

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/26/2023 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/26 PAGE# 1 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) is mandated by the City Charter to investigate officer-involved shootings (OIS) that results in physical injury or death in San Francisco involving the Department. In this incident, an OIS occurred following a warrant arrest conducted by officers working in a plainclothes capacity.

After placing an individual into custody, the plainclothes officers waited for a marked police transport unit to assist with custody transport. While waiting, the decedent - who was armed with a concealed firearm - engaged the officers in a verbal confrontation and demanded that they release the person in custody. When the officers refused, the decedent brandished a firearm and approached the officers.

The arresting officers requested additional units due to the presence of an armed individual, the need to transport the person in custody, and the formation of a hostile crowd. They described the armed individual as running in the middle of the street while holding a firearm and wearing a black beanie, a gray and black jacket, and blue jeans.

Multiple police units responded in marked patrol vehicles. Officers issued verbal commands and attempted to position bystanders behind cover, though some bystanders did not comply. Medical personnel staged nearby while officers attempted to de-escalate and manage the situation. Investigators obtained footage from multiple sources, including body-worn cameras (BWC), and cell phone recordings from open-source media. Collectively, these recordings provided a consistent account of the events and were reviewed alongside officer and civilian statements.

Video evidence shows the decedent repeatedly failing to comply with commands to raise his hands, despite warnings that failure to comply could result in the use of lethal force. The footage also documents the decedent pacing, making abrupt movements, gesturing, and verbally confronting officers while armed.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/26/2023 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/26 PAGE# 2 of 5

BWC audio recordings captured officers repeatedly issuing commands directing the decedent to raise his hands and get on the ground. These commands were primarily issued by Named Officer #1 and Named Officer #2. At one point, Named Officer #2 altered his tone while continuing to direct the decedent to comply. The decedent did not comply and later removed a firearm from his waistband and pointed it in the direction of Named Officer #1 and Named Officer #2.

Named Officer #1 and Named Officer #2 described the decedent as non-compliant. Both officers reported issuing commands for the decedent to raise his hands and get on the ground more than forty times and warning that failure to comply could result in the discharge of their firearms. According to the officers, the decedent pointed a firearm directly at them. The officers discharged their firearms until the decedent was no longer perceived as a threat. Both officers stated they believed the decedent was going to shoot them.

A civilian witness provided an account of the incident. Witness #1 reported hearing a commotion outside their residence and observing the scene from a second-story window. Witness #1 heard the decedent arguing and heard an officer order him to raise his hands. The witness reported that the decedent continued pacing and yelling. Witness #1 then heard gunshots but did not observe the shooting. After opening their front door, Witness #1 observed the decedent lying on the ground while officers rendered medical aid.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.01.02(C), *Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person*, states, in part, that officers shall, when feasible, employ de-escalation strategies and techniques to mitigate the need to use a higher level of force and to increase the likelihood of a peaceful resolution.

DGO 5.01.04(C) states, in part:

Barring exigent circumstances, the primary objective of the first responding officer(s) should be to observe the incident from a distance, assess the nature of the call, and gather the appropriate personnel or resources. When encountering a non-compliant or armed suspect, officers shall, when

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/26/2023 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/26 PAGE# 3 of 5

feasible, use de-escalation strategies and techniques in an effort to reduce the need or level of force, including: (1) making reasonable attempts to isolate and contain the suspect; and (2) creating time and distance from the suspect by establishing a buffer zone and utilizing cover.

DGO 5.01.03(D) defines reasonable force as:

“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. (Cal. Penal Code § 835a(a)(4)).”

DGO 5.01.03 further states:

“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. (Cal. Penal Code § 835a(e)(2)).”

DGO 5.01.04(A) states, in part, that officers may use objectively reasonable force options in the performance of their duties to effect a lawful arrest, overcome resistance or prevent escape, prevent the commission of a public offense, or in defense of others or self-defense.

DGO 5.01.05(E) defines life-threatening resistance as any action likely to result in serious bodily injury or death to an officer or another person. DGO 5.01.05 identifies force options for life-threatening resistance, including the use of firearms.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/26/2023 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/26 PAGE# 4 of 5

DGO 5.01.08(G)(2)(a) states, in part, that an officer may discharge a firearm in self-defense or defense of another person when the officer has reasonable cause to believe there is an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury.

DGO 5.01.08(G)(2)(b) states that, if feasible and if doing so would not increase danger, an officer shall provide a verbal warning prior to discharging a firearm.

Named Officer #1 and Named Officer #2 responded to the scene following a request for backup related to an armed individual. Upon arrival, they positioned their marked patrol vehicle to create distance and provide cover and issued repeated verbal commands directing the decedent to raise his hands and get on the ground. The decedent did not comply and continued pacing. According to officer statements and video evidence, the decedent removed a firearm from his waistband and pointed it toward the officers. The officers discharged their firearms, after which the decedent fell to the ground. The officers then approached and were the first to render medical aid.

The evidence demonstrates that Named Officer #1 and Named Officer #2 consistently attempted to de-escalate the encounter prior to the use of deadly force. Upon arrival, the officers positioned their marked patrol vehicle to create distance and utilized it as cover, consistent with Department guidance to establish a reactionary gap when encountering an armed individual. The officers issued repeated clear verbal commands directed to the decedent to raise his hands and get on the ground. The officers' de-escalation efforts continued until the decedent escalated the encounter. Therefore, the officers' actions were consistent with Department policy and justified, lawful, and proper.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers intentionally and improperly discharged a firearm, on duty, in the performance of law enforcement duties.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/26/2023 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/26 PAGE# 5 of 5

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: With respect to the previously stated facts, Department General Order (DGO) 5.01.08(G)(2)(a) authorizes an officer to discharge a firearm or use other deadly force in self-defense or in defense of another person when the officer has reasonable cause to believe there is an imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury. DGO 5.01.08(G)(2)(b) further requires that, if feasible and if doing so would not increase the danger to officers or others, a verbal warning be given prior to the use of deadly force.

The evidence shows that officers repeatedly ordered the decedent to raise his hands and get on the ground and provided multiple warnings that failure to comply could result in the discharge of their firearms. Despite these repeated warnings and attempts to gain compliance, the decedent removed a firearm from his waistband and pointed it at the officers. At that moment, the decedent possessed the apparent ability, opportunity, and intent to cause death or serious bodily injury. Under the totality of the circumstances, the officers reasonably believed that the use of deadly force was necessary to protect themselves and others from an imminent threat of death or serious bodily injury. Accordingly, the evidence establishes that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper under 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: 03/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026 PAGE# 1 of 4

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4: The officers failed to promptly respond to a scene.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant called the police regarding a domestic violence incident where her ex-boyfriend arrived at her residence and vandalized her ring camera when she denied him entrance to her unit. Dispatch advised her that officers would respond shortly but warned her that there may be delays in their response. However, the complainant stated that several days had passed and officers had still not responded, requiring her to go to the district station to generate a report reflecting the incident.

The evidence, such as the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report, and officer statements, showed the following: the complainant called Dispatch, roughly an hour after the incident occurred, to report a potential domestic violence/vandalism call for service. At that time, the ex-boyfriend had already fled the scene, and no physical harm had occurred. Dispatch re-classified the call as a priority "C," which are low-level, non-emergency calls for service.

