

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UOF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) is mandated by the City Charter to investigate all officer-involved shootings (OIS) in San Francisco involving the Department. In this instance, an OIS occurred when police responded to a 9-1-1 call to a family home. In the call, the reporting party, the father, told Dispatch operators that his son had killed his wife. The DPA's investigation included interviews with the involved parties and witnesses, as well as an examination of documents and audio and video recordings from the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), the San Francisco Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (SFOCME), and the Department of Emergency Management (DEM).

Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) records indicate that at approximately 02:40 hours on the day of the incident, the reporting party, the father, contacted 9-1-1. The father relayed that his wife was bleeding and that he thought his son had killed her by hitting her with a stick. The line then disconnected.

CAD Audio recorded the conversation between the father and the dispatcher. The first call occurred between 02:38 and 02:40 hours. The father stated that he believes his son, who is on drugs, has killed his wife by hitting her with a stick. The father says, "Everyone needs to come over.... Please fast." The call suddenly disconnects, with the father shouting, "Let go."

CAD records indicate that the named officer was dispatched at 02:41 hours.

Between 0241 and 0243 hours, the father made a second 9-1-1 call. The father says, "He is on top of me." A dog can be heard barking in the background. The barking stops, replaced by the sound of a dog moaning in pain. The sounds of approaching sirens can be heard, and a male voice, the named officer, can be heard saying, "What's going on?" The dispatcher disconnects the call.

CAD records indicated that the named officer arrived on the scene at just before 02:43 hours.

The named officer stated that on the day of the incident, he was working by himself. He responded to a 9-1-1 call to a battery incident. The dispatcher informed him that the reporting party said his son had attacked his wife with a stick, and the wife was bleeding. Dispatch also relayed that a struggle was occurring at the scene, so the officer responded with "Code 3," activating the lights and sirens of his

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 7**

patrol vehicle. The officer stated that he was close to the location and arrived at the scene within a minute. He was the first unit to arrive. Another police unit was responding to the scene subsequently, armed with an Extended Range Impact Weapon (ERIW), also known as a “less lethal” weapon, but they were responding from a greater distance.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage recorded the named officer’s arrival at the scene. The reporting party, the father, stood in the main doorway to the property holding a phone. The father was an older man and had blood on his face. The officer tried to persuade the father to leave the property and walk toward the officer, but the father did not. Instead, the father told the officer to go upstairs. The officer asked the father if the son had a weapon, and he replied, “Yes, a walking stick.” The officer entered the hallway, and banging sounds could be heard from upstairs, like someone was stomping and moving around. The officer instructed the father to stay downstairs and proceeded to walk up the stairs with a flashlight and his handgun drawn, pointing to the ground. The officer announced, “Police. Who’s up there?” The son can be heard replying, “Come on up,” and using profanity.

The named officer said that when he first entered the house, he heard what he believed to be an active assault going on inside the residence. He decided to intervene to stop the assault. He drew his weapon and flashlight, announced himself as police, and headed up the stairs. The officer stated that he reached the top of the stairs and saw the suspect, the son, standing on the right side of a corridor, in a doorway.

BWC footage showed the subject standing in a doorway in a corridor beyond an upstairs room. There appeared to be blood on the floor of the corridor. The subject faced the officer so that the doorway obscured the subject's left side. The officer ordered the subject to show his hands twice. The subject held up his open right hand, but the doorway still obscured his left hand. The officer broadcast on his radio that he had contacted the subject and that there was blood in the hallway. The subject stepped out of the doorway, revealing that he was holding a knife in his left hand. The subject transferred the knife to his right hand. The officer ordered the subject to put the knife down. The subject did not and started to edge down the corridor toward the officer. The officer radioed “222” and “ERIW” just as the subject began to walk down the corridor toward the officer.

The named officer said that he was taken aback by the size of the subject, who was either the same size or bigger than the officer. The officer stated that the subject had a “crazy look” on his face and was not intimidated by the officer’s presence at the scene. The officer could see blood in the corridor. He could not initially see the knife, but as the subject walked toward him, he could see the subject transition the knife from left hand to right hand. The subject was using profanity and challenging the officer, saying, “I am over here...” Come over here...” The officer explained “222” is police code for a knife. The officer confirmed he ordered the subject to drop the knife, but the subject did not comply. The officer explained

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 7**

that as the subject started toward him, he became aware that the father had come up the stairs and was behind him in the stairwell, potentially blocking any retreat. The officer stated that, at this point, he

believed he had cause to discharge his firearm at the advancing subject. However, he decided to try and de-escalate the situation by creating time and distance, and retreated down the stairway, guiding the father down the stairway in front of him.

BWC showed the officer, and the father turn and retreat down the stairs. As they retreat, the subject can be heard following them shouting, "So you are running away," and using profanity. The officer warned the subject that he could shoot him and told him to get back. The officer and the father exited via the front door of the building. As the officer exited the building, he turned, and the footage captured the subject at the bottom of the stairs, knife in his right hand, pursuing the officer. The officer shouted, "Get back." The subject continued to advance toward the doorway, still shouting about the officer "running away." The officer fired two shots at the subject from only a few feet away.

The named officer said that he managed to get the father down the stairs and out of the house. He kept hold of the father with his left hand to ensure the father did not fall, as the subject closed the distance between them rapidly. The officer said he fired his gun twice at the subject because he believed the subject was trying to stab himself or the father. The officer said he was defending his life and the victim's life when he fired the weapon. He had no other viable options at the time to defend against the knife attack. The officer estimated the distance between himself and the subject at the time of the shooting as less than five feet. The named officer stated that he had done everything he could to avoid having to shoot the subject. He said he did not think there was anything else he could have done, given the circumstances he found himself in.

BWC showed that seconds after the shots were fired, the backup unit arrived on the scene. Medical aid was given to the subject at the scene. From the moment that the officer encountered the subject at the top of the stairs on the second floor of the home, exited, and then turned and shot the subject, only 35 seconds had elapsed.

The father stated that around 2:00 am that day, his son, the subject, was on cocaine and grabbed a walking stick and hit the father on the head. The father remembered seeing a pool of blood by the bathroom, where he later found out his son had killed his wife. The father stated that he had called 9-1-1, and a police officer arrived. The officer told the father to leave the house and proceeded upstairs, where the officer was confronted by his son. The father remembered that the officer told his son to drop the knife twice, but his son did not and ran toward the officer. The officer warned his son to drop the knife, or he would shoot. His son still refused to drop the knife, and the officer fired twice. The first shot hit the bottom of the door, and the second shot hit his son, who fell to the ground. The father confirmed that officers did everything

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 7**

they could to try and save his son, rendering aid and performing their duties sympathetically and professionally.

The SFOCME Autopsy Report showed that the subject was transported to San Francisco General Hospital, where he later died at just before 06:00. The subject died from a single gunshot wound to the chest. A toxicology analysis found that the subject had cocaine, ketamine, Xanax, methamphetamine, and other anti-anxiety medications in his blood and urine.

Firearms and Ballistics Evidence showed that the named officer's service firearm was collected and examined. Two cartridge casings were recovered from the curblin in front of the residence. Based on the evidence, the distance between the named officer and the subject when the officer discharged his firearm was estimated to have been less than six feet. It was determined that the subject was struck by a single mushroomed, jacketed bullet removed from the subject's chest at autopsy.

Department records, including the Incident Report, Chron of Investigation, CSI report, and Crime Scene photographs, recorded that the mother was deceased in the bathroom of the residence. The bathroom doorway was the place where the named officer first encountered the subject. The crime scene photographs and the SFOCME Autopsy Report documented multiple stab wounds to the mother's neck, face, and left shoulder. Also in the bathroom was a deceased small dog with numerous deep lacerations.

Department General Order (DGO) Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person 5.01.02(C) states, in part, "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 subject, officers shall, when feasible, use de-escalation strategies and techniques in an effort to reduce the need or level of force, including: 1. Make reasonable attempts to isolate and contain the subject; 2. Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone(reactionary gap) and utilize cover to avoid creating an imminent threat that may require the use of force."

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 5 of 7**

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, and that the totality of the circumstances shall account for occasions when officers may be forced to make quick judgments about using force. Cal. Penal Code § 835a(a)(4).”

DGO 5.01.03(H) defines “deadly force” as “Any use of force that creates a substantial risk of causing death or serious bodily injury, including but not limited to the discharge of a firearm. Cal. Penal Code § 835a(e)(1).”

DGO 5.01.03 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. An imminent harm is not merely a fear of future harm, no matter how great the fear and no matter how great the likelihood of the harm, but is one that, from appearances, must be instantly confronted and addressed. Cal. Penal Code § 835a(e)(2).”

DGO 5.01.04(A) states, in part:

“Officers may use objectively reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances: 1. To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search. 2. To overcome resistance or to prevent escape. 3. To prevent the commission of a public offense. 4. In defense of others or in self-defense.”

DGO 5.01.05(E) describes:

“life-threatening resistance” as “Any action likely to result in serious bodily injury or death of the officer or another person.” DGO 5.01.05 describes possible force options for life-threatening resistance as “Utilizing firearms or any other available weapon or action in defense of self and others to stop the threat.”

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 6 of 7**

DGO 5.01.08(G)(2)(a) states, in part:

“an officer may discharge a firearm or use other deadly force in any of the following circumstances. The circumstances below apply to a discharge of a firearm or application of deadly

force: i) In self-defense when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that they are in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury; or ii) In defense of another person when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person is in imminent danger of death or serious bodily injury.”

DGO 5.01.08(G)(2)(b) states, “If feasible, and if doing so would not increase the danger to the officer or others, an officer shall give a verbal warning to submit to the authority of the officer before discharging a firearm or using other deadly force.”

In this case, the subject clearly presented a life-threatening threat to the officer and the father. The subject was armed with a knife and continued to challenge and advance on the officer. The officer had information that the subject was violent, that he had attacked the father, and potentially killed the mother. The officer took steps to de-escalate the situation by ordering the subject to drop the knife and retreating out of the house to create time and distance. These efforts failed because of the ongoing aggression of the subject. It was reasonable for the officer to believe that the subject was attempting to stab himself or the father and the threat was imminent. It was therefore within policy when he discharged his firearm.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UOF**

**FINDING: PC**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/22/2023**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 7 of 7**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** As per above, in this case, the subject clearly presented a life-threatening threat to the officer and the father. The subject was armed with a knife and continued to challenge and advance on the officer. The officer had information that the subject was violent, that he had attacked the father, and potentially killed the mother. The officer took steps to de-escalate the situation by ordering the subject to drop the knife and retreating out of the house to create time and distance. These efforts failed because of the ongoing aggression of the subject. It was reasonable for the officer to believe that the subject was attempting to stab himself or the father and was therefore within policy when he discharged his firearm.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 1 of 24**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant lodged a complaint regarding the named officer's conduct when he stopped her for a pedestrian traffic violation. Thereafter, co-complainant #1 filed a complaint alleging that the named officer detained the complainant for the pedestrian traffic violation without reasonable suspicion.

During the investigation, DPA obtained several pieces of evidence, including, but not limited to the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) report, incident reports, and footage, such as body-worn camera (BWC) and surveillance footage reflecting the incident. The evidence showed that the named officer conducted a pedestrian traffic stop on the complainant for allegedly violating CVC 21453 which prohibits an individual from crossing on a red.

CVC 21453(e)(1), however, made it unlawful for an officer to stop a pedestrian who crossed the crosswalk when facing a "steady circular red or red arrow signal" unless "a reasonably careful person would realize there was a danger of a collision with a moving vehicle or other device moving exclusively by human power." Co-complainant #1 alleged that the named officer lacked the legal basis to detain the complainant under (e)(1)'s provision.

The evidence showed the complainant momentarily paused at an intersection's crosswalk. The evidence captured the complainant, thereafter, enter the crosswalk, walking at what appeared to be a normal rate of speed, wearing large headphones. Meanwhile, the named officer's BWC footage showed that he drove towards that crosswalk and slowed his vehicle in preparation to conduct a right-hand turn as he turned his blinker on. Shortly thereafter, the BWC footage captured the name officer come to a stop and make a hand movement towards the complainant, who although not captured on his footage, was walking in the crosswalk at the time. The named officer then honked his horn and made another hand gesture by throwing up both of his hands towards her. Surveillance footage of the incident captured the complainant throw her hands up in a similar gesture in response to his and continue to walk through the crosswalk at a steady pace. The surveillance footage did not show the relevant traffic signals showing who had the right of way when the complainant stepped into the crosswalk. The footage thereafter showed the complainant exit the crosswalk and walk down the street. Meanwhile, the named officer quickly activated his emergency lights, turned his wheel, and positioned his vehicle to the left, almost onto the curb behind her. He stopped, rolled down his window, and briefly opened his door attempting to contact the complainant.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 2 of 24**

The evidence suggested that the complainant may not have heard the officer due to the fact she was wearing visibly large headphones, and he was positioned behind her as she continued to walk down the sidewalk at a normal rate of speed. The named officer, thereafter, closed his vehicle door and drove into the left-hand lane, into oncoming traffic lanes. About halfway down the street, he parked his vehicle at an angle and quickly exited. He brusquely approached the complainant from the right side and cut her off, then said “hey” and order her to “stop.” He utilized a verbal command and a hand signal which the named officer described as the “universal signal for stop.” The complainant appeared confused, removed her headphones, and asked the officer “why he was walking up on her like that.” In compliance with his request, the complainant took a few small steps backwards from the officer and stopped. Additional details of the incident will be described below. However, relevant to this allegation, the named officer cited the complainant as he alleged that she entered the crosswalk facing a steady red signal and had he not been driving defensively, they would have collided, violating CVC 21453.

Legal documentation filed by the complainant alleged that when she entered the crosswalk, there was approximately 8 seconds left on the signal for pedestrian crossing. Additionally, a bystander stated that she observed the pedestrian signal to be green for pedestrian crossing when the complainant crossed. However, the named officer attested that the complainant’s light was red and that he had the green light. The named officer articulated his understanding of CVC 21453 and confirmed that he understood the recently enacted section (e)(1) to prohibit an officer from stopping an individual who entered the crosswalk against a red light, unless a reasonably careful person would have realized the danger of an imminent collision with the moving vehicle. However, the named officer was adamant that the complainant abruptly, and without pausing, entered the crosswalk directly in front of him against the red signal violating the Vehicle Code. He emphasized that her actions caused him to quickly press the brakes on his vehicle to come to a stop. The named officer also elaborated that he routinely worked as traffic enforcement throughout his career as an officer and was well-versed in determining whether an individual “should have known” their actions in crossing the cross walk against red would likely cause an imminent collision. The named officer admitted that these types of infractions are low-level and are largely deprioritized by the Department, unless the above exception existed.

Despite a thorough investigation, DPA, was unable to determine, by a preponderance of the evidence, whether the named officer had reasonable suspicion to stop the complainant. Although the evidence showed that the complainant had momentarily paused prior to entering the crosswalk, in contrast to the officer’s statement, DPA was unable to determine facts necessary to make a finding. The unknown facts are (1) whether the signal prevented the complainant from walking into the crosswalk and (2) even if it did, whether, given the circumstances, a reasonable careful would have realize there was a danger of a collision with a moving vehicle or other device moving exclusively by human power, as even if the complainant walked on red, the named officer could not have legally stopped her unless the latter provisions were met. The available video footage is inconclusive as to what color the lights were and what

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 3 of 24**

the pedestrian signal indicated when the complainant entered the crosswalk. Additionally, the statements by the complainant and the named officer were in direct conflict. Moreover, while the named officer's footage suggested that he was already slowing down prior to the intersection and may not have to "abruptly stop" as he suggested, the available surveillance footage reflecting the actual intersection does not show the police vehicle until after they had already engaged in the "non-verbal" hand gestures towards each other. Without additional evidence, insufficient evidence exists to determine if the officer had reasonable suspicion to stop the complainant.

DPA, however, understands that the legislature enacted (e)(1) to prevent officers from stopping individuals for low-level, "deprioritized" offenses that were often being used as by officers as a pretext for an otherwise unlawful stop. DPA urges officers to be mindful of the legislative intent when deciding to conduct such stops.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 4 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 9.07.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. Co-complainant #1 also explicitly alleged that the named officer's conduct in stopping the complainant violated Department General Order, 9.07, "Restricting the Use of Pretext Stops" (DGO 9.07). The co-complainant alleged that the named officer did not have a basis to detain or stop the complainant other than her "jaywalking" and asked her questions unrelated to the alleged jaywalking.

The Department recently issued DGO 9.07 which aimed to curtail the practice of stopping vehicles [and individuals] for low-level traffic offenses as a pretext to investigate hunches that do not amount to reasonable suspicion that a crime occurred. The Department enumerated several "deprioritized stops for low-level offenses" which includes an alleged violation of CVC 21453. However, as mentioned above, the DGO, consistent with the Vehicle Code, carves out an exception where "there is an immediate danger that the pedestrian will crash with a moving vehicle, scooter, bicycle, or other device moving exclusively by human power."

The named officer confirmed that he was aware of the newly enacted DGO before the date of incident. However, he denied stopping the complainant as a pretext.

Similarly to allegation #1, DPA could not, by a preponderance of the evidence, determine whether the officer had reasonable suspicion to stop the complainant as the DGO carved out a consistent exception to the Vehicle Code, allowing officers to effectuate a stop the otherwise de-prioritized offense. Additionally, the evidence did not reflect that the named officer questioned the complainant about matters unrelated to the stop.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 5 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Co-complainant #1 also alleged that the named officer violated Department policy by failing to de-escalate the matter.

The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. The evidence showed that after the named officer drove his vehicle into oncoming traffic, he exited his vehicle, walked in front of her, to the right-hand side, and ordered her to “stop.” The complainant, appearing confused with his actions, stopped and removed her headphones and asked why he was “walking up on her like that.” The named officer continued to order her to stop. The BWC footage showed the complainant moved back a few steps to create distance between them and stopped. She thereafter took out her phone and informed the named officer that she was going to contact one of the city’s supervisors because the named officer’s actions were “unnecessary.”

The complainant appeared to begin recording the named officer and placed her other hand in her pocket in a relaxed manner. The BWC footage did not capture her making any sudden or evasive movements at this time. The named officer attempted to inform the complainant that she had walked directly in front of him and ordered her to take her hand out of her pocket. The BWC footage showed that at some point between the initial stop and when he told her to remove her hand from her pocket, the named officer pulled out his pepper spray. The complainant did not remove her hand and believing it was a taser, said that she “wished he would tase her” and informed him that there was nothing in her pockets. The complainant slowly walked towards the officer with her phone and asked for his name. The named officer repeated for her to get her hand out of her pocket. She again said there was nothing in her pocket and removed her hand from her pocket in what appeared to be an attempt to show the officer.

The complainant slowly walked closer to the officer to capture his name and badge number with her cellphone. It did not appear that she was attempting to flee or leave the scene in doing so. The named officer, however, put up his right hand, which held his pepper spray, and demanded for her to “stop” and told her that “she was not going anywhere.” The complainant backed up a few steps. The named officer instructed her to sit down. The complainant did not comply and told the named officer she did not have to sit on the ground. The named officer ordered her to “give him her ID, or she would be going to jail.” The complainant stated that she would not be going to jail and informed the named officer that she was a domestic violence survivor. In compliance with his demand for identification, the footage captured her place her hand inside her purse and pull out a black wallet. The named officer quickly moved towards her and demanded that she “get her hand out of her purse.” He reached for her hand with the black wallet. In

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 6 of 24**

response, the complainant moved her hand back, took a few steps back, and screamed that she was “getting her ID,” and that he “asked her for his ID.” The named officer continued to walk towards her instructing her to “stop,” “turn around,” and informed her that she was under arrest. The complainant continued to move backwards to evade the named officer’s reach for her arm, and continued to scream that he asked her for her ID. The BWC footage showed the named officer and the complainant screaming over each other and while not appearing to attempt to flee the scene, the complainant evaded the named officer’s grasp. The complainant screamed to her friend on the phone that the officer was trying to arrest her, emphasizing that he asked for her ID.

