraining order against the complainant.

Named officer #2 stated that he was the assigned investigator for the complainant's case. He reported conducting a thorough investigation that included reviewing extensive evidence, including thousands of pages of text messages, police reports, photographs, and videos. He also stated that he interviewed the complainant on at least six occasions and disputed her claim that they spoke only twice. According to Officer #2, there were no direct witnesses to the reported sexual assault; however, the complainant did provide the name of one individual who saw her after the incident. He stated that he attempted to contact this witness multiple times and left several voicemails but did not receive a response.

Department records document that the named officers were involved in the investigation of the complainant's sexual assault case. Detailed investigative steps were documented.

The evidence shows that the named officers conducted an investigation. The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) has concluded that a proper investigation was conducted; accordingly, it is beyond DPA's scope to evaluate the granular details of that investigation.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

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 named officer was rude when he told her she was involved in a “toxic relationship.”

The named officer stated he did not recall telling the complainant that she was involved in a “toxic relationship”; however, she provided him with text messages and documentation that showed she was in a hostile relationship.

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

The comment on its face is not inappropriate and does not violate Department policy. The named officer was describing the complainant’s relationship that reportedly ended with a sexual assault.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/31/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer was rude when he hung up on her.

The named officer reported that during an extended conversation with the complainant, he attempted to conclude the call, but the discussion repeatedly returned to the same points. He stated that he addressed all concerns raised; however, she remained dissatisfied with the information provided. Once all issues had been addressed, he decided to end the call because it had become unproductive. He explained that he intended to remain understanding, but the conversation was not progressing. He noted that at no point did he feel he was being rude.

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported to police that a suspect had harassed and threatened her child. The named officer followed up and informed the complainant that the suspect had other pending charges and that, given her child's circumstances, it was best not to pursue the charges. Consequently, the complainant declined to pursue charges. The suspect later committed a serious violent crime against her family. The complainant alleged that the named officer did not take her case seriously, resulting in violence against her family.

The named officer completed various investigative steps and learned the suspect had been arrested for a separate matter by another jurisdiction and that a warrant was pending. The officer provided the complainant and son an update. The complainant declined to pursue charges at that time, citing her child's circumstances as the reason. The named officer emphasized that he treated the case seriously, did not give the complainant any advice on whether or not to press charges, and respected her decision. He said that he was never informed of the later incident that took place involving the suspect and the complainant's family.

Department records corroborated the named officer's account, showing that he followed up with the complainant a year later and noted that complainant was not concerned about the suspect at that time. Records also showed that the suspect later committed a crime against the complainant's family.

While the Department of Police Accountability acknowledges the very unfortunate incident that later took place involving the suspect and her family, the evidence did not show that the named officer violated Department policy through the investigation and his communications.

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: 08/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer was racially biased against her and her child. The complainant said that the named officer and the suspect were both of the same race and claimed that the named officer was biased in favor of the suspect.

The named officer stated that the complainant and her son's race did not factor or influence him in conducting his investigation or any of his decision-making in the incident. He also stated that the suspect's race had no bearing on how he handled the investigation.

The Department of Police Accountability did not find any evidence that the named officer engaged in biased policing.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, a grocery store owner, alleged that the named officer entered his store without a warrant and requested that an employee hand over his backpack. Although the complainant did not witness the incident firsthand, he stated that the employee complied, after which the officer opened the bag, conducted a search, and photographed its contents without justification.

The named officer explained that he observed the employee seated behind the cash register retrieve a black backpack from beneath the counter, open it, and present it to a customer. The officer reported that he could clearly see flavored tobacco, which is prohibited for sale in California, inside the backpack. He believed the employee was attempting to sell it. Based on this observation, the officer entered the store to initiate a criminal investigation. He requested the backpack from the employee, who voluntarily surrendered it. The officer then inspected the contents, found additional flavored tobacco, photographed it, and returned the bag. He stated that he had both the employee's consent and probable cause to conduct the search for illegal items.

Department records indicate that the officer observed the employee retrieve a backpack from beneath the counter and present it to a customer. Inside, the officer observed numerous individually wrapped items that he suspected were flavored tobacco. He entered the store, requested the backpack, inspected its contents, and photographed the suspected contraband as evidence.