Named officers #1 and #2 responded to the scene when they were dispatched. However, despite all reasonable attempts, named officers #1 and #2 could not contact the complainant. The layout of the premises prevented them from entering the security gate and the complainant had not answered the phone to grant them access. It was later determined that Dispatch provided the officers with the incorrect phone number.

The complainant thereafter made several calls to Dispatch who advised her of delays and corrected her call back number. The next day, named officers #2 and #3 responded to the residence. Similarly, named officers #3 and #4 were unable to contact the complainant as they were unable to enter the premises and the complainant had not answered the phone to grant them access through a security gate.

DPA understands the distress that the delay in response caused the complainant and encourages officers to respond promptly to domestic violence calls. However, any failure here, to respond timely, was not due to any wrongdoing on behalf of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD). When the complainant called the police, the perpetrator was gone and the complainant was deemed safe, causing Dispatch to designate the call as a low priority "C" call for service. Thereafter, when Dispatch eventually assigned officers to the call, they quickly responded, but were unable to reasonably make contact as mentioned above.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026 PAGE# 2 of 4

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 properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, several days later, responded to the station with her representative to generate a report reflecting the above-described incident. The named officers interviewed her regarding the occurrence. However, the complainant alleged that they failed to properly investigate the incident as it appeared to her that they did not pay attention to her statement and dismissed the video evidence she informed them she had and told her that they did not need to see it.

DPA obtained the officers' body-worn camera footage (BWC) reflecting the interaction and preliminary investigation. The BWC footage showed that the named officers investigated what occurred and asked her the required questions mandated by law. Early in the interview, the complainant informed them that she had video evidence of the occurrence on her phone which the named officer acknowledged. Named officer #1- in this allegation- thereafter conducted a professional investigation into the matter. The officers' BWC does not capture any further mention of the video footage she had. The officer generated an incident report.

Named officer #1 stated that he recalled the incident and conducted a proper investigation. He explained that he obtained her statement, completed the required questionnaires, provided her resources, and uploaded the materials. He confirmed that the complainant had mentioned the camera footage she had. However, he stated that the footage was not available at the time and was documented for follow-up. The report was thereafter forwarded for the appropriate review and follow-up per Department policy and procedures. He also believed he remained professional and respectful during their interaction.

The evidence did not reflect that the officers failed to pay attention to her. The footage showed that the named officers asked her the requisite questions, remained professional, and displayed compassion for what had occurred. The BWC footage also did not show that the officers informed her they did not need

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026 PAGE# 3 of 4

the footage. However, it also did not appear that after their initial discussion about the Ring camera footage that they followed up with her about it. The BWC footage is inconclusive to whether the Ring

camera footage was unavailable at the time of the interview as suggested by the complainant and the complainant was unavailable for a follow-up investigation. Thus, DPA is unable to determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether the officer could have retrieved the video and failed to do so, rendering the investigation inadequate.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #7-8: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officers inappropriately interviewed her regarding the domestic violence incident - an incident sensitive in nature - in the lobby rather than a private room.

Body-worn camera footage of the incident confirmed that the officers interviewed her regarding the domestic violence incident in a section of the lobby at the station.

Department General Order 6.09, Domestic Violence, requires that victim interviews to be conducted in “private,” and to ensure confidentiality.

Named officer #1 confirmed that they interviewed her in the lobby and that he was aware of the above DGO’s provision. Named officer #1 conducted most of the investigation and interview with the complainant. Named officer #1 understood “in private,” to mean that officers should make reasonable efforts to provide privacy while balancing safety, logistics, and station constraints. Here, he stated that the initial contact occurred in the station lobby due to the complainant arriving as a walk-in and limited space availability at the time. He attested that reasonable steps were taken to provide privacy in compliance with DGO 6.09.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 03/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026 PAGE# 4 of 4

Insufficient evidence exists to determine whether the officers behaved inappropriately when they interviewed the complainant inside the lobby on said date. DPA is unable to independently verify whether there was limited availability at the station. It is also unclear, absent a clear definition, whether the language in the DGO applies to a situation such as the one here, when a victim responds to the station, or

whether it applies to incidents on-scene where both parties are present. DPA would, however, recommend that officers remain sensitive to these situations and ensure a victim's privacy.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct violated Department rules or procedures.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: 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 partially forwarded to:

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/05/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 1 of 5

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant said she was driving her vehicle on a freeway in another county when an officer pulled her over, using his overhead lights. She said she saw a car pull in front of her and cut her off. She knew it was a police vehicle because it was a dark-colored car. She said she flashed her high beams as they transitioned onto the connector freeway. She got in front of the officer, and the officer turned on his police lights and "raised his window down." She thought he wanted her to pull over, so she moved to the right, but he didn't get behind her and just kept going. She then got back on the freeway and drove up behind the officer, getting in front of him because she thought he was playing with her. She stated the officer activated his red and blue lights. The officer was behind her vehicle and close to her car, so she pulled over to the left shoulder. She stopped her car with the hazard lights on and had her phone out. When she pulled over to the left, the officer started to pass her and was now on the right side of her vehicle. The officer then backed up his vehicle while on the freeway and hit a car behind his vehicle. She got out of her car and was recording with her cell phone. She yelled at the officer that he hit the car behind him and that he needed to get out of the car. She started to walk up to the officer, and the officer told her to back up. Then they exchanged words. She told the officer he didn't have the right to pull her over, and the officer told her that just because he cut her off doesn't give her the right to be mad. The man in the vehicle that he backed into drove off and left. The other driver stayed on scene for about a minute before he left. She and the officer were exchanging words. She could not hear what the officer was saying to her because of the freeway traffic noise. She got in her car and left.

The named officer stated he did not detain the complainant. He was traveling southbound on the freeway in the #1 lane on his way to work at the police academy from home when the incident occurred. He was off duty at the time. He was driving an unmarked Department vehicle equipped with overhead lights. He acknowledged that he activated the red, white, and blue overhead lights on the vehicle because the complainant was aggressively tailgating him. He initially activated the lights briefly to signal to the complainant that she was tailgating a police officer in a police vehicle, in case she did not know, in an attempt to dissuade her from following him. He noticed a vehicle following his vehicle, aggressively close behind him on the freeway. The driver flashed the high-beam lights at him, cut between the left and right lanes of traffic to stay behind him, and even crossed the double-solid white lines into the express lane and back just to stay behind him. He described the complainant's driving behavior as aggressive and bordering on reckless. He did not know whether it was someone in need of assistance or an individual who was posing a potential threat to his safety. The driver then sped up to the right side of his vehicle with the

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26 PAGE# 2 of 5

driver's window down. He rolled down his window to investigate the situation and observed the driver, a black female, yelling at him, making reference to "cutting me off" and "I don't give a f_ if you the police!" Given the road and traffic conditions, in addition to the manner in which she was driving, he tried to tell her to pull over to the side of the road. As she began to drive over toward the right side of the road, he again activated his overhead lights to indicate to other vehicles on the road approaching from behind to slow down while she changed lanes. When she reached the shoulder safely, the interaction with her was over at that point, and he drove on. There was never any intention to affect a traffic stop. He then observed the complainant drive up aggressively again, speeding and weaving through traffic in order to tailgate him once again. She stayed behind his vehicle and was never in front of him again until she eventually took off and left the scene.