The named officer repeatedly commanded the complainant to get on the ground. The named officer closed the gap between them as the complainant appeared to back up into a wall. A struggle ensued between the two. The named officer continuously screamed that for her to get on the ground and that she was under arrest, while the complainant screamed for help. The named officer gained control of her arm. The named officer and complainant ended up moving in a circular motion while he held onto her arm. It appeared that the named officer pushed her up against a nearby wall to gain control and restrain her. The two continued to yell over each other and the officer continued to demand she get on the ground. The complainant cried and pleaded for him to get off her. The named officer held her against the wall by her right arm while waiting for back-up.

Back-up officers responded to the scene and aided in placing her in handcuffs.

The named officer explained his understanding of Department General Order 5.01 as it related to de-escalation and the use of force. The named officer stated that officers are constantly reminded to use de-escalation tactics and should attempt to de-escalate a situation prior to or eliminating the need to use force. The officer emphasized, however, that officers are only required to try to de-escalate a situation when it is “feasible,” and “possible,” to do so. He explained that he does not care if an individual is verbally non-compliant and that “they can say whatever they want,” so long as they are at least minimally compliant with certain safety related instructions. The analysis of whether he should attempt to slow down and de-escalate a situation versus resorting to physical force starts with the individual’s willingness to “simply obey clear commands.”

The named officer emphasized that officers have an obligation to do their job and that officers are not required to retreat in the name of resistance. Even when enforcing minor violations, the named officer had never seen an issue with using the minimal amount of force necessary to accomplish his objective. The named officer stated that as he approached the intersection, he observed the complainant, without pausing, enter the crosswalk in front of his vehicle causing him to abruptly stop. The named officer had not observed her look at him so he honked his horn hoping she would hear the honk through her headphones and that she would indicate to the named officer some sort of understanding of what she had done and the potential dangers and hazards she created. The complainant continued walking at the same

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 7 of 24**

steady space. The named officer threw up his hands in a gesture of confusion, “like what is going on, why are you doing this.” In return, the complainant threw up her hands in a similar gesture and continued to walk. The “non-verbal” communication was the first time the named officer knew she saw him.

He believed that the complainant’s gesture or “inaction,” towards him signaled that she was either “aware of the law and disregarded it,” or “was simply confused and unaware of her actions,” in crossing the crosswalk when she did. Either way, he felt both scenarios warranted at least a conversation to prevent similar actions in the future. The named officer pulled his vehicle up behind her and attempted to command her to stop through the open window. If she had “done anything really,” to indicate to him that she was now aware of her actions he would have warned and cautioned her to be aware of her surroundings and went on his way. However, she did not stop.

The named officer admitted that at that time, no evidence suggested that the complainant knowingly “disobeyed” his orders, as a possibility existed that her headphones prevented her from hearing him and he was behind her. That possibility was one of the reasons he decided to drive into on-coming traffic lanes with his emergency lights on to get ahead of her so he could approach her from the front to ensure she knew he was attempting to conduct a traffic stop. Moving somewhat quickly, he exited his vehicle and “firmly and unequivocally,” commanded her to stop. He felt that if he approached her from the front, it would have provided her time to “recognize that she was speaking with a uniformed police officer,” in hopes that she would “comply and act appropriately” by obeying his commands.

The complainant stopped and removed her headphones. The named officer described her behavior as immediately hostile. However, he did not have enough information to determine if she was a physical threat. She had not made any verbal or physical threats toward him other than informing him she would be contacting the city supervisor about the interaction. He wanted to handle the situation quickly because he knew that very soon his vehicle would cause a hazard.

When the named officer realized that the situation was quickly escalating, he did not attempt to de-escalate the situation because it did not feel “feasible.” The named officer elaborated and explained that she would not let him speak which prevented him from trying to establish rapport and that she quickly “shoved” her hand into her pocket. The named officer agreed that he could have ended the interaction at this time but felt it would have been inappropriate to do so. He therefore instructed her to remove her hand from her pocket, but she did not readily comply, informing him that nothing was inside her pocket. The named officer decided to pull out his pepper spray. He wanted to have a force option immediately available as he was unsure if she was a threat. He put his pepper spray away once he felt she would not be a physical threat.

The named officer thereafter instructed the complainant to provide him ID, and warned her that if she did not, she would “go to jail.” He stated she put her hand inside her purse and pulled out a wallet. He reached

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 8 of 24**

for the wallet hoping that she would comply and give it to him. However, she failed to comply and pulled it backwards, warranting him to cease verbal communication and become hands-on. He explained that he asked for her ID several times and she did not comply and when she “finally” pulled out her wallet, she did not hand it to him or otherwise make any attempt to get her ID from the wallet to give it to him. The named officer believed that he provided her with a “brief” opportunity to retrieve her ID from the wallet but that she made no motion to give him the ID. As he tried to get her ID, he stated that she continuously moved backwards, away from him. He followed her and instructed her to get on the ground because she was under arrest. She did not comply, so he grabbed her right arm. A scuffle ensued between the two (as described in more detail below) and the named officer held her against the wall to prevent her from fleeing while waiting for back-up. The named officer, in the interview, and subsequent evidence repeatedly blamed the complainant’s resistive behavior as the reason the situation ended the way it did requiring him to use force.

However, after reviewing the evidence in the DPA interview, namely, the body-worn camera footage, the named officer admitted that the complainant was not as resistive as he believed her to be. The named officer confirmed that she had complied with the first command he knew she heard, which was to “stop” after he exited his vehicle. Thereafter, he confirmed that the complainant was, in fact, in the process of complying with his request to provide ID when she placed her hand inside her purse and pulled out a wallet. The named officer also admitted that he could have provided her more time to comply before he acted and that he absolutely saw the contradiction and confusion posed by his conflicting requests of “give me your ID or you are going to jail,” but then instructing her to remove her hand from her purse when she attempted to comply. The named officer could not articulate a “good explanation” for his actions at that time other than that he was thinking in one direction and did not process fast enough that she was trying to comply, based on her past non-compliance. He emphasized that he did not have a whole lot of time to perceive what was happening and react appropriately. He admitted that he likely could have given her more time to comply with his request as she was very likely trying to provide him with her identification when she put her hand inside her purse and pulled out a wallet. Additionally, before the named officer used force, the complainant informed the officer that she was a domestic violence survivor. Although adamant that he complied with Department policy regarding non-compliant subjects, the named officer stated that he did not take into consideration how her being a victim of domestic violence may have affected her interactions with him, but that he should have. Ultimately, the named officer admitted that his actions contributed to what he believed was the need to use force.

DPA interviewed several other officers in the case, including a Subject Matter Expert (SME) in de-escalation and the use of force and a superior officer who reviewed the named officer’s use of force. Both officers reiterated that officers are required to try and de-escalate when feasible. The SME stressed that de-escalation should be at the forefront of a situation and begins with an officer’s initial approach. When discussing these concepts in departmental trainings, officers are encouraged to keep in mind their

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 9 of 24**

approach from the beginning and are warned that if they approach the situation with hostility, it can set the tone for the remainder of the interaction. The Department wants officers to be mindful of their tone when communicating, to forget their “egos” and to ensure they are providing subjects with “clear and commands and communication.”

Neither the SME nor the superior officer believed it would be fair to say that the named officer, here, solely created the need to use force as de-escalation takes two parties, the officer and the subject, and that the subject was non-compliant with the named officer. Both the SME and superior officer believed the named officer was justified in his ultimate decision to use force due, in large part, to her level of resistance when asking for the ID. When formulating those opinions, it appeared that both the SME and superior officer relied heavily on the named officer’s statement in his incident report which they believed gave insight into his perception of the incident. The report heavily emphasized the complainant’s non-compliant behavior. The SME, however, had not focused on the “non-verbal” interactions leading up to the physical confrontation between the complainant and officer, and the superior officer was unaware of certain facts, such as the named officer quickly pulling out his pepper spray which he did not necessarily believe was “appropriate.” However, after reviewing the incident in the DPA interview, the superior officer recharacterized the complainant’s behavior as “semi-compliant” because although she was verbally non-complaint, she had readily stopped and did not appear to try and evade the named officer.

Additionally, the SME pointed out that both parties were hostile from the inception of the interaction and that he could see how the complainant could have viewed the named officer’s approach as challenging, authoritative, and aggressive, particularly if she had not previously heard him due to her headphones. He believed that due to the hostility of the incident from the beginning, it would have been difficult for the named officer to attempt to de-escalate the situation as it did not appear he had a stabilized scene or would have gained control of the situation. The SME stressed that officers are trained to provide subjects with “clear instructions and communication” and that if an officer asks a subject for their identification, they should provide clear instructions regarding it and time to comply. For example, although things were moving quickly, the named officer could have informed her that he needed her ID, but did not want her to go into her purse, yet. Objectively, the SME stated that after the named officer requested her ID and observed her going into her purse, that could have been a moment to slow things down and buy him some time. He believed that the named officer’s instructions of what needed to be done and accomplished were not clear.

Throughout the incident, the named officer also instructed her to “sit down” and to “get on the ground” several times, despite knowing that the Department had issued a notice with a preference to not ask subjects to sit on the ground. The SME also opined that instructing her to get on the ground, or taking her to the ground, would likely not have been the best thing in this situation, unless she started to actively resist, or the situation worsened.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 10 of 24**

Department General Order 5.01, Use of Force Policy and Proper Control of a Person (DGO 5.01) is highly instructive on what officers should do when encountering a subject, including those who are non-complaint. The DGO emphasizes that the Department is committed to accomplishing its mission to safeguard the life, dignity, and liberty of all persons, with respect to minimal reliance on the use of force by utilizing rapport-building, communication, crisis- intervention, and de-escalation tactics before resorting to force, whenever feasible. DGO 5.01 states that, “communication with a non-compliant subject is often most effective when officers establish rapport, use the proper voice intonation, ask questions, and provide advice to defuse conflict and achieve voluntary compliance before resorting to force options.” Additionally, the DGO requires officers, when feasible, to attempt to build-rapport and consider the possible reasons why a subject may be non-compliant. This information, “may not make a subject any less dangerous. However, understanding a subject’s mental or physical state may enable officers to influence the subject’s behavior thereby allowing officers to use de-escalation strategies and techniques while maintaining public and officer safety.” Importantly, “officers who act to de-escalate an incident, which can delay taking a subject into custody, while keeping the public and officers safe, will not be found to have neglected their duty. They will be found to have fulfilled it.” When encountering a non-compliant or armed subject, the DGO requires officers, when feasible, utilize de-escalation strategies and to continue to utilize them and to take as much time as reasonably necessary to resolve the incident, without having to use force.

Taking into consideration all the available evidence, DPA finds, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the named officer violated DGO 5.01 as it pertains to de-escalation. DPA finds that the named officer not only knowingly failed to try and utilize de-escalation tactics during the encounter with the complainant, but that the named officer wrongfully created a situation requiring him to use force. The named officer had an unreasonable perception of what the complainant was either doing or going to do, created in large part, by his abrupt and aggressive actions.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 11 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, co-complainant #1, and co-complainant #2 alleged that the named officer utilized unnecessary or excessive force against the complainant.

The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. After the named officer unreasonably tried to grab the complainant's hand (not her wallet), the complainant evaded his reach, and a scuffle ensued between the two whereby the named officer grabbed her right arm, and the complainant was pushed up against the wall and restrained. The complainant alleged the named officer shoved her against the wall, causing injury.

The named officer denied shoving the complainant against the wall or otherwise engaging in unnecessary or excessive force. The named officer maintained that his actions and the force he used were within Department policy as he used proportional force in relation to her resistance when he grabbed her arm and used the minimal amount of force necessary to prevent her from fleeing the scene. The named officer stated that she immediately resisted his grasp, and a scuffle ensued between the two. During the scuffle, he decided that the best course of action would be to push her against the building rather than take her to the ground, then wait for back-up to arrive. The named officer acknowledged what the force looked like from the video footage but maintained that he did not slam her into the wall and that during the scuffle, and from turning in a circular motion, it was "momentum," that took them in the direction of the wall. He stated that he utilized the amount of pressure necessary to keep her against the wall until help arrived. The available footage of the force incident did suggest that the named officer used pressure and may have shoved her up against the wall. However, the footage was inconclusive as to whether the named officer "slammed," her into the wall, or whether it was the "momentum" from the scuffle that caused her to go into the wall that hard. The limited medical records provided by the complainant's attorney proved that she injured her shoulder and suffered a concussion.

The named officer engaged in unnecessary force because of what led up to the alleged "need" to utilize such force. DPA finds that it was the officer's unreasonable perception of the incident that created the need to utilize force, rendering the force unlawful. Had the named officer complied with de-escalation tactics and slowed down, he would have realized that the complainant was providing him with her ID and not refusing, which was his stated basis to use force. Thus, due to the failure to properly de-escalate, the named officer necessarily violated Department policy as he engaged in unnecessary force.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 12 of 24**

DPA notes that the supervisory use of force evaluation concluded the force used by the named officer was within policy. However, as is explained in more detail below, the assigned supervisor was tasked with conducting the review weeks after the incident. The assigned supervisor conducted the evaluation, in large part, based on the named officers' inaccurate statements in his report and was deprived of obtaining relevant evidence as he was not the supervisor on-scene.

While DPA took into consideration the assigned supervisor's determination that the officer's conduct was proper, DPA believed, by no fault of the assigned supervisor, that the investigation was incomplete and unreliable, given that he had no access to the scene, the complainant, or the bystander witnesses.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 13 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-6:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Co-complainant #1 alleged that the back-up officers, named officer #2 and named officer #3 also engaged in unnecessary or excessive force.

The above facts are hereby incorporated by reference. The evidence showed that named officers #2 and #3 arrived on-scene after the named officer aired a “148” (resisting arrest) and summoned for assistance. The back-up officers aided the named officer in restraining the complainant against the wall and placed her in handcuffs.

Both named officers maintained that their actions in restraining the complainant and placing her in handcuffs at the request of the responding officer were within policy. Neither of the officers knew what led up to the interaction between the complainant and the responding officer, other than that the named officer requested assistance with an individual resisting arrest. Named officers #2 and #3 stated that it would have been improper to pause and figure out what had occurred before aiding the officer in handcuffing the complainant.

The back-up officers rightfully responded to the named officer’s call for assistance and aided the named officer in restraining the complainant. Back up officers are not required to pause and inquire what happened before helping to handcuff and restrain the individual. Additionally, the BWC footage did not reflect that the force used by these officers in restraining and handcuffing the complainant was excessive or outside of policy.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 14 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #7:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 9.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA’s investigation revealed that the named officer violated Department General Order, 9.01, “Traffic Enforcement” (DGO 9.01). DGO 9.01 states that “[m]embers enforcing traffic laws should use discretion when enforcing violations. In exercising their discretion, members may use de-escalation techniques or disengage (such as giving a warning) to reduce the intensity [of] the situation.” DGO 9.01 explicitly states that “members shall not let the attitude . . . of a person influence their enforcement action.”

The named officer was familiar with DGO 9.01 at the time of the incident. When determining whether to simply warn or cite an individual for a traffic violation, he takes into consideration factors such as the severity of the offense and if the individual “showed remorse and understanding” of violations and dangers of their actions. While some violations warrant an automatic citation, if remorse and understanding is shown for a low-level, a citation is not warranted, and a conversation can be had instead. The named officer understood that pursuant to DGO 9.01, when making the decision to either warn or cite an individual, it would not be appropriate to take into consideration their “attitude, per se.” However, he stated that when making the decision, it is appropriate to take into consideration the individual’s attitude as it relates to their understanding of the nature of the violation. The named officer stated that while he does not seek out low-level offenses, when he observes a violation, he enforces the law pursuant to his duty as a police officer.

The evidence supports that the named officer cited the complainant in violation of DGO 9.01 as the named officer allowed the complainant’s attitude towards himself and his authority to influence several decisions in the case. For example, the named officer made several comments throughout the incident and the DPA investigation that shed light as to the reasons why he stopped her and ultimately cited her. He opined that he would not have even stopped the complainant if she had indicated to him or done “anything at all” to show him that she was “sorry” for her actions and understood what she had done. However, she did not do as he “hoped” but “looked at him and [through her actions] basically said she did not care and continued walking.” Additionally, after he made the decision to stop her, he had intended to merely have a conversation with her about what had occurred and not “necessarily” cite her. However, because she did not comply with his commands despite the fact he was a “uniformed police officer” he cited her. The named officer repeatedly made comments that he cited her because of her behaviors in defying his authority, such as “it was not like he was a plain clothes officer where perhaps some doubt could have existed, “and there was “no excuse for the complainant to act the way she did with a uniformed police officer.” Moreover, the incident report written shortly after the incident occurred

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 15 of 24**

corroborates that the named officer violated DGO 9.01 when he stopped her as it reflected that he decided to stop her when she “looked at him and threw up her hands in a dismissive manner.”

The named officer denied violating DGO 9.01. He attested that he did not make the decision to stop her because she “blew him off” but because her dismissive nature towards the situation rendered him to believe she did not understand the severity of her actions, and a conversation was warranted. Thereafter, he stated that he then changed his mind from having a conversation with her to citing her because “nothing about her behavior showed him that she understood the violation and how she placed herself in danger.” Due to this, a warning and mere education would not have been sufficient, and a citation was warranted. He maintained that it was not her attitude towards “him” that made him change his mind, but it was the “totality of the circumstances of how she behaved during the incident.”

The evidence supports that the named officer violated DGO 9.01 when he decided to stop the complainant and subsequently cite her for the alleged violation as he wrongfully took into her consideration her attitude towards him and his status as a police officer. Moreover, the complainant’s gesture, which the named officer emphasized as a reason to stop the complainant, was the same gesture the named officer first made towards the complainant.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 16 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Co-complainant #1 alleged that since the named officer lacked the legal basis to detain the complainant, the subsequent arrest of the complainant was unlawful.

The evidence reflected that in addition to citing the complainant for violating the Vehicle Code, the named officer also arrested the complainant for violating PC 148(a)(1), resisting, delaying, or obstructing a peace officer. The named officer cited and released the complainant from the scene.

The named officer made the decision to arrest the complainant for a 148 violation after she allegedly failed to provide him with her identification. He stated that at that point, “she had obstructed, delayed, and resisted him” for the duration of the incident, warranting an arrest.

CPC 148(a)(1) makes it unlawful for an individual to resist, delay, or obstruct a peace officer in performing their official duties.

To arrest an individual for violating PC 148(a)(1), a police officer must be acting lawfully. Because DPA cannot determine by a preponderance of the evidence whether the named officer lawfully detained the complainant, we necessarily cannot determine whether probable cause existed to arrest the complainant when she resisted his efforts to detain her.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 17 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9:** The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA's investigation revealed that the named officer prepared an inaccurate police report reflecting the incident.

