

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/04/2023

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant lodged a complaint regarding an unpleasant interaction with an officer when she mistakenly parked in a bus loading zone. She stated that the officer behaved rudely and made insulting remarks suggesting that she could not read.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) requested surveillance footage which yielded negative results. Additionally, DPA was unable to interview the officer to question him about the alleged incident as the officer has been on medical leave.

“No findings” occurs when DPA cannot complete an investigation because the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to an interview. Here, the officer’s medical status has rendered him unavailable for an interview. Additionally, the absence of independent witnesses or footage of the incident makes it impossible to make a finding by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 1 of 7

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer intentionally and improperly discharged a firearm, on or off-duty, in the performance of law enforcement duties.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) investigated the incident because San Francisco Administrative Code §96.11 mandates that the DPA investigate any incident in which the discharge of a firearm by a San Francisco Police Department officer causes injury or death. In this incident, an OIS occurred during an armed robbery investigation conducted by the named officer and his partner.

A man armed with a handgun robbed a person of his electric scooter. According to the victim, he was looking at items being sold on the sidewalk when the suspect approached him while pointing a firearm at him and demanded his scooter. In fear for his life that the suspect might shoot him, he complied, and the suspect took his scooter away. Within minutes of the incident, and after the suspect's description was broadcast over police radio, the named officer and his partner were canvassing the area when they observed a male subject who matched the suspect's description standing in an alley with several individuals. As officers attempted to make contact, the subject fled. The named officer exited the patrol vehicle and pursued the subject on foot, repeatedly identifying himself as a police officer and ordering the subject to stop. The subject continued to flee, and during the pursuit, an exchange of gunfire occurred. The subject was struck in the back and fell to the ground. Additional officers responded to the scene and immediately rendered medical aid. Paramedics were summoned and transported the subject to a local hospital, where, despite medical intervention, he later succumbed to his injuries.

Investigators and officers identified and obtained footage from multiple sources, including body-worn cameras (BWC), surveillance footage, and a recording from open-source media. Collectively, these recordings provided a consistent account of the events and were reviewed alongside other documents, and officer and civilian statements from the San Francisco Police Department, the San Francisco District Attorney's Internal Investigations Bureau (IIB), the Department of Emergency Management (DEM), and the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner.

The corresponding incident report of the shooting indicates that the subject had discharged his firearm at the named officer, and the gun was still within his grasp. The gun matched the description of the one used

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 2 of 7

in the robbery incident. The officers recovered the gun, cartridge casings, and the stolen electric scooter at the scene.

The named officer stated he and his partner were patrolling in a marked police vehicle while actively searching for the robbery suspect when he observed a male standing at the corner of an alley that matched the description of the suspect. The individual was wearing clothing consistent with the description of the robbery suspect, was in possession of a red-and-black electric scooter and a backpack and was accompanied by several other individuals. The named officer further stated he contacted officers who were with the victim to obtain additional information regarding the suspect. After initially passing the individual, his partner executed a U-turn and returned to make contact. The partner stopped the patrol vehicle and began interacting with the subject. Moments later, the named officer observed movement on his partner's side of the vehicle and heard his partner state, "It's him." The named officer then exited the patrol vehicle and observed the subject flee out of the alley. During the flight, the named officer saw the subject extend his left hand toward him and look back over his shoulder. He then heard a gunshot, observed a muzzle flash, and heard a subsequent gunshot. Believing the suspect was firing at him, the named officer determined it was necessary to stop the subject. He shouted commands for the subject to stop running, but the subject continued to flee. The named officer then drew his service weapon and fired two rounds at the subject. Believing those rounds did not strike the subject, he realigned his sights to improve accuracy. He recalled taking a knee to stabilize his position before firing a third round. Upon observing the subject fall to the ground, the named officer ceased firing and lowered his weapon. The subject landed face down on the ground, with a firearm within reach. The named officer then moved to a position of cover behind a parked vehicle and broadcast over the radio that an officer-involved shooting had occurred.

The named officer's partner stated that as they drove past the subject in the alley, other units broadcast that the stolen electric scooter had black-and-red markings on its base. Based on this information, he turned the patrol vehicle around and advised the named officer that he intended to inspect the scooter. He pulled alongside the subject, looked out the driver's side window, and observed that the scooter's base was black and red. Given the similarity between the individual's appearance, the broadcast suspect description, and the scooter, he opened his vehicle door and initiated a consensual contact, stating words to the effect of, "Hey man, nice scooter." Immediately thereafter, the subject threw the scooter in his direction, pinning him momentarily between the scooter and the patrol vehicle, and then fled out of the alley toward the street. The named officer's partner then confirmed to the named officer that the fleeing subject was the robbery suspect, prompting the named officer to exit the vehicle and pursue the subject on foot. The named officer's partner stated that he was briefly delayed due to being trapped between the

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 3 of 7

vehicle and the scooter. He picked up the scooter and attempted to use it to catch up with the subject, but while doing so, he heard gunshots. He then abandoned the scooter and ran toward the named officer. As he approached, he observed the subject lying on the ground and the named officer standing nearby with his firearm drawn and pointed at the subject. He took cover behind the vehicle alongside the named officer, drew his firearm, and aimed it at the subject. He observed an object resembling a firearm near the subject's head. He began transmitting radio traffic, requesting additional police units. At that point, he recognized the need to secure the subject and render medical assistance. He requested additional units, an arrest team, and a ballistic shield. Once sufficient personnel were in place, officers cautiously approached the subject, secured his arms, and placed him in handcuffs. He notified other officers that life saving measures needed to be taken so medical aid could be rendered until paramedics arrived. Thereafter, he removed himself from the scene.

The subject's girlfriend provided an account of the incident. She stated that she and the suspect were standing at the corner of the alley speaking with other individuals while attempting to locate someone who could repair the subject's electric scooter, which had a flat rear tire. She observed a marked police vehicle drive through the alley and then return to make contact with the subject. According to her statement, after officers asked where he had obtained the scooter, the subject threw the scooter toward the police vehicle and fled on foot. She stated that one of the officers pursued the subject and that, shortly thereafter, she heard approximately three to four gunshots. She recalled observing the subject extend his arm while holding a firearm, turn toward the pursuing officer, and discharge the weapon as he ran. She stated that both the officer and the subject fired their weapons, after which the subject fell to the ground. She attempted to run toward the subject but was ordered by officers to stop and get on the ground.

Another civilian witness provided an account of the incident. They heard approximately five to six gunshots from outside their residence. Initially believing the sounds to be fireworks, they stood up, looked out his window, and observed a male subject lying on the ground. The witness heard a woman yelling that the subject needed medical attention. A short time later, they heard officers ordering the subject to extend his arms and spread them out so officers could determine whether he was holding a firearm. The witness recalled seeing a firearm on the ground near the subject.

The robbery victim confirmed that the scooter recovered from the subject was his property. When later shown photographs of the scooter recovered at the shooting scene, the robbery victim positively identified it as his property based on distinctive features. He stated that he had no doubt the scooter belonged to him. He also recalled informing officers that the scooter's rear tire was flat and that a component was missing, and he subsequently showed officers the missing part.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 4 of 7

The named officer's body-worn camera footage shows that during the foot pursuit the named officer repeatedly ordered the subject to stop. The subject continued to flee, and a gunshot is audible shortly thereafter, which appears consistent with the subject discharging his firearm. The named officer then stopped, aimed his service weapon at the subject, and fired three rounds. After the third shot, the subject fell to the ground and appeared to be in pain. The named officer ordered the subject to extend his hands and lie face down. An officer, believed to be the named officer's partner, can be heard broadcasting their location and advising that there was one subject down. The named officer stated that the subject's firearm appeared to be located on the subject's left side. A woman, later identified as the subject's girlfriend, approached the subject and was ordered by officers to stay back. Additional officers arrived on scene. The named officer later informed a supervising officer that he was the officer involved in the shooting, and the supervisor requested his body-worn camera.

Surveillance video shows a marked police vehicle stopping near the subject, who was standing in the alley with a group of individuals. The video shows the subject immediately fleeing from officers. The named officer, who was seated in the passenger seat of the patrol vehicle, exited and pursued the subject on foot. During the pursuit, the subject can be seen on two occasions turning toward the named officer, swinging his left arm in the officer's direction, and discharging a firearm. The named officer returned fire, striking the subject and causing him to fall to the ground.

The Medical Examiner's report determined that the subject died as a result of a gunshot wound to the thorax. Toxicology results indicated the presence of cocaine, ethanol, and methamphetamine in the subject's system. The report further noted that the bullet entered the subject's back and traveled from back to front, right to left, and upward, a trajectory consistent with the named officer's account of the shooting.

Property records indicate that officers recovered from the scene a handgun belonging to the subject. Also recovered were a magazine loaded with ten unfired cartridges inserted into the firearm's magazine well, a fired cartridge casing, and an electric scooter.

Photographs of the subject's firearm show it lying on the ground near the spot where he fell, with the magazine still inserted in the magazine well. The images show that the firearm experienced a slide malfunction, with two fired cartridge casings jammed in the slide and preventing further cycling of the weapon. This condition is consistent with the surveillance video evidence showing that the subject discharged two rounds at the named officer prior to the named officer returning fire.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 5 of 7

DGO 5.01, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person, states in part:

“5.01.02 POLICY

- A. **SAFEGUARDING HUMAN LIFE AND DIGNITY** - The authority to use force is a serious responsibility given to peace officers by the people who expect them to exercise that authority judiciously and with respect for human rights, dignity and life.

- D. **PROPORTIONALITY** - When determining the appropriate level of force, officers shall, when feasible, balance the severity of the offense committed and the level of resistance, based on the totality of the circumstances known to or perceived by the officer at the time, with the level of force used and its likely injury outcome. It is particularly important that officers apply proportionality and critical decision making when encountering an armed subject.

5.01.03 DEFINITIONS

- D. **REASONABLE FORCE** - Force that would be objectively reasonable “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, rather than with the benefit of hindsight, and that the totality of the circumstances shall account for occasions when officers may be forced to make quick judgments about using force.” Cal. Penal Code §835a(a)(4).

- I. **IMMINENT THREAT OF DEATH OR SERIOUS BODILY INJURY** - A threat of death or serious bodily injury is “imminent” when, based on the totality of the circumstances, a reasonable officer in the same situation would believe that a person has the present ability, opportunity, and apparent intent to immediately cause death or serious bodily injury to the peace officer or another person. An imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm, but is one that, from appearances, must be instantly confronted and addressed. Cal. Penal Code §835a(e)(2).

5.01.08 FORCE OPTIONS

The force options authorized by the Department are physical controls, personal body weapons, chemical agents, impact weapons, extended range impact weapons, vehicle interventions, K-9 bites, and firearms. These are the force options available to officers, but officers are not required to use these force options

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 6 of 7

based on a continuum. While deploying a particular force option and, when feasible, officers shall continually evaluate whether the force option may be discontinued while still achieving the arrest or lawful objective.

G. FIREARMS AND OTHER DEADLY FORCE - Deadly force is any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury, including, but not limited to, the discharge of a firearm. It is the policy of this Department to use deadly force only as a last resort when reasonable alternatives have been exhausted or are not feasible to protect the safety of the public and police officers. The use of firearms and other deadly force is the most serious decision an officer may ever make. When safe and feasible under the totality of circumstances, officers shall consider other objectively reasonable force options before discharging a firearm or using other deadly force. Proper use of firearm for authorized training purposes, securing a weapon in accordance with Department protocols, or legal recreational activity is not within the purview of this General Order.