Due to her driving behavior, demeanor, and the fact that she was aware that he was a police officer in a police vehicle and continued to display this level of aggression toward him, several alarms were raised in his head, and he perceived her as a possible danger to his safety. The complainant pulled over to the left shoulder behind him and refused to drive up next to him. He then reversed his vehicle next to her vehicle and exited his vehicle as she approached him on foot, yelling at him. The officer tried to tell her to back up to give him space and to stop following him, but she continuously yelled over him and did not listen to what he was saying to her. Eventually, she got back in her vehicle and left the scene. Had he intended to take it further by conducting a traffic stop, his probable cause to stop the vehicle would have included tailgating, speeding, unsafe lane change, crossing double-solid lines, and reckless driving, leading to a road-rage incident. The interaction felt hostile to the officer, as the complainant was aggressively following him, followed by yelling and antagonizing behavior. All the while, he only tried to tell her to stop following him, and she disregarded that he was a police officer, which made her behavior even more suspicious. The officer described his demeanor as relatively calm, considering how aggressive the complainant's behavior was. The complainant was yelling at him with her cell phone in his face. The officer stated he tried to talk to the complainant, but she continued yelling over him. The officer said he was extremely lenient in not taking police action against the complainant. The complainant tried to paint him as the aggressor and acted as if he had victimized her in some way.

Cell phone video footage provided by the complainant does not capture the initial incident between the officer and the complainant on the freeway. The footage captures a second interaction with two vehicles stopped on the freeway. The complainant's vehicle is stopped on the left shoulder, and the officer's vehicle is to the right of the complainant's vehicle. The complainant is shown behaving in a hostile, verbally aggressive manner, walking toward the officer, cursing and yelling at him. The complainant acted in a belligerent manner toward the officer. The complainant does not ask for the officer's name or star number. The audio captures the complainant telling the officer she thought he was Antioch PD, then she says he's SFPD. The officer did not respond and remained calm. The officer is dressed in plain clothes, wearing

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/05/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 3 of 5

black cargo pants and a black t-shirt. His department-issued badge is visible on his left hip. The complainant is heard accusing the officer of backing into another vehicle that was stopped. A small, white pickup truck occupied by an adult male driver is observed. The video captures the officer speaking briefly with the driver before returning to his vehicle, looking at the rear of his vehicle, and the driver in the pickup truck driving away. Due to traffic noise, the conversation between the officer and the driver cannot be heard. The video shows the officer standing outside his vehicle with the driver's door partially open. The officer is seen holding his cell phone and can be heard telling the complainant he has the right to pull her over.

Under California law, Penal Code section 830.1, peace officers have the authority, whether on or off duty, to take police action or make lawful arrests anywhere in the State when there is a public offense committed in their presence.

By her own admission, the complainant said she saw a car pull in front of her and cut her off. She knew it was a police vehicle and then used her high beams as the two vehicles transitioned onto the connector freeway. She got in front of the police vehicle, and the officer turned on his police lights and "raised his window down." She thought he wanted her to pull over, so she moved to the right, but he didn't get behind her and just kept going. This does not constitute a traffic stop. The complainant then got back on the freeway and drove up behind the officer again. She said she got in front of him because she thought the officer was playing with her. Her statements are consistent with the officer's description of the incident. However, this was not a traffic stop. The complainant acknowledged driving erratically, pulling behind the officer, flashing her high beams, and then getting in front of the officer's vehicle, all while she was fully aware it was a police officer. The complainant demonstrated extremely poor judgment by attempting to engage the officer in a road-rage incident. When the two vehicles eventually stopped, the complainant exited her vehicle and approached the officer while yelling and cursing at him. The cell phone video evidence shows the officer remained calm and professional during the verbal interaction and tried to speak to the complainant in a calm manner to no avail. Given the number of vehicle code violations the complainant committed in the officer's presence, the officer correctly told the complainant he has the right to pull her over. Had the officer chosen to do so, it would have been justified and lawful. No traffic stop or detention occurred based on the complainant's own statements.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26 PAGE# 4 of 5

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer backed into another vehicle on the freeway, spoke to the driver briefly, and then the other driver drove off.

The named officer stated that after the complainant pulled off the highway to the left shoulder, he tried to tell her to pull up next to him so he could speak with her, but she refused and continued to yell at him while recording on her phone, then approached him on foot. Because the complainant refused to pull up next to him, the officer slowly reversed his vehicle to get closer to her and speak with her. As he reversed, he made contact with the vehicle behind him at approximately a couple miles per hour, at a very slow speed. The officer exited his vehicle and spoke with the driver behind him. The officer checked for damage to both vehicles and saw no visible damage. He approached the male driver and asked if he was okay. The driver replied that he was fine. He told the driver he did not see any damage. The officer also asked the driver if he wanted to take a look, and the driver responded, "Don't worry." Because the complainant kept approaching him on foot and was yelling at him, he told the driver to pull over and said he would speak with him after he handled the situation with the complainant. After the complainant left the scene, he turned around, and the male driver and his truck were gone, so he was unable to exchange information with the driver; however, it was not necessary since there was no damage to either vehicle, and the driver said he was fine. The officer stated he did not take any police action because the vehicle contact did not result in injury or property damage to either party and it was not necessary to create a report.

The cell phone video footage provided by the complainant shows the officer exiting his vehicle, walking back to the other driver, and speaking with him briefly. The officer then walks back toward his vehicle, and the complainant is still yelling at him. The driver in the truck drives off. The video does not show the officer's vehicle making contact with the vehicle behind him.

DGO 2.01 states in relevant part that officers "shall use and operate Department vehicles and equipment in a reasonable and prudent manner . . ."

DGO 2.06 defines a vehicle crash as, "An unplanned/unintended event involving a vehicle in transport upon a highway or private property, resulting in property damage, injury, or death."

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26 PAGE# 5 of 5

The officer acknowledged making contact with the vehicle behind him while backing up at a slow speed. The contact did not result in property damage, injury, or death. The driver left the scene, which prevented the officer from exchanging information with the driver. The contact between the vehicles was minimal and did not require investigation.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to carry required equipment.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the officer was not wearing a body-worn camera.

The officer stated he was not wearing his body-worn camera (BWC) because he was not on duty at the time of the incident.

The officer was not required to wear a BWC while off duty per Department policy. The officer was driving to work when the incident occurred.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 05/09/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026 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: This complaint involved a complex set of facts arising from a custody dispute involving a minor. The complainant reported that she went to a police station regarding her minor child who left home under distressing circumstances and was potentially being trafficked. The officers did not investigate, did not prepare a report, and did not provide any assistance.

The evidence showed that after the complainant's brief interaction with police at one station, the minor fled the scene and later contacted police at a different station. The minor met with the named officers and provided a statement as part of their investigation regarding the events that occurred earlier that day. The officers' investigation included obtaining witness statements and reviewing video footage, both of which corroborated the minor's account. Additionally, the officers obtained the minor's temporary custody order and released the minor to the temporary custodial parent in accordance with that order.