Body-worn camera footage shows the officer inside the store holding a pack of flavored tobacco while speaking with the cashier. The officer stated that he observed the cashier attempting to sell the product and informed the cashier that flavored tobacco is illegal for sale in California. The officer further noted that the cashier's attempt to conceal the product indicated that he was aware that its sale was prohibited. The employee neither responded to nor denied the officer's statements during the interaction.

The employee did not cooperate with the investigation.

Senate Bill 793 prohibits a tobacco retailer, or any of the tobacco retailer's agents or employees, from selling, offering for sale, or possessing with the intent to sell or offer for sale, most flavored tobacco products... Flavored tobacco includes e-cigarettes, flavored smokeless tobacco products, flavored loose-leaf tobacco, etc.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 2 of 4**

Health and Safety Code section 104559.5 states, “A tobacco retailer, or any of the tobacco retailer’s agents or employees, shall not sell, offer for sale, or possess with the intent to sell or offer for sale, a flavored tobacco product or a tobacco product flavor enhancer.”

A preponderance of the evidence shows that the officer observed criminal activity and had probable cause to enter the open and operating store and search the backpack for evidence.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer engaged in unwarranted action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that after the named officer searched his worker’s backpack, the officer requested the worker’s identification (ID) card and took photographs of it. The complainant believed this action was unlawful.

The named officer confirmed that he requested the worker’s identification card to identify a person involved in criminal activity.

Department records indicate that the officer did, in fact, request identification from the worker.

Body-worn camera footage shows that after observing the worker commit a criminal act, the officer requested the worker’s ID card, documented the information, and took photographs of the ID and other related evidence.

San Francisco Police Department General Order (DGO) 5.03 (Investigative Detention) states: “A police officer may briefly detain a person for questioning or request identification only if the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person’s behavior is related to criminal activity.” However, there is no SFPD policy prohibiting officers from photographing a suspect’s ID.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 3 of 4**

The evidence demonstrates that the officer had reasonable suspicion and probable cause to believe the worker had committed a crime. Therefore, the officer's request for identification was justified. On the balance of probabilities, the officer photographed the ID for evidentiary purposes, and this action did not violate department policy.

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**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the officer yelled loudly at his employee throughout the interaction. He also stated that the officer referenced a similar incident at another store, which the complainant considered inappropriate.

The named officer reported that he requested the worker's backpack and identification and denied making any reference to issues involving a neighboring store. The incident report noted that a store adjacent to the complainant's had a court-ordered injunction for selling prohibited items. It also documented that the officer observed an employee from the adjacent store exiting the complainant's newly opened business.

The DPA contacted the Department of Public Health, which confirmed that the same individual owns both the complainant's store and the adjacent store.

Body-worn camera footage shows the officer interacting with the worker in a calm, professional manner, without raising his voice. The footage also contains no reference to the neighboring store.

The evidence collected proves that the officer did not yell at the worker or mention any similar incident involving the neighboring store.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant added to his initial statement that he believed the officer was attempting to intimidate the employee to discourage him from working at the store.

The named officer denied this allegation, stating that he had probable cause to believe the complainant was engaged in criminal activity.

Department records show that the officer observed the employee selling prohibited items from a backpack.

Body-worn camera footage confirmed that the backpack contained flavored tobacco, which is classified as a prohibited item.

The evidence supports the conclusion that the officer had probable cause to believe the employee had committed a crime. However, it does not demonstrate that the officer intentionally sought to threaten or harass the employee to prevent him from working at the store.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/07/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      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 between the complainant and a representative for SFPD, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 12/10/25.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/11/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIOS #1-2:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that on a specific date, named officer #1 and named officer #2 used excessive force against her during an arrest.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) located the arrest incident described by the complainant. However, the records do not reflect that either named officer was involved in the incident. Additionally, named officer #1 had been retired from the Department and DPA could not reasonably identify named officer #2 based on the complainant's assertions.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** As mentioned above, DPA located the arrest incident described by the complainant and was able to identify the arresting officers involved in the incident.