2. DISCHARGE OF FIREARMS OR OTHER USE OF DEADLY FORCE

a. PERMISSIBLE CIRCUMSTANCES - Except as limited by Sections 5.01.07 G.2. d. and e., an officer may discharge a firearm or use other deadly force in any of the following circumstances. The circumstances below (2.a.i-iv) apply to a discharge of a firearm or application of deadly force:

i. In self-defense when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that they are in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury; or

ii. In defense of another person when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person is in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury. However, an officer may not discharge a firearm at, or use deadly force against, a person who presents a danger only to themselves, and there is no reasonable cause to believe that the person poses an imminent danger DGO 5.01 Rev. 09/04/24 Eff. 10/19/24 Page 19 of 25 of death or serious bodily injury to the officer or any other person; or

iii. To apprehend a person when both of the following circumstances exist:

- The officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person has committed or has attempted to commit a violent felony involving the use or threatened use of deadly force; AND

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/22/2024

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 7 of 7

- The officer has reasonable cause to believe that a substantial risk exists that the person will cause death or serious bodily injury to officers or others if the person's apprehension is delayed; or

iv. To kill an animal posing an imminent threat. Officers shall reassess the situation, when feasible and safe, to determine whether the subject continues to pose an imminent threat.

b. VERBAL WARNING - If feasible, and if doing so would not increase the danger to the officer or others, an officer shall give a verbal warning to submit to the authority of the officer before discharging a firearm or using other deadly force.”

The subject's act of discharging a firearm while actively fleeing from the named officer constituted a clear, immediate, and objectively reasonable threat to the officer and to others in the vicinity. The named officer reasonably believed that the subject was firing directly at him and feared that he, his partner, and nearby civilians positioned behind him were at risk of being struck. Under these circumstances, the named officer's response was proportionate to the threat presented. A subsequent firearms examination confirmed that the subject discharged his weapon twice and that the firearm malfunctioned, jamming and preventing further rounds from ejecting. The named officer's body-worn camera footage, the surveillance video, and the subject's girlfriend's statement corroborate that the subject twice turned toward the named officer, raised his firearm, and fired in the officer's direction. Additionally, the subject fled toward a main thoroughfare known to be heavily trafficked, further elevating the risk to public safety. The named officer reasonably believed that, if not stopped, the subject posed a substantial likelihood of committing additional violent acts and endangering lives. Accordingly, the named officer's decision to use deadly force was objectively reasonable and justified under the totality of the circumstances.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/14/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer arrested a person without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in his online complaint that he was wrongfully deemed the aggressor in a domestic violence incident.

Department records and body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer was dispatched to a stabbing incident with a resident being held hostage. The victim reported being punched, held down, and stabbed. Footage showed that officers interviewed both individuals to determine the primary aggressor. The victim described the attack in detail and showed officers her injuries. The complainant was uninjured and did not provide details of what happened, except to deny the victim's version of events.

The named officer determined that the suspect was the dominant aggressor based on the victims' visible injury, which was consistent with her statement, and information about prior similar incidents.

DGO 6.09 directs officers to identify a dominant aggressor in domestic violence incidents using factors that include the parties' history of violence and whether visible injuries are consistent with statements made by the parties.

Investigation shows that the officer complied with DGO 6.09 by considering the parties' histories and evaluating the parties' statements and injuries to identify a dominant aggressor.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/14/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 2 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers wrongfully gave his girlfriend custody of his dog when he was arrested.

The named officer acknowledged that the suspect requested his dog be given to a neighbor. The neighbor initially accepted the dog. Later outside the apartment building, the complainant's girlfriend asked if she could take possession of the dog, which she co-owned, until her boyfriend was released. Officers let her know that she could request the dog from the neighbors.

The evidence showed that the officers honored the complainant's wishes by giving his dog to his neighbor.

The evidence proves that the officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 1 of 6

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer unnecessarily used his baton to break a driver's window on a vehicle.

The investigation showed that the officer and his partner were following the driver's car for a prolonged period of time because they believed it was stolen. When the car stopped at a red light in traffic, the officer ran up to the car, smashed the driver's side window, and pulled the driver to the pavement. The officer made no effort to effect a traffic stop before smashing the window. The officer did not use lights and siren or signal in any way for the driver to pull over.

Officers may only use objectively reasonable force. Absent exigent circumstances, force techniques such as destroying property and taking a person to the ground may only be used on suspects who are actively resisting lawful orders. The driver had been given no orders and was not resisting. The officer's use of force was therefore unreasonable and excessive.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 2 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer improperly used a liquid chemical agent.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer sprayed a person in the face at close range with a liquid chemical agent.

Department records showed that the officer struggled to handcuff the driver after pulling him to the ground. One of the driver's arms was pinned under his body. The officer grabbed the driver's free arm and then ordered him to put his hands behind his back. The driver braced himself and tried to sit up, pulling his wrist free in the process. The officer shouted for the driver to stay down, and his partner came to assist. After the partner got ahold of the driver's free wrist and had his legs pinned to the ground, the officer sprayed pepper spray directly into the driver's face from inches away.

The minimum distance for spraying pepper spray at someone's face is 4.5 feet. The evidence showed that the officer sprayed at least four feet less than the minimum distance.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 3 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: 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 drew his firearm during a traffic stop without cause.

The named officer stated that he did draw his firearm as he approached a vehicle. The named officer believed he was approaching occupants of a stolen car and held his firearm at low ready. The named officer made contact with the passengers. When the passengers were compliant, the officer holstered his firearm and handcuffed them without incident. w that the threat level was lower than he first thought.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 4 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the driver was cited for reckless driving without cause.

The officer stated that he and his partner followed the driver for a prolonged period of time, observing him speed and run multiple red lights.

The evidence showed that the officer and his partner told a sergeant that the driver had engaged in felony evasion of an attempted traffic stop. Consequently, the driver's car was towed for felony evasion of an officer. However, the officers admitted never attempting a traffic stop of the driver.

Reckless driving is driving "upon a highway in willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property." (Vehicle Code 23103(a)) Speeding and running red lights do not necessarily constitute reckless driving without a consideration of the surrounding circumstances, including whether the driver's actions presented a substantial and unjustifiable risk of harm.

The officers followed the driver for a prolonged period of time, staying within one block of his car. During that time, the driver's speeding and running red lights did not rise to a level of danger sufficient to induce the officers to effect a traffic stop. The officer issued a reckless driving citation, which is a vehicle code violation that justifies towing a car.

The officer engaged in unwarranted action by citing the driver for a more serious offense than the one he committed.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 5 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer conducted a traffic stop without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the driver was stopped without justification.

Investigation showed that the officers believed the driver was operating a stolen vehicle because they mistakenly entered the wrong license plate number into their computer system.

The driver was not operating a stolen vehicle, and the officers therefore had no reasonable suspicion to stop him.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19/26

PAGE# 6 of 6

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: NA

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The named officer was accused of failing to properly supervise during a use of force evaluation.

The named officer stated that he conducted a supervisory use of force evaluation as required. The officer believed the use of force was in policy as the suspect was actively resisting. The named officer believed the officer did not violate policy by spraying pepper spray within inches of the driver's face.

Absent exigent circumstances, the minimum distance for deploying pepper spray into a person face is 4.5 feet. Body-worn camera footage clearly showed the officer spraying the driver a few inches from his face, while he was pinned to the ground.

The officer failed to conduct a proper supervisory use of force evaluation by neglecting to flag the improper pepper spray use.

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: 06/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/23/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: A police car drove through the complainant's neighborhood broadcasting an emergency evacuation order. The order said that evacuating was required and that radio and television stations would provide further instruction. The complainant was scared and could not find instructions on the radio or television. A call to Dispatch revealed that there was no emergency and that evacuation was not required.

The named officer was assigned to address quality-of-life crimes within a certain area of a district. He activated the evacuation announcement to clear the area of unhoused individuals who were engaged in crimes and infractions. He was aware that local residents could hear the message from inside their homes. He acknowledged that there was no emergency requiring evacuation.

The officer engaged in unwarranted action by broadcasting an evacuation order when no emergency existed. Several individuals attempted to comply with the order, which was not valid.

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: 06/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/23/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IC/S

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer should not have been making a serious announcement if there was no reason to evacuate. The complainant was concerned about any future incident where an evacuation would be required. She stated that fake emergencies would cause the public to distrust police announcements.

The officer stated that he did not consider that the evacuation order could alarm residents in the area and cause them to think they needed to evacuate their homes. He said residents from the area contacted him at the time of the incident, and if they asked him what he was doing, he advised them that the evacuation announcement had nothing to do with them. The officers stated that he was not responsible for individuals incorrectly perceiving the nature of the announcement.

The evidence showed that the officer's actions caused unnecessary alarm and confusion to residents in the area. Knowingly broadcasting a false mandatory evacuation brought discredit upon the Department and undermined public trust.

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: 06/17/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The SFPD failed to process a report in a timely manner.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated SFPD intentionally delayed releasing a traffic collision report until after the statute of limitations expired. The incident occurred in 2016. The complainant stated he had evidence to support the allegation. DPA asked the complainant to provide the documentation on several occasions, but he did not do so.

The Department records show that a Traffic Collision Report was prepared on the date of the incident in 2016 and was reviewed and approved by a supervisor the following day. The complainant submitted a Public Records Request (PRR) via the online portal in 2020, more than four years after the incident. Records show the Department acknowledged the request the same day it was received. Two days later, the Department requested further information from the complainant because he did not provide sufficient information to process the request. The complainant stated that he did not recall the date or month of the incident. The Department then referred the complainant to the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) to obtain information and provided the complainant with a form for this purpose. The complainant responded to the Department in 2022, 21 months later, stating that he was unable to request the DEM record because he lacked the required date. More than five months later, in late 2022, the complainant provided the Department with a date range spanning 11 days in 2016. The Department produced the report to the complainant via the online records portal six days later in 2023.

The evidence does not substantiate the complainant's allegation that the Department intentionally delayed the release of the Traffic Collision report. Any delay was entirely attributable to the complainant's failure to provide sufficient information to the Department so that it could conduct a proper search to locate the requested record.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he was driving to work when he noticed a police vehicle traveling fast and closely behind him, nearly causing a collision and forcing him to swerve. The complainant attempted to move out of the way, but the officer continued to follow him for no apparent reason and without emergency lights or siren activated. The complainant was not pulled over.

Department General Order 5.05.02 (A) states that members shall always drive with due regard for the safety of all persons. Furthermore, members responding to an emergency must activate their forward visible red light and the siren when necessary.

The named officer and his partners denied any misconduct. They explained that they were part of a specialized unit whose task that night was to conduct self-initiated computer queries of vehicle license plates to check if any were reported as stolen or wanted. They acknowledged that they followed the complainant briefly to run his license plate but insisted they did not follow him closely. The named officer could not recall his speed at the time. He also stated that he did not activate the emergency lights and siren because he had no intention of conducting a traffic stop on the complainant's vehicle unless it was stolen or wanted.

There were no witnesses or body-worn camera footage.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 2 of 4

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he was next to the officers at a traffic light and asked them what was happening and why they were concerned about him. He alleged that the officer informed him they had run his license plate and that everything was fine. The complainant was confused and believed the officer queried his license plate without any valid reason.

The named officer acknowledged that he checked the complainant's license plate along with several other vehicles. He explained that they were conducting self-initiated activities related to stolen or wanted vehicles that night.

Police records confirm that the officer ran the complainant's license plate, as well as those of several other vehicles.

Police officers are permitted to run a license plate number without the driver's knowledge and without needing a specific reason. This is done to verify valid registration, determine if a vehicle is stolen, or check if the registered owner has outstanding warrants or a suspended license.

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: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-5: The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers ignored his request for their badge numbers and drove off.

Department General Order 2.01.03 (8) requires officers to promptly and politely provide their name, star number, and assignment upon request.

The officers denied the allegation, stating they provided their star numbers.

There were no witnesses or body-worn camera footage.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-8: The officers knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that the officers targeted him because he is an African American man with dreadlocks.

The officers denied the allegation, stating that they could not see the individual inside the vehicle and that the complainant's race did not play a role in their decision to run a license plate check on the vehicle.

There were no witnesses or body-worn camera footage.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 1 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer failed to properly supervise her trainee during a traffic stop. The complainant reported that the nature of the stop felt more tactical than justified and there was a failure to follow standard procedures.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to obtain additional clarification from the complainant regarding his allegation, but the complainant did not provide clarifying information.

Body-worn camera footage captured the entire incident. The footage showed that the named officer actively guided the trainee throughout the traffic stop and provided appropriate instruction at each stage of the traffic stop. The named officer also discussed the reasons for the stop, including failing to signal and speeding, as well as the complainant's lack of cooperation. The named officer further guided the trainee while a records check was conducted and during the search of the vehicle. Additionally, the named officer advised the trainee on proper control procedures and instructed him that their body-worn cameras should remain activated until the complainant departed the scene.