Department General Order (DGO) 1.03.I.A.5.d requires officers to prepare written reports for crimes observed or brought to their attention that have not been previously reported.

The investigation established that the officers thoroughly investigated the incident and completed an incident report documenting their actions. Although the complainant alleged that the officers failed to act, the complainant was not present during the investigation conducted by the named officers and was therefore likely unaware of the actions taken. Accordingly, the evidence demonstrates that the alleged conduct occurred and that the officers' actions were justified, lawful, and proper.

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: 06/12/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant lodged a complaint about a demonstration he took part in. The complainant stated that San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) officers provided the demonstrators with dispersal orders but failed to provide them with a meaningful opportunity to comply with such orders, resulting in subsequent unnecessary police action.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained and reviewed several pieces of evidence, such as video recordings and body-worn camera (BWC) footage, and relevant reports pertaining to the incident. The evidence showed that a planned demonstration occurred. SFPD was aware of the demonstration beforehand. The demonstration was comprised of thousands of people and was mostly peaceful in nature. As the night went on, most of the demonstrators left the area after the planned march. However, a group of demonstrators remained who engaged in unlawful activity, such as vandalism, rendering the demonstration an unlawful assembly. The Acting Commander and Captain for the incident decided to conduct a “mass arrest,” of the remaining individuals. Dispersal orders were provided by the captain, and arrests were subsequently made.

Department General Order 8.03 governs when dispersal orders are required and the manner in which to relay such orders. In relevant part, the DGO states that members should provide sufficient time to disperse after the order with clear directions and visible and ample means of egress.

During a protest, and while people are engaging in First Amendment activity, BWC should not be activated. Accordingly, the BWC footage obtained by DPA only captured what occurred once a decision was made by the Acting Commander and Captain to conduct the mass arrest, as the demonstration turned unlawful. The existing BWC footage did reflect some conflict between announcements being made and repetition of the dispersal orders. However, after DPA interviewed high ranking members of the command team, DPA is satisfied that required orders were given repeatedly over a reasonable amount of time and with several avenues of egress available to the demonstrators. Once command staff announced and advised remaining protestors that they were under arrest, no further permission to leave was granted. SFPD can avoid conflicting commands in the future by stopping dispersal orders once arrests are announced. It should also be noted that multiple opportunities were present throughout the night for the demonstrators to leave, break up and disperse. The orders given in this incident were consistent with DGO 8.03.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 2 of 2

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: 06/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated he was standing on the sidewalk waiting for a bus when a car parked in the red zone in front of him. The complainant saw an officer standing nearby in front of a business and asked the officer to tell the driver to move the vehicle. The officer said, "I can't leave," and took no action to help.

The named officer confirmed that the complainant spoke to him about a car parked in the red zone. However, the officer was responding to a suicide call for service and was strategically positioned on standby for that incident. The officer could not divert to help the complainant while the life-threatening incident was still occurring. The officer explained that the safety of the person in crisis and the officers attending the incident took precedence. He also explained that officers have discretion in parking enforcement.

Department records show that the officer was deployed to a suicidal person at the time of the interaction between the complainant and the officer.

Department General Order 9.01 Traffic Enforcement Section 3(C)(2) provides officers with discretion when dealing with parking violations.

The evidence shows that the officer failed to comply with the complainant's request to address a vehicle parked in a red zone. However, the officer was dispatched to a life-threatening call for service and correctly prioritized his responsibilities for the life-threatening incident over the parking violation. Furthermore, the officer had discretion to deal with the 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: 06/20/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called for police assistance with two subjects passed out in a vehicle and spoke to the named officer on the phone. The officer was rude, unhelpful, and hung up on the complainant twice. The complainant had to call 911 directly to get officers dispatched to the scene.

The named officer confirmed that he spoke with the complainant, who reported that two subjects were found passed out in a vehicle. The officer said he explained to the complainant that he was unable to dispatch calls from the station and that he had transferred the complainant to DEM Dispatch. The officer stated that the complainant called back later and requested to speak with a supervisor, and he transferred the call to a sergeant. The officer denied hanging up on the complainant.

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records show that officers were dispatched to conduct a well-being check on two people slumped over in a minivan.

There is insufficient evidence to support or rebut either version 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: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/13/26

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 stated that the named officer pushed him and “knocked the wind out of him.”

The named officer denied using unnecessary or excessive force.

Body-worn camera footage documented the traffic stop. Officers informed the complainant that he was detained and to stay in his car. When the complainant got out of his car, the officers ordered him to get back inside. The complainant did not return to his vehicle and instead attempted to walk past the named officer to reach the sidewalk. The named officer put his arm out and blocked the complainant from walking to the sidewalk. The force appeared extremely light and at no point did the complainant appear to be out of breath.

The evidence showed that the complainant was being non-compliant during the traffic stop and when he attempted to walk away from the officer, the officer put out his arm to stop him. The force was minimal and proportional to the complainant’s resistance and was not unnecessary or excessive 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: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/13/26

PAGE 2 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer was aggressive during a traffic stop and was belligerent towards the complainant's partner.

The named officer believed he was professional during the interaction.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer was firm but professional during the traffic stop. The complainant's partner pushed the named officer, and he informed her that she cannot push an officer. The named officer did not raise his voice or sound aggressive.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/13/26

PAGE 3 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer was biased against him and his partner during a traffic stop.

The named officer denied bias against the complainant and stated he did not know the complainant's race prior to stopping him.

Body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer conducted a traffic stop on the complainant's vehicle. The complainant's vehicle had dark-tinted windows making it impossible to see inside the vehicle. The named officer ordered the complainant to get back in his vehicle and the complainant refused. The complainant also refused to provide identification to the named officer and the complainant's partner assaulted the named officer.

The evidence showed that the named officer could not have known the race of the occupants of the vehicle prior to stopping the vehicle. The named officer was polite and professional throughout the interaction and gave the complainant many opportunities to comply before he was arrested. There was no evidence provided by the complainant or seen in the body-worn camera footage to suggest that there was any bias in this interaction.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: During a telephone interview, the complainant stated that she and her family were doing fireworks in the middle of the street when a speeding vehicle hit her uncle. The complainant alleged that the responding officers failed to properly investigate the incident. After providing this brief statement, the call was disconnected. DPA reached out to the complainant multiple times, but the complainant did not respond to DPA's request for additional information.

Records from the Department of Emergency Management (DEM) show the named officers as the primary unit responding to a vandalism 911 call.

The Traffic Collision Report (TCR) documented that a vehicle was driving down a street when the driver observed numerous people in the middle of the street, prompting the driver to slow down. The driver then saw a male subject ("subject") in the middle of the roadway crouched down lighting a firework, causing the driver to veer to the right, coming to a complete stop, to avoid hitting the subject. The subject then "purposely jumped" on the hood of the vehicle, according to the driver. An independent witness supported the driver's account of what happened. Two additional witnesses, who were booked for vandalism, stated that the subject was in the middle of the street lighting a firework when the vehicle collided with the subject. The TCR shows that the subject "caused the collision by standing in the middle of the roadway in violation of 21954 CVC (a) which stated Every pedestrian upon a roadway at any point other than within a marked crosswalk or within an unmarked crosswalk at an intersection shall yield the right-of-way to all vehicles upon the roadway so near as to constitute an immediate hazard."