The evidence, such as body-worn camera footage, and reports, showed that neither officer used force against the complainant in any manner. The footage showed that the officers investigated the incident, conducted an arrest, and transported the complainant to the station for processing without incident.

The evidence shows that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer intentionally avoided having his identification on the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) by not notifying dispatch of his location.

The Body-Worn Camera (BWC) evidence shows a Sergeant promptly notifying Dispatch via radio of his Unit Identifier call sign and the Unit Identifier call sign of the named officer upon arrival on scene. The BWC shows the named officer and a sergeant riding together in the same vehicle.

The CAD record shows that the Unit Identifier of the sergeant who was driving was entered in the “K” Comments, but the Unit Identifier of the named officer was omitted from the K Comments.

The BWC footage is outcome-determinative. The named officer was riding with a second officer in the same vehicle. The second officer notified dispatch by radio that both were on scene.

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: 08/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer said to him, "Now be a big boy." The complainant thought the comment was inappropriate.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to a request for a supervisor to a report of a Fight/No Weapon at the residence of the complainant's parents.

The Body-Worn Camera (BWC) evidence captures the named officer telling the complainant, "Now be a big boy and go." The officer is firm and direct in his tone. The comment was made during a response to a call for service, in which the parents of the complainant told officers that the complainant had arrived at their home unannounced after being gone for a year and that they wanted him to leave. The complainant said he went to his parents' house to collect his things and found out the locks had been changed. The complainant asserted that this was his permanent address and that he believed he had been unlawfully evicted from his residence a year earlier. The named officer told the complainant, on multiple occasions, that he did not reside at his parents' home and that he needed to leave because his parents did not want him there. The specific comment was made after multiple other attempts to persuade the complainant to leave had failed. The BWC captured other officers on scene, who also told the complainant to go, and that he did not live there. The complainant was advised that the incident was not criminal in nature and was a civil matter between the complainant and his parents.

The complainant was directed to leave the premises and resisted officers' attempts to do so. The comment by the named officer, in and of itself, does not constitute officer misconduct and appears to be a tactic to persuade the complainant to leave the premises after other, more subtle, attempts had failed. The BWC footage is outcome-determinative.

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: 09/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25      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 and her roommate had a verbal altercation in their residence, and the roommate started video recording her without consent, which the complainant asserted was a crime. The complainant said she pushed the roommate's phone away from her face, and the roommate called the police, reporting that the complainant had battered her. The complainant alleged that police failed to investigate properly, which included failing to note that the incident occurred in her residence and that the roommate was illegally recording her before the complainant responded to stop her.

The named officer said he collected all information about the incident, including obtaining both parties' statements. He noted in the report that the complainant said her roommate was filming her in a common area of their residence, which she believed was a crime. The complainant admitted that she took action to stop her roommate from filming. The named officer said he advised the complainant that the filming was legal as it took place in a common area of the residence, and that slapping the roommate's phone out of their hands was a crime. He said he fulfilled his duties and obligations pertaining to investigating the incident.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the officer's account. Officers spoke to the complainant and the roommate, taking their statements, obtained video footage taken by the roommate, and took photographs. The complainant explained that the roommate had video recorded her in the kitchen of the residence, which was a common area of the home, and that she hit the camera out of the roommate's hand.

The incident report showed that the named officer documented the complainant's statement. This included that the incident took place in the kitchen, that the roommate videotaped her, her belief that the roommate had no right to record her, and that she slapped the phone out of the roommate's hand because she was being recorded.

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: 09/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer was racially biased against her during this incident and that her roommate's word was taken over hers unequally.

The named officer stated that the complainant's race did not factor into any of his actions or decision-making during this incident. He stated that his decision-making in this incident was based on all the statements and evidence in this incident. He stated that the investigation was conducted fairly without bias.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that officers took statements from both the complainant and the other party involved. BWC footage did not show any evidence of biased policing or discrimination.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she called 9-1-1 to report a violation of a temporary civil restraining order that she had against a frequent visitor to her neighbor. The complainant stated that the named officer responded to her call for service but failed to take any action.