According to the Field Training Officer, a field training officer is responsible for demonstrating proper patrol procedures and guiding the trainee as they perform law enforcement duties. The evidence shows that the named officer fulfilled these responsibilities throughout the duration of the traffic stop. Accordingly, the complainant's perception that the named officer failed to supervise the trainee is not supported by the evidence, thus the conducted alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 2 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that the officer's behavior was hostile and aggressive. He stated that he felt targeted, disrespected, and mishandled. DPA contacted the complainant on multiple occasions to request additional information or specific examples of the alleged hostility. The complainant did not respond to these contact attempts.

The body-worn camera showed that from the onset of the traffic stop, the complainant denied speeding and became argumentative with the named officer. The officer advised they were not going to argue, at which point the complainant accused the officer of being hostile. Near the conclusion of the incident, the complainant's partner requested the officer's name and star number, which was promptly provided.

The BWC footage does not show that the named officer treated the complainant discourteously or used profane or inappropriate language. Instead, the evidence shows that named officer maintained a professional demeanor and complied with the request for identifying information. Based on the totality of the evidence, the complainant's perception that officer violated DGO 2.01.03.8(a) and DGO 2.01.03.8(e) is not supported. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 3 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer conducted a search of his vehicle without his consent or probable cause. He also failed to inquire about the complainant's medical conditions prior to searching and citing him, raising concerns under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Body-worn camera footage shows the complainant voluntarily advised officers that he was on parole. The Field Training Officer and the named officer contacted Dispatch to verify the complainant's parole status and to determine whether there were any additional parole-related conditions that their computer research did not show.

The evidence showed that the complainant voluntarily disclosed his parole status, which was independently confirmed through records. Under California Penal Code section 3067, parolees are subject to search or seizure of their person, residence, or property by any law enforcement officer at any time, with or without a warrant or cause. As an active parolee, the complainant's vehicle was subject to warrantless search. Additionally, when the complainant advised officers that he had metal in his leg and could not sit in the patrol vehicle, officers allowed him to sit on the sidewalk, demonstrating accommodation of his stated medical condition.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 4 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate citation.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that the location of the violation was incorrectly indicated on the citation. He explained that the officers initially observed him at one location before following him several blocks to conduct the stop, which is where he believed the violation occurred. He expressed concerns about the accuracy and truthfulness of the police documentation. However, a careful review of the incident report, citation, and the complainant's online statement contradicts his allegations. The actual location of the violation is determined by where the officers observed the infraction, not where they made the traffic stop. Therefore, based on the evidence, the citation correctly identifies the location of the violation. Based on the evidence, the conduct alleged by the complainant did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 5 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-#6: The officers failed to properly care for property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that officers failed to properly care for his personal property, specifically claiming that his wallet, which contained cash and his identification, was left unsecured in windy conditions during the encounter, demonstrating poor handling by the officers.

Body-worn camera footage shows that the named officer and the Field Training Officer maintained control of the complainant's identification throughout the encounter. Officer #1 returned the driver's license to the complainant after handcuffs were removed. Additionally, Officer #2 maintained possession of the complainant's wallet, which contained a significant amount of cash, for the duration of his presence on the scene. Once the complainant was no longer detained, he was shown in possession of his wallet, keys, and cell phone, all of which had been returned by the officers. The BWC did not show any instances of the property being left unattended or unsecured during the detention.

The investigation demonstrates that both Officer #1 and Officer #2 properly safeguarded the complainant's property and returned all items upon the conclusion of the detention. Based on the totality of the evidence the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers used unnecessary force to stop him from providing aid to his friend who had been pepper sprayed.

Police records and body-worn camera footage documented that the complainant's friend was pepper sprayed by an assault victim in self-defense and subsequently detained and arrested for assault. The records documented the use of force against the complainant at the scene. On at least four occasions, officers told the complainant to get away from his friend because he was a suspect. As medics and officers attempted to get the complainant's friend to the ambulance, the complainant interfered by holding onto his friend, which prevented the medics from providing aid. Officers ordered the complainant to let go and move back, but he refused. One of the named officers then pushed the complainant so that medics could tend to his friend, but he again attempted to walk around the officers. One of the named officers then grabbed the complainant's arm, but he broke free and threw his hands up in the direction of the officer and pushed him. The named officers then performed a take down and he was handcuffed and arrested.

The named officers used physical control to prevent the complainant from interfering with a detained person who was receiving medical treatment. The complainant was given multiple warnings to stop delaying and obstructing officer duties, but he failed to comply and assaulted an officer.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer made an arrest without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was arrested without cause while trying to help his friend who had been pepper sprayed.

Police documents showed that the complainant was arrested for interfering with police and medics rendering aid to a detained individual. The documents also showed that the complainant was arrested for assaulting a police officer.

Body worn camera footage showed the complainant's actions that lead to the probable cause for his arrest. The evidence showed that the complainant was given many opportunities to comply with orders to move away; however, the complainant continued to interfere with both police and medics duties. The evidence also showed the complainant actively resisted the named officer.

The evidence proves that the officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 1 of 4

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: Two individuals - referred to as Complainant #1 and Co-Complainant #2- filed a complaint regarding a parking citation issued to Complainant #1's vehicle. Although complainant #1 (the parent) had authorized her child (Co-complainant #2) to use her vehicle, the named officer cited the vehicle directly rather than the driver. Complainant #1 alleged that by failing to request identifying information from the driver and citing him directly, the named officer improperly shifted legal responsibility for the citation onto herself, as the registered owner.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) located evidence which showed the named officer had in fact issued the parking citation to the vehicle, rather than the driver of the vehicle. The named officer recalled the incident and explained that he observed the vehicle in question parked illegally in violation of 7.2.25 San Francisco Transportation Code (SFTC), which prohibits vehicles from parking in designated red zones. The named officer confirmed that he did not ask complainant #2 for any identifying information because he intended to cite the vehicle for the parking violation and not the driver. He stated that it was proper for him to do so because parking citations differ from traffic citations and can be issued to vehicles and not drivers. He emphasized that a parking violation is based on the vehicle's location.

Department General Order (DGO) 9.05(B), titled "Notice of Parking Violations" as well as California Vehicle Code Section 40202(a) support the officer's assertion that parking citations may be issued to the vehicle rather than the driver of the vehicle. DPA understands complainant #1's frustration. However, the officers' conduct in citing the vehicle for the parking citation was proper and within 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: 08/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 2 of 4

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainants alleged that despite co-complainant #2 being inside the vehicle, the named officer inappropriately threw the ticket into the driver's side window and abruptly walked away.

The named officer stated when he approached the vehicle, co-complainant #2 refused to accept the citation. The named officer therefore placed the citation inside his vehicle to ensure the driver received a copy and that the citation was left with the vehicle. The named officer believed his actions were appropriate.

DGO 9.05(B) – Notice of Parking Violations, requires officers to attach a copy of a parking citation to the vehicle either under the windshield wiper or in another conspicuous location in compliance with the California Vehicle Code.

Footage of the alleged interaction was not captured (*see* allegation #4 below). Without such independent evidence, DPA is unable to determine by a preponderance of evidence whether the named officer “threw,” the ticket into the window, and if so, whether he was justified in doing so.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 3 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: Co-complainant #2 stated that the named officer issued him the parking citation without cause as he was temporarily parked in a loading zone and not a red zone. Co-complainant #2 also attested that there were other vehicles illegally parked in the vicinity, but the named officer did not cite them.

The named officer attested that he observed the vehicle illegally parked along a clearly marked red curb in violation of the San Francisco Transportation Code. Additionally, regarding the alleged enforcement disparities, the officer noted that he had been patrolling the area for several hours that day, during which he ticketed and towed numerous vehicles for parking violations.

The evidence, such as the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) reports, showed that the named officer was conducting traffic enforcement on said date and cited multiple vehicles for parking violations. However, DPA is unable to determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether co-complainant #2 parked in a red zone in violation of the code, or a temporary loading zone as there is an absence of independent witnesses or footage reflecting the alleged violation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/11/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2026

PAGE# 4 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer failed to activate a body-worn camera as required.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: During its investigation, DPA learned that the named officer did not activate his body-worn camera (BWC) during the incident.

The named officer stated that although he was equipped with his BWC, he did not activate the camera as he did not believe he was required to. The named officer attested that his actions on said date complied with the mandates in Department General Order 10.11 (Body-worn Camera) as the policy does not appear to mandate activation when issuing a parking citation.

DPA reviewed the DGO in effect at the time of incident. As the named officer mentioned, the DGO did not clearly require BWC activation for a parking violation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/16/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant stated in an online complaint that the officer used a siren and emergency lights to run a red light and then proceeded to cut off civilian vehicles in traffic to get into their parking garage. No further information was provided.

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated she called the police to come to her apartment because she wanted officers to make her neighbors stop harming her. She was annoyed with the officers because they took no action. They came and spoke to her, then left. The complainant stated she reported to the named officers that the Chinese Communist Party and the Ministry of Public Security in China have been trying to persecute her for over 14 years and are preventing her from leaving her residence. She stated they are constantly harming her and that her neighbors are trying to shock her with electricity at the direction of members of the Chinese Communist Party.

Named Officer #1 stated he does not recall the details of this particular incident. Still, he has prior knowledge of the complainant, as he has responded to numerous calls for service involving the complainant in the past. The officer stated that the complainant's statements in this incident are consistent with those she made during prior calls for service. The complainant has never provided any physical evidence of a crime, nor did he observe any physical injuries that would be consistent with being electrocuted. The officer further stated he had no reason to believe that the complainant was the victim of an assault, and that her neighbors were spies of the Chinese Communist Party trying to shock her with electricity. Thus, he took no police action against the complainant's neighbors.

Named Officer #2 stated that he recalled responding to a call for service, and he believed that he and his partner were not able to locate and make contact with the complainant on that day. The officer stated that he did not take any action because he was unable to locate or speak with the complainant. The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) record states that the caller declined to meet with the police that day. The officer also stated that the reporting party for this incident has generated previous reports that are the same as what is noted in the CAD for the incident, in that she is being surveilled and followed by her neighbors and other persons (possibly of the Chinese Government), as well as being the victim of electric shocks. The CAD mentions that Dispatch noted a history of prior calls from the complainant, noting possibly a senile subject or possibly mentally disturbed.

The CAD confirms that the officers responded to the complainant's residence for a well-being check. The reporting party (RP) requests a police report but doesn't want PD to meet with her. She is not making sense and refusing to listen. The complainant has a known history of calling 911, reporting that her

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

upstairs neighbors are shocking her with electricity. The named officers determined that there was no merit to the call or the emergency.

The complainant failed to report a crime; therefore, the named officers were under no obligation to investigate or take any 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: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/12/26

PAGE# 1 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers used excessive force on a handcuffed suspect when they threw him against a wall and then threw him against a police vehicle.

The named officers stated they did not use excessive force and did not slam the suspect into the wall or the patrol vehicle.

Department records indicate that officers responded to a call regarding possible arson in an apartment building. Officers arrested a suspect who was transported to the station and subsequently cited for possession of controlled substances.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers escorting a handcuffed suspect to a patrol vehicle with minimal force. It does not show the named officers throwing the suspect against a wall, nor does it show them slamming him into a patrol vehicle.

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) states in the relevant part that officers “shall strive to use the minimum amount of force necessary to accomplish their lawful purpose.”

The evidence does not substantiate the complainant’s allegation that the named officers threw a suspect against a wall and a patrol vehicle. Instead, it indicates that the officers employed minimal force.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/12/26

PAGE# 2 of 5

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 inappropriately slammed his patrol vehicle's door after a suspect was placed in the back seat.

The named officer and witness officer reported that the suspect repeatedly used his feet to block the patrol vehicle's door from closing, making it necessary for the named officer to shut the door quickly to prevent potential injury to both officers and the suspect.

Body-worn camera corroborates the officers' statements.

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: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/12/26

PAGE# 3 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that while participating in a Ride-Along with the named officer, she made comments about individuals with whom she had had prior interactions, noting that she did not like them. The complainant stated that she found these remarks inappropriate.