The Incident Report (IR) showed the driver reported to the officers that after the vehicle accident, one of the booked suspects became aggressive and started to punch the windshield of the driver's vehicle, damaging the windshield. The other suspect then threw a cinderblock on the passenger side of the windshield, also causing damage to the windshield. An independent witness supported the driver's account of what happened. With the approval of a sergeant, the two suspects were arrested for vandalism and booked at the County Jail.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 07/07/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

The evidence established that the named officers conducted a thorough investigation into the collision and the reported vandalism.

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: 08/21/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer prepared an inaccurate citation.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant received a citation for a red zone parking violation and denied being in the vicinity of the cited location. He alleged that the officer prepared an inaccurate citation. The complainant provided documentation showing his activity approximately forty minutes prior to the citation being issued, which was submitted as evidence during the contest process and resulted in the citation being waived.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) conducted computer research to verify and obtain evidence related to the incident. This research revealed that no body-worn camera footage or photographs associated with the incident were available.

The named officer was interviewed but was unable to recall the incident based on the citation details and stated that no photographs were taken in connection with the citation. The officer explained that the area where the citation was issued experiences frequent parking violations from food delivery vehicles and that violators often leave the area upon observing law enforcement.

The investigation found insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that the officer prepared an inaccurate citation. Due to the officer's limited recollection and the absence of photographic evidence to confirm or refute the accuracy of the license plate information, the evidence neither proves nor disproves that the alleged conduct occurred.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: M

FINDINGS OF FACT: By mutual agreement between the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 1/15/26.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 08/22/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officers treated him with disrespect. The complainant failed to provide any further information.

The body camera footage showed that officers arrived on scene to find the complainant had used his vehicle to block another vehicle from leaving an apartment complex. The named officers told the complainant to move his vehicle and let the other driver out. The complainant stated that the other person was trespassing and refused to move his vehicle. The named officers informed the complainant that he was reporting a civil matter and that they had had similar conversations with him on previous occasions about this issue. The complainant became belligerent and continued to refuse to move his vehicle. The named officers gave the complainant a final warning to move his vehicle or be cited. The complainant finally moved his vehicle.

The evidence showed that at no point did the named officers' behavior or words rise to the level of misconduct. The named officers were firm but fair with the complainant who was committing an offense and refusing to comply with the named officers.

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: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer failed to act on the information the complainant submitted, conducted an inadequate investigation, dismissed his evidence while repeatedly telling him to “file another report.”

The named officer served as the follow-up investigator on the complainant’s report that another party repeatedly called in violation of a restraining order. The officer identified the complainant as the protected person and the other party as the restrained person and suspect, reviewed the original report, verified the order and its terms, conducted records checks, and examined call logs and screenshots of messages and missed calls. The officer reported finding no documented calls from the other party’s known number during the relevant period and noted that any screenshots either predated the order or lacked visible dates, and thus, there was no corroborating evidence of a violation. The officer stated that, during multiple follow-up phone interviews, the complainant became increasingly frustrated, demanded an immediate arrest, accused the officer of inaction, and that the officer explained the need for corroborating evidence, warned calls would end if the behavior continued, and terminated calls perceived as unproductive or abusive.

The officer acknowledged receipt of a voicemail alleging that the officer failed to act and that the other party had left a voicemail. The officer sent an electronic evidence-submission link so the complainant could upload the recording but reported that the complainant did not submit it and resisted recommendations to preserve and provide further evidence. The officer reported an unsuccessful attempt to contact a possible witness, did not contact the other party due to the lack of corroborating evidence, denied portraying the complainant as the aggressor or attempting to intimidate the complainant, and stated that the officer closed the case after determining there was no corroborated violation, the matter did not meet stalking criteria, and the officer’s actions complied with applicable investigative policies.

The DPA reviewed the investigative materials, including the responding officers’ body-worn camera footage, incident reports, call logs, and related documentation.

Department General Order (DGO) 6.09, which addresses domestic violence, outlines procedures for restraining-order enforcement and investigations involving intimate partners and stalking-related

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

allegations, and the named officer's handling of the case was evaluated under those standards. Section 6.09(C), which specifically sets forth stalking response requirements and guides how officers must respond when a person reports ongoing harassment or unwanted contact.

Based on the totality of the evidence, the DPA cannot determine, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the named officer failed to take required action. The complainant reported that he repeatedly provided evidence, but the named officer refused to consider it or advance the case. However, the officer's reports, call-log review, records checks, re-interview of the complainant, and documented recommendations show that he took investigative steps consistent with the information available to him. The evidence confirms that the officer reviewed the submitted materials and concluded that they did not establish probable cause to show that the former partner violated the restraining order, primarily because the calls could not be reliably attributed to the former partner's number or to her identity.

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

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer engaged in threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior during the investigation into the restraining-order violations. He reported that when he contacted the named officer to discuss his case, the officer treated him as the problem rather than the victim. He stated that the officer used his authority in a way that made him feel intimidated and manipulated.

The named officer acknowledged ending calls but stated that he did so only after providing warnings and only when the conversations became unproductive or confrontational. He denied blocking the complainant's calls, sending personal or harassing text messages, or attempting to shift blame onto the complainant.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

The DPA reviewed the investigative materials, including the responding officer's recorded interview with the complainant. The recording corroborates the officer's account of their interactions.

Department General Order 2.01 requires members to treat all individuals fairly, respectfully, and professionally.

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: 09/14/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate citation.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officer stopped and cited them for speeding based on an incorrect understanding of the applicable speed limit. The complainant stated that the posted speed limit was higher and that a nearby school-zone restriction did not apply because the stop occurred on a Saturday evening. The complainant further alleged that the officer showed poor situational awareness. A court later dismissed the citation after the driver presented evidence.

The officer reported conducting speed enforcement using Department-issued Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR) sensor and initiating a stop after measuring a vehicle's speed in excess of the posted limit. The officer identified the location as a 25 mph "Senior Zone," with regulatory signage visible to eastbound traffic, and stated that the limit was familiar due to frequent enforcement in the area. The officer visually estimated the vehicle's speed at approximately 40 mph and confirmed it at 41 mph using LIDAR. The officer stated the vehicle exceeded the limit by 16 mph and cited safety factors, including nearby vehicles, intermittent pedestrians, and the officer's experience with speed-related collisions in the area. The officer reported activating a body-worn camera during the stop, contacting the driver, explaining the reason for the stop, and issuing a citation for the recorded speed violation. The officer stated no environmental or lighting conditions affected the observation or speed assessment. The officer also stated that they responded politely when the driver disputed the speed limit and reiterated that drivers must follow the posted speed limit rather than app-based map displays.

Body-worn camera footage showed the officer informing the driver that the Light Detection and Ranging reading indicated 41 mph in a 25-mph zone. The driver told the officer that a navigation application displayed a different speed limit. The officer responded that apps can be inaccurate and emphasized reliance on posted signage, stating that the area is a 25-mph senior-zone corridor rather than a school-only restriction. Scene documentation identified posted 25-mph signage in the relevant area (with references to both school-zone and senior-zone postings), though the complainant disputed which posted limit controlled the cited conduct.