The named officer stated that he responded to the call for service but was unable to enforce the restraining order because the restrained party was not present when officers arrived and did not answer the door to his residence. Therefore, no arrest was made, but it was documented in an incident report.

Department records confirmed that the named officer prepared an incident report for violation of a restraining order.

Body-worn camera footage (“BWC”) confirmed that the named officer responded to the scene. The named officer discussed the challenges inherent in enforcing a restraining order in which one party lives within 100 yards but is required to stay 100 yards away. The officer did all he could, given the illogical conditions in the temporary restraining order, which was due to expire in the coming week.

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: 09/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was arrested for stalking and violating a restraining order. The complainant denied stalking and stated that he was not served with a permanent restraining order.

The body-worn camera footage showed that the named officers witnessed the complainant attempting to interact with the protected party and take photos of her. The footage showed the named officers investigated the incident and interviewed witnesses.

The protected party documented numerous times that the complainant was there and allegedly harassing her and showed the officers her notebook/log.

Court records showed a valid restraining order was signed by a judge and in effect at the time of this incident.

The evidence showed the complainant engaged in harassing conduct in the presence of the officers, violating the restraining order. The officers took enforcement action and arrested the complainant per Department policy.

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: 09/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he attempted to retrieve his cell phone, but it could not be found.

DGO 6.15, Property Processing, requires officers that take property to be responsible for it until processed as property for identification and received at the district station or at Property Control Section.

The body-worn camera footage showed that the named officers informed the complainant that his phone would be booked for evidence and the complainant signed the receipt and was told the receipt would be with his property.

Department records showed that the cell phone was booked as evidence in a criminal case and that the complainant was issued a receipt. Department records also showed that the cell phone is currently being held in Property Control as evidence.

Court records showed the complainant's criminal case was still active when he sought his phone.

The evidence shows the officers performed their duties as required regarding the complainant's cell phone.

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: 09/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that a police officer activated emergency lights on a police vehicle to proceed through red traffic lights. Once on the other side of the junction the officer turned off the emergency lights.

An ID poll was sent to the station the vehicle was assigned to. The ID poll was returned with no officer identified.

There is no record of which officers signed out the police vehicle on the date provided.

All reasonable steps to identify the officer were taken but no officer was able to be identified.

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: 09/23/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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 between the complainant and a representative from SFPD, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 12/3/25.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was helping his mother move her car and double-parked on the street for a short time. He said an officer approached him and threatened to issue him a ticket. The complainant did not provide the DPA with any citation.

Computer query of the date, time, location, or complainant's name did not yield any results.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to District Station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Commanding Officer to review the incident description and identify the officers involved. The ID poll returned negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

The witness did not come forward.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25**

**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 reported he was involved in a hit-and-run vehicle collision and alleged that the named officer failed to return his phone, despite informing him that she had located it.

The named officer stated that the complainant had been involved in a serious vehicle collision and appeared to have a bloody mouth, an injured leg, and signs of disorientation. She reported that he repeatedly asked for his cell phone, which she could not locate. The complainant began reaching around inside the vehicle, prompting her to instruct him multiple times to stop, due to concerns about his injuries and the presence of a downed power line that posed a safety risk to both him and the officers. The named officer stated that she told the complainant she had found his phone in an effort to calm him and encourage him to accept medical treatment.

Department records confirm that the complainant was involved in a serious hit-and-run vehicle collision resulting in downed power lines. He sustained injuries and was transported to the hospital for medical treatment.

Body-worn camera footage corroborates the statement of the named officer.

The complainant was the victim of a hit-and-run vehicle collision and was subsequently transported to the hospital for medical care. He was never in the custody of the San Francisco Police Department; therefore, officers were not responsible for his personal property. It is clear from the body-worn camera footage that the named officer told the complainant she had found his phone solely to discourage him from continuing to move around inside the vehicle, which posed a danger due to his injuries and the presence of downed power lines.

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: 09/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The named officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the incident report prepared by the named officer indicated photographs of his injuries were taken at the hospital and that he was provided with a victim information form. However, he reported that he does not recall either of these actions taking place.