DGO 2.01(9) states, "Written Reports - While on duty, members shall make all required written reports of crimes or incidents requiring police attention. Members shall finalize felony arrest reports within 8 hours of the subject being booked at the County Jail. Members shall refer to the most current Department policies and procedures regarding timely submission of traffic collision reports, arrest reports, and the booking of felony arrestees. Additionally, no member shall knowingly:

- a. submit false, inaccurate, materially incomplete, or improper Departmental records.
- b. falsify official reports or records.
- c. falsify or alter evidence."

The report inaccurately claimed that the complainant refused to comply with several of the officer's commands which, as explained above, did not occur. The report stated that the complainant did not comply with his command for her to stop when he exited the vehicle. The complainant did comply. She also expressed her displeasure by asking the named officer why he was walking up on her like that. Thereafter, the report indicated that the complainant attempted to walk past him early in the encounter. The body-worn camera footage showed she got closer to the named officer while asking for his name and badge number, then specifically told the named officer she was trying to capture his name. The named officer also wrote that he *repeatedly* demanded her identification (he commanded her one time), then "she withdrew a thin wallet from her purse but refused to produce the identification."

The named officer stated that the above narration was consistent with his perception of what had occurred at the time. However, after reviewing his BWC footage during the DPA interview, the named officer confirmed that the statements are not an accurate description of what had occurred, and that the complainant was "very likely" trying to provide him with her identification. Although not a part of his routine practice, had he had watched the BWC footage before writing the report, he would have likely used different, "softer," language to describe her non-compliance.

The complainant complied with the first command to stop after the named officer exited his patrol vehicle and did not attempt to flee the scene or walk past the officer. Additionally, the footage showed the complainant in the process of complying with the named officer's request for ID, after the first time he asked. DPA understands that incidents occur very quickly and that often, reports are not verbatim of what



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 18 of 24**

occurred on-scene and can slightly vary depending on what an officer perceived in the moment. However, the named officer's perception of what had occurred was objectively unreasonable, rendering the subsequent description in the incident report inaccurate, and in violation of Department policy and procedure.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 19 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #10:** The officer knowingly engaged in bias policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** Co-complainant #1 alleged that the named officer targeted the complainant based on her race and asked her questions unrelated to the stop.

The named officer stated that the complainant's race did not play a factor in any of his decisions throughout the incident. The named officer adamantly explained that he stopped her for an observed traffic violation with no underlying motive or intent.

Evidence did not reflect that the named officer knowingly engaged in bias policing or discrimination towards the complainant. Additionally, the evidence did not reflect the officer asking her questions unrelated to the stop itself.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 20 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA's investigation revealed that named officer #2 violated Department policy when he failed to notify his superiors that the complainant complained of pain, rendering the use of force reportable.

Per Department General Order 5.01 (DGO 5.01), a use of force is deemed reportable when an officer engages in certain levels/types of force, there are visible injuries, and or a subject complains of pain. Officers are required to notify a superior officer when a reportable use of force occurs. Once a superior officer is notified, if they are already not on-scene, the superior officer must respond to the scene to conduct a supervisory use of force evaluation. Supervisory use of force evaluations are to be completed by the supervisor's end of watch.

The complainant, in a conversation with named officer #2, complained of pain. This rendered the detaining officer's use of force reportable. After hearing her complaint of pain, named officer #2 informed the complainant that his supervisor was enroute to the scene and that she should make sure to tell the supervisor. Named officer #2 did not inform the detaining officer nor the supervisor. The supervisor on-scene did not believe that a reportable use of force occurred and never spoke with the complainant.

It was not until several weeks later that the Department learned of the complainant's complaint of pain, rendering the force reportable. The Department thereafter conducted an after-the-fact supervisory use of force evaluation conducted by a superior officer who never had the opportunity to respond to the scene. Named officer #2 explained that after they had handcuffed the complainant, he transported her to the vehicle where he remained. He explained that she appeared upset and that he attempted to calm her down. Named officer #2 asked her whether she was injured or had a complaint of pain. She said yes and identified the areas of injury. Named officer #2 often asks individuals engaged in 148 incidents whether they are injured because the incidents often involve a use of force. Named officer #2 did not tell a superior officer nor the detaining officer. Named officer #2 was unsure whether he had a duty to inform the detaining officer but confirmed that he had a duty to report the force to the superior officer and failed to do so. The named officer expressed remorse and attested to correct these actions moving forward.

Named officer #2 had a duty to inform the superior officer of the complainant's statement. Thus, DPA finds that the named officer violated Department Policy when he failed to let the supervisor know of the complaint of pain.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 21 of 24**

DPA also recommends that the Department update the notification requirements in the DGO. First, DPA recommends the Department clarify to its members that “any officer” regardless of their involvement of the use of force, is responsible for reporting a use of force when notified. Second, after in depth discussions with two Subject Matter Experts, DPA also recommends that the Department requires the member to not only notify the superior officer, but to also notify the use of force officer and the reporting officer (if they are not the one in same.)

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 22 of 24**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #12:** The officer failed to properly supervise.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC(S)**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** DPA's investigation revealed that the named officer failed to properly supervise the scene.

The named officer, a supervisor, responded to the scene as he heard an individual was resisting arrest in his district (148). The named officer explained his duties as a sergeant and his understanding with respect to conducting use of force evaluations. The named officer explained that his obligation to conduct a supervisory use of force evaluation is triggered when a reportable use of force is brought to his attention. The named officer stated that when responding to scenes where use of forces had occurred, he would likely ask the officers involved if a reportable use of force occurred, but even that is not a requirement. He expects his officers to know when one had occurred and to report it accordingly. If they do not notify him of such force, he does not believe he is required to further investigate. He will often remain on scene and make himself available for questions from the officers. If a reportable use of force is reported to him, he will conduct the required investigation, including speaking with the officers and subject and ensuring availability of any necessary medical treatment. Supervisory Use of Evaluations are required to be conducted at the end of watch, and it is not normal for an evaluation to be conducted several weeks after the incident.

Additionally, if a witness were to claim that an officer used excessive force, he would investigate further by reviewing BWC footage or other available footage, and interviewing officers on-scene. When the named officer responded to the scene, things had already appeared to "calm down." He observed that a crowd had formed but did not recall hearing the members of the crowd yelling at the officers when he arrived. The complainant was seated in the patrol vehicle and a witness officer was speaking with the complainant's family member. The named officer overheard the witness officer inform the family member that he attempted to conduct a pedestrian stop on the complainant and she did not listen to his commands, requiring him to take physical custody of her. When a witness officer finished speaking with the family member, the named officer approached him about the incident. Witness officer #1 informed him that "no reportable use of force occurred unless there is a complaint of pain." The named officer did not believe he then had a duty to figure out whether a complaint of pain had occurred, but that it was the officer's responsibility to do so and inform a sergeant accordingly. The named officer observed the complainant in the vehicle and believed she was crying. However, he did not speak with the complainant, nor did he observe witness officer #1 asking her if she had a complaint of pain. The named officer also

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 23 of 24**

did not speak with any of the bystanders on-scene because although he heard them mention there had an “abuse of power” he did not believe the statements made were specific enough to conduct a further investigation into what had occurred. The named officer learned after the fact that she had complained of pain, rendering the force used reportable. The named officer acknowledged that certain things went wrong preventing him from conducting a supervisory use of force evaluation on-scene.

DPA interviewed a Subject Matter Expert (SME) on supervisory duties and responsibilities. The SME confirmed that while the named officer, per policy, did not have an explicit obligation to investigate further into whether a reportable use of force occurred, given the scene and the uncertainty posed by the witness officer’s statement, he certainly would have. The SME opined that there are certain obligations inherent with being a sergeant and that an uncertain statement, such as the one made by witness officer #1, should have warranted the named officer to investigate further. He believed that his comment of “no reportable use of force unless she complained of pain” could have been interpreted several ways and that it was the sergeant’s duty to figure out what had occurred at that point.

BWC footage of the incident reflected that the named officer responded to the scene and stood by while several officers spoke with several concerned bystanders. The footage captured the named officer inquire of witness officer #1 whether he was okay, at which point the witness officer informed him of the type of force he used and that “no reportable force of use occurred, *unless* she complained of pain.” The sergeant thereafter stood by and observed the scene. The footage did not capture the sergeant conducting any further investigation into the matter of whether there was a reportable use of force. The footage did not capture the sergeant speaking with any other officers on-scene, the complainant herself, or the concerned bystanders. The named officer instructed witness officer #1 to cite her out on-scene rather than taking her back to the station and applauded witness officer #1’s attempts to explain what occurred to the bystander. The named officer thereafter left the scene.

DPA finds the named officer failed to properly investigate when he responded to the scene. DPA understands that sergeants optimistically rely on their officer’s knowledge of the policies and that witness officer #2 failed to inform him of the reportable use of force. However, due to the nature of the scene for an otherwise low-level offense as well as a witness officer #1’s uncertain statements with respect to the use of force, the named officer should have investigated the incident further. The named officer, at the least, should have asked the visibility upset complainant if she was okay or instructed witness officer #1 to verify. Had he done so, the “unreported” force would have been reported, and a subsequent supervisory use of evaluation would have occurred on-scene, consistent with Department policy. Due in part to the named officer’s failure to properly supervise the scene, an incomplete supervisory use of force evaluation occurred several weeks after the incident by a different superior officer. That superior officer was not on-scene when the incident occurred and was thereby prevented from conducting an effective investigation

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/05/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025    PAGE# 24 of 24**

into the incident. The superior officer was unable to interview both the complainant and witnesses to make an informed decision as to what had truly occurred.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 1 of 6**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was sitting in his car smoking when the named officer approached his vehicle and ordered him to get out.

The named officer indicated in an incident report that he was on patrol and saw a vehicle parked in front of a handicap ramp and the crosswalk of an intersection. The named officer pulled to the side of the vehicle and saw the complainant open his driver's door. He observed the complainant stumble out of the car. The named officer believed that the complainant was under the influence of alcohol and believed that he was a danger to himself and others, which the officer said constituted reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant. The named officer said he then approached the complainant's vehicle to further evaluate his level of intoxication.

The body-worn camera (BWC) of the named officer confirmed that the named officer exited his vehicle and approached the complainant's car. The video footage shows the complainant displayed visible signs that he was intoxicated.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.03.02 (D) Investigative Detentions, Reasonable Suspicion to Detain, states that reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime is, was, or is about to occur and the person under suspicion is reasonably connected to the crime. Reasonable suspicion to detain is also established whenever there is any violation of law.

Based on the evidence available, the named officer had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant.

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: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 2 of 6**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers took him to the ground, causing him to hit his head and sustain injuries.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.01 Use of Force, Section III-A states, "Officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances: 1. To effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search. 2. To overcome resistance or to prevent escape..." Section IV B states, "Physical controls, such as control holds, takedowns, strikes with personal body weapons, and other weaponless techniques are designed to gain compliance of and/or control over uncooperative or resistant subjects."

The report documenting this incident contained officers' statements that the complainant resisted, delayed, and obstructed peace officer duties while under the influence of alcohol in a public place.

Body-worn camera (BWC) shows the named officer approaching the complainant's vehicle and asking him to get out. The footage shows the named officer attempting to grab onto the complainant's right arm. The complainant pulled away and used both of his hands to grab tightly onto the officer's left hand. The complainant said in Spanish, *"It's okay, people, don't run me over. Please, it's okay, sir."* The recording then shows the named officer pry the complainant's hands off of him and try to turn the complainant around, with the complainant turning away from the direction indicated. BWC footage shows the named officer, who was alone, giving the complainant commands such as, *"put your hands behind your back"* in both English and Spanish. The complainant did not comply. The officer used a maneuver to slowly take the complainant to the ground and handcuffed him.

The named officer wrote in the incident report that he used force to overcome active resistance. The report indicated that the complainant pulled away and failed to comply with orders. The named officer stated that he provided clear instructions to the complainant and gave him many opportunities to comply. The named officer determined that the lowest level of force should be used to overcome the complainant and conducted a takedown.

Body-worn camera footage showed that, in addition to actively resisting, the complainant assaulted the officer by grabbing onto him.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 3 of 6**

The related entry in the station Use of Force Log indicated that the named officer used a Physical Control Hold/Takedown. The Use of Force Evaluation indicated that the complainant was injured, with an abrasion, and he had a complaint of pain to the left side of his face, specifically his cheek. The evaluation showed that a Physical Control Hold/Takedown was used to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, to overcome resistance or to prevent escape, in defense of others or in self-defense, to gain compliance with a lawful order.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that during the ride to the police station, he asked the officers why they were taking actions against him. He said he had done nothing and was not told why he was arrested.

California Penal Code section 836 states that an officer may arrest a person without a warrant if the “officer has probable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed a felony, whether or not a felony, in fact, has been committed.”

The Incident Report indicated that the named officer believed that the complainant was under the influence of alcohol. When the named officer initially arrived and got out of his patrol car, the complainant got back in the driver's seat of his own car and closed the door. The named officer believed that the complainant was a danger to himself and others. He determined that he was going to detain the complainant and further evaluate his level of intoxication. The named officer opened the car door as the complainant attempted to put the key in the ignition.

BWC footage confirmed that the complainant was intoxicated and seated in the driver's seat of the vehicle as the named officer approached. The BWC footage and department records documented that the named officer approved the arrest. BWC also established that while in the station, a department-certified Spanish-speaking officer made numerous attempts to speak with him, but the complainant declined and clearly refused to discuss the citation.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 4 of 6**

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4-5:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers did not provide him with an interpreter. He said they were speaking English, and he did not understand.

Department records and BWC footage shows that officers provided the complainant with a certified Spanish-speaking officer throughout the interaction. The footage shows that the named officer, as well as other officers throughout his detention, spoke to the complainant in Spanish while on scene, at the District Station and at a hospital. Before a language-certified officer arrived on scene, the initial officer gave the complainant simple commands in English and then repeated himself in Spanish.

DGO 5.20, Language Access Services for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons, defines the importance of effective and accurate communication between SFPD members and the community they serve. Language barriers can impede such effective and accurate communication in a variety of ways. Language barriers can sometimes inhibit or even prohibit individuals with limited English proficiency from accessing and/or understanding important rights, obligations, and services, or from communicating accurately and efficiently in different situations.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-7:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 5 of 6**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that the named officers laughed when they took him to a police station.

Department General Order (DGO 2.01), Rule 14, Public Courtesy, states that when acting in the performance of their duties, while on or off duty, officers shall treat the public with courtesy and respect.

Footage from Body Worn Cameras of the named officers shows they transported the complainant to the local district station. During the transport, the named officers discussed getting the complainant settled in and processed. The footage does not show any additional discussion, nor can either officer be heard laughing at any point during the transport.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #8-9:** The officers failed to properly care for, process, or book property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers took his shoes and did not return them when he was released from custody.

Named officer #1 stated that he spoke in Spanish to the complainant while transporting him to a police station. Named officer #1 stated that he asked the complainant for his shoes, as detainees are not allowed to wear shoes while in the holding cell. The officer further stated that the complainant's shoes were not seized; therefore, there was no property receipt. He said he did not know what happened to the shoes.

Named officer #2 denied taking the complainant's shoes or completing a property receipt, as the complainant's property was not seized. Named officer #2 stated that due to staffing issues, the complainant was not held in custody, and upon providing the complainant with an SFPD certificate of release form, he was no longer in police custody and was responsible for his belongings, which were with him upon leaving the station.

BWC showed that while at the district station, named officer #1 asked the complainant for his shoes. The complainant complied, and named officer #1 left the shoes near the desk where the complainant was

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/12/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25**

**PAGE# 6 of 6**

being processed. BWC footage from named officer #2 later revealed that while the complainant was transported to the hospital, there was a paper bag with the complainant on the gurney. Neither officer's BWC footage showed an officer placing shoes in the bag that went to the hospital with the complainant.

Department records contain no property receipt regarding the detention. Records indicated that due to staffing levels, officers were unable to maintain a hospital watch for the complainant, and he was then issued a certificate of release and left for treatment at the hospital.

Department General Order (DGO) 6.15(III)(11)(a) regarding Returning Property at the District Station states that property may be returned to its owner if it is not contraband and cannot be connected to a crime.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to make an arrest.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant had obtained a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) against a fellow tenant in her building. The TRO required the restrained party to remain 3 yards away from the complainant while in or at the residence. The residence is an apartment building where everyone shares certain common areas, such as a kitchen. The complainant called the police on the date in question alleging that the restrained party violated the restraining order when he intentionally entered the kitchen knowing she was inside the kitchen. However, the named officers failed to arrest the restrained party.

The named officers responded to the scene. Named officer #1 served as the primary officer. Named officer #1 confirmed that she did not arrest the restrained party. Named officer #1 stated that she conducted a thorough investigation and found that probable cause did not exist to believe that the restrained party knowingly violated the terms of the TRO. She explained that after speaking with the complainant and the restrained party, a lack of independent evidence existed to establish probable cause. While the complainant had shown her video footage of the restrained party inside the kitchen, the video did not prove whether he had knowingly entered the kitchen while the complainant was inside, violating the restraining order. The named officer also shed light on the fact that the building does not have cameras, which would have assisted the investigation. Without more, she used her discretion and did not arrest the restrained party. Named officer #1 did generate an incident report.

Named officer #2 aided in the investigation, followed named officer #1’s lead in not arresting the restrained party.

The evidence, such as body-worn camera (BWC) footage, reflected that the officers properly exercised their discretion when deciding not to arrest the restrained party. The evidence showed the officers conducted a thorough evidentiary investigation into the matter by speaking with relevant parties and reviewing the video evidence provided by the complainant. However, as mentioned by named officer #1, independent evidence did not exist to corroborate the complainant’s allegations. Moreover, DPA consulted a witness officer who routinely responded to calls for service between the complainant and the restrained party and also stated that 99 percent of the time he responded to the scene, probable cause did not exist to make an arrest as no independent evidence existed.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that during the above interaction, the named officer behaved inappropriately towards her and made several inappropriate comments. The complainant stated that the named officer quickly became upset with her when she provided her with her middle name (preferred name) rather than her legal name, and that the named officer thereafter called her a “liar,” and accused her of being stubborn and acting like a child.

BWC footage of the incident captured the interaction between the complainant and the named officer. As suggested by the complainant, the BWC footage showed the named officer became increasingly frustrated with the complainant when the complainant provided her with her middle name and not her first name. The complainant informed the officer that she did not like her first name, and the officer, responded in an aggravated tone, “I don’t care if you like it.”

Thereafter, the BWC footage showed the named officer confused as to the terms of the restraining order and did not understand how the restraining order could prohibit the restrained party from being within 3 yards of the complainant when they share a kitchen and live down the hall from each other. The BWC footage showed the complainant trying to inform the named officer of what occurred between the two parties leading up to the date of the incident. However, the named officer quickly and aggressively accused the complainant of “lying” and did not allow the complainant a meaningful opportunity to explain what had occurred before this incident. The named officer asked the complainant whether she would be willing to move units to resolve the issue with the restrained party who lived just down the hall. However, the complainant was not receptive to the move because she had updated her unit and did not have the means to move. The named officer thereafter made several other inappropriate and accusatory comments to the complainant such as calling the parties stubborn, akin to children, and stated that “if she was really scared like she wanted to portray she was, she would move.” The BWC footage showed the

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 4**

named officer lost her patience, made several inappropriate comments, and displayed an accusatory and unprofessional tone when speaking with the complainant.