Documentation found that the court found the driver not guilty and dismissed the case.

Department General Order 9.01 directs members who actively enforce traffic laws to prioritize violations that directly affect public safety and support the City's goal of reducing traffic crashes to make San

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/14/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26 PAGE# 2 of 2

Francisco streets safer for everyone. When enforcing traffic and parking laws, members must exercise discretion.

Although the court dismissed the citation, that outcome alone does not establish officer misconduct based on the evidence reviewed in this report. The evidence supports the conclusion that the stop and citation occurred as alleged and that the officer's actions were justified, lawful, and proper.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that an officer drove past an alleyway and questioned individuals about their names as though they had committed crimes, despite no criminal activity occurring in the area. The officer reportedly asked the complainant for his name, which the complainant provided. When the complainant asked whether he was being detained, the officer responded with a question rather than a direct answer. The complainant did not know the officer's name or badge number but was able to provide the patrol car number.

San Francisco Police Department records show two officers driving the patrol vehicle that morning with one of the officers not on duty yet at the time of the incident. The DPA was able to narrow the officer to the named officer. The named officer stated that on the day in question, he had been assigned to an overtime detail for an AI conference and was not permitted to leave the location during his shift. He denied being present at the alleyway or having any interaction with the complainant.

There are no departmental records documenting the incident. However, supporting documentation confirms that the officer was assigned to a traffic detail at the time the incident allegedly occurred.

Based on the evidence collected, although the officer who drove the patrol vehicle that day was identified, the information supports that he was not present at the alleyway and did not engage with the complainant. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer drove improperly.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the officer drove in the opposite direction through an alleyway while harassing individuals present at the location.

The identified officer denied being at the alley or having any interaction with anyone in the area.

There are no departmental records documenting any incidents at the location. However, supporting documentation confirms that the officer was assigned to duty on the date and time of the alleged incident.

Based on the evidence collected, although the officer who drove the patrol vehicle that day was identified, the information supports that the officer was not present at the alleyway.

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: 9/21/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was involved in a domestic violence incident with his wife, who called for police assistance. The responding officers handcuffed the complainant, sat him on a bench, conducted an investigation, and arrested the complainant. The complainant alleged that the arrest was without cause.

The corresponding Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) printout and incident report show that the victim made statements that the complainant had punched her in the face and that she was injured. She talked about a prior domestic violence incident wherein the complainant grabbed her hair and slammed her head against a wall. She also stated that the complainant had threatened to kill her.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos were consistent with what was documented in the CAD and the incident report.

The named officers had probable cause to arrest the complainant for domestic violence.

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: 9/21/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers failed to take required action.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers did not take his statement at the scene before arresting him.

Department policies and California law do not require taking a suspect's statement at the scene before making an arrest. The legal standard for a lawful arrest is probable cause. An arrest can be made if an officer has a reasonable belief, based on facts and circumstances, that a person has committed a crime. This probable cause can be established through an officer's own observations, evidence at the scene, or information from witnesses, and does not require the suspect's input.

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: 10/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported a verbal altercation with the named officer and alleged that the officer mocked the complainant by making inappropriate comments about the complainant's appearance and by spitting at the complainant's residence.

The named officer was interviewed and denied the allegations. The officer stated that the complainant was hostile and used derogatory language toward the officer in response to the officer occupying a parking space.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) conducted a computer search to identify and obtain evidence related to the incident. This review determined that no body-worn camera footage or photographs related to the incident were available.

The investigation concluded that there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation that the officer acted or spoke inappropriately. Due to conflicting accounts and the absence of independent corroborating evidence, the investigation could neither confirm nor refute the alleged conduct.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/13/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/15/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026 PAGE# 1 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.16, Search Warrants.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant, the parent of a homicide victim, lodged a complaint regarding the investigation into their child's death. The complainant stated that the assigned investigator submitted a search warrant to obtain pertinent evidence to a judge who he believed had no jurisdiction over the matter because he typically presides over non-criminal matters. Additionally, they also expressed concerns that the judge was potentially biased towards the complainant due to a past legal matter in their court room.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) reviewed the incident reports related to the incident, all documentary evidence provided by the complainant, relevant body-worn camera footage (BWC), surveillance footage, interview recordings, and the chronological of investigation generated by the named officer.

The evidence showed that the named officer properly submitted several search warrants to whichever judge was the duty judge that day. It was appropriate for the named officer to submit the search warrant for approval to the duty judge regardless of whether that judge is typically assigned to criminal or civil courts. Additionally, any potential bias the judge had against the complainant was irrelevant as the judge signed the search warrant to aide in retrieving evidence to support the investigation in the complainant's child's death.

The named officer's actions were proper and did not violate any Department policy or applicable laws.

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: 10/15/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026 PAGE# 2 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer also failed to properly investigate the crime as he submitted and served a search warrant for vital information several months after the incident, causing key evidence to be lost.

As mentioned above, DPA reviewed a plethora of evidence pertaining to the complaint and investigation conducted by the named officer. The evidence showed that the named officer properly submitted several search warrants. Relevant to this allegation, the named officer served the first search warrant for information from this source within days of the incident. The named officer also sent a preservation letter to the source within days of the incident. The named officer served another search warrant months later for additional evidence and information. Due to the named officer's investigation, arrests were made pertaining to the incident, and the investigation remains open while SFPD follows additional leads.

DPA's review of the extensive evidence related to the incident showed that the named officer conducted all appropriate steps and conducted a thorough investigation thus far.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/15/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026 PAGE# 3 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the named officer was not proactive in his communication with the complainant and failed to follow up with him despite several calls.

The evidence showed that the named officer met with the complainant and family members and did follow-up with the complainant- though perhaps not as often as the complainant would have preferred. SFPD, however, does not have a rule or policy that requires an investigator to return every attempted contact.

Additionally, as mentioned above, after an extensive review of all the evidence, it showed that the named officer conducted all appropriate steps and that the investigation is still open and active.

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: 10/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he called the police to report strange text messages he received from an unknown source. The complainant considered these messages to be harassment and/or blackmail but stated that the named officer failed to take any action.

Department records confirmed that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding threats/harassment and later cleared the call as having no merit, explaining that the housing service had texted the complainant to tell him to leave the staff alone.

Body-worn camera footage (“BWC”) confirmed that the named officer responded to the scene. The named officer asked the complainant to show him the texts in question and to specify whether they threatened harm against the complainant or his family. The texts did not appear to threaten harm but instead instructed the complainant to leave certain people alone. The complainant asked the officer whether he would consider these threats and the officer replied that he would not.

While the complainant may have disagreed, the officer was correct. Criminal threats, in violation of Penal Code section 422(a), are defined as follows: “(a) Any person who willfully threatens to commit a crime which will result in death or great bodily injury to another person, with the specific intent that the statement, made verbally, in writing, or by means of an electronic communication device, is to be taken as a threat, even if there is no intent of actually carrying it out, which, on its face and under the circumstances in which it is made, is so unequivocal, unconditional, immediate, and specific as to convey to the person threatened, a gravity of purpose and an immediate prospect of execution of the threat, and thereby causes that person reasonably to be in sustained fear for his or her own safety or for his or her immediate family's safety, shall be punished by imprisonment in the county jail not to exceed one year, or by imprisonment in the state prison.” Messages to leave a specific person or people alone, with no threat of great bodily injury or death, do not qualify as threats.