The named officer stated she did not recall making any such statements.

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: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/12/26

PAGE# 4 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that during a Ride-Along with the named officer, who is Latina, she (the complainant) expressed her view that Black individuals should be treated with greater consideration than non-Black individuals by police due to historical experiences. She also commented that law enforcement conducts a disproportionate number of traffic stops involving Black drivers compared to white drivers. According to the complainant, the named officer responded by saying that white people commit crimes as well. The complainant stated that she found this response inappropriate.

The named officer stated that she did not believe her response to the complainant was inappropriate. She explained that the complainant attempted to engage her in a debate while an active crime scene investigation into arson was underway, which she considered distracting and inappropriate. The officer noted that it was neither the time nor the place for such a discussion.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant accompanying the named officer on a Ride-Along during an incident involving a Black suspect in handcuffs, which appeared to upset the complainant. The complainant asked the named officer why the suspect was arrested, and she explained that the arrest was based on a witness's observation. The complainant then remarked that most suspect descriptions by witnesses are typically of Black or Hispanic individuals. The named officer responded that white individuals commit crimes as well. The complainant continued by stating that white drivers are stopped less frequently than Black drivers, to which the officer replied that she was unaware of such statistics and suggested that it might be a stereotype. Throughout this exchange, the complainant actively argued with the officer while the officer attempted to investigate a possible arson. The named officer did make inappropriate comments in response to the complainant's statements.

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: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/12/26

PAGE# 5 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that while she was on a Ride-Along, she observed officers use excessive force on a Black male suspect. She said she voiced her concerns to the named officer, who was a sergeant. He responded by yelling in her face and told her, “You can go home.” She perceived the comments as rude and dismissive.

The named officer stated that he observed the complainant engaging in argumentative and disrespectful conduct toward an officer. She was challenging the officer regarding the handling of the investigation and attempting to instruct her on how to conduct it. The named officer stated that he intervened, asked the complainant what was occurring, and she stated that she did not like how the suspect was being treated. He said she became angry and flustered, immediately turned away from him, and was unwilling to speak with him. He stated that, based on her behavior, he determined the safest and best option for the complainant, his officers, and the public was to terminate her Ride-Along, which is permitted under Department policy. The named officer denied yelling at the complainant.

The named officers’ statement corroborates body-worn camera footage that shows the complainant yelling at the named officer. The footage also did not show officers using excessive or unnecessary force on the suspect.

Department Notice 25-068 states in relevant part, “Officers may discontinue a Ride-Along, with a supervisor’s approval, at any time.”

The evidence did not show that the named officer yelled at the complainant, as alleged. In addition, the named officer was a supervising officer on scene and, within policy, had the authority to discontinue the Ride-Along without cause.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 1 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he picked up a friend from his apartment and when they returned, he did not see any parking in front of the apartment, so he drove around and parked in another area. He stated officers turned their lights on him immediately after he had parked and he stated he did nothing wrong.

DGO 9.01 Traffic Enforcement allows officers to conduct traffic stops when they observe violations.

The officers stated they were conducting traffic enforcement in the area and stopped the complainant's vehicle because they observed his vehicle stopped past the limit line, a violation of California Vehicle Code section 21453(a), which states, "A driver facing a steady circular red signal alone shall stop at a marked limit line, but if none, before entering the crosswalk on the near side of the intersection or, if none, then before entering the intersection, and shall remain stopped until an indication to proceed is shown, except as provided in subdivision (b). (b) Except when a sign is in place prohibiting a turn, a driver, after stopping as required by subdivision (a)."

The body-worn camera footage showed the complainant's vehicle was stopped at a red light past the limit line and officers observed and called Dispatch to run the plate and then turned on their sirens and lights to conduct the stop.

The evidence showed the complainant committed a traffic violation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 2 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used profanity.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after the officer asked for his driver's license and insurance she went to her vehicle and then returned to tell him the insurance was not valid. The complainant had turned his camera toward her, and she told him to get the camera out of her face and used profanity.

DGO 2.01 Rule 8. Public Courtesy requires officers to be professional while on duty with the public and not use profane language.

The officer denied the use of profanity during this incident.

The body-worn camera footage did not corroborate the complainant's allegation and instead showed that the complainant was hostile and defensive toward the officer from the beginning of the incident.

The evidence showed the officer was professional during the entire incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 3 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer issued a citation without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he did nothing wrong and after twenty minutes the officer came back and asked him to put the window down and gave him a citation. He stated the police did not have any reason to pull up to him.

The officer stated she cited the complainant after she observed him fail to stop behind the limit line, a violation of CVC 21453(a). She also stated the complainant did not have valid proof of insurance and cited him for violating CVC 16028.

DGO 9.01 Traffic Enforcement gives the officers authority to cite for violations they observe.

CVC 21453 states, “(a) A driver facing a steady circular red signal alone shall stop at a marked limit line, but if none, before entering the crosswalk on the near side of the intersection or, if none, then before entering the intersection, and shall remain stopped until an indication to proceed is shown, except as provided in subdivision (b). (b) Except when a sign is in place prohibiting a turn, a driver, after stopping as required by subdivision (a).”

CVC 16028 provides, “(a) Upon the demand of a peace officer pursuant to subdivision (b) or upon the demand of a peace officer or traffic collision investigator pursuant to subdivision (c), every person who drives a motor vehicle upon a highway shall provide evidence of financial responsibility for the vehicle that is in effect at the time the demand is made. The evidence of financial responsibility may be provided using a mobile electronic device.”

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant was stopped at a red light over the limit line and showed that he did not have current, valid proof of vehicle insurance.

The complainant believed he had done nothing wrong during this incident. However, the evidence showed he committed a traffic violation and had no proof of insurance and as such the officer had the authority to cite for these violations 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: 08/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 4 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 5-6: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated after the officers left the scene they drove around again and laughed at him, which he said was unprofessional and made him feel they had intentions to harass him.

The officer denied laughing at the complainant.

DGO 2.01 Rule 8. Public Courtesy requires officers to be professional during performance of their duties.

Body-worn camera footage does not capture this portion as officers were done with the incident after the complainant was cited.

Per the evidence, the officers were professional during the incident, and the complainant was not credible as he erroneously stated the officer used profanity. The complainant did not provide detail as to why he believed the officers laughed at him as such without any other context this does not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 5 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The officer failed to comply with Department Bulletin 23-159.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: Department records showed the officer did not make a Benchmark Stop Data Entry for this self-initiated traffic stop.

The officer stated that she made the entry on 7/4/25 at 1800 hours which was technically still her shift as she works midnight hours. She said it was a busy workday and since she had to return to work on 7/4/25 at 1600 hours she completed the entry then to ensure she had 8 hours of sleep between her two shifts in accordance with department policy.

Department Bulletin 23-159 Benchmark Stop Data System states in pertinent part that members shall submit data for all stops including, but not limited to, pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle stops. BSDS entries are required when a stop is initiated based on information developed by the member's own observation, the direction and/or information from another member, DEM (Dispatch), or members of the public.

The officer admitted that she did not make the traffic stop entry at the end of her shift, however, she stated she made an entry on the next shift the following the incident. Department records did not show an entry was made and without further information there is not enough evidence to determine that the officer did not comply with department policy or if there was a human error factor while an entry was made.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 1 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant engaged in a physical altercation with his neighbor while parking his car on the street. According to the complainant, his neighbor attempted to deliberately ram his vehicle toward his car twice by swerving dangerously close. The neighbor got out of his vehicle, leaned into the complainant's window, and repeatedly punched him in the head and body. The complainant called 911 for assistance, and the named officers arrived to investigate the incident. The complainant said the officers refused to take his statement.

The named officers denied the allegation, stating that they spoke with the complainant at the scene.

The incident report documented that the officers took the complainant's statement.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the officers' body-worn camera videos of the incident. The videos were consistent with the documentation in the incident report and with the officers' statements to DPA. The videos clearly show the officers talking to the complainant and taking his statement.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 2 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to provide their names or star numbers.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers failed to identify themselves.

The officers stated that the complainant never asked for their names or star numbers.

BWC footage of the incident was consistent with the officers' statements to DPA. The complainant asked for business cards, but not their names or star numbers. The officers were also in uniform, with their names and star numbers displayed.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 3 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5: The officer failed to prepare an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer did not prepare an incident report.

Department records show an incident report was prepared by the officer.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 4 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-7: The officers made an arrest without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officers unlawfully arrested him after he stated that he would file a complaint.

Named officer #1 stated that probable cause was established to arrest the complainant based on the statements of the neighbor and witnesses, the active restraining order against him, and the video footage the officer reviewed at the scene. She stated that the restraining order prohibited the complainant from harassing or contacting his neighbor directly or indirectly.

Named officer #2 stated that the complainant was arrested for violating the restraining order.

Court records confirmed that the neighbor had an active Civil Harassment Restraining Order against the complainant when the incident occurred. The court order prohibited the complainant from doing the following: [1] Harass, intimidate, molest, attack, strike, stalk, threaten, assault (sexually or otherwise), hit, abuse, destroy personal property of, or disturb the peace of the person. [2] Contact the person, either directly or indirectly, in any way, including, but not limited to, in person, by telephone, in writing, by public or private mail, by Interoffice mail, by email, by text message, by fax, or by other electronic means. It also required him to stay at least 10 yards away from the neighbor and his partner and their home.

BWC footage from Officer #1 shows the complainant admitting to getting out of his vehicle to follow and record his neighbor with his phone. The complainant also provided DPA with security footage showing him violating the restraining order by following his neighbor to his vehicle.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 5 of 6

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #8-9: The officers failed to make an arrest.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officers refused to arrest his neighbor despite his neighbor punching him and attempting to ram his vehicle into the complainant's vehicle. In support of his allegation, the complainant submitted video recordings to DPA. One video depicts the neighbor twice cutting off the complainant's vehicle and stopping in front of it while the complainant was maneuvering to park. The video further shows the neighbor exiting his vehicle, approaching the complainant's driver's side door, and swinging at the complainant.

The officers' BWC videos confirmed that the complainant reported that the neighbor punched him and attempted to ram the complainant's vehicle and that the complainant wanted the neighbor arrested. The footage also shows named officer #1 reviewing a video from the complainant's cell phone.

Named officer #1 stated that the cellphone video shown to her at the scene differed from the security videos later submitted to DPA by the complainant. She reported that the cellphone video she reviewed at the scene was short and did not show the neighbor punching the complainant. According to her, the recording showed the neighbor exiting his vehicle, approaching the complainant from the driver's side, and then returning to his own vehicle. Based on the video she reviewed, and the statements obtained at the scene, she determined that there was no probable cause to arrest the neighbor.

Named officer #2 similarly stated that the neighbor was not arrested due to insufficient evidence and the available witness statements.

Department General Order 5.04.04 states that when receiving an arrest from a private person, the decision to cite or book shall be made upon further investigation by SFPD, rather than based on the arresting person's preference. The named officers did not have access, while on scene, to the video that showed the complainant was a victim of battery. An incident report documented the investigation done on scene and body-worn camera footage was properly tagged and retained. Given the information the named officers had while deciding what action to take, whether to arrest the neighbor at that time was within their discretion.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2026

PAGE# 6 of 6

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

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 visited an agency for assistance, but they were unable to help him. He said he was upset, raised his voice, and then left the building. The named officer arrived on scene, grabbed his arm, and then took him to the ground. The complainant stated that he did not resist, and the officer took him to the ground for no reason.

Dispatch records showed multiple calls for service regarding a suspect in an agency, screaming, threatening to blow up the building, refusing to leave, acting aggressively toward staff, and stating that on-site security could not handle the suspect. A reporting party was concerned for the safety of elderly customers in the lobby.

The named officer responded to a call regarding a person who was at an agency's building, screaming at staff, threatening to blow up the building, and refusing to leave. Upon arrival, the complainant was standing outside, and the named officer said that he asked the complainant to sit down, but the complainant refused. The officer attempted to handcuff him, but he pulled his arm away, actively resisting. The officer used a foot sweep to move the complainant to the ground and then applied handcuffs. The officer stated that his use of force complied with Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force and Proper Control of a Person, as a low level of force was used, the complainant actively resisted the detention and needed to be quickly controlled to prevent further confrontation.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the named officer approached and spoke with the complainant, and told him to sit down, but he refused. The officer attempted to grab the complainant's hand, and the complainant pulled his arm away. The named officer grabbed onto the complainant's shoulder and took him to the ground and handcuffed him with the assistance of another officer.