During the DPA interview, the named officer re-watched several portions of the BWC footage. The named officer displayed remorse over the way in which she behaved towards the complainant. The named officer stated that her overall tone was more direct than it should have been and that she could have been more patient with the complainant during the encounter. Looking back, she stated that she would have used different words to relay to the complainant the importance of providing her legal name to officers and when she realized she was becoming frustrated, she should have allowed her partner to take over communication with the complainant. The named officer also stated that she would have taken time to clarify the complainant's intentions in why she called the police when it appeared uncertain.

The named officer, however, also emphasized her frustration with the scenario. The named officer explained that the complainant habitually called the police for the on-going issues between the two parties. However, the officers are never provided with enough evidence to substantiate an arrest. Additionally, she felt the burden of resolving the on-going issues between are unfairly placed on the officers. She explained that the building failed to install cameras although other officers had asked management to install them to help substantiate the allegations and deter future violations. Moreover, she felt the terms of the restraining order were unreasonable and infeasible as the two live down the hall from each other and share the same kitchen. She became increasingly frustrated when the complainant responded that she just wanted to have the restrained party arrested. The named officer believed that the complainant had ill intentions and was using the police as a pawn to get back at the restrained party for things he had done to her. The named officer believed that the complainant was trying to manipulate the current call for service to achieve the goal of having him arrested. The named officer believed she was "simply adding allegations," and did not believe she was providing background information to her. Thereafter, amid a conversation about potentially moving units, the named officer believed the complainant acted out of retaliation when she said, "the restrained party needed to pay for what he had done." The named officer repeatedly emphasized that the two parties were "unwilling to help themselves," by moving units, and that "any reasonable person," in their situation would have moved.

Despite the frustrations, the named officer wished she could apologize to the complainant for her tone, statements, and behavior during the encounter.

Department General Order 2.01, General Rules of Conduct, requires officers to maintain the highest level of professional conduct and requires officers to conduct themselves in a manner that reflects favorably on the Department. The Department recognizes that maintaining an "even-temperament," when dealing with the public is essential to the performance of a member's duties. Members are required to understand and follow the principles of Procedural Justice which include giving members of the community a voice (opportunity to speak) and providing them with respect. When acting in the performance of their duties,



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/2025**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

the policy requires officers to treat the public with courtesy and respect and to refrain from using discourteous or profane language at members of the public. Throughout several policies, the Department also encourages officers to utilize time to their advantage and engage in rapport building with individuals, which has proven beneficial for all involved parties.

DPA understands the named officer's frustrations when she responded to the call for service, particularly with respect to the terms of the restraining order and the building management's unwillingness to install cameras which would be beneficial for the investigations. However, DPA finds that the frustrations do not justify the named officer's unprofessional conduct throughout the incident. The complainant had a legal right to call the police if she felt the restrained party violated the order. The TRO was signed and granted by a judge and the named officer had a duty to enforce the terms, whether she felt they were reasonable or not. Moreover, the named officer's interpretations and misunderstandings of the complainant's intentions were in large part self-created. The named officer reacted quickly and failed to allow the complainant a meaningful opportunity to provide the officers with context as to what had occurred. The named officer became angry from the moment the complainant provided her with the name she chooses to go by, rather than her "legal" name. The named officer became increasingly frustrated as the situation evolved. Had the named officer slowed down and spoke with the complainant in a professional and polite manner, her perception of the complainant's motives may have been different. Contrary to what the named officer believed, it appeared from the footage that the complainant wanted the restrained party arrested for violating the restraining order because she truly believed he violated the terms. The BWC footage also supported that the complainant could have very likely been referring to monetary damage when she stated she wanted the restrained party "to pay for what he had done," as the comments were made when discussing the infeasibility of her moving units. The named officer did not remain even-tempered, did not allow the complainant to speak, and failed to provide the complainant with courtesy and respect throughout the incident, in violation of Department policy.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/08/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/17/25    PAGE# 1 of 4**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that an individual with a pole crossed the street to attack him unprovoked, and then a second individual pulled a knife on the first individual. Despite this, the officers who responded to the scene allowed the two individuals to “get away.” The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) attempted to interview the complainant to obtain additional information, but he did not respond.

The named officers stated that they responded to a call for service from a third-party caller and attempted to locate the parties involved. They found an individual who matched the description provided in the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) report. That person denied being involved in an altercation and stated that he did not want, need, or request any police services. They were unable to locate a victim who claimed a crime had been committed against them.

The CAD showed that the call for service was initially created as an “A” priority, “person with a knife,” which was later updated to describe two men fighting with weapons. Descriptions were provided for the individuals involved – one had a dog and a knife, and the other had a metal and wood pole. Another caller who refused to provide his name reported a fight with a knife. The complainant then called and stated that the male with the pole was hitting things and screaming bad words. The named officers arrived on the scene, noting that they had been flagged down and that one had left on the bus, while another had left on foot. They noted that the male with the dog stated there was no merit to physical assault, and the other party was gone on arrival. The call was closed as “handled.”

The complainant did not identify any witnesses, and no body-worn camera footage was available.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/08/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/17/25    PAGE# 2 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS # 3-4: The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that officers detained him as he pointed out the fleeing suspects. The DPA attempted to interview the complainant to obtain additional information, but he did not respond to these overtures.

The named officers denied detaining the complainant or witnessing any officers detaining him.

The CAD showed that the call for service was initially created as an “A” priority, “person with a knife,” which was later updated to describe two men fighting with weapons. Descriptions were provided for the individuals involved – one had a dog and a knife, and the other had a metal and wood pole. Another caller who refused to provide his name reported a fight with a knife. The complainant then called and stated that the male with the pole was hitting things and screaming bad words. The named officers arrived on the scene, noting that they had been flagged down and that one had left on the bus, while another had left on foot. They noted that the male with the dog stated there was no merit to physical assault, and the other party was gone on arrival. The call was closed as “handled.”

The complainant did not identify any witnesses, and no body-worn camera footage was available.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/08/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/17/25    PAGE# 3 of 4**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that officers failed to take a report despite repeated emails to the Police Department. The DPA attempted to interview the complainant to obtain additional information, but he did not respond to these overtures.

The named officers stated they did not write a police report because no victim came forward to claim they were a victim of a crime.

DPA was unable to investigate further regarding the complainant's statements about emails sent to the police department.

Department General Order 2.01 provides that members shall make all required written reports of crimes or incidents requiring police attention.

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: 09/08/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/17/25    PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 7: The officer failed to write an incident report.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that officers failed to take a report despite repeated emails to the police department. The DPA attempted to interview the complainant to obtain additional information, but he did not respond to these overtures.

DPA was unable to investigate further regarding the complainant's statements about emails sent to the police department.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 4**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he was an occupant of a vehicle that was pursued by the named officers and that the pursuit was in violation of the San Francisco Police Department's emergency response and pursuit driving policy. The complainant was reluctant to provide a detailed statement; however, he denied driving the pursued vehicle, refused to identify the other occupant of the vehicle, and would not disclose their seating positions in the vehicle. He acknowledged that he noticed the activation of patrol vehicle lights and sirens as his vehicle continued driving. In response, the complainant's vehicle briefly slowed down but then accelerated. The complainant's vehicle proceeded the wrong way down at least two one-way streets, entered an intersection against traffic, collided with two vehicles, and struck a parking garage before coming to a stop. After the collision, the complainant fled the scene on foot, but officers detained him shortly thereafter. The complainant contends that his vehicle accident occurred, in part, due to an unauthorized vehicle pursuit initiated by the named officers.

The officers denied the allegations. They reported that the complainant was the sole occupant and driver of the vehicle. The officers observed the vehicle traveling at an unsafe speed for the prevailing traffic conditions, constituting a traffic infraction. In response, they activated their patrol vehicle's lights and sirens to initiate a traffic stop. The complainant's vehicle slowed and pulled to the side of the road, yielding to the officers. Officer #1 instructed the complainant to drive forward, which he did. However, as Officer #2 opened the patrol vehicle door, the complainant's vehicle continued moving forward at a slow to moderate speed. Officer #1 was uncertain whether the complainant understood the instruction to pull forward. Based on their training and experience, the officers considered the complainant's erratic driving behavior indicative of possible unfamiliarity with the area, a failure to comprehend the officers' instructions, or a need for a foreign language interpreter. Officer #1 maintained a distance of one to two car lengths behind the complainant's vehicle, traveling at the same slow to moderate speed, while Officer #2 informed dispatch that they were not in pursuit. The officers continued to follow the complainant until it became apparent that he was attempting to evade them by rapidly accelerating in the wrong direction. At this point, Officer #1 disengaged, allowing the complainant's vehicle to speed away. The officers deny

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 2 of 4**

engaging in a vehicle pursuit and explain that their department's *Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving* policy (Department General Order 5.05) permits pursuit only when an individual is suspected of

committing a violent felony. Since the complainant was not suspected of such an offense, the officers stated they were not in pursuit, as reflected in their communications records.

The DPA reviewed body-worn camera footage from the officers as well as the computer-aided dispatch records and incident report which corroborated the officers' statements. The footage showed the named officers were two blocks away, approximately over a quarter of a mile, from where the complainant vehicle crashed. The evidence supported the officers' statements regarding disengagement from following the complainant when it became apparent that the complainant was going to flee. Witnesses reported the complainant entered the intersection against a red light and drove in the wrong direction which resulted in the complainant crashing into oncoming traffic.

Under the Department General Order 5.05, *Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving*, an authorized pursuit occurs when an individual is (a) suspected of a violent felony; or (b) when there is an articulable reasonable belief that the individual needs to be immediately apprehended because of the risk that the individual poses to public safety. An officer shall not initiate a pursuit of an individual suspected of a non-violent felony, misdemeanor, property crime, or vehicle code violation, except as specified in (b) above.

Based on the totality of the evidence, the Department of Police Accountability concluded that the named officers did not engage in a vehicle pursuit. The officers articulated that the complainant was not suspected of a violent felony, and initiating a vehicle pursuit would not have been unauthorized. The complainant perceived the officers' actions as a pursuit, because he was attempting to evade them the entire time. However, from the officers' perspectives they were unsure of the complainant's motives despite his erratic driving behavior and followed him until it became apparent that the complainant was going to flee. Sometime after the officers disengaged, the complainant continued to travel at a high rate of speed in the wrong direction until the complainant's vehicle collided into oncoming traffic.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 3 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3-:** The officer drove a city vehicle in a grossly negligent or reckless manner.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer drove recklessly because he followed the complainant's vehicle as it traveled down two streets in the wrong direction.

The named officer confirmed that he followed the complainant's vehicle while it proceeded the wrong way down two streets during an attempted traffic stop. Initially, the officer observed the complainant driving at a high rate of speed while making a turn from an alley onto the main road. The officer then responded Code 3 and activated the patrol vehicle's lights and siren to initiate a traffic stop. The complainant briefly yielded by slowing down and pulling over but continued driving at a slow to moderate speed, which confused the officer. Unsure whether the complainant understood the officer's orders, the named officer maintained his light activation and intermittent siren use while they followed the complainant as he drove down two streets in the wrong direction at a slow to moderate speed. The officer stated that his intent was to conduct the traffic stop due to the observed traffic violation and followed the complainant's vehicle accordingly and to alert oncoming traffic of their position. The officer disengaged when the complainant's speed significantly increased, and it became apparent that the complainant was attempting to flee.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 4 of 4**

The incident report and body-worn camera footage confirmed the officers activated their lights and sirens. Department General Order 5.05, *Emergency Response and Pursuit Driving*, advises officers that they may respond Code 3 when an emergency response appears reasonably necessary to prevent serious injury to persons, whether or not a criminal offense is involved.

The DPA's investigation confirmed that the officer did not drive in a grossly negligent or reckless manner. The complainant's statement, police records, and other evidence confirmed that officer activated his lights and sirens, and the complainant failed to pull over as directed. The officer then followed slowly behind the complainant's vehicle, and when the complainant recklessly sped off, the officer disengaged.

The evidence proves that the officer's alleged conduct occurred, but that his actions were justified, lawful and proper.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/11/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      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 concerning the death of an individual and San Francisco Police Department (SFPD)'s potential involvement. The complainant located public records which he believed were associated with the death of the above-mentioned individual. The complainant believed that the documents showed SFPD's failure to respond to the scene of what he thought was a crime that led to the individual's death.

While the complainant was correct in his assertion that SFPD did not respond to the scene, Department of Police Accountability (DPA)'s investigation revealed that SFPD had no duty to respond. The call for service was medical in nature and handled in its entirety by medical personnel. The call did not warrant police response. Accordingly, SFPD was never dispatched to the scene and thus had no duty to respond.

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: 10/11/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed an alternative complaint, alleging that if SFPD had responded to the scene, they failed to properly investigate.

SFPD did not respond to the scene and DPA's investigation revealed that SFPD had no duty to respond. Because SFPD did not respond to the scene, they were not involved in the investigation of this incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur and that the Department was not involved.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SFFD**

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

San Francisco Fire Department  
Investigative Services Bureau  
698 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/14/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/18/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer improperly used surveillance footage to monitor her residence to locate her son. DPA's investigation revealed that at the time the complaint was made, the complainant's son was the subject of an on-going criminal investigation wherein the named officer had, in fact, utilized surveillance footage to locate the whereabouts of her son.

The named officer explained that pursuant to an on-going criminal investigation, they planned to arrest the complainant's son for what they believed to be an active felony warrant. In doing so, the named officer admitted that they utilized surveillance to locate his whereabouts within the complainant's apartment complex after he fled from them. The named officer articulated knowledge of Department policy and procedure regarding utilizing surveillance footage in criminal investigations. The named officer attested that they complied with such policy and procedures when looking for the complainant's son. The named officer emphasized that they only utilized "historical footage," (rather than real-time monitoring) to locate him. The named officer was aware that use of real-time surveillance cameras required supervisor approval and corresponding documentation.

Consistent with the named officer's statements, Department policy allows officers to request, obtain, or review historical footage from a non-city entity to gather evidence relevant to a specific criminal investigation without approval from a superior officer.

Thus, the named officer here properly utilized surveillance footage to locate the complainant's son.

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: 10/18/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer informed her that the police are monitoring her house. The complainant felt that the named officer made such comments to harass her and is in fear for her life.

Body-worn camera footage reflected that during an attempt to stop her son and arrest him; the named officer informed the complainant that they watched her son on video going in and out of her home. Then named officer denied attempting to harass or intimidate the complainant and or her son, in any way. The named officer explained that when he made the comment, he tried to explain to her why they were in front of her residence, and that her son fled from them the night before, which caused them to utilize surveillance camera footage to locate him. The named officer believed that he and other officers on-scene demonstrated restraint and de-escalated the situation.

DPA finds that the officer's comment, in the context of the investigation, was not objectively harassing.

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: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 1 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he was unlawfully detained because he was not intoxicated.

The named officer stated he detained the complainant at the request of another jurisdiction. The complainant matched the description of a suspect who reportedly assaulted a train conductor and a security guard in an area not within the San Francisco Police Department's (SFPD) jurisdiction. Law enforcement from the jurisdiction where the assault occurred requested assistance from SFPD to assist and detain the suspect until they arrived on the scene to take over the investigation.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant, dressed in a white T-shirt with fake blood, in a heated argument with a security guard in a train depot. Officers attempted to place the resisting complainant in handcuffs. One officer held his pepper spray near the complainant's face and threatened to deploy the spray if he did not stop resisting. Ultimately, the officers were able to place the complainant in handcuffs without incident. A security guard informed an officer that a train conductor would not allow the complainant to board the train because he was verbally abusing several individuals. The security guard informed the officer that the train's conductor, who had been assaulted, had departed the station with the train. The officer informed the security guard that SFPD only detained the complainant until the appropriate law enforcement agency arrived. During the detention, the complainant yelled at the officers and exhibited a belligerent demeanor. The complainant informed officers that he was autistic, lied about his age, stating he was a juvenile, when in fact he was over 18 years old. Additionally, the complainant refused to provide his name to the officers. The complainant demanded that all officers on the scene provide their badge numbers; only two officers complied. Despite the complainant's belligerent demeanor, all officers treated the complainant with respect and remained calm. The law enforcement agency, having jurisdiction, arrived and took custody of the complainant.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 2 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-5:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers used too much force when they placed him in handcuffs.

The named officers stated the complainant was very angry, hostile, and belligerent. The complainant actively resisted their attempt to place him in handcuffs by tensing his body and pulling away. They stated in response to his active resistance that they used reasonable force necessary to overcome it.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant, dressed in a white T-shirt with fake blood, in a heated argument with a security guard in a train depot. Officers attempted to place the complainant in handcuffs. A minimum amount of force was necessary to put the actively resistive complainant in handcuffs. One officer held his pepper spray near the complainant's face and threatened to deploy the spray if he did not stop resisting. Ultimately, the officers were able to place the complainant in handcuffs without incident. A security guard informed an officer that a train conductor would not allow the complainant to board the train because he was verbally abusing several individuals. The security guard informed the officer that the train's conductor, who had been assaulted, had departed the station with the train. The officer informed the security guard that SFPD was only detaining the complainant until the law enforcement agency having jurisdiction arrived. During the detention, the complainant yelled at the officers and exhibited a belligerent demeanor. The complainant informed officers that he was autistic, lied about his age, stating he was a juvenile, when in fact he was over 18 years old. Additionally, the complainant refused to provide his name to the officers. The complainant demanded that all officers on the scene provide their badge numbers; only two officers complied. Despite the complainant's belligerent demeanor, all officers treated the complainant with respect and remained calm. The law enforcement agency, having jurisdiction, arrived and took custody of the complainant.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 3 of 7**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer used excessive force when he threatened to deploy pepper spray as he held the canister near his face.

The named officer stated that the complainant actively resisted by pulling his arms away from officers who were attempting to place him into handcuffs. As a form of de-escalation, he issued a warning to the complainant about using pepper spray. He stated this was an attempt to reduce or eliminate the necessity to use other force options to gain compliance, consistent with Department training. The named officer stated he complied with Department General Order 5.01, as it allows chemical agents to be used on an unarmed attacker or to overcome resistance.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant, dressed in a white T-shirt with fake blood, in a heated argument with a security guard in a train depot. Officers attempted to place the resisting complainant in handcuffs. One officer held his pepper spray near the complainant's face and threatened to deploy the spray if he did not stop resisting. Ultimately, the officers were able to place the complainant, using minimal force, in handcuffs without incident.

Department General Order 5.01 states in relevant part, "Chemical agents can be used to subdue an unarmed attacker or to overcome active resistance that is likely to result in injury to either the subject or the officer. In many instances, chemical agents can reduce or eliminate the necessity to use other force options to gain compliance, consistent with Department training." It further states, "Officers shall provide a warning prior to deploying a chemical agent, if feasible . . ."

The named officer complied with Department policy because the complainant was actively resisting officers' attempts to place him into handcuffs. It took four officers to gain physical control, as well as the named officer, who threatened to use pepper spray. Although pepper spray was not deployed, the named officer followed policy by issuing a warning.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 4 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an unidentified officer used excessive and unnecessary force when he drew his firearm at the time of his detention.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

All officers on scene denied drawing their weapons at any time during this incident.

Body-worn camera footage does not show any officer drawing their weapon at any time during the incident.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #8-10:** The officers failed to provide his or her star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IC**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 5 of 7**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he had asked the named officers for their badge numbers, but they had failed to provide them.