The named officer stated he took photographs of the complainant's injuries while at the hospital and also left a follow-up form, a victim of crime notification, and a Marsy's Rights card with hospital staff, and explained all the forms to him. The named officer noted that at the time he did this, the complainant was lying in a hospital bed in the emergency room suffering excruciating pain.

The police report corroborates the named officer's statement.

The San Francisco Police Department provided photographs depicting the complainant's injuries while he was in the emergency room. The images clearly document the severity of his condition.

Body-worn camera footage was not activated in accordance with Department policy, which prohibits recording in hospitals to protect patient privacy rights.

Evidence indicates that the named officer took photographs of the complainant while he was in the hospital, as documented in the police report. Although there is no definitive proof that the officer provided the complainant with victim information forms, it is reasonable to conclude that, given his medical condition at the time, the complainant may not have recalled receiving them.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Referral/SFFD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially referred to:

San Francisco Fire Department  
Department Headquarters  
698 2nd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she was assaulted on a bus by an individual whom she photographed, and the San Francisco Police Department failed to conduct an investigation.

Department records indicate that the complainant reported she was assaulted on a bus, which she reported a few days after the assault. The reporting officer noted that he requested surveillance footage from the bus; however, the matter was never assigned for investigation.

The Department lacks any valid orders addressing how cases are assigned for investigation.

The evidence substantiates that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the Department lacks a relevant policy to address it. The Department of Police Accountability recommends developing a policy to provide clear guidance in the future.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer indirectly tried to stop him filing a complaint and that the officer defended other officer's behavior due to the difficulty of their jobs.

The named officer stated that he did tell the complainant that the officers perform a difficult role. The named officer stated he took down the complainant's complaint, but the complainant said he wanted to file a report with DPA on his own.

There is no other evidence for this case. There is no body camera footage, no witnesses and no documentation.

The named officer's account aligns with the complainant's account. It is not inappropriate for the named officer to comment on the difficulty of the role of a police officer. The complainant admitted he wanted to file a complaint by himself without the named officer's help. The named officer's actions were in department policy.

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: 10/01/2025    COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025    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 partially forwarded to:

San Francisco DEM  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was riding his bicycle when a police vehicle accelerated past him, exceeding the speed limit. He stated that the vehicle did not have an activated overhead light or siren, failed to stop at a stop sign, and appeared to use a loudspeaker to contact other cyclists in the area. The complainant alleged that the officer drove recklessly and unsafely. The complainant submitted a photograph they took of the patrol vehicle.

The named officer denied driving the way the complainant alleged. He said he believed he saw bicyclists who failed to stop at a stop sign in the area. He said he accelerated the patrol vehicle to the speed limit and that there was no need to go any faster, as bicyclists are inherently slower than motor vehicles. He said he stopped at all stop signs in the area, followed all traffic laws, and drove with due regard for the safety of those around him.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to obtain security footage of the incident with negative results.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer opened his apartment door and had no reason or right to do so. He stated it was unprofessional and a violation of his privacy.

The named officer stated that he responded to a call for service regarding a burglary in progress. He and other officers conducted a systematic search of the building to try to locate the suspect. He said there was a great concern for the safety of the residents, as burglars usually carry tools and weapons that can cause serious injury or death. While searching, he ensured each residence's door was locked, and there were no signs of forced entry. He came to the complainant's door, tried the handle to conduct a well-being check, and the door opened. The named officer said the occupant asked why he opened the door, and he told the occupant that there was an unwanted person in the building. The occupant confirmed they were safe, and the named officer closed the door and continued searching. The named officer said he did not fully open the door and did not cross over the threshold.

Dispatch records showed that the named officer was dispatched to a burglary call. The records showed that the reporting party advised that a person climbed up the fire escape of a building and went through a window.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the named officer and other officers responded to the burglary call and searched through a residential building. The named officer checked multiple doors and areas in the building, came to the complainant's door, opened it partially, and asked the occupant if they were okay and told them that someone was there who was not supposed to be. The occupant told the officer that he could have knocked. The named officer did not enter the complainant's residence during the check.