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: 10/15/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26

PAGE# 2 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that during the interaction the named officer essentially “blew [the complainant] off,” responded that the complainant’s concerns were not a big deal and disregarded what the complainant went through because he “did not care.”

The BWC does not show the named officer behaving in a rude, inappropriate or unprofessional manner.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

PAGE# 1 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer unlawfully detained a subject for lighting a fire in proximity to a building.

The named officer reported observing a subject igniting a pile of trash approximately eight to ten feet from the building line. The officer approached the fire, extinguished it with his boot, and then cited the subject for violating California Fire Code § 307.4.1. The officer further stated that there was sufficient reasonable suspicion to believe the subject was committing a crime, making the detention lawful.

Department records indicate that the named officer observed a subject start a small fire near a building. The named officer detained and cited the subject for violating San Francisco Fire Code § 307.4.1.

Body-worn camera footage showed a subject standing next to a small fire within a few feet of a building. The named officer issued the subject a citation for violating a fire code.

San Francisco Fire Code § 307.4.1 prohibits bonfires within 50 feet of any structure or combustible material.

Department General Order 5.03 (Investigative Detentions) states that officers may only detain an individual if they have reasonable suspicion that the person is connected to a crime.

Evidence demonstrates that the named officer lawfully detained the subject for violating California Fire Code § 307.4.1 by starting a fire near a building.

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: 10/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

PAGE# 2 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported that the named officer conducted an unlawful search of a subject who had been cited for a fire code violation.

The named officer stated the subject was not searched.

Body-worn camera footage does not show any officer conducting a search of the subject.

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/23/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

PAGE# 3 of 3

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated the named officer cited the subject for a fire code violation when he had no authority to do so.

The named officer stated he is authorized to cite for various offenses under California Penal Code § 830.1, which grants officers broad powers to enforce other codes.

Department records indicate that the named officer observed a subject start a small fire near a building. The named officer detained and cited the subject for violating San Francisco Fire Code § 307.4.1.

Body-worn camera footage showed a subject standing next to a small fire within a few feet of a building. The named officer issued the subject a citation for violating a fire code.

San Francisco Fire Code § 307.4.1 prohibits bonfires within 50 feet of any structure or combustible material.

Penal Code §§ 830.1 and 836 empower police officers to enforce municipal codes, including fire code violations.

Department General Order 5.06 (Citation and Release) allows officers to issue citations for misdemeanors and infractions under state and municipal law.

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: 10/26/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he approached officers in a hotel lobby to ask about their plans with respect to potential actions by federal agents against San Francisco residents. One officer responded, to the effect, “Those are not our orders.” This exchange left the complainant uncomfortable and with the impression that the officers would not protect the community. The complainant did not capture the names or star numbers of any of the officers. Initially, the complainant expressed interest in DPA’s mediation program but later declined.

In an attempt to identify the officers involved, DPA reviewed surveillance video from the interaction location and fleet management records to determine which officers checked out different patrol vehicles. A review of Unit Histories did not place any of the potentially involved officers at the location for the date and time. In addition, DPA sent three identification polls to district police stations, but no officers were identified.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 10/30/25

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant was attempting to park across the street from her workplace when an officer in a marked police vehicle pulled up beside her and told her to move along. She told the officer that she was waiting for the car that was about to leave so she could use the spot. The complainant said the officer became verbally aggressive and rude, yelling at her that the government sent him to patrol the street. She provided a description of the officer and the vehicle number.

Records obtained from the Department did not identify either the officer or the vehicle.

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: NF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant believed the officer's behavior was racially discriminatory.

The officer could not reasonably be identified.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/09/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2: The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that he witnessed two officers patrolling and talking to each other. He observed one of the officers “brandishing” his baton “and waving [this weapon] wildly about in way that look[ed] like he was reenacting beating someone.”

DPA reviewed surveillance video from the location of the incident and sent an identification poll to the relevant police unit to identify the officers. The video footage showed the two officers walking and one motioning with this baton briefly, potentially gesturing to something. The footage did not reveal that the officer swung the baton inappropriately, wildly, or placed anyone in danger by doing so.

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: 11/10/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/29/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: NF/W

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that his family friend was involved in a vehicle collision while driving the complainant's vehicle and that the responding officer(s) failed to take actions against the friend for making an illegal U-turn, providing a false name and for being intoxicated.

The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint, stating that he simply wanted his family friend to get the help she needed.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/26/26

PAGE# 1 of 4

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officers failed to investigate an assault during which he sustained a cut to his hand while at a bar. He further stated that the officers should have obtained surveillance footage from the establishment.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a report of an assault at a bar, where the complainant alleged that a subject stabbed him in the hand with a broken bottle. Multiple witnesses, however, provided conflicting accounts. Several stated they did not observe the subject making any stabbing motions toward the complainant. One witness reported that the complainant was holding a glass inside the bar, which broke in his hand during an altercation with the subject. The bartender stated she saw the complainant grab the subject's arm, prompting the subject to push him away in an attempt to escape. She was adamant that at no point did the subject possess broken glass or attempt to cut the complainant. The subject reported that the bar was crowded and she accidentally spilled water on the complainant, who then grabbed her purse and began yanking it. In response, she struck the complainant in an effort to get away. She stated that the complainant threw wine at her from his glass, which is how he sustained the injury to his hand. The reporting officer noted that the subject's hair was visibly wet on one side. Based on the evidence gathered at the scene, the reporting officer concluded that there was no merit to the allegation that the subject attacked the complainant with a glass bottle.

Body-worn camera footage captured officers responding to a bar fight. The complainant alleged that the subject tried to steal his jersey, stabbed his hand multiple times with a broken bottle, and punched him repeatedly in the face. The subject, however, stated that she accidentally spilled water on the complainant, which angered him. She claimed he pulled her purse, prompting her to strike him in self-defense. She further reported that he intentionally threw wine at her, and during the altercation, he broke the glass he was holding, injuring his own hand. She denied stabbing him and said she was holding a plastic cup at the time. The complainant's friend stated that the subject did not try to stab the complainant with a broken bottle but suggested the complainant might have been experiencing heightened adrenaline. The footage also captured named officer #1 asking a staff member whether there were cameras, to which the staff member responded that there were none.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/26/26

PAGE# 2 of 4

By interviewing the parties involved and witnesses and requesting security footage, the named officers demonstrated due diligence and conducted an appropriate investigation. Unfortunately, an employee at the establishment informed an officer that video surveillance footage was unavailable.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3: The officer failed to properly investigate.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant reported being injured at a bar and asked the named officer to obtain surveillance footage. The named officer advised the complainant that the bar indicated the footage was no longer available. The complainant expressed concern that the bar might be dishonest and insisted that the named officer subpoena the security footage. The named officer refused to issue a subpoena for the footage and declined to investigate the case due to its un-solvability.