Named Officer #1 stated he did not provide his badge number because the complainant was talking very loudly, making it difficult for officers to respond. In addition, he noted that another officer established communication with the complainant, and he did not want to overload him with stimulus by speaking with him at the same time. Named Officer #1 admitted he did not comply with Department policy because he was not provided with the opportunity.

Named Officer #2 stated he did not provide his badge number to the complainant because another officer established communication with the complainant, and he did not want to overload the complainant, who stated he was autistic, with stimuli, such as too many people speaking at once. In addition, he said that he did not have the opportunity to state his badge number because the complainant kept talking over him, not giving him a chance to do so. He intended to provide the complainant with his business card when feasible; however, he stated it slipped his mind. Named Officer #2 admitted he did not comply with Department policy.

Named Officer #3 stated he did not provide his badge number to the complainant because he was highly agitated and appeared to become more agitated and irate, the more officers tried to speak with him. In addition, he stated that because the complainant said he was autistic and had already established rapport with another officer, he did not want to overwhelm him and complicate the rapport he had built with the other officer. He stated that he did not provide his badge number upon request, but said he intended to provide his business card to the complainant instead; however, he forgot.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

Body-worn camera footage showed that while the complainant was detained for over 35 minutes, he demanded, on three separate occasions, that the officers provide their badge numbers. The named officers failed to do so, further agitating the complainant. The complainant informed the officers that he was autistic.

Department General Order 2.01.03(8)(e) states, "When requested, the member shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment."

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 6 of 7**

The named officers had ample opportunity to state their badge numbers over a period of 35 minutes. Their grounds for not stating their badge numbers are not reasonable, especially since the complainant became more agitated when he received no response. In addition, DGO 2.01.03(8)(e) does not offer any exceptions. It would have taken minimal effort on the part of the named officers to verbalize four digits.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #11:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer made an inappropriate comment when he asked him to write down all the officers' badge numbers because he had a bad memory. He stated that he told the named officer, who responded by saying he didn't care that he struggled with his memory and that it was not his job to help him with that.

The named officer stated that he replied, "How would I know?" when the complainant informed him that he had obvious memory problems. He said he did not feel this comment was inappropriate, as he was unaware of the complainant's memory problems.

Department records indicate that officers were dispatched to a call for service regarding an assault and battery. The suspect was described as wearing a red cowboy hat and a white T-shirt with fake blood. Officers were asked to assist another jurisdiction and hold the suspect pending the other jurisdiction's arrival.

Body-worn camera footage showed the complainant asking for officers' badge numbers. The complainant informed the named officer that he was a juvenile, which was not true, and that he was autistic with memory problems. The named officer responded by saying, "How would I know?"

Evidence indicates that the named officer did not make the alleged comment.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 7 of 7**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Referral/SFSO**

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

San Francisco Sheriff's Department IAD  
25 Van Ness Avenue #350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25 PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that he reported a threatening situation and when the named officer responded, he “rushed” the complainant’s account of the threat and demonstrated that he did not want to help. The complainant said that he could not explain quickly, and the officer showed anger regarding how much time the complainant was taking and told the complainant he should learn to summarize situations quickly.

The named officer stated that he did not bully or pressure the complainant to speed his account of the alleged threat. He said he only spoke to the complainant about what had happened to him. Additionally, the named officer said that he did not recall making a comment alleged: “What do you want out of this?” The named officer said that he did not make any inappropriate comments to the complainant.

Department records showed that the named officer responded to a call regarding threats and harassment. Body-worn camera (BWC) shows the complainant telling the named officer that while he was walking home, he encountered a man who spoke to him in what he perceived was a threat. The named officer listens to the account, explains that the comments made by the man did not constitute an assault and offers to drive slowly next to the complainant as he walked to his nearby home. The named officer explains that he understood the complainant’s concern and said it was important to ensure the complainant got home safely.

Department General Order 2.01(14) dictates that officers shall treat members of the public with courtesy and not use harsh or uncivil language.

There was no evidence that the named officer made comments alleged by the complainant or made any inappropriate comments to the complainant.

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: 11/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25 PAGE# 2 of 2**

**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 forwarded to:

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 1 of 6**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officers failed to enforce a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) she obtained against her landlord. She noted that the TRO required the landlord to refrain from entering her premises, including the basement where she stored her belongings, without providing 24 hours' notice. The complainant stated the lease she signed before the current lease allowed her access to the basement. She noted that the current lease, which did not allow her access to the basement, was void because she did not understand what she was signing at the time and would not have agreed to relinquish access to the basement. She also stated the named officers failed to address an illegal "No Trespassing" sign posted by the landlord on the basement door. She said only a court can issue "No Trespass" signage.

Named Officer #1 stated that the changing of the locks in the basement did not violate the terms of the TRO. The complainant's address is the only one listed, in a multi-unit building, on the TRO. He stated that the building features common areas, such as the garage and basement, which were previously accessible to the tenants but are no longer under the current lease agreement that was in effect at the time of the incident. Named Officer #1 stated he reviewed the current lease, which the parties mutually signed. He noted that the basement was not specifically relegated to the complainant's address and, therefore, not the property associated with the complainant. He further stated that the current lease agreement stipulated that the complainant did not have standing over the basement. Named Officer #1 noted the complainant provided him with a prior lease to support her claim that she had standing over the basement and stated that the current lease was not valid because the landlord falsified her signature but later claimed that she was not provided with the full terms of the agreement and signed an incomplete document. Named Officer #1 stated he did not enforce the TRO because the basement was not specifically the property of the complainant.

Regarding the complainant's allegation that he failed to act on an illegal "No Trespass" sign, Officer #1 stated that there was no crime or violation of the TRO. Therefore, the landlord's action was protected by the First Amendment.

Named Officer #2 stated that changing locks was not a violation of the TRO. He noted that the building is a multi-unit building, and the landlord had never entered the complainant's property, as listed in the TRO. He stated that the basement and garage are located on the first level (the complainant's unit is on the



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 2 of 6**

second), have no associated address, and are not within the complainant's unit. He stated that the landlord provided him with a copy of the current lease, which does not allow the complainant access to the basement. Named Officer #2 noted that the complainant told him the current lease was false, then changed her story and stated that she had signed it without reading it. He said that the complainant then changed her story again and stated that she was not provided with the full terms and had signed an incomplete document.

Regarding the complainant's allegation that he failed to act on an illegal "No Trespass" sign, Officer #2 stated there is no law prohibiting someone from posting a "No Trespass" sign on their property.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to the complainant's residence regarding a report of a TRO violation. The complainant stated her landlord failed to provide a 24-hour notice before entering the building, which was a violation of the terms in the TRO. In addition, she noted that the landlord attempted to change the locks on the basement where she stored her belongings and posted a "No Trespassing" sign on the basement door, which was a violation of the TRO because she believed the landlord would compromise her stored property. The complainant stated her lease allowed her access to the basement. The landlord, who remained in her vehicle, informed the officers that she manages the entire multi-unit building. The officers reviewed the TRO and the former and current lease agreements. The TRO required the landlord to stay 10 yards away from the complainant but also noted that the TRO was subject to compliance with the landlord's responsibilities to tenants. The TRO specifically listed the complainant's address (unit) as the involved address, rather than any of the separate and individually addressed units that also comprise the shared building. The current lease stated that the basement was not to be utilized by any tenants of any units of the building. The complainant showed the officers a prior lease that allowed her access to the basement. She informed the officers that she never signed the new lease. Officers showed her a copy of the new lease with her signature on the addendum, disallowing her access to the basement. The complainant stated that the landlord falsified her signature, but officers verified her signature by comparing it with the complainant's signature on the old and new lease agreements. Officers informed the complainant that the landlord did not violate the restraining order because the current lease did not permit any tenant to use the basement storage, and that she did not have a specific claim of ownership to the basement, contrary to her reported claim.

Body-worn camera footage showed officers contacting the landlord, who was sitting in her vehicle. The landlord informed the officers that she and the complainant had mutual TROs against each other. The landlord informed the officers that she was waiting for a locksmith to arrive so the locks on the basement could be changed. When asked if she had provided a 24-hour notice, the landlord informed the officers that the building is a multi-unit building and the locks were for the basement, which had nothing to do with the complainant. The landlord showed the officers the current lease, which documented that the complainant was not allowed access to the basement.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 3 of 6**

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers speak with the complainant, who informed them that the landlord was attempting to change the locks on the basement, which violated the restraining order. She informed them that the landlord was prohibited from locking her out of the basement because the landlord had allowed her access, and her belongings were stored there. The officers showed the complainant the current lease, which showed the complainant's signature on the addendum that specifically disallowed her access. The complainant verified her signature. However, she informed officers that the lease was void because she did not know what she was signing. She stated the previous lease allowed her access to the basement. The officers discussed the restraining order and the lease. They determined that the landlord did not have to provide a 24-hour notice to the complainant to enter the basement because the entry to the basement is not accessed through the complainant's residence. The officers concluded that the complainant did not have standing regarding the basement. The complainant showed the officers a "No Trespass" sign that the landlord posted on the basement door. The complainant stated that she has used the basement for five years and that her belongings are stored there.

The footage continued, showing the officers informing the complainant that they would write a police report, despite the dispute being of a civil nature. In addition, they told her that she did not have standing on the basement because it did not belong to her as stated in the current lease. They suggested she contact an attorney and the Rent Board. The officers informed the landlord that they would write a report and that they did not believe the restraining order was violated.

Photographs of the front of the building showed a stairway leading up to two separate addresses, one of which belonged to the complainant.

Lease documents showed that the lease, effective at the time of the incident, specifically disallowed the complainant access to the basement. The addendum to the lease, prohibiting the complainant from accessing the basement, was signed by the complainant.

The prior lease agreement, not in effect at the time of the incident, allowed the complainant access to the basement.

The TRO, effective at the time of the incident, prohibited the landlord from contacting the complainant unless she provided a 24-hour notice to perform obligations under the residential tenancy agreement.

The lease that was in effect at the time of the incident specifically did not allow the complainant access to the basement. The TRO required the landlord to provide a 24-hour notice if she was required to perform obligations under the residential tenancy agreement. The building is a multi-unit structure comprising three or four units. The basement does not fall under the complainant's tenancy agreement, and access to the basement does not require entry through the complainant's residence. Therefore, the 24-hour notice

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 4 of 6**

requirement in the temporary restraining order does not apply. Because this was a civil matter, the named officers were not required to write a report. However, they did so as a courtesy to the complainant.

Additionally, the landlord was permitted to post a “No Trespass” sign on her property, which does not contravene a court order. There is no authority supporting the complainant’s allegation that a court must approve such signage.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she called the police to report a violation of a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO). She said the named officer was rude and unprofessional.

The named officer stated he disagreed with the complainant’s allegation given the fact that: 1) There was no enforceable criminal action; 2) He took the time to explain the documentation and ask thorough questions while affording the complainant what he believed ample and uninterrupted time to explain her perspective; 3) He explained the legal reasoning for his actions, multiple times; and 4) He authored a courtesy police report despite the lack of criminal conduct. He stated he treated the complainant with patience, respect, and empathy and advised her emphatically to seek the aid of a civil attorney to help her with any further proceedings should she desire.

A witness officer stated the named officer never acted in a rude manner with the complainant. He noted that the named officer was calm and respectful throughout their time on the scene.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to the complainant’s residence regarding a violation of a TRO.

Body-worn camera footage does not show the named officer treat the complainant in a rude or unprofessional manner. In contrast, the footage showed the named officer demonstrating patience with the complainant by repeatedly explaining why he did not believe the landlord violated the TRO. He took the

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 5 of 6**

time to review two leases and a restraining order, allowing the complainant ample time to explain her complaint and reasoning.

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

Evidence shows that the named officer treated the complainant with respect and exercised patience, given the time he spent repeatedly explaining to the complainant why there was no violation of the TRO. As a courtesy, the named officer authored an incident report, although it was not required, as the dispute was civil and not criminal.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** 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 racist because when she spoke with the named officer, he told her, “You don’t understand.”

The named officer stated he did not tell the complainant, “You don’t understand,” but rather the complainant told him, “I don’t understand.” He stated he responded to the complainant by asking further questions. He said he did not conduct himself in a racist manner, nor does he participate in any such behaviors. The named officer stated he did not, at any time, treat the complainant with any manner of racially motivated or otherwise prejudiced bias in any capacity.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer speak with the complainant, who spoke with an accent, asking her how she knew the landlord was at the property to change locks in the basement. The complainant failed to answer the question multiple times, prompting the named officer to inform her that she was not answering the question and was going off on tangents. The complainant told him she did not understand, but eventually she answered the question.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/28/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25 PAGE# 6 of 6**

There is no evidence supporting the complainant's allegation that he treated her in a biased or racist manner.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/08/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 1of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainants stated that officers failed to enforce a restraining order.

The incident report indicates that the named officers responded to a call for service regarding a violation of a restraining order. The complainant and co-complainant sold cellular phones on the street. They reported that they had a protection order against another cellular phone vendor (“other party”) who worked across the street. The complainant and co-complainant stated that the other party was yelling profanities and displaying obscene gestures in violation of the restraining order. The complainants presented a copy of their restraining order to officers, which prohibited the other party from harassing the complainant and co-complainant and required the other party to stay at least 100 feet away. The complainant informed the named officers that he was wearing eyeglasses equipped with a recording feature to document the interaction. Named Officer #1 asked the complainant if his recording glasses captured his interaction with the other party as a way to corroborate his allegations of harassment. The complainant became immediately upset and confrontational. The complainant demanded the presence of a supervisor and insisted that the other party be arrested. The other party informed officers that she, too, had a restraining order against the complainant and co-complainant. Officers contacted the Identification Bureau (ID Bureau) to confirm the existence of the restraining orders. ID Bureau found both restraining orders on file. However, there was a discrepancy in the service of the orders.

An independent witness approached Named Officer #1, who informed him that the other party had not spoken to or harassed the complainant and co-complainant, and that she had kept her distance until the police arrived. As Named Officer #1 continued his investigation, the complainant became agitated and verbally abusive toward officers, directing profanity toward Named Officer #1. Named Officer #1 reviewed the complainant’s restraining order and determined that an arrest would not be appropriate, as it contained a “work-related exception” allowing the parties to be at their shared workspace (specifically, at their respective street corners). Named Officer #1 felt that it was unclear whether the restraining order had been violated. Until further clarification from the issuing court was received, law enforcement could not determine how to enforce the order in a shared workplace, making an arrest unjustified. A court date regarding the restraining orders was to take place in a few days and a supervisor approved Named Officer #1’s decision not to make an arrest based on 1) Inconsistencies on the proper service of both restraining orders; 2) Lack of clear evidence that a restraining order was violated; 3) Conflicting orders allowing both parties to be present at the same workplace; and 4) Fairness and consistency.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/08/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

Court documentation reveals that the complainants and the other party had mutual restraining orders against each other. Additionally, court records indicate that the complainant and the other party were scheduled for a court appearance two business days after the incident.

The body-worn camera footage is consistent with the information documented in the incident report.

The named officers did not violate Department policy when they chose not to arrest the other party for violating a restraining order due to issues with proper service, conflicting or inconsistent terms, and an independent witness statement stating that no harassment occurred toward the complainant and co-complainant. The named officers conducted a thorough investigation, lasting approximately 90 minutes, as they carried out their due diligence.

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: 11/18/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:      FINDING:      IO-2      DEPT. ACTION:**

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25 PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to comply with Department General Order 5.20.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers failed to provide him with a Mandarin interpreter for the initial ten minutes of his detention.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a shelter regarding a subject who became violent with staff. The records showed the named officers requesting a certified Mandarin-speaking officer within three minutes upon arrival at the scene.

Body-worn camera footage showed that upon arrival, the named officers observed the complainant surrounded by shelter staff who reported that he shoved staff members and refused to leave. Shelter staff informed the named officers that they wanted him to leave the facility. The named officers placed the complainant in handcuffs and escorted him outside. Named Officer #1 calmly reassured the complainant that he was only detained and not in any trouble. The complainant stated in broken English that he wanted a case number and informed the officers that he spoke Mandarin. Named Officer #2 informed Named Officer #1 that he should first request a certified Mandarin-speaking officer as opposed to calling Language Line, an over-the-phone interpretation service. Named Officer #1 immediately called Dispatch requesting a Mandarin-speaking officer. The named officers waited just a few minutes before he was advised by Dispatch that the Mandarin-speaking officer was no longer available. Named Officer #1 immediately contacted Language Line and began speaking with the complainant with the assistance of a Mandarin-speaking interpreter. Interpretation services were provided to the complainant within six minutes of initial contact. Named Officer #1 was extremely patient with the complainant and spoke with him via an interpreter for an extended period, reiterating numerous times that he was no longer welcome at the shelter. He was also advised multiple times that if he went back inside the shelter, he would be arrested.

Department General Order 5.20 states, in the relevant part, that officers must first attempt to employ the services of an officer certified in the requested language. It further states that if an officer is not available, officers may then use telephonic professional language services.

Evidence clearly shows that the named officers followed Department policy. Upon arrival and determination that the complainant required a Mandarin language interpreter, the named officers promptly

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25 PAGE# 2 of 4**

attempted to find a certified Mandarin-speaking officer. When that option was no longer available, the officers immediately utilized the telephonic services of Language Line.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that after he was removed from a shelter and detained by the named officers, they had a duty to provide him with an alternate shelter.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a shelter regarding a subject who became violent with staff. The record documented the named officers requesting a certified Mandarin-speaking officer within three minutes upon arrival at the scene.

Body-worn camera showed that upon arrival, the named officers observed the complainant surrounded by shelter staff who reported that he shoved staff members and refused to leave. Shelter staff informed the named officers that they wanted him to leave the facility. The named officers placed the complainant in handcuffs and escorted him outside. Named Officer #1 calmly reassured the complainant that he was only detained and not in any trouble. The complainant stated in broken English that he wanted a case number and informed the officers that he spoke Mandarin. Named Officer #2 informed Named Officer #1 that he should first request a certified Mandarin-speaking officer as opposed to calling Language Line, an over-the-phone interpretation service. Named Officer #1 immediately called Dispatch requesting a Mandarin-speaking officer. The named officers waited just a few minutes before he was advised by Dispatch that the Mandarin-speaking officer was no longer available. Named Officer #1 immediately contacted Language Line and began speaking with the complainant with the assistance of a Mandarin-speaking interpreter. Interpretation services were provided to the complainant within six minutes of initial contact. Named Officer #1 was extremely patient with the complainant and spoke with him via an interpreter for an extended period, reiterating numerous times that he was no longer welcome at the shelter. He was also advised multiple times that if he went back inside the shelter, he would be arrested.

Department policy does not require police officers to find shelter for individuals.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25 PAGE# 3 of 4**

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer violated his privacy by obtaining his full name from shelter staff.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a shelter regarding a subject who became violent with staff. The record documented the named officers requesting a certified Mandarin-speaking officer within three minutes upon arrival at the scene.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer obtaining the complainant's full name from shelter staff.

The complainant was lawfully detained and does not have the right to privacy regarding his name, which the named officer obtained from shelter staff. Officers are allowed to correctly identify a lawfully detained individual.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25 PAGE# 4 of 4**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an unknown officer shoved him.

Department records indicate that the named officers responded to a shelter regarding a subject who became violent with staff. The record documented the named officers requesting a certified Mandarin-speaking officer within three minutes upon arrival at the scene.