The evidence showed that the officer was investigating a burglary in progress in a residential building where the occupants' safety was at issue. The officer was justified in checking the complainant's apartment door based on the exigent circumstances doctrine. 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: 10/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was a victim of identity theft. The complainant felt that the officer assigned to the case did not properly investigate.

Department records documented that the complainant reported her backpack being stolen while she was out shopping and thereafter unknown individuals used her bank cards to withdraw thousands of dollars from her accounts. Records showed her case assigned to the named officer who obtained and reviewed video from one of the locations where cash was withdrawn. The officer has taken multiple additional investigative steps, including obtaining warrants. Records showed the investigation as still active.

Although DPA recognizes the frustration the complainant must feel regarding the theft itself, the named officer has taken many investigative steps and the case is still pending.

The evidence proved that the officers conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025      PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant's neighbor called 911 stating the complainant was breaking into her storage unit and that the neighbor was the protected party in a restraining order. The complainant stated officers told her there was a restraining order violation and when they found out she was not served they said they would serve her and prevented her from leaving the building and shut the front gate, violating her rights.

DGO 5.03 Investigative Detentions allows officers to detain individuals as they quickly conduct their investigation to determine if a crime was committed.

Department records showed that the contact with the complainant was under ten minutes.

The body-worn camera footage showed the officers were investigating a possible restraining order violation and the complainant was trying to leave. The footage showed officers had not finished looking over the restraining order while complainant was trying to leave. When they did finish looking it over, they saw it was a civil restraining order, and it was not served, and the complainant was free to leave. The complainant was detained only long enough to determine that she had not been served with the restraining order.

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: 10/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025      PAGE# 2 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer conducted an improper search and seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer unlawfully entered her garage area and tried to enter her storage unit without her permission.

The body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant's neighbor let officers in the building and directed the named officer to the lobby door entrance to the garage where the complainant was at the time. The officer walked in and announced that he was police and walked to front of a storage unit that had the light on and door slightly open. The officer opened the door as the complainant came to door and stepped out to lock the storage unit. The named officer did not enter her storage unit.

The garage is a common area of the apartment complex which did not require the officer to obtain permission from the complainant to enter.

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: 10/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/2025      PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** 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 utilized force against her and held her arm, pulled it back and pushed her, preventing her from moving.

DGO 5.01 Use of Force allows officers to use the minimal force to effect a detention.

The body-worn camera footage showed that the complainant was attempting to leave the building, first through the front and then through the back, while officers on scene were investigating a possible violation and were still reading through the restraining order. The footage showed that the named officer held the complainant's arm as she attempted to leave and that he also touched/held her shoulder and back area while she attempted to exit to the back lobby area after officers told her to stop.

The Department records showed that the named officer's contact with the complainant was under ten minutes while they investigated a possible restraining order violation and potential service of a restraining order.

The use of minimal physical restraint was permitted to effect the lawful detention and, in this case, for an investigative detention which was under ten minutes. No reportable use of force 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: 11/07/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's (DPA) jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: REF/ IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's (DPA) jurisdiction.

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: 11/12/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/2/25**

**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 reported that he overheard a police-related incident occurring within his apartment building. He stated that he went downstairs, not fully dressed, and asked the officer to wait while he changed clothes so he could speak with the victim. Upon returning, he discovered that the officer had already left the scene.

The complainant did not provide the additional requested information that would assist in identifying the specific call for police services or the responsible officer.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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: 11/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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 the named officer failed to arrest his neighbor (“Subject 1”), who had pepper-sprayed him during an altercation involving another individual (“Subject 2”) and a security guard who brandished a knife.

The named officer stated that he did not arrest Subject 1 because, based on statements from involved parties and a review of video surveillance footage, he determined that the complainant was the primary aggressor. He explained that Subject 1 deployed pepper spray in defense of Subject 2, who was engaged in a physical altercation with the complainant. The named officer further stated that he did not arrest the security guard for brandishing a knife because the complainant did not make any such allegation. Therefore, there was no probable cause to support an arrest. The officer reported that he arrested the complainant for felony vandalism and battery.