Department General Order 5.01 states in part that officers may use objectively reasonable force to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, overcome resistance, or to prevent escape. Additionally, DGO 5.01 states that physical controls and takedowns are designed to gain compliance of, and/or control over, uncooperative or resistant subjects.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

The evidence showed that the named officer used reasonable force to gain control and handcuff the complainant, whom he was attempting to justifiably detain, and the complainant actively resisted and did not comply with lawful commands.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer approached him and detained him for no reason.

The named officer said he had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant to investigate possible trespassing and disturbing the peace-related violations. The officer was responding to reports that the complainant threatened individuals at a business location with violence. Multiple 9-1-1 calls were made regarding the situation, and the staff were concerned for the safety of their clients.

Body worn camera footage for the incident showed that the named officer detained the complainant, and he was transported to a hospital for a mental health evaluation. Witnesses at the scene stated that the complainant made racial slurs, threatened to blow up the building, and was asked to leave several times but refused and kept returning.

The evidence showed that the named officer had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant based on the details provided. 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: 09/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer intentionally damaged property.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that when he was being detained, the named officer tossed his cell phone to the ground, damaging and cracking the screen.

The named officer stated that the complainant was holding his cell phone in his hand when they were attempting to handcuff him. The officer said they removed the cell phone from the complainant's hand and placed it on the ground nearby to gain control and handcuff him. The named officer was unaware if the phone was damaged.

Body-worn camera (BWC) showed that when the complainant was being detained on the ground, the named officer grabbed the complainant's hand, which was holding his phone, took the phone, and dropped it to the ground from a short distance. The complainant was then handcuffed. BWC footage did not show if the phone sustained any damage.

The evidence failed to show that the named officer intentionally damaged the complainant's phone during the incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was an urban nudist and often attends street fairs. He stated that at a particular fair, the named officer approached him in a hostile, unprovoked manner. The officer told the complainant not to go anywhere near the designated children's area. The complainant described the officer as rude.

The named officer denied being rude or hostile. He described the complainant as being completely nude and standing close to the children's area of the fair. The officer couldn't recall providing the complainant any instructions but did not think it would be unreasonable to ask the complainant to stay away from the children's area.

No further evidence was available to verify or rebut either account of the incident. The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 1-2: The officers displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that officers sounded their alarm and yelled at an older person who was crossing the street. The complainant described the officers' behavior as berating and intimidating.

DGO 2.01, Rule 14, Public Courtesy, states that when acting in the performance of their duties, while on or off duty, officers shall treat the public with courtesy and respect and not use harsh, profane or uncivil language.

The named officers acknowledged that they were on Patrol that day and confirmed their unit. However, the named officers did not recall being in the area of the incident. The officers maintained admonishing pedestrians enhances public safety and is not an abuse of power.

There was no body-worn camera (BWC) for this incident.

Department of Police Accountability (DPA) relied on various department records, which showed that while the named officers were assigned to the unit that was involved with this complaint, there was not enough evidence to support the allegations as presented by the complainant.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

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 called 911 because he was assaulted (someone spit on his face) in a parking lot. The complainant stated that officer responded and talked to the suspects but never spoke with him and instead threw his hands in the air and drove away.

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

The identity of the officer involved 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: 09/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

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 that the named officer was rude and disrespectful to him.

The named officer stated that he was dealing with a bomb threat and had an area cordoned off to prevent people from entering. The complainant entered that area and a manager for the building attempted to stop the complainant and tell him to leave. The complainant refused to leave and began to argue with the manager. The named officer intervened and told the complainant to leave and explained why the area was closed off. The complainant refused and tried to continue on his way. The named officer requested the complainant's employee identification for the building before escorting him away from the area.

The manager for the building provided a statement that corroborated the named officer's account. The witness stated that the complainant was trying to enter a closed off area during a bomb threat. The witness told the complainant he could not enter and the reason why, but the complainant tried to continue walking through. When the witness tried to stop the complainant again the complainant began to argue with him. The named officer came over and told the complainant to leave. The witnesses stated the named officer was professional and was not rude or inappropriate in how he dealt with the complainant.

The evidence showed that the complainant was trying to enter an active scene. The named officer was trying to protect the scene and the complainant from harm and the complainant stubbornly ignored orders to leave.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer grabbed his arm and tried to push him to the floor.

The named officer stated that he took hold of the complainant's arm after he refused to leave the scene of an active bomb threat. The named officer then escorted the complainant out of the area. The named officer stated he did not push the complainant.

A witness stated that he did not see the named officer push the complainant. The witnesses stated the complainant was argumentative and refused to leave the taped off scene that he had entered.

The evidence showed that the complainant entered an active scene and refused to leave. The complainant does not dispute this. The named officer is authorized to remove a person from the scene to protect the scene, and in this incident, to protect the person from a potential bomb.

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: 09/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/10/26

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 alleged that his neighbor made false accusations that led to his arrest. The complainant stated officers ignored his complaints and relied only on the neighbor's statements. As a result, the complainant was arrested on multiple charges, which he believed were unsupported by evidence.

The named officer acted as the primary investigating officer while assigned to patrol. He responded to a call for service regarding a male suspect who reportedly damaged a building with a sledgehammer and threatened the reporting party before leaving the area. At the scene, the named officer observed wall damage consistent with the reported vandalism; the suspect was not present. After locating the complainant nearby, the named officer determined that probable cause existed to arrest him. He relied on the reporting party's statements, surveillance video from related prior incidents, and physical evidence of property damage. The named officer directed supporting officers to place the complainant in handcuffs and arrest him for criminal threats and vandalism. Supporting officers also observed that the complainant was agitated and argumentative and did not provide a coherent statement when given the opportunity. The named officer later advised the complainant of his *Miranda* rights and interviewed him at a District station. During the interview, the complainant declined to provide a substantive statement about the incident and instead challenged the lawfulness of his arrest. The named officer determined that the complainant's refusal to cooperate did not undermine the probable cause already established through video evidence and witness statements.

Body-worn camera footage shows officers coordinating their approach, detaining the complainant, and attempting to de-escalate the encounter. The footage captures the complainant repeatedly alleging officer bias and harassment, stating that he was being treated unfairly due to his housing status, and at times declining to cooperate with routine identification requests. Throughout the interaction, officers repeatedly attempted to calm the complainant, explain their actions, and give him an opportunity to provide information.

Multiple San Francisco Police Department incident reports documented a series of related incidents involving reported property damage, threats, and hostile statements attributed to the complainant. Surveillance video and photographs corroborated the building's damage and showed the complainant in

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/10/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

possession of items consistent with the reported tools. Department records further reflect multiple calls for service involving similar allegations, corresponding officer responses, and documented investigative actions by the named officer and assisting officers.

Department General Order (DGO) 2.01 requires officers to conduct fair, thorough, and impartial investigations, including identifying the elements of alleged crimes, collecting relevant evidence, and properly documenting their findings. DGO 5.03 governs detentions, arrests, and authorizes officers to take enforcement action when probable cause is established.

The evidence shows that the named officer conducted a reasonable and lawful investigation based on the information available at the time. He gathered and reviewed video evidence, documented physical damage, relied on victim statements corroborated by prior incidents, and attempted to obtain a statement from the complainant. The complainant was given an opportunity to provide information but declined to meaningfully participate. No evidence demonstrates that the named officer ignored investigative duties or intentionally failed to consider relevant information during the investigation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: An anonymous complainant reported that officers failed to take a report, enforce the law, or intervene at a political event. The complainant alleged that counter protesters committed assaults, made death threats, and spat at attendees. The complainant believed political bias influenced the officers' actions.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records indicate that the complainant contacted 9-1-1 to report an assault during a political event. Concurrently, officers were responding to a protest and investigating a prowler at the same location. The complainant could not identify the subject and only provided a vague description. An officer, through the dispatcher, advised the complainant to visit the district station to file the report. However, the complainant insisted that an officer meet him at his vehicle to take the report. No officer was dispatched to the complainant's location to take the report.

The CAD does not identify the officer that instructed the complainant to visit the station to file his report and DPA conducted a comprehensive records check to locate the officer, with negative results.

The DPA was unable to identify the officer based solely on the information provided by the complainant or the CAD. DPA sent an ID Poll to the station where the incident occurred. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Commanding Officer review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/10/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant reported that she was at a café when unknown individuals threatened to hunt her down and kill her. She called the district police station where the incident occurred to report the crime. The officer that answered disconnected the call. The complainant did not provide a name, star number, or gender of the officer that disconnected the call.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the station that they called. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Commanding Officer review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

The DPA conducted a comprehensive records check to locate the call or incident alleged in the complaint, with negative results.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 1 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer used handcuffs improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that she was placed under arrest, and the named officer handcuffed her improperly as the cuffs were too tight. The named officer checked the handcuffs and said they were properly applied; however, the complainant felt they were too tight.

The complainant provided a photograph of one of her wrists, which showed redness.

The named officer said that she assisted with handcuffing the complainant. The complainant stated that one of the handcuffs was too tight, and the named officer checked the handcuffs for the proper degree of tightness multiple times. The named officer said she was able to place a finger between the complainant's wrist and the handcuffs; a technique taught in the police academy to check for the proper degree of tightness. She said she saw a gap between the handcuff and the complainant's wrist, which signified that her wrist was not improperly restrained.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborated the named officer's statements. BWC footage showed the complainant complaining about tight handcuffs, moving her wrist, and jiggling the handcuffs. The named officer checked the handcuffs for proper tightness, and a supervising officer also checked the handcuffs and confirmed that they were applied properly. The handcuffs were visible momentarily, showing they were not overly tightened, cutting off circulation.

A San Francisco Police Department Arrest and Control Manual states in part that, "The handcuffs should be tight enough that they do not easily slide around the wrist. The handcuffs should not be so tight that they cut off circulation. One method of assessing how tight the handcuffs are is to place your index finger between the inside neck of the cuff and the subject's wrists. If your fingertip just barely fits, the handcuffs are sufficiently tight."

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: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 2 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to Mirandize.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer failed to Mirandize her after he arrested her. She said that the named officer did not complete an interrogation interview with her.

The named officer stated that he did not Mirandize the complainant because he did not interrogate her or question her regarding the incident after she was arrested. He stated that before the arrest, the complainant gave her side of the story.

Body-worn camera footage did not show that the complainant was Mirandized. The footage did not show that the named officer, or any officer, interrogated the complainant after she was arrested.

The United States Supreme Court case *Miranda v. Arizona* requires police to tell people in custody prior to interrogation their Fifth Amendment protection against self-incriminating statements and their right to an attorney.

The evidence showed the complainant was not interrogated when placed under arrest, and therefore the named officer was not required to provide the complainant with a Miranda warning.

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: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 3 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that after she was arrested, the named officer gripped her arm too tightly when taking her to a police car for transport, resulting in bruising to her arm. The complainant provided a photograph showing slight discoloration on her forearm.

The named officer said that he escorted the complainant to a police vehicle and grabbed one of her arms above her elbow with a slight grip to guide her toward the vehicle. He denied grabbing her overly tightly and said he used the minimal amount of force to maintain control and bring her to the vehicle.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer assisted with escorting the complainant to the patrol vehicle after she was arrested. He held her arm with his hand just above her elbow, and the complainant entered the patrol vehicle. The complainant was compliant.

DGO 5.01 Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person states that the minimal amount of force necessary is the lowest level of force within the range of objectively reasonable force that is necessary to effect an arrest or achieve a lawful objective without increasing the risk to others.

The evidence showed that the named officer used a minimal amount of force to escort the complainant, who was in police custody and under arrest, to a patrol vehicle. The officer's action of holding onto the complainant's arm did not constitute excessive or unnecessary force.

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: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 4 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer made inappropriate comments toward her when they were at a police station.

The named officer denied the allegations. She stated that she treated the complainant with courtesy and respect and was professional during their interactions.