Body-worn camera footage does not show any officer shoving the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-5:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that a search warrant was served at his residence. He was not the subject of the warrant. The complainant said that the officers left his property in disarray and may have damaged items by stepping on them. The complaint failed to provide any evidence of damaged property.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) shows that the named officers served the search warrant at the complainant's address. The officers knocked and announced, but no one answered the door. As such, the officer forced the front door open to gain access. The officers contacted an occupant, who informed them that the target of the warrant was not present. The occupant also told officers that the complainant had left the building as officers were making their entry. The officers were calm, polite, and took the time to explain what was happening to the occupant fully.

The BWC footage showed that the whole residence was messy and cluttered, with multiple objects and boxes piled in corners, across the floor, and on shelves and tables. The officers only searched the room of the person subject to the warrant, and not the complainant's room. The officers had to force the internal door to the subject's room to gain entry.

The BWC footage showed that no officers damaged any property during the search, except for forcing entry to the two locked doors.

The Incident Report documented the search and the use of the Halligan tool to gain entry to the building and to the subject's bedroom. The report documents a handgun magazine as a result of the search.

A memorandum entitled "Damage to Private Property" was written by Named Officer #1 documenting the damage to the exterior and interior doors. Photographs obtained showed the damage to the two doors.

A copy of the search warrant was obtained. The search warrant, signed by a Superior Court judge, allowed officers to search the residence for ammunition and a handgun magazine.

Department General Order Search Warrants 5.16.05 D states, "Members should exercise reasonable care in executing a search warrant to minimize damage to property."

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/02/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

No evidence has been found to show that the officers left the complainant's property in disarray or damaged the complainant's property. The footage showed that the officers did not search the complainant's bedroom and did not damage any property except for two doors to gain entry.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/10/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/23/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was involved in a road traffic collision when he was struck by a reversing vehicle while riding his bike. The named officers responded to the scene and conducted an investigation. The complainant stated that several witnesses reported the driver had reversed in a negligent manner, but the officers failed to issue a citation to the driver.

The named officers stated there is no policy stating that an officer shall author a “Notice to Appear” or citation during a collision scene. Named Officer #1 noted that if he cited the driver, he would also have cited the complainant for 21651(B) of the California Vehicle Code (Driving on the Wrong Side of the Road).

Department General Order Traffic Enforcement 9.01.04 states, in part, “A citation may be issued by a qualified member investigating a vehicle crash...”

The named officer is correct that there are no policies that state an officer “shall” issue a citation. Instead, the policy states that an officer “may” issue a citation.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/10/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/23/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the Collision Report written by the named officer contained inaccuracies. Specifically, the report failed to mention that the vehicle that backed into him was technically traveling in the wrong direction. Also, the report noted that he was not wearing a helmet, which was not relevant to the incident and was added to discredit the complainant.

The named officer denied that the report was inaccurate. He stated the report was accurate and based on the statements he received from parties at the scene, including drivers, operators, and unbiased third-party witnesses. He took all the information and observations to decide on the possible fault.

The officer noted that the report stated the complainant reported that a vehicle had backed into him. The driver of the car and a witness said that the car was reversing in the westbound lane. The officer opined that vehicles are allowed to reverse on public streets.

The officer explained that when conducting a collision investigation involving a motorcycle, bicycle, or scooter, it is standard practice for officers to ask if the rider was wearing a helmet, as failure to wear one exposes them to a significant risk of injury, regardless of any legal obligation to do so.

The Collision Report recorded that the driver of the vehicle admitted to reversing. The report recorded that the complainant was not wearing a helmet and reported pain in the right hip area. This section of the report was separated from the other information to focus on the complainant's injuries.

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



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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant called the police about a noise complaint at her home, which was outside of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) jurisdiction. According to the complainant, when officers arrived to investigate, an unknown SFPD officer flashed his badge to the responding officers, which affected the investigation. The complainant stated that the SFPD officer should not have interfered with the investigation. The complainant also alleged that the officer had removed property from her garage. The complainant submitted photos of a vehicle at the scene but could not identify the SFPD officer. She stated further that the neighbor with whom she had a dispute had filed a complaint against her with the SF agency for whom she works.

A request to the agency for the complaint filed by the complainant was denied under a personnel exception. Records for the vehicle failed to identify an SFPD connection. Because the DPA could not identify a specific officer, there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

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

## **SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said a bus driver denied her access to a bus, called her names, and attacked her. The police were called to the scene, and the complainant alleged that the named officer arrested her without cause.

The named officer stated that he learned during his investigation that there was probable cause to arrest the complainant for both an outstanding warrant and for battering the bus driver. He took a statement from the bus driver, who worked for a private bus company, and observed that she had multiple scratches on her face. He also viewed security footage of the incident, which showed the complainant initiated a physical with the bus driver.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage showed the officer's investigation, including his interview of the bus driver. The driver told officers that she attempted to stop the complainant from getting on the bus due to a disputed ticket, they fell to the ground and the complainant sat on her and scratched her face. BWC footage showed that the bus driver had at least one wound on her face. The complainant told an officer that the bus driver denied her boarding due to her dog, and the driver pushed her to the ground, struck her multiple times in the face, and she sat on the driver to stop her. BWC footage showed the named officer obtained the complainant's identification, went to his patrol vehicle, and used the computer before returning and placing the complainant into handcuffs. The footage also showed that the named officer viewed and obtained security footage of the incident.

Security footage obtained by the named officer showed the complainant repeatedly attempting to forcefully push past the bus driver. The driver blocking the bus door with her body and arms. The footage showed the driver and the complainant struggling and falling to the ground. The complainant pinned the driver to the ground and struck her repeatedly until bystanders pulled her off of the driver. The bystander released the complainant, who attempted to reengage her fight with the bus driver. The bystander again interceded by holding the complainant's arms to protect the bus driver.

Photographs taken by the San Francisco Police Department showed wounds on the bus driver's face. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

## **SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to Mirandize her.

The named officer stated that he is trained to Mirandize when a person is in custody during an interrogation. The named officer denied interrogating the complainant. He said before being handcuffed, the complainant told officers what happened and made inconsistent statements about the incident.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) for the incident did not show the named officer interrogating the complainant. BWC footage showed the complainant speaking to an officer about the incident prior to being placed into handcuffs. She accused the bus driver of striking her and refusing her access to the bus. She later commented in reference to the incident when being transported in a patrol vehicle. The officer did not ask the complainant any questions while she was in custody.

The United States Supreme Court case *Miranda v. Arizona* requires police to inform people being questioned while in custody of their Fifth Amendment protection against self-incrimination and their right to an attorney.

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

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

## **SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY**

### **COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 4**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer made an inaccurate statement in an incident report. She alleged she never made any comment about a dog and the named officer inaccurately reported that she did.

The incident report noted that the complainant stated the bus driver refused to let her on the bus because of her dog.

The named officer said the complainant did comment about her dog. He did not recall when she mentioned that the driver refused to let her on the bus because of her dog, but said she made multiple statements without being interrogated while on scene, at a station, and at a hospital.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage shows that the complainant had a dog with her at the scene. The footage shows the complainant telling an officer that she had been waiting in line to get on a bus, the bus driver let everyone else on the bus and told her that she was not going anywhere because of her dog.

The evidence showed that the complainant commented at the scene that the bus driver would not let her on the bus because of her dog, and the named officer asserted that the complainant commented about her dog at some point during the incident.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY**

**COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer discriminated against her because of her race.

The named officer stated that he did not racially discriminate against the complainant. He stated that the complainant's race did not factor in any decisions he made or any actions he took during the incident.

Body-worn camera footage did not show any evidence of biased policing or discrimination.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated they were inside their apartment when an officer driving a marked police vehicle rolled down the window of the car and asked an unhoused person to move out of a doorway. The officer then made inappropriate comments to the person. The officer exited the vehicle and observed the man from a distance, saying, "Don't stop" as the person gathered their belongings. The complainant was unable to identify the officer but did provide the vehicle number.

Department records did not show which officer was assigned to the vehicle on the date of the incident.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent two ID Polls to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the captain and/or station members to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) involved. The ID polls yielded negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer. The identity of the officer involved could not be established.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer used profanity when speaking to an unhoused person. The complainant was unable to identify the officer but did provide the vehicle number.

Department records did not show which officer was assigned to the vehicle on the date of the incident.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent two ID Polls to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Captain and/or station

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/11/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

members to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) involved. The ID poll yielded negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer. The identity of the officer involved could not be established.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated they asked the officer to provide their name and badge number, but the officer refused. The complainant was unable to identify the officer but did provide the vehicle number.

Department records did not show which officer was assigned to the vehicle on the date of the incident.

Because the complainant could not identify the specific officer involved in the interaction, DPA sent two ID Polls to the district station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks the Captain and/or station members to review the incident description and identify the officer(s) involved. The ID polls yielded negative results. Therefore, there was insufficient information to identify the officer. The identity of the officer involved could not be established.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/14/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he left voice messages at a specialized unit of the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), but did not receive a call back.

In reviewing the complaint, the Department of Police Accountability (DPA) learned that the specialized unit had undergone a change of leadership and neither the former captain nor the acting captain had received a message. The acting captain of the unit reached out to the complainant shortly thereafter and connected the complainant with a lieutenant working on his case. The complainant and lieutenant have been in communication since that time.

There was insufficient evidence to identify the officer responsible to take any required action as described.

No Finding is made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer did not investigate a domestic violence incident properly, which led to him incorrectly being blamed and arrested.

SFPD documents showed that the complainant was arrested as the main aggressor for a domestic violence incident. The documents showed that the named officer interviewed both parties involved and an independent witness before deciding on what action to take and whom to arrest. The documents showed that officers checked for surveillance footage but were unable to access it at that time.

Body camera footage showed that the named officers spoke to both parties and obtained an account of the incident from both the complainant and the other party. The named officers also spoke to a witness. The witnesses account aligned more with the other party's account and showed the complainant as the aggressor in the incident. The witness also informed officers that he did not have access to the surveillance system for them to review it. The footage showed the officers collated the information they had collected and determined that the complainant was the aggressor and would be arrested.

The named officer did a full investigation with the information available on scene and made a decision based on that information.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The SFPD invaded a person's privacy.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the San Francisco Police Department violated his privacy by unlawfully wiretapping his phone.

DPA could not locate responsive records or any other evidence suggesting that the Department wiretapped the complainant.

The evidence proves that the conducted alleged did not occur or that the Department was not involved.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the Department, pursuant to corruption with certain entities, prevented him from filing police reports. The complainant highlighted a particular incident involving a dog bite wherein officers allegedly prevented him from filing a report. The complainant could not positively identify officers or provide dates of incidents.

DPA located several calls for service generated by the complainant. The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) reports reflecting such calls did not suggest that the Department prevented the complainant from filing reports when a report was merited. Additionally, despite several attempts, DPA was unable to locate said incident regarding a dog-bite.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer towed a vehicle without justification.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he had recently purchased a vehicle that broke down. He parked the vehicle on the street and remained in the vehicle overnight. He left the vehicle to search for his friend a few blocks away for assistance. He could not locate his friend and went back to his vehicle. When he returned, he observed a tow truck and the named officer searching his vehicle. They exchanged words and the officer informed him that his vehicle was blocking traffic and that his license was expired, warranting a tow. The complainant pleaded with the officer to cite him for the expired license but that it was not grounds to tow the vehicle. However, the named officer had the vehicle towed.

DPA was able to locate documentation reflecting the incident which reflected that the named officer conducted a hazard tow for said vehicle. However, additional evidence necessary to evaluate the incident such as body-worn camera (BWC) footage of the incident did not exist. Moreover, the named officer had since retired and DPA was thus unable to otherwise question him about said incident.

Without more evidence, DPA was unable to make a finding by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer searched his vehicle without justification.

When officers initiate a tow, officers are required to conduct an inventory search of the vehicle prior to transportation. Because DPA cannot determine whether the named officer was acting lawfully when he towed the vehicle (as mentioned above), DPA necessarily cannot determine whether the officer was justified in searching the vehicle.

Without more evidence, DPA was unable to make a finding by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer failed to provide him with documentation reflecting the tow. Due to this, he stated that the vehicle was sold at an auction by the time he learned where it was impounded.

As mentioned above, DPA was able to locate documentation reflecting the incident which reflected that the named officer conducted a hazard tow for said vehicle. However, additional evidence necessary to evaluate the incident such as BWC footage of the incident does not exist. Moreover, the named officer had since retired and DPA was thus unable to otherwise question him about said incident.

DPA understands the frustrations posed by having your vehicle sold. However, without more evidence, DPA was unable, by a preponderance of the evidence, to make a finding as to the officer's conduct.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed the named officer's actions were based on his race. As mentioned above, DPA was able to locate documentation pertaining to the incident which reflected that the named officer conducted a hazard tow for said vehicle. However, additional evidence necessary to evaluate the incident such as BWC footage of the incident did not exist. Moreover, the named officer had since retired and DPA was thus unable to otherwise question him about said incident.

Without more evidence, DPA was unable to make a finding by a preponderance of the evidence.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/2025**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Auto Return**

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

Tegsco LLC (SF Auto Return)  
450 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/30/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated officers came to her home and refused to document text messages on her cell phone from her granddaughter that the complainant believed were threatening and intimidating.

Named Officer #1 stated he read the first text message on the complainant's cell phone because the complainant said she only read the first message. Named Officer #1 interpreted that as the first message included the threatening message. Named Officer #1 stated that he did not write an incident report because, during the investigation, it was determined that no crime had occurred; however, the officer documented the call for service via the Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system.

Named Officer #2 stated she was not the primary investigating officer on scene. As such, she did not look at the complainant's cell phone or the text messages. Named Officer #1 was the investigating officer, and he read the text messages on the complainant's cell phone. An incident report was not written because her partner determined, during the investigation, that no crime had occurred. Her partner documented the incident via CAD.

The CAD record documented the incident. CAD shows that the two named officers responded to the complainant's residence on a C-priority call for service due to threats. The CAD comments state there was no merit to the threats and that the subject is "senile" per husband. The reporting party (RP) refused all further PD Action.

The body-worn camera evidence shows that the named officers arrived at the residence and were greeted at the front door by the complainant's husband, who informed the officers that the call was bogus. The husband explained that the complainant was upset with their granddaughter. The complainant mentioned that her 26-year-old granddaughter sent her threatening messages. Named Officer #1 read the message. The complainant told him that the messages were threatening and intimidating. Her granddaughter sent a message about cooking her bird. The complainant stated that the threats needed to be "documented." She informed the officers that she only looked at the first message and not the others. The complainant expressed concerns to the officers about her family and the grandchildren, mentioning that the grandchildren were taking drugs. Named Officer #1 returned the phone to the complainant and explained that the officers were documenting the incident. The officers agreed to document the incident in a CAD. Named Officer #1 then placed the form with the CAD number on the dresser and clarified to the complainant what he

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/30/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

was doing. The complainant became very agitated and belligerent. She yelled at the officers and ordered them to get out of her house, using repeated profanity and calling them derogatory names. The officers promptly exited the bedroom and closed the door behind them.

There was no evidence of neglecting duty for failing to take required action because the officers correctly determined that no crime had occurred, and an incident report was not necessary. The evidence showed that the officers acted professionally and documented the call for service in the CAD system. The BWC indicated that the complainant did not request the officers to write a report. The complainant became hostile towards the officers and ordered them to leave, and the officers complied.

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: 02/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in an online complaint that officers responded to her home regarding a prowler. She said that several responding officers laughed at and mocked her.

Named officer #1 denied that any officer mocked or made fun of the complainant. He stated that they initially had difficulty gaining entry to the apartment building, but once inside, they searched the unit. There were no signs of forced entry on the door frame, and the officers found nothing suspicious. The complainant asked how to reach the officers again, and he told her, "9-1-1."

Named officer #2 also denied that she or any other officers mocked or laughed at the complainant. She stated that the complainant asked what number she should call to reach the officers, and an officer responded, "9-1-1," at which time the complainant laughed. Upon leaving the unit, another officer indicated he would take the elevator down because he was "lazy," at which point Officer #2 laughed.

Named officer #3 similarly denied that officers mocked or laughed at the complainant. He too stated that the complainant laughed after an officer responded "9-1-1."

Named officer #4 also denied observing any officers on scene laughing at or mocking the complainant.

The computer-aided dispatch showed that the named officers responded to the complainant's apartment for an "A" priority call for service regarding a prowler. The complainant's partner had called police to report that the complainant had heard someone inside the apartment and barricaded herself in her room. Officers initially had difficulty gaining entry to the apartment building but responded to the unit and reported that the suspect was gone upon arrival, and there was no damage or anything missing.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) showed that the named officers responded to the complainant's apartment, spoke with her, and walked through the unit. There was no suspect present. At one point, the complainant asked whether there was a number she could reach the officers on if the prowling happened again, to which one of the officers responded, "9-1-1." Gentle laughter can be heard, including the complainant herself. As the officers were leaving the unit, some discussed among themselves taking the elevator versus the stairs and laughed in connection with this exchange regarding 'laziness'.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25   PAGE# 2 of 2**

The evidence proves that although officers can be heard laughing with the complainant, there was no indication that the officers were mocking or making fun of the complainant. The officers laughed after they exited the apartment, with no connection to the complainant.

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: 02/10/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he was walking across the street when he was struck by a vehicle that fled the scene. The complainant informed the responding officers that he believed a police officer was involved in the hit-and-run.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) conducted a comprehensive computer-based investigation using the limited information available to verify the incident and gather additional evidence. However, the DPA did not find any previous reports of a hit-and-run collision involving the complainant, and the search yielded no results.

The DPA attempted to contact the complainant for further information, but he did not respond. Due to the lack of sufficient details, the officer involved could not be identified.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant has not received an update on the hit and run investigation.

The DPA conducted a comprehensive computer-based investigation using the limited information available in an attempt to verify the incident and obtain additional evidence. However, the DPA did not

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/10/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

find any previous reports of a hit-and-run collision involving the complainant, and the search yielded no results.

The DPA attempted to contact the complainant for further information, but he did not respond. Due to the lack of information, the officer involved could not be identified.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/18/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**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 said she was assaulted by one of her neighbors and reported it to the police. She later followed up with her building manager about accessing the security footage from the building and was advised that officers had not reviewed or collected any footage. The complainant stated that officers failed to review and obtain the footage for the investigation.

The named officer responded to the complainant's call-for-service and was the primary investigating officer for the initial investigation. He stated that he did not attempt to acquire and review any surveillance footage because it was late at night, the complainant did not have access to the footage, and he believed the manager, who would have access to the footage, was not on site. He noted in his incident report where the surveillance cameras were located and said that any further attempt to obtain the footage would be conducted by an investigator who may later be assigned to the case.

Department records showed that the named officer responded to this call in the very early morning, not during general operating or waking hours. The incident report showed that the named officer noted that there were surveillance cameras in the lobby of the building that may have captured the incident.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage for the incident showed that the named officer responded to the call, spoke with the complainant, and attempted to make contact with the suspect. BWC footage did not show any building manager present.

The evidence showed that the named officer responded to this call very early in the morning, was unable to access the footage at that time, and noted the location of the cameras in his report for any possible follow-up investigation. Provided with the totality of the circumstances, the named officer, who was the initial investigator, was not required by policy to take any further action to review or obtain any surveillance footage.

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: 02/18/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) failed to conduct proper follow-up investigation to collect video footage of her neighbor assaulting her and damaging her property. When the complainant followed up with Department about the report she made regarding the neighbor's attack, she was advised by an officer that the case was not being investigated further and that the Department prioritizes more serious cases.