The police report indicates that officers responded to a report of a physical altercation. The complainant reported that when Subject 1 confronted him about a prior conversation with Subject 2, she pushed him, then Subject 2 punched him. He claimed he did not recall how Subject 2’s windshield became broken. In contrast, Subjects 1 and 2 reported that the complainant pushed Subject 1, prompting a physical altercation between the complainant and Subject 2. Subject 1 reported she used pepper spray on the complainant to defend Subject 2. She further reported that the complainant initially walked away, removed his shirt, and then returned to re-engage with Subject 2. After the second altercation, she stated the complainant struck Subject 2’s windshield with both hands, causing it to break. Subject 2 alleged that the complainant brandished a knife, though no weapon was recovered.

The report continued and documented that officers reviewed video surveillance footage at the scene, which showed the complainant initiating the incident by pushing Subject 1, followed by a physical fight with Subject 2. Subject 1 attempted to intervene and then used pepper spray on the complainant. The footage showed the complainant briefly walking away, removing his shirt, and returning to assault Subject 2 by slamming him into a car door and striking him multiple times. The complainant then left again, returned a second time, and struck Subject 2’s windshield with both fists, causing visible damage. The report noted that the damage to Subject 2’s vehicle exceeded \$2,400, and based on the evidence, the

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

named officer determined that the complainant was the primary aggressor and placed him under arrest for felony vandalism, battery, and brandishing a weapon.

The body-worn camera is corroborated by the named officers' statements and the police report.

The video surveillance footage is consistent with the events described in the police report, with the additional observation that a security guard approached the complainant from a distance, apparently to de-escalate the situation. The footage showed the security guard holding a knife at his side, close to his body, with the blade not pointed at anyone and no indication that it was brandished in a threatening manner.

Penal Code § 417 (a) (1) states, "Every person who, except in self-defense, in the presence of any other person, draws or exhibits any deadly weapon whatsoever, other than a firearm, in a rude, angry, or threatening manner, or who in any manner, unlawfully uses a deadly weapon other than a firearm in any fight or quarrel is guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for not less than 30 days."

Department General Order 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states in the relevant part, "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. Under the Fourth Amendment, arrests must be supported by probable cause."

The named officer did not violate Department policy by declining to arrest Subject 1 for deploying pepper spray against the complainant. Surveillance footage clearly depicted the complainant as the primary aggressor, and the use of pepper spray appeared to be in defense of another individual. Regarding the security guard, the named officer was not aware of any allegation that the guard had brandished a knife. As such, he could not be expected to arrest without a reported offense. Furthermore, had the complainant reported the brandishing of a knife to the named officer, the security guard's actions would not have met the criteria for a violation under Penal Code § 417. They would therefore not have been subject to arrest.

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: 11/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      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: 11/19/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      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: 11/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an unknown officer yelled at him to leash his dog using the public address system on the patrol vehicle. This made the complainant feel unwelcome and targeted. The complainant was unable to provide the officer's name, star number, vehicle number, or license plate number.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an Identification Poll (ID Poll) to the district station. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks the captain and/or members of the station to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) that were involved. The ID Poll returned negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer parked a patrol vehicle on the sidewalk in a park. The complainant was unable to provide the officer's name, star number, vehicle number, or license plate number. The complainant stated he believed the vehicle was entirely white but was not certain because he did not get a clear view.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an Identification Poll (ID Poll) to the district station. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks the captain and/or members of the station to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) that were involved. The ID Poll returned negative results.

Of note, the San Francisco Police Department does not have any all-white patrol vehicles in its fleet.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an unknown officer did not get out of the patrol vehicle to take any action about heroin addicts and "Junkies" sleeping in a park. The complainant was unable to provide the officer's name, star number, vehicle number, or license plate number.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an Identification Poll (ID Poll) to the district station. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks the captain and/or members of the station to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) that were involved. The ID Poll returned negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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: 11/24/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an unknown officer activated his siren and proceeded to drive through a red light.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) sent an Identification Poll (ID Poll) to the district station. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks the captain and/or station members to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) involved. The ID Poll returned negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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: 11/29/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an individual gave her scary looks while riding public transportation. She was concerned that he was wearing a mask and removed his gloves. She said she called the police to report the incident, and they failed to conduct a proper investigation.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a report of an assault and harassment on a Muni train.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers responding to the complainant's residence, where she reported receiving scary looks from an individual on public transportation. She showed the named officers photographs and a video on her phone. The video appeared to show an individual seated inside a Muni train that had been taken from the platform.