Body-worn camera (BWC) did not show the named officer making any of the alleged comments. BWC did not capture interactions between the complainant and the officer at the police station.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that the named officer called her a bitch when she was at the police station.

The named officer did not recall any interaction with the complainant. He said that he would not have called anyone a bitch, asserting that he would not have used inappropriate language such as that.

BWC did not capture interactions between the complainant and the officer at the station.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 5 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer took her prescription glasses from her when she was at the police station and ignored her when she requested them so she could see.

The named officer was assigned as a station keeper at a station and was responsible for supervising people in custody who entered the station. He stated that he did not recall interacting with the complainant, dealing with her property, or her asking for her glasses. He said that he would provide someone with their glasses if they asked and required them to see.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the complainant was wearing sunglasses when arrested. She told officers at the scene that they were prescription glasses, and the sunglasses remained on when she was placed into a police vehicle. The footage did not capture any interactions inside the station.

A San Francisco Police Department Property inventory record showed sunglasses listed.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: According to the anonymous complainant, they went out searching for their partner whom they believed was missing. They approached an officer sitting in a police vehicle to file a missing person report. However, the complainant alleged the officer made an inappropriate comment and refused to accept the complainant's request for a report.

The complainant did not provide the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) with specific details about the officer but did provide a limited description of the police vehicle. To overcome these limitations, the DPA sent a request to the Department to help identify the police vehicle and any officer(s) that might have been involved. Unfortunately, the response returned negative results, and no officers were identified. Due to the lack of sufficient information and the complainant's anonymity—which prevented any follow-up for additional details—the officer involved could not be identified. Accordingly, no findings are made, as an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 1 of 8

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 stated that the Named Officer did not arrest the subject who threatened Complainant #2. Complainant #1 conceded that the subject was not on scene when officers arrived.

The Named Officer stated that he did not arrest the subject because the subject was not present when he arrived on scene.

Department records indicate that the subject was not on scene when officers arrived.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the subject was not on scene when the officers arrived.

It was not possible for the named officer to arrest an individual who was not present; therefore, the officer did not violate 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: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 2 of 8

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 alleged that the Named Officer prepared an inaccurate incident report by omitting information and misrepresenting facts.

The Named Officer stated the report was accurate and captured the essence of the incident.

The incident report states that Complainant #1 was verbally threatened by another resident in her building (“subject.”) Complainant #1 confirmed that she was neither touched nor injured. Complainant #2 provided video evidence of the resident’s aggressive behavior and reported that the resident threatened Complainant #1, saying, “You stinking toad. I have squashed many of this sort.” The report further notes that the named officer attempted to contact the resident but was unable to locate him.

Body-worn camera footage corroborates the named officer’s statements and the information captured in the incident report.

The incident report accurately reflects the statements of Complainant #1 and Complainant #2 and contains no material inaccuracies. Accordingly, the report cannot be considered inaccurate.

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: 02/09/26

PAGE# 3 of 8

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the Named Officer approved an inaccurate incident report.

The incident report states that Complainant #1 was verbally threatened by another resident in her building (“subject.”) Complainant #1 confirmed that she was neither touched nor injured. Complainant #2 provided video evidence of the resident’s aggressive behavior and reported that the resident threatened Complainant #1, saying, “You stinking toad. I have squashed many of this sort.” The report further notes that the named officer attempted to contact the resident but was unable to locate him.

Body-worn camera footage corroborates the reporting officer’s statements and the information captured in the incident report.

The incident report prepared by the reporting officer captured the essence of Complainant #1 and Complainant #2’s statements and does not constitute an inaccurate report. The Named Officer’s approval of the report was appropriate.

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: 02/09/26

PAGE# 4 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 alleged that an unknown officer prepared a false incident report on the subject's behalf (separate from the primary incident report), which resulted in an arrest warrant for Complainant #2.

This allegation lacks merit. The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to locate the alleged incident report or find any evidence of an arrest warrant for Complainant #2.

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: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 5 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 reported that the named officer did not acknowledge or confirm receipt of the letter that was sent via United States Postal Mail.

The Named Officer stated that he did not receive a letter from the complainant and was not assigned to the station at the time it was sent.

Department records show that the Named Officer was not assigned to the station at the time the complainant's letter was sent.

There is no evidence that the Named Officer received the complainant's letter. Furthermore, even if the letter was received, failing to acknowledge or respond would not constitute conduct subject to 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: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 6 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6: The officer failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 stated that he submitted a letter to be included in the incident report, but it was not added.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved, 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: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 7 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7: The San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PF

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 alleged that SFPD failed to assign the case involving threats to Complainant #2 to the investigations division.

SFPD does not currently have an up-to-date policy outlining the criteria or the basis for exercising discretion in assigning cases for investigation.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred but was justified by Department policy or procedures; however, the SFPD or DPA recommends that the policy or procedure be changed or modified.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 8 of 8

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8: The officer behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: Complainant #1 stated that, by sheer luck, he discovered a court case online listing Complainant #2 as a defendant. He noted that her name was not spelled exactly the same and alleged that SFPD fraudulently altered her name to assist the subject in filing a false criminal case against Complainant #2.

Civil Court records document a civil case involving an individual with a name similar, but not the same, as Complainant #2.

DPA was unable to locate any court case listing Complainant #2 as a defendant.

The allegation by Complainant #1 is without merit and lacks evidentiary support.

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: 09/29/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that the officer issued him multiple parking citations and mailed them to the complainant's home while the officer was off duty and not at the location where the complainant parked his vehicle. The complainant expressed frustration that the officer did not personally contact him when issuing him the parking citations.

The complainant provided six citations issued by the officer for violations of Airport Commission Rule 4.1(C), specifically "Failure to comply with all signs – No Parking, No Waiting." The violations described on the citations included leaving the vehicle unattended while going to the restroom, standing outside of the vehicle, and parking in a posted no-parking/no-waiting area.

Airport Commission Rules and Regulations Section 4.1 require vehicles on Airport property to strictly comply with all posted signs, pavement markings, and lawful orders. Section 14.1 authorizes Airport Commission employees or law enforcement officers to enforce these rules by issuing verbal or written admonishments or citations.

According to management at the San Francisco Airport Ground Transportation Unit (GTU), officers are trained not to always make contact with drivers when issuing citations because doing so would obstruct traffic flow. At the airport, maintaining the safe and efficient movement of vehicles is a priority, and mailing citations is an accepted enforcement practice intended to avoid further congestion.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/29/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026 PAGE# 2 of 2

The evidence shows the citations were issued for observed violations of posted no-parking/no-waiting signs. The complainant's complaint centers on the manner of service—receiving the citations by mail rather than in person—rather than on the underlying violations. While the conduct alleged did occur, it was consistent with Airport Commission Rules and GTU enforcement procedures. Therefore, the officer's actions were lawful, justified, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1: The officer engaged in an unwarranted action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged the officer improperly initiated the traffic stop, unnecessarily requested multiple backup units, added a license plate violation without cause, and prolonged the detention.

Department of Emergency Management's computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records indicated that the traffic stop lasted approximately 13 minutes and confirmed that four patrol vehicles were present. The records further reflect that Officer #1 was working without a partner and requested that an additional unit roll by to monitor the traffic stop, prompting two two-officer units to respond.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage establishes that the complainant initially refused to lower her window, which delayed communication, and that she failed to produce proof of registration while displaying paper plates on the vehicle. The footage showed the officer attempted to clarify the vehicle's registration status, but the complainant declined to answer related questions. The BWC further confirms that the traffic stop was initiated after the officer obtained a LIDAR reading of 61 mph in a 35-mph zone and that he explained the basis for the traffic stop and citation multiple times to the complainant.

Department General Order 9.01.03.A.2.a. states members should act on moving violations of all applicable laws, regulations, and policies while considering the totality of the circumstances after witnessing a moving violation.

The evidence demonstrated that the officer properly initiated the traffic stop, did not unnecessarily delay the encounter, and acted within the scope of his authority. There is no indication that the traffic stop was prolonged beyond the time reasonably required to address the traffic violations. Therefore, the evidence shows that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2: The behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer behaved inappropriately by asking personal questions regarding her employment, making comments about “YouTube” while she recorded the encounter, requesting that she provide her phone number on the citation, and generally acting in a rude or snarky manner.

The body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed that the officer maintained a calm and even tone throughout the interaction. He did not raise his voice, use profanity, or interrupt the complainant, and he allowed her to speak despite repeated interruptions. The footage confirmed that the officer asked whether she was a flight attendant but also agreed that she was not required to answer if she did not want to. When acknowledging that she was recording him with her cell phone, the officer said, “Hello YouTube” in a conversational tone and did not make disparaging or mocking remarks. Additionally, he informed the complainant that including a phone number on the citation was optional.

The BWC does not support the assertion that the officer’s demeanor was rude, snarky, or discourteous. Rather, the evidence demonstrates that he remained courteous and professional. Based on the totality of the evidence, the complainant’s perception that officer violated DGO 2.01.03.8(a) and DGO 2.01.03.8(e) is not supported. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-5: The officers engaged in selective enforcement.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officers profiled, targeted, harassed, and retaliated against her due to prior DPA complaints and because she drives a Mustang. She asserted that Officer #1 stopped her for improper reasons and that comments made by Officer #2 and Officer #3 referencing her vehicle as “the Mustang,” along with statements such as “I know you,” demonstrated that she and her vehicle had been previously discussed and that she was being singled out.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage established that Officer #1 initiated the traffic stop after obtaining a LIDAR reading showing the complainant speeding. The reason for the traffic stop was clearly communicated to the complainant multiple times during the incident. The footage did not show Officer #1 referencing any prior complaints or demonstrating retaliatory intent. When the complainant alleged harassment, Officer #1 reiterated that the stop was based solely on the observed speeding violation.

The BWC further shows that Officer #2 and Officer #3 responded only as backup after Officer #1 requested an additional unit. Upon arrival, Officer #2 remarked that he recognized the complainant and inquired about the vehicle model. Officer #3, when asked if he recognized the vehicle, indicated that he did not recall it. Neither Officer #2 nor Officer #3 conducted any enforcement action, issued citations, or participated in the decision to initiate the stop.

The evidence does not demonstrate that any of the officers engaged in profiling, targeting, retaliation, or selective enforcement. Rather, the stop was supported by an observed traffic violation, and the involvement of Officer #2 and Officer #3 was limited to backup assistance. Accordingly, the allegation of selective enforcement is not supported by the evidence. Therefore, the evidence showed that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant alleged that a store employee contacted a law enforcement officer and that the employee and officer discussed the complainant and the complainant's spouse as if they were not legitimate customers. The complainant reported feeling uncomfortable and calling the spouse during this exchange. The complainant alleged the officer commented on the phone use and made a statement implying theft. The complainant reported feeling embarrassed and degraded and believed the interaction involved racial profiling. The complainant further alleged that the officer failed to use de-escalation techniques, thereby intensifying the situation.

A Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) record shows that the store manager called 911 to report a fight. In the CAD, the store manager states that police were at the store observing the individuals involved in the fight, whom the police believed were shoplifting.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage from the reported time showed an officer responding to a call for service at a retail store but did not show any contact with the complainant. The store manager is seen in the footage explaining that a different officer had earlier advised that three individuals were suspected of shoplifting. Dispatch audio contained no indication that any officer engaged with the complainant or made the alleged statements.

No Department documents recorded who the first officer was. No body-worn camera footage was available for the first interaction because the exchange appeared to have occurred in passing.

The store manager did not respond to the request to be interviewed.

The BWC available shows that the second responding officer was not the first officer. The footage shows the store manager stating that another officer had previously attended. The second officer had no interaction with the complainant. There is no record of a call for service for the first incident, and the store manager declined to provide information regarding the identity of the first officer. No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant believes the officer acted unprofessionally and with bias.