The named officer reported that two video retrieval officers were dispatched to the establishment; however, they were informed that the footage had been overwritten and was no longer available. The named officer further explained that, in his experience, private parties typically either provide video voluntarily without a warrant or state that they have video but require a warrant for legal reasons. He noted that the case was not assigned due to its low solvability, in accordance with Department Notice 20-107. He reasoned that the responding officers did not identify sufficient grounds for an arrest, that no video evidence existed to corroborate statements, and that, based on his experience, probable cause could not be established to prove a crime occurred or to meet the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt for a jury.

Department records indicated that, based on the parties' and witnesses' accounts, there was no merit to the complainant's allegation that he was stabbed.

Correspondence between the named officer and the complainant shows that the officer dispatched video retrieval officers to the bar to obtain security footage. The named officer later informed the complainant

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/26/26

PAGE# 3 of 4

that the footage was no longer available. In addition, the named officer informed the complainant that his case would not be assigned for investigation due to its solvability.

Body-worn camera footage showed that during the incident, a responding officer asked the bartender whether the establishment had security cameras, to which the bartender replied that it did not.

Department Notice 20-107 lists relevant criteria to be considered when assigning a case for investigation. The criteria include, but are not limited to, the severity of the crime, the solvability of the crime, the presence or absence of physical evidence, and the presence or absence of video footage.

The named officer demonstrated due diligence by attempting to obtain surveillance footage. Additionally, responding officers conducted an on-scene investigation and found no evidence of criminal activity. The Department is not required to investigate further or subpoena video footage when there is no indication of criminal conduct.

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PC

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that there were multiple inaccuracies contained in the incident report.

The named officer stated that the noted inaccuracies were not substantive and that the statements disputed by the complainant originated from the other party's account of the incident. The officer further explained that some omissions identified by the complainant were, in fact, included in the report. The officer also emphasized that incident reports are intended as summaries of events to document the rationale behind police actions and inactions, rather than verbatim transcripts of every statement or utterance.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/26/26

PAGE# 4 of 4

The inaccuracies alleged by the complainant were inconsequential, unfounded, or consisted of statements attributed to another party. Moreover, the incident report serves as a summary of events, while the body-worn camera footage provides an accurate record.

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

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: PF

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant asserted that the case should have been assigned for investigation, but it was not.

Department records indicate that the complainant reported he was assaulted at a bar; however, the matter was never assigned for investigation.

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 11/25/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/2026

PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that a tenant in their apartment building called for police assistance, falsely reporting that she was being physically harmed. Officers showed up and knocked on their door. She slightly opened the door and talked to the officers, who told her that they needed to check if she was harmed or injured. She told the officers that she was fine and did not want them in her unit. The complainant said the officers forced themselves in by shoving the door open, causing her to be pushed back to the dresser behind her and injuring her back.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) printout of the only incident in the given time frame showed that multiple callers reported that the complainant was involved in a domestic violence incident with her boyfriend. One caller reported that the couple was fighting and that the complainant asked for help. The caller heard screams and banging in the complainant's unit. It was also reported that an airsoft gun was placed in the trash outside the complainant's unit. Another caller reported hearing the couple yelling and things being thrown against the wall. Officers responded and knocked, but no one opened the door for them.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the Body-Worn Camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos appeared consistent with what was documented in the CAD. The officers left after the complainant refused to open the door. No forced entry occurred.

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: 01/10/2026

PAGE# 2 of 2

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4: The officers conducted an improper search or seizure.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant stated that the officers entered her apartment without cause or consent.

The BWC videos of the incident show that no entry to the apartment occurred. The officers left after the complainant refused to open the door.

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: 01/05/2026

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: 12/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 1 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant called 911 for assistance and told the responding officers that multiple people unlawfully entered her apartment unit, checked all the bedrooms, and took videos and pictures. The complainant stated that the named officers failed to conduct a proper investigation by misinterpreting the situation and dismissing explicit criminal conduct.

The complainant's records, which she submitted with her complaint, show that a 24-hour Notice of Intention to Enter Dwelling was served or posted by her landlord one day prior to the incident. The notice was for entry with the purpose of inspecting smoke and carbon monoxide detectors.

The incident report showed that the named officers, with the assistance of an interpreter, adequately listened to the complainant and checked her documents. One of them told her that because of the advance notice, the landlord had the right to enter the unit to inspect smoke and carbon monoxide detectors. The officers concluded that no crime had occurred.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. The videos were consistent with the documentation in the incident report. The officers clearly explained to the complainant why the entry was lawful, that no crime had occurred, and that the situation was a civil matter.

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: 12/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 2 of 3

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO

FINDING: U

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that the named officer was confused and uninterested, did not participate in the investigation, and demonstrated a lack of awareness of a serious criminal report.

The BWC footage of the incident shows that the named officer acted as a backup or cover officer during the investigation. The officer did not commit any misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/01/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026

PAGE# 3 of 3

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #: 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 partially forwarded to:

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/01/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26 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: 12/04/25 COMPLETION DATE: 01/07/2026 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/USPP

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

United States Park Police
1217 Ralston Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94129

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26 PAGE# 1 of 2

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that they attempted to file a police report regarding an assailant, and the named officer refused to file the report. The complainant did not provide further specific details regarding the incident.

The named officer was working in a supervising capacity on the date in question. He stated that he did not refuse to take a report and did not recall anyone providing him with information regarding an assailant.

Dispatch records failed to indicate the officer's involvement in any incident matching the complainant's description.

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

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer failed to activate a body-worn camera as required.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/05/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26 PAGE# 2 of 2

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that when they attempted to file their report with the named officer, he failed to activate his body-worn camera.

The named officer stated that the allegation was not true and that they weren't approached by anyone requesting a request. They stated that their body-worn camera wasn't activated because the encounter never occurred.

Dispatch records failed to indicate the officer's involvement in any incident matching the complainant's description.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/10/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/30/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer drove improperly.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND

FINDING: IE

FINDINGS OF FACT: The complainant alleged that they were traveling on a scooter when an officer operating a police vehicle almost hit them.

The named officer denied operating the police vehicle at the time and location where the incident was alleged to have taken place at. The named officer said he operated his assigned vehicle with due regard for the safety of all persons.

Department records showed that the named officer was assigned to the vehicle involved.

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/15/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/13/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: REF/ IO-1

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/20/25 COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26 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: 12/24/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26

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: 12/24/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: XX

FINDING: Referral/ID Bureau

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

San Francisco Police Department
Identification Bureau
850 Bryant Street, Room 549
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/29/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/07/2026 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: 12/30/2025

COMPLETION DATE: 01/07/2026

PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/ECS

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

Episcopal Community Services
165 8th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 12/31/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 01/05/2026 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/SFSO

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

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/06/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 01/20/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/13/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 01/30/26 PAGE# 1 of 1

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

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-1/RICHMOND STATION

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

San Francisco Police Department
Richmond Station
461 6th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94118

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/07/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 01/10/26 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:

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

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/15/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

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: 01/15/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26 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: 01/16/2026 COMPLETION DATE: 01/22/2026 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: 01/22/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 01/23/26

PAGE# 1 of 1

SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:

FINDING: IO-2

FINDINGS OF FACT: This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA's jurisdiction.

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

COMPLAINT DATE: 01/23/2026

COMPLETION DATE: 01/30/26

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:

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