The complainant reported an incident that was not criminal in nature, and therefore, the named officers were not obligated to conduct an 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: 11/29/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she called the police station to complain about two officers and was told that the named officer would return her call the following day, which he did not.

The named officer stated that he had not received a message to call the complainant and that, if he had, he would have done so.

There is no evidence indicating that the named officer received the message to return the complainant's call. Even if he had received it and failed to respond, such conduct would not warrant disciplinary action.

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: 11/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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:

San Francisco Police Department  
Human Resource Department  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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: 12/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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:

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: 12/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he was arrested, and the named officer interviewed him regarding the crime. He stated that he asked for an attorney during the interview, and the interview stopped; however, the officer inappropriately continued the interview later.

The named officer has left the Department and is, therefore, no longer subject to discipline.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer misrepresented the truth.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that he did not confess to the crime he was arrested for, but the named officer lied and reported that he confessed in his interview.

The named officer has left the Department and is, therefore, no longer subject to discipline.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** 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 partially 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**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 11/29/2025      DATE OF COMPLETION: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**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: 12/04/25      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she was at the airport and was trying to pull up to the curb to pick up her husband, who is disabled. An officer who was trying to keep traffic moving told her to move her car in a rude, intimidating manner. The officer also refused to provide his name and star number when asked. The complainant described the officer as an Asian male.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, the Department of Police Accountability sent an Identification (ID) Poll to the related district station or division. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Captain and/or members of the station or division review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID poll returned with negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/05/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25 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: 12/05/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer was issuing citations for expired registration on the private parking lot of his restaurant without permission.

California vehicle code section 4000(a)(1) states, in part:

(a) (1) A person shall not drive, move, or leave standing upon a highway, or in an offstreet public parking facility, any motor vehicle, trailer, semitrailer, pole or pipe dolly, or logging dolly, unless it is registered and the appropriate fees have been paid under this code or registered under the permanent trailer identification program, except that an off-highway motor vehicle which displays an identification plate or device issued by the department pursuant to Section 38010 may be driven, moved, or left standing in an offstreet public parking facility without being registered or paying registration fees.

(2) For purposes of this subdivision, “offstreet public parking facility” means either of the following:

(A) Any publicly owned parking facility.

(B) Any privately owned parking facility for which no fee for the privilege to park is charged and which is held open for the common public use of retail customers.

The complainant’s restaurant parking lot is covered by point B. The parking lot has no fee and is open to the public for retail customers. The named officer was in compliance with California law when issuing the citations.

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: 12/05/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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: 12/05/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/09/25      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:

San Francisco Police Department  
Department Of Emergency Communications  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      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 felt it was inappropriate for San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) officers to take a picture with a religious figure outside a place of worship.

The Department of Police Accountability located said picture. The picture showed several SFPD officers who took a picture with a religious figure outside the place of worship to celebrate the worship center's annual event to honor the city's first responders.

The officers conduct in taking said picture was appropriate and in line with SFPD's goal of community policing. Moreover, the center was hosting an event to honor them.

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: 12/10/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      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 described an interaction with a female officer that made the complainant feel uncomfortable and unsafe.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) cross-referenced calls for service for the reported time frame and location. The DPA found an incident, but no female officers responded to that call.

Because the DPA lacked corroborating evidence, it could not identify the involved officer or verify the alleged incident. The DPA makes no findings when it cannot reasonably identify the officer, or when the officer has left the Department and is no longer subject to discipline.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/10/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/2025      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: 12/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/16/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/APD**

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

San Francisco Adult Probation Department  
945 Bryant St.  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/19/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 12/29/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The 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.