Based on the available evidence, the BWC shows that the second responding officer was not the first officer. The footage shows the store manager stating that another officer had previously attended. The second officer had no interaction with the complainant. There is no record of a call for service for the first incident, and the store manager declined to provide information regarding the identity of the first officer.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

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 reported that while walking toward the crosswalk, an officer, driving an unmarked vehicle, failed to yield. The officer briefly activated the vehicle's emergency lights, entered the crosswalk while the signal was red, and continued westbound through the intersection. The complainant provided a vague description of the officer.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved, DPA issued an ID Poll to the Bureau. An ID Poll outlines the incident and asks the Commanding Officer to determine which officers were present. The ID Poll returned negative results, and there was not enough information to identify the officer involved.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he was assaulted and robbed by a group of males while he was attempting to obtain medical assistance. The complainant stated that he went to the hospital for treatment but encountered the same armed suspects outside the hospital. According to the complainant, the suspects threatened to kill him if he entered the hospital. Unable to locate hospital security or police officers for assistance, the complainant left the area. The complainant stated that the named officer attended the scene but failed to arrest the suspects.

The named officer reported that he responded to a local hospital to assist with an investigation related to a prior shooting incident. As he arrived at the hospital's main entrance driveway, he heard gunfire and observed the complainant standing near a vehicle while actively discharging a firearm. The officer arrested the complainant for discharging a firearm in a negligent and indiscriminate manner, including firing toward individuals in a crowded hospital entrance area, discharging rounds into the hospital building, and endangering hospital staff, patients, and members of the public.

Evidence viewed from the named officer's body-worn camera footage, other responding officers, and the hospital's surveillance footage, corroborates the officer's account of the incident.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.04 (Arrests) requires officers to make an arrest when probable cause exists. In this case, the named officer articulated probable cause based on direct observation of gunfire, witness statements, and supporting evidence.

The named officer did not identify probable cause to arrest any additional individuals at the scene, as the available evidence and witness statements did not support further arrests at that time. The named officer directly observed the complainant actively firing a weapon, which justified both the immediate detention and subsequent arrest for reckless discharge of a firearm.

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: 10/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer improperly seized his cellular phone without a warrant, despite the complainant's status as a cooperating victim.

The named officer seized the complainant's cellular phone as evidence related to the investigation. He stated that he acted in accordance with Department General Orders and explained that the complainant contacted him multiple times following the arrest. The named officer characterized these interactions as cooperative and stated that he assisted in facilitating the release of the vehicle driven by the complainant.

DGO 6.02 authorizes officers to seize evidence related to a felony offense when lawful grounds exist.

Based on the totality of the circumstances, the seizure of the complainant's cellular phone occurred in connection with a felony investigation and was consistent with Department policy and evidentiary requirements.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer prepared an inaccurate and incomplete incident report by omitting information the complainant claimed to have provided, including that he was the victim of an armed assault, that he voluntarily disclosed the location of his firearm, and that he surrendered peacefully and complied with police commands.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/08/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

The named officer stated that, at the time of the arrest, he did not positively identify any additional suspects involved in the hospital shooting and that individuals connected to the earlier shooting incident had not been identified. He reported that during their interaction, the complainant did not provide the names of any assailants or report ongoing threats. The named officer documented that the complainant was arrested and charged in connection with the hospital incident and later released on bail, while the earlier shooting incident remained under investigation.

The named officer further stated that he has served in a specialized investigative unit since 2014, has extensive experience with violent crime investigations, and has known the complainant through prior law enforcement contacts. The named officer acknowledged that the complainant had a firearm registered to him but noted that the complainant did not possess a valid license to carry a loaded firearm in a vehicle and did not present verified authorization at the time of the incident. He concluded that available surveillance footage depicted the complainant as the primary aggressor at the hospital and contradicted the complainant's claim of self-defense. He further emphasized that no license or circumstances justified the discharge of a firearm in that environment.

Video footage from the hospital corroborated the named officer's reporting in both the incident report and the related documentation.

DGO 2.01, Rule 9, requires officers to prepare accurate and complete reports based on information available at the time of the incident.

Although the complainant disputes certain aspects of the report, the evidence shows that the named officer documented observations, statements, and evidence that were consistent with surveillance footage and witness accounts available during the investigation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: An anonymous complainant alleged in an online complaint that officers responded to a call for service reporting a shooting in the area. He stated that he directed the officers to the location where the shooting occurred; however, he claimed the officers did not exit their vehicles to check the area, as required by Department policy.

Department records indicate that more than two officers were dispatched to the scene and were flagged down during nighttime hours. A superior officer later returned to the area during daylight hours to conduct a follow-up check.

Body-worn camera footage shows that the two primary officers, along with at least three additional officers, responded to a ShotSpotter incident. The footage confirms that all officers exited their vehicles and canvassed the area in search of bullet casings.

The evidence demonstrates that the officers exited their vehicles to check the area.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officers failed to properly investigate the incident, stating that they did not locate bullet casings at the scene.

Department records indicate that several officers, including the named officers, responded to the scene. Officers were directed to different locations based on reported gunshot sounds, and one officer canvassed the area with a police dog. The incident report further documented that a senior officer returned to the scene during daylight hours to recheck the area and obtain security camera footage from nearby establishments. The footage showed a group of individuals standing in a parking lot, after which several gunshots could be heard, and a muzzle flash was observed. However, the group was obscured by a staircase, preventing identification.

Body-worn camera footage captured the named officers and several other officers speaking with the reporting party upon arrival, who directed them to the parking lot. The officers then searched the area for bullet casings, using flashlights to scan the ground and check for broken vehicle windows. The footage shows that the area contained small rocks, which may have affected visibility. Officers also spoke with multiple witnesses at the scene, who indicated a different direction for the gunshot sounds. Despite these efforts, officers were unable to locate any bullet casings.

The evidence proves that the named officers canvassed the area, looked for bullet casings, checked for broken car windows, spoke with witnesses, and the reporting party, who provided different information, and went back to the scene to obtain security camera footage during the day.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6: The officers failed to prepare an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated in an online complaint that officers did not prepare a police report. He further alleged that the incident was documented only after a sergeant discovered video footage the following day, which he claimed demonstrated the officers' incompetence the prior night.

The incident report indicates that it was authored by a sergeant.

Department policy instructs officers to complete an incident report only after locating bullet casings, firearms, or other evidentiary items.

The evidence collected proves that an incident report was authored by a superior officer. However, officers are not required to produce a report when bullet casings, firearms, or other evidence are not located during the investigation.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/21/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

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 the female officer displayed rude behavior toward him and detained him for no reason, which was an abuse of power.

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) who were involved. The ID Poll came back with negative results.

The DPA also contacted Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and requested that any footage or evidence regarding the incident, as described by the complainant, however, no records were provided.

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 detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/21/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the female officer detained him for no reason, which was an abuse of power. The complainant said that the female officer then told him that he was detained and ran his name. He said that he asked why, and the female told him it was because he was talking back.

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) who were involved. The ID Poll came back with negative results.

The DPA also contacted Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and requested that any footage or evidence regarding the incident, as described by the complainant, however, no records were provided.

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: 11/12/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he attempted to file a police report at a District station; however, an officer, whom he was unable to identify, refused to assist him.

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) who 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. In this matter, the officer cannot be reasonably identified.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/14/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/10/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: Partial IO-1Referral/DEM

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

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: Partial IO-1Referral/SFSO

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Internal Affairs Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant stated that she had an issue with the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) Traffic Division. She stated that motorcycle officers were targeting the middle school parents and their workers.

The named officer confirmed that he was working as Traffic Enforcement in the area due to complaints of people not stopping at the stop signs near a school drop-off zone. During one encounter the officer observed a vehicle fail to stop at a posted stop sign. Additionally, the named officer viewed another vehicle pass a block of traffic on the wrong side of the street. With both vehicle stops, he introduced himself and explained why the individuals were being cited.

Department records showed that the named officer was working a traffic enforcement assignment and that citations were issued during the time frame the complainant indicated.

Body-worn camera footage supported the officer's statements. The footage captured the traffic violations, and the officer explaining to each person the violations they committed and why he was conducting enforcement in the area.

The investigation showed the named officer conducted Traffic Enforcement stops after observing violations and that citations were issued around the date, time and area mentioned by the complainant.

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the motorcycle officers were intimidating large immigrant families and workers. While this is a sanctuary city, the motorcycle officers have been conducting themselves like ICE workers.

The named officer stated that he did not say anything in a condescending tone, nor did he say anything in a threatening manner. He was responding to community complaints about dangerous traffic and pedestrian conditions.

Department records indicated that the named officer was working traffic enforcement in the area and pulled over various cars to enforce traffic violations. Records also confirmed that traffic enforcement had been taking place in the area in the last two weeks and the traffic stops have been brief.

Body-worn camera confirmed the officer's statement. Both encounters that were viewed were casual, and the named officer's tone did not appear to be harassing nor intimidating in any manner. Furthermore, the footage showed that the drivers were alone rather than large families. The footage also showed that the named officer informing drivers of why he was conducting enforcement in the area.

DPA determined based on the evidence that the named officer did not display intimidating, harassing, and threatening behavior.

The evidence proves that the misconduct alleged did not occur.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that officers have been targeting large immigrant families and workers. While this is a sanctuary city, the motorcycle officers have been conducting themselves like United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) workers. The complainant said that she observed officers pull children out of vehicles.

The named officer advised that he did not target anyone nor did he take any police action based on race.

The body-worn camera footage for the date and time the complainant referred to did not show the officer stopping any families with children.

There was no evidence indicating bias, or that children were pulled out of vehicles.

The evidence proves that the misconduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: According to the complainant, they witness a civilian vehicle unsafely pass vehicles prior to entering an intersection. The complainant advised there was a police vehicle in the area when it happened, but the officer failed to take any type of enforcement action.

The complainant did not provide the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) with descriptive information about the officer but did provide identifying information about the police vehicle. To overcome these issues, the DPA sent a request for information to the Department inquiring about the police vehicle as well as requesting assistance with identifying any officers who might have used the vehicle on the reported date of incident. Unfortunately, the response returned negative results as no officers were identified as checking out the vehicle. Due to the lack of information, the officer involved could not be identified. Accordingly, no findings are made, as an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated officers searched him without cause during a traffic stop.

Department records, including body-worn camera footage, showed that the complainant was stopped for going through a red light. Officers checked the complainant's driver record and learned that he had a suspended license. The officers were concerned that the complainant might have a weapon because he delayed pulling over. The officers asked the complainant to get out of his car and if they could pat him down for weapons. The complainant consented. Footage also showed that it was dark and the complainant was wearing baggy clothing. The officers recovered a firearm from the complainant's waistband.

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: 11/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer failed to take a report for burglary from the complainant.

A search of police documents found no incident involving the complainant and the named officer. There was no record of any call related to a burglary at the complainant's address.

There is no evidence that the named officer was involved in this incident.

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: 11/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

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 for San Francisco Police Department, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 2/10/26.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 1 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant had a physical altercation with his girlfriend, which prompted her to call 911 for police assistance. When the responding officers arrived, the named officer placed the complainant in handcuffs as they investigated the incident. The complainant stated the named officer used excessive or unnecessary force in handcuffing him, resulting in his finger being sprained.

The incident report did not indicate any injury to the complainant as a result of being handcuffed, and the force used was adequately documented.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos showed the officer used reasonable control holds in handcuffing the complainant. There was no unnecessary or excessive force.

The complainant's medical record indicated thumb pain, but no injuries were determined.

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: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 2 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer made an arrest without cause.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer arrested him for no reason. He stated that instead of arresting him, the officer should have tried to calm down the situation.

The DPA reviewed the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) printout, incident report, and body-worn camera footage for this incident. The named officer had probable cause to arrest the complainant for domestic violence and false imprisonment based on the statement provided by the girlfriend. She stated that the complainant threw her onto the bed and pinned her down for a couple of minutes, during which she was not free to leave. The complainant's girlfriend recanted her statement when she learned that the complainant would be arrested.

Department General Order (DGO) 6.09.02 (POLICY) states, "A. It is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department that members treat all acts of domestic violence as criminal conduct. When the elements of a crime exist, members shall make an arrest instead of using dispute mediation or other police intervention techniques." DGO 6.09 also provides that if probable cause exists to believe that an assault or battery has occurred upon a person in a current dating relationship, and the arrest is made as soon as probable cause arises, then no private person's arrest is required. Given the officers' observations and the witness statements, the officers had probable cause to arrest the complainant. Therefore, DGO 6.09 required the officers to make an 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: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 3 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said the officer did not allow him to use the bathroom at the hospital where he was transported for medical care.