Records showed that the complainant made a report regarding her neighbor assaulting her and damaging property. The reporting officer noted in the incident report that there were surveillance cameras in the lobby of the building that may have captured the incident.

Records showed that the case was not assigned for further investigation.

Under San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) policy, designated lieutenants have discretion to assign cases for further investigation. Staffing levels, the severity of the crime, and the presence or lack of physical evidence are some of the factors that can be considered when assigning cases. The fact that a reported crime was not assigned for further investigation is within SFPD 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: 02/22/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged the named officer drove unsafely and was involved in a collision.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) interviewed the named officer who was remorseful and admitted committing a traffic violation.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.05.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer engaged in an improper vehicle pursuit.

The DPA interviewed the named officer who was remorseful and admitted violating Department General Order 5.05, San Francisco Police Department's vehicle pursuit policy when the officer improperly activated his emergency lights.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/26/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he was alone and protesting in a business district in the early morning hours when an officer intervened. The complainant stated that the named officer, body slammed him multiple times.

The named officer denied using any force on the complainant. The named officer stated he tried to speak to the complainant, who was shouting in the street. The named officer was unsure what the complainant was shouting about and asked if he needed help. When the complainant did not reply, the officer stayed in the area until the complainant left.

There is no other evidence related to this incident. There was no video footage from nearby establishments or documentation of the use of force.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer got close to his face and screamed profanity at him.

The named officer denied using profanity toward the complainant. The named officer stated he tried to speak to the complainant, who was shouting in the street. When the complainant did not reply, the officer said he stayed in the area until the complainant left.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/26/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

There is no other evidence related to this incident. There is no video footage or documentation.

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

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer acted and spoke inappropriately to him.

The named officer denied behaving or speaking inappropriately towards the complainant. The named officer stated he tried to speak to the complainant who was shouting in the street. The officer said that when the complainant did not reply, he stayed in the area until the complainant left.

There is no other evidence related to this incident. There is no video footage or documentation.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer did not provide his name and badge number when requested.

The named officers denied this allegation and stated his name and badge number were both openly displayed on his chest. The named officer stated he tried to speak to the complainant who was shouting in the street. When the complainant did not reply, the officer stayed in the area until the complainant left.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/26/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

There is no other evidence related to this incident. There is no video footage or documentation.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/27/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** In an online complaint the complainant stated the officer made fun of their status as a victim of rape, human trafficking, and discrimination, in a phone conversation. The complainant did not cooperate with DPA's investigation; thus, DPA was unable to interview the complainant to determine what the officer said or did that give rise to the alleged conduct.

The named officer denied the allegation and stated he did not make fun of the complainant. The officer said he was working on an "on-call" status from home at the time the phone call occurred. The officer checked his voicemail and listened to a message from the complainant, who was upset about her case. Knowing that he would not be in the office for several days, he called the complainant to address her concerns, rather than leaving the complainant in limbo. The officer explained to the complainant the process for handling sexual assault cases in general. The named officer stated the complainant told him she was recording their entire conversation.

DPA made a written request to the complainant to provide any recordings of the phone call. The complainant did not respond to the request for evidence.

Department records showed that the case was assigned to a different member for investigation.

There is no evidence, such as a phone call recording, to corroborate or refute the different accounts.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2:** The officer was unfit for duty due to alcohol consumption.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/27/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged in an online complaint that it sounded like the officer may have been under the influence of drugs or alcohol, as the officer admitted to calling from home, and his speech was "slurred and very loud."

The named officer denied the allegation, stating he has not consumed alcohol in over 25 years and that he does not use drugs. The named officer noted that the complainant informed him she was recording their entire conversation.

DPA made a written request to the complainant to provide any recordings of the phone call. The complainant did not respond to the request for evidence.

There is no evidence, such as a phone recording, to corroborate or refute the different accounts.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer had been harassing her by calling her repeatedly and telling her to bring her mother to the police station or he would come to her house.

The named officer stated that he reached out to the complainant the day after a missing person case regarding the complainant's mother had been filed. He informed the complainant that her mother had been reported missing by her husband and was considered "at risk" due to her age and mental condition. The complainant advised the named officer that her mother was staying with her and was being well taken care of. The named officer explained that the complainant's mother needed to be seen by a law enforcement officer to be considered "found" and removed from the missing persons system. He clarified that law enforcement could either come to the complainant's home or that she could bring her mother to the police station. The complainant indicated that she would take her mother to the police station but ultimately did not do so. The named officer then called the complainant, during which she yelled at him, claimed that he was harassing her, and hung up. The named officer felt it was necessary to set up a call for service and have patrol units respond to the complainant's residence. At that time, the complainant's husband informed officers that the complainant's mother was not living with them. After several days of investigating the missing person at risk, the named officer contacted the complainant again, reiterating the need for her mother to be seen. The complainant began yelling at him once more. The named officer denied that he had ever threatened, intimidated, or harassed the complainant.

Department records showed that officers responded to the complainant's home, where the complainant's mother's husband informed them that his wife suffered from dementia and was not mobile. The husband indicated that he had been granted temporary conservatorship over his wife, but that she had been taken to the complainant's home, and he had not seen or spoken to her since. The officers rang the doorbell at the complainant's residence multiple times but received no answer. The husband expressed his desire to report his wife as missing. Officers contacted the local hospital, the medical examiner's office, and the jail, but were unsuccessful in locating the complainant's mother. Officers returned to the complainant's home and were told that the complainant's mother was not present. Subsequently, the case was assigned to the named officer for investigation. His investigation chronology indicated that he reviewed the police report, requested a well-being check at the complainant's residence, conducted a FaceTime call several

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

days later with the complainant, who would not allow her mother to be interviewed, contacted a protective services agency, and left a voice message for the complainant the following day.

Here, the named officer reached out to the complainant a few times, as needed, given the circumstances. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #2-3:** The officers intentionally damaged property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that officers came to her home and damaged her gate and window screen.

The named officers indicated that they responded to the complainant's home, where they met with the complainant's mother's husband, who requested that they file a missing person report. The husband described his wife as a gravely disabled senior citizen whom he had not spoken to or seen in several weeks. Attempts to contact the residents inside the complainant's house yielded negative results. Following this, at the direction of a superior officer, the officers returned to the complainant's home to conduct a well-being check on the complainant's mother. They noted an open second-story window and requested the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) to respond with a ladder. The officers left the method of entering the residence to the expertise of the SFFD. The SFFD placed a ladder under the second-story window and removed the window screen. They also used a tool to pry open the ground-level front gate. A resident emerged from the home and stated that the complainant's mother was not inside.

The incident report (authored by one of the named officers) was consistent with the named officers' accounts.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) was also consistent with the accounts of the named officers. The BWC revealed that no damage was caused to the screen. It was removed. However, there was damage to the metal security gate. The damage was caused by Fire Department personnel using a tool to force the gate open.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/28/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

Department General Order 6.10 (Missing Persons) provides that certain exigent circumstances require an immediate search by officers. Examples of such exigent circumstances include when the missing person is over the age of 75, and when the missing person is not able to care for his/her safety.

Department Notice 20-020 (Response to Well-Being Checks Not Involving Crisis Intervention) lists factors to consider when responding to a well-being check not involving individuals in mental health crisis and provides that time permitting and prior to making entry, which may involve property damage, members shall notify a supervisor to request approval.

Here, the named officers requested approval from a superior officer to attempt entry into the complainant's home to conduct a well-being check. There is no evidence that they intentionally damaged property. Officers requested assistance from Fire Department personnel to gain entry to the residence. The evidence showed that Fire Department personnel used a tool to force the gate open, causing damage to the gate. Fire Department personnel removed the screen from the upper window, and the screen was not damaged. The evidence shows that the named officers were not responsible for the damage caused to the gate. The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1**

**FINDING: Referral/SFFD**

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

San Francisco Fire Department  
698 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94107

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that her mother was involved in a car accident while using the complainant's car. The complainant went to the scene and spoke with the named officer who she described as rude and unhelpful.

The named officer denied being rude to the complainant. She stated that she offered to tow the complainant's vehicle several times. She issued the complainant a follow-up form with the case number for the traffic collision report and attempted to explain the insurance process to the complainant.

The traffic collision report reflected that a vehicle collision occurred, that the investigating officers took photos at the scene, and that based on the parties' statement the officers believed that the complainant's mother caused the collision and violated the vehicle code.

The named officer's body-worn camera (BWC) footage was consistent with the statement she provided to DPA.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer gave her a case number but failed to write a corresponding incident report.

The named officer stated that she prepared a traffic collision report at her district station later that same day. The report was approved by a higher-ranking member and sent to the records division. She noted that a copy can be obtained from police headquarters.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the corresponding traffic collision report that documented the officer's investigation of the incident.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/13/2025      PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1 - 3:** The officers failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was in a public bathroom when he had an altercation with a community ambassador. The complainant said the person had a gun inside the backpack and made threats to kill him. The person called 911 and told the dispatcher to send officers to the scene before he harmed or killed him and left before the responding officers arrived. The complainant said the named officers asked for the suspect. When he said that the person was no longer around, they told him to leave. The complainant said that before walking away, he asked named officer #2 if it was no longer illegal to assault or pull a gun on people. The complainant stated that the officer was unable to answer. He added that the officers just stood around without looking for the perpetrator.

Named Officer #1 stated that he remembered the complainant saying he had an altercation in the bathroom with an individual. He asked the complainant if he had a recording of the incident and if the suspect was still around. He stated that the complainant could not produce any recording and indicated that the suspect was no longer present. He asked the complainant how he could help, to which the latter replied, "Yeah, I don't give a \*expletive\*" and walked away, indicating that he did not want to pursue the investigation further. Named Officer #1 stated that he did not search for the suspect because the complainant had walked away and refused to cooperate, and he could not find any probable cause that a crime had occurred. He did not check for footage because the bathroom had no cameras, and there was no detailed description of the suspect other than that he was an African American male.

Named Officer #2 stated that since the suspect was no longer around, she asked the complainant if he could leave or move along to de-escalate the situation. She said the complainant complied and walked away. Named Officer #2 stated that the complainant did not specify what he wanted out of the situation or what course of action he wanted them to take. She said that a call back was made to the community ambassador in an attempt to reach him, but the call went to voicemail. She said they did not search for the perpetrator because the complainant provided a limited and vague description.

Named Officer #3 stated that after briefly talking to the complainant, he stepped away to let named officer #1 and named officer #2 handle the situation and asked dispatch to call the 911 caller to meet with them. Named Officer #3 said there was insufficient evidence for them to determine if a crime had occurred, the complainant made conflicting statements, and there was no corroborating evidence or

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/13/2025      PAGE# 2of 4**

witnesses. He stated that the suspect had not been identified and that he did not review the surveillance cameras because he was not responsible for investigating the incident.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained a body-worn camera video of the incident. The video appeared consistent with the named officers' statements. The complainant never requested any course of action from the named officers and moved along when asked. He also provided a general description of the alleged perpetrator, a large African American male, which made it challenging for the named officers to identify and locate the person. The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) record of the incident showed the named officers attempted to contact the person by phone to further their investigation, but the call went to voicemail.

The evidence suggests that the named officers investigated the incident, but they lacked sufficient information to conduct a thorough investigation.

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: 03/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/13/2025      PAGE# 3of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #4 - 5:** The officers failed to activate body-worn camera as required.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The facts from the previous section are hereby incorporated by reference. During the course of DPA's investigation, it was discovered that the named officers failed to activate their body-worn cameras.

Named Officer #1 acknowledged not activating her body-worn camera. She said it was unnecessary since no one was detained or arrested, the suspect had not been located, and the information the complainant had provided was insufficient for them to investigate.

Named Officer #2 stated that he did not activate his body-worn camera because no crime was reported and no one was detained.

DPA requested body-worn camera footage associated with the complainant's incident from SFPD Legal, which provided two video footage, one of which was that of named officer #2. Named Officer #2's video footage, however, pertains to the suspicious person incident. Nothing in the recording contained the incident involving the complainant. Additionally, the Department was unable to locate video footage from named officer #1 pertaining to the incident.

Department General Order 10.11, Body Worn Cameras, states in part:

**C. Authorized Use.** All on-scene members equipped with a BWC shall activate their BWC equipment to record in the following circumstances:

2. Consensual encounters where the member suspects that the member of the public may have knowledge of criminal activity as a suspect, witness, or victim, except as noted in Section 10.11.03, D.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/02/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/13/2025      PAGE# 4 of 4**

Failure to activate a BWC as outlined in this order shall subject a member to an administrative investigation and, if warranted, appropriate discipline.

Additionally, Department Notice 23-045, Activation of Body Worn Cameras, states, in part:

Members shall ensure the entire event is captured during all mandated recording circumstances or their involvement at the incident is completed.

- When responding to calls for service with a potential for law enforcement activity or any of the mandatory recording circumstances to occur, members shall begin recording by pressing the ***Event*** button while enroute and prior to arriving on scene. The purpose of this directive is to ensure that members are not distracted by the necessity of activating the BWC during a high-risk or rapidly unfolding event.

The evidence showed that the named officers responded to a high-priority fight call and spoke with the complainant, who was either the potential victim or a witness. The named officers asked the complainant questions in an attempt to determine if a crime had occurred and identify the suspect. Their actions were legitimate police activity. The failure to activate their body-worn cameras violated DGO 10.11 and DN23-045.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant left a business and saw a police officer with a police dog standing nearby. She passed by within a few feet of the officer and dog and the dog sniffed toward her not contacting her, while the officer was handing the leash loosely. She felt this was intimidating and terrifying.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) was unable to locate any evidence of the described event through a search of department records.

DPA sent identification polls to police divisions relevant to the described incident. No officer was identified through the polls. Therefore, there was insufficient information to conduct further investigation of the complaint.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/20/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she went to the police station to file a police report. She said the named officer, who was working at the front desk, asked her for her personal email and later provided her with a piece of paper containing his personal email through another male officer. She believed the named officer wanted to pick her up and establish a connection with her. She also alleged that the officer failed to follow the policies regarding the collection of crime-related evidence. The complainant provided an image of a piece of paper with a handwritten email. She stated that she did not file a police report because others had already done so.

The named officer confirmed, speaking with the complainant and provided her with a piece of paper via a PSA officer, which he initially believed to be his work email. He explained that he was distracted by a call over the PIC radio at the time and inadvertently wrote the incorrect suffix of “@gmail.com.” The officer stated that the incorrect email he wrote had never been his personal email. He does not remember asking for the complainant’s email address but indicated that it is standard practice for victims, witnesses, and reportees submitting evidence to do so via email.

Additionally, the named officer stated that the complainant had informed him she wanted to file a DPA complaint against him a few weeks prior. As soon as he realized the reportee was her, he asked the PSA officer to take the complainant’s report to de-escalate and avoid another stressful encounter. He denied trying to pick up the complainant or make any connection with her and asserted that such thoughts had never crossed his mind.

Department records show that the named officer did not have a personal email address on file. There were no other police records documenting the interaction.

The piece of paper provided by the complainant shows that the email address has the exact same prefix as the officer’s work email and a suffix of “@gmail.com.”

The DPA interviewed a witness who was also working at the front desk and witnessed the entire interaction. The witness stated that he received the piece of paper handed in by the named officer, which contained half the officer’s work email and half personal. He believed it was a typo made by the named officer. He also stated that a reportee’s email address is common information that officers typically request when someone files a police report.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/20/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the email address received by the complainant was merely an error made by the named officer. There was insufficient evidence to prove that the named officer wanted to make a connection with the complainant or mishandled evidence by providing his personal email address.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 03/31/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**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: 04/01/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated in a report to the San Francisco 311 system that he believed the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) had assisted gang members against him in a plot to harass and kill him. He included no information identifying an officer involved and did not respond to correspondence requesting additional necessary evidence.

DPA was unable to independently identify the officers based on information provided in the referred complaint, which did not describe the officers. The complainant did not respond to multiple requests for more information, and thus there was insufficient information to investigate the complaint.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 4/3/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant reported that they were cited by the named officer for committing a traffic violation. The complainant was upset because they believed they were singled out by the named officer because the complainant witnessed other drivers speeding and believed the named officer should have cited those drivers as well.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) reviewed documents detailing the traffic stops conducted by the named officer on the date of the incident and relevant body-worn camera footage. The evidence showed that the named officer conducted several traffic stops on the date of the occurrence. As a result of those traffic stops, the named officer also issued traffic citations to each of the drivers that had a violation. The named officer's body-worn camera footage showed that the named officer treated each driver respectfully and with courtesy. The named officer explained the basis for each traffic stop, the violation committed, and information on how to resolve the citations. Furthermore, the complainant did not dispute the offense.

Department General Order 9.01 instructs officers to act on moving violations of all applicable laws, regulations, and policies, while considering the totality of the circumstances, in any of the following circumstances, except any violations deprioritized in DGO 9.07.04, *Restricting the Use of Pretext Stops*. (DGO 9.01.03.A.2.)

The investigation showed that the complainant was one of many who were issued a traffic citation for violating the rules of the road. The complainant acknowledged that they committed a traffic violation and did not dispute it with the named officer. Furthermore, the officer's records showed that he was assigned to ensure that drivers were obeying the rules of the road. The complainant did not provide the DPA with any contact information or additional context regarding their complainant, other than the belief they were singled out by the named officer.

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

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: M**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and a representative for San Francisco Police Department, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on June 18, 2025.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that she called 911 to request that her spouse be placed on an involuntary “5150” mental health hold so she could take custody of their child. Instead, the officers arrested her spouse for domestic violence. The complainant stated that she did not want her spouse arrested and alleged that the officers failed to take appropriate action by not following her request to detain her spouse for mental health assessment.

Department General Order 6.09 requires officers to identify the dominant aggressor, obtain statements from both the victim and the suspect, and make an arrest if there is probable cause to believe that a battery has occurred between current or former spouses.

Department General Order 6.14 outlines the criteria for involuntary detentions as stated in the Welfare & Institutions Code § 5150(a). This code specifies that when a person, due to a mental health disorder, poses a danger to themselves or others, or is gravely disabled, a peace officer may take or cause that person to be taken into custody for up to 72 hours for assessment, evaluation, and crisis intervention, or for placement and treatment at a facility.

The body-worn camera footage and the incident report revealed that a thorough investigation was conducted. The footage confirmed that the officers addressed the complainant's concerns regarding her spouse's mental health and concluded that her spouse did not meet the criteria for involuntary detention for 72 hours. However, they determined there was probable cause to arrest the complainant's spouse for domestic violence.

The evidence confirms that the officers’ actions were proper. The additional concerns raised by the complainant were outside the scope of the Department of Police Accountability's investigative authority, as defined in the San Francisco City Charter.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/15/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he went to the station to file a report about being poisoned and asked to speak with a sergeant there. He stated that a sergeant who worked on that date refused to see him. He also wanted to complain about the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) for not investigating food and water poisoning.

There are SFPD policies regarding Assault with Poisoning, including its routing process and documentation procedures for such incidents.

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

There were no witnesses at the time of the incident.

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

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The 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: 04/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 3**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to obtain video surveillance footage in a timely manner, thereby preventing the arrest of the suspect. The complainant contacted the property owner, who showed him video surveillance footage that captured the incident, and the complainant recorded it with his cell phone. The complainant stated that the named officer informed him that he required the raw video footage and that he would dispatch an officer to retrieve it from the property owner. The complainant stated that the officer later informed him he was unable to obtain a video retrieval officer to attend the location, as no officer was available.