The officer's BWC footage of the incident shows that the officer allowed the complainant to use the bathroom.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 4 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called a district police station several times to follow up on his case. He stated that the person who answered his calls blocked his 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) to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Captain and/or members of the station review the incident description and identify officer(s) that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 5 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSD

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Investigative Services Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/26/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that an unidentified officer who patrols near their home during overnight hours did not adequately address multiple emergency calls involving serious allegations and did not provide follow-up or a meaningful investigation. The complainant also alleged a potential conflict of interest, stating that the officer reportedly has a marital relationship with a resident in the same building.

The complainant listed one specific date as the only identifiable date of occurrence. Dispatch records for that date showed that day-watch officers handled the calls. The records documented that officers dispatched and made multiple attempts to contact the complainant and did not support the allegation that officers failed to respond or that an overnight patrol officer engaged in misconduct on that date.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) could not fully assess the complaint because we needed additional information from the complainant to clarify concerns about SFPD's response and to identify the individual(s) allegedly responsible for the reported interference. The DPA scheduled follow-up interviews to obtain the required details, but the complainant did not attend. As a result, the DPA could not identify an involved officer or substantiate the allegation based on the available information.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The anonymous complainant alleged in an online complaint that he, his mother, and his aunt were standing outside his aunt's apartment building smoking cigarettes. He stated that a patrol vehicle was parked in the middle of the street, with its emergency lights activated, in response to a call for service. According to the complainant, he asked the officer to turn off the flashing lights because his mother has epilepsy and the lights could trigger a medical episode; however, he alleged the officer refused.

Department records indicate that the named officer was at the location in response to an assault/battery call for service.

Body-worn camera footage captured the named officer handling a call at the apartment building; however, it did not record any individual speaking with the officer about the patrol vehicle's emergency lights outside the building.

There are no department policies requiring officers to deactivate their patrol vehicle emergency lights to prevent potential medical issues.

San Francisco Police Department General Order 5.05 (Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving) states: "Members performing an emergency response shall activate their forward visible red light and shall sound the siren as reasonably necessary under the circumstances to provide suitable warning to afford other users of the highways an opportunity to yield the right-of-way (California Vehicle Code §21055)."

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

The evidence collected shows that the incident did not occur. Even if it did, the named officer was not required to turn off the lights to prevent medical emergencies.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/03/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

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 the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 2/4/26.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/18/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/26/26

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 the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 2/25/26.

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: M

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement between the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 2/25/26.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/21/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant filed the complaint on behalf of his mother-in-law, who was stopped by the named officer for a moving violation. He alleged that the officer asked his mother-in-law a pretextual question to prompt self-incrimination without explaining the reason for the stop. He further claimed that the officer misinformed her about a nonexistent law prohibiting turns on a yellow light.

Department records confirm that the mother-in-law was stopped by the named officer at the time of the incident.

Body-worn camera footage shows that after pulling her over, the officer immediately explained the reason for the stop. He said she made a right turn on a red light despite a posted sign stating, "No right turn on red." The officer did not ask any pretext questions, nor did he mention any new law prohibiting turns on yellow lights.

The evidence collected proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/21/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26 PAGE# 2 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his mother-in-law informed him that the named officer stopped her only after she made two additional right turns, rather than immediately after the initial turn. She believed that the late stop meant the citation was issued without cause.

The named officer is no longer with the department and therefore cannot be interviewed by the DPA.

Department records identify the location of the illegal right turn and confirm that the mother-in-law was cited for disobeying a posted sign.

Google Maps verifies that a “No right turn on red” sign is present at the location.

Body-worn camera footage shows that the officer stopped the mother-in-law after she made one right turn, not two, from the location of the illegal turn.

There are no departmental policies governing the time required for an officer to stop a vehicle for a moving violation.

The evidence proves that the officer did not stop the mother-in-law’s car after she made two more right turns. A preponderance of evidence proves that the alleged conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/30/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that he was at a public park with his dog and friend, drinking a shot of alcohol and soda. An officer approached and asked if an empty soda bottle nearby was his. After confirming it was, the officer asked him to throw it away, suspecting it contained alcohol. The complainant initially refused, feeling targeted and harassed, but eventually complied. The officer continued to follow him out of the park. The complainant mentioned that the officer's actions ruined his day. He also admitted to accidentally dropping and leaving the alcohol bottle, but he threw away the soda bottle before leaving the park.

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) who were involved. The ID Poll came back with negative results.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/30/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant called the Airport Bureau and reported that someone had fraudulently purchased an airline ticket using his wife's information. The complainant stated that the officer or staff member who answered his call was dismissive and unhelpful, and that the individual hung up on him.

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

Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer reasonably.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

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: 01/20/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/09/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to promptly respond to a scene.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant contacted Dispatch and waited approximately two hours for a response regarding a white van parked outside the property, which was related to ICE activity. Officers did not respond to the location. The complainant reviewed security camera footage and did not observe any SFPD units arriving at the property.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) dispatch evaluated the initial call, closed it without dispatching an officer, and then reclassified the matter under a second CAD as a Priority C call (defined as no present or potential danger to life or property and the suspect no longer in the area). Dispatch informed the reporting party (the complainant) of the delay in response and dispatched officers when resources became available. The responding officer investigated the reported vehicle and determined it was registered to legitimate businesses. Although the complainant perceived a lack of a timely response, the evidence does not show that the officer failed to respond promptly.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/24/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026 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 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/27/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26 PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke in a manner unbecoming an officer.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that she called the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) because her neighbor told her that there were hidden cameras in her apartment. However, the complainant said that once the officers arrived, they were not concerned. The named officers asked the complainant if she wanted to harm herself or anyone else. The officers also asked the complainant if she had eaten, and then they left.

Department records confirmed that the named officers responded to a Priority B Wellness Check. The record indicated that the complainant went to the front desk and requested that SFPD be called, as someone had a hidden camera in her apartment.

Body-worn camera (BWC) showed the named officers responded to a wellness check and showed that the complainant said that there were hidden cameras and people were watching her, according to her neighbor. The footage showed the complainant responded to the officers that she did not want to harm herself or anyone and confirmed that she had eaten.

Department of Police Accountability (DPA) relied on various Department Records, which showed that the named officers focused on the complainant's well-being rather than the mentioned hidden cameras in her apartment, their behavior did not rise to the level of misconduct.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/27/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that while she did not recall asking for the officer's information, she felt they should have introduced themselves.

Department General Order 2.01(14) states that when requested, members shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment.”

BWC did not show that the complainant asked the officers for their names and star numbers.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/27/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/27/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called SFPD for help, and once officers arrived, they kept going in circles as he continued to explain that his personal rights had been violated. The complainant stated that the police should help him as he is a victim of Financial Abuse, emotional abuse, and criminal harassment. Although the complainant said that he told them that he was a vulnerable adult, SFPD failed to help and did not de-escalate the situation. The complainant said that he became frustrated, he felt he was spoken down to, and he used profanity toward the officers and told them to leave.

Department records contradicted the complaint as presented by the complainant.

The Department of Police Accountability's investigation included reviewing police and Dispatch records. There were no records or information that corroborated the details of the incident as presented by the complainant.

While DPA attempted to locate any police related encounters or reports, nothing matched the facts that were offered by the complainant.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/27/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to write an incident report.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that he was a former planner and whistleblower and was forced out of his job. He further stated that he called the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) because he wanted them to write a police report, and they refused.

Department records contradicted the complaint as presented by the complainant.

The Department of Police Accountability's investigation included reviewing police and Dispatch records. There were no records or information that corroborated the details of the incident as presented by the complainant.

While DPA attempted to locate any police related encounters or reports, nothing matched the facts that were offered by the complainant.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/28/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer compromised an official investigation.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer provided information to alleged offenders of a crime, helping them to avoid arrest.

The named officer is no longer with the department.

No findings are made if the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer conducted illegal searches more than ten years ago.

The named officer is no longer with the department.

No findings are made if 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: 01/28/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26

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: 01/29/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3: The officers applied handcuffs without justification.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers unlawfully handcuffed him when he was placed on an involuntary mental health detention.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to the complainant's residence as part of the San Francisco Police Department's Critical Intervention Team (SFPD CIT), which included a psychologist from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH). The named officers and the SFDPH psychologist spoke with the complainant, who stated that he was legally insane, emotionally dysregulated, anxious, reactive, couldn't control his emotions, and bipolar. After speaking with the complainant for several minutes, the SFDPH psychologist assessed the complainant and decided to place him on an involuntary mental health detention pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code §5150 for being gravely disabled. The named officers placed the complainant in handcuffs based on the complainant's statements, indicating that it would be safer for all parties involved. When paramedics arrived, the handcuffs were removed, and the complainant was transported to the hospital.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage is corroborated by Department records.

Department General Order 5.01 (Use of Force) and the San Francisco Police Department Arrest and Control Manual authorize officers to place a subject in handcuffs when the subject is being arrested for a felony offense, when the subject is a violent misdemeanor, or when the arresting officer deems it necessary.

The officers acted in accordance with Department policy when applying handcuffs, as the policy permits officers to exercise discretion when they determine it is necessary for safety and control. In this instance, their decision materially reduced the risk of harm to all parties involved, particularly in light of the complainant's statements.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/29/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26 PAGE# 2 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-6: The officers engaged in unwarranted action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he was unlawfully placed on an involuntary mental health hold pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code §5150.

Department records indicate that the complainant was placed on a mental health hold by a psychologist from the SFDPH, not by any member of SFPD.

BWC corroborates the Department records.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-9: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/29/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officers failed to provide him with *Marsy's Rights* card when he was placed on an involuntary mental health hold.

Department records do not characterize the complainant as a victim. The record documents that he is a detained individual.

California Penal Code §679.026, in relevant part, requires law enforcement officers to provide victims of crimes with a Marsy's Rights card. A Marsy's Rights card provides victims with a summary of their Constitutional rights under Marsy's Law, also known as the California Victims' Bill of Rights.

California Penal Code §679.01 defines a victim as a person against whom a crime has been committed.

The complainant was involuntarily detained due to mental health reasons. He is not designated as a victim per Penal Code §679.01, and therefore, the named officers were not obligated to provide him with a Marsy's Rights card.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/29/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: Referral IAD

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

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/30/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 02/03/26 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 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/30/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/2026

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 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/10/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: Referral/IAD

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

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/09/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/26

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 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/09/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUA

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated an officer told him to go back to the country he came from.

The complainant was unable to provide a time and date for the incident. The officer's name and badge number provided by the complainant did not relate to any current serving officer.

The officer cannot be reasonably identified with the information provided.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: 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 an officer drove over his foot.

The complainant was unable to provide a time and date for the incident. The officer's name and badge number provided by the complainant did not relate to any current serving officer.

The officer cannot be reasonably identified with the information provided.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/11/26

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFDA

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

San Francisco District Attorney
Victim Services Division
350 Rhode Island Street, 400N
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/11/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/18/26

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: 02/12/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/DEM

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/10/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

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 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/13/25

COMPLETION DATE: 02/19 /26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFFD

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/13/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

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: 02/13/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said that he called the non-emergency number for help regarding a burglary at his unit, and no one ever responded. He said that he received a call from a No Caller ID number just before midnight; however, they promptly hung up the call.

Department records showed that the named officers responded to the call the following morning. The comments in the record further indicated that the complainant did not answer the phone call, so the named officers were not able to take the complainant's report.

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: IO-1/DEM

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/14/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/16/26

DATE OF COMPLETION: 02/24/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer failed to properly investigate a homicide case as presented.

The named officer is no longer with the San Francisco Police Department and is not subject to discipline.

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: 02/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/ACC

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

San Francisco Police Department
Internal Affairs Division
1245 3rd Street
San Francisco, CA 94158

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 02/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/ACC

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

Department of Animal Care and Control
1419 Bryant Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/23/2026 DATE OF COMPLETION: 02/24/2026 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSO

DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Internal Affairs Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

DATE OF COMPLAINT: 02/24/2026 DATE OF COMPLETION: 02/26/2026 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSO

DEPT. ACTION:

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department
Internal Affairs Unit
25 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 350
San Francisco, CA 94102