The named officer stated the complainant contacted the general phone number for the SFPD Burglary Unit on April 2, 2025. The complainant informed him that he had made a report on March 22, 2025, regarding his vehicle being broken into. The complainant provided him with the name and an email address for an individual who would be able to provide video surveillance footage that captured the incident. The officer stated that he told the complainant he would attempt to send a video retrieval officer to obtain the video footage. The officer stated he never told the complainant that the raw video footage was needed to move forward with an investigation. Raw video footage can sometimes be enhanced to better reveal characteristics, features, or clothing of the suspect(s) or possible vehicle(s) associated with the incident. Emails were exchanged among the complainant, the named officer, and the person who had the video. The individual who had access to the video was only available to meet on one day, before 1030 hours, and after 1530 hours. The named officer was unable to arrange for a video retrieval officer to go out on that day. However, the officer stated that the complainant provided the video he recorded on his cell phone, which was documented in a supplemental report, and that video is currently in evidence. An assignment officer reviews all cases that reach the Burglary unit before being assigned to an investigator for further investigation. Not all cases reviewed are assigned for additional follow-up. The officer stated that the incident has not been assigned for follow-up. The officer also indicated that he is not responsible for assigning cases.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) record shows that on March 22, 2025, at 0733 hours, the complainant reported to the police that his vehicle had been broken into. Department records indicate that a police report was written documenting the theft of a backpack, items of clothing, mail, and a padlock

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

from the complainant's parked and locked vehicle. The suspect was unknown. A supplemental incident report was prepared on March 27, 2025, documenting that the complainant went to the station and provided video footage of the theft from the locked vehicle incident. The complainant emailed the video footage to the reporting officer, but due to its size, the officer recorded it via a Department-approved cell phone. The footage was saved onto a CD as evidence. The surveillance video shows an adult male wearing a baseball cap and a sweatshirt approach the vehicle and look inside quickly. He then walks away. The adult male returns to the car a short time later, breaking the rear passenger window on the driver's side of the vehicle. He then opens the rear passenger door and the trunk lid. He removes a dark colored backpack from the trunk, closes the trunk lid and the door, and walks away with the backpack.

The case was not assigned for further investigation, thus there was no Chronological of Investigation available.

Emails were exchanged between the named officer and the complainant. The emails corroborate the named officer's account of the incident and that the videos would be erased on April 4, 2025. On April 5, 2025, the named officer sent an email to the individual advising that due to schedules, staffing, and other events in San Francisco, he was unable to schedule a video retrieval officer to set up a time. The complainant responded to the officer, expressing his dissatisfaction that he had not obtained the video, and that the car burglar was still at large.

Department Bulletin No. 20-107, Case Assignment for Investigation, states, in part:

It is the policy of the San Francisco Police Department to diligently investigate crimes in order to arrest and prosecute those responsible. However, the Department must manage its resources in a reasonable, effective, and efficient manner.

When assigned cases for investigation, staffing levels and the following factors should be considered:

- The severity of the crime (violence during the commission of a crime is a major contributor to the severity of the crime).
- The solvability of the crime.
- The presence or lack of physical evidence.
- The presence or lack of video footage.
- The victim(s) or witness(es) willingness or reluctance to cooperate with the investigation (the lack of cooperation by a victim or witness does not automatically disqualify the case from being successfully investigated and prosecuted).

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/17/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 3**

- The victim(s) or witness(es) ability to appear in court.
- Other articulable reason for assignment.

Cases warranting investigation under these criteria shall be assigned to a specific Investigator. The remaining unassigned cases will be administratively filed as Open/Inactive and may be activated at the discretion of the Lieutenant when new information is presented related to the above list of factors.

The DPA recognizes that the complainant is frustrated that the officer was unable to send a video retrieval officer to obtain the raw footage. However, the department has limited resources to have officers perform video retrieval, and the case does not currently meet the criteria for a follow-up investigation. The case was not assigned to the named officer for follow-up investigation. Accordingly, the named officer was not required to obtain the raw footage, and it was not necessary for the investigation. The video was recorded at the station on a department-issued cellphone and saved to a CD, which was booked into evidence. A preponderance of the evidence established that the named did not fail to take required action. The case remains in open/active status.

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated police detained her nephew because the mother of his child claimed he had a gun, which was not true. She said she was informed that officers used excessive force by slamming him down and injuring his mouth. She stated she was not present.

The Department of Police Accountability attempted to interview the subject of the complaint. However, he failed to respond.

Department records indicate the police responded to a call for service regarding a domestic violence incident involving a firearm. The complainant's nephew was identified as the suspect.

Body-worn camera footage does not show officers using any force on the complainant's nephew. The footage also does not show any injury to the mouth or otherwise to the complainant's nephew as alleged.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #5-8:** The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that a relative was on the phone with her nephew during police contact. She alleged that the relative asked for the officers' badge numbers while they were on the phone; however, the officers failed to provide them.

The relative stated he did not have a chance to ask for the officers' badge numbers while on the phone.

Department records indicate the relative called dispatch who provided him with the officers' names and badge numbers.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/21/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

The body-worn camera did not show or record anyone asking for the officers' names or badge numbers.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #9-12:** The officers failed to activate their body-worn cameras as required.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officers did not activate their body-worn cameras because the blinking light was not visible. She said she was not present at the time of the incident, but this information was relayed to her.

Department records indicate the police responded to a call for service regarding a domestic violence incident involving a firearm. The complainant's nephew was identified as the suspect.

The Department of Police Accountability obtained footage from body-worn cameras.

The named officers followed Department Policy by activating their body-worn cameras.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated his stolen vehicle was recovered in San Francisco. He said he was unable to retrieve his vehicle because the named officer failed to return his numerous phone calls.

The named officer stated that he contacted the complainant by phone the day after being assigned to the case. During the call, the complainant provided his email address. The named officer further stated that he did not receive any subsequent communication from the complainant.

Department records show that the San Francisco Police Department recovered the complainant's vehicle.

The statements of the named officer and the complainant are in contradiction with one another. However, not returning phone calls does not constitute a breach of discipline.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      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 that he contacted Dispatch to report several illegally parked vehicles. Thereafter, he observed a police vehicle driving by without doing anything to address the issue.

DPA located several calls for services generated by the complainant on said date. The Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) reports reflecting such calls did not show that SFPD was dispatched by the Department of Emergency Management (DEM). The Lieutenant for the district station also reviewed the CAD reports and confirmed that SFPD was not dispatched regarding the calls and stated that these types of calls did not fall within SFPD jurisdiction. He explained that the calls were either canceled prior to any SFPD involvement or the calls were transferred by DEM to the Municipal Transit Agency.

Thus, any such perceived misconduct by the SFPD officers who drove by was proper as the officers were not summoned to the call and did not have a duty to act.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed a complaint alleging that the police department placed a wiretap on his phone. The complainant admitted that he did not have any evidence to support this claim but felt they had done so.

DPA's investigation did not locate any evidence to suggest that the Department wiretapped the complainant's phone or otherwise had any open/active investigations into the complainant.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/26/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/01/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF/W**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer denied him and his disabled wife access to the wheelchair drop off zone at the San Francisco International Airport and ordered them to move their car. The complainant later requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/06/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/SFPD IAD**

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

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/San Mateo County Sheriff's**

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

San Mateo County Sheriff  
C/O Investigations Bureau - S.F.I.A.  
400 County Center  
Redwood City, CA 94063  
United States

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** In an email complaint, the complainant explained that an officer was cruel to them. The officer made light of their disability, and he seemed to become irrationally upset for knowing their rights. The complainant attached four YouTube videos as supporting evidence.

DPA reviewed the video evidence provided by the complainant. The first two videos do not show the complainant's interaction with the named officer. Instead, these videos feature the complainant interacting with mall security personnel in a confrontational manner, arguing with them. Mall security requested that the complainant leave the premises, but the complainant refused. The complainant can be heard telling security to call the police and is verbally abusive towards them, using derogatory names and claiming they would get them fired, mentioning a \$100,000 lawsuit. The other two videos partially capture the officer's interaction with the complainant. The officer remains professional throughout their dealings with the complainant. Both the complainant and their partner accuse the officer of violating the complainant's ADA rights and lacking sensitivity towards the complainant's mental disability. The complainant informs the officer that they wish to file a report against mall security for allegedly violating their ADA rights and mistreating them. The officer informed the complainant that they were trespassing and needed to leave; if they did not comply, they could be arrested.

The computer-aided dispatch (CAD) indicated that the named officer responded to a shopping mall for a "C" priority call regarding a trespasser. The reporting party requested assistance in removing a trespasser. The CAD records that the officer arrived at the location and filed a report. The officer was on scene for about 20 minutes.

The incident report documents that the officer spoke with a security guard who informed him that the complainant was panhandling in front of the shopping center. The security guard asked the complainant to leave the property, but the complainant refused. Security requested that the officer contact the complainant and advise them of the trespass. The officer then spoke with the complainant and informed them that they were trespassing and needed to leave the premises. The complainant stated that they were mentally disabled and claimed the security guard was rude. The complainant explained that they were attempting to record a message on their phone when the security guard interrupted them, asking them to leave. The complainant asserted that they felt the security guard had violated their ADA rights and

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

requested that the officer document the incident. The officer advised the complainant that the mall was private property and that security had the right to ask the complainant to leave. If they did not leave, legal action could be initiated against them. The complainant told the officer that they were leaving and would not return. The officer permitted the complainant to walk to a nearby bus stop and wait there.

Body-worn camera footage (BWC) showed that the complainant told the officer they had sat down to play their guitar away from everyone after getting a coffee, and that they were not trying to make money there. The complainant told the officer the person with the hat was being "ridiculous" towards them. The complainant was upset with security for yelling at a mentally disabled person. The BWC corroborates what is documented in the incident report. The complainant told the officer he wanted a record of the incident because the security guard had asked them to leave and was being incredibly rude. They wanted it documented that the security guard's behavior toward them was demeaning to their disability. The security guard informed the officer that he had instructed the complainant to remove a sign they had displayed, asking for money, but the complainant refused to comply. The officer was calm and professional when speaking to the complainant. The officer asked for the complainant's identification so that he could prepare an incident report.

The video evidence proves there was no improper conduct by the officer. The complainant was trespassing on private property, asked to leave, and refused. Security personnel called the police. The officer responded and explained the situation to the complainant, who then agreed to go, but not before becoming upset with the officer. The officer de-escalated the situation and took a report. The officer acted in a professional manner during the encounter. Nothing the officer said to the complainant rises to improper conduct.

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: 05/05/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** In an anonymous online complaint, the complainant stated that the officer “asserted authority that is far beyond that of the SFPD and that the officer suggested that he was in charge of your ability to protest, which is a clear violation of the 1st Amendment”.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to a call for service regarding a person with a knife. The reporting party told the dispatcher they were recording protestors, and a protester brandished a knife.

The body-worn camera (BWC) shows the named officer and his partner speaking with the reporting party. The reporting party showed officers a cellphone video of the incident. After watching the entire video, both officers explained that the cellphone video did not show that the other party threatened the reporting party with a knife. The officers correctly explained to the reporting party that having a knife in public is permitted, although threatening someone with a knife is illegal. The officers told the complainant that the video showed that the other party never threatened him with the knife or pointed it at him. The reporting party told the officers that someone had handed the guy a knife. The officers commented that the video shows no one gave the other party the knife. The other party had it in his hand and was holding drumsticks at the same time; he dropped the knife on the ground and then picked it up. The reporting party was upset about the altercation and felt officers were not listening to him. The reporting party requested that the named officer speak to the other party and instruct him to leave them alone. The named officer contacted the other party, who was cooperative, and told the officer he did not threaten the reporting party with the knife. He saw the knife lying on top of something, and the knife was open. He thought it was dangerous, so he picked it up to discard it in the trash. He then accidentally dropped the knife. He told the officers he disposed of the knife in a trash can. The reporting party accused him of threatening him with a knife and overreacted. The other party stated that the reporting party had gotten very close to them and was filming the license plates of protestors.

The BWC shows the named officer acted in a professional manner and did not engage in any inappropriate behavior or comments when interacting with the reporting party. The named officer did not interfere with the reporting party’s First Amendment rights. The video shows the named officer telling the reporting party several times that he has the right to be there and protest. They just did not want the situation to escalate between him and the other party.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**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: 05/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer towed a vehicle without justification.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF/W**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant submitted an online complaint about his vehicle being towed and later requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/14/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer failed to take her daughter to be evaluated and did not return a call regarding the incident.

Department records indicate that the named officer responded to a call from a Mobile Crisis Unit for service. The CAD showed that the Crisis Unit requested the officer to conduct a hold under the Health and Welfare Code. The records subsequently indicated that the Mobile Crisis Unit completed the process.

Body Worn-Camera (BWC) displayed that the named officer arrived on scene to support the Mobile Crisis Unit. BWC showed that the named officer informed the complainant she was to be taken to the hospital.

The evidence showed that the named officer arrived at the scene and supported the Crisis Unit as it conducted its service. While the complainant requested that her daughter be taken for evaluation instead of the complainant and requested a call back, the request was not a requirement of the named officer's duties.

The evidence proved that the misconduct alleged in the complaint did not occur.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/13/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/19/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      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: 05/19/2025 COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025      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: 05/19/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/12/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was riding his bicycle to work. As he made a left turn using the bicycle lane, a delivery driver behind him did the same, but was on the regular lane of traffic while making the turn. An officer in an SUV used his speaker to instruct the driver to move to the bicycle lane. The driver did not understand what the officer had said and failed to move into the bicycle lane. The officer followed the driver and stopped next to him. The officer aggressively told the driver that he should be in the bicycle lane and drove away.

There were no recordings or witnesses pertaining to the incident.

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

The officer could not be reasonably identified.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer prepared an inaccurate incident report when he referred to the suspect as a “caregiver,” when in fact she was a “housekeeper.” She stated that the suspect did not provide personal care services but only assisted with household tasks. She noted that the title of “caregiver” showed that the named officer was more sympathetic towards the suspect.

Department records indicate the named officer authored a report regarding a mutual assault between the complainant and a suspect. It was noted that the complainant reported she was assaulted by her “caregiver.”

Department of Emergency Management records document that the complainant called 911 and reported that she was assaulted by her “caregiver.” The records refer to the suspect as the “caregiver” throughout.

The named officer did not violate Department policy by referring to the suspect as a “caregiver.” The terms “caregiver” and “housekeeper” are a matter of semantics and, on its face, are not misconduct.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The anonymous complainant, who wished not to be contacted, alleged, "Police abuse and abuse of authority" without providing any further identifying details regarding the incident.

The Department of Police Accountability was unable to interview the complainant to obtain clarifying information.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/23/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer treated him like a criminal.

The complainant failed to provide additional information requested that would assist in the identification of the responsible officer.

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/23/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DEM**

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

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/25/25      COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DEM**

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

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

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/MTA**

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

SFMTA – Permits, Parking, and Citations  
11 So. Van Ness Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/28/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/09/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** UA

**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: 05/27/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SFSD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was 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: 05/30/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25      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: 05/22/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** 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 Office  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/22/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** 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 Office  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/30/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25**

**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:

DEM Division of Emergency Communications  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco  
CA 94102

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 05/30/25      COMPLETION DATE: 06/03/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

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

San Francisco Recreation & Parks Department  
SF Park Patrol Rangers  
501 Stanyan Street  
San Francisco, CA 94117

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/01/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/04/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

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

Vacaville Police Department  
660 Merchant Street  
Vacaville, CA 95688

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/12/2025      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: 06/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/12/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was at a Muni train station platform when he saw a man walk in playing loud music. He also saw a police officer and a Muni staff member dealing with an unconscious person. The complainant stated that the man continued playing loud music, disturbing him and others, and the officer took no action to stop him.

There were no witnesses identified.

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

The officer could not be reasonably identified.

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/23/25**

**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: 06/04/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/SFSO IA**

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

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



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/SFSO IA**

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

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/5/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/11/25**

**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: 06/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** NF

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that something was not handled correctly. The complainant did not provide further details and noted the incident happened in the future.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) attempted to contact the complainant; however, the complainant failed to follow up and provide additional requested information that would assist in identifying the incident and the responsible officer(s).

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officers entered her residence and “snooped” in her house to look for stolen mail. She said she had given them permission; however, she had allowed them to do so to prove her innocence.

Department records indicate that the complainant’s tenant called the police to report that the complainant (the landlord) had stolen his mail.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers speaking with the tenant, who alleged that the complainant had stolen his mail, which contained an identification card as well as a rotisserie chicken he had recently purchased. The named officers then spoke with the complainant, who admitted taking and eating the tenant’s rotisserie chicken but denied stealing his mail. The complainant explicitly invited the named officers multiple times into her residence and asked them to go through her mail, which they did. The footage does not show the named officers pressuring the complainant to enter her residence; in fact, she willingly invited them to do so. The named officers were unable to locate the tenant’s mail. The footage then showed the complainant demanding that named officer #1 search the tenant’s belongings in the garage for her stolen mail. Named Officer #1 informed the complainant that they would not conduct a search of the tenant’s property unless they had a warrant or the tenant consented.

Evidence shows that the named officers did not violate Department Policy, as the complainant explicitly allowed officers inside her home and asked them to go through her mail.

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: 06/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated she demanded the named officer to search her tenant's property to find her stolen mail.

Department records indicate that the complainant's tenant called the police to report that the complainant (the landlord) had stolen his mail.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officers speaking with the tenant, who alleged that the complainant stole his mail, which contained an identification card as well as a rotisserie chicken he had recently purchased. The named officers then spoke with the complainant, who admitted taking and eating the tenant's rotisserie chicken but denied stealing his mail. The complainant explicitly invited the named officers multiple times into her residence and asked them to go through her mail, which they did. The footage does not show the named officers pressuring the complainant to enter her residence; in fact, she willingly invited them to do so. The named officers were unable to locate the tenant's mail. The footage then showed the complainant demanding that named officer #1 search the tenant's belongings in the garage for her stolen mail. Named Officer #1 informed the complainant that they would not conduct a search of the tenant's property unless they had a warrant or the tenant consented.

Evidence shows that the named officers followed Department policy by not violating the tenant's Fourth Amendment Right against unlawful search and seizure, as they did not have probable cause to support a warrant that would justify a lawful search.

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: 06/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she called the police station, and whoever answered the phone hung up on her. She said she did not know the officer's identity.

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

The identity of the alleged officer could not be established.

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

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/23/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

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

Napa Sheriff's Office  
1535 Airport Blvd.  
Napa, CA 94558



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/BART**

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

BART Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
101 8th Street  
Oakland, CA 94607

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/09/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/10/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1**

**FINDING: Referral/Mission Station**

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

Mission Station  
630 Valencia Street  
San Francisco, CA 94110

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Referral/DPH**

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

San Francisco Department of Public Health  
101 Grove Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
United States

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/12/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the department as a whole has not approved his reports.

Department records contain no incident report made by the complainant within the time frame given. Two calls linked to the complainant's address were closed without the police being informed or dispatched.

There is no evidence that the complainant was in contact with or reported any crime to SFPD.

The evidence fails to identify an involved officer or to prove or disprove the alleged conduct occurred.

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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      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: 06/16/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/27/25      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: 06/17/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25      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 Office  
Internal Affairs  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

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

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

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/19/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

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

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO-1**

**FINDING: IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to the San Francisco Police Department.



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

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/16/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 06/24/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** 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 Office  
25 Van Ness Avenue, Room